İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa in the Age of the Households: A Study of the İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa Printing Press in Relation to Nevşehirli Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha and the 1718-1730 Period of Ottoman History

SAN SOYER

Institute of Islamic Studies, McGill University, Montreal

December 2019

A thesis submitted to McGill University in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Arts

İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa in the Age of the Households: A Study of the İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa Printing Press in Relation to Nevşehirli Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha and the 1718-1730 Period of Ottoman History

by

San Soyer

Abstract

The first Ottoman-Turkish printing press was established by İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa and Yirmisekizçelebizāde Meḥmed Saʿīd Efendi in 1727, and the first eight books printed by this press were issued in 1729 and 1730. Since the 1970s and 1980s, the Müteferriḳa press has been the subject of a variety of new historiographical analyses that have challenged the previously established conceptualization of Müteferriḳa's enterprise as an early instance of Ottoman Westernization, yet they have not sufficiently addressed the immediate sociocultural contemporaneity of İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa. This study argues that the Müteferriḳa press constitutes a single, seminal component of a broader intellectual program that emerged within the courtly culture of the socioeconomic elite of the early eighteenth century Ottoman capital and included besides Müteferriḳa's press, the 1720-1721 Ottoman embassy to France and the translation movement organized by the grand vizier Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha. The program was directed at rendering into the language of Ottoman-Turkish (through composition, translation, and publication) texts that contained mostly historiographical information on certain geographical regions beyond the Ottoman domain. Taking the 1718-1730 period as a distinct unit of historical inquiry shaped, structured, and characterized by the overwhelming dominance over the Ottoman political center of the household establishment of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha, this paper approaches the Müteferriḳa press through a study of the intellectual culture and social environment that comprised its immediate context. The intellectual culture of the 1718-1730 period was marked by an idiosyncratic openness to foreign realms and historiographies, while the social environment was formed by a bureaucratized elite bound by patron-client relationships that were interlaced into overlapping and factionalised household establishments.

Thesis Supervisor: Aslıhan Gürbüzel

Résumé

La première presse typographique Turc-Ottoman a été créée par İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa et Yirmisekizçelebizāde Meḥmed Said Efendi en 1727, et les huit premiers livres imprimés par cette presse ont été imprimés en 1729 et 1730. Depuis les années 1970 et 1980, la presse d'imprimerie Müteferriḳa a été analysée de différentes manières par les historiens. Ces analyses ont contesté le concept que la presse d'imprimerie Müteferriḳa représente l'occidentalisation. Mais ils n'ont pas suffisamment étudié le contexte socioculturel immédiat de Müteferriḳa. Cette thèse affirme que la presse d'imprimerie Müteferriḳa constitue une seule pièce importante d'un programme intellectuel plus large qui a émergé dans la culture courtoise de la capitale ottomane du début du XVIIIe siècle. Ce programme comprenait également la délégation diplomatique Ottomane 1720-1721 en France et le mouvement de traduction de grand vizir Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha. Ce programme a essayé de rendre en Turc-Ottoman des textes contenant principalement des informations historiographiques sur certaines régions en dehors de l'Empire Ottoman. Pour cette étude, la période 1718-1730 représente une unité distincte de recherche historique qui a été formée et influencée par la domination stable sur le centre politique Ottomane du faction Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha. Cet article s'approche la presse d'imprimerie Müteferriḳa au moyen d'une étude de la culture intellectuelle et de l'environnement social de son contexte immédiat. La culture intellectuelle de la période 1718-1730 a été déterminée par un intérêt particulier pour les terres et les historiographies étrangères. L'environnement social a été formé par une élite socio-économique bureaucratisée divisée en factions.

Directeur de thèse: Aslıhan Gürbüzel

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments

I would first like to thank my supervisor Professor Aslıhan Gürbüzel for her support and guidance throughout the entirety of my graduate studies at McGill University. Her advice was fundamental in leading me to the sources and the texts used in this study, and it was also through the many classes that we had together that I came to be interested in and focus on the social elite of the early eighteenth century Ottoman capital. I am moreover indebted to her for the patient and enduring concern with which she reviewed the drafts of the chapters of this thesis.

I am also grateful to Professor Faith Wallis whose detailed remarks, criticism, and careful analysis contributed significantly to the completion of my work, and allowed for a more comprehensive study of Müteferriḳa's press to be achieved. Her evaluation of the first draft of this thesis was not only constructive but also greatly encouraging.

I need also to acknowledge Professor Malek Abisaab, whose guidance and support were indispensable in my transition to graduate studies at the Institute of Islamic Studies. It was also under Professor Abisaab that I was granted my first opportunity to work independently on a research project in Ottoman studies, in the final year preceding my MA.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to Professor Catherine LeGrand, under whose supervision and with whose help I was introduced for the first time, as an undergraduate, to the experience of working on a long-term research assignment. It was in her seminar that I began to understand the methods by which the process of historical inquiry may be applied in seeking to discern the intellectual framework of meanings inhabited by a certain social community. That experience and what it has taught me has remained with me ever since and has enabled and in a manner inspired the work contained in this thesis.

<div align="center"><u>Introduction</u></div>

This thesis examines the adaptation in the early eighteenth century of a European technological contraption, the printing press, into an Ottoman intellectual, social, and cultural context. It is an attempt to understand the indigenous Ottoman dynamics which enabled, invited, legitimized and brought about the assimilation of print technology into the scholarly culture of Ottoman Turkish and it furthermore applies an approach that is predicated on the assertion that such a study, prioritizing the qualities and particularities of the specific contemporaneity of the İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa printing press, has fallen through the interstices of both general Ottoman historiography and the historiography of print culture in the Ottoman empire. This "specific contemporaneity" refers explicitly to the grand vizierate of Nevşehirli Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha (d.1730), which lasted from 1718 to 1730 and which constitutes an extended moment of Ottoman history characterized by the unbroken exercise of political hegemony by a single household faction in the Ottoman imperial center. The contention of this thesis is that the Müteferriḳa press was the product of an intellectual-cultural environment characterized primarily by what this study, borrowing a term from the historian of Ottoman architecture Shirine Hamadeh, has termed "intellectual *décloisonnement*," and which can briefly be defined as the opening out of the intellectual culture of the Ottoman capital to foreign texts, ideas, and aesthetics in innovative forms in which the foreign and the local were synthesized.[1] Notably, this was a process characterized by the absence of any perceptions of deficiency or superiority between different cultural spheres. Alongside the opening out of Ottoman intellectual interests in the early eighteenth century there emerged also a growing focus on the *adāb* fields of knowledge; this intellectual-cultural environment, inhabited and patronized by the central Ottoman elite of the capital, was further informed by an approach to the cultural value of knowledge in which the exhibition of knowledge had become a conspicuous manner of asserting social identity.[2]

It is further maintained in this paper that the Müteferriḳa press was part of a broader program which unfolded within the context of a particular web of interpersonal relationships between key Ottoman statesmen and scribal bureaucrats attached to or associated with the great household (*mükemmel kapı*) of the grand vizier Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha. The cultural sensibilities

---

[1] Shirine Hamadeh, *The City's Pleasures: Istanbul in the Eighteenth Century* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2008).

[2] The "*adāb* fields of knowledge" referred to here are used in this study to indicate the literary and scholarly intellectual pursuits of the Ottoman literate classes that were outside of the scope of theological and scriptural studies, but which were nonetheless conceptualized within scriptural contexts. In particular, the *adāb* sciences encompass the fields of historiography, epistolography, biography, and lexicography. They are to be distinguished from the Islamic religious sciences of Quran-interpretation, hadith-studies, jurisprudence, and systematic theology (*kelam*).

and intellectual consciousness of these individuals both shaped and proceeded from the intellectual environment briefly outlined above. The "broader program" which they subsidized, organized, administered, justified and defended, desired and consumed, was focused on gathering geographic, historiographic, diplomatic, zoological and technical information on certain regions beyond the Ottoman domain, namely Persia, Austria, France, China, and the Americas. The Müteferriḳa press must be seen therefore as an element of this broader program of translation and composition, the two other fundamental elements of which were the translation committees set up by Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha, and the 1720-1721 Ottoman embassy to France.

The abovementioned concept of intellectual *dêcloisonnement*, in articulating a form of broad and pervasive cultural exchange devoid of any dynamics of domination, where the incorporation of foreign cultural products into the native environment is not defined by a consciousness of remedying intellectual, cultural, or technological inadequacy, necessarily engages with and rejects the decline paradigm of Ottoman historiography, a paradigm which has persistently conceptualized the history of the Müteferriḳa press as an early, perhaps precocious, instance of state sponsored westernization.[4] Often, the decline paradigm approach operates on the fallacy of evaluating the social, economic and political transformations that reconstituted the social hierarchies and state institutions of the Ottoman polity in the sixteenth through to the eighteenth centuries against the earlier, "classical" structure of the Ottoman state in the mid-fifteenth to early sixteenth centuries. The earlier structure is seen as an ideal any deviation from which is then interpreted as decay. In so doing, this paradigm embodies what Rifa'at Ali Abou-el-Haj defines as an "ahistorical treatment," for it rests on the absurd assumption that historical change over time within the Ottoman context constitutes degeneration.[5]

The decline paradigm understands the transformative processes that impacted the Ottoman polity beginning in the mid-sixteenth century, such as the extensive penetration of the military-administrative *ʿaskerī* class by the tax paying subject class of the *reʿāyā*, or the redistribution of political sovereignty from the dynastic center to a broader spectrum of social classes and political factions, as indicators of the gradual disintegration of state power and as symptoms of imperial decline.[6] These changes and others, including the expansion and institutionalization of the Ottoman bureaucracy, the pluralization of access to the means of asserting social status, or the aristocratisation that created entrenched elites in the upper echelons

---

[4] Rhoads Murphey, "Westernisation in the Eighteenth-Century Ottoman Empire: How Far, How Fast?" *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 23 doi:10.1179.

[5] Rifa'at Ali Abou el-Haj, *The 1703 Rebellion and the Structure of Ottoman Politics* (Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut, 1984), 93.

[6] Carter Vaughn Findley, "Political Culture and the Great Households," In *The Cambridge History of Turkey Volume 3: The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839* ed. Suraiya N. Faroqhi (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 73.

of Ottoman institutions, should instead be assessed as engendering a reformulated early modern Ottoman imperial entity that took form in the late sixteenth to the late eighteenth centuries. It was the intellectual culture that emerged among and was shared by the bureaucratized socioeconomic elite of this later imperial structure that explains the successful enterprise of the first Ottoman-Turkish printing press.

It is therefore imperative that the early eighteenth-century Ottoman polity not be judged along the standards of the early sixteenth-century Ottoman state. Ottoman historiography, as demonstrated for example in the scholarship of Norman Itzkowitz, Carter Vaughn Findley, Baki Tezcan or Rifa'at Ali Abou-el-Haj, has endeavored to move beyond the decline paradigm and present alternative conceptualizations that more accurately reflect the realities of the "post-classical" Ottoman state.[7] As such, Baki Tezcan speaks of a "Second Ottoman Empire," defined by "a spider web with the monarch at the center but not on top of anyone else."[8] Likewise, Abou-el-Haj writes of an Ottoman polity "fragmented into competing sovereignties" in which state administration and political capital became diffused across the "political substructures" of the vizier and pasha households.[9]

In the field of the history of pre-late eighteenth century cultural exchange the application of the decline paradigm produces the notion of "westernization," for westernization necessitates the presence of the sort of perception of a cultural inferiority mentioned above. Here too historians, including Shirine Hamadeh and Caroline Finkel, have challenged the tenability of the decline narrative.[10] Hamadeh for example has demonstrated that the vocabulary of eighteenth-century Ottoman accounts does not provide conclusive evidence to substantiate even the assumption that European cultural motifs and influences were perceived of as foreign or alien by contemporary Ottoman observers when these influences were embedded into Ottoman cultural products.[11]

An erroneous perception of decline and decay may also be read into the history of the Ottoman Empire through retrospectively projecting late eighteenth and nineteenth century aspects of Ottoman history onto the earlier periods. This has often been the case with the period under study here, the so-called "Tulip Age" of 1718 to 1730, which Turkish historiography of the early republican period has seen as embodying an initial attempt at modernization based on

---

[7] Norman Itzkowitz, "Eighteenth Century Realities," In *Studia Islamica* No 16 (1992). Findley, "Political Culture and the Great Households." Baki Tezcan, *The Second Ottoman Empire: Political and Social Transformation in the Early Modern World* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010). Abou-el-Hajj, *The 1703 Rebellion and the Structure of Ottoman Politics*.

[8] Tezcan, *The Second Ottoman Empire,* 193.

[9] Abou-El-Hajj, *The 1703 Rebellion and the Structure of Ottoman Politics,* 1, 92.

[10] Hamadeh, *The City's Pleasures*. Caroline Finkel, "The Perils of Insouciance," In *Osman's Dream: The Story of the Ottoman Empire 1300-1923* by Caroline Finkel (New York: Basic Books, 2005).

[11] Hamadeh, *The City's Pleasures,* 221-226.

westernizing reforms.[12] This trope of the 1718-1730 period as a stillborn first phase of Europeanizing reform has also been replicated in Western European and North American scholarship, so that Wayne S. Vucinich, for example, speaks of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha as having initiated a "modest scale of modernization," for which argument the first form of evidence he provides is the printing press of İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa (d.1745).[13] Such analyses are the consequence of interpreting this period through the prism of an awareness of the reform programs initiated in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries by sulṭāns Selīm III (r.1789-1807) and Maḥmūd II (r.1808-1839). This type of approach distorts the cultural innovations that emerged between 1718 and 1730, turning them into precursors of the later reforms.

More recent Ottoman historiography has sought to redress this misrepresentation of the İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa press through a number of different conceptualizations that nonetheless fail to effectively place the Müteferriḳa press within its immediate cultural, intellectual, socioeconomic and political contexts. As such, Fatma Müge Göçek, when speaking of the motivations of İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa and Yirmisekizçelebizāde Meḥmed Saʿīd Efendi (d. 1761), both Ottoman bureaucrats and the latter a son of the Ottoman ambassador to France and a member of the 1720-1721 embassy, who together financed and established the Müteferriḳa press, writes that "these two men attempted to identify a problem and solve it through a Western innovation."[14] Such an approach to the Müteferriḳa press is at best a toned down version of the westernization trope. The focus of Göçek is misaligned. The focus in studying the Müteferriḳa press should not be on the European "identity" of this technological-cultural item, but rather on the Ottoman cultural sphere which received it and adapted it to its needs. As has already been briefly indicated in respect to Hamadeh's research, and as will be further explored in this study, the early eighteenth-century Ottoman intellectual and cultural environment was characterized by the fluid interpenetration of "foreign" and local cultural elements in which the importation of foreign cultural products did not necessarily indicate the perception of a problem that was meant to be addressed.

This overemphasis on the functional aspects of the Müteferriḳa press, and the notion that it was meant to solve a "problem," is also closely related to an uncritical and literal reading of İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa's treatise, *Vesīletüʾt-Ṭibāʿa* (The Usefulness of Printing), in which

---

[12] Can Erimtan, *Ottomans Looking West? The Origins of the Tulip Age and Its Development in Modern Turkey* (New York: Tauris Academic Studies, 2008), 146.

[13] Wayne S. Vucinich, *The Ottoman Empire: Its Record and Legacy* (New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc, 1965), 79.

[14] Fatma Müge Göçek, *East Encounters West: France and the Ottoman Empire in the Eighteenth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), 81.

Müteferriḳa defends the printing press as a solution to issues including the scarcity of available manuscripts and the loss to knowledge suffered through the destruction of manuscripts.[15] Stefan Reichmuth likewise presents İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa as an early example of an Islamic reformist based on his reading of the the *Vesīletü't-Ṭibāʿa.*[16] In so doing, Reichmuth projects an intellectual perspective more appropriate to the later reform movements in the Ottoman state that gained momentum particularly under the sovereigns Sultan Selīm III (r.1789-1807) and Sultan Maḥmūd II (r.1808-1839) . On the other hand, Vefa Erginbaş's analysis reflects more in certain ways the understanding of Göçek than Reichmuth.[17] He also bases his conclusions on Müteferriḳa's treatise, with the exception that unlike Reichmuth, he also takes into consideration the non-religious nature of the works published by the press. This leads him to propose that the Müteferriḳa press embodied an "enlightenment project," aimed at spreading literacy and what he terms the "humanistic" sciences to a more general Ottoman reading public.[18]

The reasons why the *Vesīletü't-Ṭibāʿa* should be approached critically and with a degree of skepticism will be considered in detail in the fourth chapter of this thesis. For now, it is sufficient to note that the argument maintained in this thesis interprets the initiative of İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa and Meḥmed Saʿīd Efendi as being an extension of an intellectual culture shared by a certain elite sector of Ottoman society concentrated in the Ottoman capital. The books published by this press communicated with the cultural interests of this privileged class. The Müteferriḳa press was therefore neither a project meant to spread humanistic knowledge to nor an attempt at kindling Islamic enlightenment in broader strata of Ottoman society. Orhan Salih's study of the Müteferriḳa press is also somewhat problematic. In formulating the printing press as an agent of "belated change," Salih assigns historical value to the enterprise by examining and privileging later developments in the history of Ottoman print in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.[19] As a result, this approach also disregards or at best undervalues the immediate context of the first phase of Ottoman-Turkish print culture.

---

[15] Maurits H van den Boogert, "The Sultan's Answer to the Medici Press? Ibrahim Muteferrika's Printing House in Istanbul," in *The Republic of Letters and the Levant* ed. Alastair Hamilton, Maurits H. van den Boogert and Bart Westerweel (Boston: Brill, 2005), 273-275.

[16] Stefan Reichmuth, "Islamic Reformist Discourse in the Tulip Period (1718-1730) Ibrahim Müteferriqa and His Arguments for Printings," In *The History of the Book in the Middle East* ed. Geoffrey Roper (Surrey: Ashgate, 2013), 157.

[17] Vefa Erginbaş, "Enlightenment in the Ottoman Context: Ibrahim Muteferrika and His Intellectual Landscape," In *Historical Aspects of Printing and Publishing Publishing in Languages of the Middle East: Papers from the Symposium at the University of Leipzig* ed. Geoffrey Roper (Boston: Brill, 2008)

[18] Erginbaş, "Enlightenment in the Ottoman Context: Ibrahim Muteferrika and His Intellectual Landscape," 70-71.

[19] Orlin Sabev, "A Virgin Deserving Paradise or a Whore Deserving Poison: Manuscript Tradition and Printed Books in Ottoman Turkish Society" In *The History of the Book in the Middle East* ed. Geoffrey Roper (Surrey: Ashgate, 2013), 391.

In her study of the royal wedding ceremonies resurrected and re-adapted by Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha, Tülay Artan notes that "the functions of early modern court cities and/or capitals basically included: attracting settlement and providing a habitat; embodying ideological, social and political control in space; creating venues for charity and worship; and fostering economic development."[20] The Ottoman capital was a *sui-generis* phenomenon within the Ottoman polity. It was the nexus of the state apparatus, of the bureaucratized military-administrative and religious institutions of the empire, and it was also the stage upon which the dynastic identity of the Ottoman royal household, and the vitality and magnanimity of the imperial state, were represented and embodied. One of the basic sources of economic revenue for the social elite surrounding Sultan Aḥmed III (r.1703-1730) and the household of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha were the life-lease tax farms or *mālikāne* first instituted in 1695.[21] As the research conducted in Ottoman financial archives by Mehmet Genç has demonstrated, these individuals "numbered around a thousand, and, as bureaucrats, soldiers and *'ulemā*, were almost identical with the central authority."[22]

In another article, this time examining changes to social space, Tülay Artan questions the validity of the assertions in Ottoman historiography regarding novel forms and forums of socialization in the Ottoman capital under Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha, making it easier for example for women to socialize in public.[23] Significantly, Artan indicates that changes in elite behavior should not be taken as a representation of pervasive social change in Ottoman society at large.[24] It must be emphasized from the start that this thesis does not examine or propound arguments regarding shifts in Ottoman intellectual sensibilities at large. The focus is restricted to a type of "court society," embedded in Istanbul, inhabiting a specific intellectual-cultural environment and exhibiting idiosyncratic patterns of cultural and material consumption. One basic indicator that situates the texts printed by the Müteferriḳa press within such patterns of courtly cultural and material consumption is the excessive prices of the books the majority of which, despite being

---

[20] Tülay Artan, "Royal Weddings and the Grand Vezirate: Institutional and Symbolic Change in the Early Eighteenth Century," In *Royal Courts in Dynastic States and Empires: A Global Perspective* ed. Jeroen Duindam, Tülay Artan and Metin Kunt (Boston: Brill, 2011), 344.

[21] Mehmet Genç, "A Study of the feasibility of using eighteenth-century Ottoman financial records as an indicator of economic activity," In *The Ottoman Empire and the World Economy* ed. Huri İslamoğlu-Inan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 348.

[22] Genç, "A Study of the feasibility of using eighteenth-century Ottoman financial records as an indicator of economic activity," 356.

[23] Tülay Artan, "Forms and Forums of Expression: Istanbul and beyond, 1600-1800," In *The Ottoman World* ed. by Christine Woodhead (New York: Routledge, 2012)

[24] Artan, "Forms and Forums of Expression: Istanbul and beyond, 1600-1800," 400.

beyond the capacities of even many senior government officials, found purchasers.[25] This factor will be further considered in the fourth chapter of this paper.

A second fundamental operative premise of this thesis is the understanding that the 1718-1730 period is a legitimate individual unit of historical inquiry while being at the same time immersed in processes that transcend it. Can Erimtan has examined the fallacies of the romanticized definition of this era as the "Tulip Age," the dominant conceptualization of the 1718-1730 period in early republican historiography which saw these years as embodying an age of leisurely abandon, with epicurean banquets hosted at courtly waterside residences situated across the various extramural districts of the Ottoman capital, excesses in consumption, the orchestration of ostentatious public spectacles and an early receptivity towards Westernization.[26] This false romanticization does not however repudiate the tenability of the understanding that Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's tenure as grand vizier represents what has been here conceptualized as an "extended moment of Ottoman history," an argument that will be shown to be reflected in the conclusions of scholars including Ariel Salzmann, Tülay Artan, Rifa'at Ali Abou-el-Haj and Shirine Hamadeh.

The first chapter begins with an overview of the trans-regional socioeconomic processes that penetrated the Ottoman Empire in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It then continues with a consideration of how these processes restructured Ottoman social hierarchies and state institutions, dispersing the political capital more firmly monopolized in earlier decades by the dynastic center across a greater diversity of social forces. The latter part of the chapter examines in greater depth the internal dynamics and environment of the vizier and pasha households which came to dominate the state administration after the mid-seventeenth century. In elaborating the environment of the vizier and pasha households, the processes and structural changes studied in this chapter are situated within the historical context of the 1718 to 1730 period.

The second chapter focuses on the scribal bureaucracy, which greatly expanded in size and importance in this period and became interfused with the vizier and pasha households. This is undertaken for the purposes of thereby engaging in greater detail with the distinctive properties of the intellectual environment that came to distinguish the literary tastes of the elite of the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha period. This intellectual environment, as explained above, was characterized by the sociopolitical function of erudition, an intellectual openness to foreign texts and motifs, and an enhanced presence of the *adāb* fields of knowledge. These fields, closely

---

[25] Orlin Sabev, "The First Ottoman Turkish Printing Enterprise: Success or Failure?" in *Ottoman Tulips, Ottoman Coffee: Leisure and Lifestyle in the Eighteenth Century* edited by Dana Sajdi (New York: Tauris Academic Studies, 2007), 73.
[26] Erimtan, *Ottomans Looking West? The Origins of the Tulip Age and Its Development in Modern Turkey.*

associated with the cultural sensibilities of the Ottoman scribal bureaucracy, have been defined somewhat differently by various Ottoman scholars.[27] Proficiency in these fields of knowledge came in the sixteenth through to the eighteenth centuries to be one of the constitutive elements of social membership in the Ottoman ruling class. This social identity was also predicated on forms of sanctioned "polite" behavior, so that the upper echelons of the Ottoman socioeconomic elite were also described as the *ehl-i nezāket* or "people of refinement."[28] As such, since the term *adāb* also invokes modes of refined social behavior and codes of etiquette and comportment, it has been considered herein as the most appropriate term for denoting Ottoman texts of a non-religious nature. This chapter therefore focuses on the Ottoman scribal bureaucracy and the parameters of the intellectual culture and social identity of the courtly ruling class of the Ottoman center.

Chapter Three traces the interpersonal mesh of contacts and relationships that composed the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha household faction. Here the patronage links that enabled and financed the Müteferriķa press are examined and the translation committees and individual translations commissioned by Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha described. The 1720-1721 Ottoman embassy to France is also examined as part of a broader program encompassing the translations and the printing press. In the fourth chapter, the focus shifts to the İbrāhīm Müteferriķa printing press itself. The content and nature of the books published by this press are studied in an effort to substantiate the argument that they reflected a particular manifestation of a distinctive eighteenth century Ottoman intellectual environment and program. This chapter will also engage with and argue against some of the perspectives adopted by key Ottoman historians who have studied, analyzed, and interpreted İbrāhīm Müteferriķa's enterprise.

Chapter One: The Restructuring of Ottoman State Institutions and Social Hierarchies in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries and the Consolidation of Sociopolitical Power by Grandee Households

In describing the blundering and brief career of the incompetent grand vizier "Calaily Aḥmed Pasha," who was employed in the early period of Aḥmed III's reign, Dmitrie Cantemir (d.1723) recounts an anecdote in which the sultan is hosted by the grand vizier in a banquet.[29]

---

[27] For example, Carter Vaughn Findley refers to "belletristic *adab* culture" and Madeline C. Zilfi speaks simply of the "profane letters." Findley, "Political Culture and the Great Households," 69. Madeline C. Zilfi, "The Ottoman Ulema," in *The Cambridge History of Turkey Volume 3: The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839* ed. Suraiya Faroqhi (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 215.

[28] Hamadeh, *The City's Pleasures,* 159.

[29] Kalaylıkoz Hacı Ahmed Pasha was a minor government official who held a number of posts throughout his career, including that of the grand vizier between November 1703 and September 1704. Originally from a Christian family resident in the central Anatolian town of Kayseri, he arrived at the capital in his youth and was inducted into

This anecdote, and indeed the short lived tenure of Aḥmed Pasha, are both deeply revealing in highlighting the processes examined in this chapter. At the banquet, the sultan notices a man blind in one eye, and when Aḥmed Pasha sees that the sultan does not recognize this man, the following dialogue takes place:

> What, says the Vizir with some surprize, doth not your majesty know this man? The Sultan answers, it is impossible for him to know every particular person. But, replies he, this is no Plebian, but *Kior Ali aga*, who has a fine *Chiftilyk*, (*i.e.* Farm) near *Constantinople*, which yields him so many geese, chickens, and turkeys every year, that he has not only enough for his own table, but has as many to spare as may be sold for a great sum; as to his office, he is *Basbakikulu* (which is a place of no great consideration in the *Tefterdar's* court) (*sic*).[30]

The *Başbāki Kulu* was in fact a chief tax inspector.[31] The *çiftlik* were large private farms exempt from state taxation that emerged in the wake of the disintegration of the *tımār* system of prebendal land grants in the seventeenth century.[32] *Çiftlik* owners appropriated defunct crown lands and often became revenue collectors and tax farmers.[33] They also functioned as intermediaries between the Ottoman state and its tax paying subjects, acquiring the tax burdens of peasant communities in exchange for a certain remuneration which they negotiated with the peasants.[34] The *çiftlik* owner in Cantemir's anecdote represents therefore a landowner who was also a scribal bureaucrat working in one of the bureaus of the Ottoman financial administration or *Defterdārlık*. Without further evidence regarding *Kior Ali aga*'s background and identity, it is not possible to ascertain whether this individual was a member of the Ottoman bureaucracy who had at one point invested in agricultural estates, or whether he was a wealthy landowner who purchased his way into the financial administration. It is also not possible to indicate whether *Kör Ali Aga* had a *devşirme* background, and came from a non-Muslim family, or whether he was born a Muslim.

---

the halberdier corps of the palace service. He passed away in 1715. Ismail Hami Danışmend, *Osmanlı Devlet Erkanî* (Istanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi, 1971), 51.

[30] Dimitrie Cantemir, *The history of the growth and decay of the Othman Empire: Part I.Containing The Growth of the Othman Empire From The Reign of Othman the Founder, To The Reign of Mahomet IV. That IS, From the Year 1300, to the Siege of Vienna, in 1683. Part II. Containing The History of the Decay of the Othman Empire, From The Reign of Mahomet IV. To The Reign of Ahmed III. Being The History of the Author's Own Times. Written originally in Latin, by Demetrius Cantemir, late Prince of Moldavia. Translated into English, from the author's own manuscript, by N. Tindal, M.A. Vicar of Great Waltham in Essex. Adorned with a plan of Constantinople; and twenty-two heads of the Turkish Emperors, engraved from Copies taken from Originals in the Grand Seignor's Palace, by the late Sultan's Painter.* (London: A. Millar, 1756), 442.

[31] *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi, s.v,* "Bâşbâki Kulu."

[32] Michael Ursinus, "The Transformation of the Ottoman Fiscal Regime c.1600-1850," In *The Ottoman World* ed Christine Woodhead (New York: Routledge 2012), 431.

[33] Ursinus, "The Transformation of the Ottoman Fiscal Regime c.1600-1850," 431.

[34] Ibid., 432.

What Cantemir's account does clearly show however is that by this point, members of the Ottoman military-administrative bureaucracy had become landowners and wealthy investors in agricultural estates. Aḥmed Pasha's reaction to Sultan Aḥmed III's ignorance of his wealthy guest's identity also indicates the prestige accrued by successful *çiftlik* owners and the social significance they had come to exercise in the Ottoman court. It was certainly not his position as a junior bureaucrat which convinced the grand vizier of the suitability of the *çiftlik* owner's presence at the banquet, but rather the fame and affluence of his estates in the countryside of the Ottoman capital. Aḥmed III appears not to have been impressed by Aḥmed Pasha's guest, complaining after the banquet of the idiocy of his vizier.[35]

The reasons why Aḥmed III had appointed Aḥmed Pasha as grand vizier, and why the sultan had to endure for a time the incompetence of this statesman for whom he seems to have harbored a strong personal dislike, expose the frailties of the central authority of the Ottoman court in the face of the political pressures which it faced from the different social groups of the capital. Cantemir narrates how, "as the Sultan was walking in the market place in disguise, he heard the repeated sighs of the people, lamenting the corruption of manners, and saying, there would be no reformation unless *Calaily Aḥmed* were made Vizir."[36] The Ottoman chronicler and official historian Rāşid Meḥmed Efendi, in describing how Aḥmed Pasha became grand vizier, corroborates Cantemir's observations, and indicates that a popular opinion on the streets of the Ottoman capital was that "as long as *Kalaylı* Pasha does not come (to the post of grand vizier), this seat of government will find no order" (*Kalaylı Paşa gelmedükce bu ḫāne-i devlet niẓām bulmaz*).[37] Aḥmed Pasha was a Cappadocian Armenian inducted at a young age into the *Baltacı* corps of the palace school, after which he served as a governor at Jeddah, as grand admiral, and as the *kaymakām* or mayor of Istanbul.[38] While serving as the *kaymakām* of the capital city, he somehow managed to acquire great popularity among the city's Muslim population, compelling the sultan to take him into the palace as a vizier after the urban population became restless following Aḥmed Pasha's removal from the post of *kaymakām*.[39] It should be remembered that

---

[35] Cantemir, *The history of the growth and decay of the Othman Empire*, 442.
[36] Ibid., 441.
[37] Râşid Mehmed Efendi, *Târîh-i Râşid ve Zeyli Vol. II. Târîh-i Râşid* ed. Abdülkadir Özcan, Yunus Uğur, Baki Çakır, and Ahmet Zeki İzgöer (Istanbul: Klasik Yayınlar, 2013), 731.
[38] Cantemir, *The history of the growth and decay of the Othman Empire*, 441.
[39] Ibid. Cantemir asserts that it was the wanton cruelty of Ahmed Pasha's regulations targeting Christians that acquired for him this popularity. Bearing in mind the inherent biases of Dimitrie Cantemir, it is nonetheless interesting that the policies in question were the imposition of sartorial regulations. It was, according to Cantemir, Ahmed Pasha's regulation that Christians go barefoot in the bathhouses (a great inconvenience considering the heat of the marble floors, if not outright painful) that was the final straw which compelled Sultan Ahmed III to have him removed. Shortly after, however, upon the complaints of the Muslim population, he appointed him to the post of a vizier.

these events took place not long after a janissary revolt dethroned Sultan Mustafa II (r.1695-1703) and began the sultanate of Aḥmed III.

Writing shortly after Dimitrie Cantemir, and on the cusp of the inception of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's grand vizieriate, in 1717, Lady Mary Wortley Montagu notes that "the Government here is entirely in the hands of the Army, and the Grand Signor with all his absolute power as much a slave as any of his Subjects, and trembles at a Janizary's frown," before indicating that "but when a Minister here displeases the people, in 3 hours' time he is dragg'd even from his Master's arms" (*sic*).[40] In these contemporary sources, the terms "people," "janissary," and "army" are used interchangeably and moreover the absence of any distinction between these concepts in these accounts of popular unrest, upheaval, and military insurrection in the capital conveys more organically the blending of the janissary infantry corps into the urban middle and lower productive and commercial classes that had transpired in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It was only after the popularity of Aḥmed Pasha had worn off that Sultan Aḥmed III was able to remove him from the post of vizier and send him off to the island of Kos.[41]

One final incident from the story of Aḥmed Pasha deserves mention. Describing his first actions as vizier, Cantemir explains how Aḥmed Pasha, "that he might, by some new invention, increase the marks of honour used by the Vizirs, and render them more conspicuous, he invented some new ornaments about the *Tiara*."[42] Aḥmed Pasha's alterations to the headdress of the viziers was but one of the innovations he applied to his clothing in an attempt to "render them more conspicuous" and thereby elevate the social stature of his post.[43] This account by Cantemir is remarkably explicit in expressing how in the early eighteenth century, the Ottoman elite utilized conspicuous consumption (of clothing, architecture, foodstuffs, intellectual products, etc) as a means of articulating social identities and how, moreover, they attempted to adopt ostentatious new forms of consumption as a means of enhancing the social prestige of their persons and their positions. This was directly connected to the disintegration of the fourteenth and fifteenth century imperial imagery of the military-charismatic identity of the dynasty as the dominant normative whereby social hegemony was maintained and embodied.[44] Such

---

[40] Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, *The Complete Letters of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu* ed. Robert Halsband (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), 322.
[41] Cantemir, *The history of the growth and decay of the Othman Empire,* 442.
[42] Ibid., 441.
[43] Ibid. It should be noted here that before Ahmed Pasha could present himself before the sultan in his new attire, he was warned that "dressed like a buffoon," he was sure to have himself executed if he proceeded with this design, and so he had to abandon it. Nonetheless, it is the attempt and the intentions expressed concerning the attempt that matter here.
[44] Colin Imber, "Frozen Legitimacy," In *Legitimizing the Order: The Ottoman Rhetoric of State Power* ed. Hakan Karateke and Maurus Reinkowski (Boston: Brill, 2005).

disintegration reconfigured the morphology of status expression and contention, allowing for a broader glossary of forms whereby social elites were able to seek to mimic and thereby appropriate the social stature of the dynasty or the Ottoman court. Conspicuous consumption was one of these forms, and constitutes one of the fundamental characteristics of the social, economic, and intellectual-cultural environment of the period under study here.

Fourteenth and Fifteenth Century Structures of Ottoman Administration and the Expansion of Ottoman Monetary Markets

Within the foregoing short account of the career of an early eighteenth century Ottoman vizier, there is therefore evidence that illustrates the development of the Ottoman bureaucracy and either its involvement in economic investments or its penetration by wealthy members of the tax paying public; the social stature acquired in the Ottoman court through access to and control of sources of revenue production; the transformation of the imperial infantry corps of the janissaries into an extension and embodiment of a segment of urban non-elite society; the circumscription of the political power of the palace in relation to social pressures from urban forces and the ways in which consumption patterns were being adopted to articulate and contest social status. Informing all of these processes was the expansion of monetary markets in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in the Ottoman Empire, which involved both the intensification of the range and volume of commercial exchange and the increasing availability of cash flows and the conversion of economic revenues to a cash based system; growths in consumption and shifts in consumption patterns; and a resultant recalibration of Ottoman social hierarchies and state institutions.[45] In order to study how these processes resulted in a diffusion of the political capital of the courtly center across networks of vizier and pasha households, this chapter will first briefly note the structure of the Ottoman state administration in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, before moving on to a consideration of the actual processes themselves and thereafter examining how these processes impacted and modified state administration.

Metin Kunt designates households "the building blocks of the Ottoman political edifice," and traces their presence in the structure of the early Ottoman state.[46] He notes that the earliest Ottoman households were essentially "military establishments" comprised of troops loyal to their masters, and that in being so they reflected characteristic features of medieval Islamic and Turkic polities, both of which contained a basic nuclear structure of an armed retinue attached to a political leader.[47] The household structure was therefore a constant of Ottoman history from the

---

[45] Şevket Pamuk, *A Monetary History of the Ottman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 20. Tezcan, *The Second Ottoman Empire*, 21-22.
[46] Metin Kunt, "Royal and other households," In *The Ottoman World* ed. Christine Woodhead (New York: Routledge, 2012), 103.
[47] Kunt, "Royal and other households," 105.

emergence of an Ottoman political entity in the fourteenth century through and including the period under scrutiny in this paper. The dynastic household constituted the preeminent household establishment of the Ottoman Empire which, practically in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and theoretically thereafter, fused the domestic and the political in a manner in which the monarch embodied the head of the household and his family were the royal family of a dynastic state.[48] The slaves or retinue of the household provided the state with its military-administrative functionaries who, particularly in the earlier phases of Ottoman history, combined administrative responsibilities with military service.[49] On the other hand, the tax paying subject population formed the flock the responsibility for the protection and welfare of which was assigned to the head of the household and his slave retinue.[50] Finally, the territory of the state was the patrimony of the household.[51]

That the territory of the state was seen as the patrimony of the sultan and his family meant that it could not be partitioned and bestowed upon bondsmen in an inheritable fashion. Rather, Ottoman military-administrative personnel received the tax revenues attached to specific districts, villages, or even whole provinces, for limited durations of time.[52] These revenue grants or *dirliks* were not inheritable, and provincial administrators circulated over the course of their careers between posts and revenue grants, as was also seen in the account of the vizier Aḥmed Pasha, who at one time had been a governor of a port city on the Arabian peninsula before receiving a post in the capital and finally being consigned to a minor position on an Aegean island.[53] For this reason, some Ottoman historians have defined this system as "prebendary," utilizing a term that connotes temporary grants of land, provisions, and income in exchange for service.[54]

The period of Ottoman history in which the state-as-household structure in the manner outlined above reflected historical reality has been defined as the "patrimonial period."[55] In this period, the multiplication of military-administrative households in a particularized and gradated manner proportionate to the revenues and status of government officials and military governors formed the administrative infrastructure of the patrimonial household based Ottoman state

---

[48] Karen Barkey, *Bandits and Bureaucrats: The Ottoman Route to State Centralization* (London: Cornell University Press, 1994), 27.
[49] Barkey, *Bandits and Bureaucrats*, 27.
[50] Ibid.
[51] Ibid.
[52] Kunt, "Royal and other households," 103-104.
[53] Ibid., 103.
[54] Elman R. Service, "Primitive Culture," *Encyclopedia Britannica* s.v. (2018). Barkey, *Bandits and Bureaucrats*, 36.
[55] Tezcan, *The Second Ottoman Empire*.

hierarchy.[56] These military-administrative households were structured, on a lesser scale, along the pattern of the dynastic household outlined above. They were drawn from and formed by members of the royal slave class, or *kuls,* recruited through the *devşirme* levy of non-Muslim boys.[57] Upon induction into the palace schools, these boys were remoulded into Muslim administrators, bureaucrats, soldiers and military commanders whose allegiance, lacking any other social, cultural, or political bonds, became cemented to the Ottoman dynasty.[58] Aḥmed Pasha's example presented earlier demonstrates that this system was still functioning to a degree in the period of Sultan Aḥmed III. However, by the early eighteenth century the *devşirme* levy had increasingly been replaced by other channels of recruitment to an expanding and professionalizing state military-administrative service. These more diverse channels were open to and dominated by the Muslim-born subjects of the empire, leading to a development in which the organization of the Ottoman government along the lines of the state-as-dynastic household supported atop a substructure of *devşirme* military-administrative households was gradually replaced by a system dominated by military-administrative households formed increasingly from freeborn Muslim subjects. This shift had the consequence of depriving the dynastic household establishment of actual political capital and thereby consigning to it more symbolic and ideological functions.

Fundamentally, in exploring how this shift and others came about, this chapter studies the impact that the proliferation of cash flows and the emergence of a monetary economy had on the development of a system of imperial administration based on the formation of administrative households. It is maintained that the processes whereby the administrative households of the Ottoman state came to appropriate the political sovereignty of the Ottoman dynastic household exemplify a phenomenon of evolution and change, of the development of the "household empire," and not one of decay or decline.

Monetization involves the expansion of the use and availability of cash flows which, in the period of study here, essentially involved coinage. Şevket Pamuk notes in his work on the monetary history of the Ottoman Empire that a primary cause that facilitates and accelerates monetization is the growth of commercial exchange, particularly the expansion of long distance trade.[59] This is because while exchange and payments in kind may function with relative ease in local, closed off economic units, they become far more burdensome and impracticable in transactions involving greater distance. The consolidation of regional markets into a single

---

[56] Kunt, "Royal and other households," 103-105.
[57] Abou-el-Haj, *The 1703 Rebellion and the Structure of Ottoman Politics.*
[58] Kunt, "Royal and Other Households," 108-109.
[59] Şevket Pamuk, *A Monetary History of the Ottman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 1-2.

imperial economic zone in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the integration of multiple nodes of trans-regional and maritime commercial exchange into the empire and the acquisition of a number of precious metal producing regions contributed to the monetization of the Ottoman economy.[60] Historically, these developments were achieved through the conquests of Sultan Meḥmed II (r.1444-1446, 1451-1481), Sultan Selīm I (r. 1512-1520) and Sultan Süleymān I (r.1520-1566). In addition, the development of urban centers in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and the consequent expansion of market oriented production in the countryside and the influx of silver from the American colonies of European powers further accelerated the proliferation of coinage in the Ottoman Empire, creating steep inflation in the seventeenth century.[61]

The household based Ottoman administrative system developed in an environment with a limited supply of precious metals and coinage, where revenues in the provinces were collected in kind and consumed locally.[62] The conversion of state and administrative revenues from a kind-based system to cash flows initially favored the patrimonial structure, allowing for the formation of larger administrative establishments in the provinces and thereby granting the Ottoman sultan the ability to draw from a pool of governors and administrators supporting larger armed retinues.[63] Furthermore, access to extensive cash resources enabled the Ottoman dynasty to fund a standing, professional military corps of janissaries and cavalry which were maintained in the Ottoman capital.[64] Therefore, it was in fact this pervasive shift to a cash based economy that allowed for a more extensive elaboration of the Ottoman household system, producing larger and more numerous administrative households while enhancing the political hegemony of the dynastic household that formed the capstone of this imperial administrative pyramid. The military and administrative state institutions that supported the political hegemony of the dynastic household in the mid-fifteenth to the mid-sixteenth centuries were however drastically altered as a consequence of monetization. They were transformed from conduits communicating imperial political sovereignty to factional networks appropriating and participating in political sovereignty. The changes wrought by monetization to Ottoman administrative and revenue gathering practices can help illustrate how this transformation came about.

The "prebendal" system of Ottoman land grants was, as previously mentioned, based on the surplus derived from agriculture and often collected in kind. This necessitated the evaluation and registration of the nature and quantity of the estimated revenues attached to each tax unit.

---

[60] Tezcan, *The Second Ottoman Empire,* 18, 89-90. Kunt, "Royal and Other Households," 105.
[61] Ursinus, "The Transformation of the Ottoman Fiscal Regime," 424.
[62] Kunt, "Royal and other households," 104.
[63] Ibid., 105.
[64] Tezcan, *The Second Ottoman Empire,* 91.

The *tapu-taḥrīr* registers or cadastral surveys that were compiled for these purposes recorded tax units in a manner in which the peasants became fixed to their agricultural estates.[65] This system was replaced between the mid-sixteenth and mid-seventeenth centuries by the ʿ*avārıż* levy, which was initially an emergency tax collected on the basis of specific needs.[66] The ʿ*avārıż-ı dīvāniye* (tax for the central government) and other emergency levies like the *imdād-ı seferiyye* (campaign assistance levy) and *imdād-ı ḥażariyye* (peacetime assistance levy) were regularized into annual levies in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.[67] Notably, the latter two tax levies were discussed in the imperial *dīvān* and regularized under Sultan Aḥmed III, the *imdād-ı seferiyye* in 1717 and the *imdād-ı ḥażariyye* in 1719.[68]

The *imdād* and *avārıż* levies were cash-based tax levies.[69] The tax registers that were composed for these systems significantly differed from the *tapu-taḥrīr* registers in linking taxation to persons, rather than to the land, so that instead of accounts of the agricultural productivity of a tax unit, accounts were now compiled of either individual males or groups of males as tax units themselves.[70] This new type of tax unit was called the *ḥāne* (household).[71] The *ḥānes* came to represent tax quotas, and the distribution of tax totals across the total tax quotas/units per district and region was carried out through a process called *tevzî'* (distribution).[72] The *tevzî'* was a negotiated process, an arrangement reached between the local tax paying subjects and representatives of the government administration in the form of local judges (*kadıs*), often involving mediators in the form of local notables or ʿ*āyāns*.[73] The new cash-based taxation system therefore created economic relationships that were more abstract and less personal as they did not involve evaluations of the economic productivities of local communities and did not bind tax payers and *timār* holders in intimate administrative relations. Moreover, in involving local notables, the new system placed a degree of distance between the Ottoman center and the processes of revenue collection. This development was further augmented in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries when the *çiftlik* owners also came to act as mediators, assuming the tax burdens of local communities and becoming their representatives to the central authority.[74]

---

[65] Ursinus, "The Transformation of the Ottoman Fiscal Regime,"426.
[66] Ibid.
[67] Ibid., 426-428.
[68] Ibid., 428.
[69] Ibid.
[70] Ibid., 426.
[71] Ibid.
[72] Ibid., 427.
[73] Ibid., 427-428.
[74] Ibid., 429-430.

Monetization further alienated the dynastic center from the sources of economic revenue through the emergence of the tax farm. The Ottoman tax farm or *iltizām* system was the practice whereby through auctions, tax farmers (*mültezims*) were contracted to gather the surveyed revenues of a leased imperial resource (*muḳāṭaʻa*) and remunerate a set percentage of this revenue to the government, keeping the rest for themselves.[75] Prior to the seventeenth century, the *iltizām* system had been used almost exclusively for *muḳāṭaʻa* such as customs dues or mines and mints.[76] It seems therefore to have been more adaptable to revenues based on cash flows. By the mid-seventeenth century it became increasingly applied to agricultural revenues including the *ʻavārıż*.[77] The extensive incorporation of agricultural revenues into the *iltizām system* in the seventeenth century indicates therefore that these revenues were shifting from a *timār* system more structured on the collection of agricultural produce to cash based revenues that were more suitable for tax farming. Tax farming served to distance the central authorities from the sources of financial revenue because even though many of the *mültezims* were the socioeconomic elite of Istanbul and other urban centers, the actual administration and revenue collection of their tax farms were delegated to their agents, who were often local notables conversant with the local contexts of the particular tax farms.[78]

An important development to the *iltizām* system that emerged in the years immediately preceding the 1718 to 1730 period were the life-lease tax farms or *mālikānes*. *Iltizām* tax farms were leased out for between one and three years. In contrast, the *mālikānes* allowed individuals to acquire the right to collect the tax revenues of a *muḳāṭaʻa* for the entirety of their lives, paying a set amount out of those revenues that had been established by the government.[79] Here, auctions determined the amount of cash that would be paid to the state treasury for obtaining the *mālikāne*.[80] This factor indicates that life-lease tax farms were instituted as a means for obtaining substantial immediate quantities of cash resources for the Ottoman government, and it is not coincidental that the system emerged in 1695, in the midst of a long series of conflicts

---

[75] Darling, "Public finances: the role of the Ottoman centre," In *The Cambridge History of Turkey Volume 3: The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839,* ed. Suraiya N. Faroqhi (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 120. The annual amount of tax revenues remunerated to the Imperial Treasury was determined in the auctions. Genç, "A Study of the feasibility of using eighteenth-century Ottoman financial records as an indicator of economic activity," 347.

[76] Darling, "Public finances: the role of the Ottoman centre," 120.

[77] Ibid.

[78] Ibid., 121.

[79] Genç, "A Study of the feasibility of using eighteenth-century Ottoman financial records as an indicator of economic activity," 347.

