THE OTTOMAN PRINTING ENTERPRISE:

LEGALIZATION, AGENCY AND NETWORKS, 1831–1863

AYŞE TEK BAŞARAN

BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY

2019

THE OTTOMAN PRINTING ENTERPRISE:

LEGALIZATION, AGENCY AND NETWORKS, 1831–1863

Thesis submitted to the

Institute of for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

History

by

Ayşe Tek Başaran

Boğaziçi University

2019

The Ottoman Printing Enterprise:

Legalization, Agency and Networks, 1831-1863

The thesis of Ayşe Tek Başaran

has been approved by:

Assoc. Prof. Derin Terzioğlu _____
(Thesis Advisor)

Prof. Edhem Eldem _____

Assoc. Prof. Ahmet Ersoy _____

Prof. Hatice Aynur _____
(External Member)

Assoc. Prof. Akşin Somel _____
(External Member)

May 2019

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, Ayşe Tek Başaran, certify that

- I am the sole author of this thesis and that I have fully acknowledged and documented in my thesis all sources of ideas and words, including digital resources, which have been produced or published by another person or institution;
- this thesis contains no material that has been submitted or accepted for a degree or diploma in any other educational institution;
- this is a true copy of the thesis approved by my advisor and thesis committee at Boğaziçi University, including final revisions required by them.

Signature ..... A. Başaran

Date 16.06.2019

ABSTRACT

The Ottoman Printing Enterprise:

Legalization, Agency and Networks, 1831-1863

This dissertation focuses on the consolidation of the Ottoman printing enterprise between the establishment of the Directorate of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire* in 1831 and its annexation to the Ministry of Public Education in 1863. It argues that the main agents of the printed medium emerged in this period. These agents and the Ottoman state entered a process of intensive experimentation, competition, and bargaining that paved the way for the formation of a legal framework. Moreover, their interaction with the changing socio-economic context introduced the printed book as a commercialized item in the Ottoman market. In the meantime, what was in origin a foreign technology was internalized, made Ottoman, and rendered meaningful.

This study further treats the printed books under two groups: as textbooks prioritized by the Ottoman state for their utility-value and as books introduced by non-state actors with an eye to tastes in the wider book market. In both cases, traditional and religious titles substantially outnumber new titles. This shows that a new technology was in fact utilized for the dissemination of the Ottoman traditional culture, a finding that challenges the narratives of nineteenth-century Ottoman modernization and secularization. Rather than a technological device, the printing press becomes a socio-intellectual tool for various agents bending even the traditional discourse in a new direction; by the 1860s, the press would become such a familiar part of Ottoman society that even those texts considered most sacred would be printed underground, in violation of both political and religious sensitivities.

ÖZET

Osmanlı Matbaacılığının Yerelleşmesi:

Yasal Zemin, Aktörler ve Toplumsal Ağlar, 1831-1863

Bu tez 1831 yılında *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire* Nezareti'nin kuruluşuyla başlayan Osmanlı matbaa işletmesindeki yeni dönemi, yönetimin Maarif-i Umumiye Nezareti'ne devrolunduğu 1863 senesine kadar izlemektedir. Bu dönemi Osmanlı devleti kadar ortaya çıkan yeni devlet dışı aktörler üzerinden anlamaya çalışır; birbirleriyle giriştikleri rekabet ve pazarlıklar sonucu ortaya çıkan yasal zemine de ışık tutar. Öte yandan kitabın Osmanlı piyasası içerisinde ticarileşmesini bu ilişkiler üzerinden anlamaya çalışır. Bu süreçte matbaa artık salt Batı'dan aktarılan yeni bir teknolojik aygıt olarak kalmayıp yerelleşmiş ve Osmanlı bağlamında yeni anlam ve işlevler kazanmıştır. Bu bakış açısı matbaayı teknik bir ilerleme aracı olarak görmek yerine yerel sosyal ve siyasi dinamiklerin bir parçası ve hatta sonucu olarak tartışır.

Bu çalışma aynı zamanda 1831-1863 tarihleri arasında basılmış kitap külliyatını iki grup ve farklı niyet üzerinden inceler; Osmanlı devletinin pratik ihtiyaçlarına hizmet etmek üzere öne çıkardığı ders kitapları ve devlet dışı aktörlerin daha çok maddi güdülerle satış odaklı hareket edip baskıya sunduğu daha geniş piyasaya hitap eden popüler kitaplar. İki grubun da seçimleri daha geleneksel ve hatta dini temaları öne çıkarmaktadır. Bu anlamda bu tez günümüzde hala yaygın olan 19. yüzyıl Osmanlı sekülerleşme ve modernleşme anlatılarını sorgulayan bir bakışla Batı'dan alınan teknolojinin aslında Osmanlı toplumunda geleneksel olarak var olan zemini güçlendirmeye de hizmet ettiği iddiasında bulunur. Diğer yandan bu geleneksel zeminin yine aktörlerin ve kesişen sosyal ağların katkısıyla aslında dönüşüm halinde olduğunu ortaya koyar. O kadar ki 1860'lara gelindiğinde artık

gündelik hayatın bir parçası kabul edilen matbaa hem siyasi hem de dini hassasiyetler göz ardı edilerek Kur'ân-ı Kerîm ve Eczâ-i Şerîfe basar hale gelmiştir.

CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME: Ayşe Tek Başaran

DEGREES AWARDED

PHD, History, 2019, Boğaziçi University
MA, History, 2005, Boğaziçi University
BA, Political Science, 2002, Davidson College, USA

AREAS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

History of Ottoman book culture and publishing, Ottoman cultural history, nineteenth century social and political history, historiography and historical writing and the history of education

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Instructor, Department of History, İstanbul Şehir University, 2012-2019
Research Assistant, Department of History, İstanbul Şehir University, 2010-2012
Teaching Assistant, Department of History, Boğaziçi University, 2006-2009
Research Assistant, Department of History, Boğaziçi University, 2003-2006

PUBLICATIONS

MA Thesis:

Başaran, A. (2005). *Erzurumlu Ibrahim Hakkı's Ma'rifetnâme (1757): A Case Study in Ottoman Reception of Modern Science* (Unpublished MA Thesis). Boğaziçi University

Journal Article:

Başaran, A. (2015). [Review of the book *Osmanlı Kitap Kültürü: Cârullah Efendi Kütüphanesi ve Derkenar Notları,* edited by Berat Açıl]. *İslam Araştırmaları Dergisi* 34, 175-204.

Conference Proceedings:

Başaran, A. (2016). Networks of Illicit Printing: Chapters of the Qur'an Circulating in Istanbul in the Tanzimat Era. In *American Comparative Literature Association (ACLA), Harvard University,* Massachusetts, *USA, March 17-20.*

Başaran, A. (2016). Ottoman Control of Illicit Books: A Case Study on Bulgarian Booksellers in the Tanzimat Era. In *Panel for the Centre for Cultural, Literary and Postcolonial Studies (CCLPS) Graduate Conference: Book History Beyond the Book in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East*, *SOAS, University of London, UK, June 13.*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The saying goes that it takes a village to write a dissertation. This is no exaggeration. The research and writing of this particular study has extended over a long period during which I had the privilege of interacting with many generous individuals who provided different forms of help and guidance.

I have to start with my advisor Derin Terzioğlu, to whom I owe the greatest debt. If not for a new graduate class she taught at Boğaziçi on "the history of the book" sometime in 2004, I would not have known of this fascinating field. For years, her guidance, patience, and scholarly insight have not only led my way, but also set a high standard for all my personal and academic endeavors. Her close reading of every draft, her insightful critique and historical outlook all greatly contributed to the sharpening of my own development as a scholar. I will always remain honored to have been one of her first students. At the same time, I have to express my gratitude to Hatice Aynur, who entered the course of this dissertation at a critical time of much doubt and confusion. With a clear and solid vision, she always knew the right thing to motivate me. The extent of her guidance and encouragement turned her into my mentor and informal advisor. Moreover, her knowledge of the field and the sources, professional experience, and practicality greatly contributed to the dissertation's completion. Ahmet Ersoy, who has been an inspiration to me ever since my early years at Boğaziçi, was thankfully also there for every critical step of this project. He became the ideal reader and listener, one who asked the most critical questions, pointed at potential problems, yet also offered viable solutions. I am also beyond thankful to Edhem Eldem for his invaluable contributions to not only this dissertation but also the broader span of my training as a scholar. Just the sheer knowledge that he would end up reading my project motivated me to work and push harder. Last but

not least, Akşin Somel meticulously read the study and commented on parts where help was most needed. I will always remain in awe of the professionalism with which he offered his tactful and constructive criticisms.

In the process of writing this dissertation, I was also blessed with the opportunity to work with the distinguished faculty members of İstanbul Şehir University. In particular, I would like to thank all my professors and colleagues in the history department, who supported me for years both professionally and academically. If not for Tufan Buzpınar's constantly pushing me to concentrate on my project, it would certainly still not be finished. To know that great scholars such as Cengiz Kallek, Coşkun Çakır, Cem Behar, Yunus Uğur and Günhan Börekçi were just a few doors away was a great source of comfort throughout this journey. I thank Kahraman Şakul and Abdurrahman Atçıl for always being so generous with their time in answering my constant questions. I owe special thanks to Abdülhamit Kırmızı for taking time to read a section of this project and provide heart-warming feedback at a most needed moment. I am also grateful to my long-time roommate Nicole Kançal-Ferrari, who has accompanied me through my highs and lows and served as a great example as a scholar and friend. Moreover, İsmail Kara has always made time to help me, in a spirit of patience and humility, at different stages of my research. I also consider myself one of the luckiest scholars of my generation for having the chance to work alongside Mehmet Genç and Engin Deniz Akarlı. Their passion for history and scholarship have been an inspiration to me, and their generous assistance and broad vision have greatly benefited my research.

More thanks go to a number of other friends and colleagues who have supported me in different ways throughout this journey: Yıldız Yılmaz Karakoç, Azize Çakır, Onur Öner, Reyyan Bilge and Feyza Başoğlu. I owe the greatest debt,

however, to Abdullah Saçmalı, Ayşe Seyyide Adıgüzel, Hümeyra Bostan and Hugh Turner for critical touches when they were most needed and to Murat Şiviloğlu, who also read parts of my dissertation and provided valuable feedback. Fatma Aladağ also had a hand towards its completion. Above all, my friend Betül İpşirli Argıt has been there since the beginning, offering the greatest help by setting the best example in more ways than just as a scholar. I cannot thank her enough for her unwavering encouragement through the years.

On a more personal note, this study is the product of much sacrifice on the part of my family. All the members of my extended family have shouldered more than their share of the burden, sacrificing their time for the benefit of this dissertation, which must sometimes have seemed a project without end. My mother and father placed their confidence in me a long time ago, and they never held back their love and support. My sister never faltered in her love and trust. I also extend my gratitude to my greater family, including my grandmother, mother-in-law, and father-in-law. More thanks go to two special people, who did not live to see the end of this study, but who were often in my thoughts and prayers: my late aunt, who predicted I would pursue a PhD and even insisted that I do so long before I knew what a PhD was; and my late grandfather, a more avid reader than any scholar I know, whose passion for the written word showed me that reading is not only a scholarly activity.

More than anyone else, Serkan, my husband and best friend, has believed in me, supported me, and cheered me on unflaggingly over the years. Mere thanks cannot do him justice. Last but not least, my love and thanks go to the “apples of my eye,” my sons, Yahya and Taha, who were born during the research of this dissertation. I cannot find the words to describe the love and motivation I found in

them to continue this dissertation, which ironically made me miss precious moments from their childhood. It is hence to these three lovely men that I dedicate it.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION ……...1

1.1 A brief history of the printing press in the Ottoman Empire ……...3

1.2 The nineteenth-century context for the printing press ……..8

1.3 Secondary scholarship on the Ottoman printing press ……17

1.4 Sources and methodology ……..28

1.5. Structure of the dissertation ……...36

CHAPTER 2: A MODEL FOR APPROACHING THE OTTOMAN PRINTING ENTERPRISE: 1831-1863 ……....41

2.1 Introduction ……41

2.2 The structuring of the printing enterprise until 1831 ..……43

2.3 State monopoly over print: 1831-1839……47

2.4 Diversification of the printed book market: 1840-1855 ……64

2.5 Early commercialization of the printed book market: 1856-1863 ……108

2.6 Conclusion……...…..141

CHAPTER 3: PRINTING FOR PUBLIC BENEFIT: TEXTBOOKS……142

3.1 Introduction ……...142

3.2 Discourses on Ottoman state legitimacy……144

3.3 Revisiting Ottoman education through textbooks ……152

3.4 Printing textbooks……..…169

3.5 Conclusion…….228

CHAPTER 4: PRINTING BOOKS FOR THE WIDER MARKET……...231

4.1 Introduction ……...231

4.2 Brokering books for wider readership ……..233

4.3 Commissioning for the wider market ……...248

4.4 “Printing together” for the wider market ……..283

4.5 Conclusion…….302

CHAPTER 5: NETWORKS OF ILLICIT BOOK TRADE AND ATTEMPTS AT SURVEILLANCE……304

5.1 Introduction……304

5.2 Discourse on the approval and surveillance of printing…….306

5.3 Illicit books on the Islamic creed …….315

5.4 Conclusion ……346

CHAPTER 6: EPILOGUE: A BROADER PERSPECTIVE ON OTTOMAN PRINT CULTURE……347

APPENDIX A: DIRECTORS OF THE IMPERIAL PRESS……..368

APPENDIX B: BOOKS PRINTED BETWEEN 1831-1863……..369

APPENDIX C: SAMPLE BOOK PRICES AND PROFIT RATES ……..470

REFERENCES ……... 481

LIST OF APPENDIX TABLES

Table A1. The Official Ottoman Printers between 1727-1792……368

Table A2. The Directors of the Imperial Press: 1797-1831……368

Table A3. The Directors of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire:* 1831-1857……368

Table B1. Printed Books on Grammar of Arabic, Persian, Turkish and French….369

Table B2. Printed Dictionaries……....381

Table B3. Printed Books of Qur'an Readings and Exegesis……...386

Table B4. Printed Books on History and Biography……...388

Table B5. Printed Religious Primers……...394

Table B6. Printed Books on Advice Literature (*mev'ize, nasihat, ahlak)*……402

Table B7. Printed State Regulations……405

Table B8. Printed Military Manuals……409

Table B9. Printed Books on Natural Sciences and Engineering……..411

Table B10. Printed Books on Mathematics……414

Table B11. Printed Books on Medicine……...417

Table B12. Printed Books on Geography and Astronomy……..419

Table B13. Printed Books on Jurisprudence……....422

Table B14. Printed Books on Islamic Creed……426

Table B15. Printed Books on Logic……431

Table B16. Printed Books on Rhetoric……437

Table B17. Printed Books on Sufism and Occult Sciences……442

Table B18. Printed Books on Hadith (Inclusive of Various Forms of Devotional Literature about the Prophet)……451

Table B19. Printed Books on Literature (Prose)……..455

Table B20. Printed Books on Literature (Verse)…….458

Table B21. Uncategorized Printed Books……467

Table B22. Printed School Regulations and Exams……469

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Ahmet Emin Yalman (d. 1972) received his doctoral degree from Columbia University in 1914 with a dissertation entitled "The Development of Modern Turkey as Measured by Its Press." In the preface, he explained that he had written the study "to give a view of Turkey in her struggle for survival and for betterment." He had selected the press "as an index and measure," he said, "because it has always been the leading factor in the Modern Turkish movement."[1] In a progressivist spirit, Yalman was keen to note how dramatically Turkey had transformed since the eighteenth century, a transformation he viewed as closely interlinked with the country's embrace of the press. Those who were "only able to see the surface," however, would not understand "the great and continued changes in Turkey, as indexed and measured … by the development of the press."[2] What he really emphasized about the printing press was not so much its powers as a technology, but how its integration into social and political life could be read as a measure of societal development.

Yalman was not alone. The printing press has long served as a measure of progress for assessing the level of development in the Ottoman Empire. Early Ottoman observers, late Ottoman bureaucrats, and even modern scholars have assumed a simplified relationship between technology and modernization, equating the trajectory of the one with that of the other. This understanding has obscured much of the historical change and the wider socio-political context that accompanied the printing press, especially in the nineteenth century.

---

[1] Ahmet Emin Yalman, "The Development of Modern Turkey as Measured by Its Press" (Phd diss., Columbia University, 1914), 5.
[2] Yalman, "The Development of Modern Turkey," 139.

This dissertation has arisen from the need to place the Ottoman experience with the printing press into its proper historical context. More specifically, it explores the consolidation of the printing enterprise in the Ottoman Empire during the first half of the nineteenth century. Despite the piecemeal efforts to establish a Turkish-language press in the eighteenth century, the real institutionalization of Ottoman-Turkish printing took place under the newly founded Directorate of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire* in 1831 and culminated in the annexation of its administration under the Ministry of Public Education in 1863. Marking the time interval between 1831 and 1863 as the "second formation" of the Ottoman printing enterprise, this dissertation contends that it represented a whole new period—one that gave rise to some of the main agents of the printed medium such as private printers and the contractors who brought their books to the Imperial Press for printing purposes. At the same time, it constituted a period of intensive experimentation, competition, and bargaining which led to the formation of a legal space regulating the involvement of these actors with the printing press, and thereby the Ottoman state. Uncovering the complexities of these relationships that characterized the printing enterprise is crucial to the deconstruction of the wider narratives of nineteenth-century Ottoman modernization and secularization. To this end, this dissertation explores how an imported technology was internalized and made Ottoman through the mutual exchange between the Ottoman state and non-state agents. At the same time, it demonstrates how the press, in turn, could simultaneously empower both old and new discourses on Ottoman culture and governance.

1.1 A brief history of the printing press in the Ottoman Empire

The Ottoman familiarity with the printing press extended back to the 1490s, when Jewish exiles from Spain opened their first presses in Istanbul and soon expanded to other cities of the empire, such as Salonica, Edirne, and Izmir. The first Armenian press was opened in Istanbul in 1567, and the first Greek press in 1627. As early as 1588, the Ottoman sultans were well aware of the use of the press for printing books in Arabic, as seen in the *ferman* of Sultan Murad III (r. 1574-1595) granting permission to two European merchants to trade their books and pamphlets on Ottoman territories.[3] The first book in the Ottoman Empire with movable type in the Arabic script was printed in Aleppo in 1706.[4] As we turn to the wider early-modern Ottoman geography, we find at least thirty typographic presses operated by the various non-Muslim religious communities.[5]

By the time İbrahim Müteferrika (d. 1747)[6] proposed establishing a printing press to print Turkish books, printing already had at least a two hundred-year history in Ottoman lands, a history in which Ottoman officials had actively participated. In the seventeenth century, in particular, the Ottoman court had intervened several times to resolve communal conflicts over printing.[7] Moreover, the awareness of the printing press clearly extended to the Ottoman Muslim elite, as seen in references to the printing press and the printed book in several seventeenth-century Ottoman texts. These references were, interestingly, quite positive. After noting that the printing

[3] Selim Nüzhet Gerçek, *Türk Matbaacılığı*-1: *Müteferrika Matbaası* (Istanbul, 1939), plate 8.
[4] Ami Ayalon, *The Arabic Print Revolution: Cultural Production and Mass Readership* (Cambridge, 2016), 1-32.
[5] Kathryn Schwartz, "Meaningful Mediums: A Material and Intellectual History of Manuscript and Print Production in Nineteenth Century Ottoman Cairo" (PhD diss., Harvard University, 2015), 30.
[6] There has been much confusion in the scholarship about the year of Müteferrika's death. After discussing the various alternatives, Kemal Beydilli has set it in the year 1747. Kemal Beydilli, *İki İbrahim Müteferrika ve Halefi* (Istanbul: Kronik Yayınları, 2019), 21.
[7] See, for instance, the various studies by Yasin Meral on the Hebrew press. Yasin Meral, "İbrani Matbaacılığında Telif Hakları: 16-18. Yüzyıllar," *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi* 5, no. 2 (2016): 298-320.

press had been invented in the city of Mainz, for instance, the historian İbrahim Peçevî (d. 1649) noted how printing made it easy to make "a thousand copies" of the same text.[8] Katip Çelebi (d. 1657) noted the difficulty of replicating images on Ottoman lands because of the lack of printing (*bu diyârlarda basma isti'mâl olunmamağla bir sahîfesini bile resm emr-i asîrdir)*.[9] Evliya Çelebi (d. 1682) similarly offered positive observations on the book printers (*kitâb basmacılar*) located on a special street of Vienna.[10] Moreover, among the many fascinating books owned by the khan of Bitlis, he noted the presence of two hundred volumes of printed books (*kefere hattı basmasıyla*) on geography and astronomy with such beautiful maps and inscriptions that these "different spectacles would blow away the minds of observers" (*görenin aklı gider özge temâşâdır bu*).[11] These references suggest that there was a growing awareness of certain advances in European technology and learning, including the printing press, by at least a limited segment of the Ottoman literati. However, these positive appraisals did not translate into a concrete agenda to adopt this technology before the eighteenth century.

In the eighteenth century, however, the Ottoman state took on a new initiative to gather information about the printing press in other, primarily European, countries. Mehmed Çelebi (d. 1732) was one of the early ambassadors sent to France in 1721,

[8] İbrahim Peçevî, *Tarih-i Peçevî* (İstanbul: Matbaa-i Âmire, 15 Safer 1283): 106-107. For details on Peçevî's account of the printing press as invented in Mainz, see Guy Burak, "Sansür, Kanonizasyon ve Osmanlı İmza-Takriz Pratikleri Üzerine Düşünceler," in *Eski Metinlere Yeni Bağlamlar - Osmanlı Edebiyatı Çalışmalarında Yeni Yönelimler (Eski Türk Edebiyatı Çalışmaları X*), ed. Ali Emre Özyıldırım, Hanife Koncu, Hatice Aynur, Müjgan Çakır, and Selim Sırrı Kuru (Istanbul: Klasik Yayınları, 2015), 96-117.
[9] Katip Çelebi, *Kitâb-ı Cihannümâ li-Katip Çelebi* (İstanbul, 1145), 55; Orhan Koloğlu, *Basımevi ve Basının Gecikme Sebepleri ve Sonuçları* (İstanbul, 1987), 30. For a wider discussion of these contexts, see Orlin Sabev, "Katip Çelebi ve İbrahim Müteferrika," in *Uluslararası Katip Çelebi Araştırmaları Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, ed. Turan Gökçe, Mikail Acıpınar, İrfan Kokdaş, and Özer Küpeli (İzmir: İzmir Katip Çelebi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2017), 152.
[10] Evliya Çelebi b. Derviş Mehemmed Zılli, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi*, vol. 7, ed. Yücel Dağlı, Seyit Ali Kahraman, and Robert Dankoff (Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2003), 100.
[11] Evliya Çelebi b. Derviş Mehemmed Zılli, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi*, vol. 4, ed. Yücel Dağlı and Seyit Ali Kahraman (Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2003), 155.

and while there, he took note of the presses in Paris.[12] When İbrahim Müteferrika attempted to establish a press in partnership with Mehmed Çelebi's son, Said Çelebi (d. 1761), the news was celebrated by Europeans, in the words of one scholar, as "the triumph of learning over Islamic prejudice" in a way that "fit preconceived notions of the civilizational boundaries between the Ottoman Empire and Christian Europe."[13] For Müteferrika, however, there was a concrete agenda behind the adoption of printing. His manifesto, "The Usefulness of Printing" (*Vesîletü-t-tıbâ'a*), delivered a fundamental and powerful statement legitimizing the need for a printing press.

This manifesto is extremely significant for having shaped the Ottoman official and scholarly discourse on print in a comprehensive fashion at least until the mid-nineteenth century. Published for the first time in the 1727 edition of *Kitâb-ı Lugat-ı Vankulu*, Müteferrika's manifesto attempted to place the printing enterprise in perspective for the state officials.[14] In its description of the ten benefits of printing, the manifesto argued that printing would ensure the most accurate and authentic copies of a given text, enable more people to benefit from books on the necessary arts and sciences by providing them more books at cheaper rates, facilitate the inclusion of auxiliary tools such as indexes and tables of contents to facilitate intertextual references, and give Muslims precedence in the book trade. Collectively,

---

[12] B. Harun Küçük, "Early Enlightenment in Istanbul" (PhD diss., University of California, San Diego, 2012), 195-196; Berna Kılınç, "Yirmisekiz Mehmed Çelebi's Travelogue and the Wonders that Make a Scientific Centre," in *Travels of Learning*, ed. Ana Simoes, Ana Carneiro, and Maria Paula Diogo (Boston: Kluwer, 1998), 85-89.

[13] Disseminating such views were major periodicals of the Republic of Letters such as the *Gazette de France*, the *Journal des Savants*, and the *Mercure de France*. See Jonathan Haddad, "People before Print: *Gens de Lettres*, The Ottoman Printing Press, and the Search for Turkish Literature," *Mediterranean Studies* 25, no. 2 (2017): 220. The conceptualization of Western civilization as superior to other world civilizations was largely the outcome of the Enlightenment. See, for instance, M. de Voltaire, *An Essay on Universal History, the Manners and Spirit of Nations, From the Reign of Charlemaign to the Age of Lewis XIV* (London: J. Nourse, 1759). Kathryn Schwartz has tracked the rumors regarding an Islamic ban on printing to the sixteenth-century French Franciscan priest and cosmographer Andre Thevet. Kathryn A. Schwartz, "Did Ottoman Sultans Ban Print?" *Book History* 20 (2017): 12.

[14] İsmail b. Hammad el-Cevherî, *Tercüme-i Sıhah-ı Cevherî*, trans. Mehmed b. Mustafa el-Vanî (Konstantiniyye: Dârü't-Tıbâ'ati'l-Ma'mûre, Gurre-i Receb 1141), 11-15.

these benefits would serve the higher ends of preserving Islamic heritage, invigorating Islam, and promoting the glory of the Ottoman state by serving Muslims around the world.[15] The manifesto was placed in half of the books published by Müteferrika. It was also incorporated into narrative sources of the period such as the chronicle of Çelebizade Asım Efendi (d. 1760), who referred to the printing press "as a tool for the production of opinion and imagination" (*i'mâl-i âlet-i fikr ü hayâl*) and to the treatise of Müteferrika as a "beneficial treatise" (*risâle-i nâfi'a*).[16] Taken together with the religious *fatwa* issued by Şeyhülislam Yenişehirli Abdullah Efendi (d. 1743) delimiting the lines of permissibility for printing books, these arguments permeated deeply into the emerging Ottoman print culture and facilitated the internalization of the press as part of the Ottoman official discourse in the following decades.

The history of the Ottoman press in Arabic script after Müteferrika was episodic and discontinuous.[17] As demonstrated in Appendix A, Table A1, the press was run intermittently in partnerships until 1797; following the partnership between Kadı İbrahim Efendi (d. 1777) and Kadı Ahmed Efendi, who printed their last book in 1756, the press was revived by Mehmed Raşid Efendi (d. 1798) and Ahmed Vasıf Efendi (d. 1806) in 1784.[18] In their petition to the Grand Vizier, they drew on the

[15] The entire tract by Müteferrika can be found in "Appendix: Ottoman Imperial Documents Relating to the History of Books and Printing," in *The Book in the Islamic World: The Written Word and Communication in the Middle East*, trans. Christopher M. Murphy, ed. George N. Atiyeh (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995), 286-292.
[16] Raşid Mehmed Efendi, Çelebizade İsmail Asım Efendi, *Tarih-i Raşid ve Zeyli III*, ed. Abdülkadir Özcan, Yunus Uğur, Baki Çakır, and Ahmed Zeki İzgöer (Istanbul: Klasik Yayınları, 2013), 1546-1547.
[17] Ahmed Vefik Efendi, in an account followed by later historians, explained these breaks with reference to political and military problems: "… *andan sonra ihtilâl-i dâhiliyenin azması ile umûr-ı devletin türlü müşkülâta uğraması kimesnede hayr düşünmeye mecâl komadığından basımhâne mu'attal olup*…." *Fezleke-i Tarih-i Osmani*, ed. Şakir Babacan (Istanbul: Boğaziçi Yayınları, 2011), 261. Similarly, Giambatista Toderini has ascribed the pauses to the wars. See Giambatista Toderini, *İbrahim Müteferrika Matbaası, ve Türk Matbaacılığı*, trans. Rikkat Kunt (Istanbul: Tidfruk Matbaacılık, 1990), 111.
[18] For a time frame of the printing press, see Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, *Tarih-i Cevdet*, vol. 1 (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2018), 82-83; *Tarih-i Cevdet*, vol. 3, 130-132.

discourse established by Müteferrika to argue that reopening the press would lower book prices and hence increase book circulation.[19] Similarly, Süleyman Penah Efendi (d. 1817) addressed Sultan Abdülhamid I (r. 1774-1789) in a memorandum recommending the revival of the printing press for administrative and educational purposes, while excluding religious texts such as the Qur'an and hadith, as had Müteferrika.[20] As a result, a *berat* was issued to Mehmed Raşid Efendi and Vasıf Efendi defining the press as a tax-farm (*mukâta'a*) and holding the tax-farmers responsible for paying a rent to the imperial endowments in exchange for a monopoly over printing in the Arabic script.[21]

A more concrete state policy started to crystallize with the annexation of the printing enterprise under the newly founded Imperial School of Engineering in 1797. Kemal Beydilli has referred to this stage as the "press of the engineering school" (*Mühendishâne matba'ası*) because of how the press and the school shared both the same location and the same administrative head, the chief instructor and director (*Reîs-i Dârü't-Tıbâ'a*) Abdurrahman Efendi.[22] However, after the press moved to Kapalı Fırın in 1802 and then to Üsküdar, the directors were no longer affiliated with the school. The names of various directors affiliated with the Imperial Press are presented in Appendix A, Table A2. In the meantime, the political uncertainties in Istanbul deriving from the dethronement of Sultan Selim III (r. 1789-1807) in 1807

[19] For a brief overview of the partnership between Raşid Efendi and Vasıf Efendi, see Ethan L. Menchinger, *The First of the Modern Ottomans: The Intellectual History of Ahmed Vasıf* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 20.
[20] Cahit Telci, "Bir Osmanlı Aydınının XVIII. Devlet Düzeni Hakkında Görüşleri: Penah Süleyman Efendi," in *Osmanlı*, vol. 7, ed. Gülen Eren (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye, 1999), 177-188; Orlin Sabev, "A Virgin Deserving Paradise or a Whore Deserving Poison: Manuscript Tradition and Printed Books in Ottoman Turkish Society," in *Friars, Nobles and Burghers – Sermons, Images and Prints*, eds. Jaroslav Miller and László Kontler (Budapest: CEU University Press, 2010), 389-409.
[21] Assigning tax-farms was a common practice at the time in a wide range of enterprises. For instance, a coal-mining tax-farm was assigned in 1795 on similar terms. See Kahraman Şakul, "Osmanlıların İlk Maden Kömürcülüğü Girişimi: Yedikumlar Kömür Madeni Mukataası," *Osmanlı Bilimi Araştırmaları* 18, no. 1 (2006): 39-52.
[22] Kemal Beydilli, *Türk Bilim ve Matbaacılık*, 99-159.

and the Greek revolt in the 1820s took a toll on the continuity and the publishing policies of the press.

1.2 The nineteenth-century context for the printing press

1.2.1 Printing as part of reform discourse

The immense military and fiscal crisis facing the empire at the end of the eighteenth century led to a reform agenda that started with the military, but quickly encompassed many other areas of governance. In a top-down fashion, the Ottoman sultans Selim III (r. 1789-1807) and Mahmud II (r. 1808-1838), each in his own way, instigated reform and transformed rooted Ottoman institutions and practices along the way. The embassy reports as well as reform tracts penned in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries played an important role in envisioning both the boundaries of reform and the concepts for legitimizing it.[23]

In the meantime, the discourse on the printing press continued to be emphasized in proposals, though in some more than others. While the basics of the discourse defined by Müteferrika were taken for granted, the restructuring of the state along the lines of centralization suggested a new twist: printing had begun to be increasingly conceived at the heart of reform as the fundamental disseminator of knowledge.[24] Mehmed Behic Efendi's (d. 1808) proposal from 1803 was especially explicit on the need to turn to the printing press as a vehicle to serve the interests of a state that needed to modernize. Printing would allow for the easy dissemination of regulations, legal documents on various facets of governance, and educational

[23] Kemal Beydilli, "Küçük Kaynarca'dan Tanzimat'a Islahat Düşünceleri," *İlmi Araştırmalar* 8 (1999): 55.
[24] Kahraman Şakul, "Nizâm-ı Cedid Düşüncesinde Batılılaşma ve İslami Modernleşme," *Dîvân İlmî Araştırmalar* 19, no. 2 (2005): 146.

textbooks.[25] In a fashion echoing Müteferrika's manifesto on the benefits of the printing press, Mehmed Behic noted that the printing and dissemination of three to four thousand copies of texts on Arabic grammar and syntax, logic, a few Turkish tracks on the stipulations of Islam, and prose and poetic eulogies for the Prophet (*na't*) in Arabic and Persian would allow poor students to acquire the texts they most needed at cheap rates and thus be of great public benefit (*menâfi'-i külliye*).[26] Similarly, Ömer Faik Efendi argued for the need for the state to reinforce obedience to the sultan by teaching the texts of Mehmed Birgivî (d. 1573) and İbrahim el-Halebî (d. 1549) at the mosques of Istanbul.[27] Here, too, the printed book was perceived as a way to standardize and centralize the desired religious messages and to disseminate them through state-sponsored institutions. Overall, while the early nineteenth-century treatises recognized the press's technical ability to reproduce standardized texts at a quicker rate, their greater concern was with how it would empower the bureaucratic and the religious discourse and facilitate state centralization.

This pragmatic approach to printing was echoed by higher-ranking state officials. Keçecizâde İzzet Molla's (d. 1829) memorandum presented to Mahmud II in 1827 pointed to the need to translate foreign books as part of a larger plan of centralizing and rationalizing all aspects of governance.[28] Moreover, Sadık Rifat Paşa's (d. 1857) tract on Europe, penned in 1837, described the printing press as one of the components of "European civilization" (*Avrupa sivilizasyonu*). He explained that in France and England, all information that had to be conveyed by the state and

[25] Ali Osman Çınar, "Es-Seyyid Mehmed Emin Behic'in Sevanihü'l-Levayih'i ve Değerlendirilmesi" (master's thesis, Marmara University, 1992), 10; Şakul, "Nizam-ı Cedid Düşüncesinde," 141.
[26] Çınar, "Es-Seyyid Mehmed Emin Behic," 13.
[27] Şakul, "Nizam-ı Cedid Düşüncesinde," 146.
[28] Özhan Kapıcı, "Bir Osmanlı Mollasının Fikir Dünyasından Fragmanlar: Keçecizade İzzet Molla ve II. Mahmud Dönemi Osmanlı Siyaset Düşüncesi," *Osmanlı Araştırmaları* 42 (2013): 281.

the motherland (*devletçe ve memleketçe bildirilmesi lâzım gelen şeyler*) would be printed on paper and put up for everyone to read in all corners of the cities. In this way, the people (*ahâlisi*) would be informed (*kesb-i terbiyyet ve ma'lûmât*) about world affairs.[29] Hence, the press served the purpose of communicating the state agenda directly to the wider populace.

As a whole, these accounts suggest that the printing press was perceived and projected as a tool for uniting the interests of students, the wider Ottoman populace, and the Ottoman state in a circuit of benefits. The growing awareness of the significance of the printing press for state policy came to the fore especially during the restructuring efforts of Mahmud II, which led to the establishment of the Directorate of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire* in 1831. Through this directorate, the administration of both the Imperial Press and *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'* was centralized and subsumed directly under the sultan. The various officials appointed as directors are presented in Appendix A, Table A3. The Imperial Press and the press of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'* together produced the majority of textbooks in the empire as well as the official newspaper, travel documents (*mürûr tezkireleri*), paper money (*kâime*), calenders, and various bureaucratic forms and regulations as they became necessary.

In both discourse and practice, the function of the printing press was becoming increasingly clear to the Ottoman officials in the nineteenth century. An imperial edict of Mahmud II in 1820, for instance, reveals that a guidebook on pilgrimage, *Menâsik-i Hac*, had been printed because of the scarcity of this important text in the manuscript market. This publication, the edict emphasized, addressed the wider audience of believers in general. As such, the printed copies did not have to be placed in the libraries, a place clearly identified exclusively with scholars

[29] Sadık Rifat Paşa, "Avrupa Ahvâline Dair Risale," *Marife* 6, no. 3 (2006): 466.

(*ibâdullahın intifâ' eylemeleri kâfîdir*).[30] Printing, accordingly, functioned as a way to reach out to the wider masses and thereby surpassed the role of the library in disseminating knowledge.[31]

As educational policies consolidated in the 1840s, new presses affiliated with the new schools were established in an effort to meet their demand for textbooks—namely, the presses of the Military School (*Maçka Mekteb-i Harbiyyesi*) in 1835, the Naval School (*Mekteb-i Bahriyye*) in 1842, the Medical School (*Mekteb-i Tıbbiyye*) in 1845, and the *Dârülma'ârif Rüşdiyesi* in 1849. In addition to the lithographic press available at the *Bâb-ı Hazret-i Seraskeriyye* since 1831, another one was established at the Imperial Arsenal Sapper Regiments (*Tophâne-i Âmire İstihkâm Alayları Taş Destgâhı*) in 1847.[32] There was also a press of the Imperial Military Band (*Muzıka-yi Hümâyun*) latest by 1860.[33] One must not assume, however, that the printing activities at specific venues were limited to particular themes. For example, though the press of William Churchill, known as *Cerîde-i Havâdis*, was initially granted permission only to publish a newspaper when it was established 1840, it later turned to the printing of textbooks and literary works with both typographic and lithographic presses.[34]

The idea of benefit behind the printing of important books would become so enshrined in the legitimization of printing by the 1850s that even when the finances of the imperial state did not suffice, some other party had to be sought and encouraged to print useful and needed books. In 1855, for example, merely placing

[30] HAT 1319/51224, 1235 (1819/1820).
[31] Yavuz Sezer, "The Architecture of Bibliophilia: Eighteenth Century Ottoman Libraries" (PhD Diss., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2016).
[32] For an overview of the printing presses operating in Istanbul in the nineteenth century, see Server İskit, *Türkiye'de Matbuat Rejimleri* (Istanbul: Matbuat Umum Müdürlüğü Neşriyatı, 1939), 3-42; Jale Baysal, *Müteferrike'dan Birinci Meşrutiyet'e Kadar Osmanlı Türklerinin Bastıkları Kitaplar* (Istanbul: İstanbul Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1968), 46-47.
[33] MVL 857/4, 2 Rebîülevvel 1280 (17 August 1863).
[34] İ.MVL 349/15183, 26 Zilkade 1271 (10 August 1855).

useful books such as Tahtavî's *Dürrü'l-muhtâr* in the libraries was explicitly deemed insufficient. What was needed was a way to transfer them to the printed medium, which in turn required opening up the physical and legal space for outside agents to participate in the printing enterprise.[35]

As the legal space for private presses opened up after the late 1850s, the historical narratives from the second half of the nineteenth century also adopted a more open discussion of the printing press in connection with the progress of civilizations. Ahmed Cevdet Paşa (d. 1895), in his *Târîh* written in the early 1850s, employed the term "craft" (*sınâ'at*) for printing. Being "the mother of civilization" and the most beneficial of the inventions of mankind, it facilitated progress.[36] It was only in the late 1870s, however, that there emerged a powerful discourse on the printing press as an agent of "progress." An informative example of this view can be found in the negotiations of the Press Law by the General Council (*heyet-i umûmiyye*) in the Ottoman parliament in 1877. There, Rasim Bey declared that "progress does not reside in the printing press, but in its publications (*matbû'ât*)."[37] The correlation between printing and progress, as openly stated here, coincided with growing appeal of the term "civilization," referring to refinement as well as advancement in the sciences, arts, and governance.[38] There would be one model of civilization for the Ottoman state to follow, that of Europe.

---

[35] A. MKT. MVL 71/23, 26 Cemâziyelâhir 1271 (16 March 1855). This book was ultimately published at the press of the lithographer Bosnavi Muharrem Efendi in the late 1860s.
[36] "*Sınâ'at-ı tab' u temsil ümm-i medeniyyet ıtlâk olunmağa şâyân ve muhtereât-ı beşeriyyenin enfa'u a'lâsı denmeğe cesbân bir fenn-i celîl-i adîmü'l-adîldir...ve mukaddemleri dahi kesb-i temeddün etmiş olan ba'zı milletlerde fünun ve maârif ilerlemişken eserleri münteşir olmadığından kendilerinin ınkırâzıyla içlerinde deverân eden maârif ve ma'lûmat dahi ke-en lem-yekün hükmüne girmiştir….*" Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, *Tarih-i Cevdet*, vol. 1, 75. Schwartz, "Meaningful Mediums," 68-72.
[37] "*Terakki matbaada değil matbuattadır. Matbaa durduğu yerde terakki hasıl etmez. Bir kağıt basarsa terakki ondandır.*" İskit, *Türkiye'de Matbuat Rejimleri*, 132.
[38] Doğan Gürpınar, *Ottoman/Turkish Visions of the Nation 1860-1950* (UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 151-152.

1.2.2 Printing as part of modernist discourse

The place ascribed to the printing press in contemporary scholarship resides at the intersection of modernization, technological advancement, and secularization. The 1979 edition of Elizabeth Eisenstein's *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change* presented the printing press as a technology endowed with intrinsic powers to shape cultural movements such as the Renaissance, the Reformation and the Scientific Revolution. These intrinsic powers derived from its ability to fix, standardize and disseminate the most accurate versions of texts.[39]

Charging her with technological determinism, a counter literature has turned to approach the press as a "social software," pointing to the significance of the structures of power and the nature of the cultural and social systems within particular societies. [40] Adrian Johns, in particular, has challenged the "authority" of print as inherent to technology. He has most significantly delineated how that authority was socially constructed through the intervention of new mechanisms of surveillance such as the Stationers' Company to build trust over printed matter. The fixity and authority of printing was thus repeatedly defended against outside agents such as publishers, who were ready to challenge legal conventions. In this sense, Johns concluded that "the identity of print itself is *made*" and historically shaped.[41] In the Ottoman Empire, too, the "identity of print" was made not once but many times over

[39] Elizabeth L. Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: Communications and Cultural Transformations in Early Modern Europe* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979).
[40] Christopher Cullen, "Reflections on the Transmission and Transformation of Technologies: Agriculture, Printing and Gunpowder between East and West," in *Science between Europe and Asia: Historical Studies on the Transmission, Adoption and Adaptation of Knowledge*, ed. Feza Günergun and D. Raina (Dordrecht: Springer, 2011), 25; J. F. Szyliowicz, "Functional Perspective," in *The History of the Book in the Middle East*, ed. Geoffrey Roper (Burlington: Ashgate, 2013), 251.
[41] Adrian Johns, *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 2.

the course of the nineteenth century through the inclusion and exclusion of different agents within the Ottoman legal framework.

The technological aspects of the printing press aside, the press's role in secularization is another problem to tackle. Many recent studies have redefined the relationship between modernization and religion and argued that the advent of the former did not mean the retreat of the latter. In the Ottoman context, too, religion was utilized as an ally of the political discourse of the nineteenth-century Ottoman reform agenda, which renders the arguments of secularization difficult to sustain. For instance, recent scholars have turned to explain how the Ottoman reform period was "fundamentally shaped by and for Muslim interests."[42] As Ali Yaycıoğlu has noted, while the "new order" introduced by Selim III was universal and new, it was not "anti-or non-Islamic nor even secular."[43] It represented a search for "a new interpretation of Islamic orthodoxy that would legitimize the reconfiguration of the empire after Western absolutism."[44] In fact, religion constituted a vital part of "personal identity and sense of social order" in the Ottoman Empire, as claimed by Frederick Anscombe.[45] Many acts on the part of the Ottoman sultans have been taken as signs of their devotion to Sunni Islam employed to legitimize them politically: the new army replacing the Janissaries;[46] the enforcement of the five daily prayers; the printing of the translation of an Arabic treatise on the law of war after the example of

[42] Frederick F. Anscombe, "Islam and the Age of Ottoman Reform," *Past and Present* 208 (August 2010): 160.
[43] Ali Yaycıoğlu, "Guarding Traditions and Laws-Disciplining Bodies and Souls? Tradition, Science and Religion in the Age of Ottoman Reform," *Modern Asian Studies* 52, no. 5 (2018): 1578.
[44] For a take on an early "politicization of Islam" during the reign of Sultan Selim III, see Kahraman Şakul, "An Ottoman Global Moment: War of Second Coalition in the Levant" (PhD diss., Georgetown University, 2009): 21-21; Şakul, "Nizam-ı Cedid Düşüncesinde."
[45] Anscombe, "Islam and the Age of Ottoman Reform," 159.
[46] Hakan Erdem, "Recruitment for the Victorious Soldier of Muhammad in the Arab Provinces, 1826-1828," in *Histories of the Modern Middle East- New Directions*, ed. Israel Gershoni, Hakan Erdem, and Ursula Woköck (London, 2002), 189-206; Mehmet Beşikçi, "Askeri Modernleşme, Askeri Disiplin ve Din: Düzenli Kitle Orduları Çağında Osmanlı Ordusu'nda Tabur İmamları," *Akademik İncelemeler Dergisi* 11, no. 1 (2016): 1-33.

the Prophet;[47] the printing of *Risâle-i Birgivî*, a Sunni-Hanafi catechism (*ilmihâl*);[48] and the chief mufti of the time being appointed with the task of "devising an Islamic theory of total obedience to the sultan."[49] Moreover, the Nakshbandi-Mujaddidis and later the Khalidis acquired much prestige and many followers at the imperial court.[50] Even the Gülhane Rescript (1839), which initiated an era of intensive modernization, has been connected to the impact of the *shari'a*-minded intervention of the Khalidi order.[51]

In a society where religion mattered not only as tradition for the wider populace but also as a legitimizing discourse for rulership, it would be wrong to think that printing would serve the dissemination of only the new and the modern. In this, the Ottomans were not alone. The majority of books printed in Europe before 1500, for instance, were religious texts; and among them, devotional texts, including mystical works, outnumbered those written for professional theologians.[52] Similarly, in Russia, the printing press was under the monopoly of the Orthodox Church until the late seventeenth century, when Peter the Great (d. 1725) initiated his project of reform and centralization.[53]

In non-Western contexts, too, we can see that the printing press did not necessarily lead to the secularization of societies; to the contrary, in many cases its

---

[47] Butrus Abu Manneh, "The Islamic Roots of the Gülhane Rescript," *Die Welt des Islams* 34, no. 2 (Nov. 1994): 69.
[48] Yaycıoğlu, "Guarding Traditions and Laws," 1584.
[49] Written by Yâsincizâde Abdülvehhâb Efendi and entitled *Hulâsatü'l-burhân fî itâ'ati's-sultân*, the book was printed in Arabic and Turkish in 1832. In it, the *şeyhülislam* devised a theory of total obedience to the sultan with reference to twenty-five hadith; one of the basic arguments was that in times of evil, sharia could be set aside so that the ruler could establish civilization. The role of the sultan as a "caliph" was much emphasized through different phrases. Tufan Buzpınar, *Hilafet ve Saltanat* (Istanbul: Alfa Basım, 2016), 138.
[50] Frederick F. Anscombe*, State, Faith and Nation in Ottoman and Post-Ottoman Lands* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 84.
[51] Abu Manneh, "The Islamic Roots of the Gülhane Rescript," 173-203.
[52] Lucien Febvre and Henri-Jean Martin, *The Coming of the Book: The Impact of Printing 1450-1800* (London: Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press, 1976), 250-251.
[53] James Cracraft, *The Petrine Revolution in Russian Culture* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2004), 19.

relationship to religion was quite pronounced. In the words of Nile Green, "mechanical modernity" was not separated from religion anywhere in the 1820s.[54] Rather than seeking for secularization as a new force underlying the nineteenth century transformations, Christopher Bayly argues that in the nineteenth century, the printing of religious texts, especially polemical texts between different confessions, was in fact the reason behind the emergence of conflicts over doctrine between Catholics and Protestants, Sunnis and Shi'ites, and even Hindus and Buddhists.[55]

Muslim-majority societies, in particular, had a complicated relationship with both modernity and the printing press. Already heterogeneous before the nineteenth century, modernization did not help to give it unity, but led to closer encounters with many different worldviews.[56] For instance, the entrance of biblical publications via Christian missionaries into colonial India shaped the early Indian print culture earlier than did civil, administrative, educational, and legal regulations.[57] Muslim adoption of print technology also "encouraged the creation of an ever-increasing diversity of religious producers and consumers."[58] The nature of the publications, too, varied greatly, with customary and traditionalist publications being printed at least as often as reformist and modernist ones. While the vehicle, the printing press, was itself modern, it led to the emergence of "a bewildering array of new religious

[54] Nile Green, "Journeymen, Middlemen: Travel, Transculture and Technology in the Origins of Muslim Printing," *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 41 (2009): 219.
[55] Christopher Alan Bayly, *The Birth of the Modern World, 1780-1914* (MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2004), 358-359.
[56] Nile Green, *The Religious Economy of the West Indian Ocean, 1840-1915* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 10.
[57] Kenneth R. Hall, "The Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Century Evolution of Indian Print Culture and Knowledge Networks in Calcutta and Madras," in *Print Culture Histories beyond the Metropolis,* ed. James J. Connolly, Patrick Collier, Frank Felsenstein, Kenneth R. Hall, and Robert G. Hall (Toronto: University of Toronto Press: 2016), 88-122.
[58] Green, *The Religious Economy*, 10.

entrepreneurs and firms whose positions on different subjects overlapped as much as they contradicted one another."[59]

Although Iran was not a colony like India, it was also introduced to lithographic printing via Christian missionaries, who allied with the local scholars to complete their biblical translations. As the local agents learned about the craft of printing from the missionaries, they, too, turned to adapt it to their needs, including the printing of religious texts. For instance, a local scholar by the name of Zeynel Abidin acquired the first Arabic-script press from St. Petersburg in 1816 but used it to print religious titles on Shi'ite martyrology and holy war. The adoption of printing did not bring along secularization and it certainly did not exclude the ulama, who were largely consulted in cities like Tabriz and Shiraz. In other words, the new technology was adapted to "Iran's own cultural setting."[60]

Thus, one must keep in mind that the printing press was a neutral vehicle adopted by different agents to serve a variety of agendas. The context of the nineteenth century clearly had room for religion as much as for other concepts more directly associated with modernization.

1.3 Secondary scholarship on the Ottoman printing press

It was after the *L'Apparition du livre* of Lucien Febvre and Henri-Jean Martin in 1958 that the history of books became a subject of study under the Annales school of socio-economic history in France and evolved into a scholarly discipline in the 1960s.[61] Since then, the field has branched out in many directions encompassing every conceivable stage in the production, dissemination, and consumption of books.

[59] Green, *The Religious Economy*, 10.
[60] Green, "Journeymen, Middlemen," 215.
[61] Lucien Febvre and Henri-Jean Martin, *The Coming of the Book: The Impact of Printing 1450-1800*, trans. David Gerard (London: Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press, 1976).

The adoption of a similar scholarly perspective on the book in Ottoman scholarship developed later, in the 1980s, beginning with İsmail Erünsal's comprehensive, large-scale inventories of Ottoman libraries and booksellers.[62]

Before this turn to the book as an object of study, however, there were studies penned on the printing press as early as the late Ottoman period. İbrahim Müteferrika received the earliest acclaim in many issues of *Tarih-i Osmânî Encümeni Mecmû'ası*.[63] This early interest was not unique to Ottoman scholars; two European scholars, the French philologist and historian Henri Omont (d. 1940) and the German Orientalist Franz Babinger (d. 1967), also published essays on Müteferrika.[64] These early studies, as well as many of the more recent ones, questioned both the "true" identity of Müteferrika as a Unitarian convert to Islam and the sincerity of his conversion.[65]

The early republican scholarship enthusiastically celebrated the signifiers of Westernization in the Ottoman period. Hence, the various anniversaries related to the

---

[62] For a selection of his studies on book culture, see *Osmanlılarda Sahaflık ve Sahaflar* (Istanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 2013); *Osmanlılarda Kütüphaneler ve Kütüphanecilik* (Istanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 2015); *Osmanlı Vakıf Kütüphaneleri: Tarihi Gelişimi ve Organizasyonu* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2008); "Fatih Devri Kütüphaneleri ve Molla Lütfî Hakkında Birkaç Not," *İ. Ü. Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Dergisi* 33 (1980-81): 57-78; "Şehid Ali Paşa'nın İstanbul'da Kurduğu Kütüphane ve Müsadere Edilen Kitapları," *İ. Ü. Edebiyat Fakültesi Kütüphanecilik Dergisi: Belge, Bilgi, Kütüphane Araştırmaları* 1 (1987): 79-87; "Ottoman Foundation Libraries: Their History and Organization," *Osmanlı Araştırmaları* 30 (2007): 1-86; "Tanzimat Sonrası Türk Kütüphaneciliği ile İlgili Belgeler," *Osmanlı Araştırmaları* 31 (2007): 229-339; "II. Mahmud devrinde kütüphaneler = Libraries in the era of Mahmud II," *II. Mahmud yeniden yapılanma sürecinde İstanbul*, ed. Coşkun Yılmaz (Istanbul: İstanbul 2010 Avrupa Kültür Başkenti, 2010), 238-259.

[63] For example, Imre Karacson, "İbrahim Müteferrika," *Tarih-i Osmani Encümeni Mecmuası* 3 (1326/1910): 178-185; B. A. Mystakidis, "Hükümet-i Osmaniye tarafından İlk Te'sis Olunan Matbaa ve Bunun Neşriyatı," *Tarih-i Osmani Encümeni Mecmuası* 5 (1326/1910): 322-328; Efdaleddin, "Memalik-i Osmaniye'de Tıbaatin Kadimi," *Tarih-i Osmani Encümeni Mecmuası* 40 (1332 /1916): 242-249. For a thorough review of articles and books on the printing press in the early republican period, see Orlin Sabev, *İbrahim Müteferrika ya da İlk Osmanlı Matbaa Serüveni* (Istanbul: Yeditepe Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2013), 47-54.

[64] Henri Omont, "Documents sur l'imprimerie a Constantinople au XIII. siecle," *Revue des Bibliotheques*, 105 (1895): 185-200; Franz Babinger, *Müteferrika ve Osmanlı Matbaası* (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2004).

[65] Among other early studies on Müteferrika are: Toderini, *İbrahim Müteferrika Matbaası ve Türk Matbaacılığı*; Ahmed Refik, *Onikinci Asr-ı Hicri'de İstanbul Hayatı (1689-1785)* (Istanbul: Enderun Yayınevi, 1988), 337.

year 1727, the date the official *ferman* authorizing the Müteferrika press was issued, or 1729, the date the first book was printed, were celebrated at academic conventions. For instance, the year 1929 was not only the two-hundredth anniversary of the first printed book, but also the year the first books were printed in the new Latin script adopted by the Turkish Republic. Following 1929, Server Rıfat İskit (1894-1975) and Selim Nüzhet Gerçek (1891-1945), who had both been journalists in the late Ottoman period, turned to write comprehensive books on the history of the Turkish press.[66] Selim Nüzhet Gerçek's studies in particular served the greater purpose of justifying the policies of the new Kemalist regime. He produced the first monographs on the Ottoman press, Müteferrika, and lithography.[67] His intention was explicitly stated in the preface of his monograph on Müteferrika: to explain why printing had come so late.[68] Moreover, his studies openly ascribed a civilizational mission to the printing press. According to him, those civilizations that adopted the printing press from the start had been initiated on a journey of unending progress (*hiç durmamak üzere ilerlemeye başladılar*). Thus, the printing press was assigned an emancipatory role in saving people from oppression and providing them with a torch to illuminate their way in the form of printed books.[69] In a more striking tone, he wrote that the utilization of the printing press proclaimed the coming of the "Turkish

---

[66] See the following studies by Server İskit: *Türkiye'de Neşriyat Hareketleri Tarihine Bir Bakış* (Istanbul: Devlet Basımevi, 1934); *Türkiye'de Matbuat İdareleri ve Politikaları* (Istanbul: Basın ve Yayın Müdürlüğü, 1943); *Hususi İlk Türkçe Gazetemiz, Tercüman-ı Ahval ve Agâh Efendi* (Ankara: Ulus Basımevi, 1937); *Türkiye'de Matbuat Rejimleri* (Istanbul: Ülkü ve Tan Matbaası, 1949); *Türk Gazetecilik Tarihi (1951)*. For more information on Server İskit, see Ali Birinci, "Server İskit," *Kebikeç* 3 (1996).

[67] See the following publications of Selim Nüzhet Gerçek related to the printing enterprise: *Türk Matbaacılığı* (Istanbul 1928, 1939); *Türk Gazeteciliği 1831-1931* (Istanbul, 1931); *Türk Taş Basmacılığı* (Istanbul: İstanbul Devlet Basımevi, 1939). For more information, see Ali Birinci, "Selim Nüzhet Gerçek,'" in *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 14 (Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1996), 25-27.

[68] Gerçek, *Türk Matbaacılığı I,* 8-9.

[69] "*…tozların altında kalan fen ve sanat abidelerini üstlerindeki küfü sıyırarak meydana çıktılar….*" Selim Nüzhet Gerçek, *Türk Matbaacılığı I,* 8. Adnan Adıvar (d. 1955) was another scholar of the same generation who also contextualized Müteferrika with reference to the books he authored and printed. Adnan Adıvar, *Osmanlı Türkleri'nde İlim* (Istanbul: Remzi Kitapevi, 1982).

Renaissance" and that Atatürk had set the press on a new path, mirroring the direction he had envisioned for the Turkish nation. Also, in 1939, Server İskit penned a colossal work on the laws regarding the printing press and the legislative process to illuminate the print regimes in the Ottoman period as well as the early republican period. It is also important to note that both of these works were sponsored as state projects.

The studies on the printing press in the 1960s continued to focus exclusively on the identity of Müteferrika and embrace a civilizational discourse. Islam, accordingly, would be held accountable for the Ottoman "resistance" against printing technology. It must also be noted that the scholarship on the printing press neatly fit the wider historiography on Ottoman "decline" at the time, which has, since then, been largely discredited.[70] At the peak of this generation was Bernard Lewis (d. 2018) and his *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, written in 1961. He popularized the printing press not simply as a vehicle for modernization, but specifically for Westernization. For Lewis, the press had been "one of the few signs of European influence on the Ottoman Empire" in the eighteenth century.[71] He also posited Islam as a barrier against the printing press, which he says was perceived as a threat that "might flaw the social fabric of Islam."[72]

Although closely following Lewis, Niyazi Berkes (d. 1988) did not single out Islam as the reason for the "belatedness" of Ottoman Muslim printing. Yet Berkes furthered the interest in Müteferrika's identity and religion by marking him a sincere

[70] For an excellent summary of the Ottoman decline and anti-decline scholarship as well as the role of cultural history therein, see Dana Sajdi, ed., *Ottoman Tulips, Ottoman Coffee: Leisure and Lifestyle in the Eighteenth Century* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2007), 1-40.
[71] Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), 45.
[72] Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, 41.

convert to Islam from Unitarianism.[73] Overall, the discussions of his faith seemed to serve the wider purpose of linking him and his publications in the Ottoman Empire to the civilizational track of Europe, as he was also depicted as "the representative of the most advanced version of his contemporary West."[74]

The new wave of celebrations on the occasion of the 250th anniversary of the Turkish press in 1979 exhibited the dominant perspectives on the Ottoman press at the time. Apparently in dialogue with the generation of the 1960s, the participants, such as Osman Ersoy and Ercümend Kuran, still engaged in the question of whether Islam as a civilization posited an obstacle for the printing press or not. [75] They demonstrated that while it was not an obstacle, the role of Muslims in world history remained understudied. In the 1980s, a new generation of scholars continued their interest in Müteferrika, including Joseph Szyliowicz, who also noted the civilizational gap between the West and the Ottomans.[76] Perhaps lying at the peak of this comparison in the 1980s was Fatma Müge Göçek. After crediting the role of Yirmisekiz Mehmed Çelebi in the transfer of the printing press, she concluded that the Western states' practice of gifting the Ottoman sultans technological devices—as opposed to the Ottomans, who offered only military gifts—reflected "the different value orientations of the two societies."[77]

---

[73] Niyazi Berkes, *Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma*, ed. Ahmet Kuyaş (Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2002) 50-63. Also see Niyazi Berkes, "İlk Türk Matbaası Kurucusunun Dini ve Fikri Kimliği," *Belleten* 26, no. 104 (October 1962): 717.
[74] Berkes, *Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma*, 52.
[75] *Türk Kütüphaneciler Derneği Basım ve Yayıncılığımızın 250. Yılı Bilimsel Toplantısı 10-11 Aralık 1979, Ankara* (Ankara: Türk Kütüphaneciler Derneği, 1979), 77-83; Osman Ersoy, *Türkiye'ye Matbaanın Girmesi ve İlk Basılan Eserler* (Ankara: A.Ü. DTCF Kütüphanecilik Enstitüsü. 1959), 35.
[76] Szyliowicz, "Functionalist Perspective on Technology." Also see Edward Carleson, *İbrahim Müteferrika Basımevi ve Bastığı İlk Eserler* (Ankara: 1979); A.D. Jeltjakov, *Matbaacılığın 250. Kuruluş Yıldönümüne Armağan: Türkiye'nin Sosyo-Politik ve Kültürel Hayatında Basın* (Istanbul: Nauka Yayınevi, 1979).
[77] Fatma Müge Göçek, *East Encounters West: France and the Ottoman Empire in the Eighteenth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987). For a more extended discussion, also see Haddad, "People before Print."

From the late Ottoman period into the 1980s, we have seen how the accounts of the first Ottoman press in the Arabic script rested overwhelmingly on the shoulders of Müteferrika and in turn, his indebtedness to Christian civilization. There were, however, other lines of inquiry that eschewed this ideological approach, such as bibliographical studies on the printed books themselves. The earliest was that of Fehmi Ethem Karatay, the first modern librarian of the Dârülfünûn, who prepared the first catalogues of both the manuscript and the printed-book collections in Turkish, Persian, and Arabic at the university library and the museum library of Topkapı Palace.[78] Moreover, Seyfettin Özege endowed the books he collected in his lifetime to Erzurum Atatürk University library in 1961 in order to compile a bibliography of all books printed in the Ottoman Empire. The catalogue of this collection, however, was not well prepared by the university; hence, he turned to compile his own catalogues and started to publish them in alphabetic order after 1971.[79] Another catalogue was that of Jale Baysal, who prepared an incomplete catalogue of books printed in Turkish between 1727 and 1876 as her doctoral dissertation, which was published in 1969.[80] Other than book catalogues, there were surveys of the history of printing and publishing in the Ottoman Empire.[81]

[78] Some of the bibliographical catalogues prepared by Fehmi Ethem Karatay include the following*: İstanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi Farsça Basmalar Kataloğu* (Istanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1949*); İstanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi Arapça Yazmalar Kataloğu* (Istanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1951-1953); *İstanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi Arapça Basmalar Alfabe Kataloğu* (Istanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1951-1953*); İstanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi Türkçe Basmalar Alfabe Kataloğu* (Istanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1956); *Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi Türkçe Yazmalar Kataloğu* (Istanbul: Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Yayınları, 1961); *Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi Farsça Yazmalar Kataloğu* (Istanbul: Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Yayınları, 1961); *Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi Arapça Yazmalar Kataloğu* (Istanbul: Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Yayınları, 1962-1969).

