KATIB ÇELEBİ
Muştafa b. Âbûlla, Hâcî Hâlife
(b. 1609; d. 1657)

LIFE

Autobiographical sections in his Sullam al-Wuşûl, in one Cihännümâ autograph, and Mîzânî‘l-Ḥagq,¹ constitute the primary source of information for entries in biographical dictionaries (‘Uşâqîzâde, Şeyhî) and modern reference works on K.Ç., arguably the most important Ottoman intellectual figure of the 11th/17th century.

K.Ç. was born in Istanbul. Sullam al-Wuşûl records the date of his birth as Dhul-Qada 1017/February 1609. This does not correspond to Cihännümâ’s indication that he was born during the exaltation of Mercury (şeref), which would correspond to late Jumada II/October 1608.² K.Ç.’s father was a member of the cavalry of the Porte (silâhdâr) and a scribe in the fiscal administration (Anaâdolî muhâsebesi). Although it is not known whether he was recruited through the devşirme, that his brother was also in the army makes it unlikely, since usually only one child per family was drafted. The sizable sum of money he inherited from his mother and from a wealthy merchant suggests that his mother came from a well-to-do family in Istanbul.

After his initial instruction in a mekteb in Istanbul K.Ç. joined his father in the chancery as his apprentice in 1032/1622. In 1034/1624 father and son went on campaign with the army against Abaza Paşa of Erzurum (d. 1044/1634), continuing with the campaign to recapture Bağdâd (1035/1625-26) and a second campaign against Abaza Paşa (1037/1627-28). Both his father and his uncle died during the retreat from Bağdâd in 1036/1626. Whereas his account of these campaigns occasionally reflects his personal involvement,³ there is hardly any personal reminiscence regarding events in the capital, such as the downfall and murder of ‘Osmân II (r. 1027-31/1618-22).

Following his return to Istanbul K.Ç.’s scribal career was stalled due to the death of his father. The decisive turn in K.Ç.’s intellectual career came when he made the acquaintance of Qâdiîzâde Mefmed Efendi (d. 1044/1635) and began to take lessons with him. After two more campaigns, first to Irân, then again to Bağdâd (1038-40/1629-31), K.Ç. began his serious studies on central works of kelâm and fiqh with Qâdiîzâde, as well as on al-‘âzâli‘i’s İhya’ and Birgivî’s al-‘Tariqa al-Muhammediyya. These lessons ended when K.Ç. was called to military duty in 1042/1633. Although it is clear that Qâdiîzâde’s strictly rational and legalist understanding of the scripture impressed K.Ç., there is no indication that he sympathized with the Qâdiîzâde movement’s actions against dervish lodges. At a later time, he in fact distanced himself from Qâdiîzâde’s activism (see below). He shows respect, albeit no veneration for Ibn al-‘Arabî,⁴ whereas his self-denomination as ışrâqiyyû’l-mesrây, i.e. as follower of Suhrawardî’s Philosophy of Illumination, deserves further study.

K.Ç. used the campaign of 1042/1633 to rummage through Aleppo’s (Hâleb)
bookstores, which provided the basis for his later bibliographic efforts, and to go on the pilgrimage during the winter season. The campaign took him to Yerevan (Revân) and Tabrız; he returned to Istanbul in late 1044/1635. He excused himself from the following campaign in 1047/1638 and there is no evidence that he left his hometown again. Despite his travel experience and his eye-witnessing of political and military events, his historical and geographical works are almost exclusively based on written sources or testimonies.

Despite the death of his former teacher Qâdîzade, K.Ç. continued with wide ranging but eclectic studies, including reading chronicles and - at a later time – geography and maps, but also all kinds of topics of medrese education, from law and theology to astronomy and mathematics. Among his teachers were Kûrd ʿAbdullâh Efendi (d. 1064/1654),3 Keçi Meḥmed Efendi (d. 1054/1644),6 Velî Efendi (d. ?), a student of the Egyptian scholar Ibrâhîm Laqânî (d. 1041/1631), Aʿrec Muştafa Efendi (d. 1063/1653),7 the future ʿseyhûlisâm ʿAbdürrâḥîm Efendi (d. 1066/1656).8 Although his readings covered the major part of the medrese curriculum K.Ç. never obtained a diploma, but continued to earn a living in the chancery, spending most of his mother’s inheritance on books, putting together what was probably the largest private library in Istanbul in his time.