[80] Ibid.

principally with the Habsburg Empire that between 1683 and 1699 drained the Ottoman treasury.[81]

Military confrontations at the end of the seventeenth century were not however the only cause of the cash shortages suffered by the Ottoman government in this period. Price rises and inflation throughout the seventeenth century proceeding from the vast influx of American silver and the extensive disruption of agricultural economies, particularly in Ottoman Anatolia, due to widespread brigandage and the consequent flight of disaffected peasants from the countryside to the cities, all combined to produce a chronic shortage of specie in the Ottoman state.[82] Compounding these factors was the expansion of the Ottoman state apparatus itself. Providing the government salaries of the central army and the central bureaucracy comprised one of the cornerstones of Ottoman state economic policy.[83] Arrears in the salaries especially of the central army could be quite dangerous and was indeed one of the factors that precipitated the insurrection of 1703 which led to the enthronement of Sultan Aḥmed III.[84] These priorities are reflected in the very nature of Ottoman financial archives, which were preoccupied with tracking fiscal revenues to the negligence of other factors such as the specifics of the goods exchanged in their records of commercial transactions.[85]

The conversion of the Ottoman state's fiscal administration of crown lands from a system based on the prebendal *tımār* land grant to a structure predicated on tax farms and *imdād* and *'avārıż* levies indicates an imperial economy undergoing a shift into revenue collection and economic exchange mechanisms that were monetary and cash-based. The emergence of the *çiftliks* also demonstrates this process, for as has already been noted these expansive agricultural estates were often erected on vacant *tımār* plots. These developments transformed the Ottoman economy and its state apparatus between the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. For example, the *'avārıż* levy went from comprising only four percent of Ottoman central revenue in 1567-1568 to twenty percent by 1670.[86] Another revenue collection mechanism that demonstrates these changes is the head tax payed by non-Muslims, the *cizye*. The allocation of the *cizye* per tax unit was until the 1590s registered in the *tapu-taḥrīr* surveys however as these cadastral

---

[81] Darling, "Public finances: the role of the Ottoman centre," 126. Genç, "A Study of the feasibility of using eighteenth-century Ottoman financial records as an indicator of economic activity," 348.

[82] Darling, "Public finances: the role of the Ottoman centre," 127. Christoph Neumann, "Political and diplomatic developments," In *The Cambridge History of Turkey Volume 3: The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839,* ed. Suraiya N. Faroqhi (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 45. This brigandage was the work of large groups of vagrant peasant infantry who had been temporarily armed by the Ottoman state for individual campaigns and thereafter demobilized.

[83] Pamuk, *A Monetary History of the Ottman Empire* 10.

[84] Abou-el-Haj, *The 1703 Rebellion and the Structure of Ottoman Politics,* 3.

[85] Edhem Eldhem, "Capitulations and Western Trade," In *The Cambridge History of Turkey Volume 3: The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839,* ed. Suraiya N. Faroqhi (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 288.

[86] Ursinus, "The Transformation of the Ottoman Fiscal Regime," 426.

surveys were replaced with *ḫāne*-based tax registers in the seventeenth century, the *cizye* became calculated in special *cizye* registers or *cizye taḥrīrs*.[87] The actual quantity of the *cizye* tax demanded from non-Muslims rose significantly in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, a development related to the steep inflation experienced in the Ottoman domain in these centuries.[88] This inflation in turn generated a spiralling devaluation of the silver content of the *akçe*, the standard Ottoman coinage of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[89] The expansion of commercial exchange at this time further accelerated the proliferation of coinage in the Ottoman markets, thus causing ever greater inflation.[90] Inflation and the currency crisis of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries combined with war and an expanded state bureaucracy to produce severe budget deficits in the Ottoman treasury.[91]

The budget deficits that plagued Ottoman administration in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were resolved in the first decades of the eighteenth century through a combination of fiscal reform and diplomacy. The *mālikāne* system of life-lease tax farms was successful in generating extensive cash revenues for the Ottoman treasury.[92] The absence of major entanglements in European conflicts for long durations after 1718 also contributed to the balancing of the Ottoman budget.[93] The debased *akçe* was abandoned and replaced by a new silver-based currency, the *kuruş*, in 1690.[94] The opening of new mines in Anatolia in the early eighteenth century and the centralization of minting operations in the capital city facilitated the rapid development of the *kuruş* into the leading coinage in Istanbul and the central provinces surrounding the capital, pushing out European currencies such as the Dutch *thaler* or the Spanish *real*.[95] Throughout 1718-1730 the *kuruş* remained relatively stable, and the extended period of peace experienced by the empire in this period seems to have been a fundamental contributory factor in this development.[96] Between 1690 and 1730, the *cizye* also became regularized, so that under the vizierate of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha the *cizye, 'avārıż* and *imdād* levies all became systemized mechanisms of annual taxation, with the *cizye* making up as much as forty percent of the state income between 1718 and 1730.[97] On the other hand, after 1703, of all farmed state

---

[87] Darling, "Public finances: the role of the Ottoman centre," 119.
[88] Ibid.
[89] Ursinus, "The Transformation of the Ottoman Fiscal Regime,"424.
[90] Ibid.
[91] Ibid. By 1597 this deficit was at a staggering 400 million *akçe.*
[92] Ibid.
[93] Ibid.
[94] Pamuk, "Appendix: Money in the Ottoman Empire, 1326-1914," In *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire 1300-1914* ed. Halil Inalcik and Donald Quataert (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 966.
[95] Pamuk, "Appendix: Money in the Ottoman Empire, 1326-1914," 966-969.
[96] Ibid., 970.
[97] Darling, "Public finances: the role of the Ottoman centre," 125.

revenues or *muḳāṭaʿa*, forty percent had taken the form of life-lease *mālikānes*.[98] The most profitable *mālikānes* were the collection of customs and revenue dues, demonstrating the extensive expansion of commercial exchange in this period.[99] The vast majority of these *mālikānes*, up to ninety percent of them, belonged to the Ottoman capital's ruling elite, "about a thousand bureaucrats, soldiers, and clerics."[100] A monetary tax collection system and a growing commercial sector formed therefore the economic foundations of the social, political, and cultural environment in which the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha household faction acquired political hegemony and in which the İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa press was financed and inaugurated.

The Impact of Monetization on Ottoman State Institutions and Social Hierarchies in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries

The Ottoman *ʿilmiye* produced judicial and administrative functionaries for the Ottoman state and staffed a vast, carefully hierarchized educational apparatus that provided instruction in the judicial and religious fields, fields which comprised the intellectual and operative domain of the *ʿulemā*. By the eighteenth century, the hierarchization of this institution had developed in an intricately gradated manner in which the religious colleges or *medreses* were stacked in an ascending order that culminated in the elite colleges of the Ottoman capital, the *Dārülḥadīs̱-i Süleymāniye*.[107] *ʿIlmiye* students theoretically advanced by stages and with examinations through these grades and likewise the *medrese* teachers or *müderrises* were also promoted from post to post from the first strata of the *Ḫāric* medreses up to the *Süleymāniye*.[108] The judgeships were likewise structured, moving through the judgeships of major Ottoman urban centers like Aleppo and Damascus, up to the military-judgeships of the provinces of Rumelia and Anatolia (the *kadıaskers*), to the grand mullah of Istanbul, the *şeyhülislām*.[109] Beneath and beyond this centralized imperial system were a multitude of local educational institutions in the provinces as well as countless local *kadı* posts that did not lead through the central hierarchy to the upper echelons of the *ʿilmiye*.[110]

Baki Tezcan discusses at length the impact that monetization had on empowering the Ottoman *ʿilmiye* by causing the executive members of the *ʿilmiye* hierarchy to acquire a share in the political sovereignty of the Ottoman dynasty.[111] This was a development that proceeded out of the emergence of a large variety of cash-based institutions which fell under the jurisdiction of

[98] Ibid, 127.
[99] Ibid., 128.
[100] Finkel, "The Perils of Insouciance," 340.
[107] Zilfi, "The Ottoman *ulema*", 216.
[108] R.C. Repp, "The Altered Nature and Role of the Ulema," In *Studies in Eighteenth Century Islamic History* ed. Thomas Naff and Roger Owen (London: Feffer & Simons, Inc., 1977), 26.
[109] Zilfi, "The Ottoman *ulema*", 216.
[110] Ibid., 214-218.
[111] Tezcan, *The Second Ottoman Empire,* 30-43.

the *'ulemā*.[112]. The enhancement of the significance of legal matters that came under the rubric of *fiqh* or Islamic jurisprudence compelled the eclipse in the Ottoman state, though not the complete abolishment, of the "dynastic law" of the *ḳānūn*, through which the state had in the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries been able to promulgate law codes independently of the *'ulemā*.[113] The removal of the *ḳānūn* from Ottoman legal practice was decreed in 1696, and was part of an effort by the state to directly interfere in the juridical jurisdiction of the *'ulemā* by uniting the entire law system of the empire under a single structure.[114] As will be discussed in greater length below, the decay of the military-charismatic aspect of dynastic legitimacy contributed to the growth in the visibility, importance, and application of other symbols of imperial identity and dynastic social supremacy, including the use of religious imagery.

The Islamic identity of the Ottoman sultan was in fact one of the cornerstones of Ottoman dynastic legitimacy. Dynastic legitimacy in the Ottoman polity, as explained in the studies of Hakan Karateke and Gottfried Hagen, embodied a meaningful discourse between the ruling classes and the subject populations.[115] "Legitimacy is a belief" writes Karateke, for legitimacy does not involve the physical subjugation of a population's will to a ruler's authority.[116] Rather, legitimacy only functions when the validity of a group or a person's right to exercise authority becomes internalized within the consciousness of the subject population. This may be achieved through a variety of means, including what has been stipulated as "habitual legitimacy," or the gradual routinization of the legitimacy of an authority over long periods without conflict, in which the claims of the political authority, free of opposition, come to be accepted as a matter of habit.[117] In the course of its history the Ottoman dynasty drew from a number of different mechanisms of legitimacy, including its identity as a successful military household, the pedigree of its genealogy, and, particularly following the conquest of Egypt and the Hijaz under Sultan Selīm I, its stature as the defender of the Islamic faith.

Religious legitimacy was articulated by the Ottoman dynasty in a variety of forms including the construction of vast mosque complexes and pious institutions, the subsidization of the annual pilgrimage caravans to the Hijaz, the patronage of *sūfī* brotherhoods and expressions

---

[112] Ibid.

[113] Ibid., 25-35.

[114] Ibid., 27.

[115] Hakan Karateke, "Legitimizing the Ottoman Sultanate: A Framework for Historical Analysis," In *Legitimizing the Order: The Ottoman Rhetoric of State Power* ed. Hakan Karateke and Maurus Reinkowski (Boston: Brill, 2005), 15. Gottfried Hagen, "Legitimacy and World Order," In *Legitimizing the Order: The Ottoman Rhetoric of State Power* ed. Hakan Karateke and Maurus Reinkowski (Boston: Brill, 2005), 55-56.

[116] Karateke, "Legitimizing the Ottoman Sultanate: A Framework for Historical Analysis," 15.

[117] Ibid., 17.

of the personal piety of individual sulṭāns.[118] Contrary to the popularized historiographical clichés regarding Sultan Aḥmed III, this monarch was in fact an ardent supporter of the seventeenth and eighteenth century orthodox Islamic "renewer" order of the Müceddidiyye, and Muḥammed Murād Buḥārī (d.1720), a disciple of the son of the founder of the movement, Shaykh Aḥmed al-Sirhindī (d.1624), exercised pervasive influence over the Ottoman capital's socioeconomic elite in the decades of Aḥmed III's tenure as sulṭān.[119]

These facts should serve as a caution against interpreting the social entertainments and cultural innovations of the 1718-1730 period as libertine or even irreverent. Such interpretations of this period have a very long past, and can be traced to some of the first individuals to chronicle the reign of Aḥmed III, including Şemʿdānīzāde Fındıklılı Süleymān Efendi (d.1779) and Abdi Efendi (d.1764). However, far from being indications of the irreverence or immorality of the statesmen of the time, and particularly of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha (since these works do not directly accuse the sulṭān), they should be viewed as engagements with the discourse of legitimacy, communicating with and subverting the symbols of religious legitimacy in an attempt to invalidate the government of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha and his associates. Şemʿdānīzāde, for example, exclaims that

> this vizier had no esteem for the ʿulemā and the sinless, the learned and the gallant and the heroic; for they [the ʿulemā, the sinless, etc] would not consent to such behavior [as the vizier's] and by esteeming the sinful, the sinful ceased to respect the sinless, and would mock them and while our emperor for fifteen years was occupied in commanding right and forbidding wrong, this vizier even made the emperor

(*bu vezīrin ʿulemāya ve ṣuleḥāya ve ʿuḳalāya ve bahādırlara ve şecīʿlere raġbeti yoktur; zīrā anlar bu misüllü eṭvāra rıżā vermezler ve süfehāya raġbet etmekle süfehā ṣuleḥāya adam demeyüp, istihzā eder oldu ve pādişāhımız bu vezīre gelince on beş sene emr-i maʿrūf ve neyh-i ʿaniʾl-münker ile meşġūl iken bu vezīr pādişāha dahi müsāmaḥa ve müsāʿade ettirdi*).[121]

The language used by Şemʿdānīzāde here expresses a state of social chaos and disruption, in which the natural order of Ottoman society has been turned on its head and the sinful and the vagrants mock and disrespect the sinless. One of the pillars of the rhetoric of Ottoman dynastic legitimacy was the concept of "universal order," the *niẓām-ı ʿālem*, which accorded a natural order to the structure of society in which different social classes supported and enabled the welfare and function of one another through a cycle of interdependence expressed under the

---

[118] Artan, "Royal Weddings and the Grand Vezirate," 344. Findley, "Political Culture and the Great Households," 68. Hagen, "Legitimacy and World Order," 74-80. Karateke, "Legitimizing the Ottoman Sultanate: A Framework for Historical Analysis," 25-31.

[119] Artan, "Forms and Forums of Expression: Istanbul and beyond, 1600-1800," 379.

[121] Fındıklılı Süleyman Efendi Şemdanizade, *Müriʾt-tevârih* ed. Münir Aktepe (Istanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Matbaası, 1976), 3. Direct translations from Ottoman-Turkish texts found throughout this thesis are those of the author.

concept of the "circle of equity" (*dā'ire-i 'adliye*).[122] Ottoman intellectuals beginning with Tursun Beg (d.1499) in the fifteenth century theorized chronic and intrinsic instability into the nature of human societies.[123] Such sociological theories established the need for sultanic authority, for it became the responsibility of the sultan through the aid of his administrative apparatus to restore order to an inherently disorderly society by placing each individual in the post that that individual belonged to per the circle of equity. The immoral and outrageous social disruption described by Şem'dānīzāde therefore exemplifies an attempt to appeal directly to these concepts and through them delegitimize the actions and policies of the grand vizier Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha. Notably, Şem'dānīzāde's passage also invokes a not so indirect assault on the legitimacy of Sultan Aḥmed III. That the sultan is described as having been engaged with the Qur'anic injunction to command right and forbid wrong is a standard rhetorical device. Şem'dānīzāde is not able to directly accuse the sultan of immorality; he therefore does the next best thing by asserting that the sultan allowed and tolerated his vizier's immoral activities.

The operative means whereby the Ottoman monarchs were expected to fulfill their responsibility of maintaining the natural order through the circle of equity was by upholding and implementing justice.[124] In other words, it was through the activities of the *'ilmiye* apparatus that this fundamental responsibility of good government was applied. The vast imperial network of courts and *kadıs* in dispensing law and order functioned thereby as mechanisms producing and communicating the legitimate authority of the Ottoman dynasty. Part of this understanding of imperial justice was the role of the sultan in protecting his subjects from the exploitation of his officials.[125] To this end, Ottoman subjects always had at least the theoretical right to appeal local tax collections, and could even hand in appeals personally to the sultan during royal Friday processions in the Ottoman capital.[126] Appeals were most often rendered in the local courthouses, but some could even reach as far as the imperial council (*dīvān*).[127]

The foregoing discussion has highlighted the religio-judicial aspects of Ottoman dynastic identity and legitimacy. The function of the Ottoman clerical hierarchy in administering these aspects created a potential and the means for the *'ilmiye* to intrude into the political authority of the monarchy. Preachers and religious functionaries could provide a rhetoric of validity to uprisings against an incumbent sulṭān, as was the case in fact in the 1730 revolt that dethroned Aḥmed III in which the preacher of the mosque of Haghia Sophia, one "İspīrī-oğlu," became the

---

[122] Hagen, "Legitimacy and World Order," 61, 65.
[123] Ibid., 61-62.
[124] Findley, "Political Culture and the Great Households," 68.
[125] Karateke, "'Legitimizing the Ottoman Sultanate: A Framework for Historical Analysis," 37-39.
[126] Darling, "Public finances: the role of the Ottoman centre," 120.
[127] Findley, "Political Culture and the Great Households," 67.

spokesperson for the rebels and delivered their demands to the court.[128] However, although the possibility for the appropriation of political capital by the *'ulemā* was innate to the dynamics of Ottoman state administration and legitimacy, the enhancement of the power of *'ulemā* grandees in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is related to the expansion of the monetary mechanisms that fell under their jurisdiction, and in the consequent creation at the end of the seventeenth century of a more unified field of jurisprudence in the empire. Related also is the decline of the sulṭān's role as military commander, which compelled the dynasty to appeal more to other symbols of its power and magnanimity, of which upholding the law and religiosity were two important elements. This disintegration of the military-charismatic ideal of the Ottoman sulṭāns will be considered in greater detail below in the context of the rise of the pasha and vizier households.

In addition to assimilating the *'ulemā* more intimately into the processes of state administration and policy formation, monetization also extensively impacted social stratification within the hierarchical *'ilmiye* structure itself. The *'ālims* of the upper echelons of the *'ilmiye* in the Ottoman center were able to monopolize cash flows through the fact that the sanctioning of cash *waqfs* and the granting of teaching licenses that enabled *müderrises* to be appointed to teaching posts were under their authority.[129] Furthermore, the *'ulemā* received remuneration from court fees as well.[130] The drastic expansion in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries of the number of *medrese* students striving to move through the *medrese* hierarchy on the one hand and on the other in the number of candidates for teaching and judicial-administrative positions outgrew the size of the empire's *'ilmiye* apparatus.[131] Furthermore, the gradual loss of territories beginning in the final quarter of the seventeenth century served to reduce the quantity of posts available to the *'ulemā.* The historian Meḥmed Rāşid (d.1735), for example, had to wait as long as eleven years in order to enter the entrance examination for the first *medrese* grade of the *İbtidā-i Ḫāric*.[132] These processes led to the development of an *'ulemā* aristocracy of elite *'ulemā* families who colonized the upper grades of the *'ilmiye* hierarchy and used the prerogatives granted senior *'ulemā* in the distribution of posts within the Ottoman religious bureaucracy to favor their family members and clients.[133] Madeline Zilfi, whose work traces this particular seventeenth and eighteenth century development, notes that between 1703 (the ascension of

---

[128] Selim Karahasanoğlu, *Politics and Governance in the Ottoman Empire: The Rebellion of 1730. An Account of the Revolution that took place in Constantinople in the year 1143 of the Hegira* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009), 142.

[129] Kunt, "Royal and other households," 112., Tezcan, *The Second Ottoman Empire,* 37-38.

[130] Ibid.

[131] Zilfi, "The Ottoman *ulema*," 217-219.

[132] Ibid., 217.

[133] Findley, "Political Culture and the Great Households," 70.

Sultan Aḥmed III), and 1839, three Ottoman families provided between themselves a fifth of all *şeyhülislāms* and that eight families produced father and son *şeyhülislām* combinations.[134] Of these latter eight, members of the ʿArabzāde, Mirzazāde, and Paşmakçızāde families will emerge in the third chapter of this study as important scholarly *ʿālim* members of the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha household faction. Zilfi indicates that by the early eighteenth century, the Ottoman *ʿilmiye,* especially in the imperial center, had come to be characterized by a "patrilinear pattern" of recruitment and advancement.[135]

The excessive quantity of student candidates and candidates for office created an environment in which the support and patronage of a senior *ʿālim* became indispensable for prospective individuals seeking to have a career in the *ʿilmiye.* This in turn created a suitable environment for the development of patron-client networks and by the early eighteenth century, major *ʿulemā* households had emerged that dominated the summit of the *ʿilmiye* apparatus. This shift is also visible in the *ʿulemā* biographies compiled by Ottoman *ʿālims*. Madeline Zilfi has demonstrated how Ottoman *ʿulemā* biographies compiled in the fifteenth to mid-sixteenth centuries praise *ʿālims* based on values such as their independence, courage, and humility whereas the biographies compiled after the mid-sixteenth century become increasingly obsessed with status and genealogy, defining *ʿālims* not based on personal qualities but rather on the pedigree of their families and social status.[136] This process of the aristocratization of the *ʿilmiye* became institutionalized through the *ʿulemāzāde ḳānūnu* in the eighteenth century whereby *ʿulemā* notables were able to vouch for the scholarly aptitude of their own sons, allowing their sons to benefit from a number of privileges including exemption from entrance examinations.[137] In reference to these aristocratized *ʿulemā* families, Lady Mary Montagu writes that, "The Grand Signor, the general Heir to his people, never presumes to touch their lands or money, which goes in an uninterrupted succession to their Children."[138]

Perhaps one of the best examples of this process was the *şeyhülislām* Feyżullāh Efendi (d. 1703), who "appropriated virtually all positions worth having," and even had his son appointed *şeyhülislām* designate.[139] The rise and fall of *şeyhülislām* Feyżullāh Efendi and his abortive attempt at establishing a *şeyhülislām* dynasty was tied to the politics of Sultan Mustafa II, who sought to undermine the power of the vizier and pasha households, in particular that of

---

[134] Madeline C. Zilfi, "Elite Circulation in the Ottoman Empire: Great Mollas of the Eighteenth Century" *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* Vol 26 No 3 (1983), 320-321. These three families were the Dürrizādes, Ebu Ishakzādes, and Feyzullahzādes. The eight families were the Arabzādes, Dāmādzādes, Mekkizādes, Paşmakçızādes, Pirizādes, Salihzādes, and the Vessafzādes.

[135] Zilfi, "Elite Circulation in the Ottoman Empire: Great Mollas of the Eighteenth Century," 320.

[136] Zilfi, "The Ottoman *ulema,*" 210.

[137] Ibid., 220.

[138] Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, *The Complete Letters of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu,* 316.

[139] Zilfi, "The Ottoman *ulema,*", 222.

the Köprülü household faction, through allying with and empowering Feyżullāh Efendi. However, Zilfi's remark that "a decade after Feyżullāh, nepotistic and hereditary advantage became more systematically embedded in the career, especially for senior members [of the *'ulemā*]," indicates that *'ulemā* households formed a prominent part of the socioeconomic elite of the Ottoman capital in the 1718-1730 period.[140] Indeed, from 1718 to 1730, the *şeyhülislām* was Yenişehirli Abdullah Efendi, a close associate of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha, and a scion of an old established Istanbul *'ulemā* family, the Çatalcıs.[141]

The same factors that contributed to the enhancement of the social prestige and political power of the *'ilmiye* also caused the Ottoman scribal bureaucracy, the *kalemiye*, to undergo substantial expansion between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries. The function of the Ottoman scribal bureaucracy involved the composition of official documents, land grants, decrees, letters, provincial registers, and the management of accounts and finance.[142] Such tasks multiplied and intensified with monetization, so that from a few imperial council accountants, Ottoman bureaucrats had come to staff vast bureaucratic bureaux (*kalems*) by the eighteenth century.[143] For example, the expansion and regularization of the *cizye* tax discussed earlier necessitated the formation of a separate government bureau in the seventeenth century that was solely focused on the administration of the *cizye*; the *cizye* accounting bureau (*cizye muḥāsebesi kalemi*).[144] Likewise, the growth in size and financial value of tax farms led to the creation of accounting bureaux that specialized in specific tax farms.[145]

The expansion of the Ottoman bureaucracy and the consequent impact that the cultural interests of the Ottoman scribal bureaucratic elite had on Ottoman court culture will be examined in greater depth in the following chapter. It is important to note here however that the growth and enhancement of the Ottoman scribal bureaucracy was a process that unfolded in synthesis with the rise of the vizier and pasha households in the same period. Indeed, it would not be incorrect to state that the vizier and pasha households shared a symbiotic relationship with the scribal bureaucracy. As indicated above, the economic foundations of the vizier and pasha households were the system of Ottoman land grants that underwent monetization in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The administration and bookkeeping of these revenue grants and tax farms

---

[140] Ibid., 223.

[141] Artan , "Royal Weddings and the Grand Vezirate," 371. Zilfi, "Elite Circulation in the Ottoman Empire: Great Mollas of the Eighteenth Century," 325.

[142] Linda T. Darling, "Ottoman Turkish: Written Language and Scribal Practice, 13th to 20th Centuries," In *Literacy in the Persianate World* ed. Brian Spooner and William Hanaway (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012), 182.

[143] Neumann, "Political and diplomatic developments," 54.

[144] Ursinus, "The Transformation of the Ottoman Fiscal Regime c.1600-1850," 425.

[145] Ibid.

were assigned by households to their subordinates.[146] The households provided scribal bureaucrats with employment opportunities, practical experience, and access to patronage networks. On the other hand, Ottoman grandees sought to acquire control over cash flows by placing their household clients in key government posts.[147] Furthermore, by the eighteenth century, appointment to government office in the Ottoman Empire had come to involve the payment of fees and bribes.[148] This practice, combined with annual reappointments, turned administrative service into a risky investment.[149] In effect, bureaucratic offices were commoditized and an environment of fluidity and uncertainty developed in which the patron-client relations that constituted vizier and pasha households came to serve an important function for both grandees and bureaucrats. Grandees were able to draw from a pool of subordinates with which they could seek to maintain control over government offices that regularly underwent reappointment, and the latter obtained a degree of job security in a climate of increasing professional competitiveness.

The development of the internal dynamics of the Ottoman scribal bureaucracy also mirrored in many ways the developments within the *'ilmiye* hierarchy. The "climate of increasing professional competitiveness" just mentioned was a product of a phenomenon shared by the *'ilmiye* and *kalemiye*: in both of these career lines, the quantity of aspirants to office exceeded the number of positions available for employment.[150] Furthermore, the scribal bureaucracy also experienced the type of hierarchization and aristocratization that created elite *'ulemā* households in the *'ilmiye*. As such, an upper echelon known as the *ḫācegān* emerged within the bureaucratic apparatus of *kalems* in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[151] High ranking scribal bureaucrats themselves began to exercise a greater amount of political clout. This is evidenced by the fact that by the sixteenth century, a number of finance ministers managed to acquire the post of grand vizier.[152] It was however the bureaucrats moving through the posts of the central administration or *Reīsü'l-Küttāplık* who came to acquire the greatest amount of social and political capital in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In the mid-seventeenth century, this branch of the Ottoman bureaucracy moved from the imperial palace to the palace of the grand vizier.[153] The growth in the ostentation and size of the grand vizierial palace also demonstrates the growing autonomy of the Ottoman state administration. Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha

---

[146] Abou-el-Haj, *The 1703 Rebellion and the Structure of Ottoman Politics*, 8.
[147] Findley, "Political Culture and the Great Households," 75.
[148] Ibid.
[149] Ibid.
[150] Ibid.
[151] Itzkowitz, "Eighteenth Century Ottoman Realities," 87.
[152] Tezcan, *The Second Ottoman Empire* 15.
[153] Artan "Royal Weddings and the Grand Vezirate," 370.

endeavored to further amplify the status of this edifice by organizing the route of royal wedding processions so that they passed in front of the palace of the grand vizier, which was located on the Hippodrome, the large central public square of the Ottoman capital.[154]

By the eighteenth century, therefore, the Ottoman state was no longer synonymous with the imperial household. By then, the administrative apparatus had expanded in size and undergone a thorough professionalization and institutionalization, and many of its services had moved out of the imperial palace. The fact that the Ottoman treasury never attained the pedigree and political influence of the central administration was probably related to its bureaux having remained in the palace, and thus also under the authority of the sulṭān.[155] A further aspect of the household-bureaucracy relationship concerns the intellectual culture of the scribal class, a culture which was rooted in what this study has defined as the *adāb* fields of knowledge. Unlike the *ʿulemā*, who in the *medrese* system had access to an educational infrastructure that provided instruction in their realm of expertise, the scribal bureaucracy benefited from no such structure. Accounting and bookkeeping were not in themselves sufficient for ambitious bureaucrats to advance through the Ottoman social elite. When recounting the recruitment of Çorlulu ʿAlī Pasha (d.1711) into the Ottoman palace, Cantemir writes that, moved by the handsomeness of Çorlulu ʿAlī Pasha, an Ottoman palace functionary asks him, "whether he [i.e. Çorlulu ʿAlī Pasha] would follow him and become an *Othmanly, i.e.* a courtier?"[156] To be an Ottoman meant to belong to the ruling Ottoman military-administrative class and by the eighteenth century, the social identity of this "Ottoman class" had come to be structured not only through fluency in the courtly Ottoman-Turkish language, but also upon the possession of a broad intellectual grasp of the various sciences of the *adāb* fields, most prominently those of literature and historiography.[157] The vizier and pasha households, through their private book collections, through the library endowments made by their grandees and their gathering of literary and scholarly figures, became sites of education where scribal bureaucrats could expand their understanding of the arts and letters that had come to define membership in the Ottoman ruling class.[158] This subject will however be considered in greater detail in the proceeding chapter.

Cantemir explains that when Çorlulu ʿAlī Pasha was discovered, he was a peasant boy from a Muslim family living in a Thracian village.[159] The mechanism through which members were recruited for the Ottoman military-administrative class as established in the fifteenth

---

[154] Ibid., 368-369.
[155] Ibid., 370.
[156] Cantemir, *The history of the growth and decay of the Othman Empire*, 445.
[157] Kunt, "Royal and other households," 108-109.
[158] Ibid.
[159] Cantemir, *The history of the growth and decay of the Othman Empire* 445.

century relied on the induction through the *devşirme* of non-Muslim boys into the palace service.[160] They would afterwards be trained as provincial administrators, as soldiers for the various corps of the central army, or as palace functionaries that would remain in the service of the royal family.[161] The janissary corps of imperial infantry was thus meant to be comprised of royal slaves rendered through the palace schools and the *devşirme* system. Yet, in contrast to this, a near contemporary account of the 1730 Patrona Ḥalīl Revolt that deposed Sultan Aḥmed III and caused the execution of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha describes the unrest of the janissaries in the following terms:

> This Irresolution raised the Murmurs of the Soldiers, who found themselves prejudiced; for those that were designed for this Expedition, had ruined themselves by the Expences for so long a March, and having abandoned their Shops, and sold their Barques to accouter themselves, grew discontented, not only on account of the unnecessary Expences, but also the loss of the daily Profits they might reap from their labours; for it is known to be a customary Thing for the *Turkish* Soldiers to exercise some Trade or other. (*sic*.)[162]

The Patrona Ḥalīl Revolt of 1730 was led by a small group of janissary officers organized around the Albanian janissary Patrona Ḥalīl (d.1730), and attracted mostly disaffected members of this corps whose economic interests had been damaged by the indecisive preparations undertaken in the Ottoman capital for a Persian campaign in 1730.[163] The final element that instigated the uprising on the 28th of September 1730 was the arrival of news of the fall of Tabriz to the Safavid forces.[164]

While Cantemir's account of Çorlulu ʿAlī Pasha indicates that by the eighteenth century, Muslim boys could be recruited into the palace service, the foregoing account illustrates an infantry corps that resembles an armed corporation of tradesmen or artisans more than it does a professional standing army. What were the dynamics that contributed to these developments? First, the currency devaluation that swept the empire in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries degraded the real value of the government pay received by the janissaries, forcing members of

---

[160] Kunt, "Royal and other households," 108-112.
[161] Ibid.
[162] *A particular account of the two rebellions, which happen'd at Constantinople, in the years MDCCXXX, and MDCCXXXI, at the deposition of Achmet the Third, and the elevation of Mahomet the Fifth: composed from the original memorials drawn up in Constantinople: With Remarks, Explaining the Names, Offices, Dignities, &c. of the Port. Lately publish'd in French,at the Hague: Now for the Excellency of the Relation translated into English* (London: Printed for G. Smith, 1737), 3.
[163] Standford Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey Volume I Empire of the Gazis, the Rise and Decline of the Ottoman Empire 1280-1808* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 239-240.
[164] Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey Volume I,* 240.

this corps to begin exercising "some trade or other" in order to make a living.[165] Furthermore, the seventeenth century saw a switch to the utilization of mass armies of peasants armed with firearms in the Ottoman Empire (known as *sekbāns*).[166] This development was connected to changes in the military technology and tactics used by European powers at the time; its effect was to make the janissary corps less significant as a fighting force.

The reduced value of government salaries did not however make the janissary corps an unappealing institution for urban dwellers in Ottoman cities seeking means to acquire upward social mobility or some form of welfare protection. The janissary corps provided credit, housing, legal immunities and tax exemptions for its members.[167] It remained therefore a useful investment for the Ottoman middling classes. What made this investment possible in the first place, however, was the fact that by the seventeenth century, the corps had come to control its own recruitment processes.[168] This meant that urban artisans and craftsmen living in Ottoman cities could pay the entrance fee of the janissary corps or bribe janissary officers and become admitted onto the janissary rolls.[169] That large quantities of the urban middle and lower classes were able to do so, transforming the janissaries from a professional standing army to an embodiment and representative of the productive and commercial groups of urban society, demonstrates both the extent to which the Ottoman economy had undergone monetization, and reflects also the presence of a significant non-elite contingent within Ottoman society that had access to cash flows. As a consequence of these developments, the janissary corps came to manifest the interests of this "non-elite contingent within Ottoman society." The passage presented above demonstrates that one of the key factors responsible for the revolt of 1730 was that the miscalculations of the Ottoman court damaged the economic interests of the capital's janissaries. Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha by having reduced in his tenure the inflated registers of janissaries had already antagonized the corps.[170] The Ottoman chronicler Abdi recounts that, following the deposition of the sultan and execution of the grand vizier, the janissaries registered back onto their rolls "however many people there were in a household – female, male, bastards in the womb – all were individually registered and then signed-up to the sulṭān's troops."[171]

In addition to the decline of the *devşirme* system (which incidentally was abolished under Sultan Aḥmed III, although the system itself had become ineffective as early as the early

---

[165] Tezcan, *The Second Ottoman Empire,* 190. Cemal Kafadar, "Janissaries and Other Riffraff of Ottoman Istanbul: Rebels Without a Cause?" in *Identity and Identity Formation in the Ottoman World: A Volume of Essays in Honor of Norman Itzkowitz* ed. Baki Tezcan and Karl K. Barbir (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2007).
[166] Darling, "Public finances: the role of the Ottoman centre," 118.
[167] Tezcan, *The Second Ottoman Empire,* 205-208.
[168] Ibid., 204.
[169] Ibid., 205.
[170] Finkel, "The Perils of Insouciance," 355.
[171] Ibid.

seventeenth century) and the transition of the janissary corps into an entity in which "most of the *Yeniçeris* [janissaries] pursued non-military trades and most artisans were affiliated with the corps," the emplacement of vizier and pasha household clients and graduates into the imperial administration also contributed to the gradual replacement of imperial *kuls* with Muslim-born subjects in the military-administrative ruling class of the Ottoman Empire.[172] The grandee households produced a large quantity of qualified administrators and accountants not only because they provided employment opportunities but because they also imitated to a certain degree within their establishments the palace school of the Ottoman court.[173] Therefore it is not improper to speak of "vizier and pasha household graduates."

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the Ottoman state apparatus experienced a rapid expansion in the volume of bureaucratic functions and responsibilities. This phenomenon was a direct consequence of the processes studied in this chapter. This expansion produced a need for qualified men with accounting and administrative skills, a need that the *devşirme* system could not adequately meet.[174] As described earlier, the Ottoman system of household-based administration required military governors (pashas) and viziers to maintain household establishments commensurate with their state income. This structure was in fact very carefully calibrated, so that a military governor granted a district was expected to have a retinue of one-hundred to two-hundred men whereas a governor general of a province was to maintain up to a thousand men.[175] Viziers of the imperial council, on the other hand, were expected to have several thousand men in their retinues.[176] Therefore, the infrastructure was already in place from which the central government could acquire the administrative clerical professinals which the expanding monetized bureaucracy needed. The practice of employing the subordinates of pasha and vizier households in the state apparatus developed at such a rate that by 1700, fifty percent of the Ottoman administration was staffed by these individuals.[177] The process of delegating state administration to the households in turn would alter the makeup of the Ottoman ruling class and disperse the political hegemony of the dynastic center over a more inclusive spectrum of political elites. The following section examines in greater detail this process and presents how the 1718-1730 period came to be defined by the stable dominance of a single grandee household establishment.

---

[172] Tezcan, *The Second Ottoman Empire,* 198-204, 202.
[173] Findley, "Political Culture and the Great Households," 76.
[174] Abou-el-Haj, *The 1703 Rebellion and the Structure of Ottoman Politics,* 8.
[175] Kunt, "Royal and other households," 104.
[176] Ibid.
[177] Abou-el-Haj, *The 1703 Rebellion and the Structure of Ottoman Politics.* 9.

Ottoman Administration after the sixteenth century and the Grandee Households

Within the dense stream of condemnatory and colorful rhetoric which comprises the eighteenth century *ʿālim* and self appointed Ottoman historian Şemʿdānīzāde Fındıklılı Süleymān Efendi's account of the period of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's tenure as grand vizier, an insightful passage defines and delineates the dynamics of contemporary Ottoman social politics in the following terms, "His own dependants being like this, even the dependants of his dependants would mock the humble men amongst the learned with disrespectful acts and behavior devoted to pleasure and entertainments prohibited by religion".[178] Here, the term *müteʿallıḳının müteʿallıḳları,* which has here been translated as "dependants of his dependants," but which can also perhaps be rendered "clients of his clients," expresses the complex and networked structure of a hierarchized society in which layers of clients attend grandees who themselves may in turn be clients, and where the sociopolitical capital accrued by a pre-eminent grand vizier is distilled and refracted across and down the multitude of patron-client networks that may be attached to a single prominent political elite. In addition, Şemʿdānīzāde's passage invokes anxiety and rage over perceived antinormative sociocultural behavior.[179] Despite the inherent bias of Şemʿdānīzāde, his account is useful for this study in providing near contemporary illustrations of both the lineaments of the sociopolitical entities known as the vizier and pasha households, and the innovations in cultural consumption and social space that they oversaw and subsidized in the 1718-1730 period.[180]

The "pleasures" and "entertainments" that Şemʿdānīzāde derides had more to do with the changing dynamics of social status assertion and legitimacy in the early eighteenth century than with hedonism. As Colin Imber notes, the identity of the Ottoman sultan as military commander and leader of the Islamic faith-militant was "above all" the single most important symbol of dynastic authority in the Ottoman state.[181] The crisis of legitimacy faced by the decay of this element of Ottoman dynastic identity was therefore quite serious. A number of factors contributed to this development. The sheer size of the empire after the sixteenth century made

[178] Şemʿdānīzāde, Mür'i't-tevârih, 4. (*Kendü müteʿallıkları şöyle dursun müteʿallıḳının müteʿallıkları dahi lāübāli hareket ve sefīhāne hareketle ʿukalādan meskenetlü adamları istihzā ederleridi*).
[179] There is also perhaps a subtle criticism in this passage directed towards certain groups within the literate classes, as it would seem that only those whom Şemʿdānīzāde defines as "the humble" among the learned were mocked. Were there then those among the learned who were perhaps not so humble, and were in fact associated with those perceived and presented as engaged in mockery? This may or may not be the case as Şemʿdānīzāde does use the term *ukalâ* without further qualifications or differentiation in other parts of his work where he complains of the abuses the learned were subjected to under Dāmād Ibrahim Pasha's political hegemony. Şemdanizade, *Mür'i't-tevârih,* 3
[180] Şemʿdānīzāde was a member of the Ottoman *ʿulemā* and the son of a merchant from the inner-Anatolian town of Tokat who settled in Istanbul sometime before the Patrona Halil Revolt of 1730. *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi, s.v,* "Şemdanizade Süleyman Efendi."
[181] Imber, "Frozen Legitimacy,"15. Gottfried Hagen, "Legitimacy and World Order," In *Legitimizing the Order: The Ottoman Rhetoric of State Power* ed. Hakan Karateke and Maurus Reinkowski (Boston: Brill, 2005), 99.

exceedingly difficult the possibility of annual conquests through seasonal campaigns.[182] Changes in military tactics and technology also wore away at the military advantage enjoyed by fourteenth and fifteenth century sulṭāns.[183] Over the course of the seventeenth century, as conflicts came to last for multiple years at a time, military command of the empire's forces was delegated to the grand vizier, who in turn acquired a *kethüdā* or deputy to look after his affairs when he was away on campaign, indicating futher the complexity and expansion of state administrative affairs at this time.[184] As the sulṭāns ceased to be actual military commanders, they began to adopt militaristic rituals through which they sought to persist in presenting themselves in relation to the dynasty's military identity. These rituals included the sword girding ceremony, instituted in 1617, and visits to the ancestral tombs of their martial predecessors.[185]

At the same time, the expansion of global commercial networks transformed consumption patterns in the Ottoman capital. It is important to note that, even though in the period of study here Western European trade only comprised between five and ten percent of the Ottoman market, nonetheless the Ottoman capital was a massive importer of European goods and the Ottoman court especially was a major locus of consumption.[186] However, the great majority of Ottoman consumption throughout the eighteenth century involved products that came into the empire from the east or were locally produced.[187] This also helps explain why the Ottoman state continued to encourage European merchants by handing out capitulations to Western European states, even as the import of European manufactures began to damage local manufacturing industries towards the end of the eighteenth century.[188] The information provided by records of Ottoman commercial dues leased out as tax farms in the 1718-1730 period demonstrates a stable and respectable increase in the commercial activity and income of Ottoman ports in this period.[189] Likewise, Ottoman exports of raw materials continued to grow in these years.[190] As noted above, the Ottoman central elite monopolized control over the empire's tax farms. As such, the expansion of trade between 1718 and 1730 would have contributed to the growth of the affluence of the socioeconomic elite of the capital.

Affluence enabled Ottoman elites to challenge the established status symbols of the dynasty by appropriating dynastic patterns of consumption. Whether it was in the architecture of

---

[182] Imber, "Frozen Legitimacy," 102.
[183] Barkey, *Bandits and Bureacrats,* 12.
[184] Imber, "Frozen Legitimacy," 102.
[185] Ibid., 104. Artan, "Royal Weddings and the Grand Vezirate," 347.
[186] Eldhem, 303-305.
[187] Ibid., 285.
[188] Ibid., 292-296.
[189] Genç, "A Study of the Feasibility of Using Eighteenth-century Ottoman Financial Records as an Indicator of Economic Activity," 358-363.
[190] Finkel, "The Perils of Insouciance," 341.

their timber-framed waterside villas, or in the style of their ostentatious clothing, in their engagement with floral culture or in their patronage of litterateurs or even in their consumption of comestibles the urban notables of the capital, bureaucrats, *'ulemā*, viziers and pashas and courtiers sought to replicate the behavior of the Ottoman dynasty.[191] In response, the Ottoman sultan could no longer hope to depict the grandeur of the dynasty through cultivating a magnificent elaboration of choreographed seclusion as his predecessors had in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.[192] The terms of the discourse of legitimacy had changed; it was now to be articulated through engagement and communication with the social elite and the urban middle and lower classes as well. This is the context in which the public entertainments of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha and Sultan Aḥmed III, the *lāle çırağānları* and the *helva sohbetleri* (tulip soirees and halva communions) that Şem'dānīzāde condemns so viscerally, should be interpreted.[193] The gardens of the palatial complex of *Sa'dābād* at *Kağıdḫāne* that Aḥmed III and Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha commissioned were intentionally accessible and visible to the public.[194] Likewise, the Bosphorus became a "*via imperial*" upon which imperial processions passed to convey to the watching public the magnanimity of the Ottoman dynasty.[195] This was also the purpose of the numerous religious and dynastic public festivals, for circumcisions, births, and royal marriages, that Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha and Aḥmed III organized between 1718 and 1730.[196]

The enhanced public presence of the Ottoman court in this period was therefore a direct reaction to the irruption by a number of different social groups into the political sovereignty previously monopolized by the dynastic family. The attempt by the Ottoman court to reassert its social supremacy contributed in the eighteenth century to a construction boom of such magnitude in the Ottoman capital that Shirine Hamadeh has called it the "second conquest" of the city.[197] The growth of monetary markets and interregional commercial networks in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in the Ottoman Empire transformed the key administrative institutions that enabled the power of the Ottoman dynasty to be applied to Ottoman society in such drastic ways that these institutions came to appropriate the very political sovereignty they were meant to administer. The vizier and pasha households had already come to challenge the sulṭān's authority in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries while they were still mostly composed of *kuls*

---

[191] Hamadeh, *The City's Pleasures,* 25-28. Ariel Salzmann, "The Age of Tulips: Confluence and Conflict in Early Modern Consumer Culture (1550-1730)," In *Consumption Studies and the History of the Ottoman Empire 1550-1922* ed. Donald Quataert, (New York: State University of New York Press, 2000), 93-94.
[192] For an analysis of this imperial practice and its ceremonial articulation, see Gülrü Necipoğlu, *The Age of Sinan: Architectural Culture in the Ottoman Empire* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005).
[193] Şemdanizade, Mür'i't-tevârih, 3.
[194] Artan, "Royal Weddings and the Grand Vezirate," 394-400.
[195] Hamadeh, *The City's Pleasures,* 48.
[196] Artan, "Royal Weddings and the Grand Vezirate," 355. Hamadeh, *The City's Pleasures,* 51.
[197] Hamadeh, *The City's Pleasures,* 10.

derived through the *devşirme* system.[198] However, under grand vizier Köprülü Meḥmed Pasha (d.1661) the process was conclusively initiated whereby the Muslim-born subjects of the empire came to take over and dominate the vizier and pasha household system.

The Köprülü dynasty of grand viziers lasted from 1656 to 1683, and afterwards the Köprülü household faction continued to be the main political force opposing the palace up until the insurrection of 1703, which Abou-el-Haj contends was engineered by this faction.[199] During the Köprülü period, vizier and pasha household functionaries came steadily to occupy a greater proportion of the state administration.[200] Under the second Köprülü grand vizier, Köprülü Fāżıl Aḥmed Pasha (d.1676), the Ottoman financial bureaucracy came to be centered on tax farms. It was only after the death of Sultan Aḥmed III's mother, Emetullāh Gülnüş (d. 1715), an ally of the Köprülü faction, that Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha was able to expand his power and overthrow the Köprülü household.[201] Therefore, it might be appropriate to define the 1718-1730 period not perhaps as the "Tulip Age," but as the second age of the great households (the first age of the great household being that of the Köprülü dynasty).

Çorlulu 'Alī Pasha was one of the last associates of the Köprülü faction. As previously mentioned, he came from a poor Muslim family in Ottoman Thrace. In the early reign of Aḥmed III he served as grand vizier and shortly before his death, in 1708, he was married to one of the daughters of Mustafa II, a betrothal engaged under the auspices Emetullāh Gülnüş. Cantemir's account of the young Çorlulu Ali's early years at the Ottoman palace neatly and concisely illustrates some of the dynamics that the following chapter will explore: "*Cara Bairam Ogli* [i.e. Çorlulu Ali's patron, who discovered him in Thrace] thought it more advisable to bring him into the Sultan's palace, as a spacious theatre, in which his virtues might shine; and, by being his patron, enlarge one day his fortune, rather than keep him in his own house employed in servile offices."[202] Here, Cantemir conveys the means by which a client attached to a prominent grandee household could be strategically utilized and placed in the imperial palace. The hopes of Çorlulu 'Alī Pasha's patron in bringing his protégé upon the stage of the "spacious theatre" of the court are also expressed, as is the fact that lesser "servile" positions could be held by household functionaries within the administration of a grandee household itself.

The culture of the central elite of the Ottoman capital that Chapter Two will examine bound together grandees, subordinates of the vizier and pasha households, court functionaries, and members of the Ottoman royal dynasty in a shared intellectual consciousness and identity.

---

[198] Tezcan, *The Second Ottoman Empire,* 107-108.
[199] Abou-el-Haj, *The 1703 Rebellion and the Structure of Ottoman Politics.*
[200] Ibid., 42-48.
[201] Artan "Royal Weddings and the Grand Vezirate," 368.
[202] Cantemir, *The history of the growth and decay of the Othman Empire,* 445.

The mechanism of placing household graduates in the imperial service and even in the imperial palace itself was one of the main channels that enabled this shared consciousness to emerge. "Though he had not studied the liberal arts, yet no one could hear him speak without admiring his eloquence, and his exquisite judgment," writes Cantemir of Çorlulu 'Alī Pasha, evoking the links that had come to bind Ottoman courtly identities with norms of cultivated comportment and speech.[203] The social and economic processes that shifted the contours and contents of Ottoman state institutions and social hierarchies studied in this chapter produced an altered, bureaucratized courtly socioeconomic elite that, between 1718 and 1730, financed a number of intellectual-cultural initiatives of which one was the İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa printing press. This study will now move on to consider the qualities that defined this shared intellectual-cultural environment, and examine the influence that the scribal bureaucratic class had on its development.

Chapter Two: The Ottoman Scribal Bureaucracy in the Early Eighteenth Century and the *Ādāb* Sciences

In their analyses of sixteenth and seventeenth-century Ottoman historiographical works, Gabriel Piterberg and Kaya Şahin dissect and draw out the specific forms in which Ottoman "bureaucrat-historians" used the structure of the historical narrative to express, inscribe, and in doing so, mould a distinct understandings of the nature and contours of the social identity of what may be termed "the Ottoman military-administrative *Osmanlı* class".[204] Piterberg in particular notes that fundamental to his interpretive approach is an awareness of how "the Ottomans themselves constructed the state as an autonomous and abstract agency, by writing it, among various other ways, and modern scholarship has reproduced it."[205] The intellectual-cultural environment of the socioeconomic elite of eighteenth century Istanbul, a study of the qualities of which this chapter will seek to achieve, formed the discursive matrix in which through dialogue and conflict the state as a "constructed reification" became elaborated. Furthermore, the composition of *ādāb* works in this period, and their subsidization by government officials and elites, involved sociopolitical implications and functions. The manifestations of the intellectual-cultural activity of the 1718 to 1730 period therefore went

---

[203] Ibid., 446.

[204] Kaya Şahin, "Imperialism, Bureaucratic Consciousness, and the Historian's Craft: A Reading of Celālzāde Mustafā's *Tabakātü'l-Memālik ve Derecātü'l-Mesālik,*" in *Writing History at the Ottoman Court: Editing the Past, Fashioning the Future* ed. H. Erdem Cipa and Emine Fetvaci (Bloomington: Indiana University Press,) 42. Gabriel Piterberg, *An Ottoman Tragedy: History and Historiography at Play* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003), 48.