[79] M. Seyfettin Özege, *Eski Harflerle Basılmış Türkçe Eserler Kataloğu*, 5 vols. (Istanbul: Fatih Yayınevi Matbaası, 1971-1973).

[80] Jale Baysal, *Müteferrika'dan Birinci Meşrutiyete Osmanlı Türklerinin Bastıkları Kitaplar* (Istanbul, 1968); Jale Baysal, *Osmanlı Türklerinin Bastıkları Kitaplar (1729-1876)* (Istanbul: Hiperlink, 2010).

[81] Alpay Kabacalı, *Türk Kitap Tarihi* (Istanbul: Gümüş Basımevi, 1989); Kabacalı, *Başlangıcından Günümüze Türkiye'de Matbaa, Basın ve Yayın* (Istanbul: Literatür Yayınları, 2000).

The more recent scholarship on the Ottoman printing press after the 1980s has been fairly evenly split between two periods: the eighteenth-century "beginnings" and the post-Hamidian period after 1876. Just as in the past decades, the more recent scholarly focus regarding the printing press has been on the eighteenth century and the dynamics surrounding the "origins" of the press in İbrahim Müteferrika.[82] The eighteenth-century focus, moreover, has continued to be accompanied by discussions about why the printing press was adopted so late by Ottoman Muslims. In this way, the history of the printing press in the Ottoman Empire has become the history of apologetic arguments about Ottoman backwardness.[83] Interestingly, the same questions have also been explored by scholars of Arabic printing, since the printing enterprise as shaped in Istanbul to an extent also shaped the practices in the provinces.[84] In this context, İbrahim Müteferrika has been polished into the agent for this "long-awaited" change.[85]

Other studies on the eighteenth century have also turned to Müteferrika to evaluate him in the context of the Ottoman "Enlightenment"; already acquainted with printing and the liberal arts tradition back home in Hungary as a Unitarian, he had

[82] Erhan Afyoncu, "İlk Türk Matbaasının Kurucusu Hakkında Yeni Bilgiler," *Belleten* 65, no. 243 (2001): 607-722; Kemal Beydilli, *İki İbrahim: Müteferrika ve Halefi* (Istanbul: Kronik Yayınevi, 2019); Kemal Beydilli, "Müteferrika ve Osmanlı Matbaası:18.Yüzyılda İstanbul'da Kitabiyat," *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 128 (2004): 44-52; Yasemin Gencer, "İbrahim Müteferrika and the Age of the Printed Manuscript," in *The Islamic Manuscript Tradition: Ten Centuries of Book Arts in Indiana University Collections*, ed. Christiane Gruber (Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2010).
[83] See Orlin Sabev, *İbrahim Müteferrika*, 54-67; Christoph Neumann, "Üç tarz-ı mütalaa: Yeniçağ Osmanlı Dünyası'nda kitap okumak ve yazmak," *Tarih ve Toplum: Yeni Yaklaşımlar 1* (2005), 51-76; Ami Ayalon, *The Press in the Arab Middle East: A History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995); Ami Ayalon, *Reading Palestine: Printing and Literacy, 1900-1948* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004). Also see *Türk Kütüphaneciler Derneği Basım ve Yayıncılığımızın 250. Yılı Bilimsel Toplantısı 10-11 Aralık 1979, Ankara* (Ankara: Türk Kütüphaneciler Derneği, 1979).
[84] A few examples include Geoffrey Roper, "The History of the Book in the Muslim World," in *The History of the Book in the Middle East*, ed. Geoffrey Roper (Vermont: Ashgate, 2013). Ami Ayalon, *The Arabic Print Revolution*; Fawzi Abdulrazzak, "The Kingdom of the Book: The History of Printing as an Agency of Change in Morocco between 1865 and 1912" (PhD diss., Boston University, 1990).
[85] Orlin Sabev, *Waiting for Müteferrika: Glimpses of Ottoman Print Culture* (Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2018).

also printed books on what could be categorized as the liberal arts.[86] Hence, focusing on his press has enabled historians to explore how the Ottomans of the eighteenth century fit into the wider intellectual patterns of the period in Europe. Moreover, other recent works have also delved into the non-Muslim printers who preceded Müteferrika.[87]

Where many scholars have focused on the eighteenth century, a number of others have turned to the last quarter of the nineteenth century to study the printing press and the comparatively more diverse publications of the period as a vehicle for understanding the wider socio-political dynamics of the era.[88] The scholarship on the

[86] Maurits H. Van Den Boogert, "The Sultan's Answer to the Medici Press? İbrahim Müteferrika's Printing House in İstanbul," in *The Republic of Letters and the Levant*, ed. Alastair Hamilton, Maurits H. van den Boogert, and Bart Westerweel (Leiden: Brill, 2005); 265-292; Orlin Sabev, *İbrahim Müteferrika ya da İlk Osmanlı Matbaa Serüveni;* Orlin Sabev, *Waiting for Müteferrika;* Vefa Erginbaş, "Forerunner of the Ottoman Enlightenment: İbrahim Müteferrika and His Intellectual Landscape" (master's thesis, Sabancı University, 2005); Vefa Erginbaş, "Enlightenment in the Ottoman Context: İbrahim Müteferrika and His Intellectual Landscape," in *Historical Aspects of Printing and Publishing in Languages of the Middle East*, ed. George Roper (Leiden: Brill, 2014); Haddad, "People before Print."

[87] Nil Özlem Pektaş, "The First Greek Printing Press in Constantinople (1625-1628)" (PhD diss., University of London, 2014); Nil Pektaş, "The Beginnings of Printing in the Ottoman Capital: Book Production and Circulation in Early Modern Constantinople," *Osmanlı Bilimi Araştırmaları* 16, no. 2 (2015): 3–32; Yasin Meral, "Osmanlı İstanbulu'nda Yahudi Matbaaları," in *Osmanlı İstanbulu II*, ed. Feridun M. Emecen, Ali Akyıldız, and Emrah Safa Gürkan (Istanbul: İstanbul 29 Mayıs Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2014); Yasin Meral, "Yona ben Yakov Aşkenazi ve Matbaacılık Faaliyetleri," in *Osmanlı İstanbulu IV*, ed. Feridun M. Emecen, Ali Akyıldız, and Emrah Safa Gürkan (Istanbul: İstanbul 29 Mayıs Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2016); Yasin Meral, "Nasi-Mendes Ailesi ve İstanbul'da Reyna Nasi Matbaası," in *Sahn-ı Semandan Darülfünun'a Osmanlı'da İlim ve Fikir Dünyası*, ed. Ekrem Demirli, Ahmed Hamdi Furat, Zeynep Münteha Kot, and Osman Sacid Arı (Istanbul: Zeytinburnu Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2017), 177-190; Yasin Meral, "Erken Dönem İbrani Matbaacılığında Haham Onayları ve Cemaat İçi Sansür," *Dini Araştırmalar* 18, no. 47 (July-August 2015): 96-118; Yasin Meral, "İbrani Matbaacılığında Telif Hakları: 16-18.Yüzyıllar," *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi* 5, no. 2 (2016): 298-320; Yasin Meral, "Müteferrika Öncesi Avrupalı Seyyahların Hatıratında Osmanlı'da Yahudi Matbaaları ve Arapça Kitap Basım Yasağı," *Kutadgubilig Felsefe-Bilim Araştırmaları* 28 (October 2015): 237-254; Pars Tuğlacı, "Osmanlı Türkiyesi'nde Ermeni Matbaacılığı ve Ermenilerin Türk Matbaacılığına Katkısı," *Tarih ve Toplum* 86 (1991); Teotig, *Baskı ve Harf: Ermeni Matbaacılık Tarihi*, trans. Sirvant Malhasyan and Arlet İncidüzen (Istanbul: Birzamanlar Yayıncılık, 2012); Ali Birinci, "Osmanlı Tıbaat ve Matbuat Hayatında (1567-1908) Ermeniler," *Yeni Türkiye* 60 (2014): 1-22.

[88] Some examples of this scholarship include: Özgür Türesay, "II. Abdülhamid Dönemi Yayımcılığı, Matbaa-i Ebuzziya ve Bastığı Kitaplar," *Müteferrika* 34 (2008): 3-48; Özgür Türesay, "Bir Osmanlı Matbaacısının Sergüzeşti: Ebüzziya Tevfik Efendi'nin Matbaa-i Ebüzziya'sı," *Toplumsal Tarih* 128 (August 2004): 36-43; Ali Birinci, *Osmanbey ve matbaası: Ser-kurena Osman Bey'in Hikayesine ve Matbaa-i Osmaniye'nin Tarihçesine Medhal* (Istanbul: Müteferrika, 2011); Güllü Yıldız, "İstanbul'da Bir Acem Matbaası: Kitapçı Tahir ve Ahter," *Osmanlı Araştırmaları* 50 (2017): 175-218; Filiz Dığıroğlu, *Dersaadet'de Bir Acem Kitapçı: Kitap-füruş Hacı Hüseyin Ağa* (Istanbul: Turkuaz Yayınları, 2014).

late nineteenth century has fragmented in a number of different directions. Some studies delve into a survey of administrative regulations and censorship.[89] Others have turned to certain printed book constellations such as the corpus of printed Islamic books in the Hamidian period,[90] or textbooks such as on physics.[91] Some studies have reflected deeper and in more general on the repercussions of the printed medium for the cycles of textual authority in the Islamic tradition.[92] Orhan Koloğlu (b. 1929), another journalist, has written extensively on the institutions and agents of Ottoman publishing.[93]

Several monographic have been written with a focus on particular presses. The earliest of these was Kemal Beydilli's study of the printing press established in 1797 as part of the Imperial School of Military Engineering.[94] Other studies have

[89]Ayşe Polat, "Subject to Approval: Sanction and Censure in Ottoman İstanbul (1889-1923)" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2015); Filiz Dığıroğlu, "II. Abdülhamid Dönemi Matbuat Politikaları: Mushaf Basımı ve Dini Neşriyat," in *Sultan II. Abdülhamid Han ve Dönemi*, ed. Fahreddin Gün and Halil İbrahim Erbay (Istanbul: TBMM Milli Saraylar, 2017), 621-654; Fatmagül Demirel, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Kitap Basımının Denetimi," *Yakın Dönem Türkiye Araştırmaları*, no. 5 (December 2012): 89-104; Fatmagül Demirel, *II. Abdülhamid Döneminde Sansür* (Istanbul: Bağlam Yayıncılık, 2007); İpek K. Yosmaoğlu, "Chasing the Printed Word: Press Censorship in the Ottoman Empire, 1876-1913," *The Turkish Studies Association Journal* 27, nos. 1-2 (2003): 15-49; Ali Birinci, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Matbûat ve Neşriyat Yasakları Tarihine Medhal," *TALİD* 4, no. 7 (2006): 300-310; Alpay Kabacalı, *Başlangıçtan Günümüze Türkiye'de Basın Sansürü* (Istanbul: Gazeteciler Cemiyeti Yayınları, 1990), 59-79; Orhan Koloğlu, *Osmanlı Dönemi Basınının İçeriği* (Istanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi, 2010), 94-114; Ebru Boyar, "The Press and the Palace: The Two-Way Relationship between Abdülhamid II and the Press, 1876-1908," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 6, no. 3 (2006): 417-432.

[90] Filiz Dığıroğlu, "II. Abdülhamid Dönemi Matbuat Politikları: Mushaf Basımı ve Dini Neşriyat," in *Sultan II. Abdülhamid Han ve Dönemi*, ed. Fahrettin Gün and Halil İbrahim Erbay (Ankara: TBMM Basımevi, 2017); Filiz Dığıroğlu, "II. Abdülhamid Döneminde Dini Yayıncılık: İslami Metinleri Kimler Üretir?" *Journal of History Studies* 9, no. 1 (March 2017); Filiz Dığıroğlu, "II. Abdülhamid Döneminde Dini Yayıncılık: İslami Metinleri Kimler Üretir?" *Marmara İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 54 (June 2018): 1-44.

[91] Meltem Akbaş, "The Military March of Physics-I: Physics and Mechanical Sciences in the Curricula of the 19th Century Ottoman Military Schools," *Osmanlı Bilimi Araştırmaları* 13, no. 2 (2012): 65-84; Meltem Akbaş, "The Military March of Physics-II: Teachers and Textbooks of Physics and Mechanical Sciences of the 19th Century Ottoman Military Schools," *Osmanlı Bilimi Araştırmaları* 14, no. 1 (2012): 89-108.

[92] Muhammad Qasim Zaman, *Ulama in Contemporary Islam, Custodians of Change* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002).

[93] For the studies of Orhan Koloğlu related to printing, see *Basımevi ve Basının Gecikmesi ve Sonuçları*; *Miyop Çörçil Olayı* (Ankara: Yorum Yayınları, 1986); *Osmanlı Basınının Doğuşu ve Blak Bey Ailesi* (Istanbul: Müteferrika, 1998); *Osmanlı'dan 21. Yüzyıla Basın Tarihi* (Istanbul: Pozitif Yayınları, 2013); *İlk Gazete İlk Polemik* (Istanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, 2014).

[94] Kemal Beydilli, *Türk Bilim ve Matbaacılık Tarihinde Mühendishane Matbaası (1776-1826)* (Istanbul: Eren Yayıncılık, 1995).

focused on presses operated by the Ottoman elite, especially after the 1880s. Özgür Türesay's dissertation and articles on the printing press of Ebüzziya Tevfik constitute a good example in this regard.[95] A similarly popular press of the period, one owned by Osman Bey, has been studied by Nedret Kuran-Burçoğlu in a few articles and by Ali Birinci in an extended article.[96] Moreover, a more recent study by Kathryn Schwartz and a general survey by Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu have both focused on the Bulaq press.[97] A few articles have addressed lesser-known presses such as those operated by the Sufi dervishes, as studied by Muharrem Varol,[98] the presses operated by Kurds,[99] and those operated by Iranians in the Ottoman Empire.[100] A few studies have also focused on the printing activities of non-Muslim communities,[101] as well as inter-communal relations around the book in the nineteenth century.[102] In the process, the booksellers have also been partially addressed.[103]

---

[95] Özgür Türesay, "Être intellectuel à la fin de l'Empire ottoman: Ebüzziya Tevfik (1849-1913) et son temps" (PhD diss., Institut National des Langues et Civilisations Orientales, 2008).
[96] Nedret Kuran-Burçoğlu, "Saraydan İlk Defa Kuran-ı Kerim Basma İznini Alan Hattat: Matbaacı Osman Bey," *Tarih ve Toplum* no. 209 (2001): 312-320; Nedret Kuran-Burçoğlu, "Matbaacı Osman Bey," in *Journal of Turkish Studies: Essays in Honour of Barbara Fleming*, ed. Gönül-Şinasi Tekin (Harvard University Press, 2001): 97-112; Nedret Kuran-Burçoğlu, "Osman Zeki Bey and His Printing Office, the *Matbaa-i Osmaniye*," in *History of Printing and Publishing in the Languages and Countries of the Middle East*, ed. Philip Sadgrove, Journal of Semitic Studies: Supplement 15, 35-58 (Manchester: Oxford University Press, 2005); Ali Birinci, *Osmanbey ve matbaası: Ser-kurena Osman Bey'in Hikayesine ve Matbaa-i Osmaniye'nin Tarihçesine Medhal* (Istanbul: Müteferrika, 2011).
[97] Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, *Mısır'da Türkler ve Kültürel Mirasları* (Istanbul: IRCICA, 2006); Hsu, Cheng-Hsiang, "The First Thirty Years of Arabic Printing in Egypt, 1238-1267 (1822-1851): A Bibliographical Study with a Checklist by Title of Arabic Printed Works" (PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 1985); Kathryn Schwartz, "Meaningful Mediums."
[98] Muharrem Varol, "19. Yüzyılda Bazı Tekkelerin Matbaacılık Faaliyetleri," *Journal of Ottoman Studies* 42 (2013): 317-348.
[99] Mesûd Serfiraz, *Kurd, Kitêb, Çapxane Weşangeriya Kitêbên Kurdî di Dewra Osmaniyan de (1844–1923)* (Stenbol: Peywend, 2015).
[100] Güllü Yıldız, "İstanbul'da Bir Acem Matbaası: Kitapçı Tahir ve Ahter," *Osmanlı Araştırmaları* 50 (2017): 175-218; Filiz Dığıroğlu, *Dersaadet'de Bir Acem Kitapçı: Kitap-füruş Hacı Hüseyin Ağa* (Istanbul: Turkuaz Yayınları, 2014).
[101] Evangelia Balta, *Karamanlıca Kitaplar Yunan Harflerle Basılmış Türkçe Eserlerin Çözümlemeli Bibliyografyası*, vol. 1, 1718-1839 (Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2018); Evangelia Balta, *Beyond the Language Frontier, Studies on the Karamanlıs and the Karamanlidika Printing* (Istanbul: İSİS Press, 2010); Merih Erol, "19. Yüzyılda Basılan Karamanlıca Eserler," *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 128 (August 2004).
[102] Johann Strauss, "Who Read What in the Ottoman Empire (19-20th Centuries)?," *Arabic Middle Eastern Literatures* 6, no. 1 (2003): 39-76.
[103] Erkan Serçe, *İzmir'de Kitapçılık (1839-1928)* (İzmir: İzmir Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kitaplığı, 2002).

Another important line of scholarship has revolved around the relationship between the printing press, the emergence of national consciousness, and capitalism. The tone for this scholarship was set by Benedict Anderson in 1983 through his *Imagined Communities*, where he famously associated print language with the emergence of national consciousness in North and South American creoles.[104] The reflection of Anderson's work on Ottoman scholarship has stirred discussions of how the expansion of the printed book, from the last quarter of the nineteenth century onwards, led to the expansion of the political sphere and cultural movements like the Arab *nahda*, the so-called revival of intellectual and literary activities in the Ottoman Arab provinces.[105] As demonstrated by Ilhan Khuri-Makdisi, the ideas of socialism and anarchism did disseminate into the literate population of Beirut, Alexandria, and Cairo through the mainstream periodicals before 1914.[106]

At the same time, recent studies have also argued that such chains of cause and effect need to be qualified and localized according to the specific historical context. Recent scholarship on the Arabic press has revised the perceived role of printing in the first three quarters of the nineteenth century and called into question the revolutionary nature of its impact. Through her work on the American Protestant missionary press between the 1820s and 1860s, Hala Auji, for instance, has demonstrated the overlaps between manuscript culture and printing practices even into the 1850s. This continuity has led her to conclude that it was not the press alone, but rather wider cultural and socio-political changes that triggered the expansion of

---

[104] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1991).
[105] Some examples include: Ami Ayalon, *The Arabic Printing Revolution;* George Roper, "Faris al-Shidyaq and the Transition from Scribal to Print Culture in the Middle East," in *The Book in the Islamic World: The Written Word and Communication in the Middle East*, ed. George N. Atiyeh (Albany: State University of New York, 1995), 209-231.
[106] Ilham Khuri-Makdisi, *The Eastern Mediterranean and the Making of Global Radicalism, 1860-1914* (California: University of California Press, 2013).

political space and the "emergent print intelligentsia's view of the book and its forms, meanings and uses."[107]

Other studies have considered the rise of print capitalism starting from the last quarter of the nineteenth century as a consequence of new communications media, including the newspapers and journals of the Tanzimat period.[108] İrvin Cemil Schick, in particular, has pointed to the steep rise in the number of printed books between 1876 and 1928 and the accompanying commercialization of the book market.[109] He has argued that the expansion of the book market, in turn, made it possible for "new ideas to gain momentum and influence society."[110] The commercialization of the printed book is also ascribed to the period after the 1880s by Sinan Çetin, who devoted his study to the catalogues of the bookseller Arakel, which Çetin views as byproduct of the commercial nature of the printing enterprise.[111]

1.4 Sources and methodology

The available secondary literature on the history of the printing press has provided a rich framework to understand the "before" and "after" of the time interval covered in this dissertation—the period between 1831 and 1863, corresponding to the administration of the Imperial Press under a newly established unit, the Directorate of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hane-i Âmire.* A few studies have particularly guided the

[107] Hala Auji, *Printing Arab Modernity: Book Culture and the American Press in Nineteenth-Century Beirut* (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 5.
[108] Carter Vaughn Findley, "Tanzimat," in *The Cambridge History of Turkey, Volume 4, Turkey in the Modern World*, ed. Reşad Kasaba (Cambridge University Press, 2008), 31. Since Findley specifically has the Young Ottomans in mind, he must be referring here to the late Tanzimat period.
[109] İrvin Cemil Schick, "Print Capitalism and Women's Sexual Agency in the Late Ottoman Empire," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 31, no. 1 (2011).
[110] Schick, 196.
[111] Sinan Çetin, "Booksellers and Their Catalogues in Hamidian Istanbul, 1884-1901" (master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2010).

articulation of this narrative. While the many works of Orlin Sabev on İbrahim Müteferrika have provided a wealth of material information about the eighteenth-century Ottoman print culture, Beydilli's monograph on the press of the Imperial School of Military Engineering and his various articles on Ottoman reform have illuminated the transition into the Tanzimat period. İsmail Erünsal's book and articles on Ottoman booksellers have served as a fundamental background in conceptualizing the contractors. Moreover, Kathryn Schwartz's studies on the Bulaq press and the emerging private presses in Cairo have provided comparative insight for the Ottoman printing enterprise. Taken together, these studies serve to provide a more complete picture of the nineteenth century Ottoman printing enterprise, with the work of Beydilli and Erünsal focusing on the center, and Schwartz on a major province. At the same time, many studies of Nile Green on the South Asian states and Iran have offered a transcultural view of print culture and technology linking foreign agents with local actors. The fact that he has done so without a proper recognition of the developments in Istanbul, however, has alerted to the need for substantial studies in Ottoman print culture.

This study contributes to the available scholarship on the printing press in two particular ways. First, it focuses on a time interval which has been hitherto neglected. This neglect is significant because the failure to understand the dynamics of this period pushes scholars to resort to grand narratives and precludes any complete assessment of the nineteenth century. As depicted above, the vast majority of the secondary literature has focused on the eighteenth or the late nineteenth centuries, while brushing over the qualitative change in the early Tanzimat period. The brief references in the literature that do touch on the period usually do little more than repeat the findings of the early scholars of printing, Selim Nüzhet Gerçek and

Server İskit. Despite its ideological tinge, the work of both scholars is undoubtedly important. Both based their studies on important Ottoman archival documents and, to a more limited extent, printed books. Although constrained by the state of the Ottoman archives in their day, they also enjoyed the advantages of having witnessed late Ottoman print culture firsthand. But their work is now some eighty years old, and while scholarship in other fields has made great advances in the intervening decades, scholarship on print culture in the early nineteenth century remains stuck in the early twentieth, with studies today doing little more than repeating the findings of Gerçek and İskit. Two noteworthy exceptions, both master's theses, address the first half of the nineteenth century: Necdet Öz has focused on the Imperial Press between 1824 and 1840, and Güldane Çolak has focused specifically on the new directorate of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire* between 1831 and 1863.[112] They both reflect on the administrative changes in the regulation of the Imperial Press through new documents. While they also introduce a list of books printed in their respective time intervals, the one compiled by Çolak is especially problematic because of a terminological error. Although it is clear that different terms were used with reference to the same printing location, she has included only those books explicitly noted as printed at *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire* in her list.

Indeed, although the vast majority of books were published at the Imperial Press, their colophons often list the place of publication under different names, including *Dârü't-Tıbâ'ati'l-Âmire*, *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire*, *Tab'hâne-i Âmire*, *Darü't-Tıbâ'ati'l-Ma'mûre*, *Matba'atü'l-Kürsiyyeti'l-Hilâfeti'l-Hâkâniyye*, and

[112] Güldane Çolak, "Osmanlı Matbaacılığında Takvîmhâne-i Âmire'nin Yeri ve Önemi" (master's thesis, İstanbul University, 2011); and Necdet Öz, "Tabhâne ile Takvimhane'nin Birleşmesi ve Basılan Eserler (1824-1840)" (master's thesis, Marmara University, 2012). Also see an informative article by Abdullah Saydam, "Osmanlı'da Özel Matbaacılık: Yayıncılıkta Tekelin Kaldırılması," *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 172 (April 2008): 64-71. '

Matba'a-i Dârü's-Saltanatı's-Seniyye, all of which were employed interchangeably in reference to the same place. Moreover, before 1863, direct reference to *Matba'a-i Âmire* was extremely rare.[113] This fact apparently went unnoted by the Ottoman actors of the early twentieth century, such as Ebüzziya Tevfik Efendi, who claimed in 1909 that *Matba'a-i Âmire* was the real name for the press, while *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire* had been formed for the printing of the gazette. He opted to refer to the Imperial Press as *Matba'a-i Âmire.*[114] The same anachronistic term was also employed in many of the printed catalogues of the republican period.[115] As will become clear in this study, however, the contemporary Ottoman state officials and other actors used a variety of different titles to refer to the Imperial Press. *Matba'a-i Âmire* only began to be systematically employed as the name for the press after its annexation under the Ministry of Public Education in 1863.

The second contribution of this dissertation lies in its methodology. It offers a production-oriented perspective on the printing enterprise. The prerogatives of the Imperial Press for printing included books, bureaucratic documents, forms, calendars, regulations, and even paper money. Yet this study is essentially about printed books, which should be perceived along a spectrum of different lengths varying from single-page pamphlets to several-hundred-page long compendia. These books, however, will not be analyzed in their entirety, but only to the extent that they reveal the involvement of agents in their production, including the Ottoman state as well as non-state book contractors and printers. One could say, therefore, that it

[113] The few exceptions I have identified are: Mustafa Maksud Reza, *Kasîde-i Bürde Tahmîsi* (Istanbul: Matba'a-i Âmire, 1262); İbrahim b. Mehmed el-Yalvacî, *Garâibü'l-i'lâl ve'l-iştikâk* (Istanbul: Matba'a-i Âmire, 1267); *Dîvân-ı Eşref* (Istanbul: Matba'a-i Âmire, 1278). Alpay Kabacalı has also noted that the use of *Matbaa-i Âmire* only later became standard, though he places the date for this after the 1880s. See Kabacalı, *Türk Kitap Tarihi,* 79.
[114] TBMM Library, Issue 33, Vol.3 (9 February 1324).
[115] The inventories of Seyfettin Özege and Jale Baysal, for example, mistakenly refer to books between this time interval as being printed at "Matba'a-i Âmire." Atatürk Kitaplığı, which has digitalized its printed book collection, has also repeated the same mistake in identification.

illuminates the human component of production. The books will be discussed in their connection to wider patterns about the Ottoman socio-cultural world, and without discussion of their reception by audiences. Nevertheless, the discussion of such issues as the mechanisms of printed book distribution, the competition between different agents, and the number of printed book editions will indirectly attest to the presence of a dynamic readership. Overall, the dissertation offers an account of the Ottoman printing enterprise at both the macro level, as a state enterprise, and the micro level, as a competitive platform for various individual actors who have been integrated into the wider picture.

In this light, this study has combined several different types of sources which, collectively, would not be available to a historian studying the press in any earlier period in Ottoman history—namely, Ottoman archival documents, the official newspaper, and the books printed between 1831 and 1863. It also has the advantage of being able to evaluate the physical evidence of the printed books against the socio-political context indicated by the archival documents on books and printing, which were not gathered together under a particular classification until the 1860s. Although printed books would be largely encountered under the files of the Ministry of Public Education after the 1860s, before this date, most information is divided between the imperial edicts and the decisions taken, problems deliberated on, and interrogations conducted at various councils, including foremost the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances (*Meclis-i Vâlâ-yı Ahkâm-ı Adliyye*).

Nevertheless, the archival documents have provided an unusual variety and breadth of information illuminating the formation of the official discourse on the printing press as well as the relevant actors in the process. We can follow the impersonal state mechanisms on the one hand and follow the publishing stories of

particular books and their authors, editors, and printers on the other. Moreover, despite the stereotypical image that state archives reflect only the "official" story, they have proved to be useful also for conveying the voice of non-state agents through the public interrogations of the Supreme Council. Through this venue, we find vivid details about the degree of involvement of some of the agents. Moreover, the petitions of book authors, for instance, addressing the state officials allow us to reconstruct the world of ordinary people trying to get connected to the printed medium. Both the interrogations and the petitions allow the historian to construct the world of ordinary agents while also depicting the broader state agenda and the priorities of the "great men" in Ottoman history. In addition, archival documents have provided significant contextualization for many of the books published during the period, such as their prices, number of copies per edition, and owners.

Aside from the archives, the printed books themselves have served as an invaluable source. This study has attempted to compile a list of books printed at the Imperial Press and other presses printing in the Arabic script in Istanbul between 1831 and 1863, which amounted to roughly one thousand titles consisting of pamphlets, compilations, translations, and treatises. This list, integrated as various tables under Appendix B, contains the titles and the authors as well as other contributors to the book such as the commentators or the translators. It also lists the publishing dates for various editions, many of which have been skimmed through, when available, to trace physical changes associated with a consolidating print culture. Moreover, the list has selectively noted the type of printing used for each edition together with their page numbers to provide an idea about the use of different technologies available at the time.

The making of this list, at the same time, constituted the greatest challenge in putting this dissertation together. It has drawn titles mostly from a combination of the two major catalogues: Seyfettin Özege's *Eski Harflerle Basılmış Türkçe Eserler Kataloğu* and Fehmi Edhem Karatay's two inventories, *Istanbul Üniversitesi Kütühanesi Arapça Basmalar Alfabe Kataloğu* and *Istanbul Üniversitesi Kütühanesi Türkçe Basmalar Alfabe Kataloğu.* The list prepared by Jale Baysal constituted a third source. At the same time, there were many documents in the state archives that provided much valuable context about the decisions and processes behind the printing of the particular texts in these inventories. Between the three inventories, the archival references, the focus articles in the Diyanet Encyclopedia, and, finally, the actual printed books pulled out from the digital collections of various libraries, many discrepancies emerged in the making of one full list.

One of the problems is that the book titles have been noted in different ways in different lists. This variety largely stems from the fact that the early printed books did not have fixed titles or title pages. Frequently, there would be a discrepancy between the title of the book written in its manuscript version and in its different printed editions. Even within the same printed editions, however, the title of the book could go by different names in the table of contents, in the first sentences of the books and in the colophons. Moreover, multiple books were frequently printed together in the Ottoman tradition, at least until 1863—that is, as a collection of multiple works in the same printed volume. While Özege paid the utmost attention to separately identifying these secondary texts placed either in the margins of a particular book or after the main text, many titles are still missing from his list. Overall, much of this work needs to be manually double checked, which is a task to be accomplished only in the long term.

Other than their listing, the categorization of books proved to be another problem in dealing with such extensive data. Contemporary Ottomans often did not share the modern categories into which books are placed today, and the same book could easily fit into more than one genre. For instance, titles on history often went together with biographies in the library catalogues. To escape anachronism, this dissertation has tried to respect the classification of the Ottoman system as much as possible, while forming other functional groups such as the eclectic group of books consisting of poems, histories and descriptions of the Prophet.

This dissertation has also made use of chronicles and a substantial body of travel accounts by Europeans, which offered many details about the printing enterprise, other institutions, and particular Ottoman practices. It utilizes the most frequently cited chronicles from the nineteenth century, including those of Ahmed Cevdet Paşa (d. 1895) and Ahmed Lütfi Efendi (d. 1907). Ahmed Lütfi Efendi, in *Tarih-i Lütfi* (1825-1879), has provided many details about the printed books as well as the administrative organization of the Directorate of *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire.* Ahmed Cevdet Paşa's *Tarih-i Cevdet* (1774-1826) has presented a general discourse on printing from the time of Müteferrika until the printing of the Qur'an in 1873. Moreover, Ahmed Cevdet Paşa's *Tezâkir*, or his own notes taken during his appointment as the official chronicler (1855-1855), has served as a supplement to many of events depicted from the Tanzimat period. Various issues of the official gazette, *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'*, have also been utilized for many of the concepts under consideration in this dissertation.

On a final note, what we mean by the Imperial Press needs to be carefully delineated. In this dissertation, the term Imperial Press has been employed to refer to the state press between the years 1727 and 1831. After 1831, however, the

administration of book printing was annexed under the administration of the new gazette, *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'*. This joint bureaucratic structure came to be known as the Directorate of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire.* The printing of books, however, was carried out in both the Imperial Press and *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire*, which was where the gazette was printed. To avoid confusion, the term *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire* will be utilized with reference to the administration of the press. To refer simply to the printing of books, the term "the Imperial Press" will be used. When referring specifically to the printing of the gazette, the term *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire* will be utilized.

1.5 Structure of the Dissertation

The dissertation consists of four chapters. The next chapter, the second chapter, provides a synoptic view of the Ottoman printing enterprise and contextualizes the main agents and agendas of Ottoman printing. It then proposes a model of periodization based on the transforming roles and functions of the old and new printing agents. This periodization, from which the organizing framework for the rest of the dissertation is drawn, comprises three main periods between 1831 and 1863 based on the circles of demand and supply. In the first phase, from 1831 to 1840, the demand for the printed book was shaped to a very large extent by the Ottoman state, which also designated the Imperial Press as the sole supply. The range of printed books was restricted to those for which there was deemed the greatest need—in other words, textbooks—as the financial capacity of the Imperial Press was limited. The rising demand from new agents towards the late 1830s, however, alerted the state officials to the possibility of integrating more players. From 1840 to 1857, the market was opened up to private contractors, who could appeal to the Imperial Press, as the

only legal venue, to get the books of their choice printed. The opening up of the system had to do with both the educational and the financial concerns of the Ottoman state. In other words, the demand, shaped by more agents, diversified to cover more subjects, while the supply remained under state monopoly. This time, the rising pressure from individuals who had turned to private printing served as a trigger for the Ottoman state to adopt new policies regarding the acknowledgment and legalization of private printers. Hence, from 1857 onwards, the printing market opened up, in terms of both supply and demand, to the service of any interested agent. In the meantime, a tangible market formed around the printed book and it gained much popularity.

Having set the stage for the actors, agents, and networks of the printing enterprise in Chapter Two, Chapter Three turns to prioritize the agency of the Ottoman state and attempt to establish a link between the political discourse and the printed book titles. The guiding principle in this category is the "utility" of the printed book as perceived by state agents. The chapter begins by describing the educational policies of Sultan Mahmud II (r. 1808-1839) and the Tanzimat period, including the new councils, regulations, and new schools. Questioning the notion of textbooks and discussing their new context in the nineteenth century, it then suggests that viewing education through books that transcend institutions may offer new insights regarding the fluidity of the period's educational practices. The fact that the schooling mentality of the period, at least until 1863, consisted largely of a continuation of older patterns may not be too obvious when one approaches the issue through the new institutions. The fluidity of the textbooks, however, offers insight into how similar texts continued to shape education and transcended boundaries. Moreover, the quantitative analysis reveals that more than half of the printed books

were adopted as textbooks, and the majority of these textbooks consisted of traditional madrasa titles, which were also reprinted in many editions. The newly translated books on the new sciences, on the other hand, had a more limited audience and were usually printed only once. These discussions demonstrate that while there was educational reform and an obvious turn to Europe for the newer educational models, there were also significant continuities with past educational models, which becomes more apparent through the discussion of printed books. Following these analyses, the textbooks are categorized into three groups according to their potential audience: translations in the new sciences, classical textbooks, and what can be termed "shared" textbooks, referring to those titles known to have been taught in various institutions.

Chapter Four turns to the agency of the non-state contractors and printers who had an increasing share in the printed book market. The chapter presents the changing role of the contractors via booksellers who embraced a new role as their business took a new turn. Carving out a new place for themselves, some of the ordinary booksellers initially turned to selling printed books; some further started to commission books at the Imperial Press and other available venues and became what can be termed "entrepreneurial booksellers"; a few of them even turned to printing their own books and became *sahaf*-turned-booksellers guided by a desire for more profit. In the meantime, they contributed to the widening of the book spectrum: aside from textbooks, many other sorts of books, including storybooks, poetry, devotional Islamic texts, and history books, apparently received enough demand to push the contractors and the private printers to take a risk and have them printed. Two trends emerged as continuities from the traditional manuscript practices in this chapter: first, as with textbooks, many of the titles revealed continuities with those popular in

the previous centuries. Second, printing different texts together was another continuity with the manuscript tradition which translated into a new physical printing practice. The varying textual constellations in these sorts of volumes contribute to our understanding of what texts "belonged together" for the contemporary actors.

The third and the fourth chapters together demonstrate that the use of the printing press served largely to empower existing trends and patterns in Ottoman intellectual culture, both at the scholarly level and the more popular level, rather than inaugurate ones that were entirely new. Here the meaning of the printing press can be redefined in the local context of the Ottoman Empire between 1831 and 1863: it did not lead to the spread and popularization of new themes and ideas in the first decades of its consolidation. On the contrary, it was adopted for its increasingly recognized facility for disseminating and promoting already-popular titles. In the meantime, one must also acknowledge that continuities in the popularity of traditional titles do not mean that there was no change. Ultimately, there was a creative relationship between technology and human agency, as pointed out by Bruno Latour, which shaped a new context for the reception of old texts in a new format.[116]

Having started the dissertation with an overview of the administrative and legal process of making a printing enterprise, Chapter Five turns to visit those points where the lines of legality were transgressed. It explores the boundaries of legality in terms of religious publications for Muslims communities, which also involved non-Muslim actors and networks. The chapter utilizes court interrogations to get to case studies which illuminate the human element at the micro level involved in unauthorized printing—albeit not "illegal," as the legal structures that would later turn some practices into crimes were not yet in place. Similarly, the concept of

[116] Bruno Latour, *Pandora's Hope: Essays on the Reality of Science Studies* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000), 21-23.

"censorship" did not yet have a counterpart. The print culture and its boundaries first had to consolidate and be recognized by a great number of people for censorship to have meaning. The state interrogations nevertheless reveal that there was constant contestation of boundaries as they were deliberated by the Ottoman authorities; in all cases, the state officials expressed a desire for greater surveillance but failed to prevent the widening networks from transgressing legal boundaries. In fact, it was the mounting frequency of cases of "illicit" printing towards the 1860s that constituted another reason for the administrative changes at the Imperial Press.

Ultimately, this dissertation is a story of great changes, but perhaps more importantly, one of great continuities. While the technology of printing was adopted by the Ottoman state in 1727, its reception, internalization, and perhaps even "Ottomanization" would not take place before the rise of a variety of both official and civil agents, who would render the printing press part of their own story of either conforming to or challenging the socio-political, economic, and cultural dynamics of the reign of Mahmud II and the Tanzimat period. This dissertation demonstrates how by the nineteenth century, a not-so-new technology was empowered by and in turn empowered the making of the Ottoman state identity on the one hand and the rising voice of a popular traditional discourse on the other. Hence, rather than remaining fixed on the "origins" of the printing press or prioritizing one institution or agents over the others, this dissertation has adopted a fluid and colorful narrative of the changing roles, policies, and contexts of a multiplicity of actors to better capture the vivacity of the Tanzimat period.

CHAPTER 2

A WORKING MODEL FOR THE PRINTING ENTERPRISE: 1831–1863

2.1 Introduction

Each theme explored by the historian unfolds according to its own unique scheme and sequence of development. The history of Ottoman publishing, too, has its own periodization, one that cannot be divorced from the social, political, and economic events of the period. Each of its phases is meaningful only within the larger related network of circumstances.

The Ottoman printing enterprise entered a new period together with its annexation to the newly founded Directorate of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire* in 1831, a period that continued until its annexation to the Ministry of Public Education in 1863. It was in the intervening years that the primary agents of printing as well as policies and legislation consolidated in a fashion mirroring the complexity and fluidity of the state-making process during the reign of Mahmud II (1808-1839) and the Tanzimat period. From 1831 to 1863, the printing enterprise transformed from a system shaped according to the centralist policies of the Ottoman state into a more diversified entity joined by the newly legalized contractors and emerging private printers. This chapter will contextualize the process of this transition from a relatively closed and limited system under the supervision of Ottoman officials into a contested zone where the commercial interests of these new agents could threaten the financial and legal interests of the official press.

To render this process more intelligible, this dissertation proposes a periodization based on a supply/demand model. First, from 1831 to 1839, the state shaped the demand for printing largely through its reform policies, and this demand

was met by a single main supplier, *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire*. While private customers had also been visible as book contractors since the turn of the nineteenth century, they gained official legal status only in 1840. From 1840 to 1856, they retained monopolies over the commissioning of specific book titles, while the supplier, once again, was *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire*. Private customers also entered into illicit liaisons with yet unauthorized private printers, challenging the legality of their own involvement in the printing enterprise. As a result, the Ottoman state often had to position itself against a rising body of interdependent actors who tried to take advantage of a commodifying printed book market. A new period was initiated in 1857 through a new printing regulation which reshaped the entire nature of the enterprise. On the one hand, it diversified the type of demand for books by lifting the monopolies that privileged particular contractors (*mültezim*). On the other hand, it expanded the potential supply of printed books by legalizing private printers. The author, too, emerged as a distinctively new actor acquiring a legal space under the 1857 regulation. These non-state actors at all levels contributed to the making of the printing enterprise just as much as the Ottoman state.

This chapter argues that the changing economic and political dynamics of each specified time interval of the nineteenth century also dictated a change in the perspective toward print; new concepts, agents, and institutions, each ending up being regulated by standardizing decrees and regulations, defined a new and convoluted phase in the development of printing in the Ottoman Empire. In the process, the printed book was turned into an increasingly valued commodity in the market.

2.2 The Structuring of the printing enterprise until 1831

The Ottoman experimentation with the printing enterprise in the nineteenth century was at heart a microcosm of the broader institutional experimentation carried out during the reigns of Selim III (1789-1807), Mahmud II (1808-1839), and Abdülmecid I (1839-1861). Recent scholarship, while acknowledging that the context for broadscale reform emerged from military defeats, also stresses the need to view this period in the light of continuity.[117] Many embassy reports and reform tracts written after 1793 suggested reform in various areas such as governance, the military, the navy, economic production, logistics, transportation, and civil education.[118] Starting with the *Nizâm-ı Cedîd* reforms of Selim III and continuing with the Tanzimat, the Ottoman reform era would become a symbol for transforming the nature of relations between state and society.[119]

This era also created a new platform for a technology that had hitherto operated in but a discontinuous fashion: the printing press.[120] State dignitaries were first alerted to the need for an efficient printing press because of the restructuring of military education under new institutions. The first institutional initiative to include a printing facility (*basmahâne* or *tab'hâne*) was realized under the newly established

---

[117] For a recent survey of the age of Ottoman military reform, see Ali Yaycıoğlu, "Guarding Traditions," 1542-1603.

[118] Beydilli, "Küçük Kaynarca'dan Tanzimat'a," 55. Among the reform tracts of the era are: *Hulâsatü'l-kelâm fî reddi'l-avâm*, also known as *Sekbanbaşı Risâlesi* (w. 1218), *Zebîre-i Kuşmânî fi ta'rîfi nizâmı İlhâmî* by Ubeydullah Kuşmani, Mehmed Emin Behiç Efendi's *Sevânihü'l-levâyih* and Ömer Faik Efendi's *Nizâmü'l-atîk*. Among the embassy reports are: Ebubekir Ratıb Efendi's report from Vienna in 1793, Moralı Es-seyyid Ali Efendi's report from Paris around 1798, Mahmud Raif Efendi's report from London in 1799, Mustafa Rasih Efendi from Russia in 1793, Abdurrahim Muhib Efendi from Paris between 1806-1812.

[119] Şakul, "Nizâm-ı Cedid Düşüncesinde," 142-143.

[120] The printing press in Arabic script first made its official presence under the joint initiatives of Ibrahim Müteferrika and Mehmed Said Efendi from 1729 until 1745. Kadı İbrahim Efendi and Ahmed Efendi next took over the remaining equipment after the death of Müteferrika. Before coming under the control of the Imperial School of Military Engineering, the press was then operated by Beylikçi Raşid Mehmed Efendi and Ahmed Vasıf Efendi from 1784 until 1792. For more details about the early periods, see the many publications of Orlin Sabev, including *İbrahim Müteferrika* and Sabev, *Waiting for Müteferrika.*

Imperial School of Military Engineering (*Mühendishâne-i Berrî-i Hümâyun*) in 1797 to meet the urgent need for textbooks.[121] Moreover, the state treasury (*îrâd-ı cedîd*), founded as an extension of the *Nizâm-ı Cedîd* reforms in 1793, was utilized to cover all expenses of the press, including paper, ink, and staff salaries.

The archival documentation on this period reveals that despite the search for a durable regulation for the operations of the press (*ale'd-devâm bir hüsn-i nizâma idhâl olunmak*), as expressed in the *berat* granted to Abdurrahman Efendi in 1802, this goal would not be reached in the short term. While the printing enterprise itself continued, its institutional links with the Imperial School of Military Engineering ended when the presses were carried in 1802 first from Hasköy to Kapalı Fırın and then to Üsküdar. In Üsküdar, the administration of the press was turned into a tax-farm (*maktû'an idâre*)[122] and trading capital (*sermâye*) was allocated by the state for the press to run on its own profit and loss.[123] This meant that the salaries would no longer be paid by the Ottoman state. As before, a *berat* was issued to the appointed directors (*Tab'hâne riyâseti, Tab'hâne müdiri)* which placed them in charge of this capital.[124] Moreover, the unsold printed books and printing equipment were registered as state property (*mîrî malı)* and then also placed under the custody of the directors.

---

[121] Beydilli, *Türk Bilim ve Matbaacılık,* 99.

[122] In 1784, Sultan Abdülhamid I had already granted the printing press operated by Raşid Mehmed Efendi and Ahmed Vasıf Efendi a *mâlikâne* status, whereby the new owners would pay for the equipment, salaries, rent, and any other extra expenses, as well as offer a minimal annual tax to the state in return for the exclusive printing privileges granted over books such as history, literature, dictionaries. See İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi,* Vol. IV-II *(*Ankara: TTK, 1988), 520. See İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi,* Vol. IV-II *(*Ankara: TTK, 1988), 520. For a detailed discussion of the formation of tax-farms (*mukâta'a*s) in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, see Yavuz Cezar, *Osmanlı Maliyesinde Bunalım ve Değişim Dönemi* (Istanbul: Alan Yayıncılık, 1986).

[123] Beydilli, *Türk Bilim ve Matbaacılık,* 136.

[124] In return for *berat,* the holders were expected to pay any expenses related to the equipment of the press to the *Îrâd-ı Cedîd* treasury and the rent of the building to the Selimiye Endowment. According to the terms of the *mukâta'a*, the holder would also pay the state an annual amount of 800 kuruş *mal-ı mîrî* and a one-time payment of 2,500 kuruş *mu'accele*. Beydilli, *Türk Bilim ve Matbaacılık*, 137.

The documents utilized by Kemal Beydilli illuminate the social networks and cliques forming around the printing press at the turn of the nineteenth century. Successive *berat*s from 1802 to 1809 designated the Imperial Press as the sole location for printing all "beneficial" (*kesîrü'l-menâfi'*) books except for those on Qur'anic exegesis and *hadith.*[125] On the one hand, the issuing of *berat*s indicated a form of contract between their holders and state officials and thereby constituted a source of constant negotiation regarding the lack of equipment and mounting debts of the former group. Seyyid Hüseyin Beyefendi, for instance, in 1807, negotiated his *berat* with state officials so that the Imperial Press would retain the monopoly of printing not only Turkish but also Arabic, Greek and Persian books. On the other hand, the monopoly itself suggests two things: first, that the state officials initially envisioned a limited scope for printing, which could be met by the presses available at the Imperial Press; and second, the early official recognition of competition for printing different titles by outside printers.

This competition became more evident when the printing operations at the Imperial Press halted during the Janissary revolt of 1807. At this point, non-Muslim (*ehl-i zimme*) customers turned to different locations to get their liturgical books printed.[126] This practice challenged the Imperial Press in that they lost both customers and the available pool of bookbinders (*mücellid*), which was apparently too limited to serve the expanding printed book market in Istanbul. As a result, the directors, Hafız Mehmed Emin Efendi and Ali Efendi, appealed to the state authorities in 1808 for the proper implementation of their monopoly as granted in the

[125] "*...Tefsîr ve Hadîs-i Şerîfden mâ-adâ kesîrü'l-menâfi' olan kütüb-i resâil tab' u temsîl ve neşr ü füruht etmek...*" C.M. 138/6869, 17 Şevval 1217 (10 February 1803). This notice supports the view that there was indeed a religious reference for the "ban'" on the printing of religious texts, contrary to what Kathryn Schwartz argues in "Did Ottoman Sultans Ban Print?"

[126] See Beydilli, *Türk Bilim ve Matbaacılık*, 140. We cannot claim that the activities of these non-state printers were yet "illicit" as relevant legal measures had not yet been defined.

berat.[127] Hence one can claim that at the turn of the nineteenth century, even though printing had acquired a new meaning, the monopolies served as a strategy to match the limited demand for books with the limited staff and printing equipment available in the empire.

The printing enterprise became immersed in the socio-political conflicts surrounding the Greek Revolt in 1821. As the director of the Imperial Press noted, the Greek staff employed at the press had to be replaced by Muslims because of the political atmosphere.[128] The Muslim residents of Üsküdar, however, only worked their vines and gardens. To get access to the "experienced Muslim editors, students and workers" (*teşeyyüh etmiş musahhih ve talebe ve sâir ehl-i İslâm hademe*), therefore, the press had to move to Süleymaniye.[129] These considerations reveal that the press was as much a product of the social fabric as a technology and hence early on, the physical location was important for rendering it relevant and meaningful in the Ottoman context. This incident further testifies to the competition for both customers and labor force among different presses at the turn of the nineteenth century.

At the heart of these issues were financial considerations; the inefficiency of the Imperial Press would be the subject of many debates among state officials for decades. Many officials involved with the press pointed at its insufficient capital.[130]

---

[127] Among the many documents that discuss this monopoly are: C.M. 138/6869, 17 Şevval 1217 (10 February 1803); C.M. 6346, 25 Cemâziyelevvel 1223 (19 July 1808); C.M. 6343, 2 Muharrem 1224 (17 February 1809). They have been published by Beydilli, *Türk Bilim ve Matbaacılık*, 431-435. "*Tab'hâne mukâta'asından başka mahallerde sanâyi'-i tıbâ'iye icrâ olunmamak ve ettirilmemek ve hufyeten icrâ olunur ise men' ü def' olunmak..."*

[128] For a general view of the replacement of Greek officials with Muslim ones during the Greek revolt, see Christine M. Philliou, *Biography of an Empire: Governing Ottomans in an Age of Revolution* (University of California Press, Berkeley, 2011).

[129] The press did indeed move to Kaptan İbrahim Paşa Hamamı in Süleymaniye in 1824. Beydilli, *Türk Bilim ve Matbaacılık,* 144.

[130] One of the first directors, Abdurrahman Efendi, explained that because books could not be quickly sold or carried to the provinces, there was no turnover. Sabık Deftermini Vekili Salihzade Hüseyin Beyefendi also confirmed this. Beydilli, *Türk Bilim ve Matbaacılık,* 137.

In a decade or two, it would become a custom for the state treasury to cover these debts.[131] Apparently the system was not self-sufficient or efficient, thereby necessitating a search for a more efficient model of running the press.

2.3 State monopoly over print: 1831–1839

2.3.1 Establishment of the Directorate of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire*

A more efficient organizational model for the printing enterprise was formulated during the reign of Sultan Mahmud II, who initiated a centralizing reform program following the abolishment of the Janissary corps in 1826. The Directorate of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire,* established in 1831, was initially designed as the administrative unit for directing the publication of the new official gazette, *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'*.[132] Ahmed Hulusi Paşa (d. 1836)'s *lâyiha* stated that printing this gazette (*gazete*) in a comprehensible language (*herkesin zihni teslîm edecek surette)* would serve "many general benefits" (*envâ'-ı fevâid-i mülkiye ve nice nice muhsinât-ı umûmiye*) and "properly inform" both the Ottoman subjects and the foreigners about "the occurrences in state affairs" even though it would not be possible to always reveal the "real" reasons behind them.[133] Shaping public opinion, in other words, was a clear motive behind this new outlet.[134] To host the staff and the equipment of the

---

[131] Beydilli, *Türk Bilim ve Matbaacılık,* 145.

[132] For information about the first official Ottoman gazette, see Orhan Koloğlu, *Takvîm-i Vekâyi', Türk Basınında 150. Yıl: 1831-1981* (Ankara: Çağdaş Gazeteciler Derneği Yayınları, 1981); Gerçek, *Türk Gazeteciliği*; Nesimi Yazıcı, *Takvîm-i Vekâyi': Belgeler* (Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1983).

[133] Ahmed Hulusi Paşa was referred to as *kâimmakam paşa* in the *lâyiha.* HAT 1237/48157, 1247 (1831-32): "*...saltanat-ı seniyyenin dâhilen ve hâricen teşebbüs ve icrâ buyuracağı mesâlih-i hafiyyenin gazete evrâkına yazılması tecvîz olunmayacağı müsellem ise de..."*

[134] Many European travelers remarked on the significance of publishing a newspaper for forming public opinion. See, for instance, James Ellsworth De Kay, *Sketches of Turkey in 1831 and 1832* (New York: J.&J. Harper, 1833), 405: "The Turk is now in a situation to assist in forming public opinion, and he will no longer submit in silence to the continual attempts to impugn his motives or to traduce his character."

gazette, the residence of the former deputy governor (*mütesellim*) of Bursa, Kapıcıbaşı Musa Ağa, was turned into a printing house because of its close location to the Porte, the Chief Military Office (*Bâb-ı Seraskerî*) and the Imperial Press (*Tab'hâne-i Hümâyun*).

Moreover, Mehmed Esad Efendi (d. 1848)[135] was appointed as its first director (*nâzır*)[136] because of his position as the official chronicler and his high repute (*vak'anüvislik münâsebeti ve haysiyet-i zâtiyesinden dolayı*).[137] From an official perspective, the close connection between the writing of the official chronicle and the official gazette is evident, as also noted in the introductory issue of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'*.[138] Hakan Karateke has highlighted these similarities through a content analysis of the two genres; similar to a chronicle, *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'* reported dry

[135] The other two candidates were the Süleyman Faik Efendi and Mustafa Efendi, who had been the chief secretary of Arif Bey and was known for his mastery over literary composition and calligraphy; HAT 1237/48157, 29 Zilhicce 1247 (30 May 1832); İ.DUİT 136/32, p.10. Mehmed Esad Efendi rose from the *ilmiyye* to gain high rank in Istanbul, Rumeli and Anadolu. He was the army judge, and accompanied Sultan Mahmud II on his trips. While he was appointed as the official court chronicler and the director of the Imperial Press between 1831 and 1837, shortly after his assignment, he was sent as an ambassador to Iran. On his way back, he also acquired other important posts in 1839 as a member of the Supreme Council for Judicial Regulations and in 1841 as *Nakîbü'l-Eşrâf*, followed by being assigned to the Council of Public Education in 1845 and his consecutive appointment as the Director of Public Schools (*Mekâtib-i Umûmiyye Nâzırı*) in 1846. Hence the later part of his life was shaped by the new state institutions of the Tanzimat period. At his death, Lütfi Efendi defined him as: "*nahîfü'l mizâc ve gayet fatîn ve ârif ve her bir umûra vâkıf, zevkini mütâla'a-i kütüb ü âsâra sahib bir nüsha-i nâdiri ma'ârif idi. Çoğu eseri vefâtından sonra zâyi' oldu.*"Ahmed Lütfi Efendi, *Vak'anüvis Ahmed Lütfi Efendi Tarihi*, vol. VI-VII-VIII, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı-Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1999), 1257; Sahhâflar Şeyhî-zâde Seyyid Mehmed Esad Efendi, *Vak'anüvis Esad Efendi Tarihi,* ed. Ziya Yılmazer (İstanbul: OSAV, 2000).

[136] For comparison's sake, at the Bulaq Press of Mehmed Ali Paşa, *ma'mûr* was the first title adopted for the director of the press. In the April of 1833, the title '*nâzır*' was introduced. In August 1835, another new title, *müdir,* was introduced, suggesting yet another higher level. For further details on the official appointments at the Bulaq Press, see James Heyworth-Dunne, "Printing and Translations under Muhammad Ali of Egypt: The Foundation of Modern Arabic," *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland,* No: 3 (July 1940): 331-332.

[137] HAT 1237/48157, 1247(1831-32), p. 2. We also know the central role of Mehmed Esad Efendi in the reforms of Mahmud II; he had already written *Üss-i zafer* justifying the abolishing of the Janissary corps, which had been printed in 1826. In an unpublished paper, Elçin Arabacı has claimed that it was the Naskhbandi-Mujaddidi links of Esad Efendi that facilitated his promotion to important positions. "Quest for Legitimization of the Ottoman State or, Modernization of Islam in the Early Nineteenth Century Ottoman 'Center'?" (Unpublished paper).

[138] "*...Çünkü târîh denilen fenn-i celîl kârgâh-ı âlemde vukû' bulan ahvâli vakit ve zamanıyla zabt ve beyân etmekten ibârettir...*" *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'*, "*Mukaddime-i Takvîm-i Vekâyi',"* 1247.

information on official appointments and domestic and international affairs.[139] Hence the function of a newspaper editor had been juxtaposed to the function of a court chronicler.[140]

Mehmed Esad Efendi's introductory piece in *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'* was published on 8 October 1831 to be followed by the first issue on 1 November 1831. In a few months' time on 18 May 1832, the administration of the Imperial Press was also annexed to the Directorate of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire* under the supervision of Esad Efendi. [141] As with the previous operators of the Imperial Press, all equipment and printed books previously supervised by İbrahim Saib Efendi[142] would now be placed under the custody of Esad Efendi, who would have three tasks: keeping of the imperial records and supervising the publication of both the gazette and the books.

The union between the two printing facilities may be explained in connection to the centralization policies of Sultan Mahmud II. As the English traveler Charles

---

[139] Hakan Karateke, "The Ottoman Official Gazette *Taqvim-i Veqayi*, 1831: An Ottoman Annal in its Own Right," *Turkish Language, Literature, and History: Travelers' Tales, Sultans, and Scholars since the Eighth Century*, eds. Bill Hickmann, Gary Leiser (London and New York: Routledge, 2015), 191-207. Similarly, Dana Sajdi argued that the unofficial contemporary Syrian chronicles of the eighteenth century could be read as "pre-print journalism," as the intention in their compilation was similarly to inform the audience. Dana Sajdi, "Chained: Orality, Authority and History," in *By the Pen and What They Write,* eds. Sheila S. Blair and Jonathan Bloom (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017), 222. Also see Dana Sajdi, "Print and Its Discontents: A Case for Pre-Print Journalism and Other Sundry Printed Matters," *The Translator* 15, no. 1 (2009): 125; Dana Sajdi, "A Room of His Own: The 'History' of the Barber of Damascus," *The MIT Electronic Journal of Middle East Studies* 3 (Fall 2003): 19-35.

[140] Following the tenure of Mehmed Esad Efendi as court chronicler between 1825 and 1848, this position was occupied by two other directors of the Imperial Press: Recai Mehmed Efendi from 1848 to 1853 and Akif Paşazade Mehmed Nail Bey from 1853 to 1855. In 1855, the functions were separated. See: *Takvîm-i Vekâyi',* no. 519 (14 Cemâziyelâhir 1271). Ahmed Lütfi Efendi, who had been the chief editor at the Imperial Press for years and finally served for a very brief period in 1862 as the director of the newly established Press Directorate *(Matbû'ât Müdürlüğü)*, was later appointed as the court chronicler from 1866 to 1907. Ahmed Cevdet Efendi, who was not officially appointed as staff to the Directorate, served as a chronicler between 1855-1866.

[141] This annexation was reported on *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'*, no. 26 (17 Zilkade 1247), 2. There are only two individual studies, both masters theses, on the institutionalization of the Imperial Press under the Directorate of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire.* One of them provides an overview of the staff and the mechanisms that came about with the establishment of the institution and the other delves into the published books in more detail. See Çolak, "Osmanlı Matbaacılığında Takvîmhâne-i Âmire'nin," and Necdet Öz, "Tabhâne ile Takvimhane'nin."

[142] For İbrahim Saib Efendi's notice about the transfer of the printing equipment to Esad Efendi, see HAT 671/32800, 1247 (1831-32); HAT 671/32800-A, 1247 (1831-32).

White noted in the early 1840s, "Mahmud directed the whole printing establishment, including the Takwim to be placed under the direction of an under-secretary of State and, with his wonted energy, resolved to give new splendour to the undertaking."[143] The administrative unification of the two presses parallel the "streamlining" of several conciliar bodies and ministries for efficiency. Moreover, it was conceived as a remedy for the financial problems of the Imperial Press. An article in *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'* pointed directly at the need to increase the financial and administrative efficiency of the press in order to facilitate the printing of textbooks.[144] With the annexation, the *mukâta'at* treasury[145] started to cover the expenses of both publications, which was presented to the audience, through the gazette, as a service to the benefit of subjects in general.[146]

After 1831, all official printing business in the Ottoman Empire was to be regulated from the Directorate of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire*. At the same time, *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire* and *Tab'hâne-i Âmire* remained as terms in official usage by the Ottoman bureaucracy until 1863. Even though technically the former was associated with the printing of the gazette and the latter with the printing of books, there were many crossovers between the two units between 1831 and 1863 in terms of

---

[143] White, *Three Years in Constantinople,* 207.

[144] "*... tullâbın muhtâc olduğu ve istifâde olunacak kütüb-i mütedâvile-i mukteziyenin germiyyet üzere tab' ve teksîri ümniyesiyle...." Takvîm-i Vekâyi',* (17 Zilkade 1247), 2. Printing, as articulated here, was a means of overcoming the difficulties of reproducing by hand the voluminous and prestigious books needed by scholars.

[145] The *mukâta'at* treasury was initially formed around 1825 to fund the new Ottoman army through the tax-farms assigned for the army. By 1827, the directorate of the *mukâta'a* (*Mukâta'at Nezâreti*) was formally established as independent from the imperial treasury. As the army bases expanded, so did the sources of income for the treasury. In 1829, the *Masârıfât Nâzırlığı* was founded in addition to *Mukâta'at Nezâreti*. In 1834, the *mukâta'at* was dissolved to become *Asâkir-i Mansûre-i Muhammediyye Defterdârı*. At the same time, the *mukâta'at* treasury became the *asâkir-i mansûre-i Muhammediyye* treasury, or *mansûre hazinesi* in short. Finally, in 1838, the *mansûre hazinesi* was united with the *Hazine-i Âmire* under the *Mâliye Nâzırlığı*. In 1840, the *hazine-i celîle-i mâliye* became the single treasury of the empire, unifying the *hazine-i âmire*, *hazine-i mansûre*, and *hazine-i redîf*. For futher details, see Cezar, *Osmanlı Maliyesinde Bunalım,* 252-262.