From 1052/1642 onward K.Ç. was giving lessons himself, on law, tefsîr, and kelâm, but also mathematics and astronomy, focusing on fundamentals rather than the intricacies of the higher levels. His earliest works have to be seen in this context. Despite his low rank in the Ottoman bureaucracy and the lack of formal education K.Ç. appears to have been well accepted in the upper ranks of Istanbul’s intellectual elite. His companions and patrons included ʿseyhûlisâms Zekerîya Yaḥî Efendi (d. 1054/1644), ʿAbdürrâḥîm Efendi, Ebû Saʿîd Efendi (d. 1073/1662), and Behâʾî Efendi (d. 1064/1654?). ʿAbdürrâḥîm Efendi also secured a promotion in the chancery for K.Ç. in recognition of his historical work Taqvimûʾ-t-tevârîh.

K.Ç. certainly knew prominent intellectuals of his time, including historian Hûseyîn Hezârfeṅn (d. 1103/1691). Western scholars like Antoine Galland (d. 1715), Ferdînando Marsili (d. 1730), and Levînus Warner (d. 1665) are known to have been in personal contact with these circles. There is no evidence that K.Ç. ever met Evliya Çelebî (d. >1683), although it is not unlikely, given common acquaintances. In addition, K.Ç. shows great sympathy for political figures associated with attempts at political reform. Since his work is one of the major sources for the period it is not clear if their political program aroused his sympathy, or if his ties to them caused him to depict them as reformers. Several of his works are directly related to political developments (see below). He knew Kemâneḳ Qara Muṣṭafâ Paşâ (executed in 1054/1644), and expressed sympathy for Taṛğûncu Ahmed Paşâ (d. 1063/1653). His last work, Mizânitî-l-Ḥaqq, includes a cryptic homage to Köprülü Meḥmed Paşâ (d. 1072/1661).9

According to a later note in the flyleaf of one of the Cihânûnuma autographs, K.Ç. died of a heart attack on 27 Dhulhijja 1067/6 October 1657.10 Many of his major
works remained unfinished. The only attested son had died at a young age. Parts of his library were sold in 1069/1659, presumably after the death of his wife. Several volumes were purchased by Levinus Warner and today constitute a part of the Legatum Warnerianum at Leiden University. Others were acquired by a former friend, Vişnezađe Mehmed ʻİzzeti (d. 1092/1681), and passed on to geographer Ebû Bekr Behrâm el-Dimisqî (d. 1102/1691), and further to printer İbrahim Muteferrika (d. 1158/1745).

Throughout his work, K.Ç. appears as an eager reader and compiler in the service of a broad contemporary audience, although comparison with impulses of early Enlightenment should be used only with caution. He certainly was not a scientist or philosopher seeking radical departures from current ideas. Rather, he seems to be largely representative of the intellectual currents of his age, including his openness to knowledge from Europe. He continues to perceive knowledge as an exogenous category, albeit strictly subject to rational criticism. His worldview is thoroughly theocentric, as he sees the cosmos as ordered by divine creation. Causation of historical events follows inner-worldly regularities, which however are suspended by divine will. Despite his familiarity with Western scholarship there is no trace of the heliocentric worldview in his work. K.Ç. can be considered a turning point in Ottoman intellectual history, as in his historical and geographical works a unified perspective emerges, which is interested in the world not as an indication of divine omnipotence (as was the case in classical cosmography), but seeks useful knowledge to cope with economic, military, and political challenges. Celebrated in the Turkish Republic, especially upon the 300th anniversary of his death in 1957, as a forerunner of Westernization, K.Ç. has not attracted much attention since.