[205] Piterberg, *An Ottoman Tragedy: History and Historiography at Play,* 161.

beyond mere literary pleasure and, as will be demonstrated, Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha himself personally patronized historiography as a means of enhancing the prestige of his office.

The changes that Ottoman social hierarchies and state institutions underwent in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and the socioeconomic processes that produced them were examined in the previous chapter. These changes resulted in an expansion in the structures of social status and identity assertion in the Ottoman polity. This expansion may be conceptualized as embodying horizontal and vertical patterns. As a larger quantity of the Ottoman capital's elite acquired access to dynastic forms of status assertion, the dynastic and palatial or courtly elite were compelled to amplify their representations of social pre-eminence. Therefore, in the eighteenth century the Ottoman dynasty sought not only to express the political legitimacy of its rule to its subject populations, but it endeavored also to differentiate itself from other elements in the Ottoman military-administrative class, and to maintain its hegemonic status within this class.[206] Such a "vertical" expansion of status assertion was accompanied by a horizontal expansion in which the vocabulary and forms of social status assertion as employed by the Ottoman central elite grew in scope and variety. These factors indicate that the cultural environment inhabited by the İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa printing press and the larger cultural program, outlined above, of which it was a part, was characterized by competing claims of membership in and attempts at the definition of the Ottoman military-administrative class.

The subject of this chapter is the shared intellectual-cultural environment of the bureaucratized socioeconomic elite of the early eighteenth century Ottoman capital. The seminal components of this environment as identified in the first chapter of this study were: the enhanced presence of interest in and the patronage of the *ādāb* fields of knowledge; the sociopolitical function of knowledge and the possession of knowledge; and an intellectual openness to foreign texts and motifs. Historiography as a field where competing visions of the past were articulated was a genre of prose *ādāb* literature that historically shared a close association with the scribal institutions of Islamic polities. In the Ottoman context, scribal functionaries who produced chronicles of Ottoman history included Idrīs-i Bitlisī (d.1520), Şemseddīn Aḥmed Kemālpaşazāde (d.1534), Selānikī Muṣṭafā Efendi (d.1600), Gelibolulu Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī (d.1600) Ḥasanbeyzāde Aḥmed Pasha (d.1636), İbrāhīm Peçevi (d.1650), Muṣṭafā Naʿīmā (d.1716), and Çelebizāde İsmāīl ʿĀṣım Efendi (d.1760).

A pervasive feature of the cultural life of the early eighteenth century Ottoman capital was the influence exerted upon this cultural life by the Ottoman scribal bureaucracy. Therefore, this chapter will begin with a study of the structure and historical development of the Ottoman

---

[206] Hamadeh, *The City's Pleasures: Istanbul in the Eighteenth Century,* 6.

scribal bureaucracy, noting its emergence within the imperial palace and foregrounding its interfusion with the vizier and pasha households. The second part of the chapter will involve an examination of the *ādāb* disciplines in the Ottoman cultural realm, noting their growth in popularity toward the early eighteenth century and emphasizing their sociopolitical significance. The analysis in this section of the chapter will focus on the *Teẕkire-i Ṣafāyī* of Muṣṭafā Ṣafāyī Efendi (d. 1725-1726), through an interpretive approach that sees the collection of poets' biographies or *teẕkire* of Ṣafāyī as a place where meaning was created and the contours of an Ottoman social identity constructed, defined, and circumscribed. Applying such an approach to the *Teẕkire-i Ṣafāyī* will enable a more firmly rooted study of the sociopolitical connotations attached to erudition in the intellectual culture of the eighteenth century Ottoman central elite.

The final part of the second chapter will present a brief review of Ottoman historiography up to the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha period, addressing the third component of the intellectual environment of the time, that of intellectual *décloisonnement*, through asserting its absence in the historiographical works composed by Ottoman scholars and bureaucrats in the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries.

Intisāb and The Structure of the Pre-Nineteenth Century Ottoman Scribal Bureaucracy

In the first chapter, the symbiotic relationship between grandee households and scribal bureaucrats in the Ottoman Empire was reviewed. The administrative needs and economic investments and resources of vizier and pasha households required them to maintain cadres of secretarial retainers and these households thereby effectively became centers for scribal employment. In addition to providing young scribal apprentices with instruction in such technical skills as document layouts, script styles, bookkeeping and accounting, grandee households also functioned as "literary clubs," providing exposure to the literary *ādāb* arts fluency in which, had become by the eighteenth century the fundamental cultural marker of membership in the Ottoman ruling class.[207] Carter Vaughn Findley and Cornell H. Fleischer both note that the working hours of Ottoman scribal bureaucrats before the nineteenth century were relatively relaxed, and that such a schedule allowed scribes and scribal apprentices to attend *medrese* sessions or join the literary *séances* hosted in the residences of the capital's affluent.[208] In addition to hosting literary discussions and poetry recitations, the residences of grandee households might also contain private book collections or even public libraries endowed by the

---

[207] Carter Vaughn Findley, *Ottoman Civil Officialdom: A Social History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), 55.

[208] Findley, *Ottoman Civil Officialdom: A Social History*, 61-62. Cornell H. Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire: The Historian Mustafa Ali* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), 31.

head of the households. Recep Ahıshalı notes that this was in particular the case with the households of the grand vizier and the *Reīsü'l-Küttāb*, or chief of the chancery scribes.[209]

The household establishments of the Ottoman capital's elite can therefore be conceptualized as pedagogical sites where the technical knowledge required for employment within the bureaucratic apparatus of the Ottoman state, and the intellectual cultural knowledge required for assimilation into the Ottoman ruling class, were acquired. In other words, access to both the practical and the cultural intellectual prerequisites of government service in the Ottoman Empire came to be situated in the grandee household. As consequence of this development, over the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, a growing volume of household subordinates were incorporated into the bureaucratic offices of the Ottoman state administration. This development was also related to other processes studied above, including monetization, the proliferation of the practice of the sale of government offices, and the instability of government service.

By the beginning of the reign of Sultan Aḥmed III in 1703, household clients formed the largest single source for government employees at forty percent.[210] The delegation of the government administration to the vizier and pasha households in turn consolidated a process of the diffusion of political sovereignty as the households came to appropriate an increasing portion of the political capital of the dynasty and the imperial court beginning in the mid seventeenth century. The particular mechanism that defined this patron-client relationship of the household and its subordinates was the "*intisāb*" or "connections."[211] This concept indicated a "semi-official patronage system" in which with the backing of a higher ranking military-administrative official, individuals would find employment in the government system, in exchange for which they would support and promote the interests of their patron.[212] *intisāb* operated through structures of reciprocal relationships that varied and could include kinship, friendship, marriage ties or even sexual relations.[213]

Intisāb was a mechanism that defined a particular Ottoman form of patronage; it was also the nexus that bound the Ottoman scribal bureaucracy of the early eighteenth century with the vizier and pasha households. Piterberg explains how "the line that separates state and society was dynamic and always contested, and that the household was a sociopolitical structure that

---

[209] Recep Ahıshalı, "Divan-ı Hümayûn Teşkilâtı," in *Osmanlı IV: Teşkilat* ed. by Güler Eren (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları), 1999, 51.

[210] Followed by palace graduates at twenty six percent and the military-*kul* class at twenty one percent. Rifa'at Ali Abou-el-haj, *The 1703 Rebellion and the Structure of Ottoman Politics*, 82.

[211] Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire*, 19.

[212] Ibid.

[213] Ibid., 19-20.

rendered this line porous and diffusive."[214] As the vehicle for the interpenetration of the administrative officials of the Ottoman state apparatus with the vizier and pasha households, *intisāb* enabled this rendering porous of the divide between state and society to function. In embodying the relational sinews of the "sociopolitical structure" of the household, *intisāb* further formed the very foundation of these establishments. The *intisāb* mechanism is therefore a useful angle from which to approach a survey of the history and the structure of the Ottoman scribal bureaucracy. Ṣafāyī's entry on the eighteenth century Ottoman court historian Muṣṭafā Naʿīmā is illustrative in this regard. The following excerpt comprises the second sentence of this entry,

> In his early years, coming to Istanbul and occupying himself with knowledge and joining the body of the halberdier corps of the Old Palace, [and] afterwards going out of the palace and forming *intisāb* with Kalaylı Aḥmed Pasha, [and] after serving for a long time as a *dīvān* secretary [under Kalaylı Aḥmed Pasha], upon the appointment of the aforementioned pasha as grand vizier, [Naʿīmā] acquired a position in the Anatolian [provincial] accountancy bureaux, thereby achieving the [high] rank of the *ḫācegān*.[215]

Significantly, Ṣafāyī's entry predicates the bureaucratic career of Naʿīmā on his *intisāb* with Kalaylı Aḥmed Pasha, who was encountered in the first chapter and to whom Ottoman historians also refer to as Kalaylıkoz Aḥmed Pasha.[216] In his study of Naʿīmā, Lewis Thomas provides a translation of Naʿīmā's biography from the *Tārīḫ-i Ata* of Ṭayyārzāde Atā Bey (d.1880), in which Ṭayyarzāde notes the involvement of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha alongside Kalaylı Aḥmed Pasha in the promotion of Naʿīmā to the accountancy bureau of the province of Anatolia.[217] At the time (in 1704) Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha was working as a secretary to the chief black eunuch Ṭavīl Süleymān Pasha.[218] The element that bound these three individuals together was that all three had graduated from the imperial corps of halberdiers situated in the palace.[219] This did not mean however that they had been trained as military personnel, for the corps of halberdiers had in fact a secretarial section that trained highly qualified scribal bureaucrats.[220] It was in the secretarial department of the halberdiers that Naʿīmā received his initial instruction in the scribal arts and in accounting.[221] Following his graduation from the palace, Naʿīmā acquired an important scribal position as chief scribe (*dīvān efendisi*) under another individual who had graduated from the same corps, Kalaylı Aḥmed Pasha. Later, upon the ascension of this patron to

---

[214] Piterberg, *An Ottoman Tragedy: History and Historiography at Play*, 159.

[215] Muṣṭafā Efendi Ṣafāyī, *Teẕkire-i Ṣafāyī* ed. Pervin Çapan (Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Başkanlığı Yayınları) 2005, p 624. (*Evāʾil-i hālinde Istanbul'a gelip maʿārife iştigāl eyleyip saray-ı ʿatīḳ teberdārları zümresine ilḥāḳ olup baʿdehu taşra çıkıp Kalaylı Ahmed Paşa'ya intisāb edip nice zaman dīvān efendiliği ḫıdmetinde olmagla paşa-yı mezbūr vezīr-i aʿẓam oldukda dīvān ḫāceleri silkine sālik Anatolu muḥāsebeciliği manşıbına mālik olmuşdur*).

[216] See pp. 8-10 of this study.

[217] Lewis Thomas and Norman Itzkowitz, *A Study of Naima* (New York: New York University Press, 1972), 15-16.

[218] Lewis and Itzkowitz, *A Study of Naima*, 15.

[219] Ibid.

[220] Ibid., 21.

[221] Ibid.

the post of grand vizier, and with the backing of another influential contact from the halberdiers, Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha, Naʿīmā joined the chiefs of the imperial scribes, the *ḫācegān.*

Following the dismissal of Kalaylı Aḥmed Pasha Naʿīmā was also removed from his position and banished to Gallipoli.[222] Later, Naʿīmā was able to return to the imperial capital and enjoyed a final tenure of employment in prestigious bureaucratic posts which included that of the chief of the head accountant's bureau.[223] Notably missing from Ṣafāyī's account of Naʿīmā is the latter's career in the years prior to his *intisāb* with Kalaylı Aḥmed Pasha. It was under the patronage of the grand viziers Ḥüseyin Köprülü Pasha and Moralı Ḥasan Pasha that Naʿīmā became the first ever *vakʿanüvīs* or official historian of the Ottoman court in the years between 1697 and 1704, immediately preceding the point from which Ṣafāyī picks up his narrative.[224] Nevertheless, it is common for the compendia of biographical entries which comprise the *teẕkire* genre of poets' biographies to be made up of relatively succinct accounts of the lives, qualities, and works of the individuals they describe. Often, the sample poetical fragments provided alongside the biographical entries occupy a greater portion of space than the latter. In fact, in comparison to the *Teẕkire-i Mucīb* of Muṣṭafā Mucīb Efendi (d. 1726), composed just prior to Ṣafāyī's work, or the somewhat earlier *Teẕkire-i Şuʿarā-i Yümnī* of Meḥmed Ṣāliḥ Yümnī (d.1663), the biographical descriptions authored by Ṣafāyī are far more comprehensive and detailed. It is therefore not surprising that Ṣafāyī's account does not match the more extensive scope of the biographical segment on Naʿīmā found in Ṭayyarzāde's historiographical work.

The fundamental operative function that *intisāb* relations held in determining the course of appointments or dismissals a high ranking government official could experience in the Ottoman administrative apparatus is clearly evinced from the foregoing review of Naʿīmā's bureaucratic career. Some form of *intisāb* informed the experiences of Ottoman scribal bureaucrats at every stratum of what were hierarchically gradated institutional organizations.[225] The pervasive presence of *intisāb* in the social and professional environment of the Ottoman

---

[222] Ibid., 18.

[223] Ibid., 18-19.

[224] Piterberg, *An Ottoman Tragedy: History and Historiography at Play*, 47. A note on the office of the "official historian:" *vakanüvis* in fact means "events-recorder," and it should be noted that although Naima received support for his historiographical work, his official duties involves the keeping of a "calendar of contemporary events". Thomas, 39. Therefore, perhaps a more accurate translation of *vakanüvis* would be "state chronicler;" that is to say an individual responsible for recording contemporary occurrences of significance to the Ottoman state while also drafting the official state sponsored interpretation of the past.

[225] Findley, *Ottoman Civil Officialdom: A Social History*, 68-69. Carter Vaughn Findley, *Bureaucratic Reform in the Ottoman Empire: The Sublime Porte, 1789-1922* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1980), 30. The importance of intisāb (especially family ties) becomes more pronounced from the 16th to the 18th century in another bureaucratic career track, the *ʿilmiye*, see pp. 20-25 of this study. For further information: Abdurrahman Atcil, "The Route to the Top in the Ottoman *ilmiye* hierarchy of the sixteenth century*," Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of* London Vol. 72 No. 3 (2009), and Madeline C. Zilfi, "Elite Circulation in the Ottoman Empire: Great Mollas of the Eighteenth Century" *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* Vol 26 No 3 (1983).

scribal bureaucracy is reflected by the approaches applied to Naʿīmā's biography in Ṭayyaārzāde and Ṣafāyī. In both cases, *intisāb* relations are the mechanism that drive and direct the momentum of the narrative. Ṣafāyī presents the scribal positions in which Naʿīmā was employed only after stating that Naʿīmā had formed *intisāb* with Kalaylı Aḥmed Pasha (*Kalaylı Aḥmed Paşa'ya intisāb edip*). This passage is then followed by a colorful assertion of the poetical and scholarly abilities of Naʿīmā before Ṣafāyī once again lists the secretarial offices acquired by Naʿīmā following his return from Gallipoli. This sentence begins by indicating that Naʿīmā had attached himself to the household of the grand vizier Silaḥdār Damat Ali Pasha (d.1716), becoming his privy secretary (*Vezīr-i aʿẓām Şehīd ʿAlī Paşa'nın dahi maḥrem-i esrārı olup*).[226] The longer rendition of Naʿīmā's biography found in Ṭayyārzāde as translated by Lewis Thomas follows an almost identical pattern. Ṭayyarzāde describes the shifts and the flow of the patronage relations formed between Naʿīmā and senior government officials and only after these are presented does Ṭayyarzāde move on to list the scribal offices to which Naʿīmā was appointed. Thus, Ṭayyarzāde notes that having joined "the circle of [Silaḥdār Damat] Ali Pasha," Naʿīmā was placed once again in the accountancy bureau of the province of Anatolia, and later made "custodian of the register."[227] Tayyarzade and Ṣafāyī's texts illustrate the manner in which *intisāb,* and through *intisāb* the household establishment, was embedded in the very social and professional fabric of the Ottoman scribal bureaucracy. This factor is of particular significance for the study undertaken in this paper for the contention maintained here is that the venture of İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa and the larger program surrounding this venture emerged through the activities of a specific *intisāb* network rooted in the household of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha.

A final point of interest which emerges from the study of Naʿīmā presented above is that Naʿīmā's scribal apprenticeship was achieved in the secretarial department of the corps of halberdiers. This indicates that by the late seventeenth century, the bureaucratic requirements and administrative output of Ottoman state institutions had expanded to the point where individual segments of the central imperial forces had acquired their own secretarial cohorts. In this particular example, the apprentice-secretaries of the halberdier corps were employed in the clerical work of the office of the chief black eunuch, which included of the administration of the imperial pious foundations at Mecca and Medina.[228]

In its earliest manifestations, the Ottoman scribal class comprised a handful of clerks attached to the Imperial *Dīvān* (*Dīvān-ı Hümāyūn*), or imperial council, the central administrative organ of the Ottoman state apparatus. This council retained well into the

---

[226] Ṣafāyī, *ṢafāyīTeẕkire-i Ṣafāyī*, 624.
[227] Lewis and Itzkowitz, *A Study of Naima*, 18.
[228] Ibid., 21.

seventeenth century its combined judicial, legislative, and administrative functions. Convened under the personal directorship of the *sultan* until the reign of Sultan Meḥmed II, the Imperial *Dīvān* oversaw the legislation and ratification of customary laws (*ḳānūn*), the administration of internal affairs including for example the management of migration from the countryside or issues of civil unrest, the ratification of the appointment of officials to government posts, the bestowal of prebendal land grants, the organization of taxation, and the discussion of foreign and diplomatic affairs.[229] In addition to these, the Imperial *Dīvān* also served as a sort of supreme court, where decisions taken at provincial law courts could be appealed.[230] The nature of the work performed in this administrative body naturally involved the composition of a variety of state documents structured along specific formats and incorporating diverse grammatical models and linguistic devices. Therefore, the Imperial *Dīvān* required the employment of a number of scribes versed in account keeping and conversant with the compositional structures of state documentation.

The development of a scribal culture centered on an imperial council can be traced back to the Medieval Persian courts of the tenth through to the fourteenth centuries. The output of secretaries, lexicographers, and poets at the Persian courts of the thirteenth and the fourteenth centuries was foundational in establishing the literary and the formal administrative linguistic models deployed in the later courts of the Ottoman and the Mughal Empires.[231] A notable difference between the Persian concept of *dīvāns* in this earlier period and the Ottoman Imperial *Dīvān* was that whereas the former denoted secretarial departments or chanceries organized under titles like *dīvān-i inşā* or *dīvān-i risālāt,* the Ottoman use of the term *dīvān* defined a specific type of council meeting.[232] In the Ottoman context, the central state was organized around four such *dīvān* councils. In addition to the main imperial council of the *Dīvān-ı Hümāyūn,* there existed also the Friday council (*Cuma Dīvānı*), which had mostly juridical functions, the Wednesday council (*Çarşamba Dīvānı*), which focused on municipal issues related to the administration of the Ottoman capital, and the afternoon council (*Ikindi Dīvānı*), held under the sole supervision of the grand vizier and concerned with finalizing issues that had

---

[229] Necati Gültepe, "Osmanlılarda Bürokrasi-Merkezin Yönetimi," in *Osmanlı IV: Teşkilat* ed. Güler Eren (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları), 1999, 242. Mehmet Seyitdanoğlu, "Divan-ı Hümâyûndan Meclisi Mebusana Osmanlı Imparatorlugu'nda Yasama," In *Osmanlı IV: Teşkilat* ed. Güler Eren (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 1999), 18.

[230] Gültepe, "Osmanlılarda Bürokrasi-Merkezin Yönetimi," 242.

[231] William L. Hanaway, "Secretaries, Poets, and the Literary Language," in *Literacy in the Persianate World* ed. Brian Spooner and William Hanaway (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 2012), 95.

[232] Hanaway, "Secretaries, Poets, and the Literary Language", 98. Seyitdanoğlu, "Divan-ı Hümâyûndan Meclisi Mebusana Osmanlı Imparatorlugun'da Yasama," 17.

not been fully addressed in the imperial council.[233] Provincial administrations were also structured around the *dīvāns* of provincial governors.

The Ottoman *dīvān* councils formed the organizational nuclei around which the Ottoman scribal bureaucracy germinated and developed. Up until the mid-sixteenth century, only a rudimentary small number of scribal functionaries drawn from the '*ulemā* were attached to the Ottoman *dīvāns*.[234] Before the development of internal recruitment processes within the scribal bureaux, the Ottoman state relied on *medrese* educated literate Ottomans to provide individuals who could perform the secretarial tasks required by government administration.

Gelibolulu Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī is one of the better studied examples of an Ottoman scholar educated in the *medrese* system who switched from the career stream of the '*ilmiye* to that of what was still in the early mid-sixteenth century a fledgling Ottoman scribal bureaucracy.[235] In his *Essence of History* (*Künhü'l-aḫbār*), Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī lamented the degeneration of the scholarly and literary merit and skills of the younger generations of scribal officials being inducted into the Ottoman administrative system.[236] Interestingly, Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī related the decline in the standards and quality of Ottoman prose and poetry to the maturation of recruitment processes autonomous to the scribal bureaucracy. With institutionalization the scribal bureaucracy became "the preserve of non-'*ilmiye* Muslims."[237] As the progress of professionalization created a class of technical specialists in the Ottoman scribal bureaux, *intisāb* networks ensured that in the very least a certain quantity of government officials had received their positions chiefly through patron-client relationships. In either case, the consolidation of the schematized career stream of the Ottoman bureaucracy produced, according to Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī, secretarial functionaries who did not have the extensive and encyclopedic cultural background of scholar bureaucrats like Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī himself.[238] However, as Ekin Tuşalp Atiyas has demonstrated, this contention was in fact a literary trope, and in fact "Ottoman prose composition reached its most dynamic and productive phase in the seventeenth century as there emerged and circulated an unprecedented number of collections of prose as well as manuals and theoretical works," with the expansion of the scribal bureaucratic class engaged in the production of such texts.[239]

A number of factors explain the involvement of individuals from an '*ilmiye* background in the production of *ādāb* works. First, it should be recalled from the first chapter that the

[233] Seyitdanoğlu, "Divan-ı Hümâyûndan Meclisi Mebusana Osmanlı Imparatorlugun'da Yasama," 18
[234] Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire*, 214.
[235] Gelibolulu Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī began his scribal career in the chancery of the court of Sultan Selīm II (r. 1566-1574) in the 1560s while the latter was still a prince, and later served in a number of provincial administrations. Ibid., 35.
[236] Ibid., 215-216.
[237] Ibid., 221.
[238] Ibid., 215-216.
[239] Ekin Tuşalp Atiyas, "Eloquence in Context: Şaʿbānzāde Mehmed Efendi's (D.1708-1709) *Münāẓara- ı ṭiġ u kalem* and "The People of the Pen" in Late Seveneenth-Century Ottoman Empire" *Turcica* Vol 48 (2017), 133.

medrese system did not involve a rigid curriculum that was applied universally throughout the numerous religious colleges of the capital and the empire. On the contrary, the curricula taught at each *medrese* was heavily influenced by the individual *mülāzıms* employed there, and there were instances where instruction in the *ādāb* sciences and in Persian were provided in *medreses* and in certain colleges literary séances were also held.[240] Additionally, as Carter Vaughn Findley notes, even into the early nineteenth century most prominent bureaucrats and writers in the Ottoman Empire were "autodidacts," a point reinforced by Yavuz Sezer's statement that Ottoman libraries functioned as "schools of autodidact erudition."[241] Therefore, an ʿ*ilmiye* background did not necessarily entail that an individual was versed only in the religious sciences. Rather, the instruction that an individual received in the various religious and *ādāb* sciences was determined to a degree by the personal initiative of that individual combined with the opportunities, through access to libraries, patrons, and *mülāzıms*, available to him.

By 1800, the Ottoman central administration employed between one-thousand and one-thousand and five-hundred scribal bureaucrats.[242] Although this was still a relatively small quantity when compared with other branches of government service like the central army, which employed tens of thousands, it was still a massive expansion from the between eighteen and twenty-five scribes attached to the palace in the mid-sixteenth century.[243] It was in the context of the development of an extensive class of professional secretarial functionaries that "literary and rhetorical skills became more frequently emphasized in the discourses of a particular community which claimed a distinct share for itself in imperial politics."[244] Broad encyclopedic knowledge and literary abilities came to embody markers of social status and functioned as expressions of Ottoman military-administrative identity. These continued to be seminal symbols of status and identity and their acquisition remained an important means for achieving upward social mobility.

A correlate of the diffusion of the political capital of the dynastic center was the separation of the dynastic household from the institutions of imperial administration. As the bureaucratic offices and the scribal class of the Ottoman administrative infrastructure grew and expanded, they began to separate from the dynastic household, transforming the constitution of the Ottoman polity in a manner in which the dynastic patrimonial pattern came more to embody an ideological image and less to reflect the actual configuration of the imperial state. One example of this is the course that the development of the palace service took with the emergence

---

[240] Hatice Aynur, "Ottoman Literature," in *The Cambridge History of Turkey Volume 3: The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839,* ed. Suraiya N. Faroqhi, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 485.
[241] Findley, *Ottoman Civil Officialdom: A Social History*, 53. Yavuz Sezer, "The Architecture of Bibliophilia: Eighteenth-Century Ottoman Libraries" (Unpublished PhD diss., MIT: 2016), 57.
[242] Findley, *Bureaucratic Reform in the Ottoman Empire,* 56.
[243] Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire*, 218.
[244] Atiyas, "Eloquence in Context," 116.

of a palace secretariat out of the privy chamber (*ḫāṣ odası*) of the sulṭān.[245] Under the directorship of the sword-bearer (*silāḥdār ağa*), the palace secretariat came to administer the communications between the privy chamber and other parts of the imperial administration.[246] This development was a direct consequence of the departure of certain government offices from the imperial palace to large and independent establishments outside of it in the capital, producing a communications need which had not existed before.

Another example of the separation between the administration of the imperial state and that of the sulṭān's household is the departure in the seventeenth century of the financial offices attached to the *Defterdār* or treasurer from the palace to a separate institutional structure known as the *Bāb-ı Defterī*.[247] This indicates that sometime in the seventeenth century, the process of differentiation between state finances and the finances of the dynastic family evolved to a point where this differentiation became formalized. The growth of bureaucratic offices and the enhancement of the political capital accrued by chief bureaucratic officials in the Ottoman Empire in the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries followed the pattern of dispersal from the palace, and specifically from the Imperial Council, evidenced in the case of the imperial treasury. Of these, by far one of the most significant examples for the purposes of this study is the departure of the scribal offices attached to the grand vizier from the palace to what became known in the nineteenth century as the Sublime Porte or *Bāb-ı 'Ālī*.

Interestingly, this latter development coincided almost precisely with the inception of the grand vizierate of Köprülü Meḥmed Pasha in 1656, which embodies the beginning of the first phase in Ottoman history characterized by the monopolization of political power by a vizier and pasha household in the Ottoman center. The grand vizier's offices, household, and the grand vizier's *dīvān* were transplanted to a separate location near the imperial palace, and also near the *Bāb-ı Defter,* in 1654.[248] At the time, this new headquarters was known as the *Paşa Kapısı* or the *Bāb-ı Āṣafī*, which may be translated as the "vizierial porte." Although Tülay Artan notes that in this early period of the transfer to the *Bāb-ı Āṣafī*, the new headquarters of the grand vizier did not immediately become a politically potent site, by the early eighteenth century it had indeed done so, displacing the Imperial *Dīvān* in the process.[249] Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha himself was instrumental in this development. His annexation of nearby palaces, his restoration efforts which

---

[245] Findley, *Bureaucratic Reform in the Ottoman Empire,* 49.

[246] Ibid. In the course of this development, the sword-bearer came into conflict with the chief black eunuch, who had previously exercised authority over the communications between the sultan and the bureaucratic offices outside of the palace.

[247] Muzaffer Doğan,"Divan-ı Hümâyûn'dan Babıâli'ye Geçiş: Bâb-ı Âsafî'nin Oluşumu," in *Osmanlı IV: Teşkilat* ed. Güler Eren (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 1999), 243.

[248] Piterberg, *An Ottoman Tragedy: History and Historiography at Play*, 173-174.

[249] Artan, "Royal Weddings and the Grand Vezirate", 370.

invested a new architectural ostentation into the structure, and his planning of the processional route of the twin weddings of 1724 (in which his son and nephew were married to Sultan Aḥmed III's daughters) so that the processions passed in front of the grand vizier's palace, transformed the *Bāb-ı Āṣafī* into a monumental complex.[250]

The departure of the afternoon *dīvān* (the *Ikindi Dīvānı*) to the grand vizier's palace formed the fulcrum for the outsourcing of the secretarial departments of the imperial administration to locales in the Ottoman capital outside of the Topkapı complex. This council was held after the morning sessions of the Imperial *Dīvān* and attended to public complaints as well as issues left over from the earlier assembly held in the morning.[251] By the sixteenth century, the expansion of the administrative responsibilities of the Ottoman Empire had begun to surpass the capabilities of the Imperial *Dīvān*.[252] A direct consequence of the growth of the Ottoman scribal bureaucracy was therefore the eclipse of the Imperial *Dīvān* as the functions of this council transformed into the specialized domains of independent secretarial departments that increasingly gathered under the supervisory authority of the grand vizier and the government officials immediately subordinate to him.[253] Examples of these bureaux include the *Teşrīfātçı Kalemi* and the *Beylikçi Kalemi*, the *Mektūbī Kalemi* and the *Āmedī Kalemi*.[254]

All of these departments along with their department heads were transferred to the *Bāb-ı Āṣafī* after 1654. The chief scribal officials who came to comprise the *ḫācegān* of the offices at the *Bāb-ı Āṣafī* had all been formal or supplementary members of the Imperial *Dīvān*. Among them, the *Reīsü'l-Küttāb*, the *Çavuşbaşı*, and the *Ṣadāret Kethüdāsı* were the most senior. Recep Ahıshalı notes that the height of the Imperial *Dīvān's* administrative authority falls in the period between the early sixteenth and mid seventeenth centuries.[255] By 1700, with most of its functions dispatched to the grand vizier's palace, the imperial council had come to be convened only once a week.[256] Interestingly, despite the formation of an independent institutional establishment for the treasury, the *Defterdār* remained attached to the Imperial *Dīvān* and was notably excluded from the enhancement of political influence experienced by those offices, like the *Reīsü'l-Küttāblık* and the *Ṣadāret Kethüdāşı,* which had made the move to the *Bāb-ı Āṣafī*.[257]

[250] Ibid., 362, 368-369.
[251] Doğan,"Divan-ı Hümâyûn'dan Babıâli'ye Geçiş: Bâb-ı Âsafî'nin Oluşumu", 199.
[252] Ibid.
[253] Ibid.
[254] The responsibilities of these bureaux included maintaining the correspondence of the grand vizier and government records, administering government protocols, and the composition of documents such as '*ahidnāmes*. Ibid., 243-244. .[254]
[255] Ahısalı, "Divan-ı Hümayûn Teşkilâtı, 24.
[256] Ibid., 25.
[257] Virginia Aksan, *An Ottoman Statesman in War and Peace: Ahmed Resmi Efendi, 1700-1783* (New York: Brill, 1995), 17.

Another office which remained at the Imperial *Dīvān* and consequently suffered a decline in prestige and power was that of *nişāncı*, the chancellor or affixer of the imperial signature.[258] Writing in the early eighteenth century, Dimitrie Cantemir has the following to say regarding the functions of this post: "All the Sultan's *Ferman's*, that are sent from the Vizir's chancery into the provinces, and those that are issued out of the *Tefterdar's* offices concerning *Maliè* and *Beglyk*, must be read to him by *Nishanji Kassedar Effendi,* and then he confirms them, by setting down on the top the *Tura*, or character of the Sultan's name; and lays up copies of them in particular chests."[259] Following this, Cantemir indicates that for *fermāns* (imperial decrees) that concerned the capital the *nişāncı's* confirmation was not necessary.[260] Presumably, Cantemir was speaking from his personal knowledge of conditions within the Ottoman administration (he was resident in Istanbul until 1710), and not based on information he had gathered regarding older procedures.

The intimate and detailed nature of the biographical anecdotes he provides in the footnotes to the last two chapters of his *History of the Growth and Decay of the Ottoman Empire*, which correspond to his own lifetime, do seem to indicate that for the latter sections of his work Cantemir relied on contemporary contacts eye witnesses. Therefore, from the foregoing account provided by Cantemir, which is found in the fourth chapter of the fourth volume of his work and documents the events of 1695, it appears that the responsibilities of the *Nişāncı* had been reduced by the end of the seventeenth century from what they had been before. At no point in his exposition of this office does Cantemir mention one of the most important earlier functions of the *Nişāncı,* which was the authority this position exercised over the legislation of customary law or *ḳānūn*. For Gelibolulu Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī, writing a century earlier, this quality of the *Nişāncı* formed the definition of the post to the extent that Muṣṭafā Ālī calls the *Nişāncıs* "the jurisconsults of the imperial law."[261]. The *Nişāncı* was the formal head of the Ottoman chancery; he was the chief bureaucratic officer of the scribal bureaucracy, a rank which he retained in name even as the *Reīsü'l-Küttāb* effectively appropriated this role in the latter half of the seventeenth century.[262] One indication of how this came about can be inferred from Cantemir's account. Cantemir explains that the *Nişāncı* was responsible for checking and confirming the imperial decrees issued out of what he refers to as the *Defterdār's* offices and the grand vizier's "chancery." The *Nişāncı* is therefore no longer a supervisor, or a chancellor, of an imperial chancery of secretarial departments directly attached to his office. Instead, there is now what is referred to as a grand vizier's chancery from which the *Nişāncı* received government documents

[258] Findley, *Bureaucratic Reform in the Ottoman Empire,* 55.
[259] Cantemir, *The history of the growth and decay of the Othman Empire*, 397.
[260] Ibid.
[261] Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire*, 228.
[262] Piterberg, *An Ottoman Tragedy: History and Historiography at Play*, 45.

for approval. Clearly, the position of the *Nişāncı* has moved in the direction of becoming a symbolic post that still retains an element of its former function in approving documents composed in the offices of the *Bāb-ı Defterī* and *Bāb-ı Āṣafī*.

The development of the *Reīsü'l-Küttāb* or chief of scribes into an independent and powerful government office was a phenomenon idiosyncratic to the Ottoman context.[263] Regarding the *Reīsü'l-Küttāb* Rami Meḥmed Pasha (d. 1708), who served as the Ottoman negotiator at the 1699 Peace of Karlowitz, Cantemir has the following to say:

> When he had finished the course of his studies, fortune having denied him means of rising higher, he frequented taverns; and as he was very handsome, and had a harmonious voice, and besides understood musick, he got a pretty good livelyhood there, considering his condition. He was removed from this way of life by the famous poet, *Nabi Effendi*, secretary to the *Musahib* Divan, by whose good instructions he so improved that though he had no place at court, because all his friends were dead, yet he passed among the great men for a good writer. At last, *Elmas Mehemed Pasha* made him *Mukabeleji*, and *Husein Pasha* appointed him *Reis Effendi*, in which office he displayed his abilities, while he had jointly, with *Maurocordatus,* the management of the peace.[264] (*sic*)

The manner in which Rami Meḥmed Pasha was inducted into the Ottoman military-administrative class recalls the recruitment of Çorlulu ʿAlī Pasha from chapter one. This importance attributed to physical appearance in the selection of youths for imperial service was related to patterns of slave recruitment in which physiognomy or *kiyāfet* was regarded as a scientific means of analyzing the qualities of individuals.[265] Elmas Meḥmed Pasha (d. 1697) himself, as also recounted by Cantemir, was taken into the palace as a youth by Sultan Meḥmed IV (r. 1648-1687) due to his "great beauty" (hence the nickname "*elmas*" or diamond) and was rumored to have become the *sulṭān's* lover.[266] Notably, both Rami Meḥmed Pasha and Elmas Meḥmed Pasha came from Muslim families, the former from Istanbul and the latter from Bosnia.[267] Finally, it should be highlighted that Cantemir's short synopsis of Rami Meḥmed Pasha reinforces the tendency observed earlier with Naʿīmā regarding the pattern in which appointment to government office proceeds the formation of *intisāb* relations.

The involvement of Rami Meḥmed Pasha in the 1699 Peace of Karlowitz as the most senior Ottoman delegate reflects the expanding authority of the *Reīsü'l-Küttāb* in the field of foreign affairs after 1654. As an office, the *Reīsü'l-Küttāb* was established under Sultan

---

[263] Aksan, *An Ottoman Statesman in War and Peace: Ahmed Resmi Efendi, 1700-1783*, 16.
[264] Cantemir, Dimitrie. *The history of the growth and decay of the Othman Empire*, 431-432.
[265] Findley, *Bureaucratic Reform in the Ottoman Empire*, 34.
[266] Over the course of his career, Elmas Meḥmed Pasha served as chamberlain to the *sulṭān*, military governor, *Nişāncı,* and military commander. Cantemir, Dimitrie. *The history of the growth and decay of the Othman Empire*, 396.
[267] Ibid., 396, 431.

Süleymān I and quickly developed into a stepping stone to the highest bureaucratic office of the time, to which it was the immediate subordinate, the *nişāncı*.[268] Upon following the grand vizier to the *Bāb-ı Āṣafī*, the *Reīsü'l-Küttāb* emerged as the highest supervisory authority of the bureaucratic offices gathered in the grand vizier's palace and in the process acquired a number of new functions. These included coordinating with the grand vizier's *Kethüdā* in provisioning the army for campaigns, and in carrying out military recruitment and censuses as well as organizing the army's payments.[269] Additionally, the *Reīsü'l-Küttāb* also undertook the composition of diplomatic correspondence and was responsible for meeting foreign ambassadors before their audience with the *sulṭān*.[270] The increasing experience accumulated by *Reīsü'l-Küttābs* in foreign affairs would lead to the development of this office into a type of foreign ministry in the eighteenth century.[271]

Reīsü'l-Küttābs were able to amass immense fortunes and were thereby able to support household establishments and acquire governorships, contributing to the process of the effendi-turned-pasha defined by Norman Itzkowitz.[272] Consequently, the *Reīsü'l-Küttāb* came to embody one of the most powerful positions in the factional mesh of grandee households that defined the political landscape of the Ottoman capital in the 1718-1730 period. It is not coincidental that the tenure of the *Reīsü'l-Küttāb* of the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha period, Üçanbarlı Meḥmed Efendi (d.1732), begins in 1718 and ends in 1730. Of the forty-two individuals who served as *Reīsü'l-Küttāb* in the eighteenth century, roughly eighty-six percent were promoted from the scribal offices of the *Bāb-ı Āṣafī* while about fourteen percent came from the offices of the *Defterdārlık*.[273] An important factor in this development seems to have been the more technical nature of the financial work carried out in the offices of the treasury. The quality of this work, while helping this stream of the scribal bureaucracy to professionalize and establish its internal recruitment procedures, and in doing so separate from the *ʿilmiye,* before the offices of the chancery, ultimately may have compounded the political isolation of the financial bureaucrats.[274]

The two other offices which benefited from the detachment of the grand vizier's offices from the Imperial *Dīvān* were the *Kethüdāsı* and the *Çavuşbaşı*. The *Kethüdā* served as the deputy of the grand vizier, who was in turn the deputy of the sultan and by the authority delegated to him through his possession of the sulṭān's seal, able to formalize documents and

---

[268] Aksan, *An Ottoman Statesman in War and Peace: Ahmed Resmi Efendi, 1700-1783*, 16.

[269] Recep Ahıshalı, *Osmanlı Devlet Teşkilatında Reisülküttâblık (XVII. Yüzyıl)* (Istanbul: Tatav, 2001), 11.

[270] Doğan,"Divan-ı Hümâyûn'dan Babıâli'ye Geçiş: Bâb-ı Âsafî'nin Oluşumu", 202.

[271] Ahısalı, *Osmanlı Devlet Teşkilatında Reisülküttâblık*, 31.

[272] Ibid., 33. Itzkowitz, "Eighteenth Century Ottoman Realities."

[273] Ahısalı, *Osmanlı Devlet Teşkilatında Reisülküttâblık*, 24.

[274] Ibid., 22-23.

pronounce on state issues on the sulṭān's behalf.[275] The fact that the Sulṭān's deputy needed his own deputy also reflects the increasing diversification and growth of the scribal administration. The propensity for grand viziers to serve in lieu of the sultan as the commander of the army on military campaigns in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries also contributed to the necessity of a deputy for the grand vizier. At the *Bāb-ı Āṣafī,* the *Kethüdā* was the second most senior official after the grand vizier, followed by the *Reīsü'l-Küttāb.*[276] The *Çavuşbaşı* was responsible for enforcing law and ensuring that the progress of the councils followed government protocols at the Imperial *Dīvān.*[277] This post retained the same functions after following the grand vizier to the *Bāb-ı Āṣafī.*

Before moving on to a study of the intellectual culture and sociopolitical consciousness that emerged among this scribal bureaucratic class, it is useful to note that for the greater proportion of the lower scribal service, the nature and structure of their work and experience resembled in many ways a form of craftsmanship. It is perhaps accurate to refer to these clerical functionaries as artisans of government documents. The replication of the organizational structure of the guilds across the lower strata of the Ottoman administrative apparatus reinforces this observation. Scribal apprentices, called *çıraks* (the same term used for apprentice craftsmen) or *şāgirds* usually entered the scribal offices around the age of seven or eight and would be attached to the supervision of a department head or *ḫāce.*[278] "*Ḫāce*" derives from Persian *khwājeh* "master" and it came to have the specific connotation of a high ranking scribal official in the Ottoman context.[279] This master-apprentice relationship, although not involving the political stakes of the patronage relationships between senior government officials, viziers, governors, and military commanders, nonetheless embodied a form of *intisāb.* Scribal apprentices would begin their instruction through learning to take care of the various utensils of their profession such as the inkpot or the pen case.[280] They would eventually graduate to the rank of *kātib* or scribe once they were able to independently and correctly produce the government documents particular to the office in which they had been trained.[281] This process usually took about ten to fifteen years.[282]

The growth of this class of "scribal-artisans" formed in relation to the expanding needs of the Ottoman state administration and the simultaneous multiplication of secretarial departments.

[275] Aksan, *An Ottoman Statesman in War and Peace: Ahmed Resmi Efendi, 1700-1783*, 16.
[276] Doğan,"Divan-ı Hümâyûn'dan Babıâli'ye Geçiş: Bâb-ı Âsafî'nin Oluşumu", 202.
[277] Ahısalı, "Divan-ı Hümayûn Teşkilâtı," 31.
[278] Findley, *Ottoman Civil Officialdom: A Social History*, 64.
[279] Lewis and Itzkowitz, *A Study of Naima*, 23.
[280] Hanaway, "Secretaries, Poets, and the Literary Language", 108.
[281] Aksan, *An Ottoman Statesman in War and Peace: Ahmed Resmi Efendi, 1700-1783*, 18-19.
[282] Ibid.

At the same time, with the opening out of the vocabulary of social status assertion and the expansion of the Ottoman central elite in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, erudition and the patronage of the *ādāb* sciences came to have a more visible presence and to provide a more vital function in the intellectual environment of the capital. Rāmī Meḥmed Pasha, relates Cantemir, was born to a poor family in Istanbul's Eyüp district.[283] After devoting himself to learning and poetry, "he had the name *Rami* conferred upon him by the academy of poetry."[284] Later, through the *intisāb* relationship he formed with the poet Yusuf Nābī (d.1712), he was able to enter the scribal service and went on to hold the post of *Reīsü'l-Küttāb* and to serve during his tenure as the Ottoman representative at the peace conference at Karlowitz. Clearly, the course of Rami Meḥmed Pasha's career demonstrates the import that fluency in the Ottoman imperial cultural tradition held for ambitious and literate Ottoman subjects. The following section of this chapter will explore this imperial cultural tradition, which emerged in relation to and in conjunction with the efforts of Ottoman scribal bureaucrats. The basis for this study will be a work produced by one such scribal bureaucrat, the *Teẕkire-i Ṣafāyī* of Muṣṭafā Ṣafāyī Efendi.

The *Teẕkire-i Ṣafāyī* and the Significance of the *ādāb* sciences in Ottoman scribal bureaucratic culture

In chapter one (in the first footnote), the *ādāb* sciences were defined as "the literary and scholarly intellectual pursuits of the Ottoman literate classes that were outside of the scope of theological and scriptural studies, but which were nonetheless conceptualized within scriptural contexts," and described as including historiography, epistolography, biography, lexicography, and poetry. It is important to note that Ṣafāyī's understanding of the term "poets" (*şuʿarā*) embraces those involved in the composition of poetical works that cannot be dissected into categories of "religious" and "non-religious poetry," as such a clear delineation is not applicable to premodern Ottoman poetry.[285] Taking therefore as a working definition for the *ādāb* disciplines, "literary and scholarly intellectual pursuits outside of the scope of theological and scriptural studies," this section will consider how the boundaries of a discreet social identity were elaborated in Ṣafāyī's biographical dictionary through reference to literary abilities related to the *ādāb* disciplines.[286]

---

[283] Cantemir, *The history of the growth and decay of the Othman Empire*, 431.
[284] Ibid.
[285] On the nature of pre-nineteenth century Ottoman lyric poetry, see: Walter G. Andrews and Mehmed Kalpaklı, *Age of Beloveds: Love and the Beloved in Early-Modern Ottoman and European Culture and Society* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005).
[286] For more on this, particularly relating to how "literary eloquence" (*belāġāt*) and "articulateness in expression" (*faṣāḥat*) came to be standards determining the cultural and intellectual formation of the Ottoman scribal bureaucracy, see: Atiyas, "Eloquence in Context."

Muṣṭafā Ṣafāyī Efendi was an imperial *dīvān* scribe educated in the household of Elmas Meḥmed Pasha.[287] He served in a number of scribal bureaucratic posts while preparing his *teẕkire,* which encompassed short biographical entries on a number of ʿālims and bureaucrats active during the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha years.[288] The proceeding analysis of Ṣafāyī's *teẕkire* will be based on a sample of fifteen biographical entries.[289] Twelve of these entries comprise scribal bureaucrats and the other three describe individuals from the ʿilmiye whose careers are significant for this study. Notably, individuals associated in some way with a profession based in the religious sciences, such as *kadıs*, sheikhs, or dervishes, form the largest group out of the four-hundred and eighty-four poets included in the *Teẕkire-i Ṣafāyī.* The scribal bureaucrats form the second largest group. Ṣafāyī's work covers the period from 1640 to 1720 and it should be recalled that the scribal profession employed at most one and a half thousand individuals by the end of the eighteenth century, whereas the religious colleges of the ʿilmiye had already produced thousands of graduates by the seventeenth century.[290] Judged against this quantitative differential, the less frequent yet constant prevalence of scribal bureaucrats among Ṣafāyī's poets demonstrates the degree to which proficiency in the poetical arts was a fundamental attribute of the scribal profession. A similar presence of scribal bureaucrats is also observed in the *teẕkires* of Mucīb and Yümnī.[291]

Twelve of the individuals examined in the analysis conducted here passed away in the eighteenth century and eight of these were active in the early years of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's tenure as grand vizier. The only individual out of the group of fifteen to have been dead in Ṣafāyī's lifetime was Ḥüseyin Nisārī Efendi (d.1664), who has been included as an earlier example of an Imperial *Dīvān* scribe engaged in historiographical efforts. The latest date of death within this group belongs to the scribe and later provincial *defterdār* Ḫalīl Lem'ī, who passed away in 1725, immediately before Ṣafāyī's own death around the same time.[292]

In her study of the various genres and movements in "Ottoman literature" between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries, Hatice Aynur remarks that in the textual culture of the

---

[287] *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi, s.v,* "Safâyî Muṣṭafā Efendi."
[288] Ibid.
[289] These fifteen entries are: Hüseyin Nisārī Efendi (d.1664), Mustafa Nigāhī (d.1689), Ahmed Nizāmī (d.1696), Mehmed Nāzım (d.1704), Mehmed Fennī (d.1708), Muhammed Meylī (d.1709), Mustafā Naima (d.1716), Mustafā Mācid (d.1718), Mustafā Na'tī (d.1719), Ahmed Nādī (d.1719), Mustafā Mādih (d.1720), Murtaza (d.1721), Mustafā Ledünnī (d.1721), Mehmed Em'ānī (d.1721), Halīl Lem'ī (d.1725).
[290] *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi, s.v,* "Ilmiye."
[291] Mustafa Efendi Mucîb, *Teẕkire-i Mucīb* ed. Kudret Altun (Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Başkanlığı Yayınları, 1997) Mehmed Yümni, *Tezkire-i Şuʿarā-i Yümnī* ed. Sadık Erdem (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2013)
[292] Ṣafāyī, *ṢafāyīTeẕkire-i Ṣafāyī,* 533.The Islam Ansiklopedisi provides Ṣafāyī's date of death as 1725-1726. At any rate, Ṣafāyī passed away in the hijri year 1138 and Lem'ī in the hijri year 1137. [292] *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi, s.v,* "Mustafa Safâyî Efendi."