[146] "*...mahza ilmen ve fadlen ve edeben ve örfen ve tullâb-ı zevi'l-bâb ve âmme-i ibâda ihsân-ı bî-hisâb kasdiyle fî-mâ-ba'd masârifi mukâta'at hazinesinden i'tâ ile Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâneye ilhâken tab' husûsuna ihtimâm olmak bâbında ..*" *Takvîm-i Vekâyi',* No. 51 (25 Şaban 1248).

equipment, staff and finances. Moreover, books could also be printed at *Takvimhâne-i Âmire* (*Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne)*.[147]

The publications of the Directorate of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire* did not follow a systematic policy; they covered a variety of texts such the official newspaper, pamphlets, official deeds, regulations and books. Their printing took shape according to the three distinctive yet complementary policies of Mahmud II. The first factor shaping the approach to print was his educational agenda, which corresponded to the establishment of new schools. These schools brought more students and new, increasingly fixed curricula, which relied on the multiplication of various texts. As will be discussed in Chapter Three, while the traditional madrasa education continued to thrive, as evidenced by the number of printed classical textbooks, the new schools further reinvigorated the market for textbooks around Istanbul. The utilization of print by a centralizing state would also bring better control over the dissemination of "proper" knowledge, that is to say knowledge deemed to be essential for the needs of state and society.

The second factor reinforcing the turn to print was the political propaganda accompanying the competition between Mahmud II and Mehmed Ali Paşa (d. 1849) of Egypt, which resulted in military battles that took on an international character after 1833.[148] Mehmed Ali Paşa had already established the Bulaq press in 1822 and

[147] See, for example, İ.DUİT 136/42, Gurre-i Şaban 1278 (1 February 1862).
[148] It should be noted that state propaganda through publications of books had already been practiced during the reign of Selim III. Mahmud Raid Efendi had written *Numûne-i Menâzım-ı Cedîd-i Selim Hânî,* translated into French and printed under the title *Ottoman Tableau des Nouveaux Reglements de L'Empire* in 1799. The idea was to introduce the Nizâm-ı Cedîd reforms. See Beydilli, "İlk Mühendislerimizden Seyyid Mustafa ve Nizam-ı Cedid'e Dair Risalesi," *Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi* XIII, (1987): 390-91; Kemal Beydilli and İlhan Şahin, *Mahmud Raif Efendi ve Nizam-ı Cedid'e Dair Eseri* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2001); Şakul, "Nizam-ı Cedid Düşüncesinde," 117-150. A second work was Küçük Seyyid Mustafa's *Diatribe de L'Ingénieur Séid Moustapha sur L'État Actuel de L'Art Militaire, du Génie, et des Sciences à Constantinople* published in 1803. Both books were submitted to European capitals by means of Ottoman embassies. For a broader evaluation of the reform tracts including these two, see Beydilli, "Küçük Kaynarca'dan Tanzimat'a."

launched his own official gazette, *Vekâyi'-i Mısır* in 1828.[149] Mahmud II, too, began to sponsor various publications supporting the Ottoman position by funding newspapers in both strategic centers within the empire such as İzmir and in European capitals such as Paris, London and Vienna.[150] Moreover, the official gazette, *Takvîm-i Vekâyi',* and its counterpart in French, *Le Moniteur Ottoman*, actively propagated pro- Ottoman views.[151] *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'* was also translated into Armenian, Greek, Arabic and Persian to be distributed among the various communities in the empire, although not in as a systematic fashion as its Turkish and French versions.[152] Propaganda also took the form of books legitimizing the reform policies of Mahmud II.[153] The prospects of a world enriched by the printed text provided certain advantages to Mahmud II, whose unpopular reforms had created the need for propaganda to turn public opinion in his favor.[154] Further signifying his close intervention was the official presentation of each new issue of the gazette to the attention of the sultan for authorization.[155]

[149] For an overview of the propaganda polemics between the Ottoman and the Egyptian official gazettes, see Orhan Koloğlu, *İlk Gazete İlk Polemik* (İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, 2014).
[150] For a selection of documents on newspapers subsidized by the Ottoman state within the Ottoman territories, see İ.MVL 79/1565, 8 Şaban 1262 (1 August 1846); İ.HR 14/685, İ.HR 18/873, İ.HR 32/1458, 28 Receb 1253 (28 October 1837). For those in Europe, see HR. MKT 93/49, Selh-i Safer 1271 (21 November 1854); HR.MKT 272/80, 10 Cemâziyelâhir 1275 (15 January 1859); İ.HR 216/12558, 12 Cemâziyelâhir 1282 (2 November 1865), İ.HR 220/12788, 7 Safer 1283 (21 June 1866).
[151] Ali Budak, *Münif Paşa: Batılılaşma Sürecinde Çok Yönlü bir Osmanlı Aydını* (İstanbul: Bilge, Kültür Sanat Yayınevi, 2012), 40. Budak explains how *Moniteur* was more of a way to counter Europe in European terms. Other newspapers such as *Journal de Constantinople* were also used as propaganda. See İ.MVL 207/6647, 21 Cemâziyelevvel 1267 (24 March 1851).
[152] Çolak, 56-63.
[153] See, for instance, Şeyhzâde Mehmed Esad Efendi, *Üss-i zafer* (İstanbul, bi-ma'rifeti el-Hâc İbrahim Sâib, 1243); Yâsincizâde es-Seyyid Abdülvehhâb b. Osman, *Hulâsatü'l-burhân fî itaati's-sultân* (İstanbul, bi-ma'rifeti el-Hâc İbrahim Sâib, Evâil-i Şaban 1247).
[154] About Mahmud II's concerns with public opinion, see Cengiz Kırlı, "The Struggle over Space: Coffeehouses of Ottoman Istanbul, 1780-1845" (PhD diss. Binghamton University, 2000). For a wider evaluation of the formation of public opinion under Mahmud II, see Murat Şiviloğlu, *The Emergence of Public Opinion in the Ottoman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018).
[155] See, for instance, HAT 1341/52424, 12 Safer 1253 (18 May1837); İ.DH 166/8714, 10 Rebîülâhir 1264 (16 March 1848); İ.DH 31372, 20 Şevval 1277 (1 May 1861); İ.DH 32325, 3 Cemâziyelâhir 1278 (6 December 1861). The same practice would continue during the reign of Abdülmecid I.

The third factor was the expansion and re-organization of state bureaucracy through Mahmud II's reform policies, which necessitated a large body of official papers.[156] Multiplication of the necessary documents to facilitate state affairs, in this context, was the perceived function of the printing press. Already in 1824-25, for instance, the Chief Astrologer (*Müneccimbaşı*) at the Ottoman Court and the Chief Physician jointly petitioned the Sultan to have the calenders (*ahkâm takvimleri*) printed at the Imperial Press. These calendars had been traditionally hand-copied by scribes to be distributed to statesmen, but as they complained in the petition, the number of scribes no longer sufficed to fulfill the task.[157] This need attests to the expanding bureaucratic body of the Ottoman Empire, calling for new measures to meet the need. In the years to come, state officials would continue to seek to "revolutionize both media and content" to project their reformist policies effectively throughout the empire and keep track of the mounting volume and complexity of official business.[158] At the same time, travelers such as Jerome von Crowninshield Smith would still note the inefficiency of the printing mechanism in meeting this need even in the 1850s, as: "the utility of the press in facilitating business was apparently unknown."[159] Nevertheless, there was a definite connection between the centralization of power in the hands of Mahmud II and how printing, as a state-controlled enterprise, could further reinforce this process.

---

[156] i.e. for the printing or state regulations, see C.MF 1/8, Gurre-i Rebîülâhir 1245 (30 September 1829).
[157] HAT 674/32963, 1240 (1824-25). Also see Salim Aydüz, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Müneccimbaşılık," *Osmanlı Bilimi Araştırmaları 1* (December 1995): 159-207.
[158] In the process, stylistic simplification was sought and conventions for drafting legal texts were created. Other than official newspapers, government actions were also shared with larger populace through yearbooks (1847), volumes of legal texts (1862) and diplomatic color books (1868). See Carter Findley, *Bureaucratic Reform in the Ottoman Empire: The Sublime Porte, 1789-1922* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1980), 198. Moreover, in bureaucratic documents, dating system, the verbal orders of the Sultan and the transition to *riqa* script served as evidence of standardization and centralization in official correspondances. See Ali Akyıldız, *Osmanlı Bürokrasisi ve Modernleşme* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2004).
[159] J.V.S. Smith, *Turkey and the Turks* (Boston: J. French and co.; New York: D. Appleton and co., 1854), 53.

The centralization that was envisioned by the state authorities extended also to the non-Muslim communities. While deliberating a practical solution for printing the official gazette in Greek and Armenian, the state officials demanded the respective patriarchates to bring their own types and press equipment to the Imperial Press, where their own staff would be paid to translate and print the gazettes. Moreover, the officials hoped that they would also print the necessary documents related to their own communities at the Imperial Press.[160]

This type of centralization was in stark contrast to the decentralized textual tradition of earlier centuries, in which the imperial center did not generally seek to standardize the production and dissemination of knowledge.[161] The textual production at the imperial printing enterprise at first largely served the needs or demands of those institutions created by the various departments of state. In other words, the state itself had created the demand in the first place. Then came the supply, provided by another state institution, the imperial printing enterprise. As such, in the early stages, printing was envisioned as a relatively closed game with a limited number of players, limited demand and limited output. With the advent of lithographic printing, however, the game would be changed with the entry of an increasing number of outside players.

[160] HAT 671/32799-A, 1247 (1831/1832).

[161] The palace was likely to be the only place for the central reproduction of prestigious and lavish manuscript copies as patronized by either the sultan or such palace officials as the grand vizier or *harem ağası*. See Emine Fetvacı, *Picturing History at the Ottoman Court* (Indiana University Press, 2013); Christoph Neumann, "Üç Tarz-ı Mütalaa: Yeniçağ Osmanlı Dünyası'nda Kitap Yazmak ve Okumak," *Tarih ve Toplum Yeni Yaklaşımlar* 1 (Spring 2005): 51-76. Also reflecting on the decentralized and informal production of books through manuscripts is Meredith Moss Quinn,"Books and Their Readers in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul" (PhD diss., Harvard University, 2016), 51.

2.3.2 Changing technologies and the rise of lithographic printing

In the first three decades of the nineteenth century, typographic printing was used in the Ottoman Empire, as in other parts of the world. Typographic printing necessitated the use of expensive equipment such as types, heavy presses and other mechanical tools.[162] As such, it constituted a heavy investment for the Ottoman state as well as a technological and financial obstacle to the rise of competition. In particular, there were three technological advances in print technology in Europe at the turn of the nineteenth century that together brought about the "second printing revolution," as dubbed by Nile Green[163]: the invention of the iron handpress by Charles Stanhope (d. 1816) in 1800, steam-powered printing in 1802, and lithographic printing by Alois Senefelder (d. 1834) in 1804.[164] The handpress was a modified, "rationalized" form of the typographic press, which reduced the need for skill and labor and and spread across the globe because of its durability and reduced size.[165]

In the Ottoman Empire, documents testify to the presence of both presses. On the one hand, there was the old typographic press (*basmahâne takımı*) inherited from Raşid Efendi and the Hasköy-Üsküdar presses.[166] The acquisition of new presses usually took place through the agency of foreign residents. Hence foreign agents were integrated into the official printing network early on. This pattern of transferring technology has been described by Green as "transculturalism."[167] For

[162] Aileen Fyfe, *Science and Salvation: Evangelical Popular Science Publishing in Victorian Britain* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2004), 54-56.
[163] Nile Green, "Stones from Bavaria: Iranian Lithography in its Global Contexts," *Iranian Studies* 43, no. 3 (June 2010): 305-331.
[164] Nile Green, "Persian Print and the Stanhope Revolution: Industrialization, Evangelicalism, and the Birth of Printing in Early Qajar Iran," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 30, no. 3 (2010): 414.
[165] Green, "Persian Print and the Stanhope Revolution": 415.
[166] Beydilli, *Türk Bilim ve Matbaacılık,* 353.
[167] Green, "Journeymen, Middlemen," 204.

instance, Abdurrahman Muhib Efendi, the director of the Imperial Press between 1817 and 1821, commissioned an agent in Genova for a new press through the agency of Frederiko Maryo, the ambassador of Dubrovnik.[168] For publishing the French version of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi',* the journalist Alexandre Blacque's (d. 1837) press equipment bought from England was brought to Istanbul in 1831.[169] This press was probably the "Stanhope type" press used at *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire*, as noted by the American traveler James de Kay in 1831.[170] Moreover, in 1839, three presses were ordered from France via the son of N. de Castro,[171] who operated the French press in Galata (*Galata'da Frenk Tab'hânesi*).[172]

Nevertheless, it was the lithographic press that brought about a change in the formation of a wider print culture in the Ottoman Empire. Even in its modified form, the handpress still needed types, which constituted an additional financial investment. In comparison, the appeal of lithographic printing was multifold: For one, it enabled the continuity of scribal elements through the "intermediation" of a scribe, who copied the text to a lithographic stone. As such, the style and ligatures of Arabic script could be copied in a way that looked similar to hand-written texts. Further elements of scribal culture such as page layouts, glosses and illustrations,

[168] Beydilli, *Türk Bilim ve Matbaacılık,* 355.
[169] "*İngiltere'den alınan kebîr musanna' tezgah...*" MAD. 8257, 3.
[170] De Kay, *Sketches of Turkey in 1831 and 1832,* 402.
[171] Teotoros Lapçinciyan (Teotig) refers to his press noting that he printed Christian liturgical texts. Teotig, 96.
[172] İ.DUİT 136/39, 19 Zilhicce 1254 (5 March 1839). Moreover, non-Muslim subjects were also involved in the official printing business by means of the official gazette. For example, Basmacı Araboğlu Kalost complained to the Supreme Council in 1850, following the halting of the printing of the official gazette in Armenian, that he had spent so much money on buying new presses from Europe. MVL 91/31, 16 Şaban 1266 (27 June 1850). In 1853, Churchill ordered a lithographic press from Vienna which arrived in Istanbul via Trieste. HR. MKT 58/78, 25 Cemâziyelâhir 1269 (5 April 1853). By 1862, the Ottoman ambassador in London notified the state about the newly invented Adams press; the doctor Seropyan was tasked with ordering both the Adams press and cylinders (Roglar), which would be used to print the paper money. It was ordered via contract from a factory owner in Lyon. A.MKT.NZD 373/19, 11 Cemâziyelevvel 1278 (14 November 1861).

could also be easily replicated with lithography.[173] Thanks to these features, lithography quickly became a "Muslim technology," in the words of Proudfoot.[174] Aside from aesthetics, the economic advantages of the lithographic press also contributed to its popularity.[175] Proudfoot argues that that lithography decreased the cost of reproducing texts to "about one-tenth of the price of manuscript copying."[176] The press itself was also cheap without the need for much capital. With fewer press parts involved, the technology was relatively easy to learn. Once they grasped the know-how, the typesetters and printers could print their own books in their homes or in similar unofficial and informal venues after acquiring a hand press and a lithographic stone.

The transmission of the lithographic press to the Ottoman Empire at the state level took place via a French lawyer from Marseilles, Henri Cayol (b. 1805).[177] Professionals like Cayol, as mentioned above, frequented the Ottoman territories in the early nineteenth century to serve the reformist Ottoman bureaucrats.[178] Cayol had arrived in Istanbul, while on a diplomatic mission to Romania with his cousin.[179] Recruited by Serasker Hüsrev Paşa, Cayol served a strategic role by running lithographic printing and teaching it to fifty people at the printing press of the Chief

[173] Tobias Heinzelmann, "Lithographic Prints," *Manuscript Cultures,* 9 (2016): 265-267. Also see Ian Proudfoot, "Mass Producing Houri's Moles or Aesthetics and Choice of Technology in Early Muslim Book Printing," in *Islam: Essays on Scripture, Thought and Society*, eds. Peter G. Riddell and Tony Street (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 161-184.
[174] Proudfoot, "Mass Producing Houri's Moles," 177-182.
[175] Nile Green, "Stones from Bavaria: Iranian Lithography in its Global Contexts": 313; Ulrich Marzolph, *Narrative Illustration in Persian Lithographed Books* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 14.
[176] Ian Proudfoot, "Lithography at the Crossroads of the East," *Journal of the Printing Historical Society,* no. 27 (1998): 131.
[177] Selim Nüzhet Gerçek, *Türk Taş Basmacılığı* (İstanbul: İstanbul Devlet Basımevi, 1939).
[178] For a general categorization of the role of foreign experts in Ottoman modernization, see Kemal Beydilli, *Türk Bilim ve Matbaacılık,* 85-88. For their role in the navy in particular, see İdris Bostan, "Osmanlı Bahriyesinin Modernleşmesinde Yabancı Uzmanların Rolü (1785-1819)," *Turkish Journal of History* (July 2011): 177-192.
[179] Gregoire Zellich, *Notice historique sur la litographie et sur les origines de son introdiction en Turquie* (Constantinople: Impr. A. Zellich Fils, 1895).

Military Office (*Bâb-ı Seraskerî*).[180] The connection between the military schools and the lithographic press at the time was evident: the textbooks largely consisted of military manuals and treatises with many visuals and maps which could be best reproduced via lithography. To learn lithographic skills, two students were sent from the Military School to Paris in 1838.[181] Cayol left his official post in 1836 to start his own print shop in Kulekapı, later partnering with the Dalmatian Antoine Zellich (d. 1890), but still maintained his privileged status with the Ottoman state, as will be seen below. He would describe himself in the colophons of the books he printed as "the inventor of lithography in Istanbul."[182]

The use of lithography at the imperial printing enterprise, however, however, was not systematic. Apparently, there were no lithographic presses at either the Imperial Press or *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire* in 1834, as Esad Efendi demanded the acquisition of a lithographic press, which produced '"superb" copies printed through transfer from a lithographic stone.[183] There was a notice in 1840 that even though they had had a lithographic press "produced" in Istanbul,[184] additional equipment as well as the lithographic stones had to be ordered from France via Alyon Bezirgan. By 1841, there was at least one lithographic press owned by the Imperial Press, as clear from a notice: the director notified the sultan that while the *Hayâtü'l-hayevân* of İmam Demiri and *Fetâvâ-yı Ali Efendi* were to be printed by typography, *Kasîde-i*

[180] The connection between military reform and the printing press was not new in the global context. Green discusses the case of Iran, for example, where the transfer of lithography also occurred through military and diplomatic channels. Green explains how Iran was able to acquire the material tools of lithography through the mediation of Russia in the 1830s. In fact, Iran was part of the larger process of shipping lithographic presses to ports such as Istanbul, Calcutta and Batavia. See Nile Green, "Stones from Bavaria: Iranian Lithography in its Global Contexts," 305-331.
[181] These students were Şerif and Arif. HAT 1185/46750, 1254 (1838/39).
[182] "*...der-i aliyyede fi'l-asl litografya fenninin mûcidi olan Kayolzâde Yahya Harirî bendelerinin matba'asında...*" *Kavâ'id-i Fürsiyye ve Nizâmü'l-Kelâm* (İstanbul: Kayolzâde Matbaası, 1269).
[183] "*... Litografya dedikleri taş üzerinde hattan nakille basılmış olup fi'l-hakîka bir nefis nüsha...*" HAT 493/24230-A, 1250 (1834/35).
[184] The exact word used here is *yaptırılan*. The state officials probably commissioned one of the foreign printers in Istanbul to make the press. İ.DH 18/834, 26 Cemâziyelevvel 1256 (26 July 1840).

Ameliye şerhi was be printed by lithography.[185] This document further revealed that lithography or typography could be preffered by the state officials according to the needs of the text considered.

Overall, the lithographic press would serve as a bottom-up technology in broadening the type and number of related agents of print in the Ottoman Empire. While typography was a state-run, expensive investment and for this reason remained under the auspices of the state, lithography would have a popularizing impact on the printing enterprise by allowing more agents, not necessarily licitly, into the practice. Thus, the training provided by Cayol at the Chief Military Office in the 1830s was just the beginning of the story.

2.3.3 Financial management at *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire*

The financial structure of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire* consisted of two parts, *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire* and the Imperial Press (*Tab'hâne-i Âmire*). The idea was for them to support each other financially. While the subscription fees of the gazette would pay for the salaries of employees at the Imperial Press, the extra expenditures related to equipment at *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire* would be added to the cost of printing books.[186] These strategies aimed at both efficiency and self-sufficiency for the printing enterprise.

There were, however, a few obstacles along the way. One problem concerned the nature of the ad hoc policies formulated by the new administration for the period between 1831 and 1840. Running out of stocks for paper before print, for instance, was one of the expected consequences of running the press without a clear-headed

[185] İ.DH 43/2147, 2 Receb 1257 (20 August 1841).
[186] See, for instance, İ.DH 42/2089, 1257 (1841/1842).

plan.[187] At the same time, long-term publishing policy could only be the result of broader imperial policy involving the institutionalization of other units in the government such as education and foreign affairs. Hence, a vicious cycle crippled the press treasury; in order to compensate for the limited number of printed books, the officials raised the profit rates up to 60 to 100 percent. The higher the prices, the fewer books ended up being sold. If books were not printed, in the meantime, the treasury lost more money, as the staff (*amele*) was paid monthly salaries. The short-term target was to keep the press busy at all times. This is why Esad Efendi notified the treasurer (*defterdâr*) in 1832 that the new books chosen for print had to be immediately prepared in order not to waste time and resources.[188] To add to this, there were also problems with collecting the subscription fees for *Takvîm-i Vekâyi* ', which had initially been regarded as a safety valve for their joint treasury.[189]

A second problem was the lack of capital in cash at the printing enterprise. In 1840, the director, Mustafa Sami Efendi (d. 1855), stated that the capital of *Tab'hâne-i Âmire*, amounting to 400,000 kuruş, had been spent completely on the printing of books, leaving the press with no money and many unsold books. For this, Sami Efendi blamed the distant location of the Imperial Press in Süleymaniye. He underlined that just as the headgear, *fes*, was being sold at stores despite being manufactured at the *feshâne*, printed books should also be sold at a store rented at the booksellers' bazaar which book buyers would frequent.[190] It seems that this proposal

[187] C. MF 76/3770, 11 Cemâziyelevvel 1248 (6 October 1832). The paper used at the press was at one point brought from Trieste by a member of staff, Francheski. See Mad. Müd. 8257, 29 Zilkade 1254 (13 February 1839). The same Francheski became the editor of *Le Moniteur Ottoman* upon the death of Blacque. White, *Three Years in Constantinople,* 218.
[188] C. MF 76/3770, 1248 (24 August 1832).
[189] Mad. Müd. 5257, 17 Receb 1254 (6 October 1838).
[190] İ.DH 31/1464, 25 Receb 1256 (22 September 1840). In the same document, he recommended selling newspapers on retail (*perakende*) as well as through yearly subscriptions, like they did in Europe, in order to raise the income from the newspapers. The financial income was not the only matter here; this practice would result in the beneficial outcome of enabling more people to have access to the gazette, meaning that the written material would reach more people.

was taken seriously, because the documents refer to a bookseller (*mîrî sahaf* or *sahaf-ı Tab'hâne-i Âmire)* selling books printed at the Imperial Press.[191] The petition of Rüşdi el-Mevlevî (also referred to as Derviş Rüşdi Efendi) from 1858 reveals that he had been in state service as a bookseller since 1834.[192] These official booksellers bought the books printed at the Imperial Press in bulk and then sold them at their stores.[193]

A third problem behind the inefficiency of the press was the high profit rates. Since its establishment, the directors of *Takvîm-i Veka'yihâne-i Âmire* had been responsible for preparing a budget report including separate records of the inventories at both *Tab'hâne-i Âmire* and *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire* documenting such items as pieces of furniture, press equipment, and the names and numbers of the remaining books, every six months.[194] Esad Safvet Efendi's report from 1840, for example, revealed a deficit of 27,974 kuruş, which had to be settled by the *mansûre* treasury.[195] As is typical for these reports, he provided a list of books printed during his term together with their profit rates. An overview reveals that the common practice around 1840 was to charge 100 percent profit.[196] Many examples illustrate this fact: *Birgivî şerhi*, a definite bestseller in much demand, would be sold at 16 kuruş, 8 kuruş of which corresponded to profit.[197] Similarly in 1839, a *Delâilü'l-hayrât* commentary by Kara Davud was printed at a cost of 25 kuruş, and 100

[191] In Cairo, governmental printings were sold from a bookshop in the manuscript market in Khān al-Khalīlī from at least 1833. Kathryn Schwartz, "Meaningful Mediums," 169.
[192] HH 51, p.60, 1278 (1861/1862); A.MKT.NZD 273/41, 22 Cemâziyelevvel 1275 (28 December 1858).
[193] İsmail Erünsal, *Osmanlılarda Sahaflık ve Sahaflar* (İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 2013), 121.
[194] The inventories and financial reports of Esad Efendi and the following directors of the operations of the Imperial Press can be accessed through *Takvîm-i Vekâyi' matba'ası te'sîs ve küşâd defteri,* Müd. 8257, 1255 (1839/1840).
[195] Mad. Müd. 8257, 1255 (1839/1840).
[196] From a comparative perspective, the law codes of Mehmed II and Süleyman I enforced a profit rate of 10 percent for the booksellers. See İsmail Erünsal, "Osmanlılarda Sahhaflık ve Sahhaflar: Yeni Bazı Belge ve Bilgiler," *Osmanlı Araştırmaları* XXIX (2007): 99-146:
[197] Mad. Müd. 8257, 12 Ramazan 1255 (19 November 1839).

percent profit was added, amounting to a sales price of 50 kuruş.[198] Another very popular text, a translation of Birgivî's *Tarîkat-ı Muhammediyye*, was to be sold in 1840 at 30 kuruş per copy, even though the cost was only 15 kuruş 27 para.[199] Again, a profit rate of 100 percent had been applied. At these rates, it was probably unrealistic for the press officials to expect high rates of book sales. Indeed, *maliyeden müdevver* registers reveal high number of unsold copies of even the most popular books.

To liquidate these unsold books, press officials had to be resourceful. Among the three solutions developed to alleviate the treasury, the first one concerned a general approach to printing: not to print books before there was a demand for them. As press officials sought to invigorate the printing enterprise and thrive financially, they realized early on that the book supply had to correspond to demand, and the surest source for demand was students. Hence, various official documents from the early 1830s onwards addressed this need. A direct outcome of this policy is visible in the list of book titles printed between 1831 and 1840; they consisted of various textbooks to be taught at both madrasas and new schools, as explored in Chapter Three.[200] At the same time, officials did not stop the printing of certain books as favors to important statesmen, which led to the subsequent piling up of stocks, as the director would complain in late 1839.[201]

A second policy to make the press more profitable was to employ the newspaper as a vehicle to market books before and after the printing process. This made sense as subscription to the official gazette was mandatory for civil bureaucrats

[198] Mad. Müd. 5257, 7 Şevval 1254 (24 December 1838).
[199] HAT 1622/14, 13 Cemâziyelâhir 1255 (24 August 1839).
[200] Some of the new schools include the Military School *(Mekteb-i Harbiyye)* in 1834 and the new civil schools in 1839, namely, the School of Learning (*Mekteb-i Ma'ârif-i Adliyye)* and the School of Literary Sciences (*Mekteb-i Ulûm-ı Edebiyye).*
[201] Mad. Müd. 8257, 12 Şevval 1255 (19 December 1839).

around the empire.[202] These bureaucrats, in turn, constituted the majority of the literate circles of the nineteenth century and were thus another source of demand for books. For instance, Esad Efendi listed book titles considered for print in the 1833 edition of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'*; upon this notice, interested readers were directed to register their names in advance. This practice could be taken as a means of creating "controlled demand," in other words, steering demand towards a group of books selected by the state.[203] One such book was the commentary of Müftizâde Abdürrahim Efendi (d. 1837)[204] on Ali Kuşçu's *Unkûdü'z*-zevâhir on the morphology and terminology of Arabic, reaching forty volumes. The plan was announced via the gazette for interested people to register their names. Despite the obvious need for the book for the people of learning (*erbâb-ı ilm ü tahsîle lüzûmlu*), Ahmed Lütfi Efendi noted that even students (*beyne't-tûllab)* were not familiar with it. The printing was cancelled on the grounds that there would not be sufficient demand.[205] Hence the economic feasibility of printing a book had to match the expected benefit in an ideal printing strategy adopted by the Imperial Press. It also became customary to announce book titles on *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'* together with the assigned prices once printing was completed.[206] This constituted another instance of the alliance between the two lines of publications.

---

[202] The designation of Ottoman state officials in both Istanbul and the provinces as the intended audience of the gazette can be followed through documents such as HAT 1237/48157, 29 Zilhicce 1247 (30 May 1832); HAT 463/22677, C. ML 380/15617, 18 Cemâziyelevvel 1257 (8 July 1841).
[203] Anonymous, "Fünûn," *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'* (7 Cemâziyelevvel 1249), 4.
[204] Müftizâde (d. 1837) was a well-recognized religious scholar of his age and the brother of one of the first teachers at the Engineering School, Palabıyık Mehmed Efendi. He was also the father of Müneccimbaşı Osman Saib Efendi.
[205] Ahmed Lütfi Efendi, *Vak'anüvis Ahmed Lütfi Efendi Tarihi*, vol. IV-V (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfi-Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1999), 764.
[206] Many issues of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'* contain long lists of printed books with their sales prices. See, for instance, the following issues: 190 (1255); 243(1258); 324 (1263); 343 (1263); 397 (1265); 426 (1266); 439 (1266); 451 (1266); 456 (1266); 459 (1268); 467 (1267); 484 (1269); 488 (1269); 542 (1272); 642 (1278); 728 (1280); 733 (1280), 736 (1280).

The third and the more radical measure to make the press more profitable was to change its printing policy altogether. State officials chose to make it legal for non-state agents to commission books at the Imperial Press through an imperial decree in 1840. The integration of these individuals would serve two purposes: first, aside from meeting the cost, they would pay an extra fee which would correspond to the profit from the perspective of the Imperial Press. . Second, while the Imperial Press had prioritized the printing of textbooks because of financial limitations, the contractors would serve to expand the range and number of printed book titles. Hence, the imperial decree of 1840 was articulated as a way to open the door of printing to outside agents. In other words, expanding the "demand" to include these agents while keeping the supply fixed at the Imperial Press, the Ottoman state would have contributed to the commodification of the printed book.

2.4 Diversification of the printed book market: 1840–1855

In 1839, Sadık Rifat Paşa (d. 1857) penned a treatise regarding his observations on European cities. He briefly referred to the use of the printing presses (*kitâb basmahâneleri*), noting that they operated like "the trade of artisans" (*bir nevi' esnaflık suretinde*); anyone who demanded could get the book of their choice printed.[207] In a few months time, on 2 January 1840, the imperial edict was announced on *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'* stipulating the dissolution of the state monopoly over the printing enterprise.[208] In other words, the privilege of commissioning books at the

[207] Mehmet Seyitdanlıoğlu, "Sadık Rifat Paşa ve Avrupa Ahvaline Dair Risalesi," *Liberal Düşünce* (Summer 1996): 122.
[208] *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'*, Issue 189, 26 Şevval 1255; İskit, *Türkiye'de Matbuat İdareleri ve Politikaları*, 837. Many modern scholars have also noted the impact of this decree: Ali Birinci, "Osmanli Devletinde Matbû'at ve Neşriyat Yasakları Tarihine Medhal," *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi* 7, no. 4 (2006): 295-296; Mehmet Alkan, "Sultan Abdülmecid Dönemi'nde Tanzimat Modernleşmesi," in *Sultan Abdülmecid ve Dönemi,* eds. Kemal Kahraman, İlona Baytar (İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür A.Ş Yayınları, 2015), 118.

Imperial Press had been extended to private individuals, who were willing to pay for their own printing costs in advance. Considering how closely the drafts of Sadık Rifat Paşa's proposed administrative reform matched the contents of the Gülhane Rescript, one also wonders about the impact of his views on the book publishing decree of 1840.[209]

This edict, marking the transformation of the Ottoman printing enterprise, was informed by three broader factors. First of all, it should be viewed with regard to the general Ottoman economic climate. This was a time when the Ottoman state was trying to shift the traditional controlled economy towards a market-oriented one.[210] The 1838 Anglo-Ottoman Treaty, in particular, is recognized for "liberalizing" Ottoman economy by greatly lowering the tariffs on imported goods and dissolving the Ottoman monopolies (*yed-i vâhid*) and other restrictions on trade.[211] British goods, and soon goods from other European countries, began to enter the Ottoman territories virtually unimpeded.[212] However, as with many of the Ottoman policies of the period, the 1838 Anglo-Ottoman Treaty did not owe itself only to British pressure, but also to domestic changes already in effect visible in the policies of both Selim III and Mahmud II and in the reform treatises from Ebubekir Ratıb Efendi to Sadık Rifat Paşa.[213] It was also preceded by the free-trade treatises with Russia in

[209] Şerif Mardin, *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought: A Study in the Modernization of Turkish Political Ideas* (NY: Syracuse University Press, 2000), 177-195.
[210] Deniz T. Kılınçoğlu, *Economics and Capitalism in the Ottoman Empire* (London and New York: Routledge, 2015), 18.
[211] Kılınçoğlu, *Economics and Capitalism,*17-19.
[212] The same treaty required Meḥmed Ali Paşa to dismiss the monopolies in Egypt, which led to an increased search for income for his printing press at Bulaq. Kathryn Schwartz has argued that this economic loss could have been the motive behind the turn to private contractors at Bulaq, as a means to generate extra income. Schwartz, "Meaningful Mediums," 203. On an appraisal of the 1838 Treaty, see Mübahat Kütükoğlu, *Baltalimanı'na Giden Yol: Osmanlı-İngiliz İktisadi Münasebetleri (1580-1850)* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2013).
[213] For a review of imperial decrees and reform treatises involving a liberal approach to economics, see Ahmed Güner Sayar, *Osmanlı İktisat Düşüncesinin Çağdaşlaşması* (İstanbul: Der Yayınları, 1986). For the view that the 1838 treaty was a in fact continuation of the path to economic liberalism in the Ottoman Empire, see Donald Quataert, "The Age of Reforms, 1812–1914," in *An Economic*

1829 and with America in 1830.[214] Moreover, while modern liberal economic ideas would be discussed in a more systematic fashion in the Ottoman Empire after the 1850s, various newspaper publications after the 1820s in İzmir and Istanbul, including *Le Moniteur Ottoman* and *Cerîde-i Havâdis*, became important channels for conveying the principles of economic liberalism.[215] The 1840 imperial decree was also about dissolving the state monopoly on printing and opening up the decisions and procedures to a still limited yet more diverse body of contractors.

The second thread that connected the 1840 decree to broader Ottoman policy was the correlation established between printing and the expansion of knowledge through educational reform. Already since the 1830s, expanding the benefits (*teksîr-i menâfi'*) of some books had been employed as a reason legitimizing the turn to print as a state enterprise.[216] The efforts to systematize educational policies would become more visible after the establishment of new councils in 1845 and new schools, including the elementary schools including the elementary schools (*sıbyan mektebleri*) and *rüşdiyes.* With a more diverse student body, textbooks would become commodities in much demand, which in turn led the Council of Public Education to order a new lithographic press in 1848.[217] The cost of printing textbooks, in general, was covered by the state treasury, pointing to the further centralization of education, but the surplus copies would be directed for sale to the wider market in the hope that the profit would alleviate the burden on the state treasury.

---

and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300–1914, eds. Halil İnalcık and Donald Quataert (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 764.

[214] See, for instance, Reşat Kasaba, "Treatises and Friendships: British Imperialism, the Ottoman Empire and China in the Nineteenth Century," *Journal of World History* 4, no. 2 (Fall 1993): 220.

[215] Kılınçoğlu, *Economics and Capitalism,* 24-26.

[216] Mad. Müd. 8257, 12 Şevval 1255 (19 December 1839).

[217] İ.MVL 117/2868, Selh-i Rebîülevvel 1264 (6 Mart 1848).

In general, as will be discussed further in Chapter Three, the function of a textbook was equated with the dissemination of beneficial knowledge. Hence, the 1840 decree addressed the inability to print many respected books (*kütüb-i mu'tebere ve müellefât-ı latîfe*) because of the Imperial Press's financial conundrum.. It suggested that by granting license to private contractors, those books which needed to be printed because of their apparent benefit (*nef' ve fâide-i umûmiyesi derkâr*) could now be reproduced.[218] Hence it could be argued that the initial role attributed to these private agents by state authorities was to serve as facilitators for the dissemination of knowledge and sciences (*teksîr-i ulûm u ma'rifet ve tevfîr-i sanâyi' u hırfet*).[219] This role would be even more important from 1847 onwards, when these twin aims increasingly defined state policy.[220] In fact, by the 1850s, the powers of the printing press would arguably surpass those of the libraries in terms of maximizing the benefit expected from books.[221] Such faith in the power of a technology to advancing human knowledge, however, would be toned down by 1854, as the press also came to be recognized as a source for great problems unless properly monitored.[222]

A third thread contextualizing the 1840 decree was the Gülhane Rescript of 1839. Although it is not possible to discuss the rescript here in detail, it should be underlined that it offered "a short list of promises...as guiding principles" for the

---

[218] "*…şayet satılamayıp kalacağı ve emvâl-i mîrîyeye zarar terettüb edeceği mülâhazasıyla ekser kütüb-i mu'tebere ve müellefat-ı latifenin tab' ve neşrine me'mur bulunanlar tarafından cesaret olunamadığından...*" İskit, *Türkiye'de Matbuat İdareleri,* 837.
[219] *Takvîm-i Vekâyi',* No. 189 (26 Şevval 1255); İbid., 837.
[220] İ.MVL 99/2119, 10 Cemâziyelevvel 1263 (26 April 1847). One such book was *Delâilü'l-hayrât*. See İ.DH 86/4320, 1260 (1844/1845).
[221] A. MKT. MVL 71/23, 26 Cemâziyelâhir 1271 (16 March 1855). This document underlines that it would be of little use simply to place beneficial texts such as Abdülmecid Efendi's translation of *Dürrü'l-muhtâr* in libraries, instead arguing that a proper contractor had to be sought to publish or facilitate the printing of such texts. For a perspective on printing as a service to the dissemination of the sciences (*ulûm-ı âlînin intişârı*), see İ.MVL 279/10924, 5 Cemâziyelâhir 1269 (16 March 1853).
[222] HR. TO 418/227, 1270 (1853/1854).

reform program of Abdülmecid I.[223] The basis of the rescript stipulated the rule of law particularly in matters of life, honor and property, for all subjects regardless of their religion.[224] The processing of law emerged as perhaps the most significant component. A series of legal enactments of various scales intensifying after this point would serve to lay out mechanisms vital to the re-ordering of society and the creation of a modern state.[225] Some codes were imported from Europe such as the 1850 commercial code, and some were modified according to the Ottoman needs such as the 1858 criminal code. As Carter Findley has succinctly observed:

> Beginning with the Nizam-ı Cedid, the connection between reform and the drafting of instructions, regulations and laws had impressed itself on Ottoman statesmen's awareness. The fact that instructions and laws took effect through the sultan's powers of decree made centralization, reform and legislation interdependent.[226]

Along these lines, the printing press could be situated at the intersection of the reformist, centralist, and legislative efforts of the state officials. The press served the interests of the Ottoman officials in centralizing these measures. At the same time, the regulations surrounding the printing press became part of the legislative efforts of the Tanzimat. Legislation itself, however, would be closely guided by the internal dynamics of the Ottoman printing sphere. In other words, the legal parameters defining the printing sphere would emerge in response to the ambiguity posed by the various actors getting involved in the printing business.

---

[223] Anscombe*, State, Faith and Nation,* 89.
[224] There is a wealth of scholarly literature on the role of the Ottoman state in determining the contents of the edict; the recent trends in the literature speak in favor of the Ottoman authorities adopting elements from their own political and religious discourse, such as justice and sharia. See, for example, Findley, "Tanzimat," 19; Abu Manneh, "The Islamic Roots of the Gülhane Rescript," 173-203. For a range of articles on different aspects of the Tanzimat, see Halil İnalcık and Mehmet Seyitdanlıoğlu (eds.), *Tanzimat: Değişim Sürecinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu* (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2008).
[225] Anscombe, *State, Faith and Society,* 100-101.
[226] Findley, "Tanzimat," 17-18.

The imperial decree of 1840 signified that the Directorate of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire,* and thereby the Ottoman state, had released its strict grip over printing choices by acknowledging the contractors as customers. Thus the rising demand from customers, or the rise of this group from "below" as a new agent in the printing enterprise, was legally acknowledged. Not all of these different agents, however, represent similar backgrounds or interests. Moreover, the encounters between these agents and the Ottoman state quickly transformed into a legal context whereby the contractors became customers, or the major agents contributing to the volume of prints, determining the titles, numbers and prices of printed editions. These individuals would become so significant for the financial stability of the imperial printing enterprise that the state would devise many regulations to compete for and retain their interest. At the same time, the ability of these new agents to maneuver between the Imperial Press and the various unauthorized private printers would threaten the Imperial Press's economic security. As the concept of the book-contractor as an agent of print was born, the unintended long-term impact of the 1840 decree would be the creation of a competitive, commercial market towards the end of the 1850s.

2.4.1 Book contractors regulating the book market

Book contractors were the greatest new actors to invest in and to expand the printed book market. There is ample evidence to suggest that commissioning had begun even before the edict of 1840. The earliest reference to a book printed in the name of a contractor is to the 1834 edition of *Tuhfe-i Vehbî.*[227] Archives also refer to some

[227] HAT 1422/58123, 1250 (1834/1835). It was printed in 2400 copies through a contract between the Imperial Press officials and the bookseller. Other books commissioned by the booksellers (*sahaf esnafi*) was mentioned in 1838. HAT 637/31401, 1254 (1838/1839).

"known" people from among the booksellers (*sahaf esnafından ma'lûmü'l-esâmî kesâne*) in early 1839, who had requested the printing of *Hikâye-i Leylâ*, *Delâilü'l hayrât* and Molla Cami's commentary on İbn Hâcib's *Kâfiye.*[228] In this light, the imperial decree of 1840 represented not so much a definitive break as a legal step in the institutionalization of a practice that was already in place.

What was the exact nature of this new power vested in these customers through the new decree? Now, there was a twist. While the state monopoly had been broken to an extent, a new monopoly was created around the status of the contractor. He was granted a form of monopoly (*yed-i vâhid*) by state officials over the printing rights of a particular book. In archival documents, this right was identified as *zilyedlik*. It meant that once a contractor took a book to the Imperial Press for print, no other agent could either print or sell it, until the first customer sold off all his copies.[229] In the long run, this monopoly created an alternative market outside the sphere of direct state control, which would pave the way for the eventual loss of state monopoly. Circumventing the legal regulations, some unprivileged customers would turn to get popular titles in print by private printers, a new group of printing agents located mostly in Galata.[230] Such acts indicate that the printed book market had by then come to be perceived by both contractors and these private printers as a profitable line of business.

In the legal sphere, a contract (*mukâvele*) determined the terms of the book printing procedure between the customer and the press officials. It was made in advance and was particularly significant as a road map for both parties. The terms

[228] Mad. Müd. 5257, 25 Şevval 1254 (11 January 1839). There is also reference to Molla Cami's *el Fevâidü'z-ziyâiyye* in Mad. Müd. 8257, 24 Şevval 1254 (10 January 1839), which has been also pointed out by Necdet Öz.
[229] A.MKT. NZD 86/35, 9 Zilkade 1269 (14 August 1853); İ. MMS 9/372, 18 Şevval 1271 (4 July 1855).
[230] İ.MMS 9/372, 18 Şevval 1271 (4 July 1855).

included the number of copies to be printed for each book. Moreover, the cost of each copy was determined in accordance with the price of paper, ink, casting of types, repairs and staff labor.[231] Yet, other kinds of expenses on the part of the imperial printing enterprise such as repairs were also reflected in the cost. When the pension of an employee was also to be added to the cost of the book in 1853, however, the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances (*Meclis-i Vâlâ-yı Ahkâm-ı Adliyye*) realized that such calculations inflated the book prices.[232] Moreover, when the book was to be printed via lithography, the exact estimation would be more difficult. The lithographic printing of *Kasîde-i Ameliye şerhi,* for instance, precluded the calculation of the final cost in advance. The director noted that whatever the cost would turn out to be, the profit would be one third of the cost.[233] However, the rate of profit on both customer-property and state-property books greatly varied, and the final sales prices mounted. Moreover, the Ottoman state had no control over the final sales prices of books to the public, once they delivered the printed copies to the contractors.

Overall, the basic drive for a contract was obvious: to avoid miscalculations which would harm the treasury even more. However, the presence of a contract did not remove all financial risks either. In 1841, the minister of finance, Safveti Paşa, complained that some books had been printed at the Imperial Press as both state and contractor property without an accurate calculation or estimation of the costs.[234]

---

[231] At the Bulaq Press in Egypt, the costs for printing books for the common people "were worked on a time basis; if the book took three months to print, the editor had to pay the salaries of the various employees for the three months, plus the cost of materials to which was added 50 percent of the total cost as profit fort the government." See Heyworth-Dunne, *Printing and Translations,* 332. For an example of how staff salaries were added to the cost of printing a book, see Hasan Efendi's salary in İ.MVL 267/10198, 13 Receb 1269 (22 April 1853). For the calculation of the cost of printing *Mültekâ şerhi,* see HAT 678/33034, 1249 (1833/1834).
[232] İ.MVL 267/10198, 13 Receb 1269 (22 April 1853).
[233] İ.DH 43/2147, 2 Receb 1257 (20 August 1841).
[234] İ.DH 41/2021, 14 Cemâziyelevvel 1257 (4 July 1841).

The British traveler Charles White further questioned the financial efficiency of the commissioning system at the official press around the year 1844:

> The system adopted in printing or reprinting books at the imperial establishment is extremely defective. It tends to keep up prices and acts as a heavy tax upon literature, and thus defeats one of the most important objects of the institution. For instance, when individuals desirous to print themselves with a MS at the office, they order six hundred or twelve hundred copies, the customary amount of a small or large edition. The actual expenses for paper and ink are then determined by the printer, let us say at 10 piastres for each copy; to this he adds as much more per copy for labour, government tax, and profit. The work being complete, the editor carries away the sheets, and delivers them to the binder, who makes his charge. The books being bound, the editor adds his profits, which, generally speaking, quadruple the cost price of each volume. The edition is then delivered to the booksellers, who add their required profit: and as their charges are arbitrary, it generally happens that the first prices if octupled; or that a work which may have cost the editor 25 is sold for 200 piastres.[235]

The book commissioning system and its agents were also present in Mehmed Ali Paşa's Bulaq press in Cairo. Kathryn Schwartz has demonstrated that the system was an extension of the manuscript tradition for commissioning texts: by offering to print those texts ordered by wealthy locals, Mehmed Ali Paşa assumed the role of the copyist for hire in the manuscript industry.[236] Similarly, private printers printed books largely on the basis of commissionings, meaning that they were "chosen and funded by members of the public."[237] To quote from Schwartz:

> The contractor submitted the book that they desired to print to the Minister of Public Instruction. They chose the format for their desired text, and determined the number of lines per page. The press then printed a sample page to test the justification of the text and the type of paper to be used. From there, an estimate was made of the number of pages that would comprise the completed printing, and how much the job would cost the *multazim.* Typically, the *multazim* would set a

[235] White, *Three Years in Constantinople,* 208.
[236] Schwartz, "Meaningful Mediums," 199-205. Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu and Ami Ayalon have further touched upon this practice in the Egyptian context. Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, *Mısır'da Türkler ve Kültürel Mirasları* (İstanbul: IRCICA, 2006).
[237] Kathryn A. Schwartz, "The Political Economy of Private Printing in Cairo as Told from a Commisioning Deal Turned Sour, 1871," *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 49 (2017): 26.

> deadline for the job. But the press could violate these deadlines, as it prioritized governmental printings, and the *multazim* bore the financial costs of the delays. The *multazim* also paid for the costs of the materials used, and the salaries of everyone involved in the printing. Once these sums were calculated, a percentage of the total, ranging from ten to fifty percent, was taken off the top and paid to the government. The duration of print was typically three months.[238]

Comparing the role of the contractors in the two contexts, it is possible to make the following observations: In Egypt, the role of the contractor was more pronounced in choosing the format of the book and determining the lines per page; a sample would first be printed to settle the cost. In the Ottoman case, however, it is much harder to trace the involvement of the contractor in the process of production. In both cases, the contractors did not want to invest in new titles they were not sure would sell and prioritized such long-popular manuscript titles as textbooks or works in fields with a well-established readership, such as history, literature, and mysticism. However, as long as the considered titles corresponded to those most in demand, both the state and the customers would go off their course and invest in alternative genres.

2.4.1.1 Identities of book contractors

The diversification of the Ottoman printing enterprise would be facilitated by the involvement of book contractors. In official correspondence, a contractor could be identified as a bookseller (*sahaf*), contractor (*mültezim*), customer (*müşteri*), and artisan (*esnaf*).[239] In contrast to the Bulaq-printed books, which gave information about the contractors in the colophons, the books printed at the Ottoman Imperial Press contained no physical trace of the contractors. Only the names of the sultan and

[238] Schwartz, "Meaningful Mediums," 199-205.
[239] Kemal Beydilli has referred to the demand coming from booksellers and artisans in the printing of books also at the press of the Imperial School of Military Engineering. Beydilli, *Türk Bilim ve Matbaacılık,* 328.

the director appeared in the colophon. Apparently, the role of the contractor could never surpass the significance of the Ottoman officials involved in the publishing process.

Nevertheless, perusing the printed books and documents, one can trace some of the many intermediaries who shaped and facilitated the Ottoman printing enterprise. It is with reference to them that the notion of print becomes more human, the world of print more tangible, and the agents more visible. These contractors can in general be subsumed under the following categories: booksellers, civil bureaucrats, and lower ulama.

One of the most frequent contractors was the booksellers (*sahaf*). They emerged as adaptable, active agents and manipulators of the emerging printed book industry. Since the role of booksellers is elaborated in Chapter Four, this section will only highlight some of the ways they got involved in the printing enterprise. The traveler Charles White's account of the booksellers around the 1840s, who supposedly viewed the printing press as "made of the poisonous oleander plant," was unrepresentative.[240] By that time, at least a segment of the Ottoman booksellers had become involved in the process of turning a profit from printed books. They not only pioneered the process of commissioning books at the Imperial Press, hence alleviating the burden on the press treasury, but also distributed these printed books through their networks into the provinces. Their identity was transformed together with the increase in the share of printed books in the overall book market. The term *kitapçı* came increasingly to be used to denote *sahaf* as this change gained momentum.[241] Over time, some booksellers would become *sahaf-kitapçı* and then

[240] White, *Three Years in Constantinople,*155-6. Also quoted in Orlin Sabev, "Rich Men, Poor Men: Ottoman Printers and Booksellers Making Fortune or Seeking Survival," *Oriens* 37 (2009): 177-190.
[241] Erünsal, *Osmanlılarda Sahaflık ve Sahaflar*, 85.

take the next step into becoming *sahaf*-printer.[242] Conducting a comparative study of the estates of booksellers from the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries, Orlin Sabev has concluded that by the late nineteenth century especially, booksellers-turned-printers profited a great deal from the turn to print and enjoyed high living standards.[243] Hence, a particular segment was clearly successful in adapting to the changing dynamics of state.

The practical and commercial nature of booksellers as contractors of printed books can be best illustrated through the printing of *Selections for Evliya Çelebi* (*Müntehabât-ı Evliya Çelebi)*. Brought to the Imperial Press for the first time in 1841 by customers, the officials asked for permission from the sultan to get it printed.[244] However, the earliest printed copy of the book is dated 1843.[245] Hence we do not know the fate of the first attempt. After the 1843 edition quickly sold out, a group of booksellers, this time in a joint initiative, applied for permit for a second edition in 1846, which was again granted and the copies were printed. It is worth noting that in the first half of the nineteenth century, the booksellers had already started to operate collectively (*bi'l-iştirâk*) in the printed book market, denoting the commercial nature of their endeavor. Even though the books were printed, however, the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances ruled in 1846 that the book, because of its "inappropriate" (*tab' ve neşre gayr-ı şâyân)* contents, could not be sold or disseminated.[246] This decision reflected the generally conservative policies of the

[242] Erünsal, *Osmanlılarda Sahaflık ve Sahaflar*, 81. This transformation is explained in more detail in Chapter Four.
[243] Sabev, "Rich Men, Poor Men," 186.
[244] İ.DH 49/2402, Gurre-i Zilkade 1257 (15 December 1841).
[245] Evliya Çelebi, *Müntehabât-ı Evliya Çelebi* (İstanbul: Tab'hâne-i Âmire, Evâsıt-ı Cemâziyelevvel, 1259).
[246] İ.MVL 165/4875, 15 Zilhicce 1262 (4 December 1846). The gist of criticism largely revolved around the supernatural incidents Evliya recited in his account, expressed by the critics as *"hurâfât-nâme"*. Necib Asım, while introducing a new edition of *Seyahatnâme* in 1896, stated that the early edirion printed under the title *Müntehabât* compiled from the first volume of the entire *Seyahatnâme* did really contain "useless and delusional superstitions". Hence the scholarly people who heard of the

Ottoman state at the time.

Individual initiatives, however, could break through such official blockages. Not discouraged by this obstacle, the bookseller Salih Hafız Efendi contacted the director of the Bulaq press, Hüseyin Efendi, in 1847 and negotiated with him to get these books printed there in return for submitting one-tenth of his profit to the press.[247] Over 1,200 copies of *Müntehabât* were thus printed in Egypt (*Mısır basması*) made it into the book market in Istanbul.[248] Moreover, Uncu Halil Efendi, one of the major merchants and booksellers of the Istanbul market, commissioned the chief of the booksellers' guild in Cairo, Kamil Efendi, to print four hundred copies of the *History of Evliya Çelebi* (*Evliya Tarihi*) in 1849.[249]

In the face of so many copies flooding the Istanbul market, the director of *Takvîm-i Vekâ'yihâne-i Âmire*, Recai Efendi, suggested on 7 December 1849 selling the available copies rotting at the press depository to prevent further economic loss.[250] Şeyhülislam Arif Hikmet Efendi (d. 1859), in turn, agreed that even though the text clearly contained many inappropriate expressions and superstitious stories (*bazı ekâzib ve hikâyât-ı bâtılayı müştemil)*, it would not be proper to forbid its sales, since all bookstores were full of its printed editions. Neither approving nor forbidding seemed like the best solution *(iğmâz-ı ayn)*, as was noted also in the cases of *Hadîkatü's-su'adâ* and *Ravzatü'ş-şühedâ.*[251] Hence, the agency of the booksellers,

---

work in these years would have a smile on their faces. Necip Asım, "'Bilmez efendi, çok yaşayan, çok gezen bilir' Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi'nin Tab'ını İstilzam Eden Bazı Mukaddemat (prep. by Uğur Demir)" in *Evliya Çelebi Atlası* (İstanbul: MEDAM, 2012): 222-225.

[247] İhsanoğlu, *Mısır'da Türkler,* 585, 339. The rate charged by the printer at Bulaq was standard for the period.

[248] Uğur Demir, "Yasaklanan ve Sansürlenen Bir Kitabın Macerası: Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi'nin İlk Baskıları," *Osmanlı Araştırmaları,* XLVI (2015): 201.

[249] Erünsal, *Osmanlılarda Sahhaflık ve Sahhaflar,* 500; ŞS. Rumeli Kazaskerliği 551, 23 Safer 1265 (18 January 1849), 59.

[250] İ.MVL 165/4875, 21 Muharrem 1266 (7 December 1849).

[251] *Ravzatü'ş-şühedâ* was written by Hüseyin Vâiz-i Kâşifî in 1502 about the martyrdom of *ehl-i beyt imams* at Karbala. *Hadîkatü's-su'adâ* was its translation into Turkish by Fuzûlî. Both were probably found to be contain a high dose of Alid loyalty for the nineteenth century Sunni sensibilities. The exact expression of Arif Hikmet was*: "...sâliflerde olduğu gibi bey' ü şirâsı iğmâz ve müsâmaha*

who acted without state sanction, served to shape the decision-making mechanisms in the center around the concepts of profit and loss.

As is clear from the example of Evliya's books, the commercial market was heating up as contractors tried to take advantage of the dynamics of both the Ottoman and the Cairene book markets. The popular Sufi text, *Reşahât-ı Aynü'l-hayât,* for instance, was also commissioned in Egypt twice; by Al-Haj Nuri Efendi al-Islambuli in 1840 at Bulaq and by Colonel İzmirî Emin Efendi in 1853 at al-Amira.[252] While we do not know for certain if these contractors lived in Cairo or in Istanbul, they seem to have been Ottoman subjects and we can indeed connect them to the printed book market in Istanbul. Many Ottoman intellectuals made use of the books published in Bulaq and many of the books printed in other cities of the empire such as Istanbul and Izmir did made it to Cairo.[253] According to the French director of the Egyptian Medical School, Dr. Perron in 1831, there was not much demand for printed books in Egypt except for textbooks; those titles printed by the contractors actually targeted the readers in Istanbul.[254] Bianchi would second that opinion; in a series of articles in *Journal Asiatique* that aimed to inform his readers about the state of book printing in the Ottoman Empire, he also referred to the export of books published by Egyptian private contractors to Istanbul and Izmır, where they brought three or four times more profit than in Cairo.[255]

The legalization of the Ottoman book contractors after 1840, however, placed Istanbul on the map of book production and possibly led to the increased

---

tahtında bırakılıp müdâhale olunmamak veyahut men' buyurulmak hususları irâdeden mütevakkıf bulunmuş..." İ.MVL 165/4875, 3 Cemâziyelevvel 1266 (17 March 1850). The book would be printed again in 1862. Interestingly, *Hadîka* was also printed many times, in 1273, 1282, 1283 and 1286.

[252] Abu Manneh, "The Islamic Roots of the Gülhane Rescript," 144.

[253] Johann Strauss, *The Egyptian Connection in Nineteenth Century Ottoman Literary and Intellectual History* (Orient Institut der DMG, 2000).

[254] İhsanoğlu, *Mısır'da Türkler,* 347; Heyworth-Dunne, *Printing and Translations,* 332.

[255] M. Bianchi, "Catalogue général. Des livres arabes, persans et turcs, imprimés en Egypte depuis l'introduction de l'imprimerie dans ce pays," *Journal Asiatique*, seri IV, II (July-August 1843): 25.

dissemination of printed books from Istanbul to the regional markets. In his letters written after 1840, Dr. Perron remarked that books now came from Istanbul to Cairo to be sold. However, Bianchi's lists for the years between 1856 and 1860 demonstrated the still-influential role of the Egyptian presses. Some books printed in Egypt but sold in Istanbul include the following: *Şerh-i Dîvân-ı Hâfız-ı Şîrâzî* sold at Dede Abdullah Efendi's bookstore;[256] Ibn Khaldun's *Muqaddima* sold at the bookshops of Aksaraylı Mustafa Efendi and Kayserili Muhammed Efendi;[257] Kâtib Çelebi's *Keşfü'z-zünûn* sold at Mısırlı el-Hâc Mustafa Efendi's bookshop[258] and *Tefsîr-i Ebusuud Efendi* sold in the shop of Hacı Said Efendi.[259]

Aside from the booksellers, state officials from all ranks participated in book commissioning. Their role, however, appeared as less complicated. Whether their motive was financial benefit or contributing to the expansion of knowledge, of that we cannot be sure. Osmanzâde Ahmed Tâib's (d. 1723) *Ahlâk-ı Ahmedî,* which was a translation of Mevlânâ Hüseyin Kâşifî's *Ahlâk-ı Muhsinî,* was commissioned in 1841 by Sadık Rifat Paşa.[260] In 1857, Hüsnü Bey, from the reports office of the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances, had *Kenzü'l-hesâb* printed. The book, however, did not sell in the market and his investment of 3000 kuruş was wasted.[261] He had intended to publish the book as a "charitable deed" (*eser-i hayriyye*) in his name, but the risk did not pay off. In an interesting case, *Nâzım Dîvânı* was commissioned by

[256] M. Bianchi, "Bibliographie Ottomane ou Notice des Ouvrages Publies,' *Journal Asiatique*, seri V, XIII (June 1859): 534.
[257] M. Bianchi, "Bibliographie Ottomane ou Notice des Ouvrages Publies,' *Journal Asiatique*, seri V, XIII (June 1859): 549.
[258] M. Bianchi, "Bibliographie Ottomane ou Notice des Ouvrages Publies," *Journal Asiatique*, seri V, XVI (October-November 1860): 327. The same Mustafa Efendi probably commissioned illicit books, *Amme* and *Tebâreke* at the presses of Kör Muhiddin and Maltalı Federiko. A.MKT.MVL 89/46, 4 Cemâziyelevvel 1273 (31 December 1856).
[259] M. Bianchi, "Bibliographie Ottomane ou Notice des Ouvrages Publies,' *Journal Asiatique*, seri XIV (October-November 1859): 289.
[260] İ.DH 22/1073, 9 Şaban 1256 (6 October 1840). This commissioning remained as the only printed edition of the book.
[261] A. MKT. NZD 209/61, 17 Cemâziyelevvel 1273 (13 January 1857); MVL 179/72, 17 Cemâziyelevvel 1273 (13 January 1857). This book does not show up in the printed book catalogues.

the two editors of *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire*, Cemaleddin Efendi[262] and Lütfi Efendi,[263] in 1843. Hence the employees of the Imperial Press also saw the potential for profit in commissioning books. Yet, probably due to the potential for conflict of interest, the involvement of the press staff in the commissioning process was outlawed through a decree in 1857.[264] From 1860 onwards, there would be a significant rise in the number of history books commissioned by high-ranking civil bureaucrats.[265]

Another example reveals the organic link between civil bureaucrats and Sufi sheikhs: Ömer Lütfi Efendizâde Azmi Bey (d. 1877)[266] commissioned the printing of the *Kitâbü'l-hitâb* of the Celvetî writer, İsmail Hakkı Bursevî (d. 1725) in 1841, which turned out to cost 3,5 kuruş more than the amount defined in the contract for each copy.[267] The difference would mean a financial loss for the Imperial Press. Azmi Bey agreed to abandon the books as property of the Imperial Press on the condition that they would be printed in the name of the Mevlevî sheikh, Hüsameddin Efendi (d. 1863), and that 2,000 kuruş earned from the sales would be submitted to the sheikh as gift (*atiyye*). This case presented an interesting twist where a civil bureaucrat confirmed his links to a Mevlevi sheikh through the printing of a mystical text. Sufi sheikhs also had particular privileges when they wanted to get books printed at the Imperial Press. In 1841, the sheikh of Yenikapı Mevlevîhânesi, Osman Selahaddin Dede (d. 1886) had *Rişte-i cevâhir* printed at the Imperial Press without

---

[262] Cemaleddin Efendi was awarded with "*elmaslı nişan*" in 1839 by Grand Vezir Hüsrev Paşa. Ahmed Lütfi Efendi, *Vak'anüvis Ahmed Lütfî Efendi Tarihi*, vol. VI-VII-VIII (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı-Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1999), 1034.
[263] İ.DH 50/2461, 23 Cemâziyelevvel 1257 (13 July 1841); MVL 349/119, 11 Receb 1272 (18 March 1856).
[264] A.MKT.MVL 84/59, 19 Cemâziyelâhir 1273 (14 February 1857).
[265] See Chapter Three regarding details on state officials as contractors of especially history books after 1860.
[266] Ömer Lütfi Efendi (d. 1836) was an Ottoman bureaucrat serving as the official at İzmir rüsûm-ı ihtisâbiye, İzmir voyvoda in 1830, supervisor to Feshâne. His son, Azmi Bey (d. 1877) entered the civil ranks of the corresponding secretary (*mektûbî-i sadr-ı âlî)* and receiver (*âmedî)*. In 1856, he became the *evrâk müdürü* at the Porte and the second assistant to the supervisor of judicial affairs (*de'âvî-i mu'âvin-i sânîsi)* in 1858.
[267] İ.DH 37/1764, 17 Safer 1257 (10 April 1841).

any profit charged because of a privilege (*iltimâs*) bestowed by imperial decree.[268]

Aside from these prominent figures, there were also lower ranking ulema who wanted a piece of this expanding market. One example illuminating the relevance of even the most ordinary actors in the printing business is the Friday preacher of the Şeyhzâde Mosque, Şerif Mustafa Efendi, who commissioned 750 copies of *Gülistân-ı Sa'dî* in 1849 as a way to earn his living (*medâr-ı inti'âş olmak üzere)* in 1849.[269] The story got complicated after this point, since the terms of commissioning books at the Imperial Press were such that the books under contract could not be re-printed by anyone else until all remaining copies had sold. If the demand rose from among state ranks, the remaining copies would be bought from the contractor at a price determined by the state. Yet with 650 copies of his book unsold in addition to a 15,000 kuruş debt he owed to the Imperial Press, Şerif Mustafa felt cheated when the director of *rüşdiye* schools rejected his offer to buy his books, as he made clear in his petition. Feeling justified in his complaints, he appealed to the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances to press the schools into buying his books instead of reprinting them. This case sheds an interesting light on the ways in which the printing enterprise had evolved. For one, commissioning and selling books had turned into a second job for many residents in Istanbul. In fact, for many booksellers, the act of buying and selling books was secondary to their primary occupations as instructors, *imams*, *müezzins* and Sufi sheikhs, as also shown by İsmail Erünsal for earlier centuries.[270] Perhaps more importantly, the case revealed the transformation

[268] İ.DH 50/2514, 18 Cemâziyelevvel 1257 (8 July 1841); Muharrem Varol, "19. Yüzyıl İstanbul'unda Bazı Tekkelerin," 317-348.
[269] MVL 65/57, 9 Cemâziyelevvel 1265 (2 April 1849). *Gülistân* had been penned by Sa'dî-i Şîrâzî (d. 1292) in 1258. It was a book of ethics and advice and became a textbook taught at madrasa*s* for centuries. See Tahsin Yazıcı, "Gülistân," in *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi,* Vol. 14 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1996), 240-241.
[270] Erünsal, *Osmanlılarda Sahaflık ve Sahaflar,* 123-130.

of the book market, which now included a Muslim preacher struggling for his commercial rights.