**Works**

K.Ç. was one of the most prolific Ottoman authors, although the title of the “Ottoman Suyûţ” attributed to him by modern scholars exaggerates the amount of his writings. His works are spread out over a wide variety of topics, but can easily be divided into four major groups. On the other hand, K.Ç.’s continuous work on many of his books, together with the open concept of what constitutes an original work, make a chronological presentation difficult. What follows is a discussion of K.Ç.’s extant works and their most important manuscripts.

The fact that many of his works are preserved in the autograph allows glimpses into the workshop of the Ottoman scholar. They indicate that K.Ç. was working with loose scraps of paper to collect bits of information, probably also to allow for alphabetical ordering. Vast amount of marginal notes and corrections indicate that K.Ç. continued and updated his work throughout his life. Certain types of marginal notes, concluding with *minhû* (“by the author”) were used by some Ottoman scholars; different from corrections such notes were supposed to remain in the margins when a text was copied. K.Ç. uses these marginalia in a fashion very similar to footnotes, in
order to provide additional information without interrupting the main text. His numerous references to sources indicate that he used to foliate his books, which can also be used to identify titles as belonging to his personal library.

A. The ‘Encyclopedic Project’

K.Ç.’s lasting legacy for Ottoman scholars consists of a series of encyclopedic works which are closely interrelated, albeit lacking explicit references to one another. Their common aim is to collect existing knowledge which is dispersed in numerous, partly inaccessible books, and put it at the hands of the public in simple alphabetical or chronological order, with the underlying assumption that knowledge is useful and necessary, and that its dissemination can help to dispel the crisis that befell the Ottoman state in the 11th/17th century. What is referred to here as the ‘Encyclopedic Project’ basically taps into what K.Ç. perceived as the accumulated knowledge of mankind, from the biographical, bibliographical, historical/chronological, and spatial/geographical points of view, respectively. Arabic is the preferred, but not exclusive, language used for these works.

**Kashf az-zunūn ‘an asāmi l-kutub wa l-funūn**

K.Ç.’s bibliographical dictionary, written in Arabic. It represents a unique achievement in that, after a general introduction which to a large extent depends on Ibn Khalduñ’s *Muqaddima*, it consists of one continuous alphabetic sequence of ca. 14,500 book titles and 300 names of sciences. With the latter K.Ç. is taking Taşköprüzäde’s (d. 968/1561) *Miftah al-sa‘āda* as his model. In every entry for a book K.Ç. noted, wherever possible, the title, the language, the name of the author and the date of composition, the incipit, the division into chapters (the presence of which can be taken as an indication that he had actually seen the book), as well as translations and commentaries (as cross references). Entries on sciences were also intended to include a list of relevant book titles as cross references, but these are often missing. In certain instances entries also include criticism of the book or the author. The scope of the work covers Arabic, Persian, and Turkish literature, with a few references to Greek texts. While the book is still appreciated as a reference, its potential as a source for 11th/17th century intellectual history, in particular in the definition of a literary and scholarly canon, has not yet been explored.

The way in which K.Ç. managed to arrange this mass of material is still not entirely clear. Birnbaum has argued that he must have used a system of index cards as the basis of the work. Preserved is an autograph of a partial fine copy, ending with article “–dürüs”. According to a note in *Mizānī l-ḥaqqa*, the fine copy had reached the letter ħā in 1063/1652. For the rest, the author’s draft with numerous marginal additions and annotations has been preserved. Whereas early editions and an edition-cum-translation are based on individual manuscripts, the autograph has been used as the basis of the edition by Bilge and Yaltkaya. In addition to a short continu-
Atation by Ḥanifezāde Ahmed Tāhir (d. 1217/1802), entitled Hadīṣ-i nev, a larger one was authored by Bağdādī İsmāʿīl Paşa (d. 1339/1920), together with an index of authors.25

2 Faḍlakat aqwāl al-ḥiyār
A world history, written in Arabic, continuing a tradition of world histories started in the late 10th/16th century, arranged by dynasties. The last representative of this tradition seems to be Mūneccimbaṣı (d. 1113/1702). K.Ç. mentions Cenābī’s chronicle (d. 999/1590) explicitly as the model, while Meḥmed b. Meḥmed’s (d. 1050/1640) Nuḥbetü’l-tevārîh is another important source. The reason for the emergence of this distinct historiographical form among the Ottomans more or less throughout the 12th/18th century is unknown. Just as Mūneccimbaṣı’s work in its Arabic version never found a wider audience, K.Ç.’s work, which covers history from creation to the year 1000/1592 did not make an impact.