Ottoman domain "biographical dictionaries were omnipresent."[293] These dictionaries contained catalogues of religious or political figures composed of short biographical synopses elaborating the origins, achievements, and relations of the individuals described.[294] Towards the eighteenth century, there was growing tendency in the composition of biographical dictionaries to focus on specialization, and with this development the sub-genre of poets' biographies expanded.[295]

As indicated earlier, the entries comprising Muṣṭafā Ṣafāyī Efendi's *tezkire* are notably broader in length and richer in detail than the *Tezkire-i Mucīb* and the *Tezkire-i Şuʿarā-i Yümnī*. These *tezkires* are two examples from the four poets' biographies that were composed between the *Tezkire-i Şuʿarā-i Rıżā* of Meḥmed Seyyid Rıżā (d.1671), which covered the biographies of poets up to the year 1640, and the *Tezkire-i Ṣafāyī*.[296] The entries of the the *Tezkire-i Şuʿarā-i Yümnī* are particularly short, consisting mostly of single sentences in which the name, profession, and birthplace of a poet is provided.[297] The examples from the poets' works inserted below the biographical snippets are also succinct but nevertheless take up several times the space occupied by the biographical entries. The *Tezkire-i Mucīb* is a somewhat longer *tezkire* which includes a few entries that provide a little more information regarding the literary and *intisāb* relations of the poets but otherwise, Muṣṭafā Mucīb Efendi replicates the pattern of the *Tezkire-i Şuʿarā-i Yümnī*.[298]

Muṣṭafā Mucīb Efendi, Meḥmed Ṣāliḥ Yümnī, and Meḥmed Seyyid Rıżā all came from large 'ulema families. While composing their works, Meḥmed Ṣāliḥ Yümnī and Meḥmed Seyyid Rızâ were employed in the *'ilmiye* system, the former as a *kadı* (judge) and the latter as a *medrese* teacher and court official.[299] Muṣṭafā Mucīb Efendi's father was attached to the powerful *şeyhülislām* Feyżullāh Efendi encountered in the first chapter, and worked as custodian of the *fetvā* (*fetvā emīni*).[300] Muṣṭafā Mucīb Efendi himself was able to advance to a *mevleviyet,* which embodied the upper echelon of the *'ilmiye* hierarchy and included among their ranks the two *kadıaskers* who attended the Imperial *dīvān*.[301] In contrast, Muṣṭafā Ṣafāyī Efendi was employed in the Ottoman scribal bureaucracy, joining the *Mektūbī Kalemi* through his *intisāb* with the abovementioned Elmas Meḥmed Pasha, and later serving as custodian of the register (*defter emīni*) before being appointed *Defterdār* by Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha.[302]

---

[293] Aynur, "Ottoman Literature," 492.
[294] Ibid.
[295] Ibid.
[296] Ṣafāyī, *ṢafāyīTezkire-i Ṣafāyī*, 2.
[297] Yümni, *Tezkire-i Şu'arā-i Yümnī*.
[298] *Mucīb Tezkire-i Mucīb*
[299] *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi, s.v,* "Rızâ Mehmed Seyyid." Tezkire-I Yumni
[300] Mucîb, *Tezkire-i Mucîb*, 1.
[301] Ibid., 2.
[302] Ṣafāyī, *ṢafāyīTezkire-i Ṣafāyī*, 9.

In the preface of the *Teẕkire-i Ṣafāyī,* Ṣafāyī exclaims that a fundamental motivation for his work was the fact that, "for the illustrious names of poets active after the abovementioned date [of 1640], no record has been drawn" (*tārīḫ-i meẕkūreden sonra ẓuhūr eden şuʿarānın esāmī-i sāmīlerin dahi keşīde-i cerīde-i devam itmeğiçün*).[303] In doing so, Ṣafāyī was referring to the *Teẕkire-i Şuʿarā-i Rıżā* and disregarding the four biographical anthologies compiled after Meḥmed Seyyid Rıżā's work. In his analyses of seventeenth-century Ottoman histories, Piterberg operates on the idea that historiography constituted a discourse in which the state as a contested field was written.[304] Biographical dictionaries, this paper suggests, unfolded this same function in an even more explicit manner. This was because through inclusion in the *teẕkire*, individuals were ascribed a certain identity. Participation and eloquence in the intellectual disciplines of the culture of the Ottoman court were rudimentary aspects of the definition of membership in the social class of the central elite. Furthermore, the assertion of an individual's versatility in and subscription to the particular *ādāb* sciences patronized by the Ottoman elite served not only as a means of identifying with the Ottoman ruling class, but also as a vehicle for social mobility. This does not mean that association with the *ādāb* sciences differentiated a certain category of courtly elite from other social elites in Ottoman society such as the ʿ*ulema,* who might in turn then be classified exclusively in relation to the religious sciences. The fact that three of the four compilers of poets' biographies discussed above, and the earlier consideration of the genesis of the Ottoman scribal class within the ʿ*ilmiye,* argue against such interpretations of the arguments presented here.

The religious sciences were an elementary component of the social identity of the Ottoman elite and the political legitimacy of the Ottoman state. These qualities have already been examined in the first chapter. The objective here is to consider the function of the *ādāb* sciences in informing intellectual culture and sociopolitical legitimacy in the Ottoman center. Also, although to draw a rigid line between the "scholar-bureaucrats" engaged with the *ādāb* fields and the practitioners of the religious sciences would be inaccurate, it does need to be stressed in studying the intellectual environment of the Ottoman capital that the *ādāb* sciences were more closely attached to the scribal class, and that the enhancement of the prestige vested in these disciplines was related to the expansion of the Ottoman bureaucracy in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Consequently, a text that explicitly delineates the particular individuals embodying the virtues and skills of cultural traditions which identify an imperial state may be studied as a mechanism which determines and restricts the contours of that imperial state. In this manner, the biographical dictionaries of Muṣṭafā Mucīb Efendi, Meḥmed Ṣāliḥ Yümnī, Meḥmed

---

[303] Ibid., 62.

[304] Piterberg, *An Ottoman Tragedy: History and Historiography at Play*, 161.

Seyyid Rıżā, and Muṣṭafā Ṣafāyī Efendi represent a dynamic discourse on the articulation of the parameters and symbols of the identity of the Ottoman military-administrative class. They also act as instruments by which individuals are placed within or excluded from this social class.

In this context, Ṣafāyī's remarks regarding the absence of any anthologies describing the poets active after 1640, whereas in fact four such anthologies existed, is illustrative. At the very start of his preface, Ṣafāyī states that his work has benefited and acquired popularity through the famous and exalted name of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha.[305] As mentioned earlier, Ṣafāyī was patronized by Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha and through this connection was appointed to the chief office of the Ottoman financial administration. Additionally, the prefatory remarks at the beginning of Ṣafāyī's work are followed by eighteen commendations (takrīż-i laṭīf) by poets and 'ulema attesting to the quality of this tezkire .[306] Through enlisting the support of the grand vizier and utilizing his literary connections, Ṣafāyī was able to enhance the visibility and legitimacy of his biographical dictionary. With these mechanisms, Ṣafāyī endeavored to endow the Tezkire-i Ṣafāyī with the agency to exercise authority over the establishment and the restriction of the boundaries comprising the Ottoman learned class of the period lasting from 1640 to 1720 (which is the chronological scope of this tezkire). As a result, although the distinct reasons which explain Ṣafāyī's seemingly intentional disregard of the four biographical dictionaries of poets compiled after Rıżā cannot be ascertained, and the impact that this disregard had on the reception or reputation of these tezkires cannot definitively be posited, the act of exclusion in itself can be viewed as a component of the discursive processes through which ādāb texts formulated the limits and characteristics of the Ottoman ruling class.[307]

Ṣafāyī's tezkire is a biographical dictionary of poets. The almost universal phrase which Ṣafāyī utilizes in denoting that an individual belongs to this classification is "he was of the poets of the age" (ʿaṣrın şuʿarāsındandı). Either at the very beginning or at the very end of the entries, this phrase is present in thirteen of the fifteen biographies studied in this section. Of the two exceptions, in the entry on Ḥüseyin Nisārī Efendi, Ṣafāyī explains that Nisārī became in his lifetime a "fixed poet among the famous poets" (meşāhir-i şuʿarādan bir şāʿir-i rāsiḫ).[308] Interestingly, despite the abundance of generous praise bestowed on the poetical abilities of Meḥmed Fennī (d.1708), this is the only entry where some form of an explicit sentence stating

---

[305] Ṣafāyī, ṢafāyīTezkire-i Ṣafāyī, 45.

[306] Ibid., 47-60.

[307] These four texts comprised, as listed by Pervin Çapan, in addition to Mucīb and Yümnī's works, are the Zeyl-i Zübdetü'l- Eşʿār which was begun by Kafzāde Fāizī (d.1622) and completed by Seyrekzāde Mehmed Āsım (d.1675) (and it is presumably for this reason that Hatice Aynur states that in fact five tezkires were written between Rıżā and Ṣafāyī), and the Teşrifātü'ş-Şuʿarā of Ali Güftī (d.1677). Aynur's remark that Ṣafāyī "evidently did not consider them [the 4 tezkires] important," indicates that she believes Ṣafāyī was aware of the existence of these works but consciously chose to ignore them. Ṣafāyī, ṢafāyīTezkire-i Ṣafāyī, 2. Aynur, "Ottoman Literature," 495.

[308] Ṣafāyī, ṢafāyīTezkire-i Ṣafāyī, 570.

that the individual in question was a poet is absent.[309] Yet this absence is not very conspicuous because the poetical qualities of Fennī are made the focus of his narrative through a sequence of adjectives which praise his poetry and an anecdote that describes how through dedicating a *ḳaṣīde* (ode) to the grand vizier Köprülü Fāżıl Aḥmed Pasha, Fennī was able to acquire a position in the the *cizye* accounting bureau.[310] What is more striking is that in three of the fifteen entries, the phrase "he was of the poets of the age" is the only reference in the text to the poetical nature of the intellectual output of the individual in question.

The first of these three entries is that of the historian Naʿīmā. The thrust of Naʿīmā's biography as found in Ṣafāyī covers the scribal posts and *intisāb* relations which defined this scholar's bureaucratic career. Regarding Naʿīmā's writings, Ṣafāyī only has the following to say: "Being talented in the science of history, and exceedingly qualified in this field, he passed the duration of his life in composing history, and that he composed a compilation of history until the time of his death is well-known,".[311] Here, the words "he composed a compilation of history" refer to the composition of Naʿīmā's historiographical monograph the *Tārīḫ-i Naʿīmā*. In the entry on the scribal official Muḥammed Meylī (d.1709), Ṣafāyī is even more succinct, noting simply that "in his early years, in studying knowledge to a certain degree and in achieving superior ability in the science of history, he became of the poets of the age, and found fame under the title Meylī the Great,".[312] The brief statement regarding the intellectual output of Aḥmed Niẓāmī Efendi (d.1696) follows the pattern evidenced in the entries on Meylī and Naʿīmā. Once again, there is no mention of any poetical works. Instead, Ṣafāyī notes that "being qualified in the science of Arabic and his skills in the language of Persian being evident, he achieved certain writings and works and in the boundaries [i.e. in the year] of one-thousand one-hundred and eight he passed away".[313]

Based on these three accounts, the observation could be formulated that Ṣafāyī's understanding of the concept of poets (*şuʿarā*) seems to embody an expansive definition that exceeds the category of those individuals whose compositions are exclusively restricted to the domain of poetry. Particularly in the case of Meylī, who is presented as having become of the poets of his age through his achievements in the field of history, this may appear to be the case. Drawing such an evaluation from these three entries would however entail a misinterpretation.

---

[309] Ibid., 470.
[310] Ibid.
[311] Ibid., 624-625 *Fenn-i tevārīḫde mümāreseti ve bu vādīde hayli mahāreti olmagla müddet-i ömrünü tārīḫ taḥrīri ile geçirip vakt-i irtiḥāline dek müdevven tārīḫ taḥrīr eyledigi meşhūr-ı cihāndır*
[312] Ibid., 552. *Evā'il-i hālinde baʿżı mertebe tahsīl-i maʿrifet ve fenn-i tevārīḫde kesb-i mahārēt etmekle ʿaṣrın şuʿarāsından olup Koca Meylī denmekle makrūn-ı iştihārdır ʿaṣrın*
[313] Ibid., 612. *ʿUlūm-ı ʿArabiyye'de māhir ve lisān-ı fārisīde mahāreti zāhir olup baʿżı taḥrīrāt u te'līfāta muvaffak olup bin yüz sekiz hudūdunda fevt olmuşdur*

The first reason for this is that the presence of the excerpts attached at the end of each entry has the effect of systematizing the biographies into a structure in which the fundamental common denominator uniting and defining the individuals described in the *teẕkire* is the poetic nature of their creative output; this, of course, is a basic quality of the *teẕkire* genre and is not in any way restricted to Ṣafāyī. Furthermore, an additional point that needs to be emphasized is that in the twelve biographies where references to the poetic personalities of the authors are not restricted to the formulaic "he was of the poets of the age," these references most often do not provide much information on the content of these individuals' poetry, but note rather its qualitative characteristics. As such, concerning the poems of Aḥmed Nādī (d.1719), Ṣafāyī remarks that "his poems were truly of an accessible nature, and his surprising and unprecedented words a rose-tinted beauty."[314] Regarding Nisārī, Ṣafāyī writes that "his poems were pure and his word bright and without equal," and for Lem'ī, simply that "his poems were well and his word respected."[315] A further example would be the entry on the *ʿālim* Muṣṭafā Madīḥ (d.1720), in which the phrase describing the poetry of Nādī is replicated and supplemented with elements from the praise for Nisārī and Lem'ī.[316]

Therefore, with few exceptions, such as the brief statement that in the case of Muṣṭafā Naʿtī (d.1719), whose poems celebrated the prophet Muhammad, the biographical entries of Ṣafāyī do not dwell much on the actual poetical works of the individuals described.[317] Instead, the focus of the narratives follows the personal and literary qualities, the professional backgrounds, and the *intisāb* relations of the poets. As such, it is not so much that Ṣafāyī's understanding of *şuʿarā* embraces a broader definition of the term as that his biographical approach is centered on those elements in the personal histories of his subjects which he deems most noteworthy or which perhaps comprised the most well known aspects of these individuals within the intellectual milieu in which Ṣafāyī wrote. For Naʿīmā, these were the patronage networks surrounding Naʿīmā and his historiographical project. In the case of Meylī, Ṣafāyī seems most interested in presenting how the dissolute son of a wealthy family, who spent his youth with wine and women, was able to enter the ranks of the poets through education and his historiographical abilities. And concerning the shortest of the fifteen entries, that for Meḥmed Emʿānī (d.1721), the only point of interest seems to be the fact that Emʿānī dedicated a *ḳaṣīde* to Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha.[318]

---

[314] *Hakkā ki şāhid-i naẓmı şīve-engīz-i selāset ve ebkār-ı maʿnā-yı hacle-i suḫanı gül-gūne-endūde-i leṭāfetdir* Ibid., 645.
[315] *Eşʿārı pāk ve güftārı tābnāk u bī-bedeldir.* Ibid., 570. *Eşʿārı ḫūb ve güftārı mergūb.* Ibid., 533.
[316] Ibid., 553.
[317] Ibid., 647.
[318] There is not even any mention of what Emʿānī received in exchange for this bid at patronage Ibid., 89-90.

It can be concluded therefore that the basic criterion applied by Ṣafāyī in his conceptualization of the category of *şuʿarā* was that the persons in question were composers of poetry. This was the case even in instances where the intellectual reputation of an individual subsisted in the success or popularity of his prose works. Nevertheless, the methodological choice to focus on prose works in a number of the entries of a biographical dictionary provides insights into the nature of the intellectual environment of its author, demonstrating that there existed no solid distinction between those who composed prose works and those who produced poetry; the two could be and often were the same. The cultural environment pertaining to *ādāb* which emerges from the *Tezkire-i Ṣafāyī* unfolds a fluid continuum in which strict divisions in the form and content of literary production, and in the professional backgrounds of the individual engaged with these fields, are absent. In the intellectual culture of the Ottoman court, poetic forms and structures were regularly incorporated into mainly prose works such as letters and historical chronicles.[319] Poetry was not the exclusive domain of professional poets; on the contrary, the majority of the Ottoman poetic output of the seventeenth to the early eighteenth century as presented in the *Tezkire-i Ṣafāyī* and the *tezkires* of Mucīb and Yümnī was generated in the *ʿilmiye* and scribal bureaucratic professions. However, the idea introduced above of an *ādāb* continuum should not be interpreted to entail the absence of distinct *ādāb* disciplines. Rather, this idea is meant to convey the interlaced nature of distinct *ādāb* disciplines, in the sense that alongside the presence of discreet disciplines was the fact that these disciplines drew from shared grammatical models and structures and subject material, and that they were produced by a single class of literati.

It is this notion which Flesicher reflects when he writes of the various qualifications that need be applied "in any effort to narrow down the concept of historiography in a context in which it is not clearly distinguishable from literature."[320] Within this context of an *ādāb* continuum, historiography does however emerge as a delineated form of textual composition in the *tezkire* of Ṣafāyī. When referring to Naʿīmā's works Ṣafāyī utilizes the phrases "the science of history" (*fenn-i tevārīḫ*) and "the composition of history" (*tārīḫ taḥrīri*).[321] This terminology reappears as "*fenn-i tārīḫ*" in the entry on Lemʾī, as "*fenn-i tevārīḫ*" in Meylī, and as "*tevārīḫ taḥrīr*," or "composition of history," in Murtażā.[322] The only variation is the use of the Arabic-derived word "*müverriḫ*" for historian in the entry on Nisāri.[323] Ṣafāyī seems to use the plural

---

[319] Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire*, 236. Hanaway, "Secretaries, Poets, and the Literary Language*,"* 125-126. Şahin, "Imperialism, Bureaucratic Consciousness, and the Historian's Craft", 40.
[320] Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire*, 236.
[321] Ṣafāyī, *ṢafāyīTezkire-i Ṣafāyī*, 624.
[322] Ibid., 533, 552, 563.
[323] Ibid., 570.

tevārīḫ and the singular *tārīḫ* forms of "history" interchangeably. Clearly, therefore, Ṣafāyī identified the discipline of historiography as an independent scholarly pursuit and a third of the sample derived from Ṣafāyī's *teẕkire*, all five of them scribal bureaucrats, were involved in this field.

In addition to poetry and historiography, a few other disciplines can also be distinguished from the fifteen entries studied here. The first of these is *inṣā*, which in the Ottoman context referred to either a style of literary epistolography or to literary prose and, as indicated by Piterberg, was a product of the Ottoman chancery.[324] Atiyas notes that *inṣā*, defined by her as "good literary prose," comprised one of the fundamental elements of the *ādāb* sciences.[325] Nigāhī, Murtażā, and Nādī, all scribal bureaucrats, are mentioned by Ṣafāyī as possessing proficiency in this field. With Nigāhī, Ṣafāyī notes simply that he was "skilled in *inṣā*" (*inṣāda māhir*).[326] In the case of Murtażā, Ṣafāyī uses the term "the field of *inṣā*" (*vādī-i inṣā*), and with Nādī, reference is made to a "science of *inṣā* (*fenn-i inṣā*).[327] The phrase "the science of Arabic" (*'ulūm-i 'Arabiyye'*) seen briefly above in the entry on Niẓāmī, indicates that the study of languages was also perceived as a distinct sphere of scholarship.[328] There are also two appearances of genres which fall outside of the definition of the *ādāb* sciences adopted in this paper. They are the "prophetic poems" (*na't-ı ṣerīf*) of Na'tī and the *Teẕkiretü'l-Evliyā* or biographical dictionary of saints produced by Murtażā.[329]

In summation, the limited analysis of the *Teẕkire-i Ṣafāyī* conducted here supports the applicability of the concept of *ādāb* sciences as defined above to the intellectual culture of the early eighteenth century Ottoman capital. Although in form, content, and authorship, the *ādāb* disciplines inhabited a shared space, the evidence just reviewed suggests that these disciplines embodied distinct identities within the consciousness of the Ottoman literate classes. A fundamental characteristic which distinguished them from the religious sciences (such as Quran interpretation and hadith studies) was their this-worldly perspective. Although this facet of the Ottoman centre's intellectual culture has been recognized by contemporary Ottoman historians, no standard definition has become fixed in the historiography. Therefore, while Fleischer speaks of a "broad humanistic variety" in reference to the intellectual traditions of the Ottoman palace, Findley applies the concept of a "this-worldly belletristic tradition," to the culture associated

---

[324] Aynur, "Ottoman Literature," 517. Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire*, 31. Hanaway, "Secretaries, Poets, and the Literary Language," 97. Piterberg, *An Ottoman Tragedy: History and Historiography at Play*, 44.
[325] Atiyas, "Eloquence in Context," 115.
[326] Ṣafāyī, *ṢafāyīTeẕkire-i Ṣafāyī*, 602.
[327] Ibid., 557, 644.
[328] Ibid., 612.
[329] Ibid., 557, 647.

with the scribal bureaucrats.[330] On the other hand, Madeline Zilfi uses the phrase "profane letters" and Yavuz Sezer adopts the term "*ādāb* subjects".[331] Virgina Aksan also makes use of *ādāb*, defining it as a "highly respected literary tradition" and arguing that it comprised one of the two prerequisites, the other being *intisāb*, for membership in the Ottoman scribal elite.[332]

In concluding his analysis of the medieval Islamic origins and historically evolving meanings of *ādāb*, Seeger Adrianus Bonebakker states that perhaps the most accurate meaning of the term follows that of "the literary scholarship of a cultivated man."[333] Bonebakker's definition is noteworthy because it accounts for the moral qualities embodied by *ādāb* in addition to the literary disciplines this word comprehends. Findley also draws attention to this association, noting the link between the Turkish word for "good-breeding," *edeb*, and *ādāb*.[334] In its earliest manifestations in the Arabic language, *ādāb* denoted socio-ethical tribal values, ancestral customs, and the act of educating.[335] Proficiency in the *ādāb* fields and the exhibition of this proficiency were fundamental components of integration into the social identity of the Ottoman military-administrative class. This is the reason why Aksan presents *ādāb* as a prerequisite for access to the upper echelons of the scribal service. It is also the reason why this study views *ādāb* as a more effective term than other alternatives in studying the Ottoman intellectual environment. Erudition, an encyclopedic grasp of knowledge in the *ādāb* fields and linguistic eloquence were hallmarks of membership in the socioeconomic elite of the early eighteenth century Ottoman capital. That such appellations followed instances where the literary personalities of the Ottoman elite became inscribed in text is attested by the descriptions found in the biographical entries of Ṣafāyī 's *tezkire* .

The language Ṣafāyī employs in these entries reflects the enhanced prestige that literary knowledge and the conspicuous consumption of literary knowledge had come to possess by the early eighteenth century. As noted in the first section of this chapter, a common introduction to the biographical narratives in the *Tezkire-i Ṣafāyī* consists of slightly varied versions of the statement "in his early years he studied knowledge" (*evā'il-i hālinde taḥsīl-i ma'ārif edip*).[336] This phrase is found in twelve of the fifteen entries studied here. Therefore, a basic qualification within which Ṣafāyī locates and through which he identifies the Ottoman *şu'arā* is the act of the

---

[330] Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire*, 209. Findley, *Bureaucratic Reform in the Ottoman Empire*, 9.
[331] Zilfi, "The Ottoman *ulema*", 33.
[332] Aksan, *An Ottoman Statesman in War and Peace: Ahmed Resmi Efendi, 1700-1783*, 2-3.
[333] Seeger Adrianus Bonebakker, "Ādāb and the concept of belles-lettres," in *'Abbasid Belles-Lettres* ed. Julia Ashtiany, T.M. Johnstone, J.D. Latham, R.B. Serjeant (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 30.
[334] Findley, *Bureaucratic Reform in the Ottoman Empire,* 9.
[335] Bonebakker, "Ādāb and the concept of belles-lettres," 18.
[336] The slight modifications, as in the example of the entry for Na'īmā, serve to express basic biographical information such as that the individual had arrived in Istanbul from a provincial birthplace in his youth Ṣafāyī, *ṢafāyīTezkire-i Ṣafāyī*, 533.

acquisition of knowledge at an early age. In other words, initiation into erudition forms an elementary necessary condition that distinguishes the Ottoman learned classes from the rest of society. This is further evidenced by the fact that in the three instances observed here where the formula of "in his early years he studied knowledge" is absent, the identification of the personality of the individual in question with erudition is achieved through alternate mechanisms. As such, in the case of Fennī, the sentence immediately following the opening of the entry indicating Fennī was born in Istanbul explains that "being allotted with [possessing] various sciences, he chose the abovementioned penname."[337] Following this, Ṣafāyī notes that "in his early youth," Fennī attached himself to a *Mevlevī* sheikh and "completed the path of the *tarīqa* [Sufi brotherhood]" (*tekmīl-i ādāb-ı tarīḳāt*).[338] Hence, in this entry Ṣafāyī indicates both that Fennī possessed knowledge in a number of "sciences" from an early age and that in his youth he began his spiritual and scholarly education through the *Mevlevī* brotherhood. Interestingly, Ṣafāyī applies the term *ādāb* here in the sense of moral and ethical values, or "path" of a Sufi brotherhood, which Bonebakker provides as one of *ādāb's* earliest medieval connotations.[339]

In the entry on Muṣṭafā Ledünnī (d.1721), the formula of acquiring knowledge at an early age is altered into a statement that Ledünnī set out from his country upon travels "in pursuit of the loot of science," (*ṣayd-ı şikār-ı maʿrifet*) which would bring him to the Persian court.[340] The only instance in these fifteen entries where an assertion expressing the acquisition of knowledge at an early age is absent is in the entry on Naʿtī. This absence is significant because Ṣafāyī 's account of Naʿtī provides an example in which a truly alternate approach to that of the "acquisition formula" is applied in establishing the erudite identity of the personality of the individual in question. Naʿtī's father had served as a vizier and a *Defterdār* in the Ottoman administration.[341] Presumably invoking this factor, Ṣafāyī explains how upon entering the royal palace as an apprentice (*çırak*) in the imperial service "in the days of his youth" (*eyyām-ı cevānīde*), Naʿtī became the privy secretary of Sultan Aḥmed III through the superior capabilities in knowledge and scholarship which he had inherited at birth.[342] The specific term used to express this statement is "*māderzād*," which may be roughly translated as "through his birth to his mother."[343] It can be concluded therefore that for Ṣafāyī, possession of knowledge was a basic criterion of membership in the Ottoman learned class. The assertion of this quality in

---

[337] *Envā-ı fünūndan behre-yāb olmagla maḫlaṣ-ı mezbūru iḫtiyār etmişdir.*. Ibid., 470.
[338] Ibid.
[339] Bonebakker, "Ādāb and the concept of belles-lettres," 18.
[340] Ṣafāyī, *ṢafāyīTeẕkire-i Ṣafāyī*, 535.
[341] Ibid., 647.
[342] Ibid.
[343] Ibid.

fourteen of the fifteen entries studied here precedes the narrative section of the biographical accounts.

In the use of language, semantic mechanisms and narrative structure, the *Teẕkire-i Ṣafāyī* intentionally applies scholarliness as a means by which the outlines of a particular courtly class are traced. The absence of remarks regarding erudition in the *teẕkires* of Mucīb and Yümnī attests to the fact that such mechanisms were not universals of the *teẕkire* genre but constituted rather a choice freely adopted by Ṣafāyī. In the Ottoman context, literacy functioned as a restricted medium through which social identity was expressed. What has been conceptualized as the "Ottoman imperial cultural tradition" embodied a specific articulation of literacy defined by an eclectic "amalgamation" of inherited traditions which comprised Islamic orthodoxy and law, elements of Islamic mysticisms drawn from what Piterberg calls the thirteenth to fifteenth century "*ġāzī*-dervish milieu," and the Persianate literary culture of *ādāb*.[344] This specific articulation of literacy was attached to the identity of a specific social group, the Ottoman military-administrative class. The German linguist and theologian Stephan Schultz who visited the Ottoman Empire between 1752 and 1756 noted at one point in his journals that "the Turkish chancellery script is so different from the normal handwritten scripts and the letters that occur in Persian, Turkish, and Arabic books that one might take them for a completely different language."[345] Echoing this exclusivist function of Ottoman textual culture, Findley states that Ottoman Turkish, "an artificial composite of Turkish, Arabic, and Persian—was probably more remote from common speech than that of any other Islamic state."[346]

Poetry was the field where this synthetic linguistic construction, which emerged in the Ottoman capital in the 1480s through the compositions of scribal officials like the *nişāncı* and historian Celālzāde Muṣṭafā Çelebi, was first exercised.[347] The status of poetry within the cultural portfolio of the Ottoman literati exceeded that of prose and of works that combined prose and verse.[348] Therefore, in the social environment of the early eighteenth century Ottoman center, association with poetry would have served not only as a means of symbolizing membership in the Ottoman ruling class but also as a vehicle for enhancing one's social status within that class. Ṣafāyī's text provides several examples of how language could be applied in an *ādāb* context for these purposes. One is what may be phrased as the "essence metaphor." This

---

[344] Findley, *Bureaucratic Reform in the Ottoman Empire*, 8-10. Piterberg, *An Ottoman Tragedy: History and Historiography at Play*, 34-35.

[345] Jan Schmidt, "'Guided by the Almighty': the journey of Stephan Schultz in the Ottoman empire, 1752-6," in *The Ottoman World* ed. Christine Woodhead (New York: Routeledge, 2012), 344.

[346] Findley, *Ottoman Civil Officialdom: A Social History*, 52.

[347] Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire*, 22-24. Şahin, "Imperialism, Bureaucratic Consciousness, and the Historian's Craft", 47.

[348] Aynur, "Ottoman Literature," 487.

entails descriptions in which intellectual qualities are inscribed into the very essence (*vücūd*) of the personality of subjects. Thus, when speaking of Nādī, Ṣafāyī writes that "the world-illuminating sun of knowledge and excellence that was his essence was born in the vicinity of Kastamonu."[349] Naʿtī on the other hand is described as having a "a mind and essence that express purity" (*gevher-i vücūd-ı ṣafvet-nümūdu*), Nisārī as a "knowledge-seeking essence" (*ma'ārif-şikār-ı vücūdu*), and Fennī as a "knowledge-disseminating essence" (*girān-bār-ı vücūdu*).[350] The fifth instance where Ṣafāyī uses this imagery is in the entry on Mādih, where he replicates the language used for Nādī.[351]

These examples illustrate how *ādāb* texts could function in the Ottoman intellectual cultural context as a method of communicating ideals of social identity, in this case erudition. The phraseology of the essence metaphor achieves this function through fusing the ideals of erudite refinement to the personalities of the people being described in an evocative and intimate manner. However, it does need to be pointed out that the dynamics between Ṣafāyī and those individuals included in his anthology whom he might have known (that is, those who were contemporary to his lifespan), and therefore the personal motivations Ṣafāyī might or might not have had in praising the personalities of his subjects are beyond the scope of this study. In other words, though the language found in the entries of the *Teẕkire-i Ṣafāyī* can be interpreted as a conscious attempt at enhancing the status of a social group (the Ottoman central literati), the analysis conducted here cannot provide any conclusions regarding the particular reasons the author might or might not have had in lavishing or pruning the praise he bestowed in varied sums upon the four-hundred and eighty-four individuals of the *teẕkire* .

For an example of the utilization of praise and the identification of an individual with the *ādāb* sciences for the purposes of enhancing the sociopolitical capital of that individual, the poems of Aḥmed Nedīm, studied in the following chapter, can be cited. One instance where this does happen in Ṣafāyī's *teẕkire* is in the poetical excerpt provided for Muṣṭafā Mācid (d.1718), which was produced as a chronogram (*tārīḫ*) for the *dārülhadī* (hadith college) of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha, and in which Mācid exclaims "[this] is the station of the keeper of great knowledge that is İbrāhīm Pasha" (*makām-ı ehl-i 'ilm-ābād-ı İbrāhīm Paşadır*).[352] Another example is the prefatory note where Ṣafāyī explains that his work has benefited from the support of the famous and exalted name of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha.[353] These two instances exhibit two

---

[349] *Ḫūrşīd-i cihāntāb-ı ma'ārif ü kemāl olan vücūdu havālī-i Kastamonu'da tulū' etmişdir.* Ṣafāyī, *Teẕkire-i Ṣafāyī*, 644.
[350] Ibid., 470, 570, 647.
[351] Ibid., 553.
[352] Ibid., 563.
[353] Ibid., 45.

different yet related forms in which literary compositions could be employed in the Ottoman cultural sphere in extolling the reputations and emphasizing the scholarly qualities of specific personages. The first form, represented by Mācid's chronogram (and by Nedīm's poetry), involved the direct application of praise to the personality of the exalted individual, expressing through a diversity of poetic constructions attributes, such as the wealth of knowledge or the eloquence of locution, embodied by these individuals. The second form, exemplified by Ṣafāyī 's reference to the support he had enlisted from Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha, consisted in the act of dedicating scholarly works. The language of the dedication itself often incorporated flowery phrases of praise and in this sense the two forms are related. However, the greater significance in dedications lay in their function as means by which individuals could build up their reputations as patrons of the arts.

This aspect of the intellectual culture of the early eighteenth century Ottoman capital was a consequence of the sociopolitical environment in which this culture was embedded. To reiterate, the environment in question was made up of multiple networks of patron-client relationships, organized under the household structure and elaborated through the *intisāb* mechanism. Two of the three instances in the fifteen entries studied above in which are situated references to the patronage function of *ādāb* works have already been encountered. These were the *ḳaṣīde* which Fennī dedicated to the Köprülü grand vizier Fāżıl Aḥmed Pasha and the *ḳaṣīde* Em'ānī wrote for Dāmād İbrāhīm Pash.[354] The third example concerns Mādih who, upon submitting "an extravagant *ḳaṣīde*" (*ḳaṣīde-i garrā*) to Sultan Aḥmed III, earned the Sulṭān's favor and is described as having been provided with a *medrese* of his own.[355] The success or failure that Ottoman litterateurs and scribal bureaucrats experienced in their bids for patronage shaped the course of their careers and could influence the extents of the exposure their works attained. For example, in becoming official court historian (*vak'anüvīs*), Naʿīmā was able to endow his historiographical output with the legitimacy accorded it by state sanction. His work also benefited from the access to state archives which the *Reīsü'l-Küttāb* provided the official court historian of the Ottoman Empire with.[356] Naʿīmā owed this position and its advantages to the patronage of Ḥüseyin Köprülü Pasha.[357] His successor as *vak'anüvīs,* Rāşid Meḥmed Efendi (d.1735), likewise received this appointment through his *intisāb* to Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha.[358] On the other hand, those who failed to cultivate *intisāb* attachments to senior government officials or members of the Ottoman dynasty in the Ottoman center could remain excluded from the centers

---

[354] Ibid., 89, 470.
[355] Ibid., 553.
[356] Ahısalı, *Osmanlı Devlet Teşkilatında Reisülküttâblık*, 52-53.
[357] Lewis and Itzkowitz, *A Study of Naima*, 17.
[358] Ibid., 37.

of literary patronage and experience disaffection. Gelibolulu Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī, who served throughout his career in the provincial administrative offices of governors and princes, is one such example.[359]

In the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, dedications of verse and/or prose works of an *ādāb* nature by literate Ottomans conversant with the imperial cultural matrix of the Ottoman court to members of the central socioeconomic elite of the capital was a common feature of the literary landscape of Istanbul. Two further examples from the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha period are the *ʿālim*-poet İsmāīl Belīğ (d.1729), who received the support of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha upon submitting an encyclopedia of notable personages from the town of Bursa in 1721 to him, and the court poet Seyyid Vehbī (d.1736), who composed the text of the book of festivals (*sūrnāme*) describing the events surrounding the circumcision of Sultan Aḥmed III's sons in 1720.[360] As such, the needs and consequences of a patronage-based social system shaped not only the characteristics of employment and membership in the structures of the Ottoman state, but also extensively influenced the nature of the intellectual traditions attached to these structures which concentrated in the Ottoman capital.

Although the various disciplines of the *ādāb* sciences were by no means the exclusive intellectual domain of scribal bureaucrats, these disciplines configured the social consciousness and cultural identity of the scribal bureaucracy in a manner not replicated by any other professional group. One manifestation of this is the ways in which scribes and secretarial functionaries synthesized shared courtly languages through the systematic application of grammatical and linguistic structures drawn from *ādāb* disciplines to the production of government documents. For example, in medieval Persian courts the three-tiered organizational schema of the *ḳaṣīde* was used to structure the diplomatic correspondence of the state.[361] In the Ottoman context, *niṣāncı* Celālzāde Muṣṭafā Çelebi in applied a uniform style of ornate linguistic composition in drafting imperial decrees, correspondence, peace treaties, and history, thereby creating a coherent scribal imperial language.[362] Ṣafāyī's *teẕkire* also demonstrates how the repetitive employment of themes and semantic structures, such as the statements regarding youthful acquisition of knowledge or the essence metaphors, allowed scribal bureaucrats to create collective idioms through which social identities became inscribed and delineated.

The function of patron-client networks through *intisāb* in the scribal service of the Ottoman administration should be viewed in relation to the foregoing consideration of the

---

[359] Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire*, 40.

[360] Aynur, "Ottoman Literature," 504-505.

[361] Hanaway, "Secretaries, Poets, and the Literary Language," 125-130.

[362] Şahin, "Imperialism, Bureaucratic Consciousness, and the Historian's Craft", 47.

cultural qualities of this social class. The scribal bureaucracy possessed no formal educational apparatus corresponding to the *medrese* system with its hierarchy of colleges, professors, and exams.[363] As a result, there were no schematized mechanisms in place to assess the intellectual capabilities and secretarial skills of scribal bureaucrats, and it was in response to this that patron-client relationships between senior scribal officials and government grandees, or between established scribes and apprentice clerks, emerged. In other words, *intisāb* was in part the product of a professional and social environment predicated and reliant (in a practical and a symbolic sense) on competence in certain intellectual fields, and in which institutionalized models for evaluating this competence were lacking. At the same time, *intisāb* was also an element of established organizational patterns like the guild structure that predominated in the lower scribal service or the household structure that could be traced to the format of the early Ottoman dynastic state.

This section of the chapter has sought to study the intellectual cultural environment of the early eighteenth century Ottoman center through focusing on the sociopolitical function and enhanced visibility of the *ādāb* sciences in this environment. The *Teẕkire-i Ṣafāyī* has been analyzed as a textual site where sociocultural meaning was produced and an attempt at defining the qualities and symbols of Ottoman imperial identity formulated. In addition, the driving force exercised by *intisāb* relations in determining the direction of the biographical narratives of Ṣafāyī's entries has revealed the significance possessed by this particular Ottoman form of patronage in the consciousness and experience of the lettered classes concentrated on the Ottoman court and its attendant grandee households. The central socioeconomic elite of the Ottoman capital were imbricated in hierarchically descending structures comprised of overlapping *intisāb* commitments. The patterns adopted by these commitments often mimicked those higher up the chain of patronage, so that for example as the sultan cultivated sons-in-law as a method for ensuring the dependability of powerful clients, so royal sons-in-law like Damad (son-in-law) İbrāhīm Pasha acquired sons-in-law like the Grand Admiral Kaymak Muṣṭafā Pasha and Kethüdā Meḥmed Pasha. Before moving on to a study of the household faction of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha, a brief review of the nature and development of Ottoman historiography up to the early eighteenth century will be undertaken. The majority of the books published by the İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa printing press between between 1729 and 1730, and the works translated by the committees subsidized under Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha, involved historiographical studies and monographs. A review of the features and content of Ottoman historiography in the centuries preceding the 1718-1730 period will enable the contention to be put forth in chapter four, as a

---

[363] Although the systematized nature of the *medrese*-system should not be overstated for it too relied heavily on interpersonal contacts and *intisāb*-based networks.

central argument of this thesis, that a third major and novel aspect of the cultural environment of this period was what this study refers to as intellectual *décloisonnement.*

Ottoman Historiography before the 1718-1730 Period

The historiographical output of Ottoman scholars, scribes, and *ʿālims* of the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries can be roughly divided into three genres. First, there were single-event histories, which focused on a single reign, conquest, or political event.[364] A second genre were "universal histories." These theoretically comprised a comprehensive gloss of human history from the first human to the reign of a current or recent sulṭān, and would involve sections on the history of pre-Ottoman Islamic polities and the early Muslim caliphs.[365] An example of this genre has already been encountered. In describing the historiographical work of Murtażā, Ṣafāyī writes that, "Among his works, he has composed a compilation of histories [covering the period] from the fall of Adam from heaven to his drafting of his book."[366] Despite the hyperbolic language of this statement, Ottoman universal histories, like the *Essence of History* of Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī, would mostly focus on the sections covering the Ottoman dynasty.[367] A third historiographical genre were the *Tārīḫ-i ʿĀl-i Osman,* or histories of the House of Osman, which were historical chronicles of the Ottoman dynasty.[368]

The earlier historiographical texts produced in the fifteenth century were along the lines of this third genre and constituted, in Fleischer's phrasing, "a bold recounting of events in simple language and in annalistic format."[369] The processes of a shift from the popular oral historiographical traditions of a "ġāzī-dervish" frontier society to that of an urbane historiographical consciousness rooted in the court capital of Istanbul can be identified already in the fifteenth century.[370] One example of the popular oral approach is the work of ʿĀşıkpasazāde (d.1484), who consciously integrated oral tales into his chronicles, the emotional tone of which, according to both Cemal Kafadar and Piterberg, expressed uneasiness at the centralizing direction that the evolution of the Ottoman state had taken over the course of the fifteenth century.[371] The sociocultural environment that germinated around the Ottoman palace following the conquest of Constantinople provided the setting in which the courtly language of Ottoman-

---

[364] Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire*, 240. Piterberg, *An Ottoman Tragedy: History and Historiography at Play*, 38.
[365] Piterberg, *An Ottoman Tragedy: History and Historiography at Play*, 38.
[366] Ṣafāyī, *ṢafāyīTeẕkire-i Ṣafāyī*, 557. *Cümle-i āsārından hübūt-ı Ādem'den taḥrīr-i kitāba gelince müdevven tevārīḫ taḥrīr etmişdir.*
[367] Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire*, 245.
[368] Piterberg, *An Ottoman Tragedy: History and Historiography at Play*, 38.
[369] Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire*, 235.
[370] Piterberg, *An Ottoman Tragedy: History and Historiography at Play*, 33-34.
[371] Ibid.

Turkish emerged. The qualities which informed the mental landscape of this setting rested on perceptions "which virtually required that certain types of prose work intended to be accepted as part of a high culture tradition be written in Persian or Arabic rather than Turkish."[372] It is against this context that the style and content of the first textual compositions through which Ottoman-Turkish became articulated must be considered.

In being a synthesis of Turkish, Arabic, and Persian, and thereby through its association with the courtly and religious languages of pre-Ottoman Islamic imperial entities, the Ottoman-Turkish language was perceived as being situated within a "high culture domain." At the same time, in being a novel linguistic reformulation, this language allowed literate Ottomans to elaborate an intellectual culture that was idiosyncratic to the Ottoman polity. The *ādāb* disciplines of historiography, *inşā* and poetry, as witnessed also in the *Teẕkire-i Ṣafāyī,* constituted the textual media through which an exclusively Ottoman imperial syntax was developed and an Ottoman imperial identity established. These shifts influenced the composition of history in the Ottoman realm, and in the sixteenth century the "bald" "annalistic" chronicles were joined by a new tradition of works that embodied a form of "polite literature".[373] Examples include the works of Celalzāde Muṣṭafā Çelebi, Gelibolulu Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī, Ramażanzāde Meḥmed Pasha (d.1571), Tālikīzâde Meḥmed Suphi (d.1600), and Kemālpaşazāde (d.1534). Of these five individuals, four were employed in the expanding secretarial offices of the Ottoman state and came from either scribal backgrounds or had switched from the *ʿilmiye* to the scribal profession. Kemālpaşazāde, the only exception, continued to serve as a religious scholar and judge even as he was commissioned by Sultan Bayezid II (r.1481-1512) in the late fifteenth century to render into Ottoman-Turkish the *Eight Paradises* (*Hasht Bihist*) of Idrīs-i Bidlīsī.[374]

Bidlīsī, a former *nişāncı* of the Akkoyunlu court, had written the *Eight Paradises* in Persian upon being employed by Bayezid II to produce a history of the Ottoman dynasty.[375] Therefore, Kemālpaşazāde's translation of Bidlīsī's work represents the beginning of the juncture in which the switch from Persian and Arabic to the new individuality embodied by Ottoman-Turkish in the courtly language of the Ottoman state took place. The reign of Sultan Suleymān I (1520-1566) has been presented as the turning point at which Ottoman-Turkish became the principal literary language of the Ottoman court.[376] An interesting aspect of Ottoman historiography under Sultan Suleymān I was the post of *şāhnāmeci,* or *shāhnāmeh*-writer, an official court appointed historian charged with producing histories of the Ottoman state in the

[372] Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire*, 241.
[373] Ibid., 236.
[374] Ibid., 239.
[375] Piterberg, *An Ottoman Tragedy: History and Historiography at Play*, 37.
[376] Idib.

style of the Persian *Shāhnāmeh* epic.[377] Of the abovementioned historians, Tālikīzāde Meḥmed Suphi was employed in this capacity.

Even though the position of *shāhnāmeh*-writer was a temporary innovation restricted to the monarchy of Suleymān I, it nonetheless presents one example of the sustained influence exercised by Persian literature and the Persian language on the intellectual environment of the Ottoman center. In his entry on Ledünnī, Ṣafāyī describes how Ledünnī left his homeland of Bosnia at a young age in quest of knowledge.[378] His travels would bring him to Iran where, after achieving fame in literary and poetic discussions at the Persian court, he would return to the Ottoman state and, eseteemd for his superior abilities in Persian, find employment among the scribes of the Imperial *Dīvān*.[379] Therefore, in speaking of the permeability of the Ottoman cultural sphere to foreign literary and historiographical texts and, under the concept of intellectual *décloisonnement*, attributing an enhanced openness to the early eighteenth century, it should be noted that the presence of Persian literary motifs, subjects, and grammatical models in the intellectual traditions of the Ottoman center can be traced back to the very formation of those traditions. The intellectual *décloisonnement* of the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha period should be viewed as encompassing an expansion of an interest in Persian history and literature that was already indigenous to the Ottoman intellectual domain. Nevertheless, an expansion, particularly in the field of historiography, can be identified. On the other hand, the growth of this openness to encompass European texts, pasts, and geographies in an institutionalized, state sponsored manner, was an altogether original development.

This latter contention can to an extent be demonstrated through a brief consideration of the sources and interests that determined the composition of pre-eighteenth century Ottoman historiographical texts. These texts did not exist in a vacuum. They were often involved in contentious or sympathetic conversations with other works. Ottoman historians commonly drew their narratives of the past from the works of scholars that had come before them, although they also relied in varying degrees on oral sources. For example, in compiling his *Essence of History,* Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī drew from a wealth of sources including earlier Ottoman histories, Persian and Arabic works, universal histories, his own personal memories, interviews, popular oral histories, and biographical dictionaries.[380] He claimed that his work consisted of the quintessence of a hundred and thirty different books.[381] Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī personally knew Ramażanzāde and Celālzāde, and explicitly noted that he viewed himself as the third scholar following these two to

---

[377] Ibid., 37-38.
[378] Ṣafāyī, *ṢafāyīTeẕkire-i Ṣafāyī*, 535.
[379] Ibid.
[380] Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire*, 250-251.
[381] Ibid., 246.

compose a history of the Ottoman dynasty.[382] Therefore, without emphasizing the quality of isolation too much, in terms of composition (though not intended audience), pre-eighteenth century Ottoman historiography can be conceptualized (with the notable exception of Kātip Çelebi) as an internal Ottoman dialogue, focused primarily on the Ottoman domain and reliant on Ottoman, Islamic and Persian sources. Fleischer and Şahin both note that the primary intended audience for Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī and Celālzāde were the literate classes of the Ottoman Empire.[383] The notion of an internal dialogue in composition is further demonstrated in the histories produced by seventeenth-century Ottoman scribes and scholars. The works of Ḥüseyin Tûğī (d.1623), Hasanbeyzâde Aḥmed Pasha, İbrāhīm Peçevī and Naʿīmā, which all replicate or argue against one another's narrations of the deposition and execution of Sultan Osman II in 1622, are one clear example of this tendency.[384] Kātip Çelebi's *Compendium of Ottoman History* (*Fezleke-i Tārīḫ-i Osmānī*) also engages with this event.[385]

Exceptions to the Ottoman-centric approach in pre-eighteenth century Ottoman historiography include Kātip Çelebi's *World Mirror* (*Cihānnümā*), the cartographical work of Pīrī Reīs (d.1550), a work by Hezārfen Ḥüseyin Efendi (d.1691), and a universal history written by Aḥmed Dede Müneccimbaşı (d.1702).[386] All of these works contain sections on European geography and history culled from European texts that the authors were able to acquire. They are, however, exceptions. Most significantly, the inclusion of material on the European domain in each one of these examples was a consequence of individual initiative. They are therefore not comparable to the state sponsored translations and prints achieved under Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha, which moreover included not only works incorporating elements from European texts, but translated versions of the European texts themselves.

In concluding his analysis of the *Tārīḫ-i Naʿīmā*, Lewis Thomas notes that Naʿīmā "gives us scarcely a word to show that he himself had ever paid the least heed to, or even heard of, any Europeans except those with whom the Ottomans came into direct contact."[387] In the decade and a half that followed Naʿīmā's death, this tendency within the historiography patronized by the central state elite would be replaced by a comprehensive programmatic focus on regions that lay beyond the western and eastern frontiers of the Ottoman domain. The individuals responsible for

---

[382] Ibid., 31.
[383] In terms of their function as books of advice criticizing the ills of society, the intended audience of these works was surely domestic. However, one function that sixteenth-century Ottoman historiography did provide was to promote the imperial ideology of the Ottoman state against its Safavid and Habsburg rivals and in this sense, these works can also be regarded as comprising statements of imperial legitimacy that were involved in conversation with foreign powers. Ibid., 247. Şahin, "Imperialism, Bureaucratic Consciousness, and the Historian's Craft", 39, 44.
[384] Piterberg, *An Ottoman Tragedy: History and Historiography at Play*.
[385] Ibid., 46-47
[386] Bernard Lewis, *The Muslim Discovery of Europe* (New York: W.W.Norton & Company, 1982), 153-158.
[387] Lewis and Itzkowitz, *A Study of Naima*, 130.

this shift inhabited a shared intellectual cultural environment characterized by an enhanced interest in the *ādāb* disciplines. Knowledge in this environment possessed sociopolitical functions. Furthermore, patron-client networks of household structures formulated through *intisāb* relationships formed the social substance that informed the constitution of the Ottoman military-administrative ruling class. It is the assertion of this thesis that the first Ottoman printing press emerged as a venture organized by a group of individuals embedded to one such structure, the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha household. The following chapter will now move on to study this household and its members, and their connections with the cultural projects of the 1718-1730 period.