2.4.1.2 Financial arrangements with book contractors

The typical contract between the contractors and the officials at *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire* would include the number of copies planned per edition together with the amount due on the customer. The official correspondence elaborating on the details of the contracts revealed the estimated cost of printing for the Imperial Press and the related profit. The payment system, however, was flexible and enabled customers to make payments to the directorate as they sold the books.

Even though the contract theoretically binded the parties, there could be revisions. To start with, the estimated costs could never be exact even with typographic printing. In those cases where they differed, once printing was completed, the Imperial Press officials could choose to rearrange the profit rate so that the final price per copy would appear to match the amount on the contract. For example, when *Nesîmî Dîvânı* was printed in 1844, the cost estimated on the contract was 9 kuruş per copy, on top of which 11 kuruş was added as profit.[271] The contract was for 1200 copies in total. When the printing was completed, the Sultan was notified that the cost per copy had turned out to be 7 kuruş 17 para, less than what the contractor had been informed.[272] In this case, they revised the profit as 12 kuruş 23 para, which amounted to a total of 20 kuruş as the price the contractor would pay the Imperial Press for a copy. There were also many cases in which the cost turned out to be greater than the initial estimation and hence the rate of profit was also reset. For example, *Dîvân-ı Nesîb,* on a contract for 1200 copies with the artisans (*esnaf),* 90

[271] İ.DH 84/4201, 24 Muharrem 1260 (14 February 1844).
[272] İ.DH 88/4395, 7 Cemâziyelevvel 1260 (25 May 1844).

para was set as the cost per copy and 50 para as the profit.[273] When the printing was completed in one month, the cost turned out to be 2 kuruş and they raised the profit to 1,5 kuruş.[274] Hence even though the total came out to be more expensive, the contract was apparently still valid.

As illustrated in Appendix C, the profit rates in general turned out to be very high between 1840 and 1856. For *Nesîmî Dîvânı,* for example, it was 150 percent. Similarly, in 1845, in the contract for *Münşeât-ı Mahir Bey,* the cost was estimated at 9 kuruş and the profit as 3 kuruş[275]; the turnout was 6 kuruş 35 para for cost and 5 kuruş 5 para for profit.[276] The final price demanded from the contractor remained the same but the rate of profit increased almost three-fold from 30 percent to 90 percent. These rates were not unique to the commissioned books alone. Even when the state printed books at its own expense around the 1840s, high profit rates were applied. In 1846, when *Mevâhibü'l-ledüniyye* was printed as state-property, the 42 kuruş 12 para cost was rounded to 100 kuruş total with the addition of a profit of 57 kuruş 28 para.[277] This corresponded to a profit rate of 110 percent.

We have seen how the integration of contractors to the book printing enterprise had been envisioned as a way to contribute to both the expansion of the printed book volumes and to the press treasury. For the press treasury to make profit, however, the payment system had to be efficient. The payments would of course come out of the pockets of contractors. In 1839, these people were also defined as "people of weak means" (*za'îfü'l-hâl adamlar*).[278] Unless stated otherwise, either one half or one third of the due amount, as specified in the contract, would be paid to the

[273] İ.DH 100/5029, 14 Rebîülevvel 1261 (23 March 1845).
[274] İ.DH 101/5114, 17 Rebîülâhir 1261 (25 April 1845).
[275] İ.DH 108/5460, 29 Şaban 1261 (2 September 1845).
[276] İ.DH 110/5557, 5 Şevval 1261 (7 October 1845).
[277] İ.DH 117/5951, 23 Safer 1262 (20 February 1846).
[278] Mad. Müd. 8257, 12 Şevval 1255 (19 December 1839).

treasury upfront. They would also have to bring a guarantor *(kefîl)* for the remaining debt. The rest would be paid after the completion of the printing process. However, just as with books printed by the Ottoman state, the books commissioned by private contractors could suffer from lack of sales and end up in the storage of the Imperial Press. In that case, these books could become state-property in exchange for contractors' debts.

In the 1840s and 1850s, other payment methods were adopted. The most popular procedure was the division of the remaining debts into monthly installments (*tekâsid)*. Probably the assumption here was that the intermediary would close off his debts once he sold his books. Hence the harsh economic conditions of Sultan Abdülmecid I's reign were reflected in these contracts.[279] Monthly installments of a total amount were a practice familiar to the Imperial Press in its own due payments, too. When the officials bought paper from a Jew named İsak, they agreed to make the payment with varying installments.[280] In contracts, the payment was often tied to both advance payment and monthly installments. Interestingly, most payments as installements fall between 1845 and 1850. In 1845, for example, 1200 copies of Numan Mahir Bey's *Münşeât* were negotiated with some people and the total amount due was tied to monthly installments and a deed *(sened*).[281] In 1847, the printing of *Muhammediyye* was negotiated with the contractor and the collection of the total amount of 84.000 kuruş determined for 1200 copies was attached to monthly installments and a deed.[282]

---

[279] As a way of increasing fiscal revenue, paper money (*kâime)* had been introduced in 1840 to facilitate commerce. It was in circulation especially between 1840 and 1844. The practice, however, was filled with counterfeiting also. The real problems with their circulation began in 1852 to result in a huge wave of inflation in 1861 under the impact of the Crimean War. Popular discontent led to government to abandon *kâime* by 1862. See Şevket Pamuk, *A Monetary History of the Ottoman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 208-211.
[280] İ.MVL 121/3065, Receb 1264 (June-July 1848).
[281] İ.DH 108/5460, 29 Şaban 1261 (2 September 1845).
[282] İ.DH 137/7018, 9 Safer 1263 (27 January 1847).

At the same time, there were also occurrences of wholesale (*toptan iştirâ*) of popular books such as *Tarîkat-ı Muhammediyye şerhi,* which was to be sold at 55 kuruş upon the demand of certain people.[283] The probate estate of el-Hâc Hüseyin Ağa in 1841 revealed 156 copies of *Muhammediyye şerhi*, 238 copies of *Dîvân-ı Vehbî*, 123 copies of *Fetâvâ-yı Ali Efendi.*[284] Unsurprisingly, the wholesale option was adopted for those titles considered to have the most potential for quick sales. Wholesale, in other words, attested to the propensity of a book to be regarded as an asset in the commercial market.

The economic realities had their toll on the feasibility of the contracts. Since the printing enterprise was already financially fragile, the accumulated debts alerted the press officials to resort to new measures. In many cases, the Imperial Press officials had to pursue the contractors to close off the remaining debts. The case of İlyas Efendi (d. 1864), who was a well-connected, high profile bureaucrat as well as a member of the Council of Public Education, is striking.[285] He had received permission to print his *Vekâyi'-i Letâif-i Enderûniyye* in 1858 and the printing was completed in over a year's time in 1859.[286] Follow-up documents demonstrated that in the seven months following the completion of print, he failed to close off his debt (30.700 kuruş) to the press.[287] Hence, he was repeatedly warned by the Director of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire*, Mehmed Lebib Efendi (d. 1867), who complained that because İlyas Efendi kept postponing his debt, the budget of the Imperial Press

[283] İ.DH 117/5931, 18 Safer 1262 (15 February 1846).
[284] Erünsal, *Osmanlılarda Sahaflık ve Sahaflar,* 86. Erünsal believes that this list contained the books he had commissioned for print, but there were also 133 copies of *Tarih-i Ebu Necib* and 103 copies *of Tarih-i Ebu Ali Sina* listed in the same document, which do not appear in printed book inventories before 1841.
[285] Better known as Hızır İlyas, he was an Ottoman judge and historian. See Feridun Emecen, "Hızır İlyas," in *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi,* Vol. 17 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1998), 417.
[286] A.MKT.MHM 144/27, 16 Rebîülâhir 1275 (23 November 1858); İ.DH 446/29477, 5 Rebîülâhir 1276 (1 November 1859).
[287] A.MKT.NZD 311/29, 11 Zilkade 1276 (31 May 1860).

had been destabilized. To relieve the treasury, he asked the authorities to force İlyas to pay at least 10.000 kuruş for the time being and for the remaining amount to be divided into monthly payments, 2000 kuruş each. Şeyhülislam Mehmed Sadeddin Efendi (d. 1866) noted in his report that, upon an encounter, İlyas Efendi had claimed to have been deceived (*iğfâl*) by the officials of the Imperial Press. Apparently, there was no official contract signed. Sadeddin Efendi emphasized that even though transactions as such had to be tied to deeds *(senede rabt eylemek lâzıme-i halden),* the Imperial Press had deviated from the predetermined procedure.[288] In 1860, the debt was still not paid and İlyas Efendi claimed he could not afford it. In a meeting attended by all related parties, they worked out a detailed new payment plan.[289] In 1861, his still substantial debt was forgiven and his books were admitted as state property.[290] In the same year, Şeyhülislam Arif Hikmet Efendi died with a debt of 10,000 kuruş to the Imperial Press.[291]

Clearly, such book printing favors on esteemed Ottoman scholars and statesmen figures turned into a source of further instability for the printing enterprise. When the Sheikh of Yenikapı Mevlevîhânesi, Osman Selahaddin Dede commissioned *Rişte-i cevâhir* in 1841, the printed books were delivered to him without added profit. However, he still had to pay for the cost. Even after three years, he was unable to sell the books and he remained indebted to the Imperial Press. The authorities had to find a middle way to solve this problem as he was deemed as an important scholar of the "esoteric" and the "exoteric" sciences. While they could not simply dismiss his debt, they decided to grant him 3000 kuruş as reward, so that he could close his debt on his own. As such, they financially enabled him to pay for his

[288] A.MKT.NZD 23 Zilkade 1276 (12 June 1860).
[289] A.MKT.MHM 193/50, 10 Safer 1277 (28 August 1860).
[290] A.MKT.NZD 363/2, 11 Safer 1278 (18 August 1861).
[291] MVL 382/63, 27 Cemâziyelâhir 1278 (30 Aralık 1861).

own debt.[292]

2.4.2 Private lithographers as new agents

While the Ottoman printing enterprise empowered the private book contractors, the book contractors, in turn, empowered the private printers and lithographers. The various actors in the printed book market, thereby, pulled and pushed each other into action as in a chain effect. The problem was, of course, the monopolies bestowed on particular contractors. This policy ensured the controlled participation of a limited number of non-state agents. However, the free-lance private printers, located around Galata in particular, offered a viable alternative for the profit-oriented and canny customers, who felt left out.

In his discussion of the creation of a "sustainable Muslim print tradition" through lithography primarily in Tabriz, Cairo and Lucknow, Nile Green does not give credit to the Ottoman state or the local actors therein.[293] Closer archival research reveals, however, the presence of a vivacious set of non-state actors in the Ottoman capital. In the Ottoman context, the lithographic press provided a platform for the interaction of various foreign professionals with local Muslims.[294] Foreign printers with residence permit (*müste'min*) had been visible around Galata at least since the turn of the nineteenth century.[295] As the dynamics of the Ottoman Empire transformed, however, they also adopted new roles through new networks. Henri

---

[292] "…*tahsîl-i ulûm-i zâhire ve bâtıne ile me'lûf hass-ı dâ'iyân-ı devlet-i aliyye*.." C. MF 98/4871, 26 Zilkade 1260 (7 December 1844).
[293] Green, "Journeymen, Middlemen," 203.
[294] We see foreigners especially employed for the conduct of the French version of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi', Moniteur Ottoman.* Mösyö Blacque was the best known example, who acted as the chief-editor until his death. See HAT 1343/52475, 1251 (1835/1836). Robintos was also brought from France in 1837 with 4000 kuruş salary. Under the advice of Isfenaki Bey, they added another 6000 kurus later on. HAT 1189/46855, 29 Zilhicce 1253 (26 March 1838). Another was Francheski from France. HAT 453/2248. Mösyö Ruet, who worked as the chief-editor of *Le Moniteur Ottoman.* İ.HR 13/637, 7 Şaban 1257 (24 September 1841).
[295] Beydilli, *Türk Bilim ve Matbaacılık*, 140.

Cayol and less recognized foreign printers such as the British subject Maltalı (Maltese) Federiko acted as intermediaries in forming an alliance with vigilant local actors such as Uncu Halil and Kör Muhiddin.[296] Moreover, a group of artists, who were interested in printing their works with lithography, such as the Maltese artist Charles Frederic von Brockdorff (d. 1850)[297] and Emile Mandouce (d. 1871) had also become active in Pera.[298]

What led to these partnerships was the commercial nature of the enterprise. As the director of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire*, Mehmed Said Efendi articulated in 1846, printing was a craft with little need for capital but which brought much profit.[299] The private printers were able to provide the same services to the contractors as the Imperial Press at cheaper rates. For instance, for the printing of the high state dignitary, Hayrullah Efendi's (d. 1866) book in 1847, the Imperial Press charged the following fees; 43 kuruş cost per copy if plan on 1200 copies and 53 kuruş if plan on 600. The real reason behind the high cost was the illustrations costing 35 para each. In comparison, the lithographer Henri Cayol offered to print the book charging 15-16 para per illustration.[300]

---

[296] Maltalı would be accused of illicit book printing in 1846. A.MKT.MVL 2/93, 13 Ramazan 1262 (4 September 1846). He is contextualized further in Chapter Five.

[297] The members of the Brockdorff family were only one such segment in competition with other artist families. See Dominic Cutajar, "The Lure of the Orient: The Schranzes, the Brockdorffs, Preziosi and other Artists," *Hyphen* V, no. 3 (1987).

[298] These printers imported loads of lithographic stone from a location in central France. The Alsatian lithographer Joseph Eugene Olivier (1819–92) also set up his business by importing from the quarry at Chateauroux. Green, "Stones from Bavaria: Iranian Lithography in its Global Contexts," 319.

[299] A.MKT.MVL 2/93, 19 Şevval 1262 (10 October 1846)*"... bu basmacılığın sermâyesi az ve kârı çok olduğundan..."*

[300] İ.MVL 99/2119, 28 Cemâziyelevvel 1263 (14 May 1847). Imperial Press would add an extra 11,5 kuruş profit over the cost. We do not know if it was Hayrullah Efendi approaching Cayol or Cayol approaching Hayrullah Efendi with the offer but the first scenario sounds more plausible. Hayrullah Efendi fullfilled a number of significant official duties in his life time extending from directorship of the Medical School to membership at various councils such as the Supreme Council, the Council of Public Education and the Council of Agriculture and the deputy director of *Encümen-i Dâniş.* See Ömer Faruk Akün, "Hayrullah Efendi," in *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi,* Vol. 17 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1998), 68.

Around the year 1850, the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances acknowledged that there was already much demand among people to turn to the printing of books; this demand, however, had to be managed in a way that did not violate the regulations of the Imperial Press.[301] The press officials constantly engaged in a process of delimiting the territory of private printers by recourse to a state rhetoric based on the need to respect and protect the religious and political sensitivities of the Ottoman state.[302] Another recurrent theme was to protect the press treasury from competition.[303] To closely monitor their activities day and night, Mehmed Said Efendi had unsuccessfully appealed to the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances in 1846 for the appointment of a separate official.[304]

Indeed, the structure of the printing enterprise was fluid and heterogeneous as feared by the state officials. Although the Muslim lithographic printers of the empire were perceived as an artisanal group (*litografyacı esnafı*) circa 1850, a few resurfacing names pulled all possible connections and violated the legal venues to make profit as lithographers.[305] In the meantime, they juggled the opportunities provided by *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire,* on the one hand, and the foreign printers, on the other hand, to maximize their benefit. To restrict their comfort zone, the Ottoman authorities dissolved the union of lithographers *(litografyacı esnafı ilgâ ile)* by taking over their lithographic presses and convening them all under the building of *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire* in 1850.[306] This effort in itself was a manifestation of the rising number of lithographic presses in Istanbul, which were getting hard to control.

[301] İ.MVL 196/6021, 20 Safer 1267 (25 December 1850).
[302] See, for instance, İ.MVL 233/8097, Gurre-i Cemâziyelâhir 1268 (23 March 1852).
[303] İ.MVL 233/8097, 2 Rebîülevvel 1268 (26 December 1851).
[304] A.MKT. MVL 2/93, 17 Şevval 1262 (8 October 1846).
[305] By 1860, it would become commonplace to refer to a group of lithographers not only in Istanbul but also in different provinces of the empire such as Konya. For instance, "*...litografyacı esnafından zevcim Konyalı Mehmed Efendi kullarına*…" MVL 836/53, 7 Receb 1276 (30 January 1860).
[306] İ.MVL 196/6021, 9 Receb 1266 (21 May 1850).

Accordingly, the lithographers, who would register their presses as state property, would continue to operate them at their own expense by first submitting the books for the inspection of the press authorities in advance. In this financial arrangement, they would keep their profit after paying 20 percent tax to the press treasury.[307] In this set-up, the private initiative would still be respected. Yet the idea was to centralize and increase the income of the Imperial Press.[308] This plan was briefly interrupted, as the press officials quickly discovered that by failing to present the books in advance, the lithographers tried to deceive the authorities; they printed appropriate and inappropriate books with many mistakes, refrained from submitting the due profits to the press treasury and each illegally kept three workers. The director Recai Efendi hence proposed to fully confiscate their presses and make them work as salaried employees of the Imperial Press.[309]

It is important to identify some of these versatile lithographers, who would play more prominent roles after 1856. The individual focus will shed light on how the state authorities tried to juggle and accommodate the vigilant individuals and, in the meantime, became aware of the deficits in both the legislation and execution of related decisions. To start with, in early 1855, the sheikh of Özbekler Lodge in Sultantepe, Abdürrezzak Efendi noted that he had acquired the lithographic presses of Sai Efendi, the Iranian, who had formerly received a license to print books within the Imperial Press in return for paying the 20 percent tax.[310] Although Abdürrezzak

[307] İ.MVL 196/6021, 5 Safer 1267 (10 December 1850).
[308] "*...teksîri vâridât-ı Tab'hâne-i Âmire zımnında litografyacı esnafı ilgâ ile...*" 196/6021, 9 Receb 1266 (21 May 1850).
[309] "*...kendileri zaten hüd'a-kâr olduklarından zikrolunan temettu' bir takım lübb ve lâl sırrıyla zimmetlerine geçirip el-hâletü hâzihi Tab'hâne'ye 40.000 kuruşa yakın verecekleri olduğuna...* " İ.MVL 175/5188, 21 Şevval 1266 (30 August 1850).
[310] Printers who operated their own presses under the umbrella of the Imperial Press constituted the "typesetters" regarded as the staff of the Imperial Press. İranli Sai Efendi, for instance, is mentioned as an "employee" of *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire* with 750 kuruş salary in 1853. İ.MVL 270/10399, 22 Receb 1269 (1 May 1853).

Efendi was described as a "man of skills" (*erbâb-ı hünerden),* the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances decided to buy the equipment from him and register it as the property of the Imperial Press rather than allow Abdürrezzak Efendi take over printing.[311] They realized, however, that this decision had not yet been implemented at the time of his death in 1856; the press appeared in his probate estate. This led to a further realization of the need for a decent regulation to take the increasing number of presses under control.[312]

Another early agent was Hafız Ahmed Efendi, a madrasa student. He first stood out in 1844 as a contractor of "Islamic books" (*kütüb-i İslâmiyye)* such as *Hilye-i Şerîf* at Cayol's press. His petition in 1850 disclosed his experience in the printing enterprise as a typesetter *(mürettib)* at the press of *Cerîde-i Havâdis* and *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire.*[313] He noted, however, that he did not receive a salary from *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire*, and because he had to earn his living, he wanted to practice his craft as a lithographer by opening his own printing shop.[314] In other words, he asked for permission to make the leap from public to private printing. Recai Efendi interpreted this demand as an attempt to either become a full-time employee as opposed to his part-time status or open his own print shop in the bazaar to print whatever he wanted. Neither of the options, however, was possible; only a limited number of full-time typesetters could be employed at *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire*.

---

[311] İ.MVL 270/10399, 22 Receb 1269 (1 May 1853); İ.MVL 323/13797, 28 Rebîülâhir 1271 (18 January 1855). See Varol, "19. Yüzyıl İstanbul'unda Bazı Tekkelerin," 326.

[312] "*...şurada burada küşâd olunagelen litografya tezgâhları hakkında fî-mâ-ba'd düstûru'l-amel tutulmak üzere bir nizâm-ı mahsûs tesîsi lâzım olmasıyla..*" İ.DH 358/23659, 29 Safer 1273 (29 October 1856). Muhammed Varol has also argued that this confusion paved the way for 1857 Printing regulation. Muharrem Varol, "19. Yüzyıl İstanbul'unda Bazı Tekkelerin," 323.

[313] He was named as an employee (*me'mûr)* at *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire,* just as Sai Efendi, with 750 kuruş salary in 1853. MVL 97/9, 28 Safer 1267 (2 January 1851); İ.MVL 270/10399, 22 Receb 1269 (1 May 1853).

[314] "*.. sâye-i şâhânede mürettiblik sanatını kemâliyle tahsîl eylediğimden bi'l-cümle ibâdullahın meşgûl oldukları san'atlarıyla geçinmekte oldukları misüllü kulları dahi küşâd edeceğim dükkâna litografya tezgâhı vaz'-ı resm misüllü şeylerin tab'ıyla..*" MVL 97/9, 28 Safer 1267 (2 January 1851).

Moreover, opening his own press would lower the income of the press and serve as a precedent for others. In 1853, he was allowed to operate his own press within *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire* by agreeing to pay 20 percent tax.[315] Yet apparently, he would continue to force his way through the market, as in 1855, he was caught illicitly printing the Qur'an and entangled in many illegal affairs with his partners.[316]

Among those lithographers taken under the umbrella of *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire* was Aşir Efendi from Amasya. He had been commissioned by the Council of Public Education in the late 1840s to print individual verses from the Qur'an.[317] When the presses of lithographers had been confiscated in 1850, he was appointed as a salaried employee.[318] In 1852, he was introduced as an "official of lithography" at *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire*. At the same time, he had apparently partnered with *ilmühaberci* Ali Rıza Efendi, who also operated his printing press at *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire*,[319] to print inappropriate texts despite repeated warnings.[320] As Chapter Five will reveal, however, this partnership continued until 1863, when they became part of an even larger network of the illicit printing of Qur'anic verses.[321]

The most conspicuous Muslim lithographer above all was Uncu Halil Ağa, a multi-faceted entrepreneur, who manipulated all legal niches. By occupation and in name, he was a merchant of flour trade. Aside from this line of business, he traded and commissioned books[322] at many presses including that of the master guild of the

---

[315] İ.MVL 270/10399, 22 Receb 1269 (1 May 1853).
[316] For a range of his illicit printing practices, see A. MKT.NZD 180/35, 22 Receb 1272 (29 March 1856); A.MKT.NZD 185/11, 8 Ramazan 1272 (13 May 1856).
[317] MVL 857/4, 2 Rebîülevvel 1280 (17 August 1863).
[318] İ.MVL 175/5188, 21 Şevval (30 August 1850).
[319] His task, as *ilmühaberci,* was to bring the unofficial news to be published on *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'* from Bâb-ı Zabtiye, Liman Odası and other places. After his dismissal from office, he was taken back because they needed someone to fill this important position. C. MF 37/1824, 19 Receb 1269 (28 April 1853). Also see A.MKT.NZD 78/37, 2 Şaban 1269 (11 May 1853).
[320] "*.. öteden beri Takvîmhâne-i Âmire nizâmına münâfî hareket ve daima icrâ-yı mefsedet etmekte olduklarından...*" A.MKT.NZD 54/65, 24 Receb 1268 (14 May 1852).
[321] MVL 857/4, 2 Rebîülevvel 1280 (17 August 1863).
[322] Among these books were *Delâil-i şerîf şerhi Kara Davud, Altıparmak, İzhar şerhi Adalı, Avâmil Tuhfesi, Sarf Cümlesi, Kâfiye şerhi, Molla Câmî, Dürr-i yektâ* and *Tûtînâme*. See Erünsal,

booksellers in Cairo, Edirnevî el-Hâc Kamil Efendi.[323] His commissioning at the foreign printers of Galata, however, got him into a major dispute with the booksellers of Istanbul in 1851. The Muslim booksellers at the time had united against the foreign printers as well as those customers who commissioned books at their presses. They justified their collective refusal to sell them with reference to an earlier edict.[324] Uncu Halil then requested to join the lithographers under *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire*, but he was offered, instead, to sell his presses. The state authorities simply did not trust him for fear of his plans to join forces with the "deceitful" lithographers convened under *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire* to print forbidden texts.[325] Their fears were not unfounded, as Uncu Halil next turned to the *Cerîde-i Havâdis* press. He printed books such as *Muhammediyye şerhi, Sarf Cümlesi, Nahv Cümlesi, Tecvid* and *İlmihâl,* which, apparently, were allowed to be printed only at the Imperial Press.[326] To keep him within the monitoring space of state officials, the less harmful alternative was to allow Uncu Halil print *Muhammediyye şerhi* or other permissible books at *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire* alone.[327] As such, he would use his own presses to print these books not in his own name, but as a publication of *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire* under the

---

Osmanlılarda Sahhaflık ve Sahhaflar, 500; ŞS. Rumeli Kazaskerliği 551, 23 Safer 1265 (18 January 1849), 59.

[323] Edirnevî el-Hâc Kamil Efendi is identified as '*Şeyhü's-sahhâfîn ve arzuhaliciyye'* and as a contractor at Bulaq press for the following books titles in Turkish: *Nevâdirü'l-eş'âr* (1256/1840); *Dîvân-ı Gülşen-i efkâr* (1257/1841); *Şerhu'l-Muhammediyye el-müsemmâ bi-ferahu'r-rûh* (1258/1842); *Mir'âtü'l-kâinât (1258/1842); Divân-ı Niyâzi* (1259/1843); *Tercemetü't-tibyân fî tefsîri'l-Kur'ân* (1259/1843); *Dîvân-ı Leyla Hanım* (1260/1844); *Hadîkatü's-su'adâ* (1261/1845); *Müntehabât-ı Mîr Nazif* (1261/1845); *Eş'âr-ı el-Hâc Akif Efendi* (1262/1846); *Münşeât-ı Akif* (1262/1846); *Terceme-i Risâle-i Hâlidiyye* (1262/1846). See İhsanoğlu, *Mısır'da Türkler,* 584. The other twenty-four contractors printing books at the Bulaq press also concentrate around 1840s mostly. The books contracted in Turkish after 1843 are really rare, which is further evidence for the fact that the contractors in Istanbul increased after this date and found the market satisfactory

[324] İ.MVL 196/6021, 9 Receb 1266 (21 May 1850).

[325] İ.MVL 196/6021, 5 Safer 1267 (10 December 1850).

[326] Each of these texts were impermissible for print outside of the Imperial Press due to own reasons; *Muhammediyye* contained Qur'anic verses and *hadith*, for which *Cerîde-i Havâdis* press was not the proper setting. The other titles had already been printed many times by contractors and as ensured by the contracts, their remaining copies had to be sold before new ones could be printed. Otherwise, further strife would divide the customers and harm the reputation of the Imperial Press for violating its own regulations.

[327] İ.MVL 196/6021, 5 Safer 1267 (10 December 1850).

same stipulations binding other printers.[328] He was also involved in other illicit book printing activities as Chapter Five shall demonstrate. Moreover, aside from his printing activities, he had a wide network of trading books extending as far as Silistra by 1861.[329]

The acknowledgment of different printers by the Ottoman State depended on the particular context. The forms of centralization imposed on Muslim lithographers, for instance, did not apply equally to non-Muslim or foreign printers of the empire. As shall be explained in Chapter Five, even when they were caught on an illicit publishing partnership with Muslims, it would be the latter who would receive some form of punishment. The discrepancy most likely stemmed from a conflict of interest between the Imperial Press and the Muslim printers due to the shared target audience. The presses operated by foreign residents or non-Muslims, to the contrary, were theoretically not allowed to print in Turkish. As such, they appealed to a different audience and their publications were not initially perceived as a direct threat. As the scattered foreign printers in Intramural Istanbul, Galata, Beyoğlu and Üsküdar would increasingly resort to the reckless publication of newspapers and pamphlets and thereby violate the state boundaries, however, the Ottoman state would also begin to assert more formal control over their activities as a whole.[330]

Perhaps the most important foreign (*müste'min)* lithographer with complex relations with the Ottoman state was Henri Cayol. He stood in the midst of various interests. In the first place, he retained special privileges due to his earlier government service under Serasker Hüsrev Paşa. The press he opened in Kulekapı

[328] İ.MVL 196/6021, 9 Receb 1266 (21 May 1850); A.AMD 25/63, 16 Muharrem 1267 (21 November 1850).
[329] A.MKT.DV 207/92, 14 Rebîülevvel 1278 (19 September 1861).
[330] See İ.MVL 36/648, 27 Zilkade 1257 (10 January 1842); A.MKT.NZD 52/52, 15 Cemâziyelâhir 1268 (6 April 1852) and İ.MVL 356/15604, 25 Şaban 1272 (1 May 1856) for early instances of solidifying control over the foreign presses. More of this discussion to follow in Chapter Five.

after his dismissal from the Military Office was burnt down in a fire.[331] At the same time, he apparently had connections with the lithographers in France, as he was able to supply equipment both for himself and for profit. In 1841, the Imperial Press officials not only bought two lithographic presses from his store, but they also employed Cayol once again as they still needed skilled men to operate it.[332]

Cayol was also exempt from the many limitations normally applied to both foreign and private printers. On the one hand, he could print "harmless" books in Turkish such as *Kerem Hikâyesi* or *Tûtînâme* in 1852.[333] On the other hand, while printing textbooks was supposed to remain under the auspices of the Imperial Press, the press officials had apparently asked him to print the popular textbook, *Pend-i Attar* in 1854 contrary to the imperial printing regulations (*mugâyir-i nizâm)*.[334] Hence even as lines were being drawn around the "licit" boundaries of practicing printing, legislation on who was allowed to print what in the empire was still fluid.

The fluidity of Cayol's connections and the categories of his publications caused him problems in the long term. In the first place, there was an apparent prejudice against the "infidels" among the Muslim booksellers in Istanbul. The British traveler Charles Elliott noted in 1848 that an infidel was forbidden from even laying his eyes on a Qur'an.[335] Moreover, a book about the Prophet printed at the Imperial Press in 1852 contained a note on the colophon that "whoever sells books to

---

[331] Günay Alpay Kut, "Matba'a in Turkey." The Encyclopaedia of Islam. New Edition. c. VI. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1991: 799-803.
[332] İ.DH 37/1723, 4 Safer 1257 (28 March 1841). Cayol was employed with 2500 kuruş salary. Next to Cayol, Hoca Kasbar was employed as the artist and Abdurrahman Efendi was employed as the calligrapher for the lithographic press at the Imperial Press.
[333] İ.MVL 233/8097, 22 Rebîülevvel 1268 (15 January 1852); İ.MVL 293/11827, 2 Rebîülevvel 1269 (14 December 1852): *Fransalı merkûm Kayol'un geçen sene arzuhâl takdîmiyle vâki' olan istid'âsı üzerine şer'an ve mülken tab'ı tecvîz olunmayan kütüb ve resâil ve evrâk-ı sâire tab' ve temsil etmemek ve ..ve hikâyâta dâir ufak tefek zararsızca şeyler basmak üzere kendisine imtiyâz verilmesi...*"
[334] İ.MVL 293/11827, 1270 (18 June 1854).
[335] C. B. Elliott, *Travels in the Three Great Empires of Austria, Russia and Turkey* (London: R. Bentley, 1838), 188.

idolaters should be punished by God on Judgment Day."[336] The animosity was not directed only against booksellers either. Three years after their strike at Uncu Halil, the Ottoman booksellers collectively filed a petition to the Sultan in 1854, noting the presence of a group of foreign printers around Galata, who were printing Islamic books *(kütüb-i İslâmiyye)* on demand. Even though the booksellers had previously been warned by their master not to buy or sell religious books printed by the "infidels" *(kefere)*, some members of the guild had commissioned Cayol to print books on the Islamic creed.[337] One of them was the above-mentioned Hafız Efendi, who had commissioned Cayol to print *Hilye-i Şerîf*. Despite Cayol informing them of his special printing privileges, the booksellers wanted the Director of the Marketplace (*ihtisâb Nâzırı)*[338] to stop those who violated the regulations of the artisans (*şürût-ı esnafa mugâyir*).[339]

It would perhaps be normal to expect tensions between the foreigners and the Ottoman Muslims. Due to the Crimean War, there was an increased European presence in Istanbul consisting of soldiers, officers, nuns, diplomats, traders, tourists and families. While some of the local Ottomans had respect for the "infidel" for

[336] "*işbu risâle her kim risâleyi müşrikîne füruht ederler iseler Cenâb-ı Hak rûz-i mahşerde cezâsını ondan buyursalar gerek…" Akd-i Fahr-i Kâinât min Hadîcetü'l-Kübrâ* (İstanbul, Tab'hâne-i Âmire, 1268).
[337] "*...akâide dâir İlmihâl ve Şerh-i Birgivî ve Teşrîn-i Suâl ve buna mümâsil nice kitaplar...*" İ.MVL 293/11827, 1269 (1852/1853).
[338] *Ihtisâb* was a form of tax that was redefined in 1826-27 as a means of meeting the needs of the new army. It essentially targeted the taxation of products most necessary in the daily lives. It covered all groups of artisans, traders; coffee houses, khans, stores, mills, livestock, grains and all tradeable items were as such taxed. Regulated via *ihtisâb nâzırı.* Cezar, *Osmanlı Maliyesinde Bunalım,* 251; Musa Çadırcı, *Tanzimat Döneminde Anadolu Kentlerinin Sosyal ve Ekonomik Yapısı* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2013), 119-123. For the transformation of this unit, also see Nalan Turna, "Pandemonium and Order: Suretyship, Surveillance and Taxation in Early Nineteenth-Century Istanbul," *New Perspectives on Turkey* 39 (2008): 167-189.
[339] İ.MVL 293/11827, 22 Ramazan 1270 (18 June 1854). Also see: HR. MKT 60/90, 22 Ramazan 1269 (29 June 1853). The petition of the booksellers was further mentioned in HR. MKT 52/34, 25 Safer 1269 (8 December 1852).

assisting the Ottomans, others suspected their intentions as they occupied many public buildings as their barracks.[340]

In any case, Cayol took the threat of booksellers seriously as they constituted the single most important distributors of printed books. To leverage his stand, he approached the state officials in two ways; first he wrote a petition asking them to mediate with the booksellers to make them sell his books. Second, he asked permission for his books to bear the stamp of the Imperial Press so that the booksellers could not distinguish his copies.[341] From this perspective, one could interpret this conflict as one between the traditional players in the system of book circulation that are the traditional booksellers, *sahafs* and the newly rising agents of the commercializing market economy, the lithographic printers. However, Cayol also made it very clear that he would appeal to the French embassy, if his privileges were revoked.[342] Here we see a growing tension between the Muslim subjects of the empire (the booksellers) and the foreign residents protected by the embassies right at the break of the Crimean War. The embassies were also ready to take action in the name of the communities under their protection.[343] Cayol's ability to manipulate the Ottoman dynamics with the French embassy at a strategic time could have played a role in the state showing leniency to his printing practices.

Deliberating on this incident in early 1854, the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances ruled that for this one time, Cayol would be allowed to sell all his books,

---

[340] Candan Badem, *The Ottoman Crimean War (1853-1856)* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 329-330.
[341] A.MKT.NZD 85/92, 5 Zilkade 1269 (10 August 1853).
[342] "*... şimdi bu suretle ta'ayyüş etmekte bulunmuş olduğundan mümâna'at olunduğu halde sefâreti vâsıtası ve sâir suret ile istid'âya teşebbüs edeceğini ifâde eylemiş olduğuna...*" İ.MVL 196/6021, 9 Cemâziyelevvel 1266 (23 March 1850).
[343] Edhem Eldem has noted that the European merchants had been supported by their respective embassies in Istanbul and consular networks in the provinces to compensate for their relative weakness in the local markets through the use of negotiation. Edhem Eldem, "Capitulations and Western Trade," in *The Cambridge History of Turkey: The Latter Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839,* ed. Suraiya Faroqhi (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 285.

but he was also warned, through the French embassy, not to print books of religious nature ever again. More importantly, it was noted that if booksellers or other customers wanted to have religious books printed, they would have to commission them at the Imperial Press.[344] We understand here that the Ottoman state did not prohibit the printing of Islamic books altogether. Instead, the idea was to re-route printing and commissioning around the Imperial Press. As such, many purposes would be served at once; the printing of sensitive material would be best supervised, sacred texts would be handled by a more appropriate staff and the financial profit would also land in the hands of the press treasury.

One final occasion would illustrate the attitude of the Ottoman state against Muslim and foreign lithographers. A hitherto unexplored document revealing an imperial edict from 1854 summarizes the reshuffling of relations between these agents.[345] It takes for granted that the presses run by Ottoman Muslims had been well regulated, while the printing presses and bookstores owned by the members of "other nations" (*milel-i sâire*) had not been properly controlled leading to the emergence of many books with the aim to corrupt the minds of people.

The imperial decree envisioned the creation of the Directorate of Presses and Booksellers (*Tab'hâneler ve Sahhaflar Nezâreti)* in order to determine legal and institutional guidelines for printing and selling books, just as in medicine and pharmacy.[346] The Directorate, which would operate under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, would consist of six members of the Translation Office regardless of their

[344] "*.. bundan böyle kütüb-i islâmiyye tab' ettirecek sahaf ve sâir kesân Tab'hâne-i Âmire'de tab' ve temsîl ettirmeleri lâzım geleceğinin..*" İ.MVL 293/11827, 2 Rebîülevvel 1269 (14 December 1852).
[345] HR.TO 418/227, 22 Cemâziyelevvel 1270 (20 February 1854). İsmail Erünsal made a brief note of this regulation stating that it offered no real information about the booksellers. Erünsal, *Osmanlılarda Sahaflık ve Sahaflar,* 213.
[346] "*Hekimlik ve eczâcılık hakkında riâyet olunduğu misüllü basmacılık ve sahaflık sanatlarında dahi ...ma'lûmât ve hüsni tavır ve hareket şart kılınması iktizâ eder..."* HR.TO 418/227, 22 Cemâziyelevvel 1270 (20 February 1854).

sect and *millet*. Every six months, the provincial councils would present a *defter* listing the printing presses and booksellers available within their area of jurisdiction as well as the amount of taxes due (*patente* and *cerîme).* Without paying these taxes, no one would be allowed to acquire a license (*berat)* and establish a printing press in the empire.

Two points set this regulation apart from earlier regulations on printing. First, by extending the granting of a *berat* to any applicant, it sought to extend the number of printers and booksellers to all provinces in the empire. Second, it recognized the distinct category of "bookseller-printer," a bookseller who also practiced the craft of printing. The drafting of this document was probably guided by the current printing practices. There is no clue that it was ever put into practice, but it appaears to have served as a prequel to the more famous 1857 printing regulation in terms of its main concepts.

2.4.3 Financial strategies at *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire*

The expansion of private lithographers complemented the presence of the contractors. Their growing sphere of influence attested to the rise in demand for printed books in the general book market. In the meantime, the Imperial Press suffered from unsold books piling up in storage. This apparent paradox can be partially explained with the different audience targeted by the two agencies. The state, with its limited financial capacity, had to prioritize the printing of the most necessary textbooks, while the contractors and the private lithographers also selected books with an appeal to the wider market. A more important reason for the stagnation of book sales at the Imperial Press, however, originated from the printing monopolies granted to contractors. Until this root cause was pinpointed and

addressed by the officials, however, various short-term measures were adopted to deal with the crisis that accompanied the broader financial problems of the Ottoman Empire.

The financial problems of the empire largely stemmed from the expenses of state reform. Until the 1840s, over half of the budgetary expenses was spent on the military. As the demand for reform extended to the administration, justice and education, the expenditures, too, increased by 250-300 percent from the end of the eighteenth century until the end of the 1830s.[347] The reign of Mahmud II also witnessed the highest rates of debasement and inflation in Ottoman history.[348] The Ottoman state had to come up with new methods of extracting revenues. In an effort to reorganize the state finances, a single treasury was established for all income and expenditures. The Imperial Press, too, would be funded by the *mâliye* treasury instead of *mukâta'ât* treasury after 25 May 1840.

In the meantime, the director of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire* had to cut back on some officials in 1841, as they had difficulty in raising funds for the salaries.[349] The assigned capital of *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire* would not suffice to print, either *(i'mâlâta kifâyet etmeyeceğinden)*, since the number of presses had increased in 1841. Hence the profit from the previous year had to remain within *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire* rather than be passed onto the state treasury (*mâliye*

[347] Şevket Pamuk, *A Monetary History of the Ottoman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 189. A selection of his other relevant studies include: Şevket Pamuk, "From Bimetallism to the 'Limping Gold Standard': The Ottoman Monetary System in the Nineteenth Century," in *East Meets West- Banking, Commerce and Investment in the Ottoman Empire*, ed. Philip L. Cottrell (Ashgate Publishing, 2008), 11-24; Şevket Pamuk, "From Debasement to External Borrowing: Changing forms of deficit finance in the Ottoman Empire, 1750-1914" in *Monetary and Fiscal Policies in South-East Europe, Historical and Comparative Perspectives, Conference Proceedings*, eds. Şevket Pamuk and Roumen Avramov (Sofia: Bulgarian National Bank, 2006), 7-22; Şevket Pamuk and Kıvanç Karaman "Ottoman State Finances in European Perspective, 1500-1914", *The Journal of Economic History* 70 (2010): 593-627.
[348] Şevket Pamuk and Kıvanç Karaman, 620.
[349] İ.DH 42/2089, 11 Cemâziyelâhir 1257 (31 July 1841).

hazinesi).[350] By 1844, they also cut down the custom of handing out complimentary copies of printed books to state dignitaries due to its heavy burden on the treasury upon the warning of the Minister of Finance .[351] The minister highlighted the unsustainability of this practice since the number of printed book titles had increased. The adversities reached a new high in 1846, as 1300 *keselik* books (650.000 kuruş) printed as state property remained unsold, and the fees of the *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'* subscriptions and the books printed as the property of contractors remained uncollected.[352]

Among the more systematic short-term measures to appease the financial problems, first, repeated official warnings emphasized the need for demand to precede the printing of a book as state property.[353] By 1845, it was literally forbidden to invest in printing a book unless rapid sales could be guaranteed.[354] For instance, Şevket Efendi, the accountant of the military, compiled a "beneficial" dictionary of Arabic and Persian in the "new style" (*usûl-i cedîde*) and presented it to the Council of Public Education in 1848. The book was not printed due to the risk in its sales potential in the face of unsold book piles as state-property.[355] Even when important statesmen were involved as book authors, printing their books as favors without an assessment of the rate of their sales had resulted in the accumulation of unsold books.[356] Hence when the previously mentioned Hayrullah Efendi's book was

[350] İ.DH 45/2222, 9 Şaban 1257 (26 September 1841).
[351] İ.DH 94/4694, 14 Şevval 1260 (27 October 1844). The expense of complimentary books had reached 40-50.000 kuruş.
[352] İ.MSM 20/457, 22 Muharrem 1262 (20 January 1846).
[353] İ.DH 43/2147, 2 Receb 1257 (20 August 1841).
[354] İ.DH 98/4915, 9 Safer 1261 (17 February 1845).
[355] *"... şayet sürülemeyip kalması ihtimâline nazaran..."* A.MKT.MVL 20/66, 4 Cemâziyelevvel 1265 (28 March 1849).
[356] İ.MSM 20/457, 22 Muharrem 1262 (20 January 1846).

considered for print in 1847, the decision-making process revolved around the potential demand for the book in addition to the expected public benefit from it.[357]

Second, various bureaucratic correspondences warned about the need to properly register the expenses for printing books. Since the various expenses of the Imperial Press had not been regularly recorded, the officials lost track of the final cost of books printed as state property or as commissioned by the customers, as noted in 1848.[358] For instance, the director of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire,* Recâi Efendi explained to the Grand Vezir in 1849 that they could not locate the eleven printed copies of *Hançerli Lugatı* since the deed was missing.[359] Part of the reason for confusion at *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire* resided in the mechanisms of financial exchange between the Imperial Press and *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire,* the accounting of which had to be kept in separate. At the same time, the officials envisioned the two units to financially back each other. The Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances further pointed to the need for all exchange and borrowing between to be conducted through formal correspondence; anytime *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire* demanded printing equipment from the Imperial Press, they had to submit a formal request.[360]

Third, one of the greatest economic burdens on the Imperial Press was the free distribution of some of the most needed textbooks. Especially those on the new sciences, which were imminent for education at the Military School, were immediately dispensed to students. To compensate for this cost, the officials turned to print extra copies to see with high profit in the book market so that the income would compensate for the expenses of the free copies. Ahmed İlmi's *İlmihâl,* for

[357] İ.MVL 99/2119, 10 Cemâziyelevvel 1263 (26 April 1847).
[358] A.MKT.MVL 94/38, 19 Cemâziyelevvel 1264 (23 April 1848).
[359] A.MKT 199/44, 4 Cemâziyelâhir 1265 (27 April 1849); A.MKT 201/22, 5 Receb 1265 (27 May 1849).
[360] A. MKT. MVL 94/38, 19 Cemâziyelevvel 1264 (23 April 1848).

instance, was printed in 1848 in 6000 copies, even though only 3000 copies were needed for the poor students of the elementary schools (*sıbyan mektebi*). The rest were to be sold with profit to the wealthier ones to compensate for the cost of the other 3000.[361] Similarly, around the same time, *Risâle-i Tecvidiye* had been printed in 2400 copies for 400 of them to be distributed for free to the teachers at sıbyan schools. The rest would be sold with profit to compensate for the costs.[362]

The fourth measure adopted was to liquidate the unsold books and turning them into cash. There were two practical solutions envisioned to achieve this end; one was to expand the printed book market into the provinces and the other was to lower the sales prices. Following the establishment of educational councils and policy after 1845, there was much need for printed textbooks.[363] The fundamental aim in printing books as such was recognized as assisting the expansion of knowledge and the sciences. As shall be depicted in Chapter Three, the state greatly prioritized the printing of textbooks. Directing these unsold copies to buyers in the provinces would hence serve both the expansion of education and the need for liquid income for the treasury.

There were, however, a few practical problems in this process. As books were transported from Istanbul to the provinces, both customs duty and *ihtisâb* tax were applied on them, which elevated the sales prices. The tax rates over books sold to the provinces increased by another 15 percent with the freight fees included. Hence the merchants who carried the books to the provinces suffered great financial loss. The Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances deliberated in early 1846 that if these duties (customs and *ihtisâb*) were removed, they would sell quickly even without the extra

[361] İ.DH 143/7370, 3 Rebîülâhir 1263 (21 March 1847).
[362] İ.MVL 96/2015, 26 Rebîülâhir 1263 (13 April 1847).
[363] Akşin Somel, *The Modernization of Public Education in the Ottoman Empire, 1839-1908: Islamization, Autocracy and Discipline* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2001).

reduction in their prices. In turn, more sales would lead to the expansion of beneficial knowledge to the commoners (*halkça)*, as aimed by the Sultan.[364] The books rotting in the storage of the Imperial Press, moreover, did not bring any profit or income to the state treasury. Selling them, even at reduced prices, would at least prevent further financial loss. But even without the price reduction, the elimination of the extra taxes would make the books more attractive to the customers. Hence the removal of tax from books sold in the provinces was proclaimed.[365]

In a few months' time, the tax-exemption status of state-property books being carried to the provinces was extended to the books printed by the contractors regardless of their identity. After all, the idea, again, was to get all subjects of the Ottoman Empire to benefit from the spread of knowledge and sciences.[366] Yet by 1855, some people had begun to abuse these regulations. Because of the limitations on the sales of those books printed at the presses of foreign residents, as discussed in the previous section, el-Hâc Mehmed Efendi, who had commissioned *Kırk Suâl* at one such printer, was now trying to get his books sold in the provinces.[367] The intention to enlarge the printed book market through tax-exemptions apparently had the unintended consequence of also turning the provinces into a new market for the unauthorized prints.

Through these measures, the book market indeed expanded to many provinces in the empire. The dissemination was provided by booksellers located in

---

[364] İ.MSM 20/457, 22 Muharrem 1262 (20 January 1846). "*...bu suret-i intişâr-ı ulûm ve ma'ârifi müstelzim olarak ve bu suret-i intişar-ı ulûm ve ma'ârifi halkça hayırlı olacağından..*"
[365] İ. MSM 20/457, 22 Muharrem 1262 (20 January 1846). The issue was also explained by Lütfi Efendi: Ahmed Lütfi Efendi, *Vaka'a-nüvis Ahmed Lütfi Efendi Tarihi*, vol. VI-VII-VIII (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı-Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1999), 1216. Similarly, the factories established by the Ottoman State were protected; in 1851, they would not pay customs tax for the machinery or raw material they would import or regular tax on the goods they would sell. Tevfik Güran, "Tanzimat Döneminde Devlet Fabrikaları," in *19. Yüzyılda Osmanlı Ekonomisi Üzerine Araştırmalar* (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2014), 372.
[366] İ. MSM 20/466, Gurre-i Rebîülevvel 1262 (27 February 1846).
[367] MVL 271/61, 21 Cemâziyelevvel 1271 (9 February 1855).

various parts. The networking between them, as followed through their petitions to the central state, reveal the financial stakes more agents shared in the expanding of the printed book market. Some of these petitions also enable us to have some idea about the way books were carried to the provinces. To place an order, the booksellers in the provinces first had to show a reliable guarantor in Istanbul. Trade, as such, could be carried out with an unending sequence of debts. A bookseller in Trabzon, also identified as an *imam* in the sources, Molla Velioğlu Derviş Mehmed Efendi bought books in 1847, which had been commissioned by a clerk (*evrak müdürü)* at the Imperial Press, Mehmed Efendi, but Derviş Mehmed died before he could pay his debt and without any valuable property left behind. In addition, his guarantor in Istanbul, the bookseller Hacı Hasan Efendi, was apparently a very poor man, so they tried to come up with alternative means to close the debt.[368] In 1849, the bookseller Hacı İbrahim Edhem Efendi complained of a debt owed to him by the bookseller Uşaklı İbrahim Efendi residing in Manisa.[369] In 1857, Sahaf Hacı Mustafa Efendi complained that a state official named Deli Halil had confiscated the books he had brought from Kastamonu to Ankara.[370]

A second way to melt down the unsold printed book stocks was to decrease the sales prices and make them more attractive. For example, in 1849, the prices of many books dropped by about 7 percent in the year 1849, as the *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'* issues revealed. Some examples include: *Bahâristan şerhi* from 45 kuruş in 1842 to

[368] C. MF 30/1473, 27 Safer 1263 (14 February 1847). The books were carried to Trabzon via Karahisar, Sivas and Aydın according to this document. Also see Necmettin Aygün, "Bir İmamın Kitap Ticaretiyle Münasebeti: Akçabatlı Derviş Mehmed (1847)," *Karadeniz İncelemeleri Dergisi* 20 (Spring 2016): 117-136.
[369] A.MKT 171/64, 5 Rebîülevvel 1265 (29 January 1849).
[370] A. MKT. UM 298/60, 6 Rebîülevvel 1274 (25 October 1857). For further examples, see: A.MKT.DV 176/74, 17 Cemâziyelevvel 1277 (1 December 1860), A. MKT.DV 207/92, 14 Rebîülevvel 1278 (19 September 1861), A.MKT.UM 495/94, 12 Receb 1278 (13 January 1862), A.MKT.DV 203/85, 19 Rebîülevvel 1278 (24 September 1861), A.MKT.DV 185/24, 17 Şaban 1277 (28 February 1861). Also noted by İsmail Erünsal, 425.

42 kuruş in 1849[371]; *Kâfiye şerhi İsâm* from 35 kuruş to 32 kuruş with about 8 percent decrease[372]; *Mevâhibü'l-ledünniye* from 110 kuruş to 102 kuruş also with 7 percent discount. *Fenâri Hâşiyesi Kara Halil* dropped 50 percent from 25 kuruş in 1842 to 12.5 kuruş in 1849[373]; *Tasavvurât ma'a Tasdîkât* dropped 37 percent from 13.5 kuruş in 1843 to 8.5 kuruş in 1849.[374]

This discussion reveals that the need to print books had arisen in a reverse ratio to the financial ability of the Ottoman State to meet the expenses. The profitability of printing books would become a more immanent issue, as the empire was taken by a general economic crisis by 1851. The Minister of Finance, Nazif Paşa, announced at the Council of Ministers that the monthly salaries would not be paid that month. Ahmed Cevdet Paşa noted that this was the beginning of a financial crisis, which he translated into Turkish with Fuad Paşa as "*buhrân*".[375] Even though there was no systematic economic theory employed by the Ottoman state officials until that time, "everybody at the Porte started to speak about 'crisis' after 1851."[376]

The roots of the financial crisis extended back to the long wars fought with Russia and the internal revolts including the war with Mehmed Ali Paşa between 1768 and 1840. Moreover, the reform projects generated additional financial burden; establishing new army, expanded bureaucracy, new judicial system, educational institutions, public works and the employment of foreign experts all brought new expenses.[377] Consecutive years of poor harvests, high salaries paid to dignitaries and expenditures of both Sultan Abdülmecid (r. 1839-1861) and the palace women

[371] *Takvîm-i Vekâyi',* No. 243 (Gurre-i Cemâziyelevvel 1258).
[372] *Takvîm-i Vekâyi',* No. 243 (Gurre-i Cemâziyelevvel 1258).
[373] İ.DH 54/2661, 26 Muharrem 1258 (9 March 1842); İ DH 197/11189, 17 Şaban 1265 (8 July 1849).
[374] İ.DH 80/4028, 20 Şevval 1259 (13 November 1843); İ.DH 186/10395, 21 Safer 1265 (16 January 1849).
[375] Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, *Tezâkir 1-12,* ed. Cavid Baysun (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991), 21.
[376] Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, *Tezâkir 1-12,* 21.
[377] Badem, *The Ottoman Crimean War,* 291.

further strained the treasury, as noted by Cevdet Paşa. Moreover, by 1853, the Ottoman Empire had the lowest customs duties charged in the world in addition to the problems of a debased coinage and currency inflation. Despite the introduction of new taxes and the standardization of others, budget deficits became chronic after the 1840s. While the bimetallic standard was adopted in 1844 with silver kuruş and new gold lira, the state also experimented with paper money in 1839 to facilitate commerce. These measures did not suffice and the government first turned to internal borrowing from Galata bankers or *sarrafs*. In 1854, the first Ottoman foreign debt during the Crimean War followed by the second in 1855.[378]

In the light of this overall economic backdrop, the fifth and the most significant measure targeting the profitability of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire* consisted of dissolving the monopolies. This was a long process beginning in 1853 with the joint report of the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances and the Council of Public Education on the emergence of several unauthorized presses in Galata and Beyoğlu printing religious texts (*kütüb-i İslâmiyye*) at competitive rates. Yet, it would be approved by the High Council of Reforms (*Meclis-i Âlî-i Tanzîmât*) by the January of 1856[379] and was turned into a printing regulation in 1857.[380] The delay from 1853 to 1857 might be due to the course of the Crimean War. The financial troubles, as shall be discussed in the next section, might have concerned the officials. On 25 November 1854 the Supreme Council even directly blamed the unauthorized lithographers for the huge deficit in the budget of the Imperial Press and ruled that

[378] Coşkun Çakır, *Tanzimat Dönemi Osmanlı Maliyesi* (İstanbul: Klasik Yayınları, 2001), 204.
[379] A.MKT. NZD 86/35, 9 Zilkade 1269 (14 August 1853); İ.MMS 9/372, 26 Rebîülâhir 1272 (5 January 1856).
[380] İ.MVL 356/15604, 9 Şaban 1272 (15 April 1856).

the previous decree on not printing without a license anywhere else than the Imperial Press had to be respected.[381]

Nevertheless, at the heart of this process was the realization of the necessity of revoking the monopolies granted to specific contractors in lithographic printing, if the Imperial Press desired to gain more customers, accumulate more profit and in turn, acquire the funds to be able to print more of the needed books. Hence for lithography, all privileges were revoked, while for typography, they would remain for two years starting from the submission of printed copies into the hands of the contractors. The distinction between the two forms of printing suggests that the state was essentially bothered by the competition from other lithographers. Moreover, the Imperial Press would also still keep its monopoly over the printing of books most needed by students, at least in theory due to the fear of arbitrary pricing by non-state agents. This indicated a continuity in the provisionalist policies of the traditional Ottoman economic policy.[382] To further combat arbitrariness, they fixed the rates of profit; each edition at the lithographic press would charge 15 para. Since lithographic printing required less staff and no types, it was cheaper. For typographic books, there was variation in the calculation of profit depending on the expected speed of sales; if sell quickly, they would be charged with 20 to 25 percent profit, and if need more time, would be charged with a profit of up to 40 percent.

The decision to revoke the monopolies overall was a win-win case for the state and all other legitimate actors in the book market. The advantageous pricing for contractors coupled with the release of limits on the number of participants would lead to an increase also in the number of printed book titles and volumes. The

[381] İskit, *Türkiye'de Matbuat İdareleri,* 843.
[382] Indeed, Mehmet Genç traces the recession of provisionalism to the 1840s to be completely overriden by the 1860s. Mehmet Genç, "19. Yüzyılda Osmanlı İktisadî Dünya Görüşünün Klasik Prensiplerindeki Değişimler," *Divân: Disiplinlerarası Çalışmalar Dergisi* (1999/1): 6.

different contractors on the same book, constituting the preconditions for a liberal, competitive book market, would produce affordable rates for students. The only loser in this new system with advantages curbed, at least for a short while, would be the illegal lithographers.[383] Soon, however, the legal sphere would be expanded enough to also integrate them into the printing system.