Though the work appears to be largely a compilation, a few presumably original chapters deal with rebels in Islam from the Kharijites to the Celâlis, and with historiography and chronology. An index of names is also included, while the announced bibliography is missing.26

3 Taqvīmū’l-tevārîh
Chronological tables of world history, from the beginnings until K.Ç.’s own time. Written in a mixture of Persian and Turkish, the work originated as an excerpt from Faḍlakat aqwāl al-ḥiyār, but continued up to K.Ç.’s own time and was completed in 1058/1648. Becoming highly popular as an easy reference work, it was continued after K.Ç.’s death by several authors, including Ḥüseyin Hezârfenn,27 Şeyhî (d. 1145/1732),28 and İbrâhîm Müteferriqa, who published it as the twelfth product of his press in 1146/1733. Şemānizâde Süleymân (d. 1193/1779) expanded the chronological structure into a narrative in his Mür’iyü’l-tevārîh. Equally popular in Europe as a reference work, it was translated into Latin, Italian, and French.29 Today, the afterword is the main part of interest, as it contains a brief discussion of the regularities or laws of history, and an initial elaboration of his ideas of causation in history, which are later copied by Naʿīmâ (d. 1128/1716) in his theoretical discussion.

4 Fezleke-i tevārîh
A chronicle of the Ottoman Empire written in Turkish, the work is a continuation of Faḍlakat aqwāl al-ḥiyār beginning with the year 1000/1592. While the earlier parts are quite comprehensive, the latest parts have many lacunae, suggesting that the book was not completed by K.Ç.’s death. Under every year, a narration of the main events in strictly chronological order is followed by obituaries of prominent persons who died in that year. Otherwise, it remains within the conventions of Ottoman chronicle writing. A few passages discuss European events, like the Thirty Years’
War. Küttükoğlu demonstrated that K.Ç. used several prominent chroniclers (e.g. Muṣṭafā Ṭūğī, Peçevî, Hasanbegzâde) as his main sources and makes occasional reference to individual works by Ṭūğī (d. >1034/1623), Muṣṭafâ Şâfî (d. 1025/1617), and others. As indicated above, only very few passages are based on K.Ç.’s individual experiences within the context of his participation in military campaigns, while for political events he seems to be relying on written sources and oral informants. Studies of Ottoman historiography have tried to relate K.Ç.’s political outlook to his social position as a scribe in the service of the palace, without taking into account his other works, as well as his vast education. 

Fezleke turned out to be very influential, serving as a source for ʿĪṣâzâde (d. 1163/1750) and Naʾīmâ and being continued by Silâhdâr (d. 1202/1788?).

5 Cihânnümâ

K.Ç.’s longest-lasting and, in terms of its textual history, most complex work is a world geography in Turkish. This textual history has first been studied by F. Taeschner (d. 1967), whose findings were confirmed and refined by G. Hagen. K.Ç.’s interest in geography was sparked off by the beginning of the Cretan War in 1055/1645. In keeping with the goals of the ‘Encyclopedic Project,’ K.Ç. began the work as an expansion of Şipâhzâde’s alphabetical excerpt, written in Arabic, from Abu’l-Fidâ’s Taqwîm al-buldân. The first original version, now in Turkish, largely followed the structure of a classical Islamic cosmography (i.e. the division into spheres, elements, and climes). The broader geographical scope, intended to include recent information on Europe and the New World, as well as the illustration with maps in the margins are innovative features of the work and indicate K.Ç.’s attempt to detach geography from the theological roots of cosmography and provide a comprehensive and up-to-date survey of the world based on all kinds of sources regardless of genre. Abu’l-Fidâ’ (d. 732/1331), Mehemd ʿĀṣîq (d. >1596), Pîrî Re’îs’ (d. 961/1553) Bâhriye (in both versions), as well as Hoca Sa’deddin’s (d. 1008/1599) Tâcî’t-tevârîf are K.Ç.’s main sources.