Chapter Three: 1718-1730: The Second Age of the Great Households and the Household of
Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha

In March 1722, four years into his term as grand vizier, Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha hosted the Persian ambassador to the Ottoman court, a certain Murtazā Kulu Han, at *Kağıdḫāne*, a broad and forested suburban appendage of the Ottoman capital, just to the north of the Golden Horn, used extensively at the time for leisurely retreats and entertainments.[388] Describing this event, Rāşid Meḥmed Efendi, official court historian in the earlier phase of the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha period and, a client of the grand vizier, refers to *Kağıdḫāne* as a "site of graceful entertainment" (*cilve-gāh*).[389] Somewhat later, in relating the inception of the architectural program for constructing courtly residences along the banks of the fresh water stream flowing through *Kağıdḫāne*, Rāşid speaks of "the site of public and private pleasure named *Kağıdḫāne* which was a place of peregrination for the elite and the public that comforted the soul and relaxed the mind" (*Kağıdḫāne nāmıyla nüzhet-gāh-ı ḫāṣṣ u ām olan mesīre-i dil-nişīn-i ḫāṭır-güşā*).[390] The most significant phrased used by Rāşid here, that of *ḫāṣṣ u ām* or private and public, reflects a perspective which conceptualized *Kağıdḫāne* as a space comprehending both courtly entertainment and public recreation. The ascription of this quality to *Kağıdḫāne* in the thought and attitudes of the early eighteenth-century Ottoman elite is further iterated by Ṣafāyī, who

---

[388] "*Kağıdḫāne,*" roughly translatable as "paper mill" (from Turkish paper—*kağıt*), received its name due to the use of the *Kağıdḫāne* grounds for the production of paper under the Byzantine emperors, a practice continued in the Ottoman period under Sultan Bayezid II (r.1481-1512). The site was an established locale for courtly and public leisurely retreats in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, a quality which it retained among the Ottoman capital's populace following the departure of the Ottoman court to Edirne in the mid seventeenth-century. Under Sultan Ahmed III and Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha, *Kağıdḫāne* experienced a revival, along with an extensive and unprecedented courtly architectural program. Süheyl A. Ünver, "Her Devirde Kağıthane" *Vakıflar Dergisi* Vol. 10 (2006), 437-440.
[389] Râşid Mehmed Efendi, *Târîh-i Râşid ve Zeyli Vol. II. Târîh-i Râşid* ed. Abdülkadir Özcan, Yunus Uğur, Baki Çakır, and Ahmet Zeki İzgöer (Istanbul: Klasik Yayınlar, 2013), 1277.
[390] Râşid, *Târîh-i Râşid*, 1293.

describes *Kağıdḫāne* as a "locale of public and private recreation/peregrination" (*teferrücgāh-ı ḫāṣṣ u ām*), within which Sultan Aḥmed III is presented as having commissioned the construction of a "pavilion without defect," (*ḳaṣr-i bī-ḳuṣūr*) and assigned two-hundred plots to members of the government so that the latter could further erect similar structures.[391]

This is not to argue that the social landscape of the early eighteenth century Ottoman capital experienced transformations in norms defining public interaction. The pleasure pavilions erected and the feasts held by courtly dignitaries along the banks of the *Kağıdḫāne* stream should not be interpreted as evidence illustrating changes to the delineation of public and private spheres in Ottoman society.[392] Rather, the terminology applied by Ṣafāyī and Rāşid, and also by Çelebizāde ʿAşım Efendi (d.1760), who succeeded Rāşid as *vakʿanüvīs* in 1723 under the direction of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha and who defined *Kağıdḫāne* as a *temāşāgāh* or "site of leisurely peregrination," indicates a shift in patterns of courtly and dynastic consumption and status assertion. By the eighteenth century the ideological strength and legitimacy of the imperial edifice and the dynastic family upon which it theoretically rested were no longer predicated on the image of the secluded *sulṭān*, or articulated through monumental architectural structures, processions and ambassadorial audiences in which the fundamental expressive element consisted in the controlled exposure of an immobile, silent, and otherwise concealed monarch. The factors that explain the shift from this model of imperial imagery to one achieved through public performance have been studied in the foregoing chapters. The model of public performance, an exhibitionist model of imperial magnanimity and legitimacy, operated on the premise of the need to routinely demonstrate that "since the lands the Ottoman *sultan* ruled belonged to him personally, he was materially beyond compare relative to his subjects."[393] In the periods preceding the eighteenth century, the royal family exercised a more dominant presence in the application of the exhibitionist model.[394] With the pluralization of political capital across a broader spectrum of central elite after the mid-sixteenth century, other elements with this social group, such as the grand vizier, began boldly to stake a more conspicuous space for themselves within exhibitionist displays of imperial wealth, fecundity, and power.[395] It is within this context that the ambassadorial feast organized by Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha in 1722 should be understood.

The theatrical performance orchestrated before the Persian ambassador in 1722 included poetry recitations, presentations of works of Ottoman calligraphy, the construction of a variety of

---

[391] Ṣafāyī, *Teẕkire-ī Ṣafāyī,* 674.
[392] Again, the caution advised by Tülay Artan against reading too enthusiastically a transformation in Ottoman attitudes towards private (ʿhass) and public (ʿamm) spheres into the 1718-1730 period needs to be kept in mind. Artan, "Forms and Forums of Expression: Istanbul and beyond, 1600-1800," 380-381.
[393] Karateke, "Legitimizing the Ottoman Sultanate: A Framework for Historical Analysis," 46.
[394] Imber, "Frozen Legitimacy," 99-102.
[395] Artan "Royal Weddings and the Grand Vezirate," 345-350.

temporary structures including large tents, canopies and pavilions, and a lengthy mounted processional march which began at the Mīrāhūr villa on the edge of *Kaǧıdḫāne* and ended in the grounds selected for the festival.[396] This procession included five to six-hundred riflemen as well as state officials, janissaries, palace eunuchs and a large number of high ranking state dignitaries attached to the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha household.[397] Rāşid's subtitle for the 1722 feast defines this event as the grand vizier's invitation of the Persian ambassador.[398]

That public performance and the visual perception of an audience were elementary to the new forms of status assertion is further indicated by Çelebizāde 'Āṣım Efendi's use of "*temāşāgāh*" to describe *Kaǧıdḫāne,* the locale where both Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's ambassadorial feast was held and where soon afterwards an abundance of elite villas would be constructed around a large, timber-framed palatial residence for the sulṭān. Translated as "site of leisurely peregrination," *temāşāgāh* comes from the Persian verb *temāşā,* which means "a sitting or walking about to see and be seen," and also "a public promenade".[399] *Kaǧıdḫāne* clearly functioned therefore as a field of performance upon which were applied different media communicating expressions of courtly affluence, imperial grandeur, and social status to a class of observers, be they the courtly elite themselves, foreign dignitaries, or the urban populace of the Ottoman capital. For elements within the socioeconomic elite, engagement with the stage of *Kaǧıdḫāne* involved both the exhibition and the visual reception of acts of sociopolitical assertion.

The 1722 feast, at least as rendered by Rāşid, was a product of the personal agency of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha. The list of participants recorded by Rāşid includes almost exclusively senior members of the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha household; these were, the two sons-in-law of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha, Grand Admiral Kaymak Muṣṭafā Pasha, the grand vizier's deputy Kethüdā Meḥmed Pasha, the *şeyhülislām* of the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha period Yenişehirli Abdullah Efendi, and the *Defterdār* of the same period, el-Ḥāc İbrāhīm Efendi (d.?).[400] This event fits into the pattern of courtly entertainments and festivals found throughout the *Tārīḫ-i Rāşid* and replicated, with particular intensity towards the later years covered by the chronicle, in the *Tārīḫ-i Çelebizāde.* In the texts of Rāşid and Çelebizāde, the presence of individuals associated with Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha often emerges in the context of these types of events. Public festivals, ceremonies, and the courtly entertainments arranged in the multitude of

[396] Râşid, *Târîh-i Râşid*, 1277.
[397] Ibid.
[398] "The invitation of the Persian ambassador on the part of the grand vizier to the site of graceful entertainment of *Kaǧıdḫāne*." (*Da'vet-i elçi-i Acem ez-kıbel-i hazret-i sadr-ı âlî be-cilve-gâh-ı Kaǧıdḫāne*). Ibid.
[399] Sir James W Redhouse, *A Turkish and English Lexicon* (Beirut: Librairie du Liban, 1987), 591
[400] Râşid, *Târîh-i Râşid* 1277-1278.

extramural palatial residences constructed in Istanbul during this period provide the settings in which is inscribed the documentation of the individual members of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's household.[401] The consistency and the linguistic style with which these types of events are recorded by Rāşid and Çelebizāde, and the attention paid by them to relating the presence of those who participated in these events, indicates that the courtly entertainments and festivals of the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha period embodied value laden instances of social and political significance, recognized as such by the authors of the *Tārīḫ-i Rāşid* and the *Tārīḫ-i Çelebizāde*. Therefore, any interpretation which relegates these instances into examples of libertine abandon would involve a misrepresentation of the dynamics which structured the social gatherings of the courtly elite of the early eighteenth century Ottoman capital.

Courtly entertainments, feasts and festivities, along with excursions to waterside residences, literary and religious scholarly gatherings, and public spectacles served as occasions on which senior scribal bureaucrats, scribal litterateurs and 'ālims, high ranking government officials and dignitaries affiliated with the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha household could present themselves to their peers and to the public at large. The interlaced web of patron-client relationships threading out from this household constituted the hegemonic factional network that defined the cultural patterns, programs, and consumption of the socioeconomic elite of the Ottoman capital in the period between 1718 and 1730. In tracing the contours of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's "hegemonic household faction", this chapter focuses on the *Tārīḫ-i Rāşid* of Rāşid Meḥmed Efendi and the *Tārīḫ-i Çelebizāde* of Çelebizāde İsmāīl Āşim Efendi. Both of these individuals were themselves clients of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha. The *Tārīḫ-i Rāşid* covers the period up to 1722 and the *Tārīḫ-i Çelebizāde,* composed consciously as an addendum to the *Tārīḫ-i Rāşid,* chronicles events up to 1729.[402] The following analysis of these chronicles begins first by tracing the emergence of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's "hegemonic factional network" in the wake of the 1718 Peace of Passarowitz. Afterwards, a closer examination is attempted of the discreet elements comprising the specific group of scribal bureaucrats and senior government officials who constituted the grand vizier's network. This examination of the individuals attached to the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha household will focus on ceremonial gatherings, banquets, and leisurely retreats, in the understanding that these events embodied instances of deep social significance to the courtly elite of the Ottoman center in the eighteenth century.

---

[401] These events were public in the sense of being orchestrated on publicly accessible grounds outside of the restricted inner sanctum of the imperial palace.

[402] Despite the inherent bias of these authors, who were clients of the grand vizier, their works taken together nonetheless present a valuable record of the nature of the interpersonal relations which constituted Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's household network.

The Peace of Passarowitz and the Second Age of the Great Households

In the first chapter the loaded connotations of the terminology of the "Tulip Age," connotations which evoke paradigms of decline, precocious westernization, and hedonism, were mentioned. A more effective historiographical approach to this period may be attempted through a reconceptualization that sees the stable dominance of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's household faction over the Ottoman center in the years between 1718 and 1730 as an embodiment of a second age of the great households in Ottoman history. Associations of decline and westernization necessarily involve a displacement of agency from the Ottoman sphere to a foreign one, so that the active elements determining the course of developments in Istanbul from 1718 to 1730, including the intellectual and cultural endeavors of this period, are ascribed to the inefficiencies of the Ottoman state, the growing power and influence of European powers, and a perception of cultural inferiority in relation to the European domain on the part of certain Ottoman statesmen and bureaucrats, chief among them Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha himself. In contrast, the idea of a second age of the great households not only defines the 1718-1730 period on the basis of indigenous Ottoman dynamics, but also invests agency in those dynamics while at the same time preserving the integrity of this phase as an individual temporal unit of Ottoman history. It is one of the underlying contentions of this chapter that the tenure of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha represents a discreet and autonomous segment of Ottoman history that is integrated into broader historical patterns and shifts but possesses distinctive qualities peculiar to itself.

Born in the central Anatolian town of Muşkara to a *kul* family, his father being the governor of a town in Ottoman Europe (Izdin, in modern day Greece), Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha arrived at the Ottoman capital in his late twenties.[403] Münir Aktepe notes that it was through a relative, a certain Muṣṭafā Efendi who served as accountant in the *Sarāy-ı 'Atīk-i 'Āmire*, the old imperial palace, that Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha was inducted into the palace service.[404] He was around twenty-seven years old.[405] Therefore, even though technically a palace graduate Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha cannot be placed among the prepubescent pages of the *devşirme* system raised and trained in the inner palace schools, and his early career demonstrates the transformations that had reshaped the recruitment processes of the Ottoman military-administrative apparatus since the sixteenth century.[406]

---

[403] İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi IV. Cilt 1. Kısım* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1984), 147. Muşkara was renamed Nevşehir following Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's extensive investments in the infrastructure of the town.

[404] *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi, s.v,* "Damâd Ibrahim Paşa, Nevşehirli."

[405] Ibid.

[406] Neumann, "Political and diplomatic developments," 46. Tezcan, *Second Ottoman Empire*, 30.

The earliest references to Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha in Rāşid place him as a secretary to the chief black eunuch in 1704-1705.[407] Later in 1709, he appears as a scribe in the accountancy office of the imperial *waqfs* of the Two Holy Cities.[408] Rāşid is silent on the years between 1709 and 1716, when Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha served in a number of scribal appointments outside of the imperial capital.[409] This was a consequence of the machinations of his rivals, who were jealous of the intimate relationship formed between the young Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha, who was neither *dāmād* nor pasha at the time, and Sultan Aḥmed III.[410] The trusting nature of this relationship is abundantly illustrated in narratives comprising the years after 1718 in the chronicles of Rāşid and Çelebizāde. Considering his absence from the capital after 1709, and his rapid rise in stature upon his return to the imperial court in 1716, it can be concluded that the bonds formed between the future grand vizier and the young sultan in a relatively short span of time following Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's entrance to the palace service in 1704 constitute a fundamental operative factor that determined and directed the political course of events in the Ottoman center up until the Patrona Ḫalīl revolt of 1730.

Despite being the son of a *kul* and a palace graduate, Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's professional expertise, qualifications and training were as a scribal bureaucrat employed in a variety of different secretarial offices. Rāşid picks up Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's narrative again in 1716, noting his appointment to the post of adjutant to the grand vizier (*rikāb-ı hümāyūn kāimmakāmı*) and his marriage in 1717 to Sultan Aḥmed III's daughter Fatma Sultan (d.1733).[411] Lady Mary Montagu who was present in the Ottoman capital at the time provides a more personal visualization of these developments with the following words describing Fatma Sulṭān's reaction to the betrothal: "When she saw this [second] Husband, who is at least fifty, she could not forbear bursting into Tears. He is a Man of Merit and the declar'd Favourite of the Sulṭān, which they call Mosayp, but that is not enough to make him pleasing in the Eyes of a Girl of 13" (*sic*). [412]

This passage is significant for two reasons; first, it expresses the public knowledge of the sulṭān's support of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha, even before the latter was made grand vizier. Lady Mary's assertion indicates that the intimate bond between the sultan and his "favorite" was open and widely recognized. Second, the statements regarding Fatma Sulṭān's despair and Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's age illustrate the nature of political marriage among the Ottoman socioeconomic

---

[407] Râşid, *Târîh-i Râşid*, 772.
[408] Ibid., 806.
[409] Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi IV. Cilt 1. Kısım*, 147.
[410] *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi, s.v,* "Damâd Ibrahim Paşa, Nevşehirli.".
[411] Râşid, *Târîh-i Râşid*, 1034, 1055.
[412] Montagu*, The Complete Letters of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu,* 321.

elite, indicating that these marriages functioned as a particular mechanism through which *intisāb* relations were achieved and promising, strategic, or favoured individuals assimilated into household structures. Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's marriage to the sulṭān's daughter was above all a political act; it served the interests of both the sulṭān, who in this manner cemented his patronage of a favored government official, and Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha, who in becoming a son-in-law of the Ottoman sovereign placed his household in a highly favourable context vis-à-vis the royal family. Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha also arranged the marriages of his son, Genç Meḥmed Pasha (d.?), and his nephew, Muṣṭafā Pasha (d.?), to daughters of the sulṭān.[413] In an evocative statement illustrating the benefits that kin relation to a favored vizier could bestow, Nedīm writes how "in one day Muhammed Beg [i.e. Genç Meḥmed Pasha] became vizier and relative to the sulṭān" (*Muhammed Bik vezīr-ü şıhr-ı sultan oldu bir günde*).[414] The elaborate public processions of the marriage of the grand vizier's nephew to a royal princess in 1728 are also carefully described by Çelebizāde.[415] The successes of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha were therefore refracted down through his network of clients and translated into power, wealth, and status by those most closely associated with him.

The second age of the great households in Ottoman history is framed by the Ottoman Empire's foreign entanglements. Successful management of foreign affairs in 1718 placed Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's household in the epicenter of Ottoman courtly politics and an inadequate response to the conflict in Persia precipitated the events that led to its downfall in 1730.[416] The earliest evidence of the growing influence of this household faction emerges relative to the policy debates in the Ottoman center surrounding the wars against the Habsburgs and the Venetians that informed the geopolitical context of the empire in the years immediately preceding 1718-1730. Ottoman chroniclers' accounts for 1716, 1717 and 1718 reveal the involvement of four key figures associated with Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's household in the processes that lead to the Peace Treaty of Passarowitz in 1718. First, there is İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa, who appears as a translator employed in the earlier round of negotiations with the Habsburgs at Nemce in 1716.[417] Yirmisekizçelebizāde Meḥmed Saʿīd Efendi, the 1720 Ottoman ambassador to France and the father of Meḥmed Saʿīd Efendi, the co-financier of the

---

[413] For more information on this, and on Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's political strategies and arranging marriages between members of his family and Ottoman princesses (and even in personally organizing the structure and routes of the royal marriage processions held for these occasions, for which purpose he personally studied accounts of previous royal marriage ceremonies), see: Artan "Royal Weddings and the Grand Vezirate."

[414] Ahmed Nedim, *Nedim Divanı* ed. Abdülbâki Gölpınarlı (Istanbul: Şaka Matbaası, 1951), 205.

[415] Çelebizâde Ismail Âsım Efendi, *Târîh-i Râşid ve Zeyli Vol. III. Târîh-i Çelebizâde* ed. Abdülkadir Özcan, Yunus Uğur, Baki Çakır, and Ahmet Zeki İzgöer (Istanbul: Klasik Yayınlar, 2013), 1615-1616.

[416] For more information on the Ottoman state's diplomatic and military involvement with Persia in the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha years, see: Robert W. Olson, *The Siege of Mosul and Ottoman-Persian Relations 1718-1743* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1975).

[417] Râşid, *Târîh-i Râşid*, 984.

Müteferriḳa press, is present as the subsidiary representative (*muraḫḫaṣ-ı sānī*) of the Ottoman delegation.[418] Although his son made his career in the secretarial offices of the *Bāb-ı Āsafī,* Yirmisekizçelebizāde had risen through the janissary corps and held the post of Superintendent of the Arsenal (*topḫāne nāẓırı*) in 1717-1718.[419] It was in fact due to the diplomatic experience he acquired at the 1718 negotiations, or in Rāşid's words, "due to having organized diplomatic discussions in the abovementioned treaty [of Passarowitz] and [also] being a diligent knowledgeable individual having engaged in the study of the Christians' secret wiles," that Yirmisekizçelebizāde was granted the direction of the 1720-1721 Ottoman embassy to France by Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha.[420]

The other two individuals of significance in this early period are Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha himself and the *şeyhülislām* Yenişehirli Abdullah Efendi. Silāḥdār Meḥmed Ağa (d.1726), a graduate of the palace school and an Ottoman statesmen and chronicler politically active under the Köprülü viziers, remarks that Yenişehirli 'Abdullāh Efendi, while serving as the *kadıasker* of the province of Anatolia in 1718, replaced the incumbent *şeyhülislām* Ebūisḥāḳ Ismāīl Efendi (d.1725) as head of the Ottoman *ilmiye* precisely because the latter had opposed the peace of Passarowitz.[421] Similarly, chief among the reasons provided by Silāḥdār Meḥmed Ağa for the dismissal of the grand vizier Nişancı Meḥmed Paşa (d.1728), is that he too did not support the peace negotiations being conducted with the Habsburgs.[422]

Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha was made grand vizier on the ninth of May 1718, just over two months prior to the successful conclusion of the peace of Passarowitz on the twenty-first of July, 1718.[423] It appears therefore that Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha acceded to the post of grand vizier only after the faction at the Ottoman court, backed by Sultan Aḥmed III, which endorsed the negotiations at Passarowitz had gained momentum following the progressive procession of internal political dynamics and foreign diplomacy along the route to peace. The patron-client network that emerged triumphant from the events between 1716 and 1718 was the household of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha. The consistent presence of the same group of government officials, scribal bureaucrats, intellectuals, and elite religious scholars affiliated with this household faction, dominated and defined the political landscape and intellectual-cultural life of the

---

[418] Ibid., 1186.

[419] Ibid., 1083.

[420] Ibid., 1186. "*mükāleme-i mezbūrede tertīb-i muḥāverāt ve desāyis-i Naṣārā'ya taḥṣīl-i ıṭṭılā' etmiş bir kār-dān-ı daḳīḳa-şinās olmağla*"

[421] Upon being relieved of his post, Ebūisḥāḳ Ismāīl Efendi was summarily exiled to Sinop. Silâhdar Fındıklı Mehmed Ağa, *Nusretnâme* ed. İsmet Parmaksizoğlu (Istanbul: Milli Eğitim Başımevi, 1962), 379.

[422] Ibid., 380. It should be noted that in contemporary Ottoman records, the peace of Passarowitz is phrased as the peace of Nemçe.

[423] Râşid, *Târîh-i Râşid*, 1091, 1098.

Ottoman central elite in the years after 1718. What follows is a study of these developments as set forth and described in the historical narratives of Rāşid and Çelebizāde.

The Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha Household

Courtly feasts and entertainments hosted on semi-public grounds like *Kağıdḫāne* punctuate the chronicles of the 1718-1730 period not just in Rāşid and Çelebizāde, but in other accounts written by eyewitnesses and contemporaries as well.[424] These accounts provide valuable insights into the shape and distinct individual particulars of the socioeconomic elite of the historical age they record and represent. The act of recording, of embedding an individual within the record of a specific event or within a particular interpretation of that event, in the Ottoman chronicles of the eighteenth century functioned, in a manner similar to to Şafāyī's work, as a means by which social status became inscribed through textual composition. The records representing courtly feasts and the feasts themselves both involved the perpetuation of an event that conversed with an intended audience and that conveyed a loaded and meaningful set of images to that intended audience.

The textual re-enactment of a courtly performance could serve to preserve and thereby repeat the initial expression of social eminence implicit in the performance of the feast itself. On the other hand, through manipulating the language by which the act of the feast is represented, the author of a text could subvert the inherent symbolism of the event being described. For example, Şemʿdānīzāde, in recounting the courtly entertainments organized by Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha narrates the following:

having set up swings and cradles and carousels and cabinets, [he would] mingle men and women and when the girls would get on and off the swings, sprightly youths would place them on their laps, place them on the swings, and when the girls' waists would flutter open on the swings and he would make them [the youths] cry sweet songs and melodies, the foolish girls would be desirous, [and] some with the permission of their husbands, [and] some without permission exclaiming that permission is universal would go on excursions and obtain excursion-allowances from their husbands, and if not apply for divorce.[425]

Notably, Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha is presented here as engineering immoral gatherings in which the social mores of Ottoman society are transgressed and the youth of the Ottoman capital corrupted.

---

[424] Ünver, "Her Devirde Kağıthane," 439-446. Ünver notes also that seventeenth-century observations of recreational activities organized on the *Kağıdḫāne* grounds can also be found in the work of the Ottoman traveller Evliya Çelebi.

[425] "*dolablar ve beşikler ve Atlı-karaca ve salıncaklar kurdurup, ricāl ve nisā maḫlūṭ ve kadıncıklar salıncağa binüp iner iken şāh-bāz yiğidler kadınları kucağına alup, salıncağa koyup, çıkarup kadınların salıncaklarda uçurları meydanda hoş şadā ile şarkılar çağırttığında nākışātü'l-ʿakl nisvān ṭāʾifesi māʾil olup, kimi zevcinden izin, kimi izinsiz iẕn-i āmdır diyerek, seyrāna gidüp ve cebren seyr akçası alup, olmaz ise ṭalāḳ taleb eder*" Fındıklılı Süleyman Efendi Şemdanizade, *Mürʾiʾt-tevârih* ed. Münir Aktepe (Istanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Matbaası, 1976), 3. On these entertainments, see also Artan, "Forms and Forums of Expression: Istanbul and beyond, 1600-1800."

In Şemʿdānīzāde's account not only are the courtly entertainments of the grand vizier corrupt, but the grand vizier himself is the explicit active agent consciously cultivating corruption.

This direct manner of framing Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's culpability is repeated elsewhere by Şemʿdānīzāde, who writes that "not satiated with his and his dependants' pleasure, he exclaimed that things to deceive the people are necessary," (*kendünün ve müteʿallıḳātātının ṣafāsına ḳanāʿat etmeyüp, halḳı aldatacak şey lāzımdır deyü*) before moving on to list the multitude of extramural locations where pleasure pavilions and waterside residences were constructed between 1718 and 1730.[426] Of significance in this statement are the religious overtones associated with what here has been translated as a "lack of satiation" (*ḳanāʿat etmeyüp*). *Ḳanāʿat* denotes satiation in the sense of contentment with what God has granted an individual.[427] It can be related to the verb *himmet*, or "thoughtful action or endeavor", which also embodies a religious concept comprising righteous endeavor in the service of God, and has further the connotation "a miraculous influence exerted by a saint."[428] Taken together, the concepts of *ḳanāʿat* and *himmet* indicate a religious moral code that values effort expended in the service of religion while proscribing and stigmatizing excessive investments of energy in attempts at worldly success or pleasure. From the perspective of Şemʿdānīzāde, the lavish entertainments arranged by Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha evidence a libertine sinfulness marked by a lack of *ḳanāʿat*. In contrast, Rāşid's take on the leisurely excursions of the grand vizier is markedly different.

In the same way that Şemʿdānīzāde made use of a terminology expressive of impiety in criticizing the courtly culture and character of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha, so Rāşid and Nedīm applied language with religious undertones for the purposes of glorifying and legitimizing the grand vizier. Rāşid attributes the inception of the program to plant the Ottoman court into the semi-public space of *Kaġıdḫāne* to Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha, explaining that the grand vizier found the infamous and ugly disposition of the unplanned grounds to be inappropriate.[429] In the face of the extensive expenses and difficulties involved in clearing the banks of the *Kaġıdḫāne* stream, converting the surrounding plots into estates for the courtly elite and transporting the necessary marble and timber required for constructing the palatial complex of *Saʿdābād* for the sulṭān, Rāşid claims that it was the strength of determination (*ḳuvvet-i ʿazm*), strong desire (*bülend-iḳbāl*), and *himmet* exhibited by Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha that allowed the project to succeed.[430] Rāşid evokes the *himmet* of the grand vizier on multiple occasions throughout his entry on the

---

[426] Şemdanizade, *Mürʾiʾt-tevârih*, 3.
[427] Redhouse, *A Turkish and English Lexicon,* 1474.
[428] Redhouse, *A Turkish and English Lexicon,* 2168.
[429] Râşid, *Târîh-i Râşid*, 1293.
[430] Ibid.

plan and execution of the architectural program at *Kağıdḫāne,* even incorporating the term into a phrase which designates the personality of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha as an "effort/*himmet*-enjoining vizier of sublime merit" (*murarrik-i himmet-i Āsaf-ı ālī-miḳdār*).[431] The application of this term is also found in the poems of Aḥmed Nedim, for example in Nedim's chronogram composed for the opening of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's *dārülhadīs̱* in 1720, which praises the efforts/*himem* of the grand vizier in bestowing kindness upon others. The relevant lines in this poem read, "With the efforts of the great Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha, who bestows befitting kindness upon all."[432]

This is not to argue that by using the term *himmet,* these authors were presenting the architectural projects sponsored by Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha as acts of religious charity. However, neither would it be appropriate to assume that the consistent choice of this verb was coincidental. Integrating *himmet* into these texts was a subtle means by which the actions of the grand vizier could be framed within a language embedded with pious evocations which at the same time abstained from converting those actions into overt religious acts. The composition of *ādāb* texts in the early eighteenth century Ottoman capital was therefore deeply involved in a culture shaped by the factional politics of the central elite. Where one stood in relation to a household network impacted the manner in which that individual communicated and illustrated the activities associated with that household. A further example of this is found in Çelebizāde's account of a sequence of *helva* communions (*helva sohbetleri*) conducted between the senior members of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's network and the sultan in 1728.

A notable characteristic of the 1718-1730 period is the cycles of *villeggiatura*, or leisurely retreats to the countryside, which perforate the historical narratives of Rāşid and Çelebizāde. Although he was often hosted at the various waterside villas of his grand vizier, Sultan Aḥmed III also occasionally paid visits to the residences of Kaymak Muṣṭafā Pasha and Kethüdā Meḥmed Pasha, the two sons-in-law of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha. These three individuals dominate the accounts of *villeggiatura* found in the chronicles Rāşid and Çelebizāde and the poems of Nedīm. A site particularly favored by the sultan seems to have been the grand vizier's villa at *Beşiktaş,* where the sultan would be entertained in night long banquets among illuminated flower gardens.[433] In 1727, upon hearing of the sulṭān's presence in nearby *Beşiktaş,* Kaymak Muṣṭafā Pasha had a pavilion built on property he owned in the district of *Kuruçeşme,* on a hill overlooking an expansive view.[434] Following its completion, he was visited there by the sultan and the grand vizier.[435] The following year in 1728, Sultan Aḥmed III and Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha

---

[431] Ibid., 1293-1296.

[432] *Pür himem Dāmād Ibrāhīm Paşa-yı kerīm, Lāyıḳınca lütf-u iḥsān eylemekte herkese.* Nedim, *Nedim Divanı*, 182.

[433] Râşid, *Târîh-i Râşid*, 1183. Çelebizâde*, Târîh-i Çelebizâde*, 1344, 1424.

[434] Çelebizâde*, Târîh-i Çelebizâde*, 1551.

[435] Ibid.

were feted first by Kethüdā Meḥmed Pasha and soon after by Kaymak Muṣṭafā Pasha in their respective residences.[436] Two days after the banquet at Kaymak Muṣṭafā Pasha's villa, Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha organized a feast of his own for the sulṭān.[437] Çelebizāde describes how at this feast the sultan and the grand vizier, "engaged without interruption all day in boundless pleasure and lounged, rested and relaxed" (*gün 'ale't-tevālī kemāl-i neşāt ü inbisāṭ ile ārām ü iḳāmet buyurdular*).[438] This statement illustrates how narrative contexts could by themselves determine the interpretative scope of the relation of an event. Here, as opposed to the longer excerpt from Şem'dānīzāde provided above, the focus on pleasure and entertainment serves to signify magnificence and social status. Detached from the broader framework of Çelebizāde's text, in which the dominant tone informing and surrounding the narrative on Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha is one of praise and approval, and placed in Şem'dānīzāde's condemnatory perspective, this same passage from Çelebizāde would come to express criticism as opposed to commendation.

In framing their representations of the 1718-1730 period, Çelebizāde, Şem'dānīzāde, and Rāşid each chose to include and to address the various feasts and courtly entertainments organized by Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha and by the other statesmen comprising his household network. For Çelebizāde and Rāşid, these events symbolized the wealth and stature of the grand vizier and his associates; for Şem'dānīzāde, they provided examples that depicted license and debauchery. In either case, the authors of Ottoman chronicles recognized the meaningful nature of the festivities and the excursions of the Ottoman court and engaged constructively with the symbolism they communicated. Early eighteenth century courtly banquets and festivals with their ceremonious processions, lively and varied entertainments, sporting competitions, cultural or martial events and ostentatious displays of wealth were consciously choreographed public rituals that expressed status and authority. The intended audience involved different segments of the Ottoman population, including elements within the socioeconomic elite and the middling strata of the Ottoman capital, and foreign dignitaries. Participation in these performances was a necessary component of the sociopolitical obligations of those senior elements within the household faction of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha whose actions and presence dominated the Ottoman ruling class between 1718 and 1730. It is therefore not surprising that a stable group of statesmen and government officials affiliated with the grand vizier are a constant in the depictions of the festivities of this period.

In one of the earliest festivals organized by Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha following his appointment as grand vizier in *Kaǧıdḫāne* in 1719, the core constituents of his household faction

---

[436] Ibid., 1617
[437] Ibid.
[438] Ibid.

can already be identified. The monumental feast of 1719 included races, horseback riding, and martial displays by cannon and firearms.[439] A series of structures including pavilions and canopies, timber-framed screens and large yurt-like tents were set up for the participants.[440] Among the list of attendees can be found Kethüdā Meḥmed Pasha and the *şeyhülislām* Yenişehirli 'Abdullāh Efendi.[441] Although, as noted above, 'Abdullāh Efendi had been appointed *şeyhülislām* about a year earlier, Kethüdā Meḥmed Pasha had received the post of deputy to the grand vizier a mere twenty-one days before this feast.[442] Yenişehirli 'Abdullāh Efendi became *şeyhülislām* less than a week before Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha replaced Nişancı Meḥmed Paşa as grand vizier. The direction of courtly politics shifted at this moment, beginning with the replacement of two high ranking government officials who were hostile to the negotiations being conducted with the Habsburg Empire.[443] The immediate developments following the spring of 1718 evidence the hegemonic rise of a new great household in the Ottoman center and, with the exception of 'Abdullāh Efendi, each senior administrative post staffed by an associate of the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha household received its incumbent after Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha consolidated the grand vizierate in 1718. This was the case with the *defterdār,* the *reīsü'l-küttāb*, and the grand admiral.

Kaymak Muṣṭafā Pasha is also present at the feast of 1719, and is defined as a son-in-law of the grand vizier and by his position as a scribal official responsible for assisting in the drafting of the sulṭān's seal on government documents (*tevḳī'ī*).[444] A certain Süleymān Pasha (d.?), the immediate predecessor of Kaymak Muṣṭafā Pasha as grand admiral, is listed by Rāşid alongside the unnamed *defterdār* who preceded Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's retainer el-Ḥāc İbrāhīm Efendi at the post.[445] Another important attendee is the *agha* or head of the janissaries, Şāhīn Meḥmed Ağa (d.), who would retain this commission until he was removed during the 1730 rebellion.[446] In addition, Rāşid's account, as in the case with every other account of a major festival hosted by the grand vizier outside of private residences in the *Tārīḫ-i Rāşid*, that "other government notables" (*sāir a'yān-ı devlet*) were also in attendance.[447]

Between the early *Kağıdḫāne* feast of 1719, and the first feast organized by Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha at *Kağıdḫāne* following the completion of the palatial royal residence of *Sa'dābād* there in 1722, the full implications of the process begun in 1718 emerged. It was in this earlier

---

[439] Râşid, *Târîh-i Râşid*, 1157.
[440] Ibid.
[441] Ibid.
[442] Ibid., 1155.
[443] Silâhdar Fındıklı Mehmed Ağa, *Nusretnâme*, 379-380.
[444] Râşid, *Târîh-i Râşid*, 1157.
[445] Ibid.
[446] Ibid. Subhî Mehmed Efendi, *Subhî Tarihi* ed. Mesut Aydıner (Istanbul: Bayrak Matbaacılık, 2007), 95.
[447] Râşid, *Târîh-i Râşid*, 1157.

period of the 1718-1730 period that the chief administrative posts overseeing the central state apparatus at the Ottoman capital, including both the *Bāb-ı Āṣafī* and the *Bāb-ı Defterī*, came to be dominated by senior clients of the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha household. El-Ḥāc İbrāhīm Efendi was placed at the head of the Ottoman financial administration in 1719 shortly after the feast at *Kağıdḫāne* that same year.[448] He makes an earlier appearance in Rāşid's chronicle in the section for the events of the year 1718, where he is openly defined as "known of the venerable royal son-in-law İbrāhīm Pasha who is adjutant to the grand vizier," and as being "in the shadow of the protection" (*ẓıll-i himāyelerinden*) of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha, before the latter had become grand vizier. [449]

Although the *reīsü'l-küttāb* of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha, Üçanbarlı Meḥmed Efendi (d.1732), is present in the *Tārīḫ-i Rāşid*, the earliest point at which this study has been able to identify him in the text occurs at the inauguration ceremony of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's *dārü'lḥadīs* in 1720, by which time Meḥmed Efendi was already *reīsü'l-küttāb*.[450] However, the remarks made by the later historian and imperial *divan* scribe Aḥmed Subhi Efendi (d.1769) in recording the death of Meḥmed Efendi, that "he had been chief of the secretaries throughout the entire duration of the vizierate of İbrāhīm Pasha," (*tamām-ı müddet-i vezāret-i Ibrāhīm Paşa'da reīsü'l-küttāb…olmuş idi*) indicates that Meḥmed Efendi became *reīsü'l-küttāb* in 1718.[451] These appointments illustrate that Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha was able to link major components of the state apparatus to his household through the strategic appointment of retainers like Üçanbarlı Meḥmed Efendi and el-Ḥāc İbrāhīm Efendi. Another senior client of this household, Kaymak Muṣṭafā Pasha replaced the abovementioned Süleymān Pasha as grand admiral in 1721.[452]

Therefore, by the time the structures of the imperial complex and gardens of *Sa'dābād* and the surrounding courtly residences in *Kağıdḫāne* had begun springing up in 1722, an interlaced mesh of *intisab* relations spiralling out from the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha household had become entrenched in supervisory departments overseeing every major administrative artery of the Ottoman state at the imperial center. Interlaced is a useful term to describe this factional network because the senior retainers of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha not only cultivated their own clients in turn, but also had interactions and associations with one another. They were not just linked vertically to the head of the household.

---

[448] Ibid., 1163.
[449] Ibid., 1081. (*rikāb-ı hümāyūn kāimmakāmı olan Dāmād-ı mükerrem-i Şehinşāhī devletlü Ibrāhīm Paşa hazretlerinin ma'lūmları*)
[450] Ibid., 1184.
[451] Subhî Mehmed Efendi, *Subhî Tarihi*, 172.
[452] Râşid, *Târîh-i Râşid*, 1232.

As mentioned above, Rāşid presents Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha as the main motive force behind the architectural program of *Sa'dābād*. This program included the construction of an expansive palatial residence abutting the *Kağıdḫāne* stream, which was cleared and widened, and a landscaping project involving gardens and artificial waterfalls.[453] Plots were allocated to senior government officials along the banks of the stream, numbering over two-hundred according to Şafāyī, upon which smaller elite residences were erected.[454] Like Rāşid, Çelebizāde opens his description of the first feast organized at the *Kağıdḫāne* grounds following the completion of the imperial residence by noting that the entire program had relied on the *himmet* of the grand vizier.[455] The 1722 feast differs from that held in honor of the Persian ambassador in 1719 in the inclusion of its account of a large number of elite members of the *'ilmiye*. Alongside government officials like Kethüdā Meḥmed Pasha or el-Ḥāc İbrāhīm Efendi, religious scholars and scribal litterateurs formed another branch of the clients constituting the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha household. The links cultivated with elite *'ulemā* allowed this household to expand its influence beyond the office of the *şeyhülislām* and to thereby integrate itself more extensively in the Ottoman religious hierarchy. The religious scholars affiliated with Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha provided the grand vizier with an important resource of experts in the Arabic language. Along with senior scribal bureaucrats, these scholars were employed in the translation committees set up by Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha after 1718.

At the *Kağıdḫāne* feast of 1722, in addition to Kaymak Muṣṭafā Pasha and *şeyhülislām* 'Abdullāh Efendi, the *kadıasker* of the province of Rumelia Uşşākızāde es-Seyyid 'Abdullāh Efendi (d.?) and the *kadıasker* of the province of Anatolia Paşmakçızāde es-Seyyid 'Abdullāh Efendi (d.1732) were present.[456] These latter two were also present at the opening of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's *dārü'lḥadīs̲* in 1720.[457] Paşmakçızāde es-Seyyid Abdullah Efendi, the son of a *şeyhülislām,* would survive the 1730 rebellion and go on to become a *şeyhülislām* himself in 1731.[458] Another senior *âlim* listed among the attendees of the 1722 feast is Mirzāzāde Şeyh Meḥmed Efendi (d.1735).[459] Mirzāzāde Şeyh Meḥmed Efendi was one of the thirty scholars and secretaries listed by Çelebizāde as having been commissioned by Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha to translate into Ottoman-Turkish from the Arabic the *'Iḳdü'l-cümān fî-tārīḫi ehli'z-zemān* of the *'ālim*-historian Bedreddīn 'Aynī (d.1451).[460] Known also as the *'Aynī Tārīḫi*, this text was a

---

[453] Çelebizâde*, Târîh-i Çelebizâde*, 1321.
[454] Ibid. Şafāyī, *Tezkire-ī Şafāyī*, 674.
[455] Çelebizâde*, Târîh-i Çelebizâde*, 1321.
[456] Ibid.
[457] Râşid, *Târîh-i Râşid*, 1184.
[458] *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi, s.v,* "Paşmakcizâde Abdullah Efendi."
[459] Çelebizâde*, Târîh-i Çelebizâde*, 1321.
[460] Ibid., 1485

geographic-universal history housed at an imperial mosque complex in Edirne which the grand vizier had transported to the capital for the task of translation.[461] The individuals who were selected for the ʿAynī Tārīḫi committee make sporadic appearances in different places, often in some relation to Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha, in the texts that cover the 1718-1730 period. Tracing these appearances reveals a stable group of scribal bureaucrats, elite ʿulemā, and government officials who were contemporaries and associates.

Mirzāzāde Şeyh Meḥmed Efendi was the brother of another ʿālim employed in the ʿAynī Tārīḫi committee, Aḥmed Neylī (d.1748).[462] Although appearing in a few different ceremonial and scholarly gatherings organized by Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha, Mirzāzāde's most immediate connection to the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha household appears to have been through his employment, as indicated by Ṣafāyī, as a scribe responsible for correspondence (mektūbcu) by Kaymak Muṣṭafā Pasha.[463] Ṣafāyī's entry also includes a chronogram written by Mirzāzāde for the birth of a son to Sultan Aḥmed III, demonstrating Mirzāzāde's involvement in the culture of patronage seeking poetry composition prevalent at the time at the Ottoman court.[464] This ʿālim was also the son-in-law of the late şeyhülislām Feyżullāh Efendi.[465]

Mirzāzāde's brother Aḥmed Neylī participated in the religious discussions held during the month of Ramadan by Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha in 1727 and 1728.[466] These discussions would be hosted by the grand vizier in his private residence and involved lectures and debates which followed a recitation of the Quranic commentary Tafsīr al-Baydawī of the medieval Islamic scholar ʿUmar al-Baydawī (d.1286).[467] In describing these gatherings, Çelebizāde clearly states that they were a new custom (muʿtād) that had been initiated in the "last few years" (birkaç seneden berü).[468] Interestingly, the phrases chosen by Çelebizāde to denote these gatherings refer to the grand vizier as "Aristotle natured," (Aristo-tedbīr) such as in the section for the gathering of 1728, which is titled "the exposition of a commentary-seminar [held] in the beneficence of the Aristotle-natured vizier" (taḳrīr-i ders-i tefsīr der-hużūr-ı Āsaf-ı Aristo-tedbīr).[469] It would seem from the consistent use of the term by Çelebizāde in referring to Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha in his historical chronicle, that "Aristotle-natured" was a formulaic manner favored by Çelebizāde of emphasizing the scholarliness of the grand vizier.

---

[461] Ibid., 1484-1485.
[462] Ibid. Ṣafāyī, Teẕkire-i Ṣafāyī, 666.
[463] Ṣafāyī, Teẕkire-i Ṣafāyī, 298.
[464] Ibid., 298-300.
[465] Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi, s.v, "Mirzazâde Şeyh Mehmed Efendi."
[466] Çelebizâde, Târîh-i Çelebizâde, 1542, 1593.
[467] Ibid. Baydawī's tafsīr was one of the fundamental exegetical texts in Ottoman madrasas. For the significance of this work, see Shahab Ahmed and Nenad Filipovic, "The Sultan's Syllabus: A Curriculum for the Ottoman Imperial medreses Prescribed in a fermān of Qānūnī Süleyman, Dater 973 (1565)" Studia Islamica No.98/99 (2004).
[468] Ibid., 1593.
[469] Ibid., 1542, 1593.

The Ramadan discussions held at Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's residence functioned as conspicuous assertions of the grand vizier's piety, munificence, and patronage of the religious sciences. They were a means by which Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha attempted to assign religious legitimacy to his office and to his household. The participants of these gatherings would be awarded by the grand vizier and the sultan would also pay a visit, affording greater validity and prestige to the events.[470] By regularly bringing together senior members of the Ottoman religious administration, who would travel from their various appointments, even in contexts where they staffed provincial posts, to the capital for these occasions, Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's Ramadan discussions served also to reinforce and refresh the contacts that he had cultivated within the *'ilmiye*.[471] That these contacts were restricted to a particular specific group of high ranking *'ulemā* is evidenced by the fact that the *'ālims* who appear in the Ramadan discussions are the same ones who appear in the grand vizier's translation committees and in other ceremonial events hosted by him as well. In addition to Aḥmed Neylī, of the scholars employed in the *Aynî Tārīḫi* committee, Mestcizāde 'Abdullāh Efendi (d.1737), 'Arabzāde Ṣāliḥ Efendi (d.?), Dārendeli Meḥmed Efendi (d?), Aḥmed 'Ilmī Efendi (d.?) and 'Abdüllaṭīf Rāżi Efendi (d.1733) were all also present in the 1727 and/or 1728 Ramadan discussions convened at Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's residence.[472] The participants of these gatherings would engage in sequence in disputations and analyses of al-Baydawī's work.[473] When in the 1728 gathering, 'Arabzāde Ṣāliḥ Efendi and Dārendeli Meḥmed Efendi became involved in a protracted debate, Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha had their opinions recorded and dispatched to Mirzāzāde Şeyh Meḥmed Efendi, who was not himself present, to obtain the latter's views regarding the dispute.[474] Woolen cloaks and robes of ermine fur were presented to the participants and attendees, and Kaymak Muṣṭafā Pasha appears among the recipients of these gifts in 1727, indicating that the gatherings were not restricted to members of the *'ulemā,* but provided opportunities in which the various members of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's household could come together and share in the symbolism of these affairs.[475]

Another such symbolic affair was the opening of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's hadith college or *dārü'lḥadīs* with its attendant library and the convening of the first lesson there in 1720. A momentous occasion, comprehending a far broader assembly of the clients and associates of the grand vizier than the Ramadan discussions, the course of the ceremonial acts performed at this

---

[470] Ibid., 1594.
[471] Ibid., 1593-1594, 1542.
[472] Ibid., 1542, 1593-1594.
[473] Ibid., 1542.
[474] Ibid., 1593.
[475] Ibid., 1542.

inauguration are notable in the degree to which they replicated the pageantry of imperial dynastic rituals. For example, much like at the banquets of the celebrations of Sultan Aḥmed III's four sons in the same year, the attendees were presented with coffee and sherbet by the grand vizier.[476] As with the Ramadan discussions, only involving a larger group of recipients this time, the ceremony concluded with the conferring of expensive furs and small sacks of coins upon a number of the participants.[477] The bestowing of gifts, symbolic of the sulṭān's beneficence and status as the ultimate caretaker of his subjects, were a standard feature that often concluded the gatherings hosted by the royal family. The circumcision festival of the sulṭān's sons and the opening of the palace library are two instances where gift giving occurred in the context of an imperial ceremony in the same year as the opening of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's *dārü'lḥadīs*̱.[478]

In mimicking the forms of royal ceremonial, Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha was actively appropriating the symbolic prerogatives of the Ottoman sovereign. Rāṣid's account of the inauguration does not mention Sultan Aḥmed III's presence.[479] This absence renders Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha the focal center around which the sequence of ceremonial events organized for the opening of the *dārü'lḥadīs*̱ unfold. For example, it is to the grand vizier that the attendees "show themselves" upon being seated along the cushions arranged within the central hall of the college.[480] Afterwards, the grand vizier, along with a number of his senior officers like the *çavuşbaşı*, "honor and esteem" (*iltifāt ile talṭīf buyurdular*) the assembly.[481] A prayer and religious recitation by the *şeyhülislām* follows before Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha distributes fines furs and purses to a number of the attendees, including to the religious professor appointed to teach in the college.[482]

The entire gathering at Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's *dārü'lḥadīs*̱ in 1720 embodies therefore an elaborate ritual meant to emphasize the beneficence, wealth and piety of the grand vizier. Nedīm declares in his chronogram for this structure that the grand vizier "for the dissemination of knowledge made this place without parallel" (*yaptı neşr-i 'ilm içün böyle maḥall-i bī-bedel*).[483] However, not only was the *dārü'lḥadīs*̱ and its inauguration an assertion of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's patronage of scholarship, but the library (*kitāb-ḫāne*) attached to the college, having been formed out of an endowment made from a portion of the grand vizier's private book

---

[476] Râşid, *Târîh-i Râşid*, 1184. Salzmann, "The Age of Tulips," 93.
[477] Râşid, *Târîh-i Râşid*, 1184.
[478] Salzmann, "The Age of Tulips," 93. Râşid, *Târîh-i Râşid*, 1170.
[479] Râşid, *Târîh-i Râşid*, 1184.
[480] Ibid.
[481] Ibid.
[482] Ibid.
[483] Nedim, *Nedim Divanı*, 182.

collection, constituted further a monument to its patron's erudition.[484] That the library was discerned as an autonomous component of the *dārü'lḥadīs̱* complex by contemporary observers is indicated in Rāşid statement that the grand vizier had constructed a religious college *and* a library.[485]

The momentous nature of the opening of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's *dārü'lḥadīs̱* is further illustrated by the sheer scope of the participant attendees, which greatly exceed in volume and variety those present at the inauguration of Sultan Aḥmed III's imperial library in the palace in the same year.[486] Among these attendees were retired and active *kadıaskers* of the provinces of Anatolia and Rumelia, a retired personal imam to the sultan and a retired chief physician, and a host of senior scribal officials and judges.[487] ʿAbdüllaṭīf Rāżi Efendi, Mirzāzāde Şeyh Meḥmed Efendi, and ʿArabzāde Ḥasan Efendi (d.?), three members of the *Aynī Tārīḫi* committee, were also among those present.[488] Almost the entirety of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's senior clients can be identified at this ceremony as well, including Kethüdā Meḥmed Pasha and Kaymak Muṣṭafā Pasha, *defterdār* el-Ḥāc İbrāhīm Efendi, *reīsü'l-küttāb* Meḥmed Efendi, the commander of the janissaries Şāhīn Meḥmed Ağa, *şeyhülislām* ʿAbdullāh Efendi, and the soon-to-be Ottoman ambassador to the French court Yirmisekizçelebizāde Meḥmed Saʿīd Efendi.[489] The significance of this congregation cannot therefore be overstated. An exceedingly expressive moment in which the personality of the grand vizier was glorified and the legitimacy of his authority reasserted, it was an occasion which demanded the participation of all who benefited from Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's patronage.