2.5 Early commercialization of the printed book market: 1857-1863

While the market for printed books, reinvigorated by new agents, started to grow in the second half of the nineteenth century, this market was vulnerable to the wider political and economic circumstances of the era. Particularly the Crimean War strained the entire treasury of the empire. To pull it together, new taxes were introduced.[384] The realization of the futility of attempts at currency reform in the previous decades led the officials to come up with more radical solutions to stabilize the monetary situation. Hence the previous two foreign loans were now followed by a third in 1858. The financial vulnerability was extended to a social crisis. A heavy traffic of diplomacy and negotations with the British, French and the Austrian state officials pressured the Ottoman state into recognizing equal rights for the non-Muslim subjects of the empire. Declared on 18 February 1856, the Reform Edict eliminated all sources of legal inequality for non-Muslims as a trade-off for placing the Ottoman Empire within the Concert of Europe.[385] The Ottoman non-Muslims were also granted rights to erect new churches and synagogues as well as to enter the civil and military schools and to establish own schools under state supervision.[386] Their new status as equals "greatly upset the Muslim population" (*ehl-i islâma pek*

[383] İ. MMS 9/372, 26 Rebîülâhir 1272 (5 January 1856).
[384] Badem, *The Ottoman Crimean War,* 433.
[385] Badem, *The Ottoman Crimean War,* 335.
[386] Badem, *The Ottoman Crimean War,* 347.

ziyâde dokundu), as noted by Ahmed Cevdet Paşa.[387] A hybrid but narrow group of dissenters consisting of members of the army and religious scholars, each for their own reasons, even attempted to take down the regime and assassinate the Sultan in 1859 through what came to be known as the "Kuleli Affair."[388] Many of the foreign ambassadors and translators observing the incident also commented on the public discontent with the Ottoman government.[389]

Following the declaration of the Reform Edict on 18 February 1856, an important step was taken in May 1856 by recognizing the growing number of Muslim private lithographers *(bir takım litografya basmacıları peydâ olub)* in intramural Istanbul and Galata, Üsküdar and Eyüp in legal terms. In a detailed report filed on 15 April 1856, the director Recai Efendi noted that their number had reached eight to ten and that they were in possession of over thirty presses scattered throughout the city. Away from the direct surveillance and intervention of the central authority, these printers had taken the risk in printing prohibited texts such as the Qur'anic surahs, and even the entire Qur'an, as we shall see in Chapter Five. Even within the permitted sphere, their printed texts contained many typographic errors. As such, their activities had to be banned completely (*külliyen men).*[390]

At the same time, reflecting the spirit of the times, Recai Efendi did not find it fair that the Ottoman printers would be barred from financial benefits of printing, while the foreign printers (*teba'a-yı ecnebiyye matba'aları*) enjoyed the profits. On the one hand, it is important that he recognized the right of these printers who were essentially artisans to make a living through this craft. On the other hand, the

[387] Ahmed Cevdet, *Tezâkir 1-12,* 67.
[388] Burak Onaran, *Padişahı Devirmek: Osmanlı Islahat Çağında Düzen ve Muhalefet: Kuleli (1859), Meslek (1867)* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2018), 95-105; Anscombe, *State, Faith and Nation,* 105.
[389] Onaran, *Padişahı Devirmek*, 127.
[390] İ.MVL 356/15604, 9 Şaban 1272 (15 April 1856).

distinction he drew between the non-Muslim and the Ottoman printers may be viewed as an extension of the communal conflicts in the aftermath of the Reform Edict. To prevent this asymmetry, he underlined the need for rules and regulations that would bind all parties.[391]

From the perspective of the Ottoman state, then, their respondents were these unreliable printers, whose words of promise to pay their taxes and not transcend legal boundaries could not be trusted. They were fickle. Recai Efendi underlined the fact that even if they were granted a license, they still could not be trusted. This realization could be the reason for the drafting of the printing regulation, as it was passed from the Porte to the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances on 29 October 1856 and it was proclaimed on 15 February 1857.[392] Nevertheless, it might be significant to note that only a month later, on 15 March 1857, the Ministry of Public Education would be founded. This ministry had similarly been established with the concern to monitor the schooling activities of the non-Muslim and foreign communities under the same umbrella as the Muslims in the aftermath of the Reform Edict.[393] Hence the ministry eclipsed the need to regulate the new agents of the printing enterprise as well as the need to regulate the educational needs of different communities. In other words, the institutionalization of the printing enterprise mirrored the institutionalization of education. More importantly, the printing enterprise would be annexed to the Ministry of Public Education in 1862.

---

[391] İ.MVL 356/15604, 9 Şaban 1272 (15 April 1856). His salary would have to be 800 kuruş to also cover his transportation in between these scattered presses. A.MKT.NZD 183/19, 19 Şaban 1272 (25 April 1856); "*Dersaâdet ve bilâd-ı selâsede birtakım litografya basmacıları peydâ olup ellerine geçen seyleri basmakta olduklarından...*"

[392] The Supreme Council passed the regulation onto the Council of Tanzimat on 28 January 1857. İ.MVL 367/16095, 2 Cemâziyelâhir 1273 (28 January 1857). The regulation (*Matba'a Nizâmnâmesi)* is dated 20 Cemâziyelâhir 1273 in *Düstûr*, Tertib-i Evvel, Vol. 2, 227. İskit, *Türkiye'de Matbuat İdareleri,* 846.

[393] Somel, *Modernization of Public Education*, 42.

2.5.1 Printing agents redefined around the 1857 printing regulation

Secondary sources usually refer to the 1857 printing regulation (*Matba'alar Nizâmnâmesi)* as the first of its kind in the Ottoman Empire.[394] While it is true that this is the first cumulative and comprehensive regulation on printing, there were earlier efforts to define the legal sphere for printing on an ad hoc basis, especially in connection with the illicit printing practices. Unlike some of the Ottoman legal codes directly imported from their European counterparts such as the commercial code, these articles appear to have been born out of the specific circumstances of the Ottoman experience with the printing enterprise.

The brief explanation of the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances preceding the declaration of articles acknowledged the affirmative role of the rising number of lithographic presses around the empire.[395] The greater their number, the more books would be printed to expand knowledge and the sciences at cheaper rates. Hence it essentially defined the context of an open market. At the same time, the idea was to determine the legal limits through which private printers could shape both the demand and the supply for this market. While it was not the first ordinance on printing in the Ottoman Empire, it constituted an important step in its legal consolidation.[396]

To turn to its specifics, the 1857 printing regulation consisted of nine articles. Most importantly, it redefined and legalized two actors in the printing enterprise; the private printers and the author. First, the regulation determined the conditions for receiving license (*sened-i mahsûs*) in order to operate a printing press in the Ottoman

[394] See, for example, İpek Yosmaoğlu, "Chasing the Printed Word: Press Censorship in the Ottoman Empire, 1876-1913," *The Turkish Studies Association Journal* 27, no. 1-2 (2003): 15-49.
[395] İ.MVL 367/16095, 2 Cemâziyelâhir 1273 (28 January 1857).
[396] The first regulation on printing in the Ottoman Empire was declared in 1800, when the Imperial Press was located in Hasköy. For more details, see Beydilli, *Türk Bilim ve Matbaacılık,* 126. The next regulation on the various presses would not be issued before 1888.

Empire. In particular, it distinguished the license needed to open a printing press from the license needed for the publication of every book. Taking into consideration all groups of printers in the empire including the Ottoman subjects, foreign residents, and the provincial agents, the procedures were hence tied to the supervision of the related Tanzimat institutions, namely the Council of Public Education, *zabtiye,* and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. An interesting note is the special article (*madde-i mahsûsa*) which instructed the "already present" presses on how to apply for a permit. Hence the state made it clear that printing had already turned into a business that needed the regulation of official mechanisms. In this sense, as usual with many such regulations, they would emerge as a result of certain inclinations and practices in a given society rather than introducing them anew. Second, the regulation also identified the author, for the first time, as an emerging new agent in the printing enterprise, as the following discussions will reveal. The penal mechanisms, too, supplemented the legal framework; acting contrary to these regulations would result in the confiscation of books and shutting down of presses.

2.5.1.1 Identities of the private printers

In his discussion of the 1857 printing regulation, Ami Ayalon has argued that by equally binding all provinces of the Ottoman Empire, it formally introduced licensing as a way to control publication. Viewing it retrospectively with the experience of the Hamidian practices in mind, Ayalon has also pointed at the exhausting and discouraging process of actually receiving a license as "a block on the road to printing and publishing."[397] Having contextualized the Ottoman experience with printing during the first decades of the nineteenth century, however,

[397] Ayalon, *The Arabic Print Revolution,* 67.

one may take a counterview. Rather than perceiving it as a limiting force on the mobility of related agents, it is possible to view it as the first formal recognition of these private printers as the legitimate agents of the Ottoman printing enterprise. The official recognition may also signify the awareness that the state-led initiatives would not be sufficient on their own to serve the ultimate purpose of printing, the expansion of knowledge and education. The Ottoman state needed more agents and partners in communicating its policies of educational reform to as many people as possible.

In other words, it may be argued that the 1857 Ottoman printing regulation officially confirmed the irreversible presence of private lithographers as the new agents of the printing enterprise. The Ottoman state had been unsuccessful in the past two decades in curbing their power and influence. Now, together with an increasing awareness of the significance of the printing press and the reproduction of books for the expansion of education in the empire, the officials had chosen to adopt a more constructive approach and reach a consensus whereby their benefits would be reaped, while keeping them within official boundaries.

One of the immediate consequences of the 1857 regulation was an inflow of empire-wide requests for permission to establish printing presses. However, we should be careful not to conclude that these actors were novices to the field. Many of them had already been practicing printing in a transitional state between the licit and the illicit spheres until 1857. The 1857 regulation simply served to define them in more clear terms as legitimate and legal actors. Among the applicants were Ottoman subjects, both Muslim and non-Muslim, and foreigners, who formally applied for permit for their own purposes. Often times, there was an explicit continuity between the pre-1857 and post-1857 practices of these printers.

Many of the early Muslim private lithographers had also been affiliated with either the general book market or the Imperial Press. They could now build their business on the knowledge of the market through their position as bookseller-contractors. At the same time, the fact that they were printing books did not mean it was their full-time and only job. As Kathryn Schwartz has described for the Cairene printing scene, operating a lithographic press would turn into a career only in time. Moreover, the Egyptian printers also worked in consortiums in 1850s and 1860s, which meant that the staff circulated between different printing houses as well as between the industries of manuscript and the print.[398] We see a similar pattern in Istanbul. As Ahmet Rasim narrated in his memoirs, *Tercümân-ı Ahvâl* press opening in 1860, had transferred the typesetters consisting of mosque preachers, *imams* and members of the ulema from the Imperial Press.[399]

Muslim lithographers had been on the rise as an artisanal group from the 1830s onwards. Their origins were circumstantial, and dependent on the opportunistic take of certain booksellers and merchants on the practical niches introduced by the technology of lithography. Since the lithographic press was small and easy to assemble and reassemble, it was likely that they could operate even in their own homes. It is possible to identify the names of Muslim printers with reference to the colophons of the books they printed. Thereby one can tell that some had officially started their business around 1853; in other words, before the 1857 regulation. The number of books they printed would mount only after the 1870s. These printers would consist of those who started out as booksellers in the first half of the nineteenth century, but gradually acquired their own presses.[400]

---

[398] Schwartz, "Meaningful Mediums," 261-262.
[399] Server İskit, *Hususi İlk Türkçe Gazetemiz Tercüman-ı Ahval ve Agah Efendi* (Ankara: Ulus Basımevi, 1937), 25.
[400] More discussion about bookseller-turned-printers will follow in Chapter Four.

One such figure is Sahaf Karahisarî Ali Rıza Efendi. A translation of the letters of the Naksbhandi sheikh Sirhindî *(Tercüme-i Mektubât-ı İmâm-ı Rabbâni)* by Müstakimzâde Sadeddin Efendi that appear to be printed at his press in 1853 is the earliest book that openly bears the mark of a private lithographer.[401] Ali Rıza Efendi's son, Mehmed Sadeddin Efendi's estate, when he died in 1877, revealed 48 book titles, most of which had been printed by his father. His brother Karahisarizâde Seyyid Mustafa Esad Efendi also became one of the richest booksellers of his time.[402]

We have already seen the rise of Uncu Halil Ağa, who would become even more prominent as a lithographer after 1863. The earliest instance of a book printed in his name can be dated to 1855.[403] Uncu Halil was followed by Bosnavî el-Hâc Muharrem Efendi, who printed books with his name in 1856.[404] However, his official application to run a press was dated 1861, where he stated that he had been printing books in lithography in Fatih, but now wanted license to print with typography.[405] As required by regulations, he had to bring guarantors and also apply for a license from the Council of Public Education for each book in advance.[406] He established a long-lasting printing enterprise continuing until the end of the nineteenth century and he introduced himself as a *sahaf* in many of the books he printed. He pursued wholesale of books; his estate from 1903 contained 100 to 1500 copies of 40 to 50 different

[401] Müstakimzâde Süleyman Sadeddin, *Tercüme-i Mektubât-ı İmâm-ı Rabbânî* (Istanbul: Sahaf el-Hâc Ali Rıza Efendi Litografya Matbaası, Evâsıt-ı Safer 1270).
[402] His financial status is discussed in detail in Sabev, "Rich Men, Poor Men",
[403] *Dîvân-ı Râsim* (Istanbul: el-Hâc Halil Taş Destgâhı, 1272).
[404] Yazıcızâde Mehmed, *Kitâbü Muhammediyye fî Kemâlâtı Ahmediyye* (İstanbul: Bosnavî Hacı Muharrem Efendi'nin Taş Destgâhı, 1273). Jale Baysal dates the beginning of his printing activities to 1858.
[405] İ.MVL 452/20219, 10 Muharrem 1278 (18 July 1861).
[406] A.MKT. MVL 132/8, 4 Rebîülevvel 1278 (9 September 1861). This is the reporting of decision to the Ministry of Public Education.

book titles.[407] Similar to Muharrem Efendi, Bolulu Sahaf İbrahim Efendi[408] had his own press in the khan of Süleyman Paşa, where he had been practicing lithographic printing since 1860 within the official boundaries, as clear from a petition he wrote to the Council of State (*Şûrâ-yı Devlet*) in 1872.[409] Moreover, Sahaf Mehmed Şükrü Efendi was also an influential booksellers, who must have turned to print for profit.[410] In the one book printed in his name, he was identified as a bookseller. Another bookseller was el-Hâc Mustafa Efendi (Mısırlı) with two books printed in his name, who had apparently turned to print books in 1858.[411]

Not all of these lithographers had equal importance in terms of the number of volumes they printed. Some of them just printed a couple of books and then disappeared from the historical record altogether. Among the names noted as printers by Jale Baysal, many correspond to the typesetters or the calligraphers employed in the printing of respective books, which, from time to time, have been included in the colophons.[412] Hattat Tevfik Efendi[413] after 1859 and Samatyalı Hafız Ahmed Efendi[414] after 1860 were certainly not systematic printers. Other people such as Hacı

---

[407] Sabev, "Rich Men, Poor Men."
[408] Printed *Sübha-i sıbyân, Ta'birnâme-i İbn-i Arabî and Tuhfetü'l-mülûk* until 1863. İbrahim Efendi would be entangled in the illicit printing of the Qur'ans in 1871. Ş.D 205/53, 27 Cemâziyelâhir 1289 (1 September 1872).
[409] "*... Kulları teb'a-yı Devlet-i Aliyyeden ve matba'acı esnafından bulunduğum halde on iki senedir hükûmet-i seniyyenin nizâm ve kavânîn-i münîfine mugâyir bir hâl ve hareketde bulunmayıp...*" ŞD 205/36, 27 Cemâziyelâhir 1289 (1 September 1872). follow up with ŞD 206/1, 24 Muharrem 1289 (3 April 1872).
[410] We know in fact that this is Kayserili Sahaf Mehmed Şükrü who was getting books published at Takvimhâne to sell in his store. MF. MKT 8/56, 18 Zilkade 1289. Printed only *Ta'lîmü'l-müte'allim.* The only book printed in his name is: Zarnuci Burhaneddin İbrahim, *Ta'lîmü'l-müte'allim* (İstanbul: 1273).
[411] See: Anonymous, *Tefe'ülname* (İstanbul: Mısırlı Mustafa Efendi, Evâhir-i Zilhicce, 1275). He also printed *Tuhfe-i Vehbî* in 1856.
[412] Jale Baysal, *Müteferika'dan Birinci Meşrutiyet'e Kadar Osmanlı Türklerinin Bastıkları Kitaplar* (İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1968), 46-48.
[413] Tevfik Efendi, referred to here as a calligrapher, was also a lieutenant and a teacher of cartography, astronomy and lithography at the Military School. He also wrote a book in 1861, which was deemed to be beneficial, and he was allowed to print it himself. In addition he was granted with a *mecîdîye* medal of fifth rank. A.DVN.MHM 35/2, Evâil-i Cemâziyelâhir 1278 (December 1861).
[414] This might be the "Hafiz Efendi" earlier accused for partnering in illicit printing activities. Moreover, İsmail Erünsal has located the probate inventory of "Sahaf Hafız Ahmed Efendi" who had been involved in book printing in addition to his practice as a bookseller. Some of the books he owned

Mehmed Efendi and Celil Efendi also served at the Imperial Press.[415] Hacı Mehmed Efendi was mentioned as a typesetter in 1846 as a unique talent among his peers.[416] Celil Efendi was probably the daybook accountant (*rûznâmçeci),* whom the director of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire*, Mehmed Nail Efendi complained about in 1855 for not fulfilling his tasks but working for his own "benefit" (*menâfi'-i mahsûsası).* He had therefore been dismissed.[417] Abdülvehhâb Efendi was a name that showed up in book inventories in 1856. One of the books he printed identified him as the tomb keeper of Sultan Mehmed Han.[418] The typesetters clearly got into the private printing business, as we also see typesetter Yusuf Efendi applying for permit to operate two typographic presses in 1857, but we do not see any publications specifically under his name.[419] Moroever, the Ottoman archives reveals that Hilmi and his partner, Abbas Efendi, from Çorlulu Ali Paşa madrasa, demanded to open a press together in 1858.[420]

Alaiyevî Ali Efendi, who will be discussed in Chapter Five in terms of his illicit printing practices, had a book printed in his name in 1861. This probably meant that he was accepted as an official printer. The colophon of the book identified his press as located in Sultan Bayezıd. Moreover, Aşir Efendi was reintroduced in 1857 as someone who had been "practicing lithography already for some time" referring

---

in his shop in Hakkaklar Çarşısı had over 2000 copies; 2,090 copies of *Dürr-i yektâ*, 960 copies of *Mecmû'atü'l-mühendisîn*, 631 copies of *Telhîs*, 1,495 copies of *Tuhfe-i Vehbî* and 1200 copies of *Eyyühe'l-veled şerhi.* If the three Hafız Ahmeds indeed refer to the same person, the fluidity between occupations as booksellers, book printers and contractors become even more visible. Erünsal, 88.

[415] Kabacalı, *Başlangıcından Günümüze Türkiye'de Matbaa, 72.*

[416] "*...sâir mürettipler içinde emsâli nâdir ve fenlerinde pek mütefennin ve mâhir..."* İ.DH 122/6183, 9 Cemâziyelevvel 1262 (5 May 1846).

[417] A.MKT.NZD 131/94, 20 Cemâziyelevvel 1271 (8 February 1855). Also see C.MF 13/625: "*mesâlih-i me'mûresine kat'an takayyüd etmediğinden başka ba'zı harekât-ı vâkı'ası Tab'hânenin bütün bütün ihlâl-i nizâmını müstevcib olmaktan nâşi...*"

[418] "*Sultan Mehmed Han hazretlerinin türbe-i şerîfi bahçesinde türbedâr...*" Anonymous, *Kitâb-ı Fal* (İstanbul: Abdülvehhab Efendi, 1273). His name is associated also with the printing of *Tefe'ülnâme* in 1856/1273.

[419] A.MKT.NZD 229/77, 27 Zilkade 1273 (19 July 1857).

[420] A.MKT.MHM 132/88, 29 Şevval 1274 (12 June 1858).

back to his unauthorized printing practices. He was now officially granted license to practice his craft.[421] One of the texts he printed revealed that his lithographic press had been located in Sultan Bayezıd in 1862.[422] Moreover, there was mention of a lithographer (*litografyacı esnafından*) Bosnalı Ömer Efendi, who had been granted permission by the Ministry of Public Education to print *Delâil-i şerîf* and *Kasîde-i Bürde* in 1862.[423]

An unusual lithographer was the sheikh of Özbekler Lodge in Sultantepe, Mehmed Salih Efendi, who explained in 1860 that this Nakshbandi lodge was a gathering place for dervishes (*fukarâ*) and travellers from Buhara. The sheikhs of the lodge had traditionally been involved with learning and practicing various crafts in order to provide for the needs of the lodge, and the lodge also functioned as a printing house between 1860-1875 to increase its financial income.[424] Mehmed Salih Efendi had learnt the craft of printing from these Sufi travelers.[425] It was probably through the lithographic press brought by an earlier sheikh Abdürrezzak Efendi that the residents had access to this technology. Though Mehmed Salih had received an earlier permit to print with lithography, he filed another petition in late 1859 in order to receive license for typographic printing.[426] He was granted permission to print on the condition that he would abide by the regulations. The Council of Public Education granted him a license after seeing the *imam* and *muhtâr* of his district as

[421] A.MKT.MVL 91/44, 20 Rebîülevvel 1274 (8 November 1857).
[422] *Akd-i Fahr-i Kâinât min Hadîcetü'l-Kübrâ* (İstanbul: Aşir Efendi, 20 Cemâziyelevvel 1279).
[423] İ.MVL 484/21939, 27 Ramazan 1279 (18 March 1863).
[424] The lodge functioned as a printing house between 1860-1875 to increase its financial income. Varol, "19. Yüzyıl İstanbul'unda Bazı Tekkelerin," 326.
[425] The lodge would continue to act as an intermediary between the people of Bukhara and the Imperial Press in 1872, as the sheikh of the time, Süleyman Efendi requested two typesetters, one small typographic press, one lithographic press and 200 kiyye types in order to teach the art of printing. See MF. MKT 3/75, 3 Cemâziyelâhir 1289 (8 August 1872).
[426] Muharrem Varol, "19. Yüzyıl İstanbul'unda Bazı Tekkelerin," 324-325. Muharrem Varol does not list the books printed at this press before 1867.

guarantors.[427] Another printer with links to Bukhara was the sheikh of a Bektaşi lodge, Eyüb Karyağdı Lodge, Necib Efendi (d. 1876). He had revived the lodge after 1858.[428] In the colophon of *Nuhbetü'l-etfâl,* they referred to him as a "painter" (*ressam)* and his location as "Çırçır around Sultan Mehmed".[429] He was also recognized as "father printer" (*matba'acı baba)*, and would become an influential printer of the Hamidian period.[430] He would be accused of printing Horufi books such as *Câvidân* and *Aşknâme-i İlâhî* in 1871 and hence he would be attacked by Harputlu İshak Efendi.[431]

Aside from these relatively less recognized individual printers, two presses were established in Istanbul with more recognition due to the prominent ranks of their editors and the nature of their publications. First, rising through the ranks of the Translation Office, the Ottoman civil official, Agâh Efendi (d. 1885) started to run a press to publish the first private newspaper in Turkish, *Tercümân-ı Ahvâl* together with Şinasi (d. 1871).[432] Şinasi then inaugurated his own press and newspaper in 1862, namely *Tasvîr-i Efkâr*. Their publications, however, were not restricted to the newpaper, and they quickly diversified it with journals and books.[433]

---

[427] İ.DH 455/30173, 3 Cemâziyelâhir 1276 (28 Aralık 1859); authorized in 26 Cemâziyelâhir 1276 (20 January1860).

[428] The lodge was initially established in 1758, but was closed down under Mahmud II following the abolishing of the Janissaries. Necip Efendi revived it. For more information about this lodge as well as the historical distribution of Bektaşi lodges in general, see Gülay Yılmaz, "Bektaşilik ve İstanbul'daki Bektaşi Tekkeleri Üzerine Bir İnceleme, "*Journal of the Ottoman Studies,* XLV (2015): 24. Necib Efendi printed *Nuhbetü'l-etfâl,* the only edition of this book in 1858 and *Mantıkü't-tayr* in 1857.

[429] Feridüddîn Attâr, *Mantıkü'l-esrâr, Terceme-i Mantıkü't-tayr* (İstanbul: Necib Efendi Taş Destgâhı, Safer 1274).

[430] Born in 1814, Necip Baba became the sheikh of the lodge in 1868.
Varol, "19. Yüzyıl İstanbul'unda Bazı Tekkelerin," 328; Fahri Maden, "Bektaşi Tekkelerinin Kapatılması (1826) ve Bektaşiliğin Yasakli Yillari" (PhD diss., Gazi University, 2010), 226; Nicolas Vatin and Thierry Zarcon, "Istanbul'da bir Bektasi Tekkesi: Karyağdı (Eyüp) Tekkesi", *Revue Des Etudes Islamiques*, 1992 (Trans.) Among the books he printed were *Aşknâme-i İlâhi* of Feristehzade Abdulmecid Izzeddin.

[431] Fahri Maden, 214. Studies show that the Bektaşi publications did indeed intensify after 1867. Also see Salih Çift, "1826 sonrasında Bektaşilik ve Bu Alanla İlgili Yayın Faaliyetleri," *Uludağ Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* XII, No. 1 (2003): 254-256.

[432] İ. MMS 19/822, 18 Ramazan 1276 (9 April 1860).

[433] Among the books published at *Tercümân-ı Ahvâl* are: *Endülüs Tarihi* in 1280, *Heyet-ı sâbıka-i Konstantiniyye* in 1277 are *Minhâcü'l-âbidîn* in 1280. Among the books printed at *Tasvîr-i Efkâr* are:

Non-Muslim printers had been running their presses within the Ottoman territories for centuries. Foreign residents such as the French also joined in increasing numbers from the turn of the nineteenth century. Moreover, the British entrepreneur, William Churchill would be granted license to publish the semi-official newspaper in Turkish, *Cerîde-i Havâdis* press in 1830, which also became a rival to the Imperial Press by harboring unauthorized printers and publishing illicit books.[434] By 1849, customers also commissioned books at this press.[435]

As explained in the previous sections, the fact that the foreigners were not allowed to print in Turkish was a criterion that allowed them to evade the Ottoman state's intervention. After the 1857 regulation, however, they also had to appeal to the related state institution to get a printing license. They would be subjected to the same set of rules. The following discussion will reveal only a sample of these individuals. To start with those cases in Istanbul, Basmacı Haçik demanded a license in 1856 to print in Kürkçühanı[436] and Kirkor and İsteban applied in 1859 to print in Çemberlitaş/Sandıkçılar.[437] Another demand was posted by an Armenian, Erzincanlıoğlu Artin in 1859 to open a press in Vezirhan printing in different languages.[438] In a new petition from 1861, however, he wanted permission to print texts in Turkish.[439] Interestingly, he was described as a member of the "artisanry of lithographers" together with Muharrem Efendi. Partnerships between different communities reveal that the printing enterprise was ethnically and religiously blurrier

Mecmû'a-i tesâvir-i Osmâniyye in 1279, *Tercüme-i Telemak* in 1279, *İbn Sina'nın tercüme-i hâli* in 1279 and *Durûb-ı emsâl-i Osmâniyye* in 1280.
[434] İ.MVL 196/6021, 9 Receb 1266 (21 May 1850); A.AMD 28/30, 28 Safer 1267 (2 January 1851); İ.MVL 356/15604, 25 Şaban 1272 (1 May 1856).
[435] İ.HR 59/2866, 12 Muharrem 1266 (28 November 1849).
[436] A.MKT.NZD 232/15, 21 Safer 1273 (21 October 1856).
[437] HR.MKT 311/48, 4 Rebîülâhir 1276 (31 October 1859).
[438] HR.MKT 339/87, 6 Zilhicce 1276 (25 June 1860).
[439] İ.MVL 452/20219, 10 Muharrem 1278 (18 July 1861).

than assumed.[440] These commonalities will become more obvious in the discussion of networks of illicit printing in Chapter Five.

The petitions filed by non-Muslim pioneers in the Ottoman provinces mostly justified their needs for a press with reference to their communal religious books. In a petition from Van in 1857, for instance, the governor of Van forwarded the joint petitions of the Armenian patriarch and council to receive license to print books such as the Bible, Psalms and other liturgical texts at the printing press available in Yedi Kilise for the education of Armenian children.[441] In 1861, the foreign priests stationed in Musul wanted to open a printing house to print religious books.[442] The Ottoman subject Antokaviç from the Bosnian province, Banja luca, who had been trained in printing (*tahsîl-i fenni tab' ederek*) in Austria, appealed to the governor of Bosnia in 1857 to request permission to print books necessary for the Greek community as well as the permitted books of Islam (*İslâm kitâbı)*.[443] Printing press was opened in Ioannina for Christian schools in 1859.[444] In 1863, the local council of Damascus (*Şam Meclis-i Kebîri)* demanded permission to open a press to print church-related books and pamphlets.[445]

Not every demand was immediately authorized. For instance, probably due to the general social and political disorder in the Balkans around 1856, there was much deliberation between the governor of Bosnia, the Council of Public Education and

---

[440] "*litografyacı esnafından"* A.MKT.MVL 132/8, 4 Rebîülevvel 1278 (18 July 1861). This is the reporting of decision to the Ministry of Public Education. Johann Strauss argues the same for the reading communities of the nineteenth century. Strauss, "Who read what in the Ottoman Empire."
[441] HR.MKT 218/27, 27 Rebîülevvel 1274 (15 November 1857).
[442] HR.MKT 371/60, 8 Ramazan 1277 (20 March 1861).
[443] A.MKT.NZD 229/75, 22 Zilkade 1273 (14 July 1857).
[444] A.MKT.MHM 166/28, 25 Safer 1276 (23 September 1859).
[445] İ.MVL 501/22668, 8 Cemâziyelevvel 1280. This case is particularly interesting because initially the Minister of Public Education, İbrahim Edhem Paşa objected to the establishment of a press in a province as far as Damascus due to the potential for them to print unauthorized and harmful texts. Supreme Council, on the other hand, exhibited full-scale trust in the available mechanisms of Ottoman control through the local councils. It ruled that at a time when presses were freed of monopolies and they flourished in many cities such as İzmir and Beirut, it was permissible for Damascus, too, to enjoy the same privileges under the specific conditions expected of any press.

the Ministry of Public Education about the possibility of Antokaviç illicitly printing and disseminating books under the guise of a legal printing press.[446] Interestingly, despite concerns at a local level, the Council of Public Education chose to trust him and permit the enterprise. In the aftermath of the Ottoman Provincial Law Code of 1864, the number of lithographic presses in the provinces would increase dramatically.[447] One by one, administrators from the provinces demanded printing presses as well as experienced staff to print either the bureaucratic documents or local newspapers.[448]

Matters concerning the foreign printers such as the licensing process would be passed onto the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, as noted in a letter to the foreign embassies 1861.[449] In the provinces, all applicants, regardless of their community, would first address the local governor, who would then forward applications to the relevant office in the capital. Even after receiving a license for their printing press, the printers would have to submit each desired book in advance to be granted a license per book. The notice emphasized that the "printing business" was a fragile matter in the Ottoman Empire and it had to be protected from misuse.[450] Some examples of foreign printers include the 1859 petitions of the Sardinian subjects, Karlomazi and Persiketi[451] and the French subject Mösyö Emile Mandos all aiming to open presses in Beyoğlu.[452] An American subject named Arşak Boyacıyan wanted

[446] HR. MKT 203/56, 4 Muharrem 1273 (4 September 1856).
[447] For a general survey of the Ottoman provincial presses, see Uygur Kocabaşoğlu and Ali Birinci, "Osmanlı Vilayet Gazete ve Matbaaları Üzerine Gözlemler," *Kebikeç* 2 (1995): 101-122.
[448] For example, typographic press for Bosnia was requested in 1265; A.MKT.MHM 344/18, 26 Cemâziyelevvel 1282 (17 October 1865); types were sent for the provincial press in Trablusgarp, A.MKT.MHM 433/78, 19 Şevval 1285 (2 February 1869).
[449] HR. SYS 2925/35, 15 Receb 1277 (27 January 1861).
[450] HR. SYS 2925/35, 15 Receb 1277 (27 January 1861).
[451] HR.MKT 311/70, Rebîülâhir 1276 (October/November 1859).
[452] HR.MKT 338/17, 22 Zilkade 1276 (11 June 1860).

to open a printing press through the American consulate in 1858.[453] The fact that he presented himself as an "American" is worth noting here, as Teotig named him as among the Armenian printers of Istanbul.[454] Also in Tırnova, the American missionary Albert wanted to open a press to print textbooks and necessary documents in 1860.[455]

2.5.1.2 The rise of the author as an agent

While the private printers emerged as significant actors of the Ottoman printing enterprise in the second half of the nineteenth century, the author became the new legal actor shaping the printing enterprise. In their seminal study in book history, Lucien Febvre and Henri Martin have pointed to authorship as the last profession to emerge in association with printing.[456] The printers in Europe had gradually turned from the printing of ancient texts to contemporary authors, whose exclusive rights over their works was recognized with the 1710 Act of Queen Anne in England. In the Ottoman Empire, too, the recognition of the author/translator as the true owner and hence the most legitimate person to print his own book was a process in the making. For centuries, monetary rewards had been a traditional form of remuneration that patrons had bestowed on scholars in return for the literary or scholarly works they presented.[457] This custom continued also in the age of print. Especially the provincial authors/translators in the nineteenth century who sent their books from the provinces to either the Sultan or the new councils such as the Council of Public Education

[453] HR. MKT 287/59, 12 Şevval 1275 (15 May 1859). About Boyacıyan, also see Ali Birinci, "Osmanlı Tıbaat ve Matbû'at Hayatında Ermeniler (1567-1908)," *Yeni Türkiye* 60 (2014): 1-22.
[454] Teotig, 176-172.
[455] HR. MKT 353/52, 2 Rebîülâhir 1277 (18 October 1860); HR.MKT 348/11,19 Safer 1277 (6 September 1860).
[456] Febvre and Martin, *The Coming of the Book,* 160.
[457] Halil İnalcık, *Şair ve Patron* (İstanbul: Doğu Batı Yayınları, 2018).

appointed with the task to evaluate books were usually rewarded through a few available venues. At the lowest level, the authorities could acknowledge some appreciation of the reception of such a work; the authors, usually of scholarly origins, could be promoted in rank; they could be rewarded with cash; and last of all, as a privilege specific to the flourishing age of print, their books could be printed.

As seen in the previous sections, the evolution of printing practices in the Ottoman Empire granted specific contractors the monopoly over the right to get certain titles printed after 1840, but these titles were usually classics whose authors had long been dead. Hence copyright was not an issue. Beginning from 1849 onwards, however, contemporary authors and translators acquired new significance for state officials as shapers of a new type of knowledge and with a solid right over their intellectual property. Yusuf Halis Tahir Ömerzâde's *Miftâh-ı lisân* in 1849*,* a beneficial dictionary for those wanting to learn French, contained a note in its colophon explaining that the right to print the book was granted solely to its author; anyone else attempting to print it would be imprisoned.[458] The penal article attached to this note is also rare for this period and very suggestive.

The right to print one's own book would take on a more institutional meaning with the establishment of the Academy of Sciences (*Encümen-i Dâniş)* in 1851*,* which formalized the printing rights of the authors/translators.[459] In order to encourage the volume of scientific works, three categories of awards were articulated through the bylaws of the institution. The reward of third degree corresponded to

[458] İ.HR 59/2866, 13 Muharrem 1266 (29 November 1849); MVL 230/54, 24 Safer 1266 (9 January 1850). He was rewarded with 5000 kuruş. Yusuf Halis Tahir Ömerzâde, *Miftâh-ı lisân,* (Istanbul: Matba'a-i Cerîdetü'l-Havâdis, 1266).

[459] Provisions for copyright did exist in Ottoman and Egyptian laws ever since the late 1850s, apparently inspired by European models; but the impression one gets from the scanty evidence at hand is that not much public attention was paid to them. See Ami Ayalon, *The Arabic Print Revolution,* 63. Kathryn Schwartz, on the other hand, has claimed that the manuscript tradition of replicating texts "at anyone's will" simply continued into the age of print in the case of Egypt. See Schwartz, "Meaningful Mediums," 302.

those books, which were considered to be not exactly necessary but beneficial, written or translated at the own initiative of the author/translator. These authors/translators would be granted permission to print the work at their own expense and keep the profit. They could also be paid an amount in cash in return for allowing the state to print the books in their place. The profit from these sales would then go into the treasury of the Ministry of Public Education. In the second degree, if someone wrote/translated a work that was both necessary and beneficial for the expansion of education either on his own initiative or after being commissioned, that person would also be granted the right to print the work and keep the profits.[460] The state could still buy the right to print it by paying the author in advance. The names of these privileged individuals would also be printed on the epitaph to be erected in front of the Academy of Sciences.

Since we have no real evidence of their names being written on epitaph, it is difficult to separate the second from the third-degree recipients of these awards. Yet archival documentation provides ample evidence. In 1851, Sahak Abro (d. 1900), one of the officials at the Translation Office, had translated a treatise into Turkish, for which he was awarded a license to print it at his own expense and keep the profit, but he was also awarded with 5000 kuruş *atiyye* to encourage him further.[461] This example shows that for a while the older practice of granting authors monetary rewards went hand in hand with the new practice of allowing them the right to print and profit from their work.

Identified as an external member of the Academy of Sciences in 1852, Sahak Abro also translated the *Kavâid-i Osmâniyye* by Ahmed Cevdet Efendi and Fuad

[460] *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'*, no: 449, 1 Şaban 1267 (1 June 1851); İ.MVL, 208/6740, 13 Cemâziyelâhir 1267 (15 April 1851).
[461] A.MKT.NZD 27/2, 7 Rebîülevvel 1267 (10 January 1851).

Paşa into French. As a result, he was granted a license to print it with privileges extending to ten years.[462] In 1851, the head of the provincial council of Aleppo, Abdünnâfi Efendi had written a treatise entitled *Nâfi'ü'l-âsâr,* upon which he was granted the right to print it at his own cost. Yet, to protect the book from being printed by some other person, Abdünnâfi Efendi was also granted copyright for five years.[463] This experimentation on the basis of a time limit on privilege is worth noting in this example. In 1853, one of the doctors at the Medical School, who had compiled a primer *(elifbâ)* to teach Turkish to Christian students, had been granted the printing monopoly of the books so that nobody else could print it.[464] Both the printing costs and the profits would belong to him in the meantime. In the same document, Kayserili Mehmed Rüşdü Efendi, also a doctor at the same school, was similarly granted a printing monopoly for his book, *Nuhbetü'l-etfâl,* written for his students.[465] It should not be a coincidence that also in 1853, when Kamil Sezai's *Risâle-i Muhtasar Coğrafya* was printed, there was a note before the preface stating that its printing and dissemination exclusively belonged to the translator and no one else could be granted a license to print it.[466]

An additional note on these two categories concerns the process after the authors, who were granted privileges, got their own books printed. The system also enabled them to sell and distribute their books on their own. Ismail Erünsal notes that this could be the reason why so many copies of their own books were found in the estates of some of these authors at their death. The estate of Keçecizade Fuad Paşa's

[462] A.MKT.NZD 48/89, 9 Rebîülâhir 1268 (1 February 1852).
[463] İ.MVL 199/6247, 20 Rebîülevvel 1267 (23 January 1851).
[464] A.MKT.MVL 65/17, 3 Zilkade 1269 (8 August 1853): "*...risâlenin mesârıf ve temettü' taraflarına âit olmak ve bundan başkası tab' edememek üzere kendisine imtiyâz verilerek tab' ve neşrine müsâ'ade olunması…"*Also see İ.MVL 280/10938, 12 Şevval 1269 (19 July 1853).
[465] A.MKT.MVL 65/17, 3 Zilkade 1269 (8 August 1853).
[466] Kamil Sezai, *Risâle-i Muhtasar Coğrafya*, (İstanbul: Mekteb-i Tıbbiyye, 1270).

(d. 1869) son, Ahmed Nazım Paşa, retained 240 copies of his grandfather's *Mihnetkeşân* in 1864. Moreover, when Ahmed Hamdi Şirvani died in 1890, his estate included 247 copies of his *Teshîlü'l-arûz* and 1.347 copies of his *Hindistan Seyahatnâmesi.*[467]

While the monopolies of contractors over the printing of books were eliminated in theory with the 1857 printing regulation, additional stipulations on the author/translator *(müellif)* recognized them as the ultimate owner of the right to print a book for a life-term.[468] If, however, the author did not get a "useful" book printed, the state officials, after a consultation with the author, could take over his rights to print the book for the purpose of general benefit. Similarly, the author could transfer his right to print his own book to other agents through a contract and sell his rights for an appropriate amount. The idea in abolishing monopolies, after all, as clarified by the High Council of Reforms, was to reproduce the number of necessary books and to enable students to buy them at good prices. The number of copies to be printed would be determined through the contract, and if the contractor exceeded this number, it would be considered as theft and would be punished accordingly. The time duration of this transfer of rights would also be clarified in the contract; the terms would have to be renegotiated through a new contract once the time limit was over. Another agent could hypothetically take over these rights on the condition that the Council of Public Education would be notified about this entire process. Hence the Council of Public Education would henceforth serve as the regulating agency in print until the foundation of the Ministry of Public Education. Moreover, the penal code of 9 August 1858 further supplemented the legal framework articulating the

[467] Erünsal, *Osmanlılarda Sahaflık ve Sahaflar,* 84.
[468] İ.MMS 9/372, 18 Şevval 1271 (4 July 1855). For a glimpse of studies that offer a broad view of copyrights in the Tanzimat period, see Fatmagül Demirel, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Telif Hakları Sorunu," *Bilgi ve Bellek* III*,* no. 5 (2006): 93-103

felonies of copyright.[469] In the case of overriding the newly minted privileges of the author, the printer was to pay a fine from five to a hundred golden *mecîdîs*; the seller from one to twenty-five golden *mecîdîs* and those who imported such books would pay five to a hundred golden *mecîdîs*.

As such, the 1857 regulation added a higher degree of legalization to the case of the author. While the reward system of the Academy of Sciences had recognized the printing privileges of the author, this new regulation deliberated them as life-term privileges.[470] In a paradoxical fashion, as the monopoly of the contractors on classical books was being abolished, we simultaneously observe the gradual evolution of the monopoly of the contemporary author/translator on his own work, or the copyright of a book. The monopoly was transferred from the profit-oriented contractor to its intellectual owner. In other terms, printing became the new form of reward through which, in the Ottoman context, the author's financial ownership of his work was eventually born. From another perspective, the emergence of the protection of intellectual property in the Ottoman Empire could also be read as the beginnings of an intellectual monopoly hand in hand with the breaking of institutional monopoly. With the authorization of the private presses with the 1857 regulation, authors would also turn to non-state presses to print their own books.[471] As such, by 1857, the author, the contractor and the printer had made their legal

[469] İskit, *Türkiye'de Matbuat İdareleri,* 887. Also see *Düstûr*, Tertîb-i evvel, Vol.1, 590. Cengiz Kırlı has argued that one of the important functions of the penal codes in the Tanzimat period was to take the bureaucracy under central control. Moreover, the target was not the culprits themselves but the general public as an audience. Cengiz Kırlı, *Yolsuzluğun İcadı: 1840 ceza kanunu, iktidar ve bürokrasi* (Istanbul: Verita, 2015).
[470] İ.MMS 9/372, 7 Receb 1273 (3 March 1857). The new British law on copyright that granted the authors life-term priviledges over their books was passed in 1842. The British Literary Gazette wrote in 1850: "...far from seeing bookmaking as a collobarative effort, printing presses are the torture devices that publishers use to express authorial genius onto the pages for their own profit." See Jessica Despain, *Nineteenth-Century Transatlantic Reprinting and the Embodied Book* (UK: Routledge, 2014), 7.
[471] İ.MVL 367/16095, 2 Cemâziyelâhir 1273 (28 January 1857).

debut as the three legally recognized agents next to the state in the Ottoman printing enterprise.

2.5.2 Financial regulations at *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire*

The declaration of the printing regulation of 1857 did not end the challenges posed by the non-state actors to the imperial printing enterprise. The unauthorized private printers in Istanbul continued to pressure *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire* to revise its own printing and pricing policies. The director, Recai Efendi, was especially unhappy. He argued that because these illicit lithographers did not pay tax to the state or employ the necessary staff such as an editor (*musahhih*), their cost in printing books was lower than the Imperial Press. Losing potential clients to them with the promise of lower prices was the worst possible outcome. Hence the profit rates had to be reconsidered on 16 March 1857.[472]

Recai Efendi penned a long letter involving proposals for both the imperial printing enterprise and the private printers. Regarding the Imperial Press, he argued that the 20 percent profit, previously determined as the fixed rate, had precluded the possibility of clients to appeal to the Imperial Press. Clearly dissatisfied with the legalization of private printers, he argued that the financial benefit of the press treasury had not been protected. Since the aim of the printing press was to serve the expansion of knowledge and the sciences rather than making profit, he proposed to reduce the profit rate for books printed at the Imperial Press to 5 percent and at most to 10 percent. Apparently, the term "profit" did not have commercial connotations for the state officials in the sense of a flow of extra cash. It simply meant a way to

[472] İ.MVL 370/16264, 20 Receb 1273 (16 March 1857).

compensate for the "broken equipment" while printing.[473] As such, the clients would be reclaimed and higher profits would follow the quick sales. He also asked the state dignitaries to warn the private printers about hiring editors to produce decent copies and paying a tax of one para per edition to the Imperial Press.[474]

As a result of deliberations, the High Council of Reforms accepted the 10 percent profit on printed books. Indeed, for many books printed after 1857, this ratio would be applied "according to procedure" (*usûl-i vechile*).[475] The taxation of private printers was a different matter. They indeed constituted an emerging group of artisans who could be taxed. However, the significance of the printing press was so great for the progress and spread of education and sciences that to fix taxes on their practitioners before they actually took on a more formalized identity and solidified their ventures would be premature. It would be reconsidered at a later date when the number of printing presses in the empire would have mounted.[476]

This decision reflected a conflict of interest between different levels of state representation on how they viewed the new agents. The director of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire* was naturally most interested in the protection of his own treasury, whereas higher levels of bureaucracy rendered the printing press significant insofar as it served the greater purpose of expanding knowledge and the sciences. As

---

[473] "*İşbu kütüb tab'ından....bir gûne menâfi'-i hazine gözetilmediğinden…Tab'hâne-i Âmire'de tab' olunan kütübden öyle fâhiş temettü' alınması şân-ı me'âlî-i ünvân-ı saltanat-ı seniyyeye nâ cüsban görüldüğünden...kırılan dökülen edevât bahâsına karşılık olmak üzere..."* İ.MVL 370/16264, 20 Receb 1273 (16 March 1857).
[474] İ.MVL 370/16264, 20 Receb 1273 (16 March 1857).
[475] See A.MKT.NZD 364/76, 19 Safer 1278 (26 August 1861) (*Hâşiye alâ Hâşiyeti Abdülgafur ale'l-Fevâidi'z-ziyâiyye)*; İ.DH 473/31722, 23 Zilkade 1277 (2 June 1861) (*Şerhu'l-Makâsıd)*; İ.DH 475/31896, 23 Muharrem 1278 (31 July 1861) (*Şerh-i Dürr-i muhtâr)*; İ.DH 468/31327, 4 Şaban 1277 (15 February 1861) and İ.DH 473/31735, Gurre-i Zilhicce 1277 (10 June 1861) (*Künhü'l-ahbâr)*; İ.DH 492/33392, 16 Muharrem 1279 (14 July 1862) (*Şemsü'l-hakîka*); A.MKT.NZD 402/47, 21 Receb 1278 (22 January 1862) (*Dîvân-ı Eşref*); İ.DH 473/31767, 23 Zilhicce 1277 (2 July 1861) (*Miftahu'l-fünûn*); İ.DH 414/27423, 10 Safer 1275 (19 September 1858) (*Kâfiye şerhi Şeyh Radi*).
[476] İ.MVL 370/16264, 27 Receb 1273 (23 March 1857). "*...ashâbı bir esnaf şekline girmeden vergi tahsîsi bunun revâcına mâni olacağından..."*

such, the state officials acted in a way to encourage and protect the agents of the printing press, namely the private lithographers in the long run.

Nevertheless, from 1856 to 1863, *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire* continued to deal with financial challenges, which repeatedly came down to the stock of unsold books. Ever since the turn of the century, this had been a detrimental issue for the continuation of the printing enterprise under state control. To deal with the stock of unsold books, the state officials also turned to a more systematic policy. On 17 August 1856, a commission from the Council of Public Education gathered with the director and the accountant of the Imperial Press to deliberate on ways to liquidify this capital into cash. After reviewing the unsold copies, they grouped them into three: those books that would sell fast, those that would sell 4-5 copies a year, and those that were never sought in the market and hence were ready to rot in storage. The last category was comprised by books printed as a form of gift for their authors. Moreover, the extra monetary reward afforded to them had been further added to the cost, which resulted in incredible final sales prices.

After this categorization, two solutions emerged. One was the organization of an auction to sell these unsold copies and the other was the tracking of book contractors to collect their remaining debts. To prepare for the auction, the value of unsold books at the Imperial Press would be calculated and replaced with cash from the state treasury. Immediately after, they would be auctioned off by removing the colossal profits to compensate for the initial expenses of the state treasury.[477] As such, printed books entered the auctions in the Ottoman Empire. Auctions had been one of the four fundamental means of selling manuscript books for booksellers for

[477] İ.MVL 359/15736, 15 Zilhicce 1272 (17 August 1856); A.MKT. MVL 82/55, 16 Safer 1273 (16 October 1856).

centuries.[478] They had always been utilized as a way of liquidating the book stocks, when either the state had confiscated the properties of an important individual or the estates of deceased individuals such as religious scholars or civil bureaucrats contained books.[479]

While these traditional means would continue into the twentieth century, the same form served a new function with the circulation of printed books. Thereby, what was suggested as a way to deal with the accumulated, unsold book stock of the Imperial Press, the auction, was largely informed by a traditional practice. The target audience of these auctions was clearly the provincial readers, who normally had less access to books than those in the capital. To include them all in the procedure, advertisements were printed on newspapers in Arabic, Greek, Armenian and French together and special reports were sent to these provinces containing the list of books on sale.

In two months' time, on 16 October 1856, book lists were out and sent to many provinces of the empire.[480] The state announced the formal procedures to follow for registering in the auctions in the provinces; interested parties would have to present guarantors to the local governors and register their names. The due amounts would be paid to the local treasury (*mahallî sandık*) in the presence of a reliable guarantor. The official would then write a notice to the Council of Public Education.[481] The postal fees of books sold at the auction would be paid in half as a

[478] Erünsal, *Osmanlılarda Sahaflık ve Sahaflar*, 118. The booksellers in Istanbul had traditionally resorted to four means of selling books; sales at their stores, '*ayak sahafı,*' who took the books to the customers scattered around the city, sending copies to special, wealthy clients and finally holding auctions. Erünsal first elaborated on books auctions in an earlier article: Erünsal, "Osmanlılarda Sahhaflık ve Sahhaflar."

[479] One of the most famous examples is the selling of Şehid Ali Paşa's books in the yard of Fatih Mosque after confiscated by state in the eighteenth century. See Erünsal, *Osmanlılarda Sahaflık ve Sahaflar*, 305.

[480] A.MKT.UM 257/63, 16 Safer 1273 (16 October 1856); A.MKT. UM 260/67, 17 Receb 1273 (13 March 1857).

[481] A.MKT.MVL 82/55, 16 Safer 1273 (16 October 1856).

way to obey the order of "expanding knowledge". The assessment here was clear: the press treasury could still suffer some financial loss through this strategy, as more discounts could be made for wholesales of a few hundred thousand kuruşes to appeal to a maximum number of customers. However, this loss was tolerable when compared to the "great benefit it would bring to so many millions of people".[482]

We can tell that the sole purpose of the Ottoman state in auctioning books was not avoiding bankruptcy of the press treasury. The officials also worried about the collection of all books in the hands of one person, for instance, who could then sell them gradually to public at high prices. This was not what the state wanted. Almost as important was the accessibility of as many books as possible to provincial readers. To prevent it, the regulations further stipulated for ten to fifteen copies of each book to be kept at the Imperial Press and be sold at only one to two kuruşes more than their auction price. Moreover, one copy of each book in the stocks would be sent to the libraries throughout the empire for free after contacting the trustees.[483]

The role of the Ministry of Public Education in the process had become so central that the Imperial Press officials already had to pass through a bureaucracy involving their authorization. No book, even those on most demand, would be allowed to be printed at the Imperial Press without their approval. A copy of all books sent to Istanbul from the provinces were to be sent to the notice of the Ministry, as dictated by a 1858 decree.[484]

The second solution targeted the book contractors. On 15 January 1857, the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances addressing the director of the Imperial Press

[482] "*50.000 kuruş kadar bir hasar-ı zâhiri gözükse bile bu kadar milyon halka atiyye-i hayriyye-i zillullahî kabîlinden olacak fevâid-i celîleye nazaran pek cüz'î birşey olacağından…*" İ.MVL 359/15736, 15 Zilhicce 1272 (17 August 1856).
[483] İ.MVL 359/15736, 15 Zilhicce 1272 (17 August 1856).
[484] A.MKT.NZD 254/74, 15 Şaban 1274 (31 March 1858).

stated that whoever had remaining debts from commissioning books had to be identified and questioned on the reasons for the delay on payments. The aim was to recollect as much cash possible. The long-term plan, on the other hand, was to tie the commissioning process to stricter measures involving guarantors. Moreover, the Imperial Press officials who had printed books under their own names for the sake of profit also still owed debt to the press treasury. This practice had to be banned altogether; the employees of the press could no longer print books under their own names.[485]

2.5.3 Reorganization of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire*

Ever since 1831, the Directorate of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire* had operated as two separate bureaus: as the office for the official gazette, *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'* and as the Imperial Press for the printing of books. The efficiency of this structure was sought through multiple measures enacted through the mid-nineteenth century. The turning point, however, was the establishment of the Ministry of Public Education in 1856. As educational policies consolidated, the printing press was perceived as a sub-branch of education, and hence institutionalized as a result of administrative experimentation as the following discussion will reveal.

Apart from the issue of unsold books, the publication of the gazette was disorderly and the contents were shallow, as noted by state officials. Moreover, the budget of the press had still not been taken under control due to the lack of proper accounting.[486] In fact, the keeping of accounting books was a problem for the entire Ottoman bureaucracy at the time, not specifically for the Imperial Press, as Sadık

[485] A.MKT.MVL 84/59, 19 Cemâziyelâhir 1273 (14 February 1857).
[486] A.AMD 79/86, 1273 (1856-57).

Rifat Paşa explained in his report from 1855.[487] To make things worse, the Minister of Public Education, Sami Efendi (d. 1882) reported on 2 October 1857 that there was no proper registering of the various expenses of the Imperial Press such as for the paper, ink and other equipment as well as the salaries of the staff and workers. Since the related costs could not be accurately calculated, the settled profit rate of 10 percent had no meaning and resulted in further financial loss. The accounting of *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire* was more orderly, because it was conducted by the financial accountant (*mâliye rûznâmçesi*). Sami Efendi demanded a proper keeping of records and for an official from the Ministry of Public Education to inspect their accounts once every year.[488] Hence on 12 November 1857, the financial and accounting tasks (*umûr-ı mâliye ve hesâbiye*) were separated from the tasks of the Directorate and appointed to a separate official.[489]

Despite these attempts, the costs and profits had still not been properly registered and the salaries of employees had not been paid for six months in 1861.[490] Ahmed Farisi, the head editor of the Arabic version of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'*, would complain in 1861 that he had never been able to receive his salary in full.[491] The financial difficulties would intensify after the 1860s and detain the government from paying the wages of its employees in general.[492] Paying salaries in books instead of in cash was considered as an alternative in the case of the press official Mösyö Nogues, whose nine-month salary had accumulated.[493] In the November of the same

[487] Çakır, *Tanzimat Dönemi Osmanlı Maliyesi,*166.
[488] İ.MVL 385/16846, 27 Safer 1274 (17 October 1857).
[489] İ.MVL 380/1666, 19 Rebîülevvel 1274 (7 November 1857); A.MKT.MVL 91/53, 23 Rebîülevvel 1274 (11 November 1857).
[490] A.MKT.NZD 329/8, 13 Rebîülâhir 1277 (29 October 1860).
[491] A.MKT.NZD 369/9, 15 Muharrem 1278 (23 July 1861).
[492] Yavuz Selim Karakışla, 'The Emergence of the Ottoman Industrial Working Class, 1839-1923,' in *Workers and the Working Class in the Ottoman Empire and the Turkish Republic* (eds.) Donald Quataert and Erik Jan Zürcher (London and New York: I.B. Tauris Publishers, 1995: 21.
[493] A.MKT. NZD 362/8, 4 Safer 1278 (11 August 1861).

year, the employees, probably in a hopeless attempt, even demanded their salaries to be transferred from the pay-desk at *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire* (*vezene)* to the state treasury (*hazine-i celîle*).[494] This crisis was naturally reflected in the publication practices; in 1862, although the book presented by the religious scholar Hacı Mustafa Efendi of Baghdad on Islamic creed (*akâid-i İslâmiyye)* was deemed to be valuable, the Imperial Press noted the insufficiency of their capital to fund its printing.[495]

At the face of these challenges, a more radical solution regarding restructuring the administration of the printing enterprise was sought; annexing it to the Ministry of Public Education. Two attempts were made in this direction in 1862 and 1864. First of all, in 1862, a special committee consisting of Ahmed Vefik Efendi (d. 1891), Ahmed Kemal Paşa (d. 1886), the Minister of Finance and Ahmed Cevdet Efendi (d. 1895) convened to deliberate a new administrative hierarchy. The overseer of the enterprise was officially declared to be the Ministry of Public Education, which was defined as the overseer of all printing activities.[496] They reported on the need for all printing matters to be entrusted to a press director (*Matbû'at müdîri)*. Moreover, to ensure a more regular publishing of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'* at least once a week, a separate editor-in-chief (*Takvîm-i Vekâyi' Muharriri)* would have to be appointed to report to the director.[497] The last director of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire*, Lebib Efendi, was to resign.

Moreover, the committee portrayed a snapshot of the printing enterprise; the editors employed at both *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire* and *Tab'hâne-i Âmire* worked on

[494] A.MKT.NZD 388/30, 23 Cemâziyelevvel 1278 (26 November 1861).
[495] İ.MVL 469/21272, Gurre-i Muharrem 1279 (29 June 1862).
[496] İ.DUİT 136/42, Receb 1278 (January 1862).
[497] "*…ale'l-umûm matbû'ât maddesinin bir müdîre havâle kılınması ile emr-i tıbâ'at nizâm bularak Takvîm-i Vekâyi''in umûr-ı tahrîriyesi için dahi muktedir ve ehliyetli zevâttan biri mahsûsan Takvîm-i Vekâyi' muharriri nasb ü ta'yîn olunup..*"

monthly salaries.[498] These salaries, as well as other expenditures such as the repairing of equipment, were in turn added to the cost of printing books. Due to the state of worn out types used at the Imperial Press, the customers often appealed to the presses in Egypt and the Imperial Press remained idle as a result. However, the nature of printing anywhere was such that the more copies were printed, the cheaper the printing became.[499] When books could not be sold, there was no profit to pay the staff at the press either, resulting again in a vicious cycle. In this light, it was better to employ the editors charging on the basis of page numbers and lines since then they would be more eager to get work completed.[500] A fixed, standardized new tariff had to be set for editors, typesetters and technicians employed at both presses to replace the previous mode of bargaining with the employees for each book and every customer.[501] The related imperial edict was issued on February 1, 1862.[502] The decisions were announced the next day on *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'*. The restructuring was presented to the public as a way of devising an efficient administration and tying the procedures to stricter rules and mechanisms of surveillance.[503] This was a way of endowing them both with more prestige and significance, as Ahmed Lütfü Efendi explained.[504]

These decisions, which were soon implemented, indicate a few new directions in the Ottoman experience with the printing enterprise. For one,

---

[498] İ.DUİT 136/42, 1278 (January 1862).
[499] İ.DUİT 136/42, 1278 (January 1862).
[500] "*...ba'demâ ücret-i tashîhiye ve tertîbiye ve tab'iye ve daha sâ'ir masârıf hep satır ve sahîfe hesâbı üzerine ta'yîn olunarak bir ta'rîfe yapılıp gerek Tab'hâne ve gerek Takvîmhâne'de mu'teber tutulması ve gerek mîrî ve gerek sahaf esnâfı ve avâm için kütüb ve sâire tab' olundukta bi'l-cümle musahhih ve mürettiblere ve destgâh ve çarh hademesine ber-mûceb-i ta'rîfe ücret verilerek mukaddemki gibi her def'asında pazarlığa hâcet olmaması..*"
[501] A.MKT.NZD 398/25, 9 Şaban 1278 (9 February 1862).
[502] İ.DUİT 136/42, Gurre-i Şaban 1278 (1 February 1862).
[503] *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'*, no: 630, 8 Şevval 1278.
[504] Ahmed Lütfü Efendi, 28-29. Ahmed Lütfü Efendi had to retire from his position as the last director of *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire*. The old building of the Imperial Press was sold to Mustafa Fazıl Paşa and that of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'* was used as a school by the Ministry of Public Education.

institutionalization as a concept clearly made more sense to the Ottoman officials of the late 1850s than the 1830s, but in a way that only time and experience could have revealed. As the volume of work within the Directorate mounted and as printing presses proliferated, the professional posts related to printing also became more refined and defined in terms of job descriptions and payments. A standardized pay roll was one way in which these functions would be reflected in the professional printing market.[505] Moreover, it suited the general direction of Ottoman administrative modernization whereby all functions had to be well-defined and standardized. For the Ottoman state, printing had fulfilled the function of expanding knowledge from the start. The audience, however, had been limited in the first half of the nineteenth century. As the school network expanded, more people were drawn into it; the textbooks, together with other types of books, became a primary vehicle for the state officials to reach and shape society. All three drafters of the proposal would later be appointed as ministers of education. Hence, the printing enterprise also became a branch of the wider concerns of the Ottoman state with education.

Once the annexation was formally complete, the Minister of Public Education, İbrahim Edhem Paşa (d. 1893), noted the dilapidated state of both the building and the equipment of *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire* on 8 April 1863. An orderly state of affairs at the printing press was most desired by the administration for the expansion of knowledge and the sciences.[506] Hence, the best option was to sell it and move to the derelict factory building originally constructed as *Kavâim-i nakdiyye*.[507] In addition to the existing presses and printing equipment, state of the art steam

[505] İ.DUİT 136/39, 1254 (1838-1839) stated that other than the chief typesetters, all other typesetters were paid on the basis of job.
[506] "*…matba'a-i devletin hâl-i intizâm-ı dâimîde bulunması intişâr-ı ulûm ve fünûn için saltanatı seniyyece an be an ...ve şâyân buyurulagelen müsâ'adât-ı mahsûsiyeye mebnî-i lâzımeden olarak..*" İ.MMS 26/1155, 18 Şevval 1279 (8 April 1863).
[507] İ.MMS 26/1155, 18 Şevval 1279 (8 April 1863).

presses were bought and carried to the new location, which was described as Ahmed Lütfü Efendi as a "press factory with perfect machinery" (*her bir levâzımı mükemmel bir Tıbâ'at Fabrikası*). There was a grand opening ceremony attended by Grand Vezir Fuad Paşa and the Head of the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances, Kamil Paşa.