K.Ç. states that this work was abandoned when he was unable to locate sufficient information on Europe. Numerous manuscripts of this incomplete version were circulating, comprising the description of the seas, lakes, rivers, and of the climes of al-Andalus, Mağrib, and Rûmeli. Two different stages of this version can be distinguished. A detailed study of manuscripts in Istanbul may reveal even more variations. Despite his frustration K.Ç. continued to add notes and excerpts to a fine copy in his possession.

K.Ç.’s work on the Cihânnümâ was revived when he was able to lay his hands on several European geographical works, which a French convert to Islam translated for him (contrary to assertions in some later studies, K.Ç. certainly did not know Latin or Italian). The most important of these works is Iodocus Hondius’ redaction of Gerhard Mercator’s Atlas, entitled Atlas Minor, translated as Levâmi’ü’n-nûr. In 1065/1654,
with the translation still in progress, K.Ç. started over with his work on Cihannümâ. The second version of the work began with a systematic introduction to cartography and mathematical geography, including a refutation of mythical Islamic cosmography. Moreover, K.Ç. started by making for the first time an explicit argument for the strategic and political usefulness of the science of geography.

After an overview of the seas and the continents, K.Ç. begins the descriptions of countries in the east, working westward. Each description is based on a template which can be found in the Viennese Draft and is derived from Mercator’s approach. East and Southeast Asia are described primarily according to Western sources. In addition to Mercator these include Theatrum Orbis Terrarum by Ortelius, Introductio in totam geographiam by Philippus Cluverius, La Fabbrica del Mondo by Giovanni Lorenzo d’Anania, and a commentary on Aristotle’s Meteorologica by the Jesuit Collegium Conimbricense. Further west K.Ç. relies on Islamic sources. Besides those used for the first version of Cihannümâ, the most important ones among these sources are ˘amdallâh Mustaufi’s Nuzhatu l-qulûb and Amîn A’hmad Râzî’s Haft Iqlîm.42 Each chapter was supposed to be accompanied by a map, some of which were copied from Atlas Minor, some drawn by K.Ç. based on textual evidence. Such maps indicate that K.Ç. was not a skilled cartographer, with little interest in issues of projection and calculation.

The second version of Cihannümâ remained unfinished after K.Ç.’s death, ending with the description of Armenia. The autograph copy43 bears marginal comments by Ebû Bekr b. Behrâm ed-Dimiﬂı, geographer and translator of Blaeuw’s Atlas Maior for Me˘hmed IV (r. 1058-1099/1648-87),44 who obviously intended to use it for a new geography of the Ottoman Empire. It is also the basis of the printed edition by İbrâhîm Müteferriqa, entitled Cihannümâ, which consists of the second version,45 supplemented with excerpts from a work by Ebû Bekr with a description of the Asiatic part of the Ottoman Empire,46 making the most frequently cited part of Cihân- nümâ not K.Ç.’s but Ebû Bekr’s.47 Why Müteferriqa decided to publish the fragmentary and increasingly outdated Cihannümâ, instead of a version of Ebû Bekr’s more recent and complete work remains somewhat of a mystery.