In comparison to the inauguration of the grand vizier's *dārü'lḥadīs̱,* the opening of Sultan Aḥmed III's palace library seems to have been a humbler affair. This, at least, is the impression given by Rāşid's chronicle of the event. Rāşid explicitly mentions only the participation of the grand vizier and the *şeyhülislām.*[490] Whether any of the other abovementioned dignitaries were among the "noble viziers" (*vüzerā-i ʿiẓām*) described as having attended cannot be ascertained.[491] It is interesting that whereas in narrating the opening ceremony of the grand vizier's *dārü'lḥadīs̱,* Rāşid chooses to list each senior official who was present, he does not choose to do so when relating the inauguration of the sulṭān's palace library.

---

[484] Râşid, *Târîh-i Râşid*, 1184..
[485] Ibid.
[486] Ibid., 1170, 1184.
[487] Ibid., 1184.
[488] Ibid.
[489] Ibid.
[490] Ibid., 1170.
[491] Ibid.

Contemporary accounts of the inception and construction of this structure provide important insights into the intellectual culture surrounding Sultan Aḥmed III, his grand vizier, and the restricted group of senior scribal officials and *'ālims* who surrounded them. Silāḥdār Meḥmed Ağa notes that a fundamental motivation behind the project was the sulṭān's personal passion for books.[492] Rāşid goes into greater detail, explaining how over the centuries a large quantity of manuscripts had accumulated at the imperial palace through gifts, purchases, and commissions.[493] Stored in niches and chests in various imperial treasuries, by the early eighteenth century these texts had become dilapidated and were in danger of completely falling apart.[494] As previously mentioned, regarding the initiative to turn the *Kağıdḫāne* grounds into a vast residential space for the sultan and the imperial elite, Rāşid is quite candid in assigning agency to the grand vizier. There is therefore reason to regard as accurate Rāşid's indication that it was the sulṭān's personal desire that the crumbling texts stored at the palace be gathered, tended for and preserved in a purpose-built structure.[495] The palace library functioned as an active workspace providing palace personnel with access to the texts it contained. A religious professor was appointed to it, and the sultan is openly described by Rāşid as having envisaged a structure that would enable palace functionaries to easily benefit from the various manuscripts amassed at the palace which up until then were maintained in disparate locations.[496] Rāşid himself benefited from the sulṭān's new library, accessing Na'īmā's "calendar of events" (*taḳvīm-i veḳāyī'*) at it and using it to help compile his chronicle.[497]

The palace library may be seen as part of the bibliophilic cultural environment which framed the novel intellectual-cultural initiatives undertaken under the direction of Sultan Aḥmed III and his grand vizier. These initiatives consist essentially of endeavors involving a circumscribed number of *'ulemā* and scribal officials, a significant portion of whom have already been encountered in this chapter, working under the tutelage of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha and the senior clients of this grand vizier's household. In addition to those mentioned above, Çelebizāde himself, Meḥmed 'Avfī (d.?), Şākir Ḥüseyin Bey (d.?) and 'Izzet 'Alī Pasha (d.1734) comprise other notable members of the *'Aynī Tārīḫi* committee.[498] Ṣafāyī's remarks regarding these individuals differ markedly in tone from his entries on older, deceased poets, revealing intimate familiarities and expressing the shared enthusiasms of a common environment. For example, 'Izzet 'Alī Pasha is treated with particular high praise in the *Teẕkire-i Ṣafāyī*, where mention is

---

[492] Silâhdar Fındıklı Mehmed Ağa, *Nusretnâme*, 384.
[493] Râşid, *Târîh-i Râşid*, 1150.
[494] Ibid.
[495] Ibid.
[496] Ibid.
[497] Thomas and Itzkowitz, *A Study of Naima*, 39.
[498] Çelebizâde, *Târîh-i Çelebizâde*, 1485

made of the hope that this individual will continue to produce great poetry and complete his study of knowledge "as he is still in the days of his youth" (*henüz ʿunfuvān-ı şebāb-eyyāmı olmagla*).[499] Şafāyī even incorporates as a worthy example of Ottoman *inşā* the letter he received in response to his request for a sample of poetry from ʿIzzet ʿAlī Pasha.[500] The pedigree of ʿIzzet ʿAlī Pasha is also presented. The scion of an established scribal family, he is described as being the *mektūbcu* of el-Ḥāc İbrāhīm Efendi, having succeeded his recently deceased father in this same post.[501]

Further allusions to contemporaneity follow in Şafāyī's accounts on Meḥmed ʿAvfī, Şākir Ḥüseyin Bey, Süleymān Nahīfī (d.1738), and Çelebizāde ʿĀṣım Efendi. In his entry on Meḥmed ʿAvfī, Şafāyī recounts Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's pleasure at a *gazel* dedicated to him by this scribe, who was the son of a *defterdār* and the brother of Sultan Aḥmed III's privy secretary Muṣṭafā Naʿtī (encountered in the preceding chapter).[502] In this reference to Muṣṭafā Naʿtī, mention is also made of the influence and the role that Meḥmed ʿAvfī's brother played in encouraging the composition of the *Teẕkire-i Şafāyī*.[503] Like Meḥmed ʿAvfī, Şākir Ḥüseyin Bey also submitted poetry for the purposes of acquiring the patronage of the principal courtly figures of his time.[504] In his case, he composed *ḳasīdes* honoring Sultan Aḥmed III, Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha, and *şeyhülislām* ʿAbdullāh Efendi.[505] In exchange, Şākir Ḥüseyin Bey was appointed to an *ibtidā-i ḫāric medrese,* the lowest rung in the Ottoman *medrese* hierarchy.[506] While it is not clear from the ambiguity of Şafāyī's remarks whether this *ʿālim* was appointed as a professor or student to this *medrese*, the former seems more likely considering the social standing that Şākir Ḥüseyin Bey must have accumulated in order to be in a position where his poetry could be scrutinized by the *sulṭān*, the grand vizier, and the *şeyhülislām.*

Süleyman Nahīfī was a member of the smaller delegation of eight scribes and *ʿulema* organized by Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha for the translation from the Persian of the *Ḥabībüʾs-siyer*, a history of Persia.[507] Similar to Muṣṭafā Ledünnī, Nahīfī was also a member of the imperial *ḫācegān* who possessed superior abilities in the Persian language which he had acquired through sojourns at the Persian court.[508] Çelebizāde clearly states that the members of the *Ḥabībüʾs-siyer*

---

[499] Şafāyī, *Teẕkire-i Şafāyī*, 417.
[500] Ibid.
[501] Ibid.
[502] Ibid., 428.
[503] Ibid.
[504] Ibd., 333.
[505] Ibid.
[506] Ibid.
[507] Çelebizâde, *Târîh-i Çelebizâde*, 1485.
[508] Şafāyī, *Teẕkire-i Şafāyī*, 649-660.

committee were chosen for their competence in Persian.[509] Nahīfī's visited the Persian court as part of the Ottoman embassy dispatched to the Persian emperor in 1698.[510] While there, he engaged the Persian literati in literary séances and gatherings, surpassing his interlocutors (according to Ṣafāyī).[511] He is presented as being an expert composer in the Persian, Arabic, and Turkish languages, a quality that must have made him ideal for the *Ḥabību's-siyer* translation.[512] Nahīfī was also included in the Ottoman delegation which negotiated the Peace of Passarowitz in 1718, receiving his appointment to a *ḥācegān* post as remuneration for his involvement in the successful conclusion of these talks.[513]

Ṣafāyī refers to Nahīfī as a "a youth who is a treasure of knowledge" (*gencīne-i künūz-ı ma'ārif*), thus intimating that this scribal littaretuer was a contemporary of Ṣafāyī.[514] Two other contemporaries of Ṣafāyī, and the two final members of the *Aynī Tārīḫi* committee included in the *Teẕkire-i Ṣafāyī*, are Çelebizāde and Aḥmed Nedīm. Although Nedīm was an exceedingly productive poet, whose collection of poetry (*dīvān*) includes dozens of references to the leading figures of the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha period, Ṣafāyī is relatively succinct in describing him, noting only that Nedīm was an *'ālim* whose works included chronograms and *ḳasīdes*.[515] On Çelebizāde Ṣafāyī is more informative, pointing out Çelebizāde's skill in the Turkish and Persian languages, his participation in literary gatherings, and his excellence in the art of *inşā*, which Ṣafāyī relates to Çelebizāde being a "son of a scribe" (*kātib-zāde*).[516] However, even though his father had been a *reīsü'l-küttāb*, Çelebizāde chose to pursue a career in the *'ilmiye,* receiving his certificate of graduation (*mülāzemet*) from the *şeyhülislām* Feyzullah Efendi himself.[517]

That two of the religious scholars engaged on the *'Aynī Tārīḫi* translation (Mirzāzāde and Çelebizāde) had prior involvements with the deceased and disgraced Feyżullāh Efendi, a figure who had transformed the office of the *şeyhülislām* into an autonomous center of political power and had come close to establishing a *şeyhülislām* dynasty, indicates that the *'ālims* employed by Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha in his translation committees constituted representatives of the uppermost stratum of the senior echelons of the Ottoman religious bureaucracy. Regarding another *'ālim*-translator, 'Abdüllaṭīf Rāżi Efendi, Ṣafāyī remarks that he was the bearer of a *mevleviyet,* or one of the higher ranking *'ilmiye* offices.[518] The religious scholars surrounding Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha

---

[509] Çelebizâde, *Târîh-i Çelebizâde*, 1485.
[510] Ṣafāyī, *Teẕkire-ī Ṣafāyī*, 649.
[511] Ibid.
[512] Ibid., 651-652.
[513] Ibid., 659-660.
[514] Ibid., 649.
[515] Nedim, *Nedim Divanı*. Ṣafāyī, *Teẕkire-i Ṣafāyī*, 672.
[516] Ṣafāyī, *Teẕkire-ī Ṣafāyī*, 414
[517] Ibid.
[518] Ṣafāyī, *Teẕkire-ī Ṣafāyī*, 247.

and appearing in his cultural projects, at the *Ramadan* gatherings at his residence and at the opening of his *dārü'lḥadīs*, were a small exclusive group of elite 'ulemā. Their involvement with the grand vizier's translation committees does not reflect the development of a literary movement within the 'ulemā of the Ottoman capital. Instead, what it shows is that within the sociopolitical environment of the imperial center in which patronage networks transcended career streams, a certain number of highly placed 'ālims who had cultivated relations with the grand vizier came to be recruited for their linguistic abilities to an intellectual-cultural program launched by a bureaucratized socioeconomic elite.

Scribal bureaucrats and senior government officials trained and employed in secretarial capacities composed the chief active agents responsible for the conception and execution of the three fundamental intellectual-cultural initiatives of the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha period; the İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa printing press, the embassy to France, and the translation committees. This chapter has examined the particular individual components of the hegemonic household faction under whose supervision and support these undertakings emerged in the years between 1718 and 1730. Yirmisekizçelebizāde Meḥmed Saʿīd Efendi, el-Ḥāc İbrāhīm Efendi, Kethüdā Meḥmed Pasha, Kaymak Muṣṭafā Pasha, *şeyhülislām* Abdullah Efendi, *reīsü'l-küttāb* Meḥmed Efendi, Şāhīn Meḥmed Ağa, as well as a small group of scribal-litterateurs and *'ālims* including İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa constituted the major junctures of a household structure that was elaborated through a set of *intisāb* relations filtering down from the royal son-in-law and grand vizier Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha. The final chapter of this paper will focus exclusively on the intellectual products of the cultural program organized by Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's household. In doing so, it will reveal how this program reflects particular cultural sensibilities, and is above all characterized by a novel intellectual openness to and curiosity in the historiographies and other facets of certain cultural realms and geographies beyond the Ottoman domain.

Chapter Four: The İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa Printing Press as Part and the Broader Intellectual Programs of the 1718-1730 Period

The previous chapter has considered at length the interpersonal networks from which the household establishment of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha was formed. This chapter moves on to consider the intellectual projects launched by members and associates of this household under the direction of the grand vizier and with the support of Sulṭan Aḥmed III. It argues moreover that the first Ottoman-Turkish printing press established by İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa composed one such intellectual project, and that the texts printed by this press were components of a broader program that transcended the Müteferriḳa press.

İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa was himself connected with the grand vizier's household and his initiative, far from being conceptualized as "entirely a private and personal undertaking" (as argued by Orhan Salih), should be approached as part of a coherent cultural program that emerged within the community of scribal littérateurs, intellectuals, and religious scholars associated with the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha household.[519] This is not to understate the importance of İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa's personality and his own skills and personal motivation in the successful establishment of the first Ottoman-Turkish printing press. In recounting this undertaking, Çelebizāde Ismāīl 'Āṣım Efendi notes how İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa had planned for and desired such an enterprise for a long time, highlighting the evident nature of Müteferriḳa's determination and readiness to assist Meḥmed Saʿīd Efendi in setting up the printing press.[520] These remarks, however, follow Çelebizāde's account of Meḥmed Saʿīd Efendi's aspirations for applying print technology to Ottoman-Turkish texts, and are concluded with a list of four religious scholars appointed by the sultan for the purposes of "editing and criticizing" (taṣḥīḥ ü tenḳīḥ) the works printed at the Müteferriḳa press.[521] These four religious scholars were Yanyalı Esad Efendi (d.1731), Pīrīzāde Meḥmed Ṣāḥib Efendi (d.1749), Şeyh Mūsā Efendi (d.1744), and İsḥāḳ Efendi (d.1743). The latter was the son of the şeyhülislām Ebū İsḥāḳ İsmāīl Efendi, encountered above as preceding Yenişehirli Abdullah Efendi in the post of şeyhülislām.

İsḥāḳ Efendi appears along with Yanyalı Esad Efendi among the group of 'ālims and scribal intellectuals recruited by Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha to the 'Aynī Tārīḫi translation committee.[522] Şeyh Mūsā Efendi, on the other hand, was part of the group tasked with translating the Ḥabību's-siyer.[523] Therefore, three of the four editors assigned to the Müteferriḳa press were members of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's translation committees. Moreover, Meḥmed Saʿīd Efendi, the son of a senior client of the grand vizier's household, a member of the embassy to France, and Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's mektūbcu, appears in Çelebizāde's account as a fundamental instigative force behind the initial inception of the press. These factors should caution scholars of Ottoman history from responding too enthusiastically to H.A.R Gibb and Harold Bowen's exclamation that İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa was a "one man show."[524]

On the contrary, İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa benefited from his relations to the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha household, and even though he may not himself have been a member of the inner circles

---

[519] Orlin Sabev, "Waiting for Godot: The Formation of Ottoman Print Culture," in *Historical Aspects of Printing and Publishing in Languages of the Middle East: Papers from the Symposium at the University of Leipzig*, ed. Geoffrey Roper (Boston: Brill, 2008), 102.
[520] Çelebizâde, *Târîh-i Çelebizâde*, 1547.
[521] Ibid., 1548.
[522] Ibid., 1485.
[523] Ibid.
[524] Sabev, "Waiting for Godot," 112.

of this household, his enterprise was deeply involved with these inner circles. In addition to the physical links between İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa and members of the grand vizier's household, the nature and contents of the texts published by his printing house in 1729-1730 conspicuously evidence the fact that the Müteferriḳa press emerged as part of a broader intellectual program that was organized and orchestrated under the supervision and with the direct personal involvement of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha in the years following the Peace of Passarowitz. This program reflected the interests of an Ottoman courtly cultural environment, peculiar to the early eighteenth century and characterized by an intellectual openness or *dêcloisonnement* to foreign texts, ideas, and aesthetics, and a general bibliophilic fervour for the *ādāb* sciences.

The cultural environment of intellectual *dêcloisonnement* prevalent in the early eighteenth century Ottoman capital produced an expansive interest in geographic, historiographic, diplomatic, zoological, anthropological, and technical information on regions beyond the Ottoman domain. This interest was related to the geopolitical developments of the 1718-1730 period, which entangled the Ottomans diplomatically and militarily in the affairs simultaneously of European powers on the one hand, and of the disintegrating Safavid Empire in Persia on the other. This chapter aims to situate the Müteferriḳa press within this broader intellectual program and in doing so to frame the endeavor of İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa and Meḥmed Saʻīd Efendi within a specific courtly cultural tradition. The intellectual output of the Müteferriḳa press as present in the 1729-1730 publications was in conversation with the interests and outlook of a class of socioeconomic elites comprising scribal bureaucrats, government officials, members of the Ottoman dynasty, and high ranking *ʻālims*. Six of the eight books printed in 1729-1730 were extensions of a literary movement that comprised a total of thirteen texts composed, translated, and published between 1718 and 1730. Another six of these thirteen texts were translated either in committees set up for that purpose by Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha, or through separate commissions granted by the grand vizier to individual scholars and *ʻālims*. Therefore, between the printing press and the translations, twelve overwhelmingly historiographic-geographic works were rendered into Ottoman-Turkish and made available to the literary circles of the imperial capital in 1718-1730. The remarkable similarities in form and content between the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha translations and the Ibrahim Müteferriḳa press publications will be analyzed and presented in this chapter. The thirteenth text that has here been ascribed to this movement is the embassy report or *Sefāretnāme* of Yirmisekizçelebi Meḥmed Efendi, which was incorporated by Rāşid Meḥmed Efendi into his chronicles and was therefore incidentally published by İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa in 1741 when he printed the *Tārīḫ-i Rāşid*. However, the books printed by the Müteferriḳa press after 1732 should be analyzed separately

from those works published in 1729 and 1730. The approach applied in this chapter to the Müteferriḳa press is designed to present a rebuttal to previous Ottoman historiography on print technology, which lumps all of the books published by İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa between 1729 and 1741 into a single analytical category.

This chapter will first provide a brief account detailing the process of the inauguration of the Müteferriḳa Press, addressing aspects of the history of this press such as where the actual presses were acquired from or how and by whom the Ottoman-Turkish type required for the prints was cast. This discussion will focus solely on the technical aspects of the formation of the Müteferriḳa Press. The study will then proceed with an examination of Yirmisekizçelebi Meḥmed Efendi's *Sefāretnāme,* noting the aspects of his encounters which the Ottoman ambassador dwells on at greater length in his account and thereby establishing an intellectual framework of focal subjects which are also visibly persistent in the other works published and composed between 1718 and 1730. After this, an analysis of the content of the texts translated under Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's patronage will follow. Having drawn a set of common themes and content from the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha translations and the *Sefāretnāme*, and having therefore identified a number of specific scholarly interests with which *décloisonnement* became associated as it unfolded in the intellectual culture of the 1718-1730 period, the focus will shift to a consideration of the actual books translated and printed by İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa.

The final section will engage with the arguments of four Ottoman historians who have sought to reconceptualise the first Ottoman-Turkish printing press beyond the Westernization paradigm. The objective of this chapter is to elaborate how specifically the Müteferriḳa Press, the 1720-1721 Ottoman embassy to France, and the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha translations together embody a coherent intellectual program focused on accumulating certain forms of knowledge on a number of lands situated beyond the boundaries of the Ottoman Empire. In doing so, the historiographical works studied here vary markedly from the Ottoman histories studied in the end of the second chapter.

The Process of the Organization and Formation of the Müteferriḳa Press 1719-1727

Çelebizāde's chronicle places the establishment of İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa's printing press among the events for the year 1139/1727.[525] Göçek notes that Meḥmed Saʿīd Efendi and İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa had worked privately for two years to organize the enterprise before they were granted an official license in 1726.[526] Çelebizāde's account reflects this, indicating that by 1727 the necessary implements and supplies for the print shop had been gathered at İbrāhīm

---

[525] Çelebizâde, *Târîh-i Çelebizâde*, 1546-1547.
[526] Göçek, *East Encounters West*, 115.

Müteferriḳa's private residence in the Istanbul district of Sultanselim and that a group of four *'ālims* (listed above) had been appointed to oversee the preparation of Vanī Meḥmed Efendi's (d.1685) seventeenth century translation of the Arabic dictionary of İsmāīl bin Ḥammād Cevherī (d.1002).[527] Known as the *Lugat-ı Vankulu* and defined by Çelebizāde as "*Ṣıḥāḥ-ı Cevherī Tercemesi Vankulu Lugatı*," or "the *Vankulu Dictionary* that is the translation of the *Ṣıḥāḥ-ı Cevherī* [Cevherī's dictionary]," this was the first book to be printed by İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa in the January of 1729.[528]

İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa was a Hungarian Unitarian trained as a minister who converted to Islam in his twenties and came to serve in a number of diplomatic and scribal posts at the Ottoman court, chiefly as translator.[529] The Hungarian town of Kolozsvár/Cluj in modern day Romania, where he was born and raised, forms the cultural context of Müteferriḳa's early education.[530] This was where he would have acquired his skills in Latin and Greek, and where he experienced his initial encounters with the culture of print technology. In fact, in the period when Müteferriḳa was present in Kolozsvár, the Hungarian Unitarian typographer and printer Miklós Tótfalusi Kis (d.1702) was active in this city, having established there a printing press in 1689 that published Unitarian tracts.[531] Miklós Tótfalusi Kis was also a typeface designer, and had cast Georgian, Armenian, and Hebrew types for his press.[532] It has been speculated by certain Ottoman historians that Müteferriḳa was acquainted with Tótfalusi Kis and at any rate it is broadly assumed in Ottoman historiography that Müteferriḳa received his first insights into the craft of printing while resident at Kolozsvár.[533]

There is also clear evidence that Müteferriḳa was well informed of the activities of contermporary non-Muslim Ottoman printers working in Istanbul. The first print book published in the Ottoman domain was a Hebrew print of the Torah achieved in the Ottoman capital in

[527] Çelebizâde, *Târîh-i Çelebizâde*, 1547.

[528] Ibid. William J. Watson, "Ibrahim Muteferika and Turkish Incunabula," in *Journal of the American Oriental Society* Vol 88 No 3 (July-September 1968), 437.

[529] The region around Kolozsvár suffered from inter-communal violence between Catholics and a number of Protestant denominations, including Calvinists and Unitarians, as well as military conflict between the Ottomans and the Habsburg Empire in this period. There has consequently been debate concerning whether Müteferriḳa fled Catholic Habsburg oppression in his homeland and voluntarily joined Ottoman service upon converting to Islam, or whether he did so after he had been captured and enslaved by Ottoman auxiliaries, and brought to Istanbul. Erginbaş, "Enlightenment in the Ottoman Context: Ibrahim Mutefferika and His Intellectual Landscape," 66. Alpay Kabacalı, *Türk Yayın Tarihi* (İstanbul: Can Matbaa, 1987), 26-27. Osman Ersoy, *Türkiye'ye Matbaanın Girişi ve İlk Basılan Eserler* (Ankara: Güven Basımevi, 1959), 27. Selim Nüzhet Gerçek, *Türk Matbaacılığı I Müteferrika Matbaası* (Istanbul Devlet Basımevi, 1939), 48-49.

[530] Kabacalı, *Türk Yayın Tarihi,* 25-26.

[531] Ibid., 28.

[532] Ibid.

[533] Kabacalı, *Türk Yayın Tarihi,* 28. Ersoy, *Türkiye'ye Matbaanın Girişi ve İlk Basılan Eserler,* 30. Sabev, "Waiting for Godot," 112.

1494.[534] Hebrew language presses had proliferated across major Ottoman urban centers including Salonica, Edirne, and Izmir in the sixteenth century, and were joined by Armenian printing presses following the establishment of the first Armenian press in Istanbul, with equipment and materials shipped from Venice, in 1565.[535] At the time when Müteferriḳa and Meḥmed Saʿīd Efendi were endeavoring the organize the Müteferriḳa press, there was also operational in Istanbul a Jesuit press that had been instituted in 1703.[536] That Müteferriḳa interacted with non-Muslim printers in the Ottoman capital is evidenced by the fact that Jonah ben Jacob Ashkenazi (d.1745), a Hebrew printer, engraver, and typographer who had established a Hebrew language press in Istanbul in 1710, was employed by Müteferriḳa for the purposes of carving and casting the typeface used in the Müteferriḳa press prints of 1727-1742.[537]

İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa, therefore, most likely began to acquire his expertise in print technology before arriving in Istanbul, and he remained actively involved with this profession and its practitioners after having joined the Ottoman state service and settled in the Ottoman capital. Müteferriḳa's experience and interest in the printing craft in the years prior to 1718 is also noted by Çelebizāde.[538] However, Müteferriḳa was only able to act on his interests after forming the partnership with Meḥmed Saʿīd Efendi and receiving the support, attention, and involvement of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha. The Müteferriḳa press as it emerged between 1727 and 1730 was very much an extension of the intellectual initiatives and culture of the 1718-1730 period. The personal skills and contacts of Müteferriḳa certainly comprise a fundemental component of the history of the formation of the first Ottoman-Turkish printing press, but the acknowledgment of this fact need not necessitate a definition of this enterprise exclusively in relation to the figure of Müteferriḳa.

The prelude to the inauguration of the Müteferriḳa press was İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa's print, on his own initiative and with his own resources and abilities, of a map of the Marmara Sea in 1719.[539] This he achieved as a woodcut derived from an engraving on boxwood, presenting it to the grand vizier having written on one corner "my esteemed lord, if you so decree larger ones will be made" (*benim devletlu efendim, eğer fermānınız olursa daha büyükleri yapılır*).[540] Clearly Müteferriḳa had already developed a limited ability to achive prints before the Müteferriḳa press itself was formed, but at this point he may be described at best as having

---

[534] Ersoy, *Türkiye'ye Matbaanın Girişi ve İlk Basılan Eserler,* 18-19.

[535] Ibid., 19-20.

[536] Ibid., 21.

[537] Coşkun Yılmaz and Fikret Sarıcaoğlu., edit. *Müteferrika: Basmacı İbrahim Efendi ve Müteferrika Matbaası* (Istanbul: Esen Ofset, 2008), 149.

[538] Çelebizāde, *Târîh-i Çelebizâde*, 1547.

[539] Yılmaz and Sarıcaoğlu., edit, *Müteferrika: Basmacı İbrahim Efendi ve Müteferrika Matbaası*, 157.

[540] Ersoy, *Türkiye'ye Matbaanın Girişi ve İlk Basılan Eserler*, 31.

organized a small workshop for cartographic prints. In 1724-1725, he managed to print a map of the Black Sea derived from engravings on four copper plates, which he also presented to Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha.[541] By 1724, Meḥmed Saʿīd Efendi, having returned from the French embassy, had become involved in Müteferriḳa's efforts and the early steps in organizing the printing press, with state support, were underway.[542]

The Müteferriḳa press received state sanction and was officially inaugurated as the *Dārü't- tıbāʿati'l-āmire* in 1727.[543] The location was the private residence of Müteferriḳa in the Istanbul neighborhood of Sultanselim.[544] The books would be printed on four incunabula printing presses acquired most likely from France, though some scholars argue that they were imported from Leiden in the Netherlands.[545] Jean Baptise Holdermann (d.1730), who was employed as a translator at the French embassy and was the author of *Grammaire turque,* indicated in a letter that Müteferriḳa had four presses for incunabula prints and two presses for cartographic prints.[546] The Latin type required for the *Grammaire turque* was imported from France and consititued therefore the only type used in Müteferriḳa prints of 1727-1741 that was not cut and cast in Istanbul.[547]

The Ottoman-Turkish type used at the Müteferriḳa press was cut and cast by Jonah ben Jacob Ashkenazi at a point size above sixteen and below eighteen.[548] A copyright was placed by Müteferriḳa on the type produced by Jonah ben Jacob Ashkenazi.[549] Among the requests submitted by Müteferriḳa in 1727 to the grand vizier and the sultan alongside his application for a printing license (in response to which Müteferriḳa would receive a *fermān* granting him the right to print) was that Jonah ben Jacob Ashkenazi along with his sons be exempted from the *cizye* tax so that they could keep working at the Müteferriḳa press.[550] This appeal indicated the importance of Ashkenazi's expertise in the printing craft and furthermore stated that this individual was an important associate of the enterprise because he had access to printing equipment.[551] Müteferriḳa's petition also included requests for the establishment of a paper mill, assistance in the payment of workers, and that the state fix a price on the books that were

[541] Yılmaz and Sarıcaoğlu., edit, *Müteferrika: Basmacı İbrahim Efendi ve Müteferrika Matbaa,* 143.
[542] Ibid., 144-146.
[543] Ibid., 180.
[544] Ersoy, *Türkiye'ye Matbaanın Girişi ve İlk Basılan Eserler,* 30.
[545] Ibid., 34. Ian Proudfoot, "Mass Producing Houri's Moles" in *Islam: Essays on Scripture, Thought and Society A Festschrift in Honour of Anthony H. Johns* ed. Peter G. Riddell and Tony Street (New York: Brill, 1997), 161.
[546] Ersoy, *Türkiye'ye Matbaanın Girişi ve İlk Basılan Eserler*, 35. Kabacalı, *Türk Yayın Tarihi,* 33.
[547] Ersoy, *Türkiye'ye Matbaanın Girişi ve İlk Basılan Eserler,* 42.
[548] Ibid., 35.
[549] Yılmaz and Sarıcaoğlu., edit, *Müteferrika: Basmacı İbrahim Efendi ve Müteferrika Matbaası*, 149.
[550] Ibid., 150.
[551] Ibid.

printed.[552] These entreaties reflect the financial strains that had begun to afflict the Müteferriḳa press by 1727, as Meḥmed Saʿīd Efendi, the main financier of the project, had begun to run short of funds by this point.[553]

There also exists documentation stipulating the daily rations that were to be granted to the workers engaged in printing the *Lugat-ı Vankulu*.[554] Besides Jonah ben Jacob Ashkenazi, who is described by certain Ottoman historians like Osman Ersoy and Alpay Kabacalı as the chief compositor, typographer, and engraver of the Müteferriḳa press, two Ottomans by the name of Aḥmed el-Kırīmī (d.?) and Mıgdırıc-ı Galatavī (d.?) are also presented as having worked as assistants to Müteferriḳa in organizing the maps and diagrams included in some of the Müteferriḳa press editions.[555] Furthermore, Kabacalı, citing an earlier nineteenth century Ottoman source, states that a certain silversmith engraver identified only as "Zanbak Oğlu" (son of Zanbak) assited in the production of the type used by İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa.[556] Finally, Magnus Olaus Celsius (d.?), Librarian of the Royal Library of Stockholm who received a number of Müteferriḳa prints, claims that Müteferriḳa had brought over a number of German specialisets who worked at his print shop until the 1730 Patrona Ḫalīl Revolt.[557]

From the foregoing discussion it may tentatively be concluded that the specialists and workes employed at the Müteferriḳa press and trained and/or proficient in the various aspects involved in the production of incunabula books were recruited mainly from Ottoman craftsmen and local non-Muslim printers resident in Istanbul at the time of the establishment of this enterprise. Foreign specialists might also have been brought in if there is any truth to the unverified assertions of Magnus Olaus Celsius. It should also be reitereated that İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa was personally himself a competent printer, and that he employed his own sons in the print shop as well.[558]

In spite of the fact that as early as 1727 İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa requested support from the Ottoman state in setting up a paper mill, he would only be able to achieve this somewhat later in 1744.[559] The paper mill established by Müteferriḳa at Yalova in 1744 would succumb to the competition it faced from chapter European paper imports, and would therefore not outlast its

---

[552] Ibid.
[553] Ibid.
[554] Kabacalı, *Türk Yayın Tarihi,* 31-32.
[555] Compositors were responsible for arranging the type to be printed onto each page in accordance with the text of the work to be printed. According to Ersoy and Kabacalı, Ashkenazi was therefore involved in multiple aspects of the printing process at the Müteferriḳa press. Yılmaz and Sarıcaoğlu., edit, *Müteferrika: Basmacı İbrahim Efendi ve Müteferrika Matbaası,* 161. Kabacalı, *Türk Yayın Tarihi,* 34. Ersoy, *Türkiye'ye Matbaanın Girişi ve İlk Basılan Eserler,* 35.
[556] Kabacalı, *Türk Yayın Tarihi,* 33.
[557] Ibid., 34.
[558] Ibid.
[559] Ibid., 95.

founder (Müteferriḳa died in 1745) by much.[560] Therefore, the paper used in the books printed by the Müteferriḳa press in 1729-1730 was imported from Europe.[561] Müteferriḳa printed these books overwhelmingly on paper that had been produced in Paris, although the *Tüḥfetü'l-kibār*, combining paper from Parisian, Venitian, and Veronan mills, is a notable exception.[562]

The only Müteferriḳa press edition of the 1729-1730 period that included illustrations was the *Tārīḫ-i Hind-i Garbī*. The thirteen woodcuts contained in this work were printed from woodblocks that were cut by specialists employed by Müteferriḳa.[563] These specialists were tasked with reproducing the images found in one of the manuscript editions of the *Tārīḫ-i Hind-i Garbī*, though in doing so they seem to have made a few minor alterations, such as combining two of the manuscript images into a single woodcut.[564]

The financial difficulties faced in carrying out the 1729-1730 prints are evoked in a number of the abovementioned requests submitted by Müteferriḳa in 1727 along with his petition for a publishing license. To reiterate, Müteferriḳa had appealed for aid in renumerating his workers and had also asked the Ottoman state to set fixed prices for his publications. The capital that went into organizing the Müteferriḳa press between 1724 and 1727 was drawn heavily from Meḥmed Saʿīd Efendi, to the extent where the argument has been made that Meḥmed Saʿīd Efendi and İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa entered into a contractual agreement known as a *şirket-i mudārebe*.[565] This was a form of contract where one partner (in this case, Meḥmed Saʿīd Efendi) pledged to invest financial capital for a joint venture in which the associate partner pledged his labor and skills.[566] As indicated previously, by 1727 Meḥmed Saʿīd Efendi had started to run low on funds. Kabacalı, in his history of Turkish and Ottoman publication and printing, presents the French historian Jean-Henri Abdolonyme Ubicini (d.1884) claims that the Müteferriḳa press was granted an annuity derived from state funds for the purposes of meeting its financial needs.[567] This, however, is not clearly corroborated in the historiography on the Müteferriḳa press.

The paper on which Müteferriḳa's books were printed as well as the presses that printed them had all been imported from European countries. The labor that went into cutting, casting, and setting the metal typeface used in the Müteferriḳa press editions was time consuming and required specialized craftsmen like Jonah ben Jacob Ashkenazi, and may have also involved the recruitment and training of artisans, such as silversmiths, whose expertise was not directly

---

[560] Ibid.
[561] Ersoy, *Türkiye'ye Matbaanın Girişi ve İlk Basılan Eserler,* 38-42.
[562] Ibid., 39.
[563] Kabacalı, *Türk Yayın Tarihi,* 36.
[564] Thomas D Goodrich, *The Ottoman Turks and the New World: A Study of Tarih-i Hind-i Garbi and Sixteenth-Century Ottoman Americana* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1990), 57.
[565] Yılmaz and Sarıcaoğlu., edit, *Müteferrika: Basmacı İbrahim Efendi ve Müteferrika Matbaası,* 146.
[566] Ibid.
[567] Kabacalı, *Türk Yayın Tarihi,* 31.

related to the technology of print. Furthermore, the inclusion of maps, diagrams, and woodcuts necessitated the employment of assistants capable of carrying out cartographic prints as well as specialists capable of working with woodblocks. Consequently, notable financial costs were involved in the production of the eight books printed by the Müteferriḳa press in 1729 and 1730. These costs were reflected in the prices of the Müteferriḳa publications. As Müteferriḳa had requested, the Ottoman state did establish fixed prices for Müteferriḳa's books. For example, the *Lugat-ı Vankulu* was fixed in 1729 at a price of four-thousand two-hundred *akçe* (thirty-five *kuruş*) unbound and four-thousand eight-hundred *akçe* (forty *kuruş*) bound.[568] In comparison, manuscript works around this time sold for between three-hundred and six-hundred *akçes*.[569] Müteferriḳa press prints continued to average out prices in the thousands of *akçe* despite the fact that their exorbitant prices compelled Müteferriḳa to repeatedly have them reduced in the 1730s.[570] However, Orhan Salih's research has demonstrated that in spite of the financial resources required for purchasing these books, Müteferriḳa was able to successfully sell a majority of each work published by his press.[571] Salih only provides statistics of sale for four of the eight books printed by Müteferriḳa in 1729-1730; of these, all but one copy of the *Lugat-ı Vankulu* prints and 69.9% of the *Tüḥfetü'l-kibār,* 91.6% of the *Grammaire turque* and 53% of the *Gülşen-i ḫulefā* prints were sold (the *Gülşen-i ḫulefā* was published in the year of the Patrona Ḥalīl Revolt).[572] This indicates that, as this thesis has maintained, the Müteferriḳa press produced works that were consumed by the moneyed classes of the Ottoman capital and that therefore also corresponded to the literary tastes and preoccupations of the socioeconomic elite of Istanbul in the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha years.

Kathryn A. Schwartz in studying the political economy of private Arabic printing presses in Cairo in the late nineteenth century, notes that the operation of these presses relied heavily on the active engagement of the reading public, who through commissions chose and funded the books that were to be printed.[573] In consequence, there developed "mutual dependence between the printer and those who commissioned from him."[574] Commissions were structured upon detailed but adaptable agreements formed between printers and commissioners in which were set facets of the printing enterprise such as the estimated amount of quiries that were to be printed, the typeface that was to be used, and the advance that the commissioner agreed to pay for the

---

[568] Ibrahim Erünsal, *Osmanlılarda Sahaflık ve Sahaflar* (Istanbul: Timaş, 2013), 190.
[569] Erünsal, *Osmanlılarda Sahaflık ve Sahaflar,* 191.
[570] Ibid., 181-192. Sabev, "The First Ottoman Turkish Printing Enterprise," 73.
[571] Sabev, "The First Ottoman Turkish Printing Enterprise," 72.
[572] Ibid., 89.
[573] Kathryn A. Schwartz, "The Political Economy of Private Printing in Cairo as Told from a Comissioning Deal Turned Sour, 1871" *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 49 (2017), 26-29.
[574] Schwartz, "The Political Economy of Private Printing in Cairo as Told from a Comissioning Deal Turned Sour, 1871," 39.

text.[575] Were similar mechanisms in operation in the early eighteenth century prints of the Müteferriḳa press? İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa did not print commissions in the specific manner just outlined, but the nature of the relationships between printers and customer/investors evidenced in Schwartz's research do evince some of the dynamics involved in the process of publication at the Müteferriḳa press.

Of the two books printed in 1729-1730, the *Graimmaire turque* and the *Tārīḫ-i seyyāḥ* were commissions (more on this below). However, even where Müteferriḳa did not print commissions, his publications still emerged out of the relationships that existed between printer and customer in a manner that reflects the publication of commissioned works by late nineteenth-century Cairene printers. The interests and the demands of the particular community of scribal litterateurs, bureaucrats, and religious scholars that had gathered under the patronage of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha and his household clients determined the course that the Müteferriḳa print editions took in 1729-1730.

Between 1719 and 1727, the Müteferriḳa press emerged and developed in a manner where it became increasingly intertwined with its customer base, the socioeconomic elite of the Ottoman capital. The various technical aspects of this process having been outlined, this paper will now move on to consider the shared qualities that characterize the texts produced in the 1718-1730 period, beginning with Yirmisekizçelebi Meḥmed Efendi's *Sefāretnāme*. Afterwards, an attempt will be made to study the different ways in which the works printed by Müteferriḳa in 1729 and 1730 were embedded in the intellectual program launched under the direction and with the patronage of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha.

The 1720-1721 Ottoman Embassy to France

In her monograph study of Yirmisekizçelebi Meḥmed Efendi's embassy to France, Fatma Müge Göçek notes that the embassy report produced by the Ottoman ambassador was a public document, focusing on material subjects and excluding information of a more sensitive nature such as the diplomatic matters discussed between Yirmisekizçelebi and his French counterparts.[576] Göçek then explains that Yirmisekizçelebi appears to have presented detailed accounts of the embassy orally in private audiences with the grand vizier and the sultan.[577] This does not negate, however, the significance of Yirmisekizçelebi's *Sefāretnāme*. The fact that this document received "widespread circulation," to the extent that even the French ambassador in Istanbul was privy to it, means that it can be studied as an accessible intellectual product of the textual culture shared by the socioeconomic elite of the Ottoman capital in the 1718-1730 period.

---

[575] Ibid., 34.
[576] Göçek, *East Encounters West*, 65.
[577] Ibid.

It has already been indicated that Rāşid made use of this document and through the *Tārīḫ-i Rāşid,* as also through his partnership with Meḥmed Saʿīd Efendi, it is almost certain that İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa would have read this work as well.

The four scholars of Ottoman history studied below in this chapter include in addition to Göçek, Stefan Reichmuth, Orhan Salih, and Vefa Erginbaş. All four of these studies undervalue the significance of Meḥmed Saʿīd Efendi's early involvement with the project, simply noting this as a fact before moving on without mentioning this individual ever again and presenting a narrative in which İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa becomes the sole actor of any significance, indeed "the 'soul' of the press."[578] When Meḥmed Saʿīd Efendi is brought up as a member of the Ottoman embassy to France, he serves to supplement the contention as stated by Salih that "the major trend that started during the Tulip Age was the so-called Westernization of the Ottoman Empire, which was to a great extent sparked by the first long-term Ottoman embassy to France."[579] Likewise, Göçek argues that "the Ottoman interaction with the West through the embassy of Mehmed Efendi in 1721 created enduring impacts on Ottoman society," a consequence of which was that "a new type of Ottoman emerged, oriented toward the West and assimilating Western culture."[580]

These claims are precariously close to the outmoded Westernization paradigm, exemplified in the first chapter by Wayne S. Vucinich, whose 1965 history of the Ottoman Empire perceived the Müteferriḳa Press as the seminal element of a Europeanizing modernization program launched by Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha.[581] In contrast to Vucinich, and to Göçek and Salih as well, in seeking to apply Shirine Hamadeh's concept of *décloisonnement* to the intellectual history of the 1718-1730 period, the perspective of this study is that rather than an unprecedented form of encounter with European culture and technology which leads directly to the cultural and psychological Westernization of the Ottoman central elite, Yirmisekizçelebi's embassy and his embassy report represent instead the expanded interest in and experimental receptivity towards foreign cultural elements that was characteristic of the Ottoman capital's cultural environment in the early eighteenth century. This openness was devoid of any sentiments regarding the cultural inferiority of the Ottoman sphere, and neither was it unidirectional. Alongside the embassy to France, the 1718-1730 period involved embassies

---

[578] Sabev, "Waiting for Godot," 112.

[579] Ibid., 101.

[580] Göçek, *East Encounters West*, 81. Göçek further claims in this same passage that Meḥmed Saʿīd Efendi and İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa "wanted to establish the printing press to advance science and promulgate education in the Ottoman Empire," and that therefore "these two men attempted to identify a problem and solve it through a Western innovation." Such interpretations of the Müteferriḳa press not only overemphasize the European origins of the technology of the press at the expense of the Müteferriḳa press's immediate Ottoman context, they also frame the this endeavor squarely within a paradigm of Westernization.

[581] Vucinich, *The Ottoman Empire: Its Record and Legacy*, 79.

dispatched to the Persian court as well; and in addition to historiographical-geographic texts describing European societies, this period witnessed also the translation and publication of historiographical-geographies pertaining to Persia, China, and the Americas. The *Sefãretnãme,* like the books printed by İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa, should be contextualized within this broader intellectual scope.

Often, the cultural encounters which captured the interest of Yirmisekizçelebi, and which he subsequently incorporated into his embassy account, were precisely those aspects of French society that were familiar and comprehensible to him. Rather than evidencing an Ottoman encounter with alien European technologies and arts which prompts a process of "assimilating Western culture," the 1720-1721 embassy to France illustrates a historical moment in which the Ottoman elite emerge as engaged in conversations with shared trans-regional cultural qualities and values. Examples from the Yirmisekizçelebi *Sefãretnãme* which will presently be considered include a shared culture of *villeggiatura,* shared floral cultures, and common interests in hydraulics and water infrastructure and textiles. Much like how the means by which the integration of the styles of Persian palatial structures into the native architectural syntax of the Ottoman capital was enabled through shared aesthetic sensibilities, it was the intelligible nature of the shared cultural elements witnessed by Yirmisekizçelebi that endowed them with meaning and applicability for the Ottomans. Alongside this feature of comprehensibility is, however, another theme that runs through the *Sefãretnãme,* appearing also time and again in some of the texts translated under Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's direction as well as in some of the works printed by İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa. This is the quality of the "wonderful," or the "strange," expressed in the twin terms *acāyib and garāib*. Sir James W. Redhouse translates *garāîb* as "strange things."[582] *Acāyib,* on the other hand, is "wonderful, marvellous," and the plural of *acîbe* "wonder."[583] Yirmisekizçelebi deploys these terms on multiple occasions in his narrative. They also appear in some of the other texts produced between 1718-1730, most notably in the *Tārīḫ-i Hind-i Garbī* and the *Ḫıṭāy Sefãretnãmesi.* These terms, the *acāyib and garāib,* evoke the *acāyib* genre of Islamicate geographical literature which involved descriptions of the marvelous creations of God.[584] Datable to the early medieval period, these texts presented geographical and cosmographical accounts steeped with narrations of the semi-mythical.[585]

---

[582] Redhouse, *A Turkish and English Lexicon*, 1340.

[583] Ibid., 1286.

[584] C.E Dubler, *Encyclopedia of Islam* Second ed., s.v. "Adjāʾib," 2012 https://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopaedia-of-islam-2/adjaib-SIM_0319?s.num=0&s.au=%22Dubler%2C+C.E.%22 (accessed July 4, 2019). C.E. Bosworth and I. Afshari, *Encyclopedia Iranica,* I/7., s.v. "AJĀʾEB AL-MAḴLŪQĀT." 2011 http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/ajaeb-al-makluqat#pt2 (accessed July 4, 2019).

[585] C.E Dubler, *Encyclopedia of Islam* Second ed., s.v. "Adjāʾib," 2012

Therefore, the *acāyib and garāib* also reflect a shared pre-nineteenth century consciousness that unites the observations of Yirmisekizçelebi with the Timurid author of the *Ḫıṭāy Sefāretnāmesi*, and the Ottoman translator (İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa himself) of the *Tārīḫ-i Hind-i Garbī*. What differentiates the early eighteenth century from previous periods of Ottoman history is that the literate classes of the Ottoman center were open to and interested in the strange and the wonderful aspects of non-Ottoman cultural domains to a greater and more expansive degree than their predecessors. This explains why some of the texts produced under the grand vizierate of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha abound with semi-mythical descriptions of creatures, plants, and foreign customs and traditions.[586]

Ottoman engagement with French culture and society in the 1718-1730 period needs to be understood as part of the broader intercultural interactions characteristic of these years, interactions in which often a clear demarcation of foreign cultural elements as alien or foreign cannot conclusively be evidenced on the basis of the language employed in Ottoman texts (a point also expressed by Shirine Hamadeh in regard to the Ottoman reaction to French architectural motifs).[587] At the same time however, the intellectual *dêcloisonnement* of the early eighteenth century also involved also an appetite for manifestations of the strange and the wonderful as found in those non-Ottoman geographies described in the texts produced in these years.

An illustrative example that combines comprehensibility with the experience of the novel can be found in the early sections of Yirmisekizçelebi's *Sefāretnāme,* where he describes the Royal Canal of Languedoc. This structure seems to have made a deep impression on the Ottoman ambassador as evidenced by the fact that the carefully detailed account of the canal's mechanisms and measurements comprises the longest single narrative unit of the *Sefāretnāme* as incorporated into the *Tārīḫ-i Rāşid*.[588] The Ottoman embassy traversed the entire course of the Languedoc canal from around Sète in the south of France to the port of Toulouse.[589] Yirmisekizçelebi notes that through this innovation, one is able to commute between the Mediterranean Sea and the Atlantic Ocean through mainland France without setting foot on land.[590] At Toulouse, the canal connects to the Garonne river, which in turns flows all the way to the Atlantic.