For the still vacant position of the Press Director (*Matbû'at müdürü)* by 24 April 1863*,* Edhem Paşa suggested Şinasi Efendi (d. 1871), who at the time was a member of the Council of Public Education, due to his merit and experience in the printing affairs.[508] While the offer was rejected on the grounds that the appointee should be selected from among the already large staff employed at the Imperial Press, there was also subtle criticism directed at Şinasi by noting that the candidate would have to be of admirable and agreeable character.[509] The new press was to be administered by *müneccim-i sânî* Tahir Efendi.[510]

Nevertheless, experimentation with the new administration would continue. The Ministry of Public Education apparently acted as the overseer of the Imperial Press in 1864, as the minister at the time, İbrahim Edhem Paşa's name was printed on the colophon of a book printed on 14 March 1864.[511] He then informed the Grand

[508] İ.DH 507/34485, 5 Zilkade 1279 (24 April 1863). İbrahim Şinasi Efendi (d. 1871) was started his bureaucratic career as a clerk in the office of the Imperial Ottoman Artillery. He was then sent to France by his patron Reşid Paşa in 1849, where he stayed until 1853 studying public finance and literature. Upon his return, he was appointed as a member of the Council of Public Education in 1855. He also turned to writing his first books, *Dîvân-ı Şinasi* and his translation of French classics. In 1860, he established the first privately owned newspaper with Âgah Efendi entitled *Tercümân-ı Ahvâl.* In 1862, he would start another newspaper, *Tasvîr-i Efkâr.* 1863 was a time of mixed reception of Şinasi at the Ottoman court due to his political commentaries in *Tasvîr-i Efkâr.* See Şerif Mardin, *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought,* 252-275.

[509] İ.DH 507/34485, Selh-i Zilkade 1279 (19 May 1863), "*memdûhu'l-etvâr*".

[510] Hacı Tahir Efendi had formerly served as the editor of the Arabic version of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'* in 1857. A.MKT.NZD 221/83, 29 Şaban 1273 (24 April 1857). In 1864, he was referred to as '*Tab'hâne müdürü'* with 3000 kuruş salary. At the same time, he worked as the inspector of *rüşdiye* schools in İstanbul and a member of the Council of Public Education. A.MKT.MHM 308/97, 8 Rebîülevvel 1281 (11 August 1864).

[511] "*Tercüme-i İbn Hallikân'ın tab' ve temsîli Ma'ârif-i Umûmiyye ve Umûr-ı Nafi'a nâzırı Edhem Paşa hazretlerinin zamanı nezâretinde Tab'hâne-i Âmire-i Şâhânede resîde-i hüsn-i hitâm*

Vizier on 17 July 1864 that the Imperial Press had the potential to print a high volume of books and pamphlets with the steam presses available and this business continued to grow. For a brief period, this expansion resulted in the transfer of the administrative unit of printing from the Ministry of Public Education to the Directorate of Publications (*Matbû'at Nezâreti)* as a way to facilitate efficiency. İbrahim Edhem recommended Lütfü Efendi for the position due to his long experience as a staff member at the press. To connect printing affairs more organically to matters of education, and because the issue of printing was a branch of Public Education,[512] Edhem Paşa further recommended the appointment of Lütfü Efendi as a member of the Council of Public Education.[513] In the next few days (21 July 1864), however, Lütfi Efendi was now appointed as *Matbû'at Nâzırı,* as the Imperial Press was reunited with *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'* administration.[514] On 5 October 1864, Tahir Efendi was suggested as an appropriate candidate to serve as *Matbû'at Nâzırı* and Lütfi Efendi, who had just been sent on a retirement, to continue to work as an editor of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'* and as a member of the Council.[515] Not before the month was completed, on 30 October 1864, Ministry of Publications (*Matbû'at Nezâreti)* was dissolved for good and annexed under the Ministry of Public Education to be administered by a competent official. Lütfi Efendi hence was once again sent to retirement.[516]

olmuştur..." Kadı Şemseddin Ebu'l-Abbas Ahmed (İbn Hallikan), *Vefeyâtü'l-a'yân ve enbâü ebnâi'z-zamâ*n (trans. Rodosizâde Muhammed) (İstanbul: Tab'hâne-i Âmire, 5 Şevval 1280).

[512] "*…çünkü taba'at maddesi ma'ârif-i umûmiyyenin bir şubesi olduğundan dolayı…*" İ.DH 527/36440, 12 Safer 1281 (17 July 1864).

[513] İ.DH 527/36440, 12 Safer 1281 (17 July 1864).

[514] A.MKT.MHM 306/99, 16 Safer 1281 (21 July 1864); İ. DH 535/37163, 29 Cemâziyelevvel 1281 (30 October 1864).

[515] İ.DH 537/37215, 4 Cemâziyelevvel 1281 (5 October 1864).

[516] İ.DH 535/37197, 29 Cemâziyelevvel (30 October 1864).

2.6 Conclusion

This chapter has revealed that the development of the printing enterprise in the Ottoman Empire mainly from 1831 until 1863 was closely intertwined with the bureaucratic, administrative and economic changes in the period. In 1831, the Ottoman state established *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire* as a way to centralize the entire printing business, agents and networks. Guiding state policy in this period was never really the idea of profit. The state officials simply targeted the self-sufficiency of the imperial printing enterprise in a way that would reinforce the reforms carried out in the Ottoman bureaucracy and education. While this institution always remained as an important component of the printing enterprise, it was joined by various other agents who contested its centrality and wanted a share of the expanding market of printed books. These actors also compelled the Ottoman state to define the boundaries of legality in a way to integrate the non-state actors into the printing enterprise. They also constantly challenged the financial stability of the imperial printing business. Hence as much as the Ottoman state defined legislation and hence boundaries around the printed book, much of its moves were positioned in response to the demands of non-state actors. As such, this chapter has argued that the Ottoman printing enterprise cannot be just explained by focusing on the agency of Ottoman state but must take into consideration other agents, who were motivated by the financial stakes of a commercializing market. Eventually by pursuing their own financial interests, the non-state actors contributed to the consolidation of the Ottoman printing enterprise.

CHAPTER 3

PRINTING FOR PUBLIC BENEFIT: TEXTBOOKS

3.1 Introduction

As discussed in the previous chapter, the Ottoman imperial printing enterprise emerged with a new cause and organization in the first half of the nineteenth century. The state tried to affirm its position as its primary owner, who set the rules and tried to regulate its growth. The nature of printed material, as such, had to comply with the needs and priorities of the Ottoman state. Given its limited financial capacity, however, the state had to screen both the titles and the volume of printed books in a way to make room only for the most needed. To diversify production, at the same time, more printing agents were incorporated into the system early on. As the "cake", or the printing enterprise would get bigger in size over time, so would the demand by contenders for more of its slices.

The majority of the "needed" books, from the perspective of the state, consisted of textbooks that would be taught at schools. This correlation was related to the rising centrality of education and related institutions in the context of the nineteenth-century Ottoman reforms. Textbooks mattered as vehicles in conveying the correct and beneficial messages from the state to the students, who would fill the future ruling ranks. It was in its capacity to sustain this link and disseminate those texts that best served the interests of the state that the printing press became a primary agent of education.

This chapter will discuss the agency of the Ottoman state in utilizing a significant corpus of printed books in shaping the educational policies around the reign of Mahmud II (r. 1808-1839) and the Tanzimat era. An overview of the book

titles printed between the establishment of the press at the Imperial School of Military Engineering in 1797 and 1831 reveals that over 90 percent consisted of titles that could be taught at both the new schools and the madrasas. The same pattern continued after the establishment of the Directorate of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire;* between 1831 and 1840, over 92 percent printed book titles consisted of textbooks. The diversification of printing practices after 1840, however, resulted in a decrease in the proportion of textbooks within the entire printed book market of around one thousand titles pertaining to at least 55 percent between 1831 and 1863.

However, as will be shown below, the printed textbooks themselves were not homogenous and they represented the different discourses employed by the Ottoman state at the turn of the nineteenth century. They can be grouped roughly in two categories: classical textbooks of the madrasa "curriculum" and modern textbooks that were translations from European languages and which were about the new sciences About 30 percent of these titles fell under the new sciences as translated from European languages, while 70 percent represented the classical madrasa curriculum. As far as the printed output can be taken as a measure of governing mentalities, these numbers demonstrate that while the discourse on the European sciences was powerful at the state level, it was not singularly representative of the intellectual and even political inclinations. Indeed, together with the number of reprinted editions, the classical textbooks dominated the Ottoman educational sphere until at least the 1860s. Coupled with the textual crossovers between different educational venues, this numerical data also allows us to approach Ottoman educational history in a way that transcends institutions, demonstrating the continuities rather than ruptures, and fluidity rather than duality in the Ottoman intellectual climate.

This chapter consists of two parts. The first part draws largely from secondary sources to display an overview of the dominating discourses in Ottoman state polity insofar as they can be related to the educational and printing policies of the empire. It also draws from the curriculum of different schools, old and new, to demonstrate how fluid the boundaries were and how books were hence shared. The second part turns to the compilation of book titles printed between 1831 and 1863 to categorize them in three groups according to the printing intentions and priorities of the state authorities.

In this context, this chapter will explore the educational policies as reflected in the legal and the institutional spheres to argue that it was not the modern binaries between the "religious" and the "secular", or the "traditional" and the "progressive" that defined the perspective of the Ottoman officials to knowledge. Instead, the immediate, practical needs of the Ottoman state emerging from the special context of the first half of the nineteenth century onwards created a utilitarian framework, which could be monitored through the publishing policies centered around textbooks. In other words, a strong correlation emerged between the legitimization of a book for print with reference to its benefit and utility and its potential to serve as a textbook.

3.2 Discourses on Ottoman state legitimacy

As elaborated in Chapter Two, the printing enterprise was initially conceived as a tool for the Ottoman state to convey and facilitate its own agenda. Hence in order to contextualize its publishing practices in general, one needs to lay out the sources of Ottoman policy and legitimacy. It may be claimed that the consolidation of the authority of any ruler depends on his ability to ground it on a legitimating framework

with appeal to "religious, social or economic precedent."[517] At any given point in history, this framework is determined as a result of the negotiation between the ruler and the ruled.

For centuries, the Ottoman claim to legitimacy rested on a particular blend of political and religious themes. The domain of sultanic rule did not operate over a "religious-secular distinction."[518] On the one hand, the sultans appealed to dynastic legitimacy through multiple public acts such as the waging of holy campaigns (*jihad*), attending public ceremonies, displaying generosity through gift giving and sponsoring charitable institutions. They also sought religious legitimacy and established their own sacred image through deeds such as the procession to the mosque for Friday prayer or the protection of the pilgrimage routes.[519] On the other hand, there was a wider discourse of legitimacy consisting of the political and ethical notions of the Ottoman ruling elite subsumed under *nizâm-ı âlem* or world order.[520] Rather than a mere pragmatic political mechanism, this concept was imbued with notions of the metaphysical. It permeated into the law codes *(adâletnâmes, kanunnâmes)* and advice treatises (*siyâsetnâmes, nasihatnâmes*), repetitively invoking concepts such as "justice" and "good governance." Hence, as noted by Gottfried Hagen, what seemed on the outside as a pragmatic concern of the Ottoman state to maintain power represented a more complex contestation over legitimacy.[521]

---

[517] Hakan T. Karateke and Marcus Reinkowski, "Introduction," in *Legitimizing the Order: The Ottoman Rhetoric of State Power,* eds. Hakan T. Karateke and Marcus Reinkowski (Brill, Leiden-Boston, 2005), 1.
[518] Shahab Ahmed, *What is Islam? The Importance of Being Islamic* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press), 223.
[519] Hakan Karateke, "Legitimizing the Ottoman Sultanate: A Framework for Historical Analysis," in *Legitimizing the Order: The Ottoman Rhetoric of State Power,* eds. Hakan T. Karateke and Marcus Reinkowski (Brill, Leiden-Boston, 2005), 31; Hakan Karateke, "Opium for the Subjects? Religiosity as a Legitimizing Factor for the Ottoman Sultan," in *Legitimizing the Order: The Ottoman Rhetoric of State Power,* eds. Hakan T. Karateke and Marcus Reinkowski (Brill, Leiden-Boston, 2005), 118.
[520] Hagen, "Legitimacy and World Order," 57.
[521] Hagen, "Legitimacy and World Order," 57.

Together with shifts in the political constellations of the late eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries, the discourse of legitimacy was also redefined.[522] The Ottoman state had to renegotiate its position with its own population as well as with foreign powers.[523] Despite bureaucratic transformation, the traditional state rhetoric was remodeled over "the stock of pre-Tanzimat phrases".[524] As concepts such as *teb'a* now applied for all Ottoman subjects, until the 1860s, they existed side by side with the more traditional terms such as *re'âyâ* used with reference to the Christian people.[525]

Moreover, contrary to the retrospective readings of the period as marked by the clash of clearly defined, separate discourses, the new era of social and military reorganization, Nizâm-ı Cedîd, or New Order did not entail dissociation from religion.[526] Instead, it represented "a new Islamic order" enforcing Islamic morals and rituals at all levels.[527] While the reform tracts proposed by various agents displayed a variety of positions with reference to saving the empire,[528] many of them illuminated the relevance of religion by employing traditional Islamic concepts such as "serving faith and state" (*dîn ü devlete hizmet), "*obeying those in positions of

[522] Gottfried Hagen, "Legitimacy and World Order," 56.
[523] For different aspects of the struggle of the Ottoman State to maintain its legitimacy in the Hamidian period, see Selim Deringil, *The Well-Protected Domains: Ideology and the Legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire 1876-1909* (London-New York: I.B. Taurus, 1998); Benjamin Fortna, *Imperial Classroom: Islam, the State, and Education in the Late Ottoman Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).
[524] Maurus Reinkowski, "The State's Security and the Subjects' Prosperity: Notions of Order in Ottoman Bureucratic Correspondence (19th Century)," in *Legitimizing the Order: The Ottoman Rhetoric of State Power,* eds. Hakan T. Karateke & Maurus Reinkowski (Brill, Leiden-Boston), 199.
[525] Maurus Reinkowski, "The State's Security," 204.
[526] Anscombe, "Islam and the Age of Ottoman Reform," 159; 164.
[527] Yaycıoğlu, "Guarding Traditions and Laws-Disciplining Bodies," 1578.
[528] Kahraman Şakul has argued that the typology of the new intellectual acting with the intention to save the empire embraced a larger pool from different walks of career. See Kahraman Şakul, "Nizâm-ı Cedid Düşüncesinde Batılılaşma ve İslami Modernleşme," *Divân İlmî Araştırmalar* 19 (2005/2): 129.

authority" (*ulu'l-emre itâ'at*)[529] and and "countering in equal measure" (*mukâbele-i bi'l-misl*).[530]

The radical re-organization and centralization of the empire under Sultan Mahmud II (r. 1808-1839) further contributed to the increased space afforded to religious elements.[531] The pace of his reforms caused his adherence to the Islamic code of justice to be questioned by his Muslim subjects as evidenced by the unrest in the Balkans and Anatolia. Coupled with his military defeats against Mehmed Ali Paşa of Egypt, rumors circulated against him around the public spaces of Istanbul.[532] As noted by one historian, he had thrown the empire into the "most extended existential crisis that the late empire faced."[533]

To recover from his negative image and to legitimize his policies, Mahmud II adopted new strategies such as the establishment of the first official gazette, *Takvîm-i Vekâyi',* in 1831.[534] This new venue was introduced to the wider audience in familiar

---

[529] Ubeydullah Kuşmânî's (d. 1808) *Zebîre-i Kuşmânî fî ta'rîfî nizâmı İlhâmî* was particularly striking in connecting the necessity of reform to the religious stipulation to obey those in positions of authority (*ulu'l-emre itâ'at*), an argument also utilized by Şeyhülislam Yâsincizâde Abdülvehhâb Efendi (d. 1833). He wrote a pamphlet in Arabic and Turkish, entitled *Hulâsatü'l-burhân fî itâ'ati's-sultân,* compiling twenty-five *hadith* on the same idea after the dissolution of the Janissaries in 1831-32/1247. See Tufan Buzpınar, *Hilafet ve Saltanat: II. Abdülhamid Döneminde Halifelik ve Araplar* (İstanbul: Alfa Yayınları, 2016).

[530] This principle was based on the 126th verse in *Sura al-Nahl* in the Qur'an, which enforced the Muslims to counter the infidel enemies with the same weapons and methods. It had significance both as a legitimizing religious discourse by political theologians especially during the reign of Mahmud II and for taking the military training in Europe as a model. See Mehmet Beşikçi, "Askeri Modernleşme, Askeri Disiplin ve Din: Düzenli Kitle Orduları Çağında Osmanlı Ordusu'nda Tabur İmamları," *Akademik İncelemeler Dergisi* 11, no. 1 (2016): 1-33. 6; Şakul, 120. Ethan L. Menchinger has further followed the transformation of this phrase within the Ottoman intellectual discourse from a context of mere technological imitation into a "conceptual tool" for reform. For further details, see Ethan L. Menchinger, "Intellectual Creativity in a Time of Turmoil and Transition," in *Wiley-Blackwell History of Islam and Islamic Civilization,* ed. Armando Salvatore (John Hopkins University Press, 2016), 467.

[531] For a revisionist review of the policies and reforms of Mahmud II, see Anscombe, *State, Faith and Nation.*

[532] Cengiz Kırlı, *Sultan ve Kamuoyu: Osmanlı Modernleşme Sürecinde 'Havadis Jurnalleri': 1840-1844* (İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2008). Mahmud II was openly called the "infidel sultan" in 1837 for violating the sharia in the minds of many Muslims and Mehmed Ali Paşa was perceived as the better alternative. See Virginia Aksan, *Ottoman Wars 1700-1870: An Empire Besieged* (London and New York: Routledge, 2013), 365-367; Anscombe*, State, Faith and Nation.*

[533] Anscombe, *State, Faith and Nation*, 10.

[534] For a discussion of different incidents of religious legitimization for the Ottoman Sultans: Hakan Karateke, "Opium for the Subjects? Religiosity as a Legitimizing Factor fort the Ottoman Sultan," in

and acceptable terms as in benefiting the subjects of the empire.[535] In addition, the promotion of specifically Sunni-Hanafi Islamic norms by the Ottoman elite was evident first and foremost through their Nakshbandi-Mujaddidi links.[536] The new army, as already noticeable in the name given to it, *Asâkir-i Mansûre-i Muhammediyye* (The Victorious Soldiers of Muhammad), was also imbued with a strong dose of the Sunni-Hanafi rhetoric as in the assignment of Islamic religious primers (*ilmihâls*) as compulsory reading, the construction of mosques, the collectively performed ritual prayers and the appointment of *imams* to every military battalion.[537]

The secondary literature on the Tanzimat period is also replete with examples of a dominating Islamic discourse. The Gülhane Rescript of 1839 was to a large extent shaped by Islamic vocabulary and the traditional Islamic concepts of governance.[538] Tanzimat reforms were "fundamentally shaped by and for Muslim interests[539]" to heal divisions within the Muslim society. Moreover, the early educational acts also served as declarations of the hybridization of basic religious discourse with “wordly-practical" functions.[540] As Akşin Somel argues, Islam was "too much of a natural component" of Ottoman culture before the 1870s to argue for a binary between modernization and Islam.[541]

Legitimizing the Order: The Ottoman Rhetoric of State Power, eds. Hakan T. Karateke and Marcus Reinkowski (Brill, Leiden-Boston, 2005), 111-130.

[535] Anonymous, *Takvîm-i Vekâyi‘,* 1, 1831.

[536] Butrus Abu Manneh, "The Naqshbandiyya-Mujaddidiyya in the Ottoman Lands in the Early 19th Century," *Die Welt des Islams*, 22, no. 1–4 (1982): 1-36.

[537] The active role of these *imams* of the battalions lasted until the end of the Ottoman Empire. In this context, Beşikçi has argued that an Islamic indoctrination as deemed proper by political authority was not simply a legitimizing act for the reform policies of the Sultan, but that religious agents had become legitimate on their own right. Beşikçi, 8.

[538] Manneh, "The Islamic Roots of the Gülhane Rescript," 184.

[539] Anscombe, "Islam and the Age of Ottoman Reform," 160.

[540] Somel*, The Modernization of Public Education*, 25.

[541] Somel*, The Modernization of Public Education*, 2.

In parallel to the heightened religious framework, a pragmatic discourse on the "new sciences" transmitted via translations from European languages penetrated into the Ottoman Empire in the late 1790s and early 1800s.[542] Their newness, however, had nothing to do with their relevance to the rational sciences. Fields such as mathematics, geography, astronomy and medicine had already been well-studied in the Ottoman-Islamic intellectual tradition in and outside of the madrasas.[543] Recent scholarship, moreover, has pointed at their vivacity up to the eighteenth century.[544] Studies have also noted the Ottoman awareness of the advances in the European sciences, as evident in the beginning of translations into Turkish in the seventeenth century.[545]

---

[542] Darina Martykanova, *Reconstructing Ottoman Engineers: Archeology of a Profession (1789-1914)* (Pisa: Pisa University Press, 2010), 127.

[543] In support of this view, see, for instance, Gottfried Hagen, "The Order of Knowledge, the Knowledge of Order," in *The Cambridge Histpry of Turkey, Vol. 2, The Ottoman Empire as a World Power, 1453-1603, eds.* Suraiya Faroqhi and Kate Fleet (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

[544] Khalid el-Rouayheb, *The Myth of 'The Triumph of Fanaticism' in the Seventeenth-Century Ottoman Empire. Die Welt des Islams 48 (2008):* 196-221; Khalid el-Rouayheb, *Islamic Intellectual History in the Seventeenth Century: Scholarly Currents in the Ottoman Empire and the Maghreb* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015); B. Harun Küçük, "Early Modern Ottoman Science: A New Materialist Framework," *Journal of Early Modern History 21*, no. 5 (2017): 407-419; B. Harun Küçük, "Early Enlightenment in Istanbul," (PhD Diss., University of California, San Diego, 2012); Miri Shefer-Mossensohn, *Science Among the Ottomans: The Cultural Creation and Exchange of Knowledge* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2015).

[545] See Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, "Tanzimat Öncesi ve Tanzimat Dönemi Osmanlı Bilim ve Eğitim Anlayışı," in *150. Yılında Tanzimat*, ed. Hakkı Dursun Yıldız (Ankara, 1992), 335-395; Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, "Modernization Efforts in Science, Technology and Industry in the Ottoman Empire (18-l9th Centuries)," in *The Introduction of Modern Science and Technology to Turkey and Japan: International Symposium October 7 11, 1996,* eds. Feza Günergun & Shigehisa Kuriyama (Kyoto: International Research Center for Japanese Studies, 1998), 15-35; Miri Shefer-Mossensohn, "An Ottoman Physician and His Social and Intellectual Milieu: The Case of Salih bin Nasrallah Ibn Sallum," *Studia Islamica 1* (2011): 133-158; Gottfried Hagen, "The Order of Knowledge, the Knowledge of Order," in *The Cambridge History of Turkey, Vol. 2, The Ottoman Empire as a World Power, 1453-1603, eds.* Suraiya Faroqhi and Kate Fleet (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012); Gottfried Hagen, *Ein osmanischer Geograph bei der Arbeit: Entstehung und Gedankenwelt von Katip Celebi's Cihannuma* (Berlin: Klaus Schwarz, 2003); Gottfried Hagen, "Atlas and Papamonta as Sources of Knowledge and Power," In *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi'nin Yazılı Kaynakları,* eds. Hatice Aynur and Hakan Karateke (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2012); Gottfried Hagen, "Some Considerations on the Study of Ottoman Geographical Writing," *Archivum Ottomanicum 18* (2000): 183-191; Bekir Harun Küçük, "New Medicine and the Hikmet-i Tabiiyye Problematic in Eighteenth-Century Istanbul," In *Texts in Transit in the Medieval Mediterranean,* eds. Tzvi Langermann and Robert Morrison (Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2016).

What rendered the late eighteenth and early nineteenth-century context different was the utilitarian aspect of these new sciences, especially the military ones, for Ottoman reform. The utilitarian spirit or the diffusion of useful knowledge had also been a guiding force in England in the nineteenth century. In that context, useful knowledge referred to "the good, solid, employable facts," which could be "applied in the workshop and on the railway line, to produce goods more cheaply and efficiently, to communicate and transport more swiftly."[546] The new sciences were thus viewed as a "useful category" for Ottoman state reform, as tools and weapons to counter the Western threat with their own tools.[547] In this vein, the author of *Sekbanbaşı Risâlesi* and Ubeydullah Kuşmânî (d. 1808) defended the necessity of modern military sciences and employed the Qur'anic verses and *hadith* in defense against the critics.[548] This necessity was further underlined in a proposal for the Imperial School of Military Engineering by Ignatius Mouradgea D'Ohsson (d. 1807) in 1794, who stated that what ensured victory in battles was not the number of soldiers, but expertise over the science of warfare.[549] The strictly utilitarian tone of the Ottoman import of European sciences was observed by J.V. C. Smith; he noted in 1854 that even when the Ottoman state sponsored sciences like medicine, it was for immediate needs, rather than for "the sake of the diffusive good that would result to the people from introducing skillful practitioners".[550]

It should also be mentioned that rather than being readily imported into the Ottoman context, the meaning of the new sciences was in the process of making for

[546] Richard D. Altick, *The English Common Reader: A Social History of the Mass Reading Public 1800-1900* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), 129-140.
[547] Berrak Burçak, "Modenization, Science and Engineering in the Early Nineteenth Century Ottoman Empire," *Middle Eastern Studie*s 44, no. 1 (Jan. 2008): 69.
[548] *Sekbanbaşı Risâlesi* is also known as *Hulâsatü'l-kelâm fî reddi'l-avâm*. Its authorship is debated. Beydilli, "Küçük Kaynarca'dan Tanzimat'a," 36.
[549] Beydilli, *Türk Bilim ve Matbaacılık,* 29.
[550] Smith, *Turkey and the Turks,* 133.

the Ottomans as for others in the course of the nineteenth century. It would be the transmitting agents, hereby the Ottoman bureaucrats, who defined it in varying ways "to establish, expand or protect their authority and autonomy."[551] Hence the discourse on science was rendered useful and beneficial by the rising new socio-political elite in the Ottoman Empire, who had been exposed to a European education or European languages, in an effort to legitimize their new hold over state ranks.[552] For instance, in 1830, Hüsrev Paşa defined the sciences taught at the Imperial School of Military Engineering as the type "needed" by the empire. The "new" and the "needed", as such, were increasingly one and the same. In the meantime, the same socio-political elite serving in state ranks and shaping educational reform also became the agents in authoring, translating or commissioning the related textbooks.

The new knowledge and technology, as they made their way into the Ottoman scholarly discourse, were subsumed under an Islamic terminology such as *ilm*, *hikmet*, *ma'ârif*, *fen* and *san'at*.[553] Especially *ulûm* and *fünûn* were interchangeably used. What seemed as a conceptual confusion in official documents, as İsmail Kara argues, was in fact the manifestation of a deliberate strategy to unite the new sciences under the symbolism of the religious sciences.[554] One of the first students of the Imperial School of Military Engineering, Seyyid Mustafa already claimed in 1803 that the adoption of the Western sciences did not run counter to Islam.[555] As the new

[551] Alper Yalçınkaya, *Learned Patriots: Debating Science, State and Society in the Nineteenth Century Ottoman Empire* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2016), 5.
[552] Yalçınkaya, *Learned Patriots*, 94.
[553] There were many overlaps in the usage of such terms; "*talebe-i ulûm*", for instance, traditionally employed for madrasa students would also be used for *Dârülfünûn* students. İsmail Kara. "Modernleşme Dönemi Türkiyesi'nde 'Ulum, Fünun' ve 'Sanat' Kavramlarının Algılanışı," in *Din ile Modernleşme Arasında* (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2018), 119-188.
[554] Kara, "Modernleşme Dönemi Türkiyesi'nde," 122.
[555] The book in French was entitled *Diatribe de l'ingenieur Seid Moustapha sur l'etat actuel de l'art militaire, du genie, et des sciences a Constantinople.* It was printed at the Imperial Press in Üsküdar in 1803. It was also printed in France twice in 1807 and 1810. For further details, see Kemal Beydilli, *İlk Mühendislerimizden Seyyid Mustafa ve Nizâm-ı Cedîd'e Dair Risalesi* (İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1987).

bureaucrats gained prominence among state ranks and penned the main administrative texts of the Tanzimat period, their representation of new knowledge would also become official.[556]

The fluidity of these epistemological discourses was manifested in the new educational structuring of the nineteenth century. On the one hand, new schools had been established to embody new knowledge, as it appealed to the pragmatic needs of the Ottoman State. On the other hand, the traditional Islamic knowledge continued to thrive in both the madrasas and the other informal locations of Ottoman education. Yet, the lines between both the structure and the contents of education in these different types of institutions were blurred. [557] At least for the first half of the nineteenth century, it would not be accurate to speak of a cultural duality deriving from "the epistemological disjuncture" between the two types of knowledge.[558] The fluidity in education, in turn, allows us to contextualize the different strands of textbooks printed by the Ottoman state under the rubric of benefit and utility.

3.3 Revisiting Ottoman education through textbooks

At the juncture of these different discourses adopted by the state at the turn of the nineteenth century stood the Ottoman approach to education, which was conceived as an urgent leg of reform early on. An overview of the scholarship on the history of Ottoman education in the first half of the nineteenth century displays the

[556] Yalçınkaya, *Learned Patriots,* 44.
[557] Somel, *Modernization of Public Education*; Benjamin Fortna, *The Imperial Classroom: Islam, the State and Education in the Late Ottoman Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).
[558] Classic examples of scholars who claimed such a cultural duality include Niyazi Berkes, Bernard Lewis and a more recent generation of the same line of thinking, Fatma Müge Göçek, *Rise of the Bourgeoisie, Demise of Empire: Ottoman Westernization and Social Change* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 73. Göçek argued here that whereas Islamic knowledge had been embedded in the moral system of religion emphasizing the significance of the community, scientific knowledge of the West was founded on scientific thinking and organized around the rational individual. A more recent study continuing the same strand of scholarship is Banu Turnaoğlu, *The Formation of Turkish Republicanism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2017).

predominance of institutional history.[559] The institutionalization and compartmentalization of education is, in fact, legible only in retrospect, when it did become more associated with the confines of specific locations. For the time interval falling under the concerns of this dissertation, the idea of education was fluid, rather than institutional. This chapter argues that the direction of educational policies can be "read" through shared texts/textbooks, which reflected the fluidity of the discourse more realistically than the hard boundaries of physical buildings. The dissemination of textbooks, in turn, was made possible through the reproductive powers of the printing press. Hence this section will delve into the pragmatic and experimental nature of educational policies up to the mid-nineteenth century insofar as it related to the formation of a curriculum and incorporated textbooks, all of which led to the increasing utilization of the printing press.

3.3.1 Development of an educational discourse

The basic institutions of education in the Ottoman-Islamic tradition, the elementary (*sıbyan*) schools and the madrasas, had never been singularly authoritative in this largely decentralized system. Neither did they lose their significance as legitimate

[559] See Osman Nuri Ergin, *Türk Maarif Tarihi* (İstanbul: Eser Matbaası, 1977); Yahya Akyüz, *Türk Eğitim Tarihi (Başlangıçtan 1999'a)* (İstanbul: Alfa, 1999); Yahya Akyüz, "Tanzimat Dönemi'nde Eğitim Biliminde ve Öğretim Yöntemlerinde Gelişmeler," *Tanzimat'ın 150. Yıldönümü Uluslararası Sempozyumu Ankara: 31 Ekim-3 Kasım 1989* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1994); Ekmeleddin Ihsanoğlu, "Modernization Efforts in Science, Technology and Industry in the Ottoman Empire (18-l9th Centuries)", 15-35, in *The Introduction of Modern Science and Technology to Turkey and Japan: International Symposium October 7 11, 1996*, eds. Feza Günergun and Shigehisa Kuriyama (Kyoto: International Research Center for Japanese Studies, 1998); Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, "Tanzimat Öncesi ve Tanzimat Dönemi Osmanlı Bilim ve Eğitim Anlayışı," in *150. Yılında Tanzimat*, ed. Hakkı Dursun Yıldız (Ankara, 1992), 335-395; Bayram Kodaman, *Abdülhamid Devri Eğitim Sistemi* (Istanbul, 1980); Seyfi Kenan, "Türk Eğitim Düşüncesi ve Deneyiminin Dönüm Noktaları Üzerine bir Çözümleme," *Osmanlı Araştırmaları* XLI (2013): 1-31; Selim İlkin, İlhan Tekeli, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Eğitim ve Bilgi Üretim Sisteminin Oluşumu ve Dönüşümü* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1993); Necdet Sakaoğlu, *Osmanlı Eğitim Tarihi* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1991); Faik Reşit Unat, *Türk Eğitim Sisteminin Gelişmesine Tarihi Bir Bakış* (Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, 1964).

components of the educational network at least until 1869.[560] At the same time, mosques, Sufi lodges and private residences *(konaks)* also constituted spaces of shared knowledge disseminated among religious scholars, civil bureaucrats and even commoners.[561] The institutional fluidity was best expressed in instances when many prestigious scholars lectured interchangeably at each of these venues[562]; the Nakshbandi sheikh, Mehmed Murad Molla, taught the *Mesnevî* at his lodge, but also delivered the Friday sermons at the Sultanahmet mosque.[563] Evidence from autobiographies and *ijazas* reveals that the texts exchanged covered a diversity of subjects including classical logic, Arabic and Persian languages and poetry. At the same venues, classical texts of philosophy, which constituted a core rational science in the Ottoman tradition, were taught. Fatih mosque, in specific, was a central setting for the gathering of scholarly circles, where texts of logic (*ilm-i mantık)* such as *Burhân-ı Gelenbevî* and *Tasdîkât* were taught.[564] Cevdet Paşa also noted that aside from these courses, he studied books of arithmetics, mathematics and astronomy, philosophy in the "old style" (*tarz-ı kadîm üzere)* on his off days.[565] At the same time, he was tutored in the new sciences that were being translated from European languages.[566] Complementing the fluidity of educational settings was, therefore, the

---

[560] Somel, *Modernization of Public Education*, 15.
[561] Konrad Hirschler, *The Written Word in the Medieval Arabic Lands: A Social and Cultural History of reading Practices* (Edinburgh University Press, 2011): Jonathan Berkey, *Popular Preaching and Religious Authority in the Medieval Islamic Near East* (USA: University of Washington Press, 2001); Hatice Kelpetin Arpaguş, *Osmanlı Halkının Geleneksel İslam Anlayışı* (İstanbul: Çamlıca Yayınları, 2001), 58-66.
[562] See Ahmed Cevdet Efendi's account of the sessions at Fatih mosque. *Tezâkir 40-Tetimme,* ed. Cavid Baysun (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991), 7-15.
[563] Ahmed Cevdet Efendi mentioned that he studied Persian with Hafız Tevfik Efendi and *Mesnevî* with Sheikh Mehmed Murad Molla and received his *ijaza*. He also studied the *dîvâns* of Şevket and Urfî with the poet Süleyman Fehim Efendi at his konak in Karagümrük and studied *tefsîr* with Kuşadalı İbrahim Efendi at his konak. Ahmet Cevdet, *Tezâkir 40-Tetimme,* 13.
[564]Ahmet Cevdet, *Tezâkir 40-Tetimme,* 11.
[565] Ahmet Cevdet, *Tezâkir 40-Tetimme,* 7.
[566] Ahmed Cevdet Efendi explained how he taught the instructor at *Hendesehâne-i Berriye*, Miralay Nuri Bey *Muhtasaru'l-Me'ânî* and *Kadı Mîr*, and in turn, studied "according to new methods" (*usûl-i cedîde üzere)* logorithms, mathematics, calculation, geometry with him and read *Mecmû'atü'l-mühendisîn*, *Oktant Risâlesi* and İshak Efendi's *Ulûm-ı riyâziyye*. Ahmed Cevdet Efendi, 7.

fluidity of studied texts. This dissertation reinforces this view by arguing that the type of knowledge traditionally transmitted by these venues continued and even acquired greater significance between 1831 and 1863 as represented in the list of printed book titles.

At the same time, in parallel to the larger agenda of the Ottoman state to keep up with the military and diplomatic skills of the European powers, systematic and centralized schooling emerged in the nineteenth century. In fact, not only in the Ottoman Empire, but overall in Europe, the nineteenth century was the first time that "schooling itself became a feature of state."[567] To this audience, education stood out as "a god and an engine of progress."[568] As the state monopolized education, all relations between the schooling system, society and state were radically transformed.[569]

The early efforts by Ottoman reformers to establish a network of new schools were piecemeal, limited to a few locations, pioneered by the first generation of Ottoman diplomats trained in Europe, and advised by foreigners. The bureaucratic turn of the empire under the restructuring of Mahmud II and Abdülmecid (r. 1839-1861) rendered new councils responsible for overseeing the reforms on education; the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances (*Meclis-i Vâlâ-yı Ahkâm-ı Adliyye)* in 1838*, (Mekâtib-i Rüşdiye Nezâreti)* in 1839, Temporary Council (*Meclis-i Muvakkat)* in 1845*,* Council of Public Education *(Meclis-i Ma'ârif-i Umûmiyye)* in 1846 and the Directorate of Public Schools (*Mekâtib-i Umûmiyye Nezâreti)* in 1846.[570] Following

[567] See James Van Horn Melton, *Absolutism and the Eighteenth-Century Origins of Compulsory Schooling in Prussia and Austria* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), xxii. Also see Andy Green, *Education and State Formation: Europe, East Asia and the USA* (UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 11.
[568] Harvey J. Graff, *The Legacies of Literacy. Continuities and Contradictions in Western Culture and Society* (Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis, 1987), 261.
[569] Green, *Education and State Formation*, 12.
[570] For a detailed survey of the institutionalization of education under the Ministry of Public Education in this period and after, see Teyfur Erdoğdu, "Maarif-i Umumiye Nezareti Teşkilatı I," *Ankara*

the 1856 Reform Edict, the diversifying school network required more systematic monitoring, which resulted in the formation of the Ministry of Public Education (*Ma'ârif-i Umûmiyye Nezâreti)* and many specialized inter-communal educational councils. [571]

The solid steps to restructure education as a whole were taken by the report of the Temporary Council in 1845 shortly following the edict of Sultan Abdülmecid.[572] This date was also pinpointed by Abdolonyme Ubicini (d. 1884) as a time when "the Government perceived the necessity of a radical change and improvement."[573] The report of the Council served to enforce education at three levels; *sıbyan* schools for young children,[574] *rüşdiyes*[575] for ages 10 and up and finally *Dârülfünûn,* as the university.[576] The 1845 report also rendered the *sıbyan* schools obligatory without much qualitative change. Opening for the first time as pilot schools in 1847, *rüşdiye*s received considerably more attention than the *sıbyan* schools, a practice criticized by

---

Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi 51, no. 1 (1996); Teyfur Erdoğdu, "Maarif-i Umumiye Nezareti Teşkilatı: İdari Teşkilat Açısından" (Masters Thesis, Istanbul University, 1995); Ali Akyıldız, "Maarif-i Umumiye Nezareti," in *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi,* Vol. 27 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2003), 273-274.

[571] The official chronicler, Lütfi Efendi, while explaining the foundation of the Ministry of Public Education, acknowledged its significance for the progress and expansion of the sciences and knowledge (*ulûm ve ma'ârif*). Yet he traced its roots to *Meşîhat*, which had served and regulated education for centuries. The establishment of the Ministry, hence, was tradition in a new dress. Ahmed Lütfi Efendi, *Vaka'a-nüvis Ahmed Lütfî Efendi Tarihi*, vol. IX, ed. Münir Aktepe (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1983), 133.

[572] Mahmut Cevat bin eş-Şeyh Nafi*, Maârif-i Umûmiye Nezâreti tarihçe-i teşkilat ve icraâtı: XIX. asır Osmanlı Maarif Tarihi* (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 2001).

[573] M.A. Ubicini, *Letters on Turkey: An Account of the Religious, Political, Social and Commercial Conditions of the Ottoman Empire*, trans. Lady Easthope (London: John Muray, 1856), 191-192.

[574] Ubicini reported that there were 396 mektebs in Constantinople in 1852 with 22.700 pupils. See Ubicini, 200. The same statistics are repeated by Hyde Clark (p.512) as quoted from M. Heuschling- except that he mentions the year as 1850. Hyde Clark adds that this must be the number of schools for all sects; in 1860, the official return was 279 Mussulman (sıbyan) schools with 9975 boys and 6787 girls, hence a total of 16,752 students. For rüşdiyes, 10 schools existed in Constantinople in 1850 and it increased to 13 in 1859. By 1862, Clark argued that there had to be at least 13 rüşdiyes in Constantinople. Hyde Clark, 531.

[575] The courses taught in rüşdiyes were Arabic syntax and grammar, orthography, composition and style, sacred history, Ottoman history, universal history, geography, arithmetic, geometry. See Ubicini, *Letters on Turkey,* 201.

[576] For details on Dârülfünûn, Mehmet Ali Ayni, *Darü'l-fünun Tarihi* (Istanbul: Yeni Matbaa, 1927); Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, *Darülfünun* (İstanbul: IRCICA, 2010)

Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, who complained in *Tezâkir* that the Ottomans had begun educational reform from the middle of the system.[577]

It was in the aftermath of reports submitted by related councils that we find the formation of a mixed discourse of religious and practical topics in education. The 1824-25 imperial edict of Mahmud II, for instance, was the first such instance where religious precepts were intercepted with "worldly" punishment, or means of social disciplining, as articulated by Akşin Somel.[578] All official declarations repeatedly drew on themes such as the acquisition of beneficial knowledge (*iktisâb-ı ma'ârif-i nâfi'a),* the study of the religious sciences (*tahsîl-i ulûm-ı dîniyye*) and annihilating ignorance (*izâle-i cehl-i teba'a)* to legitimize the educational reforms after 1845.[579] Hereby, religious and beneficial knowledge were together conceived as a means to combat ignorance. Similarly, the 1845 report of the Temporary Council addressing the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances emphasized the function of new schools, namely the *sıbyan* schools and *rüşdiyes,* as teaching the "necessary" sciences *(ta'allümü zarûrî olan ulûm ve fünûna mekseb)* for the benefit of the general public (*umûm nâs için)* within the sphere of religion (*usûl-i dîniyye dâiresinde*).[580] Both in Istanbul and as expanded into the provinces, the new educational institutions would ultimately serve the wider official agenda of instilling in students love of their country and patriotism (*hubb-ı vatan)*

This wider agenda also resulted in more direct expressions of the link between the needs of education and the printing press. We can perceive this link through two complementary channels; internal correspondences of state mechanisms,

[577] Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, *Tezâkir 1-12*, 10.
[578] Somel, *Modernization of Public Education*, 26.
[579] Mahmut Cevat bin eş-Şeyh Nafi, *Maârif-i Umûmiye Nezâreti târihçe-i teşkîlât ve icrââtı: XIX. Asır Osmanlı Maarif Tarihi* (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 2002), 25.
[580] Mahmut Cevat, *Maârif-i Umûmiye Nezâreti,* 27.

and public notices through *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'*. First, the internal correspondences of the Ottoman state reveal some formulas that became generic over the decades. These formulas, interestingly, were based on the same concepts voiced by İbrahim Müteferrika through his manifesto for printing in 1727.[581] A circular relationship was constructed between the printing press, the increase in the number of books and the expansion of learning. For instance, the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances ruled in 1853 that the primary purpose of printing books was to facilitate the expansion of the sciences.[582] Similar statements followed in 1854, when a new regulation clearly marked printing as a craft (*san'at*) worthy of much praise and with much benefit for the accumulation and expansion of knowledge (*ma'ârif*) of all humans.[583] Moreover, in 1862, a commission consisting of Ahmed Cevdet, Ahmed Kemal and Ahmed Vefik confirmed that the real intention for the establishment of the printing enterprise was the expansion of beneficial publications and to advance general education (*terbiye-i umûmiyye*).[584] These views were echoed by a deliberation at the Council of Public Education in 1864; the rise in the number of the printing presses facilitated the access of students (*erbâb-ı tahsîl)* to books and treatises that would attest to the expansion of knowledge.[585] The officials similarly emphasized their use and benefit, as books were transferred into the printed medium; in 1847, the director of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hane-i Âmire* asserted that the expansion of the benefits of a book *(fevâid-i mündericesinin neşri ve ta'allümü)* on agriculture,

[581] See Introduction for a brief discussion of İbrahim Müteferrika.
[582] "*...kütüb tab'ından murâd-ı aslî ulûm-ı âlînin intişârını teshîl etmek niyet-i hayriyyesine mebnî olduğundan..."* İ.MVL 279/10924, 5 Cemâziyelâhir 1269 (16 March 1853).
[583] HR.TO 418/227, 22 Cemâziyelevvel 1270 (20 February 1854).
[584] İ.DUİT 136/42, Receb 1278 (January 1862).
[585] "*...matba'anın teksîri terakkî-i neşr-i fünûn ve ma'lûmatı delîl-i mahsûs olan kütüb ve resâilin erbâb-ı tahsîl için teshîl-i tedârik ve istihsâlini müeddî olacağını derkâr olarak..'"* İ.MVL 501/22688, 11 Şaban 1280 (21 January 1864).

Beyt-i dihkânî, depended on the reproduction of its copies through the printing press (*tab‘ ve temsîl ile nüshasının teksîr ve tevfîrine mütevakkıf*).[586]

Second, printing was exalted also through public notices. Many printed books contained prefaces praising the role of sultans such as Sultan Abdülmecid (r. 1839-1861) as the perpetuators of education and the sciences with reference to his patronage of many books translated from the European languages.[587] The same mission was ascribed to various articles published in *Takvîm-i Vekâyi‘,* which corroborated that the printing press was valuable for the Ottoman state insofar as it facilitated the access of students to textbooks by reproducing them in sufficient numbers and thereby decreasing their sales prices.[588]

3.3.2 The development of school curricula and shared textbooks

The teaching system at the Ottoman madrasas was traditionally based on the completion of specific textbooks, which nevertheless could vary according to time, location and teacher.[589] In this sense, it would not be wrong to say that Ottoman medreses before the nineteenth century did not have a standard curriculum in the modern sense.[590] The consolidation of a "textbook" culture, this study contends, was

[586] İ.MVL 99/2119, 28 Cemâziyelevvel 1263 (14 May 1847). Hayrullah Efendi, *Beyt-i dihkânî* (İstanbul: Dârü’t-Tıbâ‘ati’l-Âmire, 1264).
[587] İ.DH 339/22311, 11 Cemâziyelevvel 1267 (14 March 1851). This document refers to the compilation, translation and printing of books on many sciences during the reign of Sultan Abdülmecid.
[588] See, for example, Anonymous, "Fünûn," Takvîm-i Vekâyi‘ (Gurre-i Zilhicce 1269), 4.: " ...fenn-i tab‘ın vaz‘ından maksûd ber-vechi suhûlet kütüb ve resâilin teksîri ile beraber tahsîl-i ulûm ve ma‘ârife hâhiş-ger olan zevât lüzûmu olan kitâbın tedârikinde suhûbet çekmemek için ehven bahâ ile alınıp satılması kaziyyesi olub..." More examples include Anonymous, Takvîm-i Vekâyi‘ (25 Zilhicce 1274); Anonymous, "Fünûn," Takvîm-i Vekâyi‘, no. 604 (26 Cemâziyelevvel 1277), 4; Anonymous, Takvîm-i Vekâyi‘ (17 Zilhicce 1247); Anonymous, Takvîm-i Vekâyi‘ (24 Safer 1248); Anonymous, Takvîm-i Vekâyi‘, no. 324, (11 Rebîülevvel 1263).
[589] Cevad İzgi, in particular, details these sources with regard to school curriculums and textbooks until the eighteenth century. See Cevad İzgi, *Osmanlı Medreselerinde İlim* (İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık, 1997).
[590] Francis Robinson warned that by late seventeenth century, the idea of a curriculum referred to a list of books rather than "a carefully constructed pattern of learning". Francis Robinson, "Ottoman-

an outcome of the centralized educational policies of the nineteenth century. As a growing schooling network was established to empower the Ottoman state agenda, it had to be complemented by standardized practical teaching equipment such as the globe and books.[591] In other words, educational reform created the textbook in a stricter sense and rendered the printing press a meaningful medium in meeting the demand for them in mass.

Moreover, the "making" of textbooks in the nineteenth century was itself a gradually emerging, joint enterprise of the educational policies, deliberations at various administrative councils and the printing press. The unique constellation of these factors in the nineteenth century, in other words, would re-define the context and need for the textbook. In the late 1830s, however, these "guides" did not yet meet the expectations of a modern educational system. The American missionary bishop Horace Southgate remarked that:

> ...when the schools commenced, there was an almost entire destitution of the requisite textbooks. Some of a temporary and imperfect character have been prepared and are used in manuscript. Others have been prepared and are used in manuscript. Others have been translated, almost exclusively from the French and printed at the royal presses…[592]

The archival references and the prefaces to some books printed before 1863 would describe them as "useful" material for the learning of students in specific schools.[593]

Safavids-Mughal: Shared Knowledge and Connective Systems," *Journal of Islamic Studies* 8, no. 2 (1997): 153.

[591] In an effort to complement the more practical aspects of books on geography at *rüşdiyes*, Kemal Efendi, the Director of Public Schools ordered maps and model globes *(küre)* from Europe as teaching material displaying the cities, rivers and all unique geographic characteristics of all states. See İ.DH 238/14391, 9 Şevval 1267 (7 August 1851). "*…her bir devletin makarr-ı saltanatını ve bi'l-cümle memâlik ve meşhur şehir ve nehirler ve coğrafyaca dâir lüzumlu şeyler gösterilerek…"* Also see İ.MVL 198/6146, 25 Rebîülâhir 1266 (10 March 1850).

[592] Horatio Southgate, *Narrative of a Tour Through Armenia, Kurdistan, Persia and Mesapotamia*, Vol. I (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1840), 85.

[593] For example, the miralay of Mekteb-i İdâdî, Ibrahim Paşa's Emsile-i Arabiyye specifically addressed the students of idâdîs in the preface of the book. İbrahim Paşa*, Emsile-i Arabiyye*, (İstanbul: Mekteb-i Harbiyye-i Şâhâne Matbaası, 1263).

Towards the last quarter of the nineteenth century, however, the function rendered on textbooks (*ders kitâbı*) by the Ottoman state would become more direct as "extremely useful indicators of the state's stance towards its citizens/subjects".[594] In other words, education and textbooks would serve a more ideological purpose for state policy. In a striking example, Mehmed Tahir Paşa explained in the preface to his book printed in 1863, that even though the subject of mechanics (*ilm-i cerr-i eskâl)* had been taught at the Military School for years, the students did not have a textbook and hence had to contend with their class notes. Due to their heavy workload, however, they did not have time to compile their *mecmû'as,* which was why he had brought together this concise textbook.[595] This example indicated the changing patterns of textual learning; a ready-made and reproduced textbook was handy and became necessary, as the school structure transformed.

What were these textbooks? How could they be classified? One obvious answer lies in the continuity between the titles sought in the manuscript culture and those printed in the first decades of the nineteenth century. The hybridization between different discourses adopted by the Ottoman state in education enabled the old to survive, while introducing the new. This further pointed to a pool of shared texts that transcended ideological barriers. In the early nineteenth century, while the traditional schools gradually incorporated more practical courses, the curriculum of the new institutions revealed many traditional courses and textbooks.

At the foundational level, we find the 1839 report of the Director of *Rüşdiye* Schools *(Mekâtib-i Rüşdiye Nezâreti),* İmamzâde Esad Efendi (d. 1851) that the elementary (*sıbyan*) schools were to teach only the Qur'an through memorization and

[594] Benjamin Fortna, *Learning to Read in the Late Ottoman Empire and the Early Turkish Republic* (U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 15.
[595] Bostanizâde Mehmed Tahir Paşa*, İlm-i cerr-i eskâl* (İstanbul: Mekteb-i Harbiyye-i Cenâb-ı Mülûkâne Basmahânesi Litografya, 1279).

recitation.[596] At the same time, an upper level of schooling was designed as *selâtîn-i izâm* schools with the intent to integrate the teaching of more practical, literary compositions, dictionaries such as *Tuhfe-i Vehbî, Nuhbe-i Vehbî, Sübha-i sıbyân*, *ilmihâls* such as *Risâle-i Birgivî* and books of ethics and calligraphy. This proposal of the Council of Public Works (*Meclis-i Nâfi'a)* was not received well on the grounds that the level of students would not suffice for the comprehension of related texts.[597] Still, the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances agreed that at least in some *selâtîn-i izâm* schools, some foundational training could be provided for skillful students to start with *Emsile, Binâ, Maksûd, İzzî* in morphology (*sarf*) and move onto *Avâmil* from syntax (*nahiv).* Depending on their level of success, the students could then be taught in the texts mentioned above.[598] With the 1846 report of the Council of Public Education, the primer (*elifbâ), ilmihâls*, vocalized texts and *Risâle-i Ahlâk*[599] would be added to this program.

Education pursued in the madrasas, however, was a continuation from the previous centuries with only minor alterations.[600] For instance, Şeyhülislam Akşehirli Hasan Fehmi Efendi's report in 1869 would reveal a total of 5369 students in 166 madrasas in Istanbul, out of which 3605 were studying Arabic grammar (*sarf* and *nahiv)*, 1101 studying logic (*Fenârî, Tasdîkât and Tasavvurât)*, 287 studying *Akâid,* 108 studying *Kadı Mîr* and 182 studying *Celâl*.[601] Despite suggestions by scholars such as Ali Suavi to include the new sciences into the curriculum, they would not be

[596] Cevat, *Maârif-i Umûmiye Nezâreti,* 21-23.
[597] Cevat, *Maârif-i Umûmiye Nezâreti,* 10-11.
[598] Cevat, *Maârif-i Umûmiye Nezâreti,* 18.
[599] Ahlâk Risâlesi was a textbook written on ethics by Sadık Rifat Paşa that will be covered in the next sections.
[600] The core curriculum at the madrasas consisted of: Arabic morphology and syntax (*sarf ü nahiv),* Arabic rhetoric (*belâgat*), logic (*mantık*), Islamic theology (*kelâm*), and Islamic jurisprudence (*fıkıh*). For comprehensive coverage of these specific courses, see İzgi, *Osmanlı Medreselerinde İlim*; Murat Akgündüz, *Osmanlı Medreseleri: XIX. Asır* (İstanbul: Beyan Yayınları, 2004), 85; Mübahat Kütükoğlu, "1869'da Faal İstanbul Medreseleri," *Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi* (1977): 277-85.
[601] İzgi, *Osmanlı Medreselerinde İlim*, 109.

formalized until the Second Constitutional Era.[602] At the same time, Erbay notes that the new sciences were indeed studied by madrasa students at their personal initiative and there were also madrasa teachers who concentrated on different branches of the new sciences.[603] Moreover, while the textbooks remained largely the same, one cannot argue that the madrasa structure also remained static; the availability of printed textbooks gradually shifted the relation of the student with the text and the teacher.

The curriculum of the new schools, especially in the first few decades, was infiltrated by the traditional madrasa curriculum. The madrasa impact constituted a point of criticism for some reformers of the late Tanzimat period for not being on par with Europe.[604] That is, of course, if a curriculum existed. As Bishop Southgate observed:

> they are modeled after European patterns, while they are managed by men, as is every Turk, uninstructed in European learning, and destitute of European experience. They are, therefore, "without a settled organization". They pass from hand to hand and the system of control changes with the change of governors. There is no trained and experienced mind to regulate the branches of instruction, to test the competency of teachers or to arrange the various parts into one orderly system. Hence changes have been hastily adopted, some departments have been so much curtailed as to be nearly inefficient and little, or permanent utility, has been accomplished. Yet the design is noble and praiseworthy.[605]

Among the new schools, the Imperial School of Military Engineering constituted the earliest case for experimenting with different courses on the new sciences. At the same time, courses on the study of Arabic and Persian were integrated into the

[602] Halil İbrahim Erbay, "Teaching and Learning in the Madrasas of Istanbul During the Late Ottoman Period" (PhD diss., University of London, SOAS, 2009), 32.
[603] Erbay, "Teaching and Learning," 33.
[604] Erbay, "Teaching and Learning," 40-96.
[605] Southgate, *Narrative of a Tour,* 84.

curriculum both with the 1806 regulation[606] and after its restructuring by the director, Bekir Paşa in 1848.[607] Similarly, the curriculum of the Medical School (*Mekteb-i Tıbbiyye*) in 1850-51 included courses on Turkish, Arabic syntax and grammar, French, geography, history, *ilmihâl*, and the rules of reciting the Qur'an.[608] It is important to note that in documents discussing the need to teach classical subjects at new schools, the emphasis was on specific books titles to be taught rather than subjects, mirroring the madrasa tradition.

The structure of the Military School (*Mekteb-i Harbiyye-i Şâhâne)* was especially suitable for the placement of classical texts. Initially, education was

---

[606] In 1794, Mouradgea D'Ohsson reported in the need to teach: mathematics and calculus (*ilm-i hesâb ve'l-cebr*), measurements (*mesâha*), the science of building bridges (*fenn-i inşâ-yı süfün*), marine science (*fenn-i deryâ),* astronomy, drawing, military organization and architecture. French was necessary to facilitate the translations. See Mustafa Kaçar, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Mühendishanelerin Kuruluşu ve Bilim ve Eğitim Anlayışındaki Değişmeler" (PhD diss., İstanbul University, 1994), 86-87. As explained by Kemal Beydilli, the 1806 regulation of the Imperial School of Military Engineering showed a total of four classes, first grade: *resm-i hatt ve imlâ, erkâm*, drawing, Arabic, French, introduction to geometry and accounting (hesab); second grade, ilm-i hesâb ve hendese, geography, Arabic, French; third year, *ilm-i cebir, müsellesât-ı müsteviyye, cebir, tahdîd-i arâzi, military history, fourth: mahrûtiyât, hesâb-ı tefâzulî, hesâb-ı tamâmî, ilm-i cerr-i eskâl, ilm-i heyet, talîm-i asker, ilm-i istihkâmât, ameliyat-ı fenn-i remy ve lağım*. See Mustafa Kaçar, 130-131; Mustafa Kaçar, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Askeri Teknik Eğitimde Modernleşme Çalışmaları ve Mühendishanelerin Kuruluşu (1808'e kadar)," *Osmanlı Bilimi Araştırmaları,* Vol. II, (1998): 69-137; Mustafa Kaçar, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Askeri Sahada Yenileşme Döneminin Başlangıcı," *Osmanlı Bilimi Araştırmaları,* Vol. I (1995): 209-225.

[607] First year (preparatory class): Arabic, Persian, history, geography, arithmetic, geometry, algebra; Second year: mechanics, physics, descriptive geometry, perspective, French, drawing; Third year (artillery class): field fortification, topography, chemistry, permanent fortification, military practice for artillery soldiers, reading on artillery from French books; Third year (architecture class): art of architecture, topography, chemistry, application of mechanics to architecture, architectural drawing, and readings on architecture from French books; Fourth year (artillery class): Artillery maneuver, riding practice, permanent fortification, artillery practice; Fourth year (architecture class): mineralogy, steam production, drawing of buildings, roads, bridges, construction of reservoirs and channels, architectural subjects. See Kolağası Mehmed Esad, *Mir'at-ı Mühendishane-i Berri-yi Hümayun* (İstanbul: İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi Bilim ve Teknoloji Tarihi Araştırma Merkezi, 1986), 79-84; Meltem Akbaş, "The Military March of Physics-I: Physics and Mechanical Sciences in the Curriculum of the 19th Century Ottoman Military Schools," *Osmanlı Bilimi Araştırmaları,* XIII/2 (2012): 70.

[608] Education continued with French, geography, Ottoman history and arithmetic in the third year and French, cosmography, geography, world history, geometry and mathematics in the fourth year and only those students successful in these classes would be able to move onto fifth year to take medical classes. Y. I. Ülman, "Mekteb-i Tıbbiye-i Adliye-i Şahane'nin 1846-1847 öğretim yılı faaliyet raporu," *Yeni Tıp Tarihi Araştırmaları* IV (1998): 145; Y. I. Ülman, "Mekteb-i Tıbbiye'nin 1850-51 öğretim yılı faaliyet raporu ve mezuniyet töreni", *Osmanlı Bilimi Araştırmaları* IV, no.1 (2002): 59; John Mason *Three Years in Turkey: The Journal of a Medical Mission to the Jews* (London: John Snow, 1860), 173-174; Nil Sari, "Mekteb-i Tıbbiye," in Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi, Vol. 29 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2004), 3.

divided into two schools, first of which lasted for eight years. Therein the following texts intersected with the curriculum of the elementary (*sıbyan*) schools and the madrasas*; elifbâ,* the Qur'anic chapter *Amme*, *Şürût-ı İslâmiyye, Tuhfe-i Vehbî, Nuhbe-i Vehbî, Sarf* and *Nahiv* as well as books on the creed of Islam (*akâid-i diniyye),* the virtues of jihad (*fezâil-i cihâd),* the rules of Qur'anic recitation *(kırâat),* numbers and geometry.[609] Since the Military School in this time period largely functioned as a military training ground for soldiers, even the potential illiteracy of the students had to be taken into consideration while designing the curriculum. Hence it reflected a clear preference for religious and grammatical knowledge. Although a detailed program containing many specialized sciences through the second school was determined through the new regulations of the Military School in 1837, one could still not be sure that they were actually taught.[610] It was common for the curriculum to remain on paper in this period. For the teaching of scientific lessons, for instance, the French military attaché, observing the cadets in the Military School, stated in 1838:

> There is not truth in the information published in the Moniteur Ottoman of 15 August 1835 that students are taught trigonometry, algebra and foreign languages. None of these subjects is studied and they do not have a professor of French...prayers occupy...a great part of the day's program and sessions at the mosque are a nuisance as far as studying is concerned.[611]

---

[609] Mehmed Esad, *Mir'ât-ı Mekteb-i Harbiyye* (İstanbul: Artin Asaduryan Şirket-i Mürettibiye Matbaası, 1310), 17-19.

[610] Students at the Military School were divided into three categories; infantry, cavalry and the elite (mümtâz) corps. In 1837, the planned curriculum for the first two corps consisted of: the need to obey the Sultan, the virtues of jihad, ethics, art, French, geography, astronomy, mathematics, *tahdîd-i bilâd*, *piyâde ta'lîmi, istihkâmât-ı hafîfe, kal'a muhârebeleri, sevku'l-ceys, topcu ta'lîmi* and military organization. The curriculum for the elite corps included: *cebr-i mukâbele, hikmet-i tabî'iyye, cebirin hendeseye tatbîki, piyâde, süvâri, topcu ve köprücü ta'lîmleri ve manevraları, ilm-i baytarî, âlât-ı nâriye ve sâir âlât ve edevât-ı harbiye resimleri, ilm-i lağım, köprü inşası, a'mâl-i kimyeviyye, cerr-i eskâl, istihkâmât-ı kaviyye, kıyâs-ı menâzil-i mermiyyât, cebehânecilik, siyâsât-ı dâhiliyye ve hâriciyye*. Hayrullah Gök, *Arşiv Belgelerinin Işığında Kara Harp Okulu Tarihi* (Ankara 2005), 98-99.

[611] Avner Wishnitzer, "The Transformation of Ottoman Temporal Culture during the Long Nineteenth Century" (PhD diss., Tel Aviv University, 2009), 242.