Manuscripts of Cihannümâ may consist of the first version, the second version, or a combination of both.48 The number of extant manuscripts indicates the widespread interest in geography, while the printed edition may have found more interest among Europeans.49

Several attempts have been made to supplement the Cihannümâ. A second volume announced by Müteferriqa never materialized.50 Şehrîzade A’hmed’s Ravţatu’l-enfûs fi’t-ta’rîf was conceived as a continuation.51 The Atlas of Bartınlı İbrâhîm Hamdi, completed in 1163/1750, with individual additions until after 1173/1760, has been characterized as an expanded revision of the Cihannümâ.52 Several minor continuations, partly in private manuscript collections, have been noted by Taeschner and Sarıcaoğlu.53
A biographical dictionary in Arabic, primarily focusing on scholars. In the context of the ‘Encyclopedic Project’ this work can be also understood as an index of authors for Kashf az-żunūn. The first part, in which entries are arranged according to personal names (ism), is largely based on Tašköprüzâde’s aš-Šaqā’iq an-nu‘mâniyya and Ibn Khallikân’s Wâfayât al-a‘yân. The second part, covering persons primarily known under their nicknames (laqab), is based on Suyûṭi’s Taḥřîr al-lubâb. Though a note in the autograph indicates that these two parts were completed in 1053/1643, there remain many blanks or entries consisting of references only. Another part was added in 1058/1649. The work includes an autobiographical entry.

B. Translations and Rewritings
K.Ç. prepared several translations of European, primarily Latin, works as basis for his encyclopedic works, especially Cihânînûmâ. These translations are mostly preserved in unique manuscripts, an indication that they were not considered independent works and were not disseminated in the same way. His excerpts and rewritings of older works fall into the same category.

1 Levāmî‘u‘n-nūr fi ‘ulmât Aṭlâs Mînûr
A translation of Iodocus Hondius’ redaction of Gerhard Mercator’s Atlas, entitled Atlas Minor, intended as a basis for the rewriting of Cihânînûmâ, completed in 1065/1655.

2 Revnaqu’s-salṭanat
A translation of Historia rerum in Oriente gestarum ab exordio mundi et orbe condito ad nostra haec usque tempora (Frankfurt, 1587), a Latin translation of four Byzantine chronicles with an appendix on Ottoman history.

3 Ta’rîh-i firangî
Translation of Johann Carion’s Chronicon (Paris, 1548) into Turkish, completed in 1065/1655. Carion’s Chronicon was printed many times all over Europe. The edition of Philipp Melanchthon became a staple of Protestant propaganda. K.Ç.’s preface describes the translation as a working draft and source for future books.

4 Bahriye
An excerpt from Pîrî Re‘îs’ Bahriye from K.Ç.’s hand, expanded to form a new work, has recently been discovered by Fikret Sarıcaoğlu.

C. Occasional Treatises
A number of K.Ç.’s works are momentary interventions in current political and scholarly discourse, and have to be carefully placed in their chronological context.
Düstürü'l-’amel li-ışlāhi l-ḥalel

In order to discover the causes of the financial crisis in 1063/1653, grand vizier ʻArfancu Aḥmed Paşa ordered a collation of the account books, which might have involved the clerk K.Ç. In addition, K.Ç. produced a small treatise in the tradition of reform (or “decline”) treatises, which analyses the crisis with the means of an analogy between the body politic and the human body, drawing on Ibn Khaldūn’s concept of the ages of the state, and Dawwání’s analogy with Galenic medicine, in which the four humors of the body are likened to the estates of human society. K.Ç. pleads for a return to qānūn-ı qadım, and for a reduction in the number of the Porte troops, whereas other treatises of the same kind have focused on the decline of the timar system. K.Ç. ultimately leaves the question open if a “man of the sword” would be able to revert the seemingly unavoidable decline. Düstürü'l-’amel has influenced Hezārfenn, and especially Na‘īm’s theoretical discussions.

İrşādu'l-ḥayārā ilā Ta’rīhi'l-Yūnān ve ’r-Rūm ve’n-Naṣārā

A short treatise on the Christian confessions and dynasties in Turkish, begun in 1065/1655. Based on older apologetic literature, K.Ç. discusses the distinctions of the Eastern Church (Jacobites, Melkites, Nestorians), but not the one between Catholics and Protestants. The histories of European countries are hardly more than lists of rulers. It breaks off after 9 chapters. Descriptions of kings suggest that K.Ç.’s source was illustrated. Despite K.Ç.’s claim to provide important information on the struggle against Christendom, the information in this book is profoundly trivial.