Yirmisekizçelebi defines the Languedoc canal in the following terms: "this [thing] that they call a canal, is an invented-river brought together from the surrounding districts and

---

[586] Again, this is very reflective of the content of *acāib* works.
[587] Hamadeh*,* 221-226.
[588] Râşid, *Târîh-i Râşid,* 1239-1240.
[589] Ibid., 1239-1240.
[590] Ibid., 1239.

localities" (*bu kanal dedükleri, eṭrāf ü eknāfdan cemʿ olunmuş bir nehr-i muḥdeṣdir*).[591] Later, in remarking on the capital expended on the project and on the roads which were disconnected in the construction of the canal, reference is once again made to the "invention" (*iḥdāṣ*) of a river.[592] The Languedoc canal clearly embodied a representation of French engineering for the members of the Ottoman embassy; however, the stress placed by the Ottoman ambassador on the innovated technological nature of this waterway reflects the extent of the impact that this experience had on Yirmisekizçelebi. Furthermore, the account which he presents is filled with meticulous details, noting the precise rises and falls in elevation as the canal makes its way up towards Toulouse and the features of the fixed lock system of the canal.[593] In a fixed lock system, differences in elevation are compensated through shifts in the volume of water in the locks or chambers, which Yirmisekizçelebi calls pools (*havuz*).[594] The *Sefāretnāme* records the features of the Languedoc canal chambers as they were in 1721, noting the apertures and the time it takes for the shifts to be accomplished.[595] Yirmisekizçelebi also lists the precise number of locks that they passed, and notes the towns between which the elevation in the canal rose and where it fell.[596]

It may be tempting to interpret the extensive discussion of the Languedoc canal in Yirmisekizçelebi's account of his embassy as an astonished early first-hand encounter by the Ottoman state elite of an advanced and alien European technology. From the perspective of this interpretation, the sizeable space afforded the canal in the embassy report becomes a representation of a dawning Ottoman awareness of the superior efficacies of European technologies, and perhaps a blueprint by which this European innovation may be imported into the Ottoman Empire. The language which Yirmisekizçelebi uses, however, in describing the features of the canal effectively fits this structure within a recognized Ottoman cultural framework. The bridges, walls, and archways of the canal are expressed by the words *kemer* and *sedd*, which are the terms used to describe the archways and walls of the aqueducts, reservoirs, canals and other implements of the water infrastructure used by the Ottomans themselves in their empire.[597] The tendency of the Ottoman ambassador to evaluate his observations against a contextual Ottoman framework pervades his *Sefāretnāme,* so that the port of Bordeaux is described as being similar to that of Istanbul, the city of Paris as being smaller in population than the Ottoman capital, and the fountains at Versailles that recount a mythological fable are

---

[591] Ibid.
[592] Ibid., 1239-1240.
[593] Ibid.
[594] Ibid.
[595] Ibid., 1239.
[596] Ibid., 1239-1240.
[597] Ibid., 1240.

presented as narrating stories from the *Hümāyūnnāme,* a Persian book of tales familiar to the Ottomans.[598] Another example would be the tapestries exhibited for the Ottoman embassy at a royal textile mill, which are designated *kilim*, referring to the traditional Turkish carpets of Anatolia, by Yirmisekizçelebi.[599]

Yirmisekizçelebi's interest in the canal should be ascribed not to an amazed encounter of an advanced and alien innovation, but rather to the Ottoman state's own involvement with water infrastructure projects in the Ottoman capital in the 1718-1730 period. Following the court's return to Istanbul with the ascension of Sulṭan Aḥmed III in 1703, the roads, bridges, and landing docks, water networks and channels, fountains and dams and reservoirs were revamped, repaired, or constructed anew.[600] In 1722-1723, the Great Dam (*Büyük Bend*) was built in the forest of Belgrad in the Ottoman capital, and the water distribution systems erected to supply royal palaces in the suburbs of Istanbul expanded.[601] This is the context in which should be placed Yirmisekizçelebi's concern for a careful and mathematically precise recording of the details of the Languedoc canal. The interest of the Ottoman ambassador and Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha in these details is one example of the openness to foreign ideas and developments that characterizes the intellectual *décloisonnement* of the 1718-1730 period. Often, what most focused the cultural interactions of this openness were aspects of foreign societies that corresponded to cultural preoccupations already established within the Ottoman domain. This is further demonstrated by the fact that after the Languedoc canal, the descriptions of French *villeggiatura*, palatial architecture, fountains and gardens takes up the most space in Yirmisekizçelebi's embassy report.[602]

The extensive engagement of the Ottoman central elite, in particular senior government officials and members of the Ottoman dynasty, in cycles of leisurely retreats to countryside residences, or *villeggiatura,* in the 1718-1730 period was reviewed in the foregoing chapter. Excursions to pleasure pavilions situated along the banks of the Bosporus or around the different extramural suburban districts of the Ottoman capital became commonplace following the return of the Ottoman court to Istanbul in 1703. These activities seem to have multiplied after 1718 when a measure of stability was achieved along the European frontiers of the empire. It is highly likely that Yirmisekizçelebi and his son Meḥmed Saʿīd Efendi were both hosted at some point or perhaps regularly at the suburban residences constructed in Istanbul at this time, or even that they themselves possessed such property, although this study has not been able to identify them at any

---

[598] Ibid., 1240, 1248, 1251.
[599] Ibid., 1251.
[600] Hamadeh, *The City's Pleasures*, 4, 24.
[601] Ibid., 76.
[602] Râşid, *Târîh-i Râşid,* 1241, 1243, 1247-1250.

of the banquets or retreats described by Rāşid and Çelebizāde in their chronicles. At any rate, the countryside palaces of the French royal family and nobility, with their broad tree lined avenues and ornate garden complexes, their multi-storeyed fountains and terraced pools, encapsulated a form of courtly leisure and habitation with which the Ottoman ambassador would have been intimately familiar.[603]

Yirmisekizçelebi describes in detail a number of the aristocratic and royal palaces he visited over the course of his stay in France. These include the royal complex at Versailles, and in particular the palace of Trianon, the palace of the Duke of Orleans at Saint-Cloud and the royal residence at Marly.[604] The landscaped gardens of these residences are recorded with a careful detail to statistics that evokes the passage on the Languedoc canal. Yirmisekizçelebi notes the exact numbers of the fountains and their spouts which he observed, as well as the precise height to which these fountains sprayed water out.[605] He describes the architecture of the pools and the shapes and material of the statues that surround them.[606] At Marly, the manner by which trees have been groomed into one another to form a sort of curtain affects Yirmisekizçelebi to such an extent that he remarks how the sight witnessed to him the truth of the hadith which states that the created world constitutes a paradise for unbelievers and a dungeon for the righteous.[607] The tapestries, walls, and furniture of the rooms inside of the palaces are also described.[608]

The Ottoman correlate to the residences of the French dynasty and nobility were the waterside residences of Istanbul with their gardens, the canal and the avenues at *Sa'dābād*, as well as the large number of fountains, including the monumental fountain of Sulṭan Aḥmed III located before the outermost gate of the Topkapi palace, that were constructed at this time in Istanbul.[609] Yirmisekizçelebi's observations, therefore, and the ardent Ottoman interest in those aspects of French society and culture described in the *Sefāretnāme,* do not so much reflect the beginnings of Ottoman receptivity to European influences as they represent one branch of a broader Ottoman engagement with the somewhat altered qualities of a common cultural continuum which the Ottoman Empire shared with its neighbors in Europe and West Asia. Another example of this in Yirmisekizçelebi's *Sefāretnāme* is found in the Ottoman

---

[603] In fact, as Shirine Hamadeh has pointed out, the similarities between early eighteenth century French and Ottoman courtly *villeggiatura* has compelled scholars of Ottoman history to overstate the influence that the Ottoman embassy to France had on the development of Ottoman waterside residences and pleasure pavilions after 1721. Hamadeh, *The City's Pleasures*, 225-226.
[604] Râşid, *Târîh-i Râşid*, 1247-1250.
[605] Ibid., 1247-1248.
[606] Ibid.
[607] Ibid., 1249.
[608] Ibid., 1249-1250.
[609] Hamadeh, *The City's Pleasures*.

ambassador's enthusiastic reaction upon encountering the flower garden of the warden of the Bordeaux castle.[610] Before moving on to identify the flowers as Cretan tulips, Yirmisekizçelebi remarks his surprise with the phrase "as it happened, the warden was a flower-cultivator" (*meger dizdār şükūfe-perver imiş*).[611] The narration of this event indicates that Yirmisekizçelebi enjoyed the tour and banquet organized for him at the castle of Bordeaux, and he seems to have found the city as a whole pleasurable as well, comparing it favorably with the port of Istanbul and describing the variety of shipping vessels anchored there.[612] This interaction between the Ottoman ambassador and the French warden in the flower gardens upon the terraces of the castle at Bordeaux is an illustrative example of what Ariel Salzmann terms the "floral intertext of mass consumer society," which she defines to the denote cultural symbols that united diverse societies across the Mediterranean and Asia in a shared set of "apocryphal as well as conjunctural meanings."[613]

A closer analysis of Yirmisekizçelebi's *Sefāretnāme* reveals therefore a more pervasive presence of the shared and the familiar in the experiences of the Ottoman embassy than might at first appear. However, alongside the comprehensible, there appear also instances of the unusual and the bizarre. One of the longest descriptive sections after the canal and the palaces consists in Yirmisekizçelebi's relation of a showing of the French opera. The *Sefāretnāme* defines the opera as a "play particular to the city of Paris" (*Paris şehrine maḫṣūṣ bir luʿb*) in which strange arts (*acāyib ṣanʿatlar*) were performed.[614] The stage mechanics, the music, the clothing and arrangement of the audience (consisting of the nobility), the interior architecture of the opera hall as well as the plot of the show witnessed by Yirmisekizçelebi are all described.[615] Although the Ottoman embassy would have been familiar with public spectacles and shadow theater, the opera was in itself certainly a novel experience which, in this case, due to its very novelty appears to have fixated Yirmisekizçelebi's attention. The shifts in the stage sets in particular are described as "*acāyib u garāib*".[616] Other descriptions in the *Sefāretnāme* where the terms *acāyib* and *garāib* are deployed include the trees and statues at Versailles, the plants and flowers of a greenhouse which included specimens from the Americas, the creatures housed in the Parisian

---

[610] Râşid, *Târîh-i Râşid*, 1240.
[611] Ibid.
[612] Which castle in Bordeaux it was precisely that Yirmisekizçelebi visited this study has not been able to conclusively affirm. Yirmisekizçelebi refers to it simply as "the castle of Bordeaux" (*Bordo kalʾası*). However, judging from eighteenth-century images that show flower gardens upon its terraces, it seems highly likely that this was the now destroyed massive Château Trompette, which used to look down upon the port of Bordeaux. Yirmisekizçelebi also notes that the castle he visited commanded a view of the port and was situated so that the entire city could be seen from its ramparts. Ibid.
[613] Salzmann, "The Age of Tulips: Confluence and Conflict in Early Modern Consumer Culture (1550-1730)," 88.
[614] Râşid, *Târîh-i Râşid*, 1246.
[615] Ibid.
[616] Ibid.

zoo which again included an animal from the Americas described by Yirmisekizçelebi by comparing its various parts to those of animals he was familiar with, the tools and implements witnessed at the Paris Observatory, and the custom of the French nobility of observing the king's mourning routine.[617]

The preceding analysis indicates that above all, the 1720-1721 Ottoman embassy to France seems to have been concerned with collecting cultural, technological, and anthropological knowledge pertaining to those segments of the French environment witnessed by Yirmisekizçelebi and his compatriots. The official purpose of the Ottoman embassy was to deliver to the French court the sultan's authorization for the French restoration of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, a task for which as Göçek points out there need not have been an entire diplomatic delegation dispatched.[618] It should also be noted that the interactions of the Ottoman embassy were restricted to the French nobility and the French king. This was natural as the visiting Ottomans were members of an imperial embassy. Nonetheless, this qualification means that the Ottoman embassy's experience exemplifies an encounter between two early eighteenth-century court societies. This aspect is constantly evoked by Yirmisekizçelebi's description of those Frenchmen partaking in the banquets and entertainments arranged for the Ottomans as "the polite" (*kibār*), and clearly distinguishing them from the "public" (*ḥalḳ*) that crowded the streets whenever the Ottomans commuted from one location to another.[619]

In the form of Yirmisekizçelebi's *Sefāretnāme,* the Ottoman embassy to France produced an intellectual document that recorded a modest quantity of descriptions relating at times in great detail certain features of French society and culture. In this capacity, as a text communicating cultural, geographic, and anthropological knowledge to the courtly elite of the Ottoman capital, the *Sefāretnāme,* as well as the entire embassy itself, should be seen as one of the major components of a larger intellectual program that consisted in producing in the Ottoman-Turkish literary language a quantity of studies that involved descriptions of the various features of foreign cultural spheres. Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha was the principal agent responsible for the organization of this embassy. The extent of his power and influence at this time is evidenced by the fact that two letters were delivered by Yirmisekizçelebi to the twelve-year old French king, one from the sultan and the other from Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha.[620] Philippe II, the Duke of Orleans and Regent of France (d.1723), the active ruling power at the time in France, received a letter only from Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha.[621]

---

[617] Ibid., 1242, 1247, 1250, 1252-1253.
[618] Göçek, *East Encounters West*, 10.
[619] Râşid, *Târîh-i Râşid*, 1246
[620] Ibid., 1243.
[621] Ibid.

In addition to being the main force behind the first ever Ottoman embassy to France, Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha was also the chief investor who subsidized the translation committees established in Istanbul after 1718. The subject matter of the works translated by these committees, as well as separately at the same time by scholars and scribes commissioned individually by the grand vizier, were similar in many ways to the observations recorded by Yirmisekizçelebi in his *Sefāretnāme* and to the topics discussed in the books published by İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa. It is to these "Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha translations" that this chapter now turns.

The Translations of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha

Between 1720 and 1730, a total of six manuscripts were translated from the Arabic, Persian, and German languages to Ottoman-Turkish under the auspices of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha.[622] Two of these translations were divided among committees and the other four were assigned to individual scholars.[623] Five of these six works were histories while the sixth was a travelogue that can be interpreted as a geographic-historiographical text. In addition, per the request of *şeyhülislām* Abdullah Efendi and Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha, Aristotle's *Physics* was translated from Greek into Arabic by a committee of indeterminate size.[624] Since this work was translated into Arabic, and since other works, such as a celestial atlas translated from Latin by İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa and two texts on medicine, were commissioned separately by individuals other than the grand vizier, they are excluded from the study here. In this section only the six historiographical works translated into Ottoman-Turkish under the direction of the grand vizier will be scrutinized.

The complete register of elite *'ālims* and scribal bureaucrats assigned to the committees tasked with the translations of the *'Aynī Tārīḫi* and the *Ḥabībü's-siyer,* provided by Çelebizāde in his account for the events of the year 1138/1726, show the frequent presence in these committees of clients of the grand vizier.[625] The proper title for the work that came to be called by the Ottomans the *'Aynī Tārīḫi* was *'Ikdü'l-cümân fî târihi ehli'z-zamân*.[626] Çelebizāde explains how a copy of this work was discovered among the legacy left behind by a certain *kadı* named Muʿīd Aḥmed Efendi by Kethüdā Meḥmed Efendi, who in turn presented the work to Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha.[627] The grand vizier upon receiving this copy is described as

[622] Salim Aydüz, "Lâle Devri'nde yapılan ilmî faaliyetler, " *Divan Dergisi* (January 1997).
[623] Aydüz, "Lâle Devri'nde yapılan ilmî faaliyetler."
[624] Ibid.
[625] Çelebizâde, *Târîh-i Çelebizâde*, 1484-1485.
[626] Ibid., 1484.
[627] Ibid.

"immediately" commissioning a translation for Sulṭan Aḥmed III.[628] The *'Aynī Tārīḫi* was a universal history composed in the Arabic language by the medieval *'ālim* Bedreddīn 'Aynī .[629] Constituted of twenty-four volumes, each comprising around eight-hundred pages, the *'Aynī Tārīḫi* required a committee of thirty individuals for its translation into Ottoman-Turkish .[630]

The *'Aynī Tārīḫi* falls most comfortably into the category of the Islamocentric "universal histories" described in the second chapter. Four of the thirteen texts produced under Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's patronage comprised historiographical studies of regions within the Ottoman domain. Two of these were the *Cāmi'u'd-düvel* and the *'Aynī Tārīḫi,* and the other two were the sixth and seventh books published by İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa. The argument presented here is not that every historiographical work translated, composed, or printed with the support of the grand vizier in the 1718-1730 period presents an example of engagement with the histories, geographies, and customs of foreign cultural spheres. Rather, considering the incidental and private nature of the few instances in Ottoman historiography before 1718 where references are made to territories beyond the Ottoman Empire, the fact that the majority of the historiographical-geographical works produced under state supervision in 1718-1730 were focused beyond the Ottoman domain indicates an unprecedented development in Ottoman intellectual history that, coupled with the embassy to France, reflects a distinct phenomenon which this paper has sought to understand within the framework of intellectual *décloisonnement.*

One way in which the *'Aynī Tārīḫi* does resemble those works of the 1718-1730 period that describe foreign geographies is in its intellectual scope. Aydüz notes that Bedreddīn 'Aynī 's history was not restricted to a chronological narrative of events but that it also contained information on geography, nature, zoology, and "many other fields."[631] Whether the same could be said of the *Ḥabībü's-siyer fī aḫbāri efrādi'l- beşer* of Hāndmīr Gıyāseddīn Muḥammed (d.1535) cannot be ascertained based on the comments of Aydüz. Aydüz mentions only that this work was a three volume history of Persia comprising the Timurid and Safavid periods.[632] Çelebizāde presents a group of eight individuals selected for translating this work from Persian into Ottoman-Turkish.[633] It does therefore represent a historiographical work focused beyond the Ottoman Empire, and it is also one of the three Persian histories found in the group of thirteen texts studied here. The other two are the *Tārīḫ-i 'Ālemārāy-i 'Abbāsī,* and the *Tārīḫ-i seyyāh der beyān-ı zuhūr-ı Aġvāniyān ve-inhidām-ı devlet-i Ṣafeviyān,* the latter a book translated and

---

[628] Ibid.
[629] Aydüz, "Lâle Devri'nde yapılan ilmî faaliyetler."
[630] Ibid.
[631] Ibid.
[632] Ibid.
[633] Çelebizâde, *Târîh-i Çelebizâde*, 1485.

printed by İbrāḥīm Müteferriḳa. Another book printed by Müteferriḳa, the *Tārīḫ-i Timur Gurkan,* although a history of Timur, can also be included among the Persian histories as a great deal of its content actually covers the geography of Iran.

The emphasis in the 1718-1730 texts on Persian historiographical-geographies, as noted also by Aydüz and Salih, was undoubtedly related to the Afghan overthrow of the Safavid dynasty in Persia after 1722 and the subsequent military and diplomatic Ottoman involvement there.[634] However, this interest should also be situated within the context of the expanded intellectual openness to Persian culture, as manifested also in poetry, gardening, and palatial architecture, prevalent at the time in the Ottoman court.[635] Therefore, the Persian histories translated under Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha constitute an important aspect of this "West Asian branch" of the intellectual *décloisonnement* of the 1718-1730 period. The translation movement of the grand vizier produced two of these texts: the *Ḥabībü's-siyer* and the *Tārīḫ-i ʿĀlemārāy-i ʿAbbāsī.* The *Tārīḫ-i ʿĀlemārāy-i ʿAbbāsī* was the work of the Persian-Turkmen historian Iskender Beg Munshī (d.1634), and was translated from Persian at the personal request of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha in 1729 by a certain Meḥmed Nebīh (d.?), an *ʿālim*.[636] Aydüz asserts that this text provides ethnographic information on the Turkmen tribes resident in Persia in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and Roger M. Savory's 1930 translation of the text does to an extent corroborate Aydüz's claim.[637] The overriding momentum of the *Tārīḫ-i ʿĀlemārāy-i ʿAbbāsī* is driven by a linear narration of political and military events. Beginning with Shāh İsmāil's (d.1524) rebellion against the Akkoyunlu Turkmen confederacy, the text moves through to chronicle the conflicts in which the Safavid emperors were involved up until the reign of Shāh ʿAbbās I (d.1629). Different sections of the work employ different organizational principles. The earlier chapters follow the campaigns and conquests of the emperors preceding Shāh ʿAbbās, pausing to include after the chronicle of Shāh Tahmasp I's reign (d.1574) a long segment of biographical entries on poets, calligraphers, government officials and scribes, musicians and physicians and holy personages.[638] After this the narrative resumes and follows once again a structure patterned on significant events (almost exclusive military campaigns and political intrigue) which the author seems to have deemed pertinent. The section on Shāh ʿAbbās is then introduced with twelve separate discourses on the qualities and achievements of this sovereign,

---

[634] Aydüz, "Lâle Devri'nde yapılan ilmî faaliyetler." Orlin Sabev, "The First Ottoman Turkish Printing Enterprise," 78.
[635] The influence of Persian culture on Ottoman literature has a long pedigree, see for example Murat Umut Inan, "Imperial Ambitions, Mystical Aspirations: Persian Learning in the Ottoman World" in *The Persianate World: The Frontiers of a Eurasian Lingua France* ed. Nile Green, (Oakland: University of California Press, 2019).
[636] Aydüz, "Lâle Devri'nde yapılan ilmî faaliyetler."
[637] Ibid.
[638] Eskandar Beg Monshi, *History of Shah Abbas the Great (Tārīk-e ʿĀlamārā-ye ʿAbbāsī) Vol I* trans. Roger M. Savory (Boulder: Westview Press Inc, 1930), 283.

and then the work switches its organizational scheme again and separate entries for each year between 1587 and 1628 are provided.

Where the twelve translations commissioned by Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha and printed by İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa delve into physical geography and cultural and social anthropology, they essentially achieve this in one of two ways. Either these descriptions are incorporated into the narrative of political and military events, or they are afforded their own separate headings and sub-sections. The *Tārīḫ-i ʿĀlemārāy-i ʿAbbāsī* employs both methods. For example, in the account of Shāh İsmāīl's conquest of Khuzestan, Iskender Beg Munshī details the practices of an Arab tribe inhabiting a district in that province, noting that they had deified the prophet Ali, and explaining the violence of their devotional ceremonies.[639] In another example, the population of the province of Astarabad is presented as "not entirely immune from diabolical suggestions, original sin, and temporary derangement of the brain," qualities which are ascribed to the climate of the region.[640] A disorderly and mischievous clique known as the "black-robed ones" are also described as being resident in this area.[641] Similar passages can be found in the narration of Shāh Tahmasp's invasion of Georgia as well.[642] There is also a section in this work which Roger Savory has translated as "strange happenings and wondrous events" [*acāyib u garāib*] under Shāh Tahmasp" which recount earthquakes, flames observed in the sky, grain falling from the clouds, and the exploits of hashish addicts.[643]

Unfortunately, without engaging with the Ottoman translation of Meḥmed Nebīh there is no way to confirm whether, to what degree, and in what form these passages were included in the edition prepared for Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha. Savory's translation does illustrate, however, the general nature of this work, showing how cultural and anthropological anecdotes, as well as general geographical outlines noting the locations of towns, streams, and mountains, were woven into the historical narrative. Aydüz's statement that Iskender Beg Munshī's text was in particular an important source for the Ottomans on the reign of Shāh ʿAbbās I indicates the probability that the later sections of the *Tārīḫ-i ʿĀlemārāy-i ʿAbbāsī* were translated by Meḥmed Nebīh.[644] The detailed descriptions of the public works and palace complexes constructed under Shāh ʿAbbās I are notable. One of the twelve discourses on Shāh ʿAbbās I in this part of the work meticulously lists the structures founded by this sovereign by the city or the region in which they were

---

[639] Eskandar Beg Monshi, *History of Shāh Abbas the Great (Tārīk-e ʿĀlamārā-ye ʿAbbāsī) Vol I*, 56-57.
[640] Ibid., 175.
[641] Ibid., 175-177.
[642] Ibid. 140-141.
[643] Ibid., 226-228.
[644] Aydüz, "Lâle Devri'nde yapılan ilmî faaliyetler.".

located.[645] The annual entries composed for the period between 1587 and 1628 also provide greatly detailed descriptions of the construction projects of Shāh 'Abbās I. For instance, when presenting the expansion of palatial structures and public works undertaken in the Naqsh-e Jahan district of Isfahan in 1598, Iskender Beg Munshī provides a precise report of the number of gardens that were constructed, the types of trees that were planted there and the number of terraces built into the gardens, the material used on the porticoes, balconies and in the murals of the pavilions, and the channels into which the river was directed so that it would flow through all of the gardens.[646] There is also information on bridges and pools and on the length of the avenues that were revamped.[647]

In these descriptions of palatial architecture, with their emphasis on hydraulics, Iskender Beg Munshī's text resembles those passages in Yirmisekizçelebi's *Sefāretnāme* that relate the French gardens and palaces visited by the Ottoman ambassador. In this sense, and particularly in the sections covering Shāh 'Abbās I's reign, the *Tārīḫ-i 'Ālemārāy-i 'Abbāsī* becomes a source comprehending Persian architecture and *villegiatura*. The argument, as will be discussed below, has been made that the translation of Persian historiographies into Ottoman-Turkish under Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha had a utilitarian purpose tied to the Afghan invasions of Iran in the 1720s. Such a contention goes beyond the idea of an increased interest related to current affairs by attaching a specific definition of function to these texts. However, it is useful to question the actual utilitarian value of these texts. In the case of Iskender Beg Munshī's work, the significance of the translation of a work detailing seventeenth-century Persian architectural programs at a time when novel developments in Ottoman architecture in Istanbul were incorporating Persian elements should caution scholars from approaching the *Tārīḫ-i 'Ālemārāy-i 'Abbāsī* as a text of practical military and diplomatic value. Moreover, it is questionable what the immediate practical value of a work describing events up to two centuries prior to the eighteenth century might have had for the statesmen of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's time.

Another translation commissioned by the grand vizier and assigned to an individual scholar was the *Ḫıṭāy Sefāretnāmesi*. The author of this text was the princely ambassador Hoca Gıyāseddīn Naḳḳāş (d.?), who travelled to the Chinese capital at Beijing in the fifteenth century as part of a delegation of diplomats dispatched by a group of Timurid lords.[648] The Ottoman-

---

[645] Eskandar Beg Monshi, *History of Shāh Abbas the Great (Tārīk-e 'Ālamārā-ye 'Abbāsī) Vol I*, 535-537.

[646] Eskandar Beg Monshi, *History of Shāh Abbas the Great (Tārīk-e 'Ālamārā-ye 'Abbāsī) Vol II* trans. Roger M. Savory (Boulder: Westview Press Inc, 1930), 724-725.

[647] Ibid.

[648] Muhaderre N. Özerdim, "Acaib-ül-Letaif (Hıtay Sefaretnamesi) ile Çin Kaynakları Arasında İlgi" in *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi* Vol. 3 No. 2 (1950), 345.

Turkish translation of this Persian work was accomplished by Çelebizāde in 1727.[649] In the process, Çelebizāde converted the original title, *'Acāyib-ül-leṭāif,* which may roughly be translated as "pleasant words regarding strange wonders," to *Ḫıṭāy Sefāretnāmesi*, or *Travelogue of China*. Compiled upon Naḳḳāş's return to Herat in 1422, the *Ḫıṭāy Sefāretnāmesi* is a record of the peculiar customs, eating habits, religious ceremonies, and royal, judicial, and leisurely practices witnessed by the members of the Timurid embassy over the course of their voyage across Inner Asia and their provisional residence at the Chinese court between 1419 and 1422. The body of the text comprises the residence at Beijing.

Alongside descriptions of customs and habits, Naḳḳāş provides relatively detailed observations regarding architecture and physical geography. For example, in the Inner Asian cities of Tarkan and Kamel (modern Turpan and Ḥāmī), the Timurid ambassador clearly appears impressed by the large Buddhist temples with their numerous statues.[650] Indicating that the inhabitants were idolaters, Naḳḳāş relates the splendor of the temples' murals and the astonishing beauty of a copper statue of the Buddha.[651] Where the Timurid embassy is hosted at military outposts between towns, the text goes into detail describing the form of the Chinese tents, their material and the manner in which they were set up, as well as the nature of the shades put up to screen the banquets organized for the delegation by local imperial officials.[652] At Sekçu (modern Dunhuang), a precise account is presented of the walls, public squares, bazaars, and temples.[653] Naḳḳāş notes that covered towers were placed once every twenty steps along the walls.[654] A perhaps superficial similarity between Naḳḳāş's *Sefāretnāme* and that of Yirmisekizçelebi regarding infrastructure and communications along waterways emerges in the section where Naḳḳāş describes the particular means by which the Chinese had moored and chained boats to create a bridge across the Yellow River.[655] And where for Yirmisekizçelebi Istanbul and the Bosporus provided a comparative framework for his observations, Naḳḳāş relates his assessments of the Yellow River to the Amu Darya (the Oxus River).[656] However, the *Ḫıṭāy Sefāretnāmesi* most closely resembles the *Sefāretnāme* of Yirmisekizçelebi when Naḳḳāş begins describing the Chinese capital.

---

[649] Ibid.
[650] Ibid., 350-351.
[651] Ibid.
[652] Ibid., 351-352.
[653] Ibid., 352.
[654] Ibid.
[655] Ibid., 355.
[656] Ibid.

Upon their arrival at Beijing, the members of the Timurid delegation where housed in a number of royal villas.[657] Over the course of their residence here they were routinely hosted at royal banquets and audiences, in some of which they also got to experience the sentencing of criminals brought before the Chinese sovereign from across the Chinese Empire.[658] Naḳḳāş provides exact measurements (to the extent that he is able to do so) where he describes the public squares, royal pavilions, and imperial palace of the Chinese capital.[659] For example, in his first account of the royal pavilion where the Chinese emperor initially welcomes the Timurid embassy, Naḳḳāş notes the area of the foundation upon which the structure stands, the height of the pillars that support the pavilion and the area of the pavilion itself.[660] He indicates that timber-framed structures atop stone foundations were the architectural norm in Beijing.[661] Naḳḳāş even measures out the size of the calligraphy on the murals decorating the interior of the imperial audience chamber, and he remarks also on the material, size, and shape of the various thrones upon which the Chinese emperor was seated in the various receptions organized for the ambassadors.[662] Further descriptions of food and music, of porcelain and sculpture and painting, adolescent male dancers, burial rites, and palatial architecture in general abound in the *Ḫıṭāy Sefāretnāmesi*.[663] This work should therefore be interpreted chiefly as a record of cultural and social commentaries produced by a late medieval Persianate scribal official. As one of the documents translated under Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's supervision, Naḳḳāş's travelogue provides an additional example of the presence of an outward facing intellectual disposition in the textual culture of the early eighteenth century Ottoman court.

The similarities noted here between works like the *Ḫıṭāy Sefāretnāmesi,* the *Tārīḫ-i ʿĀlemārāy-i ʿAbbāsī,* and the *Sefāretnāme* of Yirmisekizçelebi taken together represent a notable openness in the intellectual concerns of the Ottoman central elite towards foreign cultural realms and social geographies. One final example of this openness found in the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha translations is the *Nemçe Tārīḫi,* translated in 1722 at the request of the grand vizier by Temeşvārlı Osman Ağa (d.1725), an Ottoman officer held captive by the Habsburgs for several years who was conversant in Hungarian and German.[664] A history of the Habsburg state culled from a number of anonymous German sources, this was perhaps the first Ottoman

---

[657] Ibid., 358.
[658] Ibid., 357.
[659] Ibid., 356-361.
[660] Ibid., 356.
[661] Ibid.
[662] Ibid., 357, 359-360.
[663] Ibid., 357-365.
[664] Aydüz, "Lâle Devri'nde yapılan ilmî faaliyetler."

historiographical work on Central Europe composed solely from Central European sources.[665] Out of the thirteen works studied in this chapter, the *Nemçe Tārīḫi* comprises one of the two texts (the other being Yirmisekizçelebi's *Sefāretnāme*) that focus exclusively on a European state. It should be noted also that Temeşvārlı Osman Ağa was employed in the *Bāb-ı 'Āli* as a translator.[666]

The only historiographical text translated by the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha translation movement not considered thus far is the *Cāmi'u'd-düvel.* Falling into the category of traditional Ottoman dynastic histories considered in chapter two, this was a relatively recent work at the time of its translation, having been compiled by an Ottoman, Müneccimbaşı Derviş Aḥmed Dede (d.1702), in Arabic in the final quarter of the seventeenth century.[667] Beginning with the rise to power of the first Ottoman sultan, Osman I (d.1326), Müneccimbaşı Derviş Aḥmed Dede chronicled mostly military and political events taking place under the reigns of the various Ottoman sultans who ruled up until the year 1673.[668] Aḥmed Ağırakça states that this work was delegated by Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha to a committee including Aḥmed Nedīm.[669] There is however no consensus regarding this contention and Aydüz argues that Aḥmed Nedīm translated the entire work by himself between 1720 and 1730.[670] Therefore, this paper has not included the *Cāmi'u'd-düvel* among the works committed by the grand vizier to his translation committees, although this may very well have been the case.

In conclusion, between 1718 and 1730, Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha desired and subsidized the translation of a total of six historiographical works, four of which were centered on foreign geographies (Persia, China, and the Habsburg Empire). Likewise, in 1729 and 1730, İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa printed six historiographical works of which four covered realms beyond the Ottoman domain, in this case the Americas, Persia, and the Western Mediterranean. In many ways, the subject matter and thematic scope of İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa's books mirror those of the works translated under Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha. They can therefore be seen as an extension of the intellectual movement embodied by the grand vizier's translations.

The Books of the İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa Printing Press

Between January 1729 and August 1730 (mere weeks before the Patrona Ḫalīl Revolt of September 1730), İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa printed eight books. Six of these were historiographical and geographical texts. Of the other two, one was the *Lugat-ı Vankulu,* and the other the

---

[665] Ibid.
[666] Ibid.
[667] Ahmed bin Lütfullah Müneccimbaşı, *Camiü'd-Düvel* ed. Ahmed Ağırakça (Istanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 1995), 24-29.
[668] Ibid.
[669] Ibid., 37-40.
[670] Aydüz, "Lâle Devri'nde yapılan ilmî faaliyetler."

Grammaire turque, a French text explaining Turkish grammar preprared and printed at the request of the French embassy, and meant to be used by pupils being trained as translators by the French in Istanbul.[671] Orhan Salih, in his study of the probate inventory of İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa, concludes that these two works had the highest sale percentages of all the books printed between 1729 and 1744.[672]

Several months after printing the *Lugat-ı Vankulu,* the İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa press published Kātip Çelebi's *Tüḥfetü'l-kibār fī esfāri'l-biḥār* in May 1729.[673] In 1732 and 1733, İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa printed two more works of Kātip Çelebi, including the *Cihān-nümā,* a geographical compendium incorporating translations from European geographical texts.[674] For reasons that will be outlined below, however, these latter publications should be analyzed separately from the Müteferriḳa press editions of 1729-1730. Kātip Çelebi was one of the few pre-eighteenth century Ottoman scholars who engaged with European texts and included material on European states in his works. The *Tüḥfetü'l-kibār* is a history of Ottoman naval warfare, finalized in the last year of its author's life, in which the bulk of the text covers naval campaigns between 1460 and the 1650s.[675] The latter sections of the work include short biographical sketches of Ottoman naval commanders, advice regarding naval warfare, and detailed accounts of naval equipment and types of naval craft.[676] The most pertinent segment of the work for the purposes of this paper is the prefatory geographical descriptions that precede the historical narrative.[677] Kātip Çelebi begins this section with a statement defending his use of European texts in composing the *Tüḥfetü'l-kibār* by asserting that the "infidels" had excelled in the science of geography to the point where they had utilized it to reach the New World and the Indian subcontinent.[678] He then explains that the earth is divided into two hemispheres, one containing the Old World and the other the New World, before noting that more detailed information regarding these matters has been provided in his *Cihān-nümā.*[679]

Although the geographical descriptions of the *Tüḥfetü'l-kibār's* preface are quite succinct, they are nonetheless detailed. Measurements of distances are provided in the accounts of the various islands and fortifications controlled by the Venetians along the coast of the Morea

---

[671] Watson, "Ibrahim Muteferika and Turkish Incunabula," 437, 439.
[672] Sabev, "The First Ottoman Turkish Printing Enterprise," 84-85.
[673] Watson, "Ibrahim Muteferika and Turkish Incunabula," 437.
[674] Ibid., 439.
[675] Kâtip Çelebi, *Deniz Savaşları Hakkında Büyüklere Armağan (Tuhfetü'l-Kibâr Fî Esfâri'l-Bihâr)* (Istanbul: Kabalcı Yayınevi, 2007).
[676] Kâtip Çelebi, *Deniz Savaşları Hakkında Büyüklere Armağan (Tuhfetü'l-Kibâr Fî Esfâri'l-Bihâr)*, 165-197.
[677] Ibid., 17-25.
[678] Ibid., 17.
[679] Ibid., 17-18.

and in the Adriatic Sea.[680] The size of the fortresses, the length and area of the islands, and the presence of villages, rivers, mountains, and water mills are described while short historical anecdotes, regarding for example the local nobility of the island of Corfu, are occasionally included.[681] The most analytic and extensive section concerns Venice. Kātip Çelebi defines Venice as a city state and notes that its territory comprehends sixty small islands, that it is inhabited by three-hundred-thousand people divided into sixty-four neighborhoods, and that a total of six-thousand boats and four-hundred and fifty bridges of stone and timber service the Venetians.[682] He also explains that the population of Venice is divided into three classes and remarks on the "*acāyib* and *garāib*" Basilica of Saint Mark.[683] In describing Venice, Kātip Çelebi also makes explicit reference to two "Frankish" works that he has consulted.[684] The geographical preface of the *Tüḥfetü'l-kibār* ends with a very brief gloss on the Italian, French, and Spanish Mediterranean coasts.[685]

The first historiographical book printed by İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa, therefore, contained a short but detailed geographical essay on the northern shores of the Mediterranean Sea. Afterwards, in August 1729, Müteferriḳa printed the *Tārīḫ-i seyyāḥ der beyān-ı zuhūr-ı Afġāniyān ve-inhidām-ı devlet-i Ṣafeviyān* (*The History of a Traveller in the Beginning of the Afghan invasions and the Fall of the Safavid Government*).[686] This was a very recent work, a Latin text composed in 1727 by Tadeusz Juda Krusinski (d.1756), a Jesuit procurator resident in Isfahan at the time of the Afghan invasions.[687] Aydüz indicates that İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa himself translated this work into Ottoman-Turkish at the request of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha and Sulṭān Aḥmed III.[688] Therefore, the *Tārīḫ-i seyyāḥ* can be included among the texts of the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha translation movement. Its translation and subsequent publication by İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa evidences on the one hand Müteferriḳa's own involvement with this movement while at the same time providing a direct physical link between the translations and the printing press, reinforcing the notion that these two enterprises embody a single process.

In being the translation of a contemporary eyewitness account of Persia, the *Tārīḫ-i seyyāḥ* provides the most convincing example for the argument that the texts produced between 1718 and 1730 entailed utilitarian functions. In the case of this text, the composition of which was concluded a mere two years before Müteferriḳa's translation and publication, a utilitarian

---

[680] Ibid., 19-21.
[681] Ibid.
[682] Ibid., 22-23.
[683] Ibid., 23.
[684] Ibid., 24.
[685] Ibid., 24-25.
[686] Watson, "Ibrahim Muteferika and Turkish Incunabula," 437.
[687] Ibid.
[688] Aydüz, "Lâle Devri'nde yapılan ilmî faaliyetler."

analysis is valid. At the same time, however, the geographic and cultural information contained in the *Tārīḫ-i seyyāḥ* regarding regions and societies situated east of the Ottoman frontier should not be overlooked. For example, Krusinski sketches a colorful anthropological assessment of the Afghan tribes early on in his manuscript, declaring that they would eat wild grasses without ceremony, that they would bind intestines filled with water around their waists to keep themselves warm, and that they had extraordinary and coarse garments which they washed in muddy water.[689] Moreover, their women felt no need to veil themselves due to their sheer ugliness.[690] More flattering descriptions of towns and fortresses are often inserted where the narrative dwells on the various campaigns and sieges that took place in Persia and Afghanistan in 1722-1727. Examples include Julfa, Isfahan, Kandahar, Cashween, and Farhabad.[691] The vineyards, gardens, fishponds and lakes, palaces and residents of Farhabad in particular are described as resembling paradise.[692]

Following the *Tārīḫ-i seyyāḥ,* İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa published in March 1730 the *Tārīḫ-i Hind-i Garbī*.[693] Of the thirteen texts studied in this chapter, this historiographical-geography by far contains the greatest volume of social, cultural, zoological, botanical and geographical descriptions. The *Tārīḫ-i Hind-i Garbī* was compiled from a number of Italian translations of sixteenth-century Spanish texts on the Americas in the mid-sixteenth century by Meḥmed bin Emīr el-Ḥasan el-Suʿūdī (d.1591).[694] The illustrations printed in the Müteferriḳa edition of el-Ḥasan el-Suʿūdī's manuscript depicted some of the exotic and semi-mythical creatures and plants described in the work.[695] Of all of the 1718-1730 texts, the element of the *acāyib* and the *garāib* is most extensively exhibited by the descriptive passages found throughout the *Tārīḫ-i Hind-i Garbī*. These are both integrated within the historical narratives relating the exploits of Christopher Columbus (d.1506), Hernan Cortes (d.1547), and Francisco Pizzaro (d.1541), and arranged also into short botanical and zoological sections placed at the end of the work.

The *Tārīḫ-i Hind-i Garbī* opens with a cosmographical and geographical exposition, focused mostly on the oceans and the seas, that is based on medieval Arabic sources.[696] That the text then moves on to describe at length through its European source texts the geography of

---

[689] Tadeusz Jan Krusinski, *The chronicles of a traveller: or, A history of the Afghan wars with Persia, in the beginning of the last century, from their commencement to the accession of Sultan Ashruf* ed. Johann Cristian Clodius (London: James Ridgway, Piccadilly, 1840), 26.
[690] Ibid., 27.
[691] Ibid., 29, 102-103, 121-123, 133-134, 140-141.
[692] Ibid., 102.
[693] Watson, "İbrahim Muteferika and Turkish Incunabula," 437.
[694] Vefa Erginbaş, "Enlightenment in the Ottoman Context: Ibrahim Mutefferika and His Intellectual Landscape," 74. Although Thomas Goodrich argues that Meḥmed bin Emīr el-Ḥasan el-Suʿūdī Suudi was not the author of this work, Erginbaş, writing after Goodrich, states that this has in fact been established.
[695] Goodrich, *The Ottoman Turks and the New World,* 56-57.
[696] Ibid., 77-143.

Central and South America means that the *Tārīḫ-i Hind-i Garbī* presents also an interesting amalgamation of the classical Greco-Islamic geographical scholarship available to the Ottoman scholars with sixteenth-century European works. The body of the text involves a chronicle of fifteenth and sixteenth century Spanish activities in the Americas heavily perforated with definitions and explanations of animals and plants native to the New World. Examples of these include maize, the coconut, cacao, guava, and avocado trees, iguanas and armadillos, llamas and tapirs and anteaters.[697] Alongside these are included mythical creatures like the mermen of Cubagua and the pelicans of the Papaloapan river of Mexico that eat three children in a single gulp.[698] Semi-mythical locales also occasionally intersperse the geographical depictions, as in the case of the province of Sumaco in Peru, a site inundated with endless cinnamon.[699] It seems that, given this semi-mythical aspect of the European source texts, the author of the *Tārīḫ-i Hind-i Garbī* felt it appropriate to include in his introductory section certain examples of wonders from the Old World as well, such as the eternal whirlpool of the Persian Gulf or the Wakwak Tree, the fruit of which are beautiful women, that grows on an island in the Sea of China.[700] The *Tārīḫ-i Hind-i Garbī* also provides detailed and again sometimes semi-mythical descriptions of the architecture, customs and beliefs of the populations of the towns and cities of the New World.

The final historiographical work dealing with regions outside of the Ottoman Empire published by İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa in 1729-1730 was the *Tārīḫ-i Timur Gurkan,* printed in May 1730.[701] Originally composed by Aḥmad ibn 'ArabShāh (d.1450), who was carried off to Samarkand from Damascus at the age of twelve by a Timurid army, the text follows Timur's campaigns and often pauses to present descriptions of the populations and the geographies of the regions in which the battles and the sieges take place.[702] These range from the customs and habitations of the Turkic tribes of the Volga River valley to the settlements scattered between the Oxus and Jaxartes Rivers in Central Asia, and including therefore the towns and fortifications of the Caucuses, Anatolia, and Persia.[703] As such, although ostensibly a chronicle of Timur's campaigns, the *Tārīḫ-i Timur Gurkan* in fact includes a significant amount of cultural and geographic information for regions both within the boundaries of Ottoman territory (as far west as Izmir), as well as lands beyond the Ottoman frontiers. This analysis is based, however, on the translation by J.H. Sanders of Ibn 'ArabShāh's work itself. Watson indicates that the version

---

[697] Ibid., 172, 186-187, 222, 282, 295, 305.
[698] Ibid., 197, 222. The Merman was depicted in one of the thirteen woodcuts printed by İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa.
[699] Ibid., 283.
[700] Ibid., 102, 104. The Wakwak Tree comprised another one of the thirteen woodcuts.
[701] Watson, "Ibrahim Muteferika and Turkish Incunabula," 438.
[702] J.H. Sanders, *Tamerlane or Timur The Great Amir from the Arabic Life By Ahmed Ibn Arabshah.* (London: Luzac & Co., 1936).
[703] Ibid.

printed by Müteferriḳa, the Ottoman-Turkish rendition of this text by Nazmīzāde Murtezā ibn 'Alī (d.1720-23), greatly abbreviated the Arabic original.[704] However, as the geographic and cultural descriptions of Ibn 'ArabShāh are inscribed into the campaign narratives, and not set apart in separate sections, it is highly likely that a portion of them were included in the Müteferriḳa edition. The two other historiographies printed by İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa in 1729-1730 were the *Tārīḫ-i Mıṣri'l-cedīd ve-Tārīḫ-i Mıṣri'l-ḳadīm* of Aḥmad ibn 'Alī ibn Zunbul (d.1153), and the *Gülşen-i ḫulefā,* a history of Baghdad up until the year 1718 written by Nazmīzāde Murtezā ibn 'Alī.[705] Ibn Zunbul's work was a history of Egypt translated from Arabic at some point in the sixteenth century by one Süheylī (d.?), an Ottoman scribal secretary.[706] These two works were printed just before the Patrona Ḫalīl Revolt, in the June and August of 1730, and this seems to have hampered their sale.[707]

Therefore, with the exception of the *Tārīḫ-i Mıṣri'l-cedīd ve Tārīḫ-i Mıṣri'l-ḳadīm* and the *Gülşen-i ḫulefā,* the printing press established through the efforts of İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa and Meḥmed Sa'īd Efendi produced in 1729 and 1730 a number of historiographical-geographies that, in their focus beyond the traditionally introverted scholarly sphere of pre-eighteenth century Ottoman historiography, reflected an intellectual openness that was also evident in the types of works commissioned for translation by the grand vizier Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha between 1718 and 1730. Furthermore, in terms of content, the books printed in 1729-1730 mirrored those translated around the same time in their shared concern for social and cultural details. In this capacity, all twelve translated and published texts of this period also resembled the 1721 *Sefāretnāme* of Yirmisekizçelebi. For these reasons, the first successful attempt at applying print technology to Ottoman-Turkish scholarship should be conceptualized as constituting one branch of a larger intellectual program comprising also the first Ottoman embassy to France and the first instance of a coordinated state sponsored translation movement in the Ottoman Empire.

Approaches to the İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa Printing Press

Since the 1970s and 1980s, alongside the growing dissatisfaction of scholars of Ottoman history with the narrative of Ottoman decline, the perspective that situated Müteferriḳa's printing press within a paradigm of modernization/westernization has become challenged from a number

---

[704] Watson, "Ibrahim Muteferika and Turkish Incunabula," 438.
[705] Ibid.
[706] Ibid.
[707] Salih notes that of all the Müteferriḳa editions that came out in 1729-1730, these two books were the ones that sold the least. Sabev, "The First Ottoman Turkish Printing Enterprise," 84-85.

of different scholarly points of view.[708] In this section, a number of key concepts that have come to define the altered approach in Ottoman historiography to the Müteferriḳa press will be addressed through a consideration of the studies of scholars including Orhan Salih and Vefa Erginbaş. Following this, the interpretation defended in this thesis, which sees the Müteferriḳa press prints of 1729-1730 as one constituent of a larger intellectual endeavor involving a community of individuals, will be reiterated.