At the Military School, the development of teaching and curriculum was incremental with each new director. In 1840, the teaching of French was added.[612] A document from 1841 revealed that the students had to finish reading the Arabic grammar books *İzhâr* and *İzzî*.[613] The real change in the curriculum came under the directorate of Mirliva Emin Paşa (1841-1846), coinciding with Sultan Abdülmecid's imperial edict in 1845 on the reform of the Military School.[614] The school was now perceived as an institution producing knowledge.[615] Passing to a higher class would be on the basis of the completion of particular textbooks, which would be determined by the school director.[616] However, there was a clear deficit in the supply of printed textbook copies. Many times, the director corresponded with the Commander of the Army (*Serasker*), the Military Council (*Dârüşşûra-yı Askeriyye)* and the state officials for authorization to get urgently needed copies in print.[617]

Military *idâdî* schools were established in 1846 to provide four-year education to cover the preparatory courses initially assigned to the first part of the Military School. Among the variety of texts taught at the *idâdîs* were: *Emsile, Binâ, Avâmil, Sarf, Kavâ'id-i Fârisî, Tuhfe-i Vehbî, Bahâristân, Gülşen-i ma'ârif* together with the translations of textbooks on the newly introduced courses on geography and math.[618] In 1847, through a new institutional regulation, more courses were introduced including one centered on the teaching of the classic Persian texts of

[612] Mehmed Esad, *Mir'ât-ı Mekteb-i Harbiyye*, 32.
[613] Margarita Dobreva, "Sofya'ya Vagonlardan: 1820'li-1870'li Yıllarda İstanbul'da Açılan Osmanlı Okullarıyla İlgili Belgeler," in *Osmanlı İstanbulu III*, eds. Feridun M. Evecen, Ali Akyıldız, Emrah Safa Gürkan (İstanbul: İstanbul 29 Mayıs Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2015), 127.
[614] Emin Paşa was the son of Hüseyin Rıfkı Paşa, an early instructor at the Imperial School of Military Engineering. He was sent to London for education.
[615] Gök, *Arşiv belgelerinin ışığında Kara Harp Okulu tarihi,* 21.
[616] Mehmed Esad, *Mir'ât-ı Mekteb-i Harbiyye*, 29-30.
[617] For example, see A.MKT.MHM 221/85, 26 Zilkade 1277 (5 June 1861); A.MKT.MHM 164/82, 8 Safer 1276 (5 September 1859); A. MKT. MHM 168/70, Selh-i Rebîülevvel 1276 (September-October 1859).
[618] Mustafa Ergün and Tayyip Duman, "19. Yüzyılda Askeri Okullarının Ders Programları ve Ders Kitapları," *Yeni Türkiye Eğitim Özel Sayısı* 2-7 (January-February 1996): 494-511.

Bostân and *Gülistân.*[619] A revision in 1850 integrated classes on Arabic and Persian as well as ethics (*ahlâk)* and religion to the curriculum.[620] However, the lack of competent teachers largely contributed to the problem of a proper curriculum. The curriculum would change again in 1862-3.[621]

Aside from these military oriented institutions, the first civic schools, *Mekteb-i Ma'ârif-i Adliyye* (School for Learning) and *Mekteb-i Ulûm-ı Edebiyye* (School of Literary Sciences), were organized to raise scribes for the state bureaucracy in early 1839.[622] In parallel to scribal training in the earlier centuries, textbooks on grammar and language were named in the curriculum: *Emsile*, *Sarf, Nahiv*, *Kâfiye* and *Mîzânü'l-edeb* in Arabic, *Tuhfe-i Vehbî, Gülistân*, *Dîvân-ı Hâfız* and *Dîvân-ı Şevket.* Similarly, the first *rüşdiye* school, established in 1847 under the Directorate of *Rüşdiye* Schools, was tied to a curriculum consisting of the study of the Qur'an, *ilmihâl,* Arabic, Persian, geography, arithmetic and calligraphy. In the four-year curriculum planned for the *rüşdiye* to be opened in İzmir in 1856, history was to be taught every year. Aside from general Ottoman history in the first two years, Katip Çelebi's *Takvîmü't-tevârih* and *Hoca Tarihi (Tâcü't-tevârih)* were individually

---

[619] They included arithmetic, trigonometry, plane and spherical, cebir, analytical geometry, conica, perspective, mechanics, differentials and integral, astronomy, geography, physics, logistics, map making, bridge building, chemical analysis, inflammatory substances, firearm training, piyâde, süvâri training, Bostân and Gülistân, swimming, art, Navigation, Gülşah Eser, 33-34. Gülistân was also used to teach Persian to Britons in East Indian Company's schools. In Iran, it was more than an educational text but also a "poetic guide to Muslim morality and Sufi wisdom." Green, *Terrains of Exchange*, 90.

[620] Takvîm-i Vekâyi', no. 429 (21 Safer 1267).

[621] The curriculum from 1862-3 included: *Ameliyat-ı muhâsara, cebr-i âdî ve cebr-i âlâ, coğrafya-yı askerî, fenn-i baytarî, fenn-i batarya, fenn-i harb, fenn-i kimyâ, fenn-i esliha, fenn-i eşkâl, fenn-i inşâ, fenn-i makine, fenn-i lağım, fenn-i usûl (metodoloji), fenn-i mi'mârî, fenn-i mi'mârî-i askerî, fenn-i topçuluktan barut, kovan, döküm ve fındık (mermi) bahisleri, fotografya, gölgeler fenleri ve eşkâlleri, harita tersîmi, harekât-ı cesîme-i askeriyye, hendese-i halliye, hendese-i resmiye, hizmet-i dâhiliye kanûnnâmesi, hizmet-i dâhiliye-i piyâdegân, hücûm ve müdâfa'a, ilm-i hayvânât, ilm-i nebâtât, istihkâmât-ı cesîme, jimnastik ta'lîmi, kıla' muhâsara ve sahra topçuluğu, kitâbet, kozmografya, kuvâ-yı tabî'iyye, köprücülük, meç-kılıç-eskrim ta'lîmi, mebânîü'l-inşâ, piyâde ta'lîmâtı, piyâde dâhiliye kanunu, süvâri dâhiliye kanûnu, süvâri ta'lîmâtı, seferiye kanûnnâmesi, sevkü'l-ceyş, şeşhâne dâhiliye kanûnları, tahtît-i arâzi, taksîm-i arâzi, tabi'atü'l-ceyş, ta'lîmât, tarama, tathîr-i esliha, tarih-i âdî, tarih-i âlem, tarih-i harb, ta'yînü'l-ceyş, tesviye-i turuk, top ta'lîmi, topçu manej ta'lîmi, topografya, topografya ameliyatı, topografya eşkâli, topçu ta'lîmâtı, topçuluk fenni, ulûm-ı âlîye (dînî), ulûm-ı riyâziye, umûm-ı piyâde ta'lîmi, umûm-ı topçuluk, umûr-ı hesâbiye, umûr-i tahrîriye.*

[622] Somel, *Modernization of Public Education*, 34-35.

named as texts to be taught at the upper levels.[623] Moreover, the six-year curriculum planned in 1858 for *rüşdiyes* in the empire overall included history courses for the last two years.[624] For the School of Civil Service (*Mülkiye*), the curriculum, as announced in 1858, also included sufficient degrees of *Sarf* and *Nahiv* and logic up to *Îsâgûcî* in addition to texts on geography, history and statistics.[625] The French traveler Ubicini reported that Kemal Efendi, the Minister of Public Instruction, had told him that since the re-organization of the schools in 1846, he had directed and supervised the publication of twenty-works on education (for the most part translated or taken from the French) of which 75.000 copies had been printed by the lithographic presses at Galata-Serai.[626]

This overview reveals that in the early decades of the nineteenth century, the curriculum of the new schools and madrasas shared similar texts; grammar and syntax would be basic to them all as "instrumental sciences" (*âlet ilimleri)* for further studies.[627] History and geography were also gradually integrated into civil schools. Basic religious knowledge, once again, as represented in the form of *ilmihâls*, would be taught at the elementary (*sıbyan*) schools, *rüşdiyes* and the army alike, but this act was also entangled with a political agenda, as the following discussion will reveal. Textbooks related to these fields represented a scholarly tradition that extended back

[623] İ.DH 353/2335, 9 Muharrem 1273 (9 September 1856).
[624] Ayşegül Altınova Şahin, *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Rüşdiye Mektepleri* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2018).
[625] The curriculum was announced in 1858: history, geography, statistics, applied mathematics (hendese-i ameliye), international law and treatises signed by the Exalted state (hukuk-ı milel ve mu'âhedât-ı Devlet-i Aliyye), mathematics, economics and politics had to be taught. Moreover, they had to be taught in official handwriting well enough to read and understand the official documents as well as sufficient degree of sarf and nahiv and logic up to Îsâgûcî. Babıali Evrak Odası Ayniyat Defterleri, AYN. d. 1725, 4-6, 3 Cemâziyelevvel 1275 (9 December 1858); Somel, *Modernization of Public Education*, 52.
[626] Ubicini, *Letters on Turkey,* 243. Many of these printers were, probably, not legally recognized by the Ottoman state.
[627] Taşköprüzade Ahmed Efendi, in his *Miftâhu's-saâde,* attested to this division. İlhan Kutluer, "*Miftâhu's-Saâde,"* in Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi, Vol. 30 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2005), 18-19.

centuries and widely used in the Ottoman-Islamic madrasa system. Moreover, to meet the needs of schools, these books were printed over and over again at various presses in Istanbul. Almost all new directions of educational structuring fed on the traditional discourse on education.

3.4 Printing textbooks

In tracing the transformation in the Ottoman political discourse of the Tanzimat period, Maurus Reinkowski has studied the bureaucratic correspondences. While acknowledging the continuities with traditional elements including the frequent references to God and *shari'a*, however, he warns us take them as "simple figures of speech".[628] By extending the pool of written material produced in this period, particularly the printed books, this study argues thats the relevance of the traditional discourse was stronger than assumed until the 1860s.

There were about one thousand texts printed between 1831 and 1863 in Ottoman Istanbul in Turkish with Arabic letters. Compiling an accurate list of "all" books used as textbooks in Ottoman schools is precluded by the fluid notion of a "textbook" and school curricula, as discussed above.[629] Through a broad overview, nevertheless, one can generalize at least 55 percent to have been taught as textbooks at various schools. Since this chapter deals with the perspective of the state agents, the rest of the discussion will contextualize the official processes behind the printing of certain titles as textbooks through the help of the archival documents, the official gazette *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'* and the prefaces of printed books. The study, will not,

[628] Reinkowski, 199.
[629] Nevertheless, some contemporaries provided estimate numbers. For example, François Belin, the translator of the French Embassy wrote to *Journal Asiatique* that between 1868-1873, 580.000 copies of books were printed at the Ottoman Imperial Press. He also claimed that 60 percent of these books were textbooks or administrative texts. Özgür Türesay, "II. Abdülhamid Dönemi Yayımcılığı," 7.

however delve into each of these titles and their complicated intellectual baggage. Instead, it will selectively examine some of these books with the aim of understanding the intentions of the authors and the state actors in both producing and mobilizing these texts for the use of a wide audience. The number of editions for each printed title will be an important measure guiding the inferences about the function of a specific text from the perspective of the state. Hence the discussion of textbooks will be limited to those with a significant number of reprinted editions.

This utility-based approach reveals that the books intended as textbooks coalesced around two major areas; new sciences and the traditional madrasa curriculum. Moreover, a third area consisting of titles on grammar, history and *ilmihâls* intersected with the curricula of many schools and hence transcended the institutional barriers. In each of these categories, the Ottoman State acted upon different sets of concerns and expectations. First, the broader state agenda behind the printing of shared book titles such as grammar, history and *ilmihâls* led to the formation of a canonical basket of books that best represented the minimum expectations of the state from the populace across the empire through all levels of schooling. The religious and the political interests were perhaps most intertwined in this category. Second, for the new sciences, the state officials most frequently resorted to the discourse on benefit and utility to legitimize their value and printing. To enforce this connection, there was clear focus on the need for texts to be comprehensible by the readers, preferably in Turkish. By contrast, the traditional titles printed in the third category already had well-established prestige and legitimacy. At the same time, they still needed a different kind of legitimization; they had to convince that the printed copy was based on an authentic manuscript copy.

Printing was articulated as a need, this time with reference to a need to provide access to sufficient number of accurate texts at low prices.

3.4.1 Printing of shared textbooks

Insofar as they stood at the intersection of the curricula in many schools in the Ottoman Empire, old and new, there was strong emphasis on the printing of textbooks on grammar, dictionaries and history on the one side, and *ilmihâls* and works on ethics on the other. Even though these books can be considered as an extension of the madrasa curriculum, by themselves, they also represent a significant percentage of printed textbooks. Their diffusion across the educational spectrum was so extensive that one might claim that all students of the Ottoman Empire were trained in these common texts at least until the turn of the twentieth century.

Different types of textbooks deemed to belong together constituted a "textbook package." These texts, which were sent from Istanbul to the newly founded schools in the provinces in different constellations, were primarily on grammar and ethics such as *Risâle-i Ahlâk, Emsile, Elifbâ, Coğrafya, Dürr-i yektâ, Tecvîd, Ta'lîmü'l-Farisî* and *Kavâ'id-i Osmâniyye*.[630] In this sense, one may argue that these foundational texts also served as the bare minimum of an imperial and a bureaucratic canon of textbooks deemed most necessary and beneficial by state officials for the standardization of education in the empire. In the documents, this act was explained with reference to the need for the residents to acquire "literacy and the imperatives of religion and state" the lack of which would lead to ignorance and

[630] The pattern would be even more emphasized after 1870s. Some examples include Salonica: MF. MKT 2/35, 23 Rebîülâhir 1289 (30 June 1872).

other damages.[631] Hence in many archival documents contextualizing the printing process, the necessity to distribute the copies to different schools would be emphasized.[632] The trafficking of these textbooks would also become more intense together with the centralization and institutionalization of the schools across the empire.

3.4.1.1 Teaching languages: books of grammar, dictionaries and others

Some of the most "needed" books, from the perspective of the state, consisted of titles of Arabic and Persian grammar and dictionaries. While Turkish, as a scholarly language, had been on the rise since the sixteenth century, it was very common to find books especially on Arabic grammar and syntax to be widely taught. Appendix B, Tables B1 and B2 demonstrate that they constituted a significant percent of printed books between 1831 and 1863. Approximately 85 books were printed on Arabic syntax and morphology, pointing to 8.5 percent of all printed texts in this period. On the one hand, some of these texts would be classical madrasa texts, printed without any prefaces as the value and use of the book was taken for granted. These were evidently as "textbook-ish" as they could get; standardized and widely disseminated, as the footnotes will reveal. Still, their significance and benefit would be underlined through secondary sources such as the official gazette. Many times, these books were introduced in *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'* as some of the most necessary

[631] İ.MVL 313/13100, 27 Şaban 1270 (25 May 1854): "*...okuyup yazmayı ve zarûriyyât-ı diniyye ve dünyevîlerinin bilmeyerek zîr-i zulmet-i cehl ve nâdânîde kalıp gitmeleri pek çok mazarrat ve mehâzire sebeb-i kavî...*"

[632] A.MKT 121/4, 24 Rebîülâhir 1264 (30 March 1848). Also see A.AMD 5/91, 13 Safer 1264 (20 January 1848), Mad. Müd. 8257, 12 Ramazan 1255 (19 November 1839). In 1833, 1200 copies of Risâle-i Birgivî were printed at the Imperial Press with the intention of distributing 200 copies to the five rüşdiye schools located in Dersaadet, Salıpazarı and Üsküdar. Since there was much demand for these schools, the number of students had increased so the Council of Public Education requested 400 more copies. HAT 622/30759, 1249 (1833-34); 1200 more copies were printed in 1848. İ.DH 178/9713, 24 Ramazan 1264 (24 August 1848).

books for the students in the empire, which explained the reason they were printed at the Imperial Press. Even without being carried into the printed medium, one must consider that these books continued to be handcopied by students and scribes throughout the nineteenth century. On the other hand, important contemporary scholars wrote commentaries or glossaries over these classics. The printing of these derivative texts would be with reference to the superior qualities of their authors, as noted in many archival documents. Moreover, the state officials projected an image of relevant texts as needed and beneficial also through public means such as the newspaper.

To start with, among the most popular textbooks were the five foundational texts, *el-Emsile, Binâü'l-ef'âl, Maksûd, İzzî* and *Merâhu'l-ervâh,* which were also subsumed under *Sarf Cümlesi* in the Ottoman curriculum with many reprints starting from 1818.[633] In 1862, a notice in *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'* would praise this constellation with already numerous copies in the hands of people as the "origin" and "foundation" (*menba' ve esâsı*) of the sciences of Arabic (*ulûm-ı Arabî*) and thereby as the "the most necessary" texts for anyone who wanted to learn Arabic.[634] These texts were printed together in a cluster, and also printed as separate titles on their own or with their own derivative literature in both Turkish and Arabic with the exception of *Merâhu'l-ervâh*. Moreover, especially *el-Emsile, Binâü'l-ef'âl* and *Maksûd* were part of the state "package" of textbooks to be distributed to numerous provincial schools after the 1870s.[635]

[633] 1233, 1243, 1249, 1252, 1254, 1266. In 1255, 200 copies were distributed to School for Learning and 100 copies to School of Literary Sciences. See Mad.Müd. 8257, 1255.
[634] Anonymous, "Fünûn," *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'* (5 Şevval 1278), 4.
[635] See, for example, MF.MKT 15/4, 12 Şevval 1290 (3 December 1873); MF.MKT 3/6, 21 Cemâziyelevvel 1289 (27 July 1872); MF.MKT 3/17, 21 Cemâziyelevvel 1289 (27 July 1872).

A widely popular text in derivative literature was *el-Emsile,*[636] which was also printed separately with its commentary by Davud b. Mehmed el-Karsî (d. 1756)[637] and by Çörekçizâde Ahmed Nüzhet (Köse Efendi).[638] A notice in *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'* in 1833 further pointed at the significance of Edirneli Eskicizâde Ali Mehdi Efendi's (d. 1827) commentary on *el-Emsile* as among the most necessary books to inform the readers that it would be printed if sufficient demand arose.[639]

Within this cluster, *Binâü'l-ef'âl,* another anonymous book on Arabic grammar, was printed on its own.[640] Aside from Mehmed el-Kefevî's (d. 1760) commentary,[641] many contemporary commentaries on this text were printed and announced to wider public through *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'*. İbrahim b. Mehmed el-Yalvacî's (d. 1876) commentary was very popular.[642] Ahmed Rüşdü Karaağacî's (d. 1835) commentary, *Esâsü'l-binâ*, was also printed and announced.[643] According to a 1862 edition of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'*, *Sarf Cümlesi* had been printed with Ahmed Cevdet Efendi's *Ta'lîkât* on *Binâü'l-ef'âl* and Tahir Efendi's commentaries on the margins of *Emsile, İzzî* and *Maksûd* for their "obvious benefits" for students.[644]

---

[636] el-Emsile was an anonymous text on Arabic grammar widely taught at Ottoman madrasas in manuscript form for centuries. For the entire range of its commentaries in Turkish and in Arabic, see İsmail Durmuş, "el-Emsile," in Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi, Vol. 11 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1995), 166-167.
[637] 1263, 1272, 1273, 1274. There was an ownership mark on one of the copies of el-Karsî's commentary; a student of third grade at Nuruosmaniye *rüşdiye,* Behçet Efendi owned it in 1863. Davud el-Karsî, *Davud el-Karsî ale'l-Emsile* (Istanbul: Matba'atü'l-Mektebi'l-Harbiyeti's-Sultâniye, 1281).
[638] 1256, 1262, 1269, 1276.
[639] Anonymous, "Fünûn," *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'* (7 Cemâziyelevvel 1249), 4.
[640] 1256.
[641] 1257, 1278. Anonymous, "Fünûn," Takvîm-i Vekâyi, (7 Cemâziyelevvel 1249), 4.
[642] *Garâibü'l-i'lâl ve'l-iştikâk ale'l-Binâ:* 1260, 1262, 1268, 1275, 1278. Yalvaçlı İbrahim Efendi was a famous scholar of his time, who rose through the ranks of ilmiyye and served as a müderris. He also participated in huzur lessons. He wrote a number of books on Arabic grammar and syntax. Necdet Gürkan, "Yalvaçlı İbrahim Efendi," in Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi, Vol. 2 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2016), 673-674.
[643] 1250, 1265, 1275, 1277. Anonymous, "Fünûn," Takvîm-i Vekâyi' (Selh-i Zilkade 1252), 4. The announcement explained that müderris Ahmed Rüşdü Efendi had presented his book to the Sultan by means of a 'benefactor' (hayırhâh) and an imperial decree had followed as permission to print it.
[644] Anonymous, "Fünûn," Takvîm-i Vekâyi' (5 Şevval 1278), 4.

Birgivî's commentary on *Maksûd, İmânü'l-enzâr* was popular in print.[645] Ayşî Mehmed Efendi's (d. 1607) commentary was also printed together with Birgivî in at least two editions.[646] While İzzeddîn Zencânî's (d. 1262) *el-İzzî fi't-tasrîf* was printed on its own in many editions,[647] Seyyid Şerif Cürcânî's (d. 1413) commentary was printed twice.[648] As a comprehensive work treating all essential texts under *sarf,* İshak Harputî (d. 1892)[649] penned *Risâle-i Es'ile ve ecvibe* meant as a guidebook for *rüşdiye* students in particular.[650]

Nahiv cümlesi[651] was a follow-up on *sarf* as the compilation of the famous texts, *el-Kâfiye*[652] by İbn Hâcib *İzhârü'l-esrâr*[653] by Birgivî, and *el-Avâmilü'l-cedîd*[654] by Birgivî. These texts were again also printed separately with or without their commentaries. Hüseyin b. Ahmed Zeynîzâde's (d. 1759)[655] and Molla Câmî's (d. 1492)[656] commentaries on *el-Kâfiye* were most in demand, as also announced with their sales prices to a wider readership through the *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'* ads.[657] İsâmüddîn İsferâyînî's (d. 1538)[658] and Sivasî Muharrem Efendi's (d. 1601)[659] super-commentaries on Molla Câmî's commentary on *el-Kâfiye* entitled *el-Fevâidü'z-*

---

[645] 1253, 1260, 1269.
[646] 1253, 1269.
[647] 1233, 1253, 1254, 1278.
[648] 1266, 1280.
[649] İshak Harputî was an esteemed religious scholar who taught at many schools including *Dârülmuallimîn*, pariticipated in *huzur* lessons and served the Ottoman state in many bureaucratic ranks as a judge in various districts and as a member of the Council of Public Education. Mustafa Kara, "Ishak Efendi, Harputlu," in Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi, Vol. 22 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2000), 531-532. He also penned many rebuttals (reddiyes) defending Islam against the religious polemics of his time.
[650] 1272, 1273,1274, 1277, 1278. For permission regarding the printing of his book, see İ.DH 492/33392, 16 Muharrem 1279 (14 July 1862). İshak Harputî, *Risâle-i Es'ile ve ecvibe* (İstanbul: Cerîde-i Havâdis Matbaası, 1277).
[651] 1234, 1241, 1249, 1253, 1254, 1256, 1260, 1262, 1263, 1267, 1268, 1269, 1271, 1273, 1274, 1276.
[652] 1253, 1254, 1266, 1267, 1274, 1276, 1280.
[653] 1219, 1280.
[654] 1234, 1257, 1272, 1273, 1277, 1280.
[655] 1200, 1220, 1223, 1235, 1241, 1251,1265, 1267, 1269, 1271, 1279.
[656] 1242, 1253, 1254, 1269, 1279.
[657] Some include: Takvîm-i Vekâyi' 1258, no: 243; 1263, no: 343; 1263, no: 324; 1266, no: 439; no: 467, 1267.
[658] 1235, 1256, 1259, 1276.
[659] 1254, 1257, 1259, 1266, 1269, 1271, 1274, 1280.

ziyâiyye fî halli müşkilât-ı Kâfiye were also big successes. The only contemporary scholar with a commentary from this cluster is Abdullah Eyyûbî (d. 1836)[660], who wrote a supplement to Sivasî Muharrem Efendi's text entitled *Muharrem Tekmilesi* printed in many editions.[661]

Birgivî's (d. 1573) *el-Avâmilü'l-cedîd* also got printed many times.[662] Adalı Şeyh Mustafa b. İbrahim (d. 1704) wrote a *Tuhfe* on Birgivî's *Avâmil.*[663] Hüseyin b. Ahmed Zeynîzâde (d. 1759)'s *İ'râb*, *Ta'lîku'l-fevâdıl alâ i'râbi'l-Avâmil*, however, was the most printed in this category.[664] Two popular commentaries on *İzhârü'l-esrâr* were Adalı Şeyh Mustafa b. Hamza's commentary *Netâicü'l-efkâr* [665] and Hüseyin b. Ahmed Zeynîzâde (d. 1759)'s *İ'rab* both of which had numerous editions.

Given the popularity of these classical texts which were taught at all educational institutions, writing commentaries was a common way to bring one's scholarly abilities to the attention of state officials. While writing their petitions introducing their works, scholars also directly resorted to the concept of "benefit". Especially after the regulation of the Academy (*Encümen-i Dâniş*) in 1851 conferring rewards for authoring books, as explained in Chapter Two, getting beneficial books printed had turned into a recognized mode of fulfilling the intentions of the Sultan and other state officials to facilitate the expansion of knowledge. For instance, in his request for the printing of his supra-commentary on Adalı Mustafa Efendi's *Netâicü'l-efkâr* in 1862*,* the religious scholar from Amasya, Hacı Mustafa Efendi

[660] Abdullah Eyyûbî studied sarf and nahiv, Qur'anic exegesis and hadith from the famous scholars of the period including Gelenbevî Ismail Efendi. He rose to serve as the chief imam of Eyup Mosque and delivered sermons at Sultanahmet mosque. See Ali Turgut, "Abdullah Eyyûbî," in Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi, Vol. 1 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1998), 102-103.
[661] 1259, 1266, 1274.
[662] 1234, 1257, 1272, 1273, 1277, 1280.
[663] 1226, 1250, 1255, 1256, 1267, 1274, 1280.
[664] 1220, 1226, 1231, 1234, 1237, 1243, 1250.
[665] 1243, 1251, 1255, 1257, 1263, 1277, 1280.

asserted that helping students would be possible by the expansion of various sciences. Right after, he also demanded permission to print his book.[666]

In most cases, however, unless the author was already well-established, the chances for a book getting printed were low. For instance, in 1853, a prolific religious scholar, Tecelli Efendi submitted two books to the Council of Public Education for evaluation; his Turkish commentary on *el-Kâfiye* and translation of Birgivî's *el-Avâmilü'l-cedîd.* It was along the same vein that he had started to translate other classics such as *Maksûd* and *Merâm* on Arabic grammar, *Îsâgûcî* on logic as well as *Telhîsu'l-miftâh* on rhetoric into Turkish. The decision of the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances, however, was to place the books into Ragıp Efendi library for the easy access of interested people.[667] It was, however, no surprise to have *Emsile-i cedîde,* which had been compiled by İbrahim Paşa, the *miralay* of *mekteb-i idâdîye,* printed in 1847; the bureaucratic correspondence revealed that he had written it in order to facilitate the learning of the Arabic sciences in *idâdî* schools.[668] Furthermore, the book was praised for being abridged, compact and beneficial to an "unprecedented" extent for pupils who wanted to learn Arabic, be it the *idâdîs,* or anywhere else.[669] The benefits of this new book was so obvious that it

---

[666] "*...cümle tâlibâna suhûlet olmaklığı istilzâm edecek encümen-i fünûnun ta'addüd ve teksîriyle olabileceğinden..."* İ.MVL 479/21718, 2 Cemâziyelevvel 1279 (26 October 1862).

[667] The pattern in this period was to collect worthy contemporary books at Ragıp Efendi library with the aim to transfer them all to the library of Dârülfünûn once it was completed."*...zikrolunan kitaplar güzel tercüme olunmuş ve erbâbı isti'dâda göre mürâca'ata elverişli bulunmuş olduğundan...*" İ.MVL 283/11127, 19 Şevval 1269 (26 July 1853).

[668] İ.MSM 13/281, 12 Muharrem 1263 (31 December 1846). İbrahim Paşa here referred to İbrahim Edhem Paşa, who would turn into one of the greatest reformers of the Ottoman Empire in the nineteenth century. As a slave of Serasker Hüsrev Paşa, he had received military education in France and served in the Ottoman military at his return. Quickly rising through the military ranks, he then became a member of the Ottoman Ottoman Academy of Sciences and the High Council of Tanzimat (*Meclis-i Âlî-i Tanzîmat*) and also served as the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Minister of Commerce, the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Public Education in addition to memberships in many educational councils, initiatives and publications. İbnülemin Mahmut Kemal İnal, *Osmanlı Devrinde Son Sadrazamlar* vol. 2 (Ankara: Maarif Matbaası, 1945), 600.

[669] " *...şimdiye değin emsâli görülmemiş suretde muhtasar ve müfît sayfa derkenâr tertîbi dahi bütün bütün tarz-ı cedîd olarak bundan yalnız mekteb-i idâdîde değil her yerde tahsîl-i ulûm-ı Arabiyye*

did not even have to be proclaimed through scholarly endorsements (*âharın beyânına bile muhtaç olmadığı*).

Besides the "syntactical complexity" of language, vocabulary also constituted an obstacle for the aspiring state bureaucrats. As an aid to this situation, dictionaries were very important, yet scarce. Şerif Mardin claimed that this resulted in the "imprecise and incorrect use of non-Turkish words."[670] Hence it is no surprise that Müteferrika had started the printing enterprise with *Vankulu,* "the source of the Arabic sciences" *(mebâdî-i fünûn-ı Arabiyye)* to facilitate the education of the students.[671] In fact, it was common for dictionaries to constitute some of the earliest outputs of the printing enterprise. The first books printed at the first Muslim-owned printing press in Lucknow, just like in Cairo, was a dictionary, in other words, a "middletext" in the service of exchange.[672] Other dictionaries of Arabic were also printed in multiple editions in the nineteenth century; *Ahterî-i kebîr*[673] of Muslihuddîn Mustafa (d. 1560-61), *Lugat-ı Ferişteoğlu*[674] by Ibn Melek (d. 1418) and *Nuhbe*[675] of Sünbülzâde Vehbî (d. 1809). Moreover, *Sübha-i sıbyân* by Mahmud b. Ahmed er-Rumi was a frequently printed dictionary of Arabic-Turkish meant for the memorization of students at *sıbyan* schools. [676] Its commentary by Mehmed Necîb Efendi, called *Hediyyetü'l-ihvân*, was also very popular in print.[677] This work contained scholarly endorsements (*takrîzat)* by important statesmen of the time such

heveskâr olanların ezher cihet müstefid olacakları derkâr olup..." İ.DH 134/6919, 26 Muharrem 1263 (14 January 1847). Printed in 1263 and 1268.

[670] Şerif Mardin, "Some Notes on an Early Phase in the Modernization of Communications in Turkey," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 3, no. 3 (April 1961): 250-271, 255-256.

[671] Mehmed Suudi Efendi, *Tarihu'l-Hindi'l-Garbî* (İstanbul: Dârü't-Tıbâ'ati'l-Âmire, 1142). Vankulu was printed also in 1169, 1217 and 1218.

[672] Green, *Terrains of Exchange*, 96.

[673] 1242, 1256, 1263, 1271, 1275.

[674] 1268, 1277, 1278, 1279.

[675] 1220, 1242, 1246, 1251, 1252, 1259, 1264, 1265.

[676] 1216,1224, 1246, 1249, 1251, 1259, 1264, 1269, 1274, 1276, 1277.

[677] The commentary was called *Hediyyetü'l-ihvân*. Until 1863, it was printed only in 1840, but until 1903, it had six editions. Atabey Kılıç, "Manzum Sözlüklerimizden Sübha-i Sıbyan Şerhi '*Hediyyetü'l-İhvan*,'" *Turkish Studies* 1, no.1 (July-Aug.-Sept. 2006): 19-28.

as Ömer Akşehrî and Mehmed Esad Efendi. In fact, the number of scholarly endorsements in contemporary books should be interpreted as another means of providing legitimacy for their printing.

Aside from Arabic books of grammar and dictionaries, Persian classics were printed. Texts such as Ferîdüddîn Attâr's (d. 1221) *Pend-i Attâr*[678], Celaleddin Rumî's (d. 1273) *Mesnevî*[679] and Sadî of Shiraz's (d. 1291) *Gülistân*[680] and *Bostân* had been the major sources of Persian learning at the Ottoman madrasas in earlier centuries, even though they had been initially compiled as *adab* texts.[681] The fact that they got printed and continued to complement language instruction in various levels of schooling attests to further fluidity and continuity with the earlier centuries. *Pend-i Attar* and its commentary by İsmail Hakkı Bursevî, *Şerh-i Pend-i Attâr*[682] were many times printed together. The latter was definitely used as a textbook around 1835 as seen in archival documents.[683] In 1839, 500 copies of the book had been distributed to School for Learning[684] and 100 copies to School of Literary Studies.[685] While *Mesnevî* was not published at least until 1863, *Tuhfe-i Şâhidî* by the Mevlevi poet Şâhidî İbrahim Dede (d. 1550), a rhymed Turkish-Persian dictionary prepared to clarify the meaning of *Mesnevî,* was printed.[686] The related archival document states that there was much benefit expected from its printing for the people of learning (*erbâb-ı ma'ârif*).[687] *Gülistân* of Sadî was widely used at *rüşdiyes* to teach Persian.[688]

---

[678] 1251, 1257, 1260, 1266.
[679] Instead, commentary on Mesnevî by İsmail Rusûhî Ankaravî entitled *Mecmû'atü'l-letâif* was printed in 1257.
[680] 1255, 1263, 1275.
[681] Selim Kuru, "The Literature of Rum: The Making of a Literary Tradition (1450-1600)," in *Cambridge History of Turkey* Vol. 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 560-561.
[682] There is debate regarding the author of this commentary. 1250, 1253, 1267
[683] "*ketebe ve talebe meyânında…"* C.MF 42/2052, 6 Ramazan 1250 (6 January 1835).
[684] Mad. Müd. 8257, 20.
[685] Mad. Müd. 8257, 22.
[686] 1264, 1269, 1275.
[687] İ.DH 54/2651, 23 Muharrem 1258 (6 March 1842).
[688] MVL 65/57, 23 Cemâziyelevvel 1265 (16 April 1849).

Its commentary by Sûdî Bosnavî (d. 1598) was also found very useful and printed many times.[689] In fact, it became part of a canon of texts sent to the newly opening schools in the provinces.[690] In 1841, *Dîvân-ı Hâfız*[691] was one of the books to be distributed to students of School for Learning and School of Literary Sciences.[692] This was another classic book used for teaching in madrasas and its popularity extended to the new schools.

Persian grammar complemented the teaching of languages across schools. Ahmed Kemal Paşa (d. 1887)[693] wrote *Ta'lîmü'l-Fârisî*[694] in 1851 to teach Persian to especially *rüşdiye* students in the course of three to four months according to the new methods (*usûl-i cedîde*). In the preface to the book, he claimed that this new method would enable students to learn over a year's worth of Persian over the course of three

[689] 1249, 1276.
[690] İ.DH 700/48998, 11 Rebîülevvel 1291 (28 April 1874). 6000 copies were demanded; MF. MKT 13/75, 15 Şaban 1280 (25 January 1864) where 30 copies were demanded for Çankırı rüşdiyesi; MF. MKT 4/75, Selh-i Cemâziyelâhir 1289 (August-September 1872). 20 copies were demanded for Samsun rüşdiyesi; MF. MKT 2/11, 21 Rebîülâhir 1289 (28 June 1872), 30 copies needed for Edirne rüşdiyesi; MF. MKT 2/35, 23 Rebîülâhir 1289 (9 June 1872), 15 copies for Salonica rüşdiye; MF. MKT 3/5, 21 Cemâziyelevvel 1289 (27 July 1872), 40 copies for Gelibolu rüşdiyesi; MF. MKT 3/6, 21 Cemâziyelevvel 1289 (27 July 1872), 20 copies for Yenice Varda rüşdiye; MF. MKT 3/17, 21 Cemâziyelevvel 1289 (27 July 1872), 15 copies for Sofia rüşdiye; MF. MKT 3/23, 22 Rebîülâhir 1289 (29 June 1872), 40 copies for Birecik and Rumkale rüşdiyes in Aleppo; MF. MKT 4/41, 27 Cemâziyelevvel 1289 (2 August 1872), 50 copies for Adapazarı rüşdiye; MF. MKT 4/80, Gurre-i Receb 1289 (September-October 1872), 30 copies for Amasya rüşdiye; MF. MKT 5/13, 13 Receb 1289 (16 September 1872), 10 copies for Cezâir-i bahr-i sefîd rüşdiye; MF. MKT 6/138, 11 Şaban 1289 (14 October 1872), 30 copies for Zagra-yı Atîk rüşdiye in Edirne; MF. MKT 7/21, 24 Şaban 1289 (27 October 1872), 20 copies for Ma'mûretü'l-Azîz rüşdiye in Diyarbekir; MF. MKT 10/144, 10 Rebîülevvel 1290 (8 May 1873), 10 copies for Kirmasti rüşdiye in Hüdavendigâr; MF. MKT 15/46, 18 Şevval 1290 (9 December 1873), 20 copies for Kastamonu rüşdiye.
[691] 1255, 1257, 1259, 1264, 1267.
[692] İ.DH 45/2207, 29 Receb 1257 (16 September 1841).
[693] Ahmed Kemal Paşa was an important statesman with much contribution to the expansion of education in the Ottoman Empire. Yet there is not much secondary information on him. He rose through the ranks of civil bureaucracy under Pertev Paşa. He was appointed as an ambassador to Iran. Due to his knowledge of Persian, he was appointed as the translator of Persian at Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne (HAT 756/34755, HAT 1423/58218). He first served as the Director of Public Schools (Mekâtib-i Umûmiyye Nâzırı) after Mehmed Esad Efendi in 1848 and pioneered the foundation of the first rüşdiyes in Istanbul from his own pocket (İ.DH 163/8475, 17 Muharrem 1264 [25 December 1847]). He travelled in Europe in 1849 to observe the techniques of education and introduced the new ways including usûl-i cedîde into the empire. He served as a member of the Supreme Council and the Minister of Public Education between 1863 and 1865. His other books are *Müntehabât-ı Şehnâme* and *Kavâ'id-i Fârisiyye*.
[694] 1264, 1265, 1267, 1270, 1274, 1280.

to four months. He also advised language instructors at the *rüşdiyes* to focus also on practice.[695] Another book of Persian grammar that was printed numerous times was a translation by Mehmed Murad Molla, the Nakshbandi sheikh of Murad Molla lodge, entitled *Kavâ'id-i Fârisiyye*, which became instantly popular.[696] Murad Molla was already a well respected scholar and his lodge had become a meeting point for many of the high dignitaries of his time including Ahmed Cevdet Efendi. His book was also well promoted in *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'* as a textbook much needed by those seeking to learn Persian.[697] The most popular dictionary of Persian-Turkish, and arguably the most reprinted book in İstanbul until 1863 was Sünbülzâde Vehbî's (d. 1809) *Tuhfe-i Vehbî*.[698] From 1838 to 1839, 500 copies of the book were submitted to the School of Learning and 100 copies to the School of Literary Studies.[699] Its commentary by Ahmed Hayatî Elbistanî (d. 1814) was also very popular in print.[700]

The method of Qur'anic recitation (*kırâat*) was also a popular field of study across different educational venues. Books of *tecvîd* were not rare either, as demonstrated in Appendix B, Table B3. While many of the printed books were anonymous and identified with generic titles such as *Tecvîd*, some can be ascribed to popular classics. *Karabaş Tecvîdi* by Abdurrahman Karabaşî (d. 1498) was probably the most popular.[701] Also a contemporary text, *Tecvîd-i edâiyye* had been penned by a Qur'an teacher at Süleymaniye mosque, Hamza Miskin.[702] The announcement and promotion of the book on *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'* highlighted that Hamza Efendi had

---

[695] A.MKT. NZD 41/11, 21 Rebîülâhir 1267 (23 February 1851). Ahmed Kemal, *Ta'lîmü'l-Fârisî* (İstanbul: Arif Efendi Matbaası, 1313), 31.
[696] The original book was entitled *Mefâtihu'd-dürriyye*. 1251, 1253, 1256, 1262, 1269, 1274, 1275, 1278, 1279, 1280.
[697] Anonymous, "Fünûn," Takvîm-i Vekâyi' (25 Safer 1251), 4.
[698] 1208, 1213, 1219, 1223,1224, 1230, 1232, 1238, 1241, 1245, 1249, 1250, 1251, 1252, 1253, 1256, 1258, 1261, 1263, 1267, 1268, 1270, 1272, 1273, 1274, 1275, 1276, 1277, 1278, 1280.
[699] Mad. Müd. 8257, 22
[700] 1215, 1237, 1251, 1254, 1262, 1266, 1271.
[701] 1249, 1251, 1253, 1260, 1280.
[702] 1251, 1253, 1257, 1280.

integrated the rules necessary for the study of *tecvîd* to his text.[703] Moreover, a book on the rules of *tecvîd* was commissioned in 1846 by the Council of Public Education to Hacı Hüseyin Efendi, who worked as an editor at the Imperial Press, to teach both students and their teachers how to read the Qur'an and how to teach reading the Qur'an. The state officials saw much benefit in distributing this *risâle* to poor children in *sıbyan* schools.[704] In addition, around 1858, books of *tecvîd* were among the pile of books sent to the provincial schools together with primers and *Risâle-i Ahlâk.*[705]

The classical languages aside, there was an increased focus on Turkish rising from the specific circumstances of the nineteenth-century Ottoman Empire, as will be explained further in the next section. Interestingly, the author of *Emsile-i cedîde,* Mirliva İbrahim Paşa (d. 1893) appears to have been the real trigger behind the preparation of *Kavâ'id-i Osmâniyye* by Ahmed Cevdet Efendi and Fuad Paşa as commissioned by the Ottoman Academy of Sciences in 1851. In 1847, İbrahim Paşa convinced the state officials of the necessity of compiling a dictionary of the Turkish language as well as the rules of its grammar as a prerequisite for the production and dissemination of various sciences in Turkish.[706] He argued that school children could not properly comprehend the necessary concepts, if study the sciences in their non-native Arabic. However, if the same children were first exposed to the rules of their

[703] Anonymous, "Fünûn," Takvîm-i Vekâyi' (25 Safer 1251), 4.
[704] İ.DH 145/7497, 26 Rebîülâhir 1263 (13 April 1847). 400 copies of the book were distributed to "*hoca efendiler*". The other 2000 copies were to be sold. Hüseyin Efendi was also awarded according to the regulations of the Ottoman Academy of Sciences.
[705] There is no other identification on archival documents besides the title of the book, so we cannot be sure which exact book was sent. For some cases in the Balkans, see İ.MVL 96/2015, 26 Rebîülâhir 1263 (13 April 1847); A.MKT 84/22, 20 Cemâziyelâhir 1263 (5 June 1847); A.MKT.UM 327/83, 25 Safer 1275 (4 October 1858); A.MKT.MHM 167/84, 18 Rebîülevvel 1276 (15 October 1859), İ. MVL 313/13100, 27 Şaban 1270 (25 May 1854); A.MKT.UM 327/76, 25 Safer 1275 (4 October 1858)
[706] "*...bir lisânın lugat ve kavâ'idi mazbût olmadıkça o lisânın fünûn-ı adîdeye dâir teksîri kütüb-i muktezîye ile ma'mûriyeti mümkün olamayacağından başka...*" İ.DH 134/6919, 26 Muharrem 1263 (14 January 1847).

own language, learning Persian and Arabic afterwards would also be easier. Though he was "eager" *(heveskâr)* to complete this project, he needed the assistance by a group of competent scholars among whom Fuad Paşa, then working as a translator for the Imperial Council, was named.[707] There is no evidence to trace how this commission really worked, but the compilation of *Kavâ'id-i Osmâniyye* by Fuad Efendi and Ahmed Cevdet Efendi, presented as the first project of the Ottoman Academy of Sciences in 1851, had probably been triggered by İbrahim Paşa. Moreover, Ahmed Cevdet Efendi would soon prepare its abridged version for the use of *rüşdiye* and *sıbyan* students, entitled *Medhal-i kavâ'id,* which would become one of the fundamental texts of Turkish grammar for the rest of the century.[708]

The turn to Turkish was also visible in the texts that targeted all educational levels such as the primers, *elifbâs.* In accordance with the regulations of the Ottoman Academy of Sciences, in 1852, the Council of Public Education granted license to Kamil Efendi, an instructor at the Medical School to print his primer. He had compiled it in particular for the instruction of Christian students at the Medical School, who could speak Turkish but not read it.[709] In the same year, another doctor

[707] İ.DH 134/6919, 26 Muharrem 1263 (14 January 1847). Among others mentioned in the document to assist İbrahim Paşa was Şakir Efendi, a member of the Council of Agriculture, who was one of the early authors compiling a text on the rules of morphology and logic (*nahiv and mantıkiyye*). Some mistakes were found upon the examination of the book by Serasker Hüsrev Paşa and the Supreme Council, but his merit in the Arabic sciences had been recognized. İ.DH 139/7170, 15 Rebîülevvel 1263 (3 March 1847). There is a printed book of conversational Arabic-Persian-Turkish in 1269 that belongs to "Şakir Hoca". It might be the same person. Other candidates were Necip Efendi, who was versed also in French and Rıza Efendi, the examiner of the commercial court (*mahkeme-i ticâret mümeyyizi*) at the Imperial Council. The work could be checked by Vak'anüvis Mehmed Esad Efendi, who was also known as Nakib Efendi, Emin Paşa and the translator of the Imperial Council, Fuad Efendi.

[708] 1268, 1280. Interestingly, the imperial decree for the printing of "the abridged version of *Kavâ'id-i Osmânî*" was dated 1269. See A.MKT.MHM 51/45, 29 Safer 1269 (12 December 1852). This abridged version also preceded *Kavâ'id-i Osmâniyye* in print. The latter would be printed in 1281.

[709] A.MKT.MVL 65/17, 3 Zilkade 1269 (8 August 1853); İ.MVL 280/10938, 26 Şevval 1269 (2 August 1853).

Kayserili Mehmed Rüşdü Efendi[710] composed a new primer entitled *Nuhbetü'l-etfâl* to teach Turkish at *sıbyan* schools.[711] In the preface to the book, Mehmed Rüşdü legitimized it under the broader project of *Encümen-i Dâniş* to make Turkish easy to learn.[712] Bianchi further commended the book in *Journal Asiatique* for introducing an innovative way of reading Turkish with vowels following in the footsteps of Fuad Paşa and Ahmed Cevdet Efendi.[713] The collective support of state officials behind the printing of this book can also been seen in the diversity of officials writing scholarly endorsements.[714]

3.4.1.2 History books

History books had circulated for a number of reasons; on the one hand, biographical works of religious figures such as *siyers* and hagiographies had long been read for leisure and personal edification by a wider reading public since the earlier centuries. On the other hand, they came to be formally taught in schools starting from the mid-1840s. As such, various history books came to serve as textbooks in the newly opened schools.[715]

---

[710] Mehmed Rüşdü Efendi later became the second doctor (*tabîb-i sânî*) and *kâimakâm* at Tarabya hospital in 1275. A.MKT.MHM 138/17, 6 Muharrem 1275 (16 August 1858); İ.DH 411/27214, 3 Muharrem 1275 (13 August 1858).

[711] A.MKT.MVL 65/17, 3 Zilkade 1269 (8 August 1853); İ.MVL 280/10938, 26 Şevval 1269 (2 August 1853).

[712] Even though Mehmed Rüşdü Efendi was granted a license to print the book in 1269, he was able to actually get it printed in 1274 at a lithographic press. Mehmed Rüşdü, *Nuhbetü'l-etfâl* (İstanbul: Necib Efendi Taş Destgâhı, 1274).

[713] M. Bianchi, "Bibliographie Ottomane ou Notice des Ouvrages Publies," *Journal Asiatique*, seri V, XVI (October-November 1860): 327.

[714] The endorsements belonged to the following: Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, the chronicler, Mehmed Emin Efendi, the corrector (*mümeyyiz)* at the Directorate of Public Schools (*Mekâtib-i Umûmiyye*), the Nakshbandi sheikh Feyzullah Efendi, Ziver Efendi, Eşref Efendi, the poet and graduate of the Military School, Senih Efendi, the poet and the corresponding secretary (*mektûbî-i vekâletpenâhî hulefâsından*), Şeyh Osman Şems Efendi and Fatin Efendi, the poet. Mehmed Rüşdü, *Nuhbetü'l-etfâl* (İstanbul: Necib Efendi Taş Destgâhı, 1274).

[715] For the use of history books in the newly established schools, see Meltem Toksöz, "Geç Osmanlı Devleti'nde Popüler Tarih: Ahmed Midhat ve Dünya Tarihi," *Toplumsal Tarih,* 266 (February 2016): 50; Meltem Toksöz, "The World of Mehmed Murad: Writing Histoires Universelles in Ottoman Turkish" *Journal of Ottoman Studies XL* (2012): 343-363. For a contextual analysis of newly written history books, see Hakan Karateke, "The Challenge of Periodization: New Patterns in Nineteenth-

The institutionalization as well as the formalization of this education was new; the interest in history books was not. While history was not recognized as "a formal science with a set content or method" in the earlier centuries, it occupied an important position in the training of statesmen in the Ottoman intellectual world together with other fields of *adab* literature including poetry, lexicography, rhetoric, geography and biography writing. As such, history constituted part of a wider call for a "man's acquisition of humane, urbane culture".[716] Hence they were taught as part of the curriculum of Enderun school alongside the religious sciences. This view was also reflected in the library collections of the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries, in which books of *adab* literature had significant representation, at times even matching the number of books on the religious sciences.[717] Similarly, as seen in Appendix B, Table B4, history books were among the first printed titles of the Ottoman press in the eighteenth century.[718]

Many of the chronicles were specifically commissioned by high-ranking state officials and this was especially noted in the archival documents. Due to the immediate links of these "commissions" with public use at the educational institutions employing the discourse of "public benefit" rather than profit, they should be evaluated as perhaps "sponsoring" the printing of desired texts rather than commissioning. In the long run, we might even think of these individuals as

---

Century Ottoman Historiography," in *Writing History at the Ottoman Court,* eds. H. Erdem Çıpa and Emine Fetvacı (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2013), 129-154.

[716] Ethan Menchinger and Gottfried Hagen, "Ottoman Historical Thought," in *A Companion to Global Historical Thought,* eds. Prasenjit Duara, Viren Murthy and Andrew Sartori (John Wiley & Sons, 2014), 105.

[717] Sezer, "The Architecture of Bibliophilia," 136.

[718] *Tarih-i Seyyah der Beyân-ı Zuhûr-ı Agvaniyân* was printed in 1142 and 1277; *Tarih-i Timur-i Gürhan* was also printed in 1142 and 1277; *Tarih-i Mısrü'l-Cedîd* in 1142; *Tarih-i Hind-i Garb* in 1142; Gülşen-i hulefâ in 1143; *Takvîmü't-tevârih-i umûmî-i İslâm* in 1146; *Tarih-i Çelebizâde* in 1153 and 1283; *Ahvâl-i gazevât der diyâr-ı Bosna* in 1154; *Tarih-i Sami ve Şakir* in 1198; *Tarih-i İzzî* in 1199; *Mehâsinü'l-âsâr ve Hakâyıkü'l-ahbâr* in 1219.

practicing patronage, the traditional domain of the Ottoman elite, but one adapted to the printed medium.

The earliest printed edition of Mustafa Âlî Efendi's (d. 1600) *Künhü'l-ahbâr* was commissioned by Behçet Efendi, the corresponding secretary of the Office of Şeyhülislam, in 1861.[719] *Tarih-i Nişancı* by Nişancı Mehmed Paşa (d. 1571) was commissioned by an unidentified customer in 1862.[720] Similarly, *Tarih-i Peçevî* was commissioned by the state officials Tahir Efendi, Mustafa Efendi, Galip Efendi, who had found the printing a "beneficial act for public".[721]

The fact that these books were pragmatically prepared for purposes of education can be traced in the colophon of *Tarih-i Selânikî,* which had been commissioned in 1865, that the last eight years of this chronicle had been omitted because those years had already been covered by *Tarih-i Naîmâ,* which of course had already been printed twice by that time.[722] The rank of the relevant commissioner of *Tarih-i Naîmâ* had been as high as a minister; the Minister of Finance, Mustafa Fazıl Paşa (d. 1875), had commissioned it in 1863.[723] One must also note that Mustafa Fazıl Paşa was the grandson of Mehmed Ali Paşa of Egypt, who rose to high ranking posts in the Ottoman government including the Ministry of Public Education in 1862. He was also an avid sponsor of the Young Ottomans including Ziya Bey, Ali Suâvi

[719] 1200 copies of the book were commissioned to be sold by 10 percent profit by Behçet Efendi. İ.DH 468/31327, 4 Şaban 1277 (15 February 1861).
[720] Although this edition is missing in inventories of printed books, *Tarih-i Nişancı* seems to have been commissioned as customer property in 1862 for the first time. İ.DH 497/33804, 28 Rebîülevvel 1267 (31 January 1851).
[721] MVL 859/30, 17 Receb 1280 (28 December 1863). The book was printed only in 1866. Peçevi İbrahim Efendi, *Tarih-i Peçevî* (İstanbul: Matba'a-i Âmire, 1283).
[722] İ.DH 534/37084, 28 Şevval 1281 (26 March 1865). "...bundan sonra olan vukû'ât Naîmâ Tarihi'nde bi't-tafsîl muharrer bulunduğundan ilerisinin tab'ından sarf-ı nazar olunmuştur..." *Tarih-i Selânikî* (İstanbul, Evâil-i Receb 1281).
[723] İ.DH 515/35032, 8 Rebîülâhir 1280 (22 September 1863). Giridî Mustafa Naîmâ, *Ravzatü'l-Hüseyn fî hulâsati ahbâri'l-hâfikayn (Naîmâ Tarihi*) (İstanbul: Matba'a-i Âmire, 1865). *Tarih-i Naîmâ* was one of the earliest printed chronicles, the first edition dated 1147 and also in 1259.

and Namık Kemal at his residence in Istanbul during these years.[724] Moreover, *Raşid Tarihi*, which was projected as a continuation of *Tarih-i Naîmâ*, was commissioned in a consortium of state officials at the Ministry of Public Education, Naşid Efendi, Vacid Efendi, Hilmi Efendi and Mehmed Cemil Efendi in late 1863.[725] Similarly, Ahmed Vefik Efendi, who was at the time a member of the Council of Public Education, commissioned the printing of Hoca Sadeddin Efendi's (d. 1599) *Hoca Tarihi,* which had been assigned to the curriculum of the *rüşdiyes.*[726] Hoca Sadeddin's own *Selimnâme* was also printed at the end of this edition. While it was not a chronicle like the others, Kadı Şemseddin Ebu'l-Abbas Ahmed (İbn Hallikân)'s (d. 1282) *Vefeyâtü'l-a'yân ve enbâü ebnâi'z-zamân* was commissioned by Mustafa Fazıl Paşa, who was identified in the official document as a member of the Council of Tanzimat (*Meclis-i Âlî-i Tanzimat*) in the first days of 1864.[727]

Aside from the printing of old chronicles, contemporary books on history were also commissioned, compiled and printed at the request of their authors. Ahmed Cevdet Paşa's *Tarih-i Cevdet* was a long-term project commissioned under the Ottoman Academy of Sciences (*Encümen-i Daniş),* which was printed between 1854 and 1884 as the volumes got completed.[728] Similarly, Mehmed Şem'i Molla (d. 1881), the son-in-law of Meşrepzade Mehmed Arif Efendi, had compiled *Esmarü't Tevârih* in 1851 to be taught at both *Dârülma'ârif* and the *rüşdiye* schools around

[724] Ş. Tufan Buzpınar, "Mustafa Fazıl Paşa," in Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi, Vol. 31 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2006), 300-301.
[725] "*Naîmâ Tarihi'nin bu defa tab'ı mülâbesesiyle zeyli bulunan Raşid Tarihi'nin dahi umûma fâideli olarak mûmâileyhüm bunda kendi zimmetlerine tab' ettirecekleri cihetle..."* MVL 858/14, 4 Cemâziyelevvel 1280 (17 October 1863). Formerly. Formerly also printed in 1153, the chronicle would now make it to print only in 1282.
[726] İ. DH 505/34347, 27 Ramazan 1279 (18 March 1863).
[727] İ.DH 524/36163, 11 Zilkade 1280. This was a biographical dictionary of the famous religious figures of the Saljukid period.
[728] Christoph K. Neumann, *Araç Tarih Amaç Tanzimat: Tarih-i Cevdet'in Siyasi Anlamı* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2000).

the empire.[729] This book was probably the earliest uncredited project of the Academy of Sciences. Hayrullah Efendi (d. 1866) had also started writing his *Devlet-i Aliyye-i Osmâniyye Tarihi* around 1851 and was completed in fifteen volumes. While he was serving as the deputy director of the Academy in 1853, Hayrullah Efendi informed the Council of Public Education, of which he was also a member, that he only wanted permission for the printing of his own book *(ondan başka mükâfat istid'âsında olmadığı)*.[730] It was noted again the next year that Hayrullah Efendi's only intent was not profit but "the expansion of benefits" (*fevâidinin intişârı*).[731] It was finally printed in 1854. Moreover, Raşid Efendi (d. 1895), the correspondent secretary (*mektupçu*) at the Ministry of Public Education, had compiled a book about the history of Prophets for *rüşdiye* students based on the new ways to serve public good (*umûma fâideli)*.[732]

3.4.1.3 *İlmihâls* and books of ethics (*Ahlâk)*

Aside from books on grammar and history, *ilmihâls* united the curricula at schools. *İlmihâls* referred to Islamic catechismal literature encompassing the basic tenets of faith largely written for a lay audience.[733] Yet these books should also be considered

[729] İ.DH 237/14322, 22 Ramazan 1267 (21 July 1851).
[730] İ.DH 269/16828, 13 Cemâziyelâhir 1269 (24 March 1853).
[731] İ.MVL 302/12360, 3 Receb 1270 (1 April 1854).
[732] "*... talebe-i mûmâileyhin istifâde edecekleri surette elde bir tarih olmadığı cihetle bu yolda umûma bir hizmet olmak üzere...*" İ.DH 536/37225, 7 Cemâziyelevvel 1281 (8 October 1864); MVL 858/14, 4 Cemâziyelevvel 1280 (17 October 1863).
[733] For a wider discussion of *ilmihâl* literature in the Ottoman Empire, see Hatice K. Arpaguş, *Osmanlı Halkının Geleneksel İslam Anlayışı ve Kaynakları* (İstanbul: Çamlıca Yayınları, 2001); Hatice K. Arpaguş, "Bir Telif Türü Olarak İlmihal Tarihi Geçmişi ve Fonksiyonu," *M.Ü. İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi,* 22 (2002/1): 25-56; Tijana Krstic, *Contested Conversions to Islam: Narratives of Religious Change in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire.* Stanford: Stanford University Press; Tijana Krstic, "From *Shahada* to *'Aqida:* Conversion to Islam, Catechisation and Sunnitisation in Sixteenth-Century Ottoman Rumeli," in *Islamisation: Comparative Perspectives from History*, ed. C.S. Peacock (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2017); Tijana Krstic, "State and Religion. 'Sunnitization' and 'Confessionalism' in Süleyman's Time," in *The Battle for Central Europe: The Siege pf Szigetvar and the Death of Süleyman the Magnificient and Miklos Zrinyi (1566),* ed. Pal Fodor (Leiden: Brill, 2019); Osman Güman, "Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e İlmi hal Literatürü," in *Osmanlı'da Fıkıh ve Hukuk*, ed. Süleyman Kaya and Haşim Şahin (İstanbul: OSAMER, 2017), 69-101.

in a different light due to the interference of state agenda in imposing some of these titles over the larger populace. The gist of this agenda resided in encouraging obedience to political authority through religious arguments and it connects back to the arguments in the earlier sections of this chapter.

It is commonly known that the first Islamic text printed in the Ottoman Empire is *Risâle-i Birgivî,* also known as *Vasiyetnâme*. This was a basic treatise on the articles of faith written by the conservative Sunni-Hanafi scholar Mehmed Birgivî (d. 1573). His works addressed a wide spectrum of readers from the most educated to the lay subjects.[734] Just like many other religious treatises written in his age, it was written in simple Ottoman Turkish so that "all people could benefit from it."[735] It was already a very popular manuscript with wide dissemination. With its ten printed editions between 1803 and 1863, it became a powerful text in the early printing history of the empire. [736] The text had also been the subject of popular commentaries such as those of Kadızâde Şemseddîn Ahmed b. Mehmed[737] and Şeyh Ali Sadri el-Konevî. Osmanpazarı Müftüsü Şumnulu İsmail Niyazi Efendi's (d. 1894) super-commentary on Konevî was also printed multiple times.[738]

The function and the timing of the printing and distribution of Birgivî's text was of course not accidental. Its transmission into the printed medium had initially been sponsored by Hatice Sultan, who had ordered 1000 copies for the edification of

[734] For an extended study on Birgivî and the dissemination of his books in manuscript, see Ahmed Kaylı, "A Critical Study of Birgivi Mehmed Efendi's (d. 981/1573) Works and Their Dissemination in Manuscript Form" (Masters Thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2010).
[735] "*ketebehâ bi't-Türkiyye li-ye'umme nef'uhâ...*" See İhsan Fazlıoğlu, "Osmanlı Bilim Alanında Türkçe Telif ve Tercümelerin Türkçe Oluş Nedenleri ve Bu Eserlerin Dil Bilinci Oluşmasındaki Yeri ve Önemi," Kutadgubilig Felsefe-Bilim Araştırmaları Dergisi 3 (March 2003): 170.
[736] 1218, 1220, 1247, 1249, 1255, 1261, 1264, 1265, 1276, 1280.
[737] The commentary by Kadızâde Ahmed Efendi was entitled *Cevhere-i behiyye-i Ahmediyye fî şerhi'l-Vasiyyeti'l-Muhammediyye.* It was printed in 1219, 1223, 1225, 1232, 1241, 1242,1251, 1255, 1258, 1262.
[738] While Konevî's commentary was printed in 1268 alone, the supra-commentary by İsmail Niyazi was printed in 1262, 1264, 1268.

Nizâm-ı Cedîd soldiers and "to instill piety via the printed text."[739] At a time when Selim III (r. 1789-1808) sought the "right" way to reform the empire, the strong Sunni- Hanafi ethos articulated in Birgivî's text could serve to protect the reforms. One of these reforms included the new army, which was constructed with a distinctive Sunni character in direct opposition to the Janissaries, historically identified with the heterodox Bektashî order. The printing of Sunni religious texts in this context served the purpose of "promoting cosmopolitan, ulama-mediated, text-based Sunni Islam" over "the localism, eclecticism, and orality of the Bektashi Alidism."[740] Sunni Islam, in other words, was in the making once again, this time adapted to the different context of the nineteenth century bolstered by an increasing number of printed Islamic books.