Tuḥfetü'l-kibār fi esfārīl-biḥār

A history of Ottoman maritime warfare in Turkish, written in Safer 1067/November 1656. This date places the book in a moment of utmost danger for the Ottoman capital following the defeat of the Ottoman navy at the hands of the Venetians at the Dardanelles (4 Ramadan 1066/26 June 1656) and the subsequent loss of the islands of Lemnos and Tenedos. It is also written shortly after the appointment of Köprüli Mehmed Paşa as grand vizier (25 Dhulqada 1066/14 September 1656). Thus it is suggested to read it as a program of reform of the navy intended for a person in whom K.Ç. might have seen the “man of the sword” who might revert the fate of the Empire. Of the four ʻulemā who wrote endorsements for the book two are closely related to the Köprüli family.

The first part is a history of Ottoman maritime campaigns from the beginning to 1067/1656, while the second is a systematic description of naval affairs, from administration and offices to shipbuilding, culminating in a list of 40 suggestions for organization and strategy of the Ottoman navy, including the use of recent scientific and technological innovations. Thus the juxtaposition with history provides an argument for reform. Suggestions are largely centered around the traditional qānūn-ı qadım; there is no reference to high-board ships. The final pages include an important
discussion of historical causality, explaining how divine omnipotence creates the conse-
quence of historical causes, in reward for righteous rule, or punishment of injus-
tice.62

④ Mızânü'l-хаqq ft ihityā'ı'l-ахаqq

A belated intervention in the conflict between the Qâdizâde movement and the
dervish orders of the Ottoman Empire, written in the immediate aftermath of Köprülü
Meḥmed Paşa’s cracking down on the former in 1066/1656. The contentious points
are discussed in a series of short chapters: The life of the Prophet Ḥîdr, singing,
dancing and whirling, the invoking of blessings on prophets and companions, tobac-
co, coffee, opium and other drugs, the parents of the Prophet, the faith of Pharaoh,
Ibn al-Ś Arabî, the cursing of Yazid, innovation, pilgrimages to tombs, supererogatory
prayers, shaking hands and bowing, enjoining right and forbidding wrong, the
religion of Abraham, bribery. Ḵ.Ç. mostly reaches conclusions on a middle ground,
although his line of reasoning is closer to the rationalism of the Qâdizâdeli than to
mysticism. In several cases he justifies a particular custom on historical grounds,
despite legal arguments against it. Since he finds that the parents of the Prophet were
unbelievers, the relevant chapter was omitted from the printed edition. Carefully
supported by a lengthy autobiography which emphasized the author’s scholarly
qualification and his piety, Mızânü'l-хаqq became Ḵ.Ç.’s most popular work. Most
major manuscript collections have a copy.63 Gökyay counted about 30 in Istanbul.64

⑤ İlhâmü'l-muqaddes mine'l-feyzî'l-aqdes

A short legal treatise on astronomical questions, written in criticism of şeyḫīlislâm
Behâ’ı Efendi in 1064/1654.

D. Didactic and Entertaining Compilations

Several of Ḵ.Ç.’s works are collections of bits of texts, partly for the purpose of
teaching, partly as entertaining anthologies. None of them have been studied.

① Jami’ al-muṭūn min jall al-funûn

An anthology of scholarly texts of different disciplines.

② Tuhfetî l-āḥyar fî'l-ḥikem ve l-emṣâl ve'l-aṣʿār

An anthology of entertaining and edifying texts in Arabic, Persian, and Turkish,
arranged according to keywords in alphabetical order, written between 1061-63/1651-
53, edited from drafts and supplemented by a certain Yazicizâde Meḥmed. It remains
to be seen if this should be considered part of the ‘Encyclopedic Project.’

③ Dürer-i münteşire ve ğurer-i münteşire

A compilation of anecdotes largely from biographical sources, and thus a by-
product of Sullam al-Wušūl. The title is not original, but is based on a phrase in the introduction. Presumably identical with a work mentioned in Mīzānī‘l-ḥaqq⁶⁵ and described as a collection in the manner of Ghaffārī’s Nīgāristān.
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