An important consideration which recent studies of the Müteferriḳa press engage with is the question of the success of İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa's enterprise in reaching readers. Salih notes and argues against the conclusions of previous Turkish scholars, such as Niyazi Berkes, which assert that Müteferriḳa had failed in distributing the books published at his printing house.[709] Berkes claims that the early eighteenth century Ottoman context lacked the reading public necessary for there to have been a receptive environment for the books printed by Müteferriḳa.[710] The study conducted in this paper has argued against this contention, and has sought to show that the exact opposite was the case and that it was the courtly reading public of the Ottoman center and the peculiarities of their interests in the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha years that allowed for the establishment and later survival of the Müteferriḳa press. Salih's analysis of İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa's probate inventory corroborates this assertion, for he indicates that the majority of Müteferriḳa's publications, 69.3% to be exact, were in fact sold.[711] Salih also takes into consideration that the Müteferriḳa books "were far more expensive than manuscripts and were beyond the reach of even high-level functionaries," noting also that "their high initial price seems not to have been a problem for many potential buyers".[712] Relating this to the fact that the majority of these books were in fact sold, Salih concludes that, in the context of the limited reading public of the Ottoman capital, Müteferriḳa's output was "not at all insufficient, but actually a bit on the ample side."[713] Salih does follow through these conclusions, but he does so by presenting the idea that Müteferriḳa's prints seem to have been directed to government officials, basing this interpretation on their supposed "didactic" qualities.[714] He does not really question in greater depth the implications of his research, which indicate that the books printed by Müteferriḳa were purchased by a elite courtly social class, so that the high volume of Müteferriḳa press sales demonstrates the purchasing power and intellectual interests of this

---

[708] Reichmuth, "Islamic Reformist Discourse in the Tulip Period (1718-1730) Ibrahim Müteferriqa and His Arguments for Printings," 149-151.
[709] Sabev, "The First Ottoman Turkish Printing Enterprise," 65.
[710] Ibid.
[711] Ibid., 72.
[712] Ibid., 73, 76.
[713] Ibid., 76.
[714] Ibid., 77-78.

courtly class, and may only incidentally be related to any didactic administrative function which they may have provided for government employees (a point briefly addressed above).[715]

Erginbaş's approach to the issue of the reception of Müteferriḳa's prints is framed within his understanding that Müteferriḳa's endeavor represents a religiously formulated "Enlightenment project, which consisted of spreading literacy and the knowledge of humanistic (history and geography) as well as natural sciences (physics and astronomy)."[716] He argues that one of the objectives of İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa was to "expand the public sphere by the dissemination of social and humanistic disciplines through printing."[717] It is however questionable whether the mere physical act of printing books can in itself expand a public sphere. Rather, a sufficient public sphere needs to already be in place, the receptivity of which creates the possibility of success in the first place for endeavors that aim to disseminate printed texts. Erginbaş reaches this interpretation through combining the arguments propounded in Müteferriḳa's *Vesīletü't-Ṭibāʿa* (The Utility of Printing)*, a treatise in which Müteferriḳa presents a set of mostly religious arguments in favour of print technology (more on this below), and the nature of the non-religious works published by the press. However, a fundamental factor that belies the conceptualization of the Müteferriḳa press as a project meant to spread humanistic knowledge across Ottoman society is the sheer cost of the printed books, as just mentioned. Erginbaş's attempt at figuring this factor into the framework of an Ottoman Enlightenment project is somewhat problematic, for the argument that the high prices of the books, which exceeded the capacities of *medrese* students, evidence "that Müteferriḳa was targeting a wider audience," is not convincing.[718]

A common feature of recent studies on the Müteferriḳa press is that they take the entire corpus of books printed by the Müteferriḳa press between 1729 and 1742 as a whole. They also tend to ignore the similarities between the books printed by Müteferriḳa and the works translated through Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's endeavors at the same time. Salih for example does not consider these similarities and argues that the interest in the Müteferriḳa books was due to the "rareness and unavailability," of the texts Müteferriḳa was offering, and to how they differed from "the traditional reading taste."[719] He also does not distinguish between the eight Müteferriḳa editions

---

[715] There is also no apparent reason to suppose that those who acquired Müteferriḳa books represented the entirety or majority of the Ottoman capital's reading public. The Müteferriḳa press publications, therefore, considering both their similarities with other texts translated and commissioned by the Ottoman capital's courtly elite in the 1718-1730 period and their expensive prices, indicate that they were on the "ample side" of a courtly reading market, as opposed to the entire "Istanbul reading market." Ibid., 76.
[716] Erginbaş, "Enlightenment in the Ottoman Context: Ibrahim Mutefferika and His Intellectual Landscape,", 70.
[717] Ibid., 59.
[718] Erginbaş, "Enlightenment in the Ottoman Context: Ibrahim Mutefferika and His Intellectual Landscape," 69.
[719] Orlin Sabev, "A Virgin Deserving Paradise or a Whore Deserving Poison: Manuscript Tradition and Printed Books in Ottoman Turkish Society," 400.

published in 1729-1730, and the nine others printed between 1732 and 1742. Indeed, as has been demonstrated, four of the six historiographical-geographies published in 1729-1730 differed significantly from the "traditional reading tastes" of the Ottoman literati. This is not, however, the case with most of the books published after 1732. These are as follows; Müteferriḳa printed two of his own works in 1732 and the *Cihān-nümā* of Kātip Çelebi.[720] A year later, he published Kātip Çelebi's *Taḳvīmü't-tevārīh*, a traditional work of Ottoman historiography.[721] A year after that, he published Naʿīmā's *Tārīḫ,* and in 1741 he published the *Tārīḫ-i Çelebizāde,* the *Tārīḫ-i Rāşid,* and an Ottoman chronicle of the Bosnian war of 1736-1739.[722] The last text printed by him was a Persian-Turkish dictionary in 1742.[723] Five of these six historiographic-geographic books fall into the category of traditional Ottoman historiography; they comprise one single-event history, one universal history, and three chronicles. The only exception that fall outside of the scope of the Ottoman "traditional reading taste" is the *Cihān-nümā* of Kātip Çelebi.

The notion that the Müteferriḳa press involved the printing of historiographical texts characterized by their dissimilarities to traditional Ottoman historiography only makes sense if the books published by this press are identified as belonging to two discreet phases: 1729-1730, and 1732-1742. However, without forming this distinction, Salih, Erginbaş, Göçek, and Stefan Reichmuth all structure their analyses of the Müteferriḳa press based on their particular approaches to this question of the dissimilarity of Müteferriḳa's publications to the traditional works of Ottoman historiography.

Salih presents the claim that "by providing secular and utilitarian knowledge, he [Müteferriḳa] challenged the traditional Muslim concept of knowledge and learning, which placed the emphasis on religious matters."[724] This argument is problematic for a number of reasons. First, the application of the term "secular" is objectionable. The publishing license granted to the Müteferriḳa press did explicitly exclude works of the religious sciences of *fiqh, tafsīr*, and *kelām,* as well as scriptural texts.[725] However, the use of the concept of secularity in relation to the Müteferriḳa books needs to be carefully qualified before being deployed, for in a sense, being as they are framed within scriptural contexts and moreover including overtly religious prefaces, the texts published by İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa, as also the works translated under Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's direction, were not strictly speaking secular. What Salih is getting at here with the term "secular" is more likely what this paper has identified under the concept of the

---

[720] Watson, "Ibrahim Muteferika and Turkish Incunabula," 439.

[721] Ibid., 440.

[722] Ibid., 440-441.

[723] Ibid., 441.

[724] Sabev, "The First Ottoman Turkish Printing Enterprise," 78.

[725] Reichmuth, "Islamic Reformist Discourse in the Tulip Period (1718-1730) Ibrahim Mütefferiqa and His Arguments for Printings," 158.

non-religious *ādāb* sciences. In this case, however, it would be wrong to declare that historiographical and geographical *ādāb* works "challenged the traditional Muslim concept of knowledge and learning." Quite on the contrary, the *ādāb* fields were an integral component of Islamic literary cultures, as the second chapter of this paper has attempted to demonstrate. Instead of challenging, the books printed by İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa inhabited established Ottoman scholarly traditions and concepts of knowledge, exemplifying a distinct intellectual movement that emerged within the *ādāb* fields of Ottoman historiography and geography. Furhermore, the terminology of secularity is also troublesome in its evocations of modernization and westernization; attributing it to the Müteferriḳa texts may lead to an understanding wherein these texts become detached from their indigenous Ottoman cultural context, and are reframed as instances of European influence.

Vefa Erginbaş's arguments resemble Salih's in following once again the notion that the Müteferriḳa press publications were secular or, in Erginbaş's case, "humanistic" in nature.[726] Erginbaş presents recent developments in studies of the European Enlightenment that argue for the presence of many different enlightenments throughout Europe, some of them having emerged within religious frameworks, in an attempt to situate the Müteferriḳa press within the concept of an Ottoman engagement with the Enlightenment.[727] In support of this statement, Erginbaş examines eighteenth century European approaches to geography and historiography, citing passages from Charles Withers on Enlightenment uses of geography, and examining the meanings attaches to cartography and historiography in eighteenth century France and Scotland.[728] Therefore, the analysis formulated by Erginbaş essentially interprets the Müteferriḳa press and the issue of the specific intellectual fields the publications of this press comprised against contemporary European development. Erginbaş qualifies this approach by citing arguments presented by Müteferriḳa himself, for example in the the *Uṣūlu'l-ḥikem fi niẓāmi'l-ümem*, to the effect that the science of geography could help the Islamic community unite under a single sovereign and thereby resist European-Christian domination.[729] However, once again it

---

[726] Erginbaş, "Enlightenment in the Ottoman Context: Ibrahim Muteferrika and His Intellectual Landscape," 70. Erginbaş's application of the term "humanistic" to refer to the *ādāb* texts printed by Müteferriḳa is also deeply problematic, and made more so by the fact that he does not dwell on the historiography of the concept of humanism, or qualify his employment of this term. "Humanism" as a concept was formulated in the nineteenth century, and then to refer to the system of education based on the classics that emerged in Italy in the fifteenth century. Later, it came to denote a comprehensive cultural movement predicated on an "emphasis on man, on his dignity and privileged place in the universe." Therefore, to define the Müteferriḳa publications through this term, simply because they involved works of a non-religious focus, involves a set of far reaching associations which cannot be justified. Paul Oskar Kristeller, *Renaissance Thought and its Sources* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979), 30, 99.

[727] Erginbaş, "Enlightenment in the Ottoman Context: Ibrahim Muteferrika and His Intellectual Landscape., 53-59.

[728] Ibid., 72-73.

[729] Ibid., 73.

needs to be pointed out that the *Uṣūlu'l-ḥikem,* published in 1732, should be analyzed separately from the works published in 1729-1730.

Erginbaş's framing of İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa as an individual bent on initiating a program of intellectual enlightenment across Ottoman society emphasizes the exceptionality of the personality of Müteferriḳa, and in so doing, isolates this individual and his printing press from the broader context of Istanbul in the 1718-1730 period. Such an emphasis on the individuality of Müteferriḳa is repeated in Salih's and Reichmuths' works. Salih attributes the success of the Müteferriḳa press exclusively to İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa himself and relates it to Müteferriḳa's early immersion in European print culture. Citing Gibb and Bowen's claim that the Müteferriḳa press was a "one-man show", Salih argues that Müteferriḳa "was a confident bearer of the already developed European print culture."[730] In light of Itzkowitz's assessments on the propensity of Gibb and Bowen to artificially divide in an acute manner the Ottoman military-administrative ruling class between European converts and freeborn Muslims (with the former embodying the dynamic and innovative element and the former exemplifying reactionary traditionalism), Gibb and Bowen's claim that the Müteferriḳa press was a "one-man show" should not be readily accepted.[731] In the opinion of this study, formulating the Müteferriḳa press as the transplantation of European print culture into the Ottoman context by a European-cum-Ottoman ignores the internal Ottoman dynamics and the cultural atmosphere indigenous to the courtly social circles of the Ottoman capital that not only explain the success of Müteferriḳa's enterprise, but are also responsible for it.

Reichmuth structures his understanding of the exceptionality of İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa on his reading of Müteferriḳa's *Vesiletü't Tibaa,* based on which he presents Müteferriḳa as an early Islamic reformist.[732] In this treatise, segments from which are incorporated by Çelebizāde into his narrative of Meḥmed Saʿīd Efendi and İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa's efforts, the advantages of print technology are set forth in a set of rationalizations. Those propositions of the *Vesīletü't-Ṭibāʿa* repeated by Çelebizāde include the statement that "endless and boundless" (*bī-ḥadd ü pāyān*) texts were lost in past disasters in the city of Istanbul, as well as in earlier periods with the deprivations of Genghis Khan and Hulagu, as also with the Frankish invasion of the land of Andalusia.[733] As these works had been preserved in the form of handwritten manuscripts, their

[730] Sabev, "Waiting for Godot,"112. Sabev, "The First Ottoman Turkish Printing Enterprise," 81.
[731] Sabev, "Waiting for Godot,"112 Norman Itzkowitz, "Eighteenth Century Realities," in *Studia Islamica* No 16 (1992), 80-81. For more on the early presence of converts recruited through the *devşirme* system in the Ottoman military-administrative class, and on the disintegration of this practice with the expanding acquisition of government posts and military positions by free-born Ottoman Muslims, see the first chapter of this study.
[732] Reichmuth, "Islamic Reformist Discourse in the Tulip Period (1718-1730) Ibrahim Müteferriqa and His Arguments for Printings," 156.
[733] Çelebizāde*, Târîh-i Çelebizāde*, 1547.

destruction entailed irreversible losses for Islamic scholarship. Another point made by Müteferriḳa which Çelebizāde presents is the idea that those who sought knowledge often could not make effective use of manuscripts due to the errors of negligent and incompetent manuscript scribes.[734]

Many of the reasons expressed by Müteferriḳa in defense of print technology are couched in religious justifications. So, for example, Müteferriḳa notes the care traditionally placed in the Islamic world on the preservation of scriptural texts, particularly (he claims) when contrasted with Judaism and Christianity.[735] Formulated in relation to print technology, this statement has the effect of situating the printing press, a tool capable of preserving texts through processing numerous duplications in short periods of time, firmly within the scholarly and religious values of an Islamic framework. Furthermore, the ability to rapidly print large volumes of books means, according to Müteferriḳa, that the prices of texts will drop and their availability increase.[736] This will prompt broader public access to religious scholarship, enhancing the piety of all Muslims across the Islamic world, providing textbooks for a greater scope of *medrese* students, and diminishing ignorance in the countryside.[737] By printing the works of the *mujtahidūn,* scholarly experts of Islamic law, the affairs of state and religion (*dīn ü devlet*) will be strengthened.[738] Finally, Müteferriḳa contends that sanctioning the formation of an Islamic printing press is important to counter European efforts at printing books in the Arabic script, for it would be disastrous for the Islamic community if Christian powers excel in the publication of Islamic works.[739]

As mentioned above, these arguments compelled Erginbaş to understand the Müteferriḳa press as an Ottoman attempt, framed within an Islamic religious mindset, at spreading literacy and enlightenment. Unlike Reichmuth and Salih, Erginbaş does place Müteferriḳa within the framework of the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha household, stating that "there was an enlightened circle at the Ottoman court in the first decades of this century," of which Müteferriḳa was a part.[740] However, Erginbaş's definition of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's household is flawed, for he claims that the activities of this household represented an Ottoman Enlightenment, arguing that "Ibrahim Paşa and the wealthy elites of the Ottoman capital, in an attempt to strengthen public

---

[734] Ibid.
[735] Reichmuth, "Islamic Reformist Discourse in the Tulip Period (1718-1730) Ibrahim Müteferriqa and His Arguments for Printings," 156.
[736] Ibid., 157.
[737] Ibid., 157-158.
[738] Ibid., 157.
[739] Ibid., 158.
[740] Erginbaş, "Enlightenment in the Ottoman Context: Ibrahim Mutefferika and His Intellectual Landscape," 83.

morale, indulged in the construction of beautiful palaces and kiosks."[741] Again, this reflects a misrepresentation of the building activities of the 1718-1730 period, which involved the interests of a courtly elite and, to the extent that they were directed to the general public, were meant to express social status, not enhance morale.

Like Erginbaş, Stefan Reichmuth also takes Müteferriḳa's assertions in the *Vesīletü't-Ṭibā'a* at face value and, in this case, relies on them to argue that the Müteferriḳa press represents an early, precocious instance of the Islamic reform movement that matured in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and came to be exemplified by the *nizām-ı cedīd* reform programs of Mahmud II (r.1808-1839).[742] In interpreting Müteferriḳa into an Islamic reformist, Reichmuth claims that "both *khavāss* and *'avāmm* are his target group," and that he stands at the beginning of "an Islamic discourse of modernization and reform," and embodies furthermore an early advocate for pan-Islamism.[743] These assertions involve the projection of later intellectual developments within the Ottoman Empire upon the environment and cultural atmosphere of the 1718-1730 period. This becomes evident once the arguments presented by Müteferriḳa in the *Vesīletü't-Ṭibā'a* are compared to the actualities of his printing house.

First, since works of the religious sciences and scripture were excluded from the publishing license granted the Müteferriḳa press, the notion that this press was meant to spread Islamic reform and publicize the works of prominent of *mujtahidūn* is inapplicable to the reality of the books that came to be published. The argument that print technology would make books readily accessible to broad sectors of the Ottoman public is discredited by the fact of the exorbitant prices that the Müteferriḳa prints came to have. The financial resources required for accessing these books and, furthermore, the nature of their contents, which engaged with elements of a courtly *ādāb* culture with which only the upper echelons within the Ottoman military-administrative class were conversant, means that the Müteferriḳa press was geared towards a reading public comprised of the socioeconomic elite of the Ottoman capital. The target audience of these books was certainly not "both *khavāss* and *'avāmm*."

It is also questionable whether Müteferriḳa actually felt that European prints of Islamic works threatened to take over the Ottoman book market, as these prints had been available since the sixteenth century and not only had they failed to even manage a foothold in the Ottoman Empire, they had often in fact been met with hostility.[744] It seems more likely that Müteferriḳa voiced this notion simply as an additional argument in favor of his enterprise. Reichmuth notes

---

[741] Ibid.
[742] Reichmuth, "Islamic Reformist Discourse in the Tulip Period (1718-1730) Ibrahim Müteferriqa and His Arguments for Printings," 160.
[743] Ibid., 157, 160.
[744] Sabev, "A Virgin Deserving Paradise or a Whore Deserving Poison," 396-397.

that one way in which to interpret Müteferriḳa's use of an Islamic discourse in justifying print technology has been to see it as "based on expediency rather than on conviction."[745] While the entirety of Müteferriḳa's religious arguments should not be dismissed simply as expediency, the enormity of the traditional resistance in Ottoman society to the application of the European technology of print to Islamic texts needs to be remembered.[746] This was related both to the antiquity of the manuscript tradition in Ottoman scholarship, particularly with regard to religious scholarship, and also to the fact that a large professional group of scribes found employment in the reproduction of handwritten manuscripts.[747] The fact that, in addition to the *Vesīletü't-Ṭibāʿa,* Müteferriḳa included the *fetvā* of the *şeyhülislām's fetvā* which sanctioned his enterprise, the sultan's decree (*fermān*) to the same effect, as well as appraisals supporting the printing press penned by *ʿālims* in the first book he published, as well as the presence of many of the arguments he formulated in his treatise in the introductions he compiled for some of the other books printed by him, demonstrates the calibre of the resistance that he must have faced.[748] Therefore, although the religious justifications formulated by Müteferriḳa should not be viewed solely as representing expediency, it is also highly likely that the particular emphasis placed on religious rationale by Müteferriḳa was related to the specifically religious objections that he faced.

In Çelebizāde's account of the Müteferriḳa press opens with a discussion of Meḥmed Saʿīd Efendi, explaining how this individual was the son of the Ottoman ambassador to France and indicating that upon witnessing the expedience with which French printers were able to reproduce texts, Meḥmed Saʿīd Efendi formed a resolution to have this technology replicated in the "land of Rome," (*diyār-ı Rūm*), the Ottoman Empire.[749] Afterwards, Meḥmed Saʿīd Efendi is presented as having approached İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa, following which the two began gathering the tools and implements necessary to establish a printing house.[750] Çelebizāde does note that Müteferriḳa had maintained the desire for an Ottoman-Turkish printing press for a long time, and the narrative clearly illustrates the significance of Müteferriḳa's expertise and financial in the successful initiation of the project.[751] Nonetheless, the active agent that drives the initiation of the enterprise in the account as rendered by Çelebizāde is without question Meḥmed Saʿīd Efendi. If the Müteferriḳa press "was entirely a private and personal undertaking," as Salih claims, then why had Müteferriḳa, who had desired a press for such a long time, not set it up

---

[745] Reichmuth, "Islamic Reformist Discourse in the Tulip Period (1718-1730) Ibrahim Müteferriqa and His Arguments for Printings," 159.

[746] Sabev, "A Virgin Deserving Paradise or a Whore Deserving Poison," 392-399.

[747] Sabev, "Waiting for Godot," 107-110.

[748] Erginbaş, "Enlightenment in the Ottoman Context: Ibrahim Mutefferika and His Intellectual Landscape," 69.

[749] Çelebizāde, *Târîh-i Çelebizāde*, 1546-1547.

[750] Ibid.

[751] Ibid.

before the involvement of Meḥmed Saʿīd Efendi?[752] What is more, if the "enormous enthusiasm" of Müteferriḳa explains the success of his press, then why is there such a stark difference between the Müteferriḳa press prints of 1729-1730 and those of 1732-1742?[753]

In 1729-1730, İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa set to print six historiographical-geographies, four of which reflected an intellectual extension of similar texts being translated in the same period at the request of the grand vizier. One of these four works, the *Tārīḫ-i seyyāḥ,* essentially constitutes a crossover between the two enterprises and can be seen as a Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha commissioned translation printed by İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa. What links the Müteferriḳa books with the texts of the grand vizier's translation movement is their common focus on foreign geographies, with Persia emerging as a joint category of interest. A further connection between the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha household and translation movement and the Müteferriḳa prints of 1729-1730 are the four *ʿālims* appointed as editors of the Müteferriḳa's press's first publication, three of whom were members of the grand vizier's translation committees. Therefore, in view of the sanction of the şeyhülislām Abdullah Efendi, the support and involvement of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha and the sultan, and the financial investment of Meḥmed Saʿīd Efendi, the idea that the Müteferriḳa press emerged as a "private and personal undertaking" is questionable.

In the period when the household faction of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha exercised political hegemony in 1729-1730, the Müteferriḳa press managed to print eight books in two years. In this first phase of publications, İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa was not acting in an independent manner. Rather, whatever may have been his own personal motivations and concerns, in 1729-1730 his printing activity was structured and directed by the intellectual interests of a cultural movement attached to the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha household. Following the downfall of this household, the execution of the grand vizier, and the consequent loss of royal patronage, after a gap of two years İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa was able to print three books in 1732, one in 1733, one in 1734, two in 1741 and one in 1742. Therefore, while on the one hand the Müteferriḳa press managed to turn out eight books in two years under the grand vizierate of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha, once the press became operational again after the Patrona Ḫalīl Revolt, it took İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa an entire decade to publish as many books as he had in 1729-1730.[754] Were it that the Müteferriḳa press was an altogether private undertaking contingent solely on the sheer potency of İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa's personal enthusiasm, why did it take him ten years to print as many books as he had in the two years when the household faction with which he was involved was in power?

---

[752] Sabev, "Waiting for Godot," 101.
[753] Ibid., 103.
[754] Nine works were published, but as the *Tārīḫ-i Rāşid* and *Tārīḫ-i Çelebizāde* were bound together, a total of eight books comprising nine volumes were printed.

Moreover, in terms of content the books printed after 1732 differ markedly from those printed in 1729-1730. Whereas in 1729-1730, the majority of the historiographical prints are concerned with foreign geographies, the only such example from the post-1732 books is the *Cihān-nümā.* Also, it is only after 1732 that Müteferriḳa begins publishing volumes from the traditional Ottoman historiographers studied in chapter two. Vefa Erginbaş documents Müteferriḳa's desire to have had all the works of official Ottoman historians printed.[755] Between 1732 and 1742, he managed to publish three such books. Also, it was at this time that he printed two manuscripts composed by himself. It seems, therefore, that with the downfall of his patron, Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha, and the scattering of the intellectual movement gathered around the scholars and *'ālims* attached to this grand vizier's household, Müteferriḳa was able to begin exercising a greater degree of personal taste in the selection of the works published by his printing house. While the 1729-1730 Müteferriḳa books conspicuously embody features of the intellectual *décloisonnement* that characterizes the intellectual environment of the 1718-1730 period, the works printed after 1732 exhibit more the individual interests of İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa himself.

In conclusion, it may be stated that the elements of the immediate sociopolitical context of İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa, elements comprising scribal bureaucratic consciousness and the Ottoman patron-client system of the household structure, and the specific cultural sensibilities attached to this context, were meaningful in both directing the establishment of the Müteferriḳa press and in determining the types of texts that were selected to comprise the first books printed in the script and language of Ottoman-Turkish. The publications of İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa's print shop divide naturally into the two phases of 1729-1730 and 1732-1742, and the six historiographical-geographies printed by Müteferriḳa in 1729 and in 1730 embody one component of a larger coherent state driven program involving also the 1720-1721 embassy to France and the translation movement organized by the grand vizier of the period. Cumulatively, this program produced a total of thirteen documents in Ottoman-Turkish that are notable for their focus on the history, geography, social traditions, religious norms, architecture, and natural history of a number of foreign regions situated beyond the Ottoman domain. Specifically, these regions involved the Americas, the Habsburg Empire, France, the Northern Mediterranean coast, Persia, China, and parts of Central Asia and the Caucuses.

In being concerned mostly with foreign geographies, the intellectual movement launched under the supervision and patronage of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha differed markedly from the intellectual concerns of sixteenth and seventeenth century Ottoman elites and reflected an

---

[755] Erginbaş, "Enlightenment in the Ottoman Context: Ibrahim Mutefferika and His Intellectual Landscape," 75.

intellectual-cultural environment characterized by what this study has defined as intellectual *décloisonnement*. The Müteferriḳa press should be studied neither as an early instance of Westernization, nor as an example of Islamic reformism, nor yet again as an entirely private achievement related to the enthusiasms and personality of İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa alone. Rather, it should be contextualized in relation to the intellectual and cultural qualities of its specific contemporaneity, the 1718-1730 period of Ottoman history.

Conclusion

The first three chapters of this study involved an attempt at understanding a particular historically delimited sociopolitical context, that of the central elite of the Ottoman capital in the early eighteenth century, in the contention that the characteristic qualities of the cultural environment inhabiting this context determined the contours of the intellectual projects undertaken between 1718 and 1730. The focus of the first chapter was the development of the central administrative structures of the Ottoman state through the dissemination of the dynasty's political sovereignty across a broader range of social groups including grandee households, an expanding scribal bureaucracy, an aristocratizing *'ulemā*, and a central army corps which increasingly became towards the end of the seventeenth century the embodiment of the capital's working classes. Following this, the second chapter moved on to consider in greater detail the changes experienced by the Ottoman scribal bureaux after the initial emergence of a secretarial class around the imperial *dīvān* in the fifteenth century, and the growth of a bureaucratized central state identity elaborated through a cultural consciousness that endowed the *ādāb* fields with particular significance and attributed social value to erudition and to the patronage of scholarship.

The second and the third chapters both provided examples of how the composition itself of historiographical and biographical *ādāb* texts functioned in the endeavors to define and circumscribe the boundaries of the social identity of the *Osmanlı* military-administrative class. The third chapter further illustrated that a particular set of *intisāb* relations, that of Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha's household, defined and directed the political landscape of the Ottoman capital in the years between the 1718 Peace of Passarowitz and the 1730 Patrona Ḫalīl Revolt. The final chapter has sought to examine the particulars of the intellectual concerns exhibited by the scholarly circles and social elites attached to and associated with this household, and to see how these concerns dictated the types of books chosen for print and manuscripts selected for translation in the 1718-1730 period. The argument was presented that an expansive interest in geographic, historiographic, diplomatic, zoological, botanical, and cultural information on

certain regions beyond the Ottoman domain emerged at this time within an intellectual-cultural environment defined by intellectual *décloisonnement* and the enhanced significance of the *ādāb* sciences (particularly of historiography).

The textual products of the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha translation movement, the 1720-1721 Ottoman embassy to France, and the 1729-1730 publications of the İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa printing press together evidence an openness to foreign cultures, geographies, and histories. This openness reflects both an intellectual flexibility that integrates aspects of non-Ottoman societies within an Ottoman framework of familiarity, and an acute interest in the strange and the novel in the form of the genre of the *acāyib* and *garāib*. In approaching the thirteen texts printed, translated, and composed between 1718 and 1730 as elements of a single process, the study attempted herein has sought to situate the printing press of İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa within the proper immediate context of the period of its formation. Although the concept of a Tulip Age is problematic due to the evocations of westernization and hedonism which it has come to evoke, nonetheless the singularity of the 1718-1730 period becomes evident in any in-depth examination of these years. Over and again, the presence of the same particular group of statesmen, *‘ulemā*, and scribal bureaucrats, is patently evident throughout the projects, festivities, and political developments that took place in the final twelve years of Sultan Aḥmed III's reign. The common denominator which binds together this diversity of personages is the grand vizier Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha.

İbrāhīm Müteferriḳa was not a member of the inner circles of the grand vizier's household establishment, and this explains how he was able to survive the Patrona Ḫalīl Revolt and go on to print publications (and exercise a greater degree of personal choice in their selections) after 1732. Nonetheless, he was only able to set up his printing press in 1719-1729 by becoming a lesser, somewhat outlying associate of this patron-client network; and it was the son of a senior member of the Dāmād İbrāhīm Pasha household who approached Müteferrika, enabling the would-be printer to realize aspirations he had apparently maintained for a long time. It was in this manner that the first ever Ottoman-Turkish printing press becamse established, and though Müteferrika's publications embody therefore the first successful application of print technology to the literature of Ottoman-Turkish, they are also historically significant as seminal components of an early eighteenth century Ottoman intellectual program that emerged during and endured until the end of the second age of the great households in Ottoman history.

Works Cited

Primary Sources

A particular account of the two rebellions, which happen'd at Constantinople, in the years MDCCXXX, and MDCCXXXI, at the deposition of Achmet the Third, and the elevation of Mahomet the Fifth: composed from the original memorials drawn up in Constantinople: With Remarks, Explaining the Names, Offices, Dignities, &c. of the Port. Lately publish'd in French,at the Hague: Now for the Excellency of the Relation translated into English. London: Printed for G. Smith, 1737.

Cantemir, Dimitrie. *The history of the growth and decay of the Othman Empire: Part I. Containing The Growth of the Othman Empire From The Reign of Othman the Founder, To The Reign of Mahomet IV. That IS, From the Year 1300, to the Siege of Vienna, in 1683. Part II. Containing The History of the Decay of the Othman Empire, From The Reign of Mahomet IV. To The Reign of Ahmed III. Being The History of the Author's Own Times. Written originally in Latin, by Demetrius Cantemir, late Prince of Moldavia. Translated into English, from the author's own manuscript, by N. Tindal, M.A. Vicar of Great Waltham in Essex. Adorned with a plan of Constantinople ; and twenty-two heads of the Turkish Emperors, engraved from Copies taken from Originals in the Grand Seignor's Palace, by the late Sultan's Painter.* London: A. Millar, 1756.

Çelebi, Kâtip. *Deniz Savaşları Hakkında Büyüklere Armağan (Tuhfetü'l-Kibâr Fî Esfâri'l-Bihâr)* Istanbul: Kabalcı Yayınevi, 2007.

Çelebizâde, Ismail Âsım Efendi. *Târîh-i Râşid ve Zeyli Vol. III. Târîh-i Çelebizâde* edited by Abdülkadir Özcan, Yunus Uğur, Baki Çakır, and Ahmet Zeki İzgöer. Istanbul: Klasik Yayınlar, 2013.

Goodrich, Thomas D. *The Ottoman Turks and the New World: A Study of Tarih-i Hind-i Garbi and Sixteenth-Century Ottoman Americana.* Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1990.

Karahasanoğlu, Selim. *Politics and Governance in the Ottoman Empire: The Rebellion of 1730. An Account of the Revolution that took place in Constantinople in the year 1143 of the Hegira.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009.

Krusinski, Tadeusz Jan. *The chronicles of a traveller: or, A history of the Afghan wars with Persia, in the beginning of the last century, from their commencement to the accession of Sultan Ashruf* edited by Johann Cristian Clodius. London: James Ridgway, Piccadilly, 1840.

Monshi, Eskandar Beg. *History of Shah Abbas the Great (Tārīk-e ʿĀlamārā-ye ʿAbbāsī) Vol I* translated by Roger M. Savory. Boulder: Westview Press Inc, 1930.

Monshi, Eskandar Beg. *History of Shah Abbas the Great (Tārīk-e ʿĀlamārā-ye ʿAbbāsī) Vol II* translated by Roger M. Savory. Boulder: Westview Press Inc, 1930

Montagu, Lady Mary Wortley. *The Complete Letters of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu* edited by Robert Halsband. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.

Mucîb, Mustafa Efendi. *Tezkire-i Mucîb* edited by Kudret Altun. Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Başkanlığı Yayınları, 1997.

Müneccimbaşı, Ahmed bin Lütfullah. *Camiü'd-Düvel* edited by Ahmed Ağırakça. Istanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 1995.

Nedim, Ahmed. *Nedim Divanı* edited by Abdülbâki Gölpınarlı. Istanbul: Şaka Matbaası, 1951.

Râşid, Mehmed Efendi. *Târîh-i Râşid ve Zeyli Vol. II. Târîh-i Râşid* edited by Abdülkadir Özcan, Yunus Uğur, Baki Çakır, and Ahmet Zeki İzgöer. Istanbul: Klasik Yayınlar, 2013.

Safāyī, Mustafa Efendi. *Tezkire-i Safāyī* edited by Pervin Çapan. Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Başkanlığı Yayınları, 2005.

Sanders, J.H. *Tamerlane or Timur The Great Amir from the Arabic Life By Ahmed Ibn Arabshah* London: Luzac & Co., 1936.

Şemdanizade, Fındıklılı Süleyman Efendi. *Mür'i't-tevârih* edited by Münir Aktepe. Istanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Matbaası, 1976.

Silâhdar Fındıklı, Mehmed Ağa. *Nusretnâme* edited by İsmet Parmaksizoğlu. Istanbul: Milli Eğitim Başımevi, 1962

Subhî, Mehmed Efendi. *Subhî Tarihi* edited by Mesut Aydıner. Istanbul: Bayrak Matbaacılık, 2007.

Yümni, Sālih Mehmed. *Tezkire-i Şu'arā-i Yümnī* edited by Sadık Erdem. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2013.

Secondary Sources

Abou-el-haj, Rifa'at Ali. *The 1703 Rebellion and the Structure of Ottoman Politics.* Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut, 1984.

Ahıshalı, Recep. "Divan-ı Hümayûn Teşkilâtı." In *Osmanlı IV: Teşkilat* edited by Güler Eren, 24-34. Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 1999.

Ahıshalı, Recep. *Osmanlı Devlet Teşkilatında Reisülküttâblık (XVII. Yüzyıl)* Istanbul: Tatav, 2001.

Akgündüz, Murat. *Osmanlı Devletınde Şeyhülislamlık.* Ankara: Beyan Yayınları, 2002.

Aksan, Virginia. *An Ottoman Statesman in War and Peace: Ahmed Resmi Efendi, 1700-1783.* New York: Brill, 1995.

Artan, Tülay. "Royal Weddings and the Grand Vezirate: Institutional and Symbolic Change in the Early Eighteenth Century." In *Royal Courts in Dynastic States and Empires: A Global Perspective* edited by Jeroen Duindam, Tülay Artan and Metin Kunt, 339-401. Boston: Brill, 2011.

Artan, Tülay. "Forms and Forums of Expression: Istanbul and beyond, 1600-1800." In *The Ottoman World* edited by Christine Woodhead, 378-409. New York: Routledge, 2012.

Atiyas, Ekin Tuşalp, "Eloquence in Context: Şaʻbānzāde Mehmed Efendi's (D.1708-1709) *Münāẓara-ı ṭıġ u kalem* and "The People of the Pen" in Late Seveneenth-Century Ottoman Empire." *Turcica* Vol 48 (2017): 113-155.

Aynur, Hatice. "Ottoman Literature." In *The Cambridge History of Turkey Volume 3: The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839,* edited by Suraiya N. Faroqhi, 481-520. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Aydüz, Salim. "Lâle Devri'nde yapılan ilmî faaliyetler." *Divan Dergisi*, January 1997.

Barkey, Karen. *Bandits and Bureaucrats: The Ottoman Route to State Centralization.* London: Cornell University Press, 1994.

"Bâşbâki Kulu." In Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi. 44 vols. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, İslâm Ansiklopedisi Genel Müdürlüğü, 2013.

Bonebakker, Seegur Adrianus. "Adab and the concept of belles-lettres." In *'Abbasid Belles-Lettres* edited by Julia Ashtiany, T.M. Johnstone, J.D. Latham, R.B. Serjeant, 16-30. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Bosworth, C.E. and Afshari I. *Encyclopedia Iranica,* I/7., s.v. "AJĀʾEB AL-MAḴLŪQĀT." 2011. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/ajaeb-al-makluqat#pt2 (accessed July 4, 2019).

van den Boogert, Maurits H. "The Sultan's Answer to the Medici Press? Ibrahim Muteferikka's Printing House in Istanbul." In *The Republic of Letters and the Levant* edited by Alastair Hamilton, Maurits H. van den Boogert and Bart Westerweel, 265-293. Boston: Brill, 2005.

Darling, Linda T. "Public finances: the role of the Ottoman centre." In *The Cambridge History of Turkey Volume 3: The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839,* edited by Suraiya N. Faroqhi, 118-135. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

"Damâd İbrahim Paşa." In Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi. 44 vols. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, İslâm Ansiklopedisi Genel Müdürlüğü, 2013.

Danışmend, İsmail Hakkı. *Osmanlı Devlet Erkanî.* Istanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi, 1971.

Darling, Linda T. "Ottoman Turkish: Written Language and Scribal Practice, 13th to 20th Centuries." In *Literacy in the Persianate World* edited by Brian Spooner and William Hanaway, 171- 195. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012.

Doğan, Muzaffer. "Divan-ı Hümâyûn'dan Babıâli'ye Geçiş: Bâb-ı Âsafî'nin Oluşumu." In *Osmanlı IV: Teşkilat* edited by Güler Eren, 199-211. Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 1999.

Dubler, C.E. *Encyclopedia of Islam,* Second ed., s.v. "Adjāʾib." 2012 https://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopaedia-of-islam-2/adjaib-SIM_0319?s.num=0&s.au=%22Dubler%2C+C.E.%22 (accessed July 4, 2019).

Eldem, Edhem. "Capitulations and Western Trade." In *The Cambridge History of Turkey Volume 3: The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839,* edited by Suraiya N. Faroqhi, 283-336. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Erginbaş, Vefa. "Enlightenment in the Ottoman Context: Ibrahim Mutefferika and His Intellectual Landscape." In *Historical Aspects of Printing and Publishing in Languages of the Middle East: Papers from the Symposium at the University of Leipzig* edited by Geoffrey Roper, 53-100. Boston: Brill, 2008.

Erimtan, Can. *Ottomans Looking West? The Origins of the Tulip Age and Its Development in Modern Turkey.* New York: Tauris Academic Studies, 2008.

Ersoy, Osman. *Türkiye'de Matbaanın Girişi ve İlk Basılan Eserler.* Ankara: Güven Basımevi, 1959.

Erünsal, Ibrahim. *Osmanli Vakif Kutuphaneleri.* Ankara: Turk Tarih Kurumu, 2008.

Erünsal, Ibrahim. *Osmanlılarda Sahaflık ve Sahaflar*. Istanbul: Timaş, 2013.

Faroqhi, Suraiya. "Guildsmen Complain to the Sultan: Artisans' Disputes and the Ottoman Administration in the 18th Century." In *Legitimizing the Order: The Ottoman Rhetoric of State Power* edited by Hakan Karateke and Maurus Reinkowski, 177-198. Boston: Brill, 2005.

Findley, Carter Vaughn. "Political Culture and the Great Households." In *The Cambridge History of Turkey Volume 3: The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839,* edited by Suraiya N. Faroqhi, 65-80. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Findley, Carter Vaughn. *Ottoman Civil Officialdom: A Social History.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.

Findley, Carter Vaugh. *Bureaucratic Reform in the Ottoman Empire: The Sublime Porte, 1789-1922.* Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1980.

Finkel, Caroline. "The Perils of Insouciance." In *Osman's Dream: The Story of the Ottoman Empire 1300-1923* by Caroline Finkel, 329-372. New York: Basic Books, 2005.

Fleischer, Cornell H. *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire: The Historian Mustafa Ali.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.

Genç, Mehmet. "A Study of the feasibility of using eighteenth-century Ottoman financial records as an indicator of economic activity." In *The Ottoman Empire and the World Economy,* edited by Huri İslamoğlu-Inan, 345-374. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Gerçek, Selim Nüzhet. *Türk Matbaacılığı I Müteferrika Matbaası.* Istanbul Devlet Basımevi, 1939.

Göçek, Fatma Müge. *East Encounters West: France and the Ottoman Empire in the Eighteenth Century.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Gültepe, Necati. "Osmanlılarda Burokrasi-Merkezin Yönetimi." In *Osmanlı IV: Teşkilat* edited by Güler Eren, 241-256. Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 1999.

Hagen, Gottfried. "Legitimacy and World Order." In *Legitimizing the Order: The Ottoman Rhetoric of State Power* edited by Hakan Karateke and Maurus Reinkowski, 55-85. Boston:

Brill, 2005.

Hamadeh, Shirine. *The City's Pleasures: Istanbul in the Eighteenth Century.* Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2008.

Hanaway, William L. "Secretaries, Poets, and the Literary Language." In *Literacy in the Persianate World* edited by Brian Spooner and William Hanaway, 95-142. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012

Hathaway, Jane. *Beshir Agha: Chief Eunuch of the Ottoman Imperial Harem.* Oxford: Oneworld, 2005.

Imber, Colin. "Frozen Legitimacy." In *Legitimizing the Order: The Ottoman Rhetoric of State Power* edited by Hakan Karateke and Maurus Reinkowski, 99-108. Boston: Brill, 2005.

"Ilmiye." In Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi. 44 vols. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, İslâm Ansiklopedisi Genel Müdürlüğü, 2013.

Inalcik, Halil. "Centralization and Decentralization in Ottoman Administration." In *Studies in Eighteenth Century Islamic History* edited by Thomas Naff and Roger Owen, 27-53. London: Feffer & Simons, Inc., 1977.

Itzkowitz, Norman. "Eighteenth Century Ottoman Realities." *Studia Islamica* No. 16 (1992): 73-94.

Kabacalı, Alpay. *Türk Yayın Tarihi.* İstanbul: Can Matbaa, 1987.

Kafadar, Cemal. "Janissaries and Other Riffraff of Ottoman Istanbul: Rebels Without a Cuase?" In *Identity and Identity Formation in the Ottoman World: A Volume of Essays in Honor of Norman Itzkowitz* edited by Baki Tezcan and Karl K. Barbir, 113-135. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2007).

Kareteke, Hakan. "Legitimizing the Ottoman Sultanate: A Framework for Historical Analysis." In *Legitimizing the Order: The Ottoman Rhetoric of State Power* edited by Hakan Karateke and Maurus Reinkowski, 13-52. Boston: Brill, 2005.

Kristeller, Paul Oskar. *Renaissance Thought and its Sources.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1979.

Kunt, Metin. "Royal and other households," In *The Ottoman World* edited by Christine Woodhead, 103-116. New York: Routeledge, 2012.

Lewis, Bernard. *The Muslim Discovery of Europe.* New York: W.W.Norton & Company, 1982.

Mandaville, Jon. E. "Usurious Piety: The Cash Waqf Controversy in the Ottoman Empire." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* Vol.10 No.3 (1979): 289-308.

"Mehmed Seyyid Rızâ." In Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi. 44 vols. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, İslâm Ansiklopedisi Genel Müdürlüğü, 2013.

"Mirzazâde Şeyh Mehmed Efendi." In Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi. 44 vols.

İstanbul Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, İslâm Ansiklopedisi Genel Müdürlüğü, 2013.

Murphey, Rhoads. "Westernization in the eighteenth-century Ottoman Empire: how far, how fast? *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 23 (1999) doi:10.1179

"Mustafa Safâyî Efendi." In Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi. 44 vols. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, İslâm Ansiklopedisi Genel Müdürlüğü, 2013.

Necipoğlu, Gülrü. *The Age of Sinan: Architectural Culture in the Ottoman Empire.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005.

Neumann, Cristoph. "Political and diplomatic developments." In *The Cambridge History of Turkey Volume 3: The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839,* edited by Suraiya N. Faroqhi, 44-62. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Özerdim, Muhaderre N. "Acaib-ül-Letaif (Hıtay Sefaretnamesi) ile Çin Kaynakları Arasında İlgi." *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi* Vol. 3 No. 2 (1950): 345-371.

Pamuk, Şevket. *A Monetary History of the Ottoman Empire.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Pamuk, Şevket. "Appendix: Money in the Ottoman Empire, 1326-1914." In *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire 1300-1914* edited by Halil Inalcik and Donald Quataert, 947-981. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

"Paşmakcizâde Abdullah Efendi." In Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi. 44 vols. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, İslâm Ansiklopedisi Genel Müdürlüğü, 2013.

Piterberg, Gabriel. *An Ottoman Tragedy: History and Historiography at Play.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.

Proudfoot, Ian. "Mass Producing Houri's Moles." In *Islam: Essays on Scripture, Thought and Society A Festschrift in Honour of Anthony H. Johns* edited by Peter G. Riddell and Tony Street, 161-187. New York: Brill, 1997.

Redhouse, Sir James W. *A Turkish and English Lexicon.* Beirut: Librairie du Liban, 1987.

Reichmuth, Stefan. "Islamic Reformist Discourse in the Tulip Period (1718-1730) Ibrahim Müteferriqa and His Arguments for Printings," In *The History of the Book in the Middle East* edited by Geoffrey Roper, 150-161. Surrey: Ashgate, 2013.

Repp, R.C. "The Altered Nature and Role of the Ulema." In *Studies in Eighteenth Century Islamic History* edited by Thomas Naff and Roger Owen, 277-288. London: Feffer & Simons, Inc., 1977.

Sabev, Orlin. "Waiting for Godot: The Formation of Ottoman Print Culture." In *Historical Aspects of Printing and Publishing in Languages of the Middle East: Papers from the Symposium at the University of Leipzig*, edited by Geoffrey Roper, 101-120. Boston: Brill, 2008.

Sabev, Orlin. "The First Ottoman Turkish Printing Enterprise: Success or Failure?" in *Ottoman Tulips, Ottoman Coffee: Leisure and Lifestyle in the Eighteenth Century* edited by Dana Sajdi, 63-89. New York: Tauris Academic Studies, 2007.

Sabev, Orlin. "A Virgin Deserving Paradise or a Whore Deserving Poison: Manuscript Tradition and Printed Books in Ottoman Turkish Society," in *The History of the Book in the Middle East* edited by Geoffrey Roper, 389-409. Surrey: Ashgate, 2013.

Şahin, Kaya. "Imperialism, Bureaucratic Consciousness, and the Historian's Craft: A Reading of Celālzāde Mustafā's *Tabakātü'l-Memālik ve Derecātü'l-Mesālik.*" In *Writing History at the Ottoman Court: Editing the Past, Fashioning the Future* edited by H. Erdem Cipa and Emine Fetvaci, 39-57. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013.

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

Schwartz, Kathryn A, "The Political Economy of Private Printing in Cairo as Told from a Comissioning Deal Turned Sour, 1871." *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 49 (2017), 25-45.

Schmidt, Jan. "'Guided by the Almighty': the journey of Stephan Schultz in the Ottoman empire, 1752-6," In *The Ottoman World* edited by Christine Woodhead, 332-347. New York: Routeledge, 2012

Service, Elman R. *Encyclopedia Britannica* s.v. "Primitive Culture." 2018.

"Şemdanizade Süleyman Efendi." In Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi. 44 vols. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, İslâm Ansiklopedisi Genel Müdürlüğü, 2013.

Seyitdanoğlu, Mehmet. "Divan-ı Hümâyûndan Meclisi Mebusana Osmanlı Imparatorlugun'da Yasama." In *Osmanlı IV: Teşkilat* edited by Güler Eren, 17-24. Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 1999.

Sezer, Yavuz. "The Architecture of Bibliophilia: Eighteenth-Century Ottoman Libraries," Unpublished PhD diss., MIT, 2016.

Stanford Shaw, J. *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey Volume I Empire of the Gazis:The Rise and Decline of The Ottoman Empire 1280-1808.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Thomas, Lewis, and Norman Itzkowitz. *A Study of Naima.* New York: New York University Press, 1972.

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

Ursinus, Michael. "The Transformation of the Ottoman Fiscal Regime c.1600-1850." In *The Ottoman World* edited by Christine Woodhead, 423-436. New York: Routeledge, 2012.

Uzunçarsılı, İsmail Hakkı. *Osmanlı Tarihi IV. Cilt 1. Kısım.* Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu

Basımevi,1984.

Ünver, Süheyl A. "Her Devirde Kağıthane." *Vakıflar Dergisi* Vol. 10 (2006): 435-460.

Vucinich, Wayne S. *The Ottoman Empire: Its Record and Legacy.* New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc, 1965.

Watson, William J. "Ibrahim Muteferika and Turkish Incunabula," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* Vol 88 No 3 (July-September 1968): 435-441.

Yılmaz, Yıldız. "Cutting a Fine Figure among Pots and Pans: Aghas of the Sultan's Harem in the Eighteenth Century." In *Living the Good Life: Consumption in the Qing and Ottoman Empires of the Eighteenth Century* edited by Elif Akcetin and Suraiya Faroqhi, 113-133.

Yılmaz, Coşkun, and Fikret Sarıcaoğlu., edit. *Müteferrika: Basmacı İbrahim Efendi ve Müteferrika Matbaası.* Istanbul: Esen Ofset, 2008.

Zilfi, Madeline C. *The Politics of Piety.* Minneapolis: Biblioteca Islamica, 1988.

Zilfi, Madeline C. "Women and Society in the Tulip Era, 1718-1730." In *Women, the Family, and Divorce Laws in Islamic History* edited by Amira El Azhary Sonbol, 290-303. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1996.

Zilfi, Madeline C. "The Ottoman Ulema." In *The Cambridge History of Turkey Volume 3: The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839* edited by Suraiya Faroqhi, 207-225. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Zilfi, Madeline C. "Elite Circulation in the Ottoman Empire: Great Mollas of the Eighteenth Century." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* Vol. 26 No. 3 (1983): 318-364.