Risâle-i Birgivî also became part of a package of foundational texts chosen by the state officials to be sent to many provinces across the empire. Particularly after 1848, the connection between this *ilmihâl* and the five *rüşdiyes* in İstanbul was reinforced through many documents.[741] Once the Ministry of Public Education was founded in 1857 to centralize and control the institutionalization of the *rüşdiyes,* these books were more frequently dispatched from the imperial presses in Istanbul to the provinces.

The function of Birgivî's text was shared by another *ilmihâl* from the eighteenth century; *İlmihâl* of Ahmed İlmî Çelebi (alive in 1722)*,* which became one of the most printed texts of the nineteenth century.[742] Even though there is a dearth of

[739] Cabi Ömer Efendi, *Cabi Tarihi veya Tarih-i Sultan Selim-i salis ve Mahmud-ı sani,* Vol.1, ed. Mehmet Ali Beyhan (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 2003), 90. The same issue is discussed by Brett Wilson, "The Qur'an After Babel: Translating and Printing the Quran in Late Ottoman and Modern Turkey" (PhD diss., Duke University, 2009), 49.
[740] Wilson, 49.
[741] For example, 200 copies were printed under the supervision of the Council of Public Education to be distributed to the five rüşdiyes in İstanbul. İ.MSM 25/687, 6 Safer 1264 (13 January 1848).
[742] 1250, 1259, 1260, 1263, 1264, 1267, 1275, 1279.

information on Ahmed İlmî in secondary literature, we know from the commentary on his book that it was extracted (*mahrec ve müntehib*) from Birgivî's *ilmihâl*.[743] *İlmihâl,* too, was listed within the canon of textbooks to be sent to the provinces to be taught at *sıbyan* schools and the *rüşdiyes.*[744] The function of the text in strengthening the official discourse is evident from its preface, where the unity of religion and political "nation" was emphasized: *"dîn ve millet ikisi dahi birdir".*[745] At the same time, from early on in 1832, the printing of the book was explained with reference to the benefit for the larger public (*menâfi'-i âmme*).[746] A *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'* issue from 1833 stated that the book had been written in the past in order to teach the requirements of religion to children and beginners.[747] Its usage in the army was highlighted; in 1837, an imperial decree asserted the need for both the provincial population and the soldiers (*redif askeri*) to know about the rules of religion including the five daily prayers. The state officials were especially warned to monitor the implementation of these rules.[748] In this light, ten to fifteen copies of both *İlmihâl* and *Dürr-i yektâ* were to be distributed to every province.

We also find many documents attesting to its usage as a textbook at all levels including the *sıbyan* schools[749] and the Imperial School of Military Engineering.[750] In 1852, the Supreme Council announced that for every new school established, a variety of books, which in most cases included *İlmihâl,* would be printed and sent out

[743] Şeyh el-Hâc Mustafa b. Mehmed Hulusi, *Şerh-i İlmihâl, Feyzü'l-Bahreyn* (İstanbul: Mehmed Said ma'rifeti, Evâsıt-ı Safer 1260), 3. Also see İ.DH 84/4192, 21 Muharrem 1260 (11 February 1844).
[744] Hüdavendigâr province was an example. İ.MVL 313/13100, 20 Zilkade 1270 (14 August 1854).
[745] Ahmed İlmi Efendi, *İlmihâl* (İstanbul: Dârü't-Tıbâ'ati'l-Âmire, 1260), 2.
[746] HAT 666/32453, 1248. See the printing of 1200 copies also in C. MF 125/6224, 26 Cemâziyelevvel 1249 (11 October 1833).
[747] Anonymous, "Fünûn," *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'* (13 Muharrem 1249), 4: "*...Zarûriyyât-ı dîniyyeyi etfâl ve mübtedîlere öğretmek için ez-kadîm te'lîf olunmuş olan meşhûr ilmihâl risâle-i şerîfesi..."*
[748] HAT 449/22340-C, 7 Rebîülevvel 1253 (11 June 1837).
[749] In 1847, 3000 copies of *İlmihâl* were to be distributed to poor students of *sıbyan* schools free of charge. Another 3000 would be sold to affluent children to compensate for the expenditures of state treasury. İ.DH 143/7370, 3 Rebîülâhir 1263 (21 March 1847).
[750] In 1836, 100 copies were distributed to the students. C. MF 63/3103, 29 Cemâziyelevvel 1252 (11 September 1836).

to meet the need.[751] In fact, the immediate need for such foundational texts, also prioritized in terms of the state agenda, was the reason behind the empowerment of private lithographers such as Uncu Halil and Cayol in the first place, as contextualized in Chapter Two and Five.

The presence of a state discourse that to a large extent relied on legitimization through the religious sphere necessitated the compilation of a new text in the *ilmihâl* tradition in the nineteenth century. İmamzâde Esad Efendi's (d. 1851) *Dürr-i yektâ* represented the new alliance between state and religious scholars along Sunni-Hanafi lines on the basis of the specific needs of the legitimacy of Sultan Mahmud II and the need for all Muslims to unquestionably obey him.[752] It is no coincidence that such an important mission had been trusted on one of the most prestigious *ulema* of the period, who had also served as the personal *imam* to Sultan Abdülmecid (r. 1839-1861) during the latter's childhood.[753] In his introduction, İmamzâde stated clearly that his work, written in Turkish, served the most important task of facilitating the access of common people (*avâm-ı nâs*) to the imperative rules of the Hanafi school.[754]

The text was immensely popular; it was reprinted ten times until 1866.[755] *Dürr-i yektâ* was strategically chosen to appeal to a wide group of people, as standardized, and reproduced copies to complement the newly standardizing army

[751] İ. MVL 233/8097, 22 Rebîülevvel 1268 (15 January 1852).
[752] İmamzâde Esad Efendi was a high-ranking member of the ilmiyye, who had risen high enough to supervise the regulation of the two new schools, School for Learning and School of Literary Sciences. under the Directorate of Public Schools (*Nezâret-i Mekâtib Müdürlüğü*). He also became a member of the Supreme Council. See Recep Cici, "İmamzâde Esad Efendi," in Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi, Vol. 22 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2000), 211-212.
[753] Regarding the religious scholars around Sultan Abdülmecid, see Zeynep Altuntaş, "Sultan Abdülmecid Dönemi Uleması" (PhD diss., Marmara University, 2013).
[754] "*... avâm-ı nâs hakkında ta'lîm ve ta'allümü âsân olması için fukahâ-yı izâm-ı hanifiyenin esahh-ı akvâllerinden kadar kifâye, lisân-ı Türkî üzere bir risâle tedvîn ve akâid-i zarûrât-ı dîniyye ile tasdîr ve tezyîn...*" İmamzâde Esad Efendi, *Dürr-i yektâ* (İstanbul: Dârü't-Tıbâ'ati'l-Âmire, 1275), 3.
[755] 1243, 1256, 1257, 1259, 1260, 1264, 1275, 1277, 1279, 1282,

protocol.[756] It should also be noted that in some editions, it was printed together with *Risâle-i Birgivî.* The two texts were also integrated into the *sıbyan* school curriculum and free copies were distributed to poor children in 1847.[757] It would also be taught as a textbook in *rüşdiye* schools as well as being distributed among the army ranks.[758] Other *ilmihâls* would also be printed for wider circulation among the populace, as demonstrated by Appendix B, Table B5 and discussed in Chapter Four.

Ahlâk texts compiled in the nineteenth century also served as the common denominator of many schools represented by Sadık Rifat Paşa's (d. 1857) *Risâle-i Ahlâk*[759] and its supplement called *Zeyl-i Risâle-i Ahlâk.*[760] Sultan Abdülmecid personally edited the text in 1847, before the printing of the first edition.[761] Sadık Rifat Paşa[762] represented the eclectism of state discourse between 1831 and 1863 that was elaborated in earlier sections. As a conservative reformist, his worldview was shaped by the classical Islamic-Ottoman concepts of political literature such as the circle of justice as much as by the new appreciation for Europe.[763] Rifat Paşa explained that he had written this book for the students of *sıbyan* schools for two reasons; to facilitate their acquisition of literacy and to instill morals.[764] Hence this text was a perfect blend of the official discourses explained in earlier sections.

---

[756] One example for the distribution of *Dürr-i yektâ* to the soldiers concerns the 600 piyade under Çirmen Mutasarrıfı Esad Paşa; 2 copies for every hundred soldiers were sent, which meant a total of 12 copies in 1827. Moreover, an extra 1016 copies had been distributed in varying numbers to posts such as enderûn-ı hümâyûn ağavâtı, soldiers appointed in İstanbul, Rumelia and Anatolia, *mu'allem Bostaniyân-ı Hâssa, Tüfekçiyân, cebehâne-i âmire, tersâne-i âmire, mehterhâne-i âmire*, soldiers of the Grand Vezir and etc. Beydilli, *Türk Bilim ve Matbaacılık*, 329.
[757] İ.DH 143/7370, 3 Rebîülâhir 1263.
[758] HAT 449/22340-C, 7 Rebîülevvel 1253 (11 June 1837); İ.DH 15/694, 6 Rebîülâhir 1256 (7 June 1840).
[759] 1263, 1267 1273, 1275, 1278, 1280.
[760] 1273, 1275.
[761] İ.DH 150/7798, 8 Receb 1263 (22 June 1847).
[762] Sadık Rifat Paşa was one of the key statesmen of the Tanzimat period, who served as an ambassador to Vienna and then was repeatedly appointed to the most strategic posts of civil bureaucracy including the head of the Supreme Council for Judicial Ordinances.
[763] Mardin, *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought,* 177.
[764] İ.DH 150/7798, 8 Receb 1263 (22 June 1847); A.MKT 84/47, 21 Cemâziyelâhir 1263 (6 June 1847); İ.DH 134/6911, 5 Muharrem 1263 (24 June 1846).

Moreover, at the heart of his discourse resided the notion of obedience to both religious commands and the Sultan. In other words, the concepts of both religion and reason stipulated the obedience of a moral individual to the Sultan.[765] Moreover, it intercepted the main notions in Ahmed İlmî Efendi's *İlmihâl* and it is no surprise that the two became the most fundamental textbooks. At the same time, just as with the *ilmihâls,* other popular books on advice literature including ethics would be printed, as revealed in Appendix B, Table B6.

As part of the textbook canon, the audience for this *Risâle* was extremely diverse, and it served as one of the basic texts for engraining loyalty and obedience in school children, who would constitute the new bureaucrats of the Ottoman Empire. Hence Rifat Paşa was preaching to the Ottoman administrators about lessons of traditional morality.[766] *Risâle-i Ahlâk* was printed in large letters for the ease of the reading of young students in *sıbyan* schools.[767] It had wide and free distribution in the Balkans and Western Anatolia and as such, represented the dominant educational attitude in especially the 1850s and 1860s.[768]

3.4.2 Printing translations in the new sciences

[765] Yalçınkaya, *Learned Patriots,* 55-57.
[766] Kerem Ünüvar, "Economic and Moral Organization of the Ottoman Society in the Tanzimat Period: Sadık Rifat Paşa's Ahlak Risalesi" (Masters Thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2004), 39-54.
[767] İ.DH 134/6911, 5 Muharrem 1263 (24 June 1846); İ.DH 150/7798, 8 Receb 1263 (22 June 1847);.
[768] For example, in 1854, 100 copies were sent to Bursa and its vicinity to be distributed to *sıbyan* schools. İ.MVL 313/13100, 27 Şaban 1270 (25 May 1854). Another 20 copies of *Risâle-i Ahlâk* and 20 copies of its supplement were sent to the schools in Rumelia in 1858. A.MKT.UM 327/83, 25 Safer 1275 (4 October 1858); 8 more copies were sent to Mustafa Vehbi Efendi be distributed for free to the poor Muslim rüşdiyye students in Rumelia and Anatolia. A.MKT.UM 327/76, 25 Safer 1275 (4 October 1858). Somel, *Modernization of Public Education*, 62.

3.4.2.1 State as an agent in shaping textbooks in the new sciences

The production of contemporary textbooks on the new sciences was a joint process between the state officials and the authors. In fact, there was a thin line separating the two groups. On the one hand, the Ottoman state actively shaped the educational policies and directed the printing process. On the other hand, while the contemporary scholars and authors constituted the direct recipients of state policy, they also served as agents of production. An overview of this process reveals that the same socio-political elite could serve in state ranks and also produce books on the new sciences to benefit the students and the Ottoman State.

The agency of the Ottoman state officials in directing publications on the new sciences can be argued from a number of different cases. First of all, they constructed a defensive discourse about the necessity of the printing press for the new sciences. In 1797, for instance, the Superintendate of Artillery (*Humbaracı)* and Sappers Crops *(Lağımcı)* Memiş Efendi's memorandum had acted as a trigger for the printing press within the Imperial School of Military Engineering by focusing on two points; the education for engineers was strongly dependent on the expansion of the books of sciences (*kütüb-i fenniye*) and it was very difficult to replicate the Turkish books, treatises (*resâil)* and tables, which contained maps and visuals, by hand without modification. New education, in other words, had to rely on the printing press.[769] This necessity to print respectable, newly compiled and translated (*mütercem ve müellef*) books on geometry (*hendese*), accounting (*hesâb*), and the military sciences (*sanâyi'-i harbiyye*) such as military regimentation (*tasnîf-i asker*), military engineering (*istihkâmât)* and defense (*istihfâzât)* that would serve as the new

[769] Beydilli, *Türk Bilim ve Matbaacılık*, 100.

textbooks was also specified in another document from 1805.[770] Once again, the printing press acquired meaning and legitimacy to a large extent by virtue of serving education. Even when the printing enterprise was reorganized under the Directorate of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire* in 1831, the reason was explained as "the printing and multiplication of different beneficial books needed by students."[771]

Second, after shaping the discourse, state officials also assigned the task of compiling, translating and printing works on the new sciences such as mathematics and geometry to the instructors at the new schools. Hyde Clark, a British traveler and resident in Izmir and Istanbul around the 1850s, wrote that the government at the time had been employed in the publishing of the requisite books for the elementary schools and the *rüşdiyes* on topics such as military, law, navy, medicine and geographical maps.[772] Moreover, the imperial decree affirmed that it was mandatory for the instructors of the Imperial School of Military Engineering to compile and translate different books on the mathematical sciences.[773] Similarly, students at the Medical School would start learning Italian and start translating books on medicine into Turkish already in their second year. [774] This was not a one-time task either. The Ottoman officials appeared to be aware of the pace of change and the fact that the transfer of knowledge had to be continuous. In 1846, an imperial decree announced that even though books on mathematics, geometry and geography had already been translated from Arabic and French into Turkish, new works had to be translated quickly due to the speed of advances in these fields in Europe. The aim was for

---

[770] Beydilli, *Türk Bilim ve Matbaacılık*, 228. Also see HAT 674/32961, 1247 (1831-32): "*...kütüb-ü hendesiyenin dahi teksîri emrinde ruhsat-ı seniyye erzân buyurulmuş olduğuna nazaran..."*
[771] Anonymous, *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'* (17 Zilhicce 1247), 3. "*...tullâbın muhtâc olduğu ve istifâde olunacak kütüb-i mütedâvile-i mukteziyenin germiyyet üzere tab' ve teksîri ümniyesiyle..*"
[772] Hyde Clarke, "On Public Instruction in Turkey," *Journal of the Statistical Society of London* 30, no. 4 (Dec., 1867): 519.
[773] "… *Mühendishâne-i hümâyûn hocaları aralık aralık ulûm-ı riyâziye dâir ve fenn-i hendeseye mütedâir kitâp te'lîf ve tercüme eylemeleri meşrût olduğundan*…." HAT 922/40090, 1245 (1829-30).
[774] Sarı, "Mekteb-i Tıbbiye," 3.

students to learn sufficient French to be able to translate these new books.[775] In 1860, the need to retranslate and print the military manuals in line with the changes in the organization of infantry in France was noted.[776]

The instructors and administrators at these new schools also took on the responsibility of disseminating the new, specialized textbooks through the new presses. Already in 1797, the main drive for reactivating the Imperial Press had been the textual needs of students at the Imperial School of Military Engineering. The Military School also ordered its press from Europe in 1836, which was operated by a few of its students.[777] Similarly, the Medical School started running its press in 1838. The latter was a lithographic press to print textbooks that contained many visuals but a typographic press was also acquired in 1850.[778]

Moreover, one should consider that for the duration of this time interval, 1830s to 1860s, a number of foreign authors and scholars presented their books to the Ottoman Sultan with the expectation to be awarded with monetary reward or medals. Apparently, this was a trend in Europe, and as the scholars noted in their letters, they submitted the same work to various rulers in Europe. These books usually represented the latest advances in European scholarship. In later years, these books would be communicated through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Some examples

[775] HAT 1646/12, 1263 (1846-47).
[776] İ.DH 496/33734, 14 Rebîülevvel 1279 (9 September 1862).
[777] Gülşah Eser, "Mekteb-i Harbiye'nin Türkiye'de Modern Bilimin Gelişmesindeki Yeri (1834-1876)" (Masters Thesis, İstanbul University, 2005), 70. Eser identified 155 books printed at the school press between 1840-1876. 67 of these titles were related to the military sciences. A weekly bulletin was also published starting from 1864.
[778] Gülten Dinç, "Mekteb-i Tıbbiye Matbaası'nda Basılan Arap Harfli Türkçe Yayınlar Aracılığı ile Tıbbiye'nin Yayın Faaliyetleri Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme (1844-1928)" (PhD diss., Istanbul University, 2003), 4-6. John Mason explained the state of education in the empire in 1847. Dr. Spitzer's report to Abdülmecid in 1847, stated that public education had become priority of any statesmen. But he also noted that opening schools was not enough. that textbook translations were being prepared for print at the school press, and they were not meant exclusively for students at this school but also presented for sale for the benefit of others. See John Mason, *Three Years in Turkey: The Journal of a Medical Mission to the Jews* (London: John Snow, 1860)

include the book of a French medical doctor on the smallpox vaccine in 1855,[779] a three-volume book by another doctor in Europe in 1843,[780] a book compiled in Vienna on agriculture in 1857,[781] and a book on military sciences written by a military commander in France in 1863.[782]

Third, perhaps best demonstrating the concern of the Ottoman state with printing textbooks was the foundation of overarching societies such as the Ottoman Academy of Sciences in 1851 and Society of Ottoman Knowledge (*Cemiyet-i İlmiye-i Osmâniye)* in 1862*,* which had both arisen from the need to meet the textbook demand for the first Ottoman university, *Dârülfünûn.*[783] As articulated through the 1846 report of the Temporary Council, the Academy of Sciences was to encourage the writing and translation of books serving the expansion of education.[784] Murat Şiviloğlu has characterized its function as "the catalyst to transform the nascent idea of the schooling of the public into a reality," motivated by a belief of Ottoman governors in the role of "education as a modernizing force."[785] The memorandum from 1851 elaborated on the importance of the spread and growth of various sciences for the progress of states, and how, in the meantime, state patronage was essential. In repeated documents, the Sultan was presented as the benefactor of the "high sciences and beneficial knowledge."[786] Hereby education and sciences were linked to the

[779] İ.DH 323/21018, 26 Şevval 1271 (12 July 1855).
[780] İ.HR 169/9094, 15 Zilkade 1275 (16 June 1859).
[781] HR.MKT 204/71, 10 Muharrem 1274 (31 August 1857).
[782] İ.HR 113/5530, 19 Zilhicce 1270 (12 September 1854).
[783] The university offered public classes for a short duration in 1863, but it would officially open in 1870. See Ali Budak, *Münif Paşa*; Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, "Cemiyet-i İlmiye ve Mecmua-i Fünun," in *Osmanlı İlmi ve Mesleki Cemiyetleri* (İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1987), 221-245; Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, Cemiyet-i İlmiye-i Osmaniye'nin Kuruluş ve Faaliyetleri (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1994); Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, Darülfünun (İstanbul: IRCICA, 2010).
[784] "*...Dârülfünûn te'sîsi maddesi ile tedrîs olunacak kütüb-i fenniyeti vücûda getirmek için bir de Encümen-i Dâniş teşkîli tezekkür..."* Mahmut Cevat, *Maârif-i Umûmiye Nezâreti,* 41; İ.DH 139/7170, 9 Rebîülevvel 1263.
[785] Murat Şiviloğlu, "The Emergence of Public Opinion in the Ottoman Empire: 1826-1876" (PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 2014), 140-141.
[786] "*...velî-ni'met-i bî-minnet efendimiz ulûm-ı aliyye ve fünûn-ı nâfi'anın neşr ü revâcı hakkında derkâr olan ikdâm ve ihtimâm..."* Mahmut Cevat, *Maârif-i Umûmiye Nezâreti,* 42.

sphere of state control and patronage. The same agenda would be further pursued through the establishment of Society of Ottoman Knowledge in 1861 by Halil Şerif Paşa (d. 1879) with the requirement from its members to write and translate books on all branches of the sciences with the exception of religious and political subjects.[787] Also at the Military School, new measures were adopted under the directorate of Hüseyin Avni Paşa (r. 1857-1862) for rewarding instructors with service to the institution with medals.[788]

Commissioning books had been widely practiced for centuries. After the establishment of the Academy in 1851, however, the system of commissioning and rewarding books became more systematized. Rather than the Sultan or the Grand Vizier, intermediary institutions would serve as the arbiter in deliberating rewards. As elaborated in Chapter Two, the bylaws of the Academy introduced a three-level reward system on submitted works.[789] This categorization demonstrated that the Ottoman state had agreed to cover the printing expenses of those books found most "beneficial" in their capacity to serve as textbooks, while others could also be extended the right to be printed with expenses to be covered by the author. As such, printing had become the highest form of reward. In years to come, attractive rewards including medals would be bestowed upon textbook translators also by other specialized councils that emerged after the 1850s[790] such as the Ottoman Medical Society (*Cemiyet-i Tıbbiyye-i Osmânî).*[791] While Ahmed Cevdet Efendi claimed that

[787] "*...mesâil-i diniyye ve politikiye müstesnâ tutularak her türlü ulûm ve ma'ârife dâir kütüb ve resâil te'lîf ve tercümesi..."* Cevat, *Maârif-i Umûmiye Nezâreti,* 63.
[788] Gök, *Arşiv belgelerinin ışığında Kara Harp Okulu tarihi,* 130.
[789] Osman Zahit Küçükler, "Osmanlı Devletinde Eğitimde Modernleşme ve Encümen-i Daniş" (PhD diss., Ankara University, 2016), 61-62.
[790] İhsanoğlu, "Tanzimat Öncesi ve Tanzimat Sonrası Osmanlı," 378-380. For Ottoman scientific societies around the Tanzimat period in general, see Ahmet Karaçavuş, "'Tanzimat Dönemi Osmanlı Bilim Cemiyetleri" (PhD diss., Ankara University, 2006).
[791] Emre Karacaoğlu, " Kırımlı Aziz İdris Bey'in Hayatı, Çalışmaları ve Cemiyet-i Tıbbiye-i Osmaniye'de İrad Ettiği Nutuk Hakkında," *Türkiye Klinikleri* 24, no.1 (2016): 11-19.

these efforts had produced no worthy work other than his own books[792]-an observation taken for granted by also some secondary literature-[793], archival research, backed by Ahmed Hamdi Tanpınar has refuted these claims.[794] The state initiative through these intermediary organs did result in the production of many textbooks in this time period.[795]

The direct addressees of the Academy and the Society of Ottoman Knowledge were the potential authors of textbooks across the empire. At the same time, for the majority of the cases, there was a strong match between the textbook authors/translators on the one hand and important statesmen, school administrators or translators at the Translation Bureau on the other.[796] In fact, we see that there was no author/translator of mathematics, geography and military sciences who was not affiliated with an important official position. Through the active process of translating the technical texts into Turkish, they played a part in constructing a "new discourse" in the Ottoman intellectual medium by focusing on the "beneficial" nature of knowledge and sciences imported from Europe. As they rose through the ranks of

[792] Ahmed Cevdet, *Tezâkir 1-12,* 13: "*bi'l-fiil işe yarayacak a'zâya tevzî' olunan te'lîfât içinde hisse-i fakîre isâbet eden Tarih-i Cevdet'ten başka bir eser görülmedi*".
[793] See İhsanoğlu, "Tanzimat Öncesi ve Tanzimat'dan Sonra Osmanlı," 370.
[794] Ahmed Hamdi Tanpınar, *19. Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*, ed. Abdullah Uçman (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2012), 151.
[795] Among the books commissioned by Encümen-i Dâniş was Ibn Khaldun's *Muqaddim*a. Initially translated by Pirizade Sahib Molla (d. 1748), the remaining parts were completed by Suphi Paşa and Cevdet Paşa. Following were Melek Ahmet Eğribozî's *Tarih-i kudemâ-yı Yunan ve Makedonya*, Sahak Abro's *İlm-i tedbîr-i menzil,* a translation from Jean Baptise Say and *Avrupa'da Meşhur Ministroların Tercüme-i Hallerine Dâir Risâle*; Hayrullah Efendi's Kıt'a-i Afrika, which was a translation of Conrad Malte-Brun's *Geographie Universelle*; Rusçuklu Ali Fethi Efendi's *İlm-i tabakât-ı arz*. One other grand project commissioned by the society was the compilation of a general history book in Turkish, which would bridge the contents and methodology of the Western and Arabic sources. In addition to Enis Efendi and Aleko, Derviş Paşa, a set of scholars would be working together to compile the three volumes. Hayrullah Efendi also started writing his own history of the Ottoman Empire, *Tarih-i Devlet-i Aliyye-i Osmâniyye* in 1851, which was printed between 1853-1865.
[796] Ceyda Özmen's study integrates the function of the instructors at the new Ottoman schools with the translators of scientific works between 1789 and 1839 under "translator-educators". Ceyda Özmen, "Translating Science in the Ottoman Empire: Translator-Educators as 'Agents of Change' in the Ottoman Scientific Repertoires (1789-1839)," *Osmanlı Araştırmaları* XLVIII (2016): 143-170.

civil and military bureaucracy, they also elevated the status of science and rendered them as significant.[797]

The translation movement of the new sciences was a reflection of the wider turn to Turkish in the Ottoman literary, scholarly and official discourse since the early nineteenth century.[798] This turn was dictated by successive sultans as well as the high-ranking reform-minded state officials and adopted by authors. Championing this agenda was Sultan Mahmud II, who, as such, had initiated "a communications revolution" in the Ottoman Empire.[799] Moreover, the reforms of the civil and military bureaucrats such as Mustafa Reşid Paşa and Ahmed Cevdet Paşa carried Turkish to even greater significance by making it the center of bureaucracy.[800]

The literary and the scholarly medium would naturally follow the political discourse. Among textbooks, too, aside from the madrasa books which were predominantly in Arabic, suitable for the skills of their intended audience, it was mostly those texts written in Turkish that made it to the printed medium. The pioneering name for favoring Turkish in also the written and the printed medium was Ahmed Cevdet Efendi. In a speech he penned for Hayrullah Efendi for the opening ceremony of the Academy, he underlined the need to produce books on new types of knowledge in plain Turkish; in other words, in a language that everybody would be able to understand. The audience for the new sciences was now larger than the

---

[797] Yalçınkaya, *Learned Patriots,* 69.
[798] Literary historians speak of "türkî-i basît" or "mahallîleşme" in Turkish literature especially after the eighteenth century. See Hatice Aynur, "Türki-i Basit Hareketini Yeniden Düşünmek," *Turkish Studies* 4/5 (Summer 2009): 34-59; Fuad Köprülü, *Edebiyat Araştırmaları I*, 267-270; İhsan Fazlıoğlu, "Osmanlı Bilim Alanında Türkçe Telif ve Tercümeler." Rhoads Murphey claims that a general movement favoring the use of Türkî-i basît style was noticeable in the seventeenth century: Rhoads Murphey, "Forms of Differentiation and Expression of Individuality in Ottoman Society," *Turcica* 34 (2002): 153.
[799] Carter Vaughn Findley, *Ottoman Civil Officialdom: A Social History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), 175. Mahmud II also intervened closely with the publishing language of Takvîm-i Vekâyi' and demanded "*açık açık ta'bîrat ve herkes bilip anlayacağı elfâz ile kaleme aldırılması...*" HAT 668/32606, 1247 (1831-32).
[800] Fazlıoğlu, "Osmanlı Bilim Alanında Türkçe," 184; Tanpınar, *19. Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi,* 120.

previous centuries due to the schooling projects. He emphasized that the more literary and scientific works would be written in a given language, the more that language would acquire distinction.[801] These views were also codified through the bylaws of the institution specifically emphasizing the need for textbooks in simple Turkish.[802] In the long run, however, broader publishing venues such as the newspapers and journals would further shape the ascendency of Turkish.[803] Şinasi, in the introductory article to *Tercümân-ı Ahvâl* in 1860, noted that the newspaper had been designed in a way that could be easily comprehended by the populace" (*halkın kolayca anlayabileceği mertebede.* [804] The above-mentioned socieities such as *Cemiyet-i Tıbbiyye-i Osmânî* would also initiate more systematic efforts to find the Turkish equivalents of terms developing out of contact with Europe.

3.4.2.2 The use of Turkish and benefit as criteria for printing books on the new sciences

The textbooks prepared for the new schools to a great extent consisted of translations from the European languages. Yet these were far from metaphrasing in the modern sense. How the Ottomans utilized translation was more open-ended and pragmatic, suited to the needs of the Ottoman context.[805] Moreover, due to the foreignness of European culture, many "code-switching operations" were necessitated in translating

[801] Yalçınkaya, *Learned Patriots,* 62-63. These words of Ahmed Cevdet Paşa echo İbrahim Paşa as discussed earlier.
[802] Ayni, *Darü'l-fünun Tarihi*, 38.
[803] About the role of newspapers and journals in the ascendancy of Turkish, also see Şerif Mardin, *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought*, 227-265; Fatih Altuğ, "Modernity and Subjectivity in the Literary Criticism of Namık Kemal" (PhD diss., Boğaziçi University, 2015), 409-417.
[804] Agah Sırrı Levend, *Türk Dilinde Gelişme ve Sadeleşme Safhaları* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1949), 119.
[805] In his discussion of the translations made from Persian to Turkish from the late fifteenth to the early seventeenth century, Gottfried Hagen has noted how the Ottoman translators assumed a status similar to that of authors as evident in the way they interfered with the text and made significant additions from other sources. Gottfried Hagen, "Translations and Translators in a Multilingual Society: A Case Study of Persian-Ottoman Translations, Late Fifteenth to Early Seventeenth Century," *Eurasian Studies,* II/I (2003): 130.

culturally specific elements.[806] Any form of abridgment, appropriation and commenting could also be considered as an integral part of the translation process. The regulations on printing did not distinguish the original compilations from translations either. Therefore, translation could be read as a means of rendering these texts meaningful and comprehensible for students as in the madrasa system. At the same time, the overall benefit serving state interests should not be neglected. In this sense, it could be argued that translating was a way of "commenting" on the "canonical" texts of the new sciences in Europe; there was not even a systematic distinction between the terms '*te'lîf*' and '*terceme*' in the archival documents.[807]

In the early part of the nineteenth century, education was primarily refashioned along the needs of the military. The military dominated Ottoman policy to such an extent that the intentions in translating works of even medicine and geography were interwoven into serving the military. This brought about a remarkable emphasis on practical knowledge. In official discourse, the principal target of the state officials became the raising of "scientific-minded military officers" (*mütefennin zâbit)* with a command of military technology*,* instead of scholars who could comprehend and construct knowledge within a comprehensive worldview.[808] As Findley described, what the military needed was men with "a significant

[806] Hagen, "Translations and Translators," 133. For more information about the wider practices of translations in the Ottoman Empire, see Taceddin Kayaoğlu, *Türkiye'de Tercüme Müesseseleri* (İstanbul: Kitabevi, 1998); Arzu Meral, "A Survey of Translation Activity in the Ottoman Empire," *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, XLII (2013): 105-155.

[807] Focusing on the literary translations, Saliha Paker identifies "te'lîf" with "terceme' in the Ottoman context, because te'lîf was not deemed as original, but only "creative mediation". For a reprisal of the translations as a practice within the literary field, see Saliha Paker, "Terceme, te'lif ve özgünlük meselesi," *Metnin Halleri: Osmanlı'da telif, tercüme ve şerh* (İstanbul: Klasik Yayınları, 2014). Paker defends the use of "terceme" instead of "ceviri" in the Ottoman literary sphere. Cemal Demircioğlu, "Osmanlı Çeviri Tarihi Araştırmaları Açısından 'Terceme' ve 'Çeviri' Kavramlarını Yeniden Düşünmek," *Journal of Turkish Studies* 33/1 (2009); Cemal Demircioğlu, "From discourse to practice: rethinking 'translation' (terceme) and related practices of text production in the late Ottoman literary tradition" (PhD diss., Boğaziçi University, 2005).

[808] İhsan Fazlıoğlu, "Muhasebe Dönemi," in *İslam Düşünce Atlası,* ed. İbrahim Halil Üçer (İstanbul: Konya Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2017), 1040.

command of more technical subjects, such as medicine, military engineering or naval architecture, and their applications."[809]

In this light, the translation and the printing of texts related to the military sciences peaked between 1831-1863. Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu's catalogue has revealed that out of 3273 texts compiled in the military sciences in all centuries of the Ottoman Empire, 39.3 percent was compiled in the nineteenth century, which came second after the 54.5 percent compiled in the twentieth century. Out of this sample, 2734 texts were printed and 964 of these printed texts belonged to the nineteenth century and with the exception of two texts printed in the eighteenth century, the remaining were printed in the twentieth century. Moreover, 95.1 percent of the entire compilations were written in Turkish.[810] These statistics demonstrate that in one of the most need-based, pragmatic fields that was both taught at the schools and practiced by the new army, the overwhelming majority of texts were written in or translated into Turkish and ended up getting printed. The connection between the pragmatic-utility ends of the printing enterprise and the choice of language was hence no surprise.

On an interesting note, as the new sciences were translated into Turkish, the Ottoman state came to export them to other Muslim states; in 1838, the Iranian state, for instance, demanded four of the books on the new sciences taught in Istanbul, namely the translations on the military manuals on infantry and artillery and music.[811] Moreover, Mehmed Ali Paşa's staff in Cairo re-translated many of these texts from Turkish into Arabic and printed them at Bulaq press. [812] Orhan Koloğlu

[809] Findley, *Bureaucratic Reform,* 59.
[810] Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu and Receb Şeşen (eds.), *Osmanlı Askerlik Literatürü* (İstanbul: IRCICA, 2004), I-LXXII.
[811] HAT 657/32106-A, 1253 (1837-38); HAT 657/32106-B, 1254 (1838-39); HAT 657/32106.
[812] Koloğlu, *İlk Gazete İlk Polemik,* 32. For example, he invented "havâ-i memât" for Memphitis (Nitrogen), "esâs-ı muhdesetü'l-milk" for salifiable base, "havâ-i nesîmî" for atmospheric air and

notes that out of the 135 technical books translated in Mehmed Ali's time, sixty-seven were translations from French and sixty-eight were translations from Turkish.[813] More importantly, while translating these books, the translators made no attempt to "create a new set of Arabic military technical terms"; hence the Turkish terms were transferred.[814] From a counter view, one could see that the printing of Arabic books had significantly declined in Istanbul by the 1850s, as the Arabic editor of the Imperial Press, Ahmed Fârisî Efendi noted in a petition that there were no books in Arabic to be edited or printed at the Imperial Press.[815]

An overview of the translations on the new sciences demonstrates a gradual increase in their number in parallel to the institutionalization and rising efficiency of the new schools. The Ottoman scholarship in the new sciences including the military sciences, mathematics and medicine gradually became completely dependent on the translations from Western sources.[816] Except for Hüseyin Rıfkı Efendi's works, however, the majority of these translations were printed only once until 1863. Hence despite the official focus, the audience was limited with the students of the new schools. Tables B8, B9, B10, B11 and B12 in Appendix B reveal the distribution of printed books on these topics.

As explained above, the instructors freely mixed different original texts in the act of their translations. For instance, Hüseyin Rıfkı Tamanî (d. 1817)'s *Usûl-i hendese,*[817] first printed in 1797, was freely compiled from John Bonnycastle's

"havâ-i hayat" for respirable air. See Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, "Başhoca İshak Efendi: Pioneer of Modern Science in Turkey," in *Decision Making and Change in the Ottoman Empire*, ed. Caesar E. Farah (MO: The Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1993), 162.

[813] Koloğlu, *İlk Gazete İlk Polemik*, 32.

[814] Heyworth-Dunne, *Printing and Translations,* 339.

[815] MVL 441/96, Gurre-i Zilkade 1280 (April-May 1864).

[816] İhsan Fazlıoğlu, "Muhasebe Dönemi'nde Nazari İlimler," in *İslam Düşünce Atlası*, ed. Halil İbrahim Üçer (İstanbul: Konya Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2017), 1051.

[817] It was printed in 1212, 1220, 1246, 1269, 1271. In 1845, 500 copies of *Usûl-i hendese* was needed for the Military school but out of stock; hence a report was sent to the Imperial Press by Serasker to print them. Dobreva, "Sofya'ya Vagonlardan," 128.

Elements of Geometry and Robert Simson's *Elements of Euclid* to make it the "best Euclid" encountered by a foreign teacher of mathematics at the Military Arsenal.[818] The teaching of this new science was one of the most important matters, as many things they needed depended on it, according to Hüseyin Rıfkı. His intention was to benefit the organization of military weapons, the protection of the Ottoman borders and the struggle against the enemy, as he explained in the preface in 1797.[819] He further turned to Turkish to benefit and facilitate the comprehension of readers in his *İmtihânü'l-mühendisîn*[820], *Mecmû'atü'l-mühendisîn*[821], *Logaritma Risâlesi*[822] and in *Telhîsü'l-eşkâl.*[823]

İshak Efendi (d. 1836), also a former translator at the Translation Office, taught at both the Imperial School of Military Engineering as the Chief-instructor and the Military School.[824] His translations diffused widely in the Islamic geography making Turkish the medium of the new science.[825] First, his *Rekz ü nasb-ı hıyâm fennine ve teferru'atına dâir risâle*[826] was presented to the Sublime Porte in 1828 by

---

[818] Macfarlane, *Turkey and Its Destiny* Vol.1, 290-292.

[819] "*…muhtâç olduğumuz ekser eşya bu fenn-i celîl usûlüne müte'allik olmağın ta'lîm ve ta'allümü ehemm-i mehamm-ı vâcibetü'l-ihtimâmdan olmak mülâbesesiyle fenn-i mezkûra eşedd-i ihtiyâç ile muhtâç..."* Hüseyin Rıfkı Tamanî, *Usûl-i hendese* (İstanbul: Mühendishâne, 6 Cemâziyelâhir 1212); Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, "Tanzimat Öncesi ve Tanzimat Dönemi Osmanlı Bilim ve Eğitim Anlayışı," 353.

[820] "*... menâfi'-i kesîreyi müştemil olmak mülâhazasıyla erbâbına yüsr ü sühûlet zımnında lisân-ı Türkîde bu risâle..."* Hüseyin Rıfkı Efendi, *İmtihanü'l-mühendisîn* (İstanbul: Dârü't-Tıbâ'ati'l-Âmire, 1217). It was also printed in 1220, 1246, 1260.

[821] "*...etfâl-i mekâtib-i şâhânenin ta'lîm ve ta'allümleri için..."* Hüseyin Rıfkı Efendi, *Mecmû'atü'l-mühendisîn* (İstanbul: Dârü't-Tıbâ'ati'l-Âmire, 1269). It was also printed in 1217, 1220, 1246, 1260, 1273, 1274.

[822] 1232. Fazlıoğlu, "Osmanlı Bilim Alanında Türkçe," 172.

[823] 1215.

[824] İshak Efendi was a student of Hüseyin Rıfkı Tamanî. He attended the Imperial School for Military Engineering between 1806-1815 and worked in the Balkans to strengthen the fortifications. He was appointed as the Chief Instructor at the Imperial School of Military Engineering in 1830. Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, *Başhoca İshak Efend*i (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1989). His other printed works included *Usûlü'l-istihkâmât*, *Aksü'l-merâyâ*..The latter was introduced as "*mühendisîne ve muvakkitin kullarına ma'lûmatı elzem ve nâfi' bir kitap olmağla*.." in HAT 655/32030, 1248 (1832-33).

[825] Fazlıoğlu, "Osmanlı Bilim Alanında Türkçe," 172.

[826] This book was also called *Rekz ve nasbü'l-hıyâm*. It was printed in 1242 and the copies were distributed to a number of military officials as listed in C.AS 743/31228, 26 Cemâziyelâhir 1243 (14 January 1828).

Serasker Hüsrev Paşa, who claimed that the book could be useful to engineers employed at the new army.[827] İshak Efendi wrote a petition for another book, *Usûl-i siyâga,* in 1831 explaining that since the enemy was using artillery, the Ottomans also had to counter their weapons with their own, as jihad necessitated it. His two other works, *Usûlü'l-istihkâmât* and *Aksü'l-merâyâ* were authorized for print by Mahmud II to be handed out to the engineers and the soldiers due to their apparent benefit.[828] His most significant work, however, was *Mecmû'a-i ulûm-i riyâziye*, a four-volume translation from French sources integrated with his own notes.[829] This was a collection that spanned several of the new sciences at the time such as mathematics, geometry, conic spheres, physics, astronomy, biology and mechanics among others. He stated his own intention in the preface as "presenting all these sciences cumulatively in one place in the European style in an abridged and beneficial format after translating and abridging foreign books to serve the competent people who wanted to study them."[830] Many of the foreign travelers interested in education in the Ottoman Empire had been introduced to İshak Efendi's "encyclopedia," as termed by James De Kay in 1832.[831]

---

[827] Following the consult between Director of Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire, İbrahim Sa'ib Efendi and Hüsrev Paşa, 300 copies were printed and completed in 1828. There were 104 people listed to receive a free copy including many of the military officials and engineers. The remaining 196 copies would be kept at the Imperial Press to be later distributed to the high officials appointed to the provinces. See Beydilli, *Türk Bilim ve Matbaacılık*, 253. Ahmed Lütfi Efendi also noted the necessity of this book for the military officers and soldiers and mentioned that the many printed copies had been distributed to the soldiers and students at the Imperial School for Engineering. "...zabitân-ı askerî içün lüzûm olduğunu Serasker Hüsrev Paşa inhâ eylemiş…" Ahmed Lütfi Efendi, *Vaka'a-nüvis Ahmed Lütfî Efendi Tarihi,* vol. I, ed. Münir Aktepe (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1983), 167.

[828] HAT 655/32020, 1248 (1832-33).

[829] Although İshak Efendi did not name his sources, Feza Günergun has surmised that the books he resorted to could be: Mathurin-Jacques Brisson (1806)'s Elémens ou principes physico-chymiques and Valmont de Bomare (d. 1807)'s Dictionnaire raisonne universel d'histoire naturelle, as they were both at the library of the Imperial School of Military Engineering. Feza Günergun, 10.

[830] "…ulûm-ı ta'lîmiyye-i mezkûrenin cümlesi bir yerde ve sûreti ifâdeleri Avrupa usûlü vechile muhtasar ve müfîd ve kestirme olmak üzere kütüb-i efrenciyyeden tercüme ve tenkîhiyle tahsîlini murâd eden erbâb-ı isti'dâdın..." İshak Efendi, *Mecmû'a-i ulûm-i riyâziye Vol.* 1 (İstanbul: Dârü't-Tıbâ'ati'l-Âmire, 1247).

[831] De Kay, 140. Also mentioning the work as "a cyclopedia of mathematical science"' was George Larpent. See *Turkey: Its History and Progress from the Journals and Correspondences of Sir James Porter (*London: Hurst and Blackett Publishers: 1854), 179.

This book, in particular, greatly shaped the formation of a technical vocabulary in Turkish on the new sciences. Some of the terms coined by him were taught at both the Imperial School of Military Engineering and the Military School for years. Again, the sciences contained therein such as mathematics and geography were deemed worthy in connection to their benefit for military engineering. Hence he had translated the four volumes for the benefit of students.[832] Printing these works, according to Ahmed Lütfi Efendi, served to generalize and spread their benefit.[833] In 1834, 500 copies of the 1200 were to be distributed to the students at the Engineering School.[834]

Another chief-instructor at the Imperial School for Military Engineering, Seyyid Ali Paşa (d.1846), compiled a book of geometry in 1840 entitled *Usûl-i kutû-i mahrûtiyyât,* based on the works of a wide range of scholars both in the Islamic and the Western traditions.[835] In the introduction to his work, he noted that it was a necessary text for the students of his school.[836] Furthermore, he complained about the lack of sufficient books in Turkish in his petition to Sultan Abdülmecid seeking for permission to print.[837] Ali Paşa emphasized that the knowledge of conic sections was especially important for military sciences.

The connection between mathematicians and high-ranking state positions was especially clear. The mathematics instructor at *Dârülmuallimîn*[838], Miralay Safvet Bey (d. 1911), wrote a book in 1858 on calculus (*hesâb)* entitled *Usûl-i ilm-i hesâb*

[832] HAT 655/32030-A, 1248 (1832-33).
[833] "*...ta'mîm-i fevâidi zımnında nüsah-ı müte'addideleri..."* Ahmed Lütfi Efendi, Vaka'a-nüvis Ahmed Lütfi Efendi Tarihi, vol. III, (ed). Münir Aktepe, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1983), 659.
[834] C. MF 42/2088, 14 Receb 1250 (16 November 1834).
[835] Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, Recep Şeşen and Cevad İzgi (eds.), *Osmanlı Matematik Literatürü Tarihi* (Vol. 1-2) (Istanbul: IRCICA 1999), LXI; İhsan Fazlıoğlu, "Seyyid Ali Paşa," in Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi, Vol. 37 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfi, 2009), 48.
[836] İshak Efendi, *Kutû-i Mahrûtiyyât* (İstanbul: Bâb-ı Seraskerî Matbaası, 1257).
[837] İ.DH 19/898, 18 Cemâziyelâhir 1256 (17 August 1840).
[838] Established in 1848 to train teachers for the new schools. See Osman Ergin.

in order to be taught at his own school and the *rüşdiye* schools.[839] In the preface to his work, he acknowledged that it was a translation from the French scholars to benefit students who were eager to learn this science.[840] By 1861, Safvet Bey had also started to teach physics at the Military School and served as a member of the Council of Public Education, when he translated *Logaritma* from the French mathematician Jerome Lalande (d. 1807). Therein he introduced the logarithmic tables as the primer of mathematics.[841] Again, his translation into Turkish intended to facilitate study of this subject by the ambitious students.[842] A colonel and an instructor at the Military School, Mustafa Sıdkı Paşa (d. 1889), translated a treatise on calculus by the most respected French scholars, which was printed in 1862.[843] Noting the lack of available works in Turkish that were conducive to learning, he intended his book to be beneficial and be taught at the military high schools (*askerî idâdî*) and perhaps others.[844] He would later be also promoted as the governor of Erzurum. [845]

The link between teaching and translating, however, was not a prerequisite either. Serving in various ranks of *ilmiyye* as well as civil bureaucracy, Ahmed

---

[839] İ.DH 411/27185, 8 Muharrem 1275 (18 August 1858); A. MKT. MHM 142/87, 5 Rebîülevvel 1275 (13 October 1858). Yahya Akyüz, "Türkiye'de Öğretmen Yetiştirmenin 160.Yılımda Darülmuallimin'in İlk Yıllarına Toplu ve Yeni bir Bakış," *Ankara Üniversitesi Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi*, 20: 41. For more information about Safvet Bey, also see Mahmut Cevat, *Maârif-i Umûmiye Nezâreti*, 61.

[840] "*...işbu fennin ta'allümüne hâhişkâr olan kâffe-i ihvâna nef'i şâmil olamayacağı... mütâla'asından arzû-mendânı ma'ârif ve fünûnu bi's-sühûle hâiz-i emeli derûn olmak üzere…*" Safvet Bey, *Usûl-i İlm-i hesâb* (İstanbul: Mekteb-i Harbiyye-i Şâhâne Litografya Destgâhı, Evâsıt-ı Receb 1275).

[841] Safvet Paşa here is probably Mustafa Safvet Paşa (d. 1911) who wrote books on astronomy and mathematics. See Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, ed. *Osmanlı Matematik Literatürü Tarihi* (İstanbul: IRCICA, 1997), 429.

[842] "*...şerhi ve sûret-i isti'mâli ise lisân-ı Türkîye tercüme olunmadığından hâhişkerânı ma'rifeti isti'mâl husûsunda usret ve zahmet çekmekte olduklarından..."* Saffet Paşa, *Logaritma* (İstanbul: Cerîde-i Havâdis Matbaası, 1278).

[843] Mustafa Paşa, *İlm-i hesâba dâir risâle* (İstanbul: Matba'a-i Âmire, 1290).

[844] A.MKT.MHM 464/61, 28 Receb 1280 (8 January 1864).

[845] A graduate of the Military School, he also served as an instructor in artillery, topography and arazi taksimi for years. He was sent to Erzurum as a governor in 1863. Bursalı Mehmed Tahir Bey, *Osmanlı Müellifleri,* Vol. 3.

Tevhid Efendi (d. 1870) wrote *Telhîsü'l-a'mâl* in Turkish. In his preface, he legitimized his work by noting the few number of specialists in the mathematical sciences, who had become rare like a "phoenix." [846] Hence he had translated and compiled a few works on practical geometry and measurement (*mesâha)*. His second treatise on mathematics was entitled *Nuhbetü'l-hesâb.* It was introduced as a book praise-worthy by the editor at the Imperial Press for facilitating the learning of interested people.[847] Bianchi also pointed at the "indisputable" utility of the book.[848] While both books had been presented to Sultan Mahmud II much earlier, they were printed only in 1854.

Another free-style translation from a combination of German and French sources was compiled by Erkan-ı Harbiye Kolağası Ömer Naili Efendi in 1859, who was also an instructor of fortification (*istihkâmât)* and mechanics at the Military School and translated a book entitled *Fenn-i istihkâmât-ı hafîfe ma'a atlas.* He meant it as a necessary text for students of the Military School as well as those soldiers outside of the school.[849] Moreover, the review of the book by different councils including *Dâr-ı Şûrâ-yı Askeriyye* and the Council of Public Education affirmed the benefit of this book for the military soldiers.[850]

As noted above, the translation of books on medicine and geography was also closely attuned to the needs of the Ottoman military. The Medical School was

---

[846] Ahmed Tevhid Efendi, *Telhîsü'l-a'mâl* (İstanbul: Takvimhâne-i Âmire, Evâhir-i Receb 1270). For more information about his place in the Ottoman mathematical tradition, see İhsan Fazlıoğlu, "Hesap," in Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi, Vol. 17 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1998), 252; İhsan Fazlıoğlu, "Ahmed Tevhid Efendi," in *Yaşamları ve Yapıtlarıyla Osmanlılar Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 1 (İstanbul: Yapı Kredı Yayınları, 1999), 164-165.

[847] " *...bu fenne tâlib ve râgıb olanlara yüsr ve sühûleti mucîb olmak üzere..."* Ahmed Tevhid Efendi, *Nuhbetü'l-hesâb* (İstanbul: Tab'hâne-i Âmire Litografya Destgâhı, 1270).

[848] M. Bianchi, "Bibliographie Ottomane ou Notice des Ouvrages Publies," *Journal Asiatique,* seri V, XIII (June 1859): 534.

[849] Ömer Naili, *Fenn-i istihkâmât-ı hafife ma'a atlas* (İstanbul: Mekteb-i Harbiyye-i Şâhâne Matbaası, (Evâil-i Cemâziyelevvel 1278).

[850] "*mezkûr kitâbların mütâla'ası zâbıtân-ı askeriyece fâildeli şey olduğu anlaşılmış...*" İ.DH 445/29386, 15 Rebîülevvel 1276 (12 October 1859). Ömer Naili Efendi also translated *Fenn-i harb ve Tarih-i asker*, printed at the Military School in 1283 and 1289-two editions, lithography each.

established in 1827 for the service of the army, too. The treatises in medicine enhanced the prestige of Turkish as a language of science.[851] Starting with Mustafa Behçet Efendi (d. 1834),[852] Şânîzâde Mehmed Atâullah Efendi (d. 1826)[853], and Müneccimbaşı Osman Sâib Efendi (d. 1864),[854] whose works were among the earliest translations made from European languages into Turkish, this movement paved the way towards the formation of a technical terminology in Turkish. Şânîzâde Mehmed Atâullah Efendi, in particular, invented new terms in Turkish to meet the new European terms for medicine and re-shaped the older ones. Moreover, Osman Sâib Efendi (d. 1863)'s *Ahkâmü'l-emrâz* was a translation of August Francois Chomel's (d. 1858) *Eléments de pathologie générale.* The Supreme Council stated explicitly in 1836 that the book had print value due to its benefits for everyone.[855] In 1856, a special class was formed by the director of the school, Cemaleddîn Efendi, offering linguistic education in Arabic, Persian and Turkish. Another such instructor, Miralay Doctor Seyyid Hafız Mehmed Bey translated two volumes of the surgical sciences entitled *Kavânîn-i cerrâhîn* in 1852, originally written by the French surgeon Purgeri. The director of the Medical School, who introduced the book to the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances, explained that even though there were doctors graduating from the Medical School, there were no textbooks in Turkish. Hence everyone had to learn French before they could become a doctor. More similar books had to be translated into Turkish.[856]

---

[851] Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu and E. K. Unat (eds.), *Osmanlıca Tıp Terimleri Sözlüğü* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2004), XVII.
[852] *Kolera Risâlesi*, printed in 1247.
[853] *Mir'âtü'l-ebdân*, printed in 1235.
[854] *Ahkâmü'l-emrâz,* printed in 1252.
[855] "*…herkes hakkında intifâ'ı olacağına binâen...*" C.SH 10/457, 15 Şevval 1252 (23 January 1857).
[856] İ.DH 250/15333, 29 Cemâziyelevvel 1268 (21 March 1852). The book, however, was printed at the press of the Medical School only in 1289.

At the same time, learning French could be easier than reading a bad translation of a scientific work into Turkish. Since "the new word-makers did not proceed upon any uniform system or principle," according to Charles Macfarlane in 1848, learning French could have been easier than reading the translations which were "found to be unintelligible the students."[857] Turning the language of the Medical School into Turkish would become an important concern for students, who established a foundation called the Society of Ottoman Medicine (*Cemiyet-i Tıbbiyye-i Osmâniyye)* in 1862 with the aim to translate medical books into Turkish for general usage and consumption.[858] In fact, in 1873, Kırımlı Aziz İdris Bey would address the members of the association claiming that the "expansion of medical knowledge" in the Ottoman Empire would be through the translation of beneficial scientific books into Turkish.[859]

In contrast to the specialized nature and audience of medical books, books on geography had a broader appeal. Perhaps due to their practical nature, translations on geography found their place within the curricula of a variety of schools such as the *rüşdiyes*, the Military School and the Medical School more than any other new science.[860] Moreover, not only these printed books, but also a majority of all

---

[857] Charles Macfarlane, *Turkey and Its Destiny* Vol. 2 (London, 1850), 271-272.

[858] Nil Sarı, "Cemiyet-i Tıbbiye-i Osmaniyye ve Tıp Dilinin Türkçeleşmesi Akımı," in Osmanlı İlmi ve Mesleki Cemiyetleri, ed. Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu (İstanbul: IRCICA, 1987), 121. The society became official in 1866 under the superintendentate of Salih Efendi, 124. Feza Günergun, 4. As a result of these efforts, a dictionary of medicine was published in 1873 on the basis of Pierre-Hubert Nysten, conducted by Cemiyet-i Tıbbiye-i Osmâniyye. The translation of this dictionary led to the emergence of many new medical terms in Turkish with reference to Şanizade's Hamse and Meninski's dictionary. 1868-76, 34 books on medicine would be published, even though only 20 books had been published between 1817-1856.

[859] Emre Karacaoğlu,"Kırımlı Aziz İdris Bey'in Hayatı, Çalışmaları ve Cemiyet-i Tıbbiye-i Osmaniye'de İrad Ettiği Nutuk Hakkında," *Türkiye Klinikleri,* 2016 (24/1): 18.

[860] To complement the more practical aspects of books on geography, we may also mention the efforts of Kemal Efendi, the Director of Public Schools to facilitate the teaching of geography at rüşdiyes through maps and model globes (*küre*) displaying the cities, rivers and all unique geographic characteristics of all states. He even ordered the preparation of 150-200 new model globes in Turkish from Paris in 1851. See İ.DH 238/14391, 9 Şevval 1267 (7 August 1851). *"... her bir devletin makarr-ı saltanatını ve bi'l-cümle memâlik ve meşhûr şehir ve nehirler ve coğrafyaca dâir lüzumlu şeyler gösterilerek…*" Also see İ.MVL 198/6146, 25 Rebîülâhir 1266 (8 February 1850).

compiled books on geography ever since the beginning of the empire had been written in Turkish. For the nineteenth century in specific, only 36 out of the 208 printed books were in Arabic.[861] Due to its pragmatic ends, it would be the most up-to-date texts that would be printed for the new schools.[862]

The most popular title in print until 1863 was Hüseyin Rıfkı Tamanî's treatise on geography, *el-Medhal fi'l-coğrafya*.[863] It was prepared for print by his student, İshak Hoca, who explained in the preface that he had abridged it (*telhîs ve tenkîh birle*) as a separate work from among the larger notes of Hüseyin Rıfkı on astronomy and geography. The preface further drew attention to the connection between geography, astronomy and the military; using maps depended on knowing geography and knowing geography was dependent on knowing astronomy.[864] Using maps, in particular, was the most necessary for commanders to learn about their enemies.

The translators of geography books were, almost without an exception, instructors at various new schools. Şirvanlı Ahmed Hamdi Efendi (d. 1890)[865], for instance, was a teacher at İzmir Rüşdiyesi in 1855, who demanded permission to print his translation of Eugene Cortambert entitled *Usûl-i coğrafya-yı kebîr: Nüzhetü'l-büldân li-tenşîti'l-ihvân.*[866] Kamil Sezai Bey was an instructor at the

---

[861] Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu et al., *Osmanlı Coğrafya Literatürü Tarihi* (İstanbul: IRCICA, 2000), LXVIII.

[862] In a very interesting document from 1859, the printing of the most recent translation on geography compiled by an instructor at the Military School, Ali Rıza Efendi had to be postponed because the earlier translation by Osman Saib Efendi had not yet been sold out. MVL 323/37, 12 Receb 1275 (15 February 1859).

[863] 1247, 1266, 1274, 1277.

[864] "*Harita kullanmak mutlaka coğrafya bilmeye, coğrafya bilmek de astronomi bilmeye bağlıdır.*" Hüseyin Rıfkı Tamanî, *el-Medhal fi Coğrafya,* ed. İshak Efendi (İstanbul: Takvîmhâne-i Âmire, 1266).

[865] Ahmed Hamdi Efendi would quickly climb the bureaucratic ranks and became a favorite during the reign of Sultan Abdülhamid II (r. 1876-1908). Some of his other books include: *Makâmât-ı Harirî* (1290), *Türkçe muhtasar usûl-i fıkh* (1301), *Teshîlü'l-arûz ve'l-kavafi ve'l-bedâyi* (1872), *Süverü'l-kevâkib* (1867), *Medhal-i inşâ* (1882), *Seyahatnâme: Hindistan, Svat ve Afganistan* (1875).

[866] "*...fâide-i mucîb ve neşri münâsib âsârdan idiği anlaşılmış olduğundan bunun temettü' ve mesârıfı kendisine âit olmak üzere hususun nezârete havâlesi..*" İ.MVL 553/24809, 6 Zilhicce 1272 (8 August 1856). Yet, the book was printed only in 1283, eleven years after he sent the petition. For more information, see İzgi, *Osmanlı Medreselerinde İlim*, 247.

Medical School, who translated into Turkish a text called *Risâle-i Muhtasar-ı coğrafya* in 1854.[867] Binbaşı Mehmed Enverî Bey was an instructor of geography at the Naval School and he translated his book in 1856.[868] Another prolific translator was Beşiktaşî Bogos Tiryakioğlu, who was an instructor teaching French at the Medical School, who translated a treatise on geography by August Michelot focusing on the European continent, printed in 1848.[869] After the printing of the part on the European continent in 1848, he translated and printed another one at the press of the Medical School the next year, focusing on Europe once again as a continent, but this time on its general description.[870] He noted in the preface that he would continue translating the other four continents and print them as completed.[871] A standard procedure in all of these contemporary books was to discuss the significance of geography, thereby the significance of their books. They all pointed to the utility of this science and the proven need for its comprehension not only by professionals, but also by students and the general public.

The evaluation councils, which always included the Council of Public Education, the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances and also the specialized councils of each related school, reciprocated on the significance and the related benefit of these textbooks. In certain cases, the contributions of the books were

[867] "*Fenn-i coğrafyada pekçok kütüb-i mu'tebere ve resâil-i adîde te'lîf olmuş ise de onların ekserisi ehl-i kemâl kimesne anlayacağı mertebelerde tertîb ve tasnîf olunduğundan etfâl ve sıbyânın ekserisinin havsala-i isti'dâdları fehminden âciz olmalarıyla...*" Kamil Sezai, *Risâle-i muhtasar-ı coğrafya* (İstanbul: Mekteb-i Tıbbiye-i Şâhâne, 1270).
[868] "*.. dîn-i devlet ve mülk-i milletçe tahsîl ve ta'lîmi eşedd-i elzem bir fenn-i kesîrü'l-menafi' olduğuna binâen... mekteb-i mezbûru şakirdânına mucîbi yüsr ü sühûlet ve âmme-i ibâdullahın fenn-i mezkûru tahsîllerinde sühûlet çekmeleri için...*" Mehmed Enverî, *Coğrafya* (İstanbul: Mekteb-i Bahriyye Tabhânesi 1273). Also see İ. DH 339/22311, 11 Cemâziyelevvel 1272 (19 January 1856).
[869] A.AMD 8/20, 26 Cemâziyelâhir 1265 (19 May 1849).
[870] A.MKT.NZD 8/9, 17 Receb 1266 (29 May 1850).
[871] Boğos Tiryakioğlu, *Risâle-i coğrafya-kısm-ı sâni,* Avrupa kıt'asının ta'rîf-i umûmisi (İstanbul: Mekteb-i Tıbbiyye, 1266).

specified; the Naval Council, for instance, praised Mehmed Enverî's book for including the American continent in perfect detail.[872]

All in all, with the printing of textbooks on the new sciences, we observe an attempt by the Ottoman state officials to connect with the sources of European technology. To make this knowledge accessible, Turkish became the preferred medium. While the number of printed titles increased towards 1863, however, the audience of these books remained limited to students and bureaucrats with immediate benefits in studying these texts. Therefore, there was a great emphasis on the immediate pragmatic returns expected from the printing of these books on the new sciences. At the same time, compared to the broader spectrum of printed textbooks between 1831 and 1863, both the number of textbooks on the new sciences and their reprinted editions remained low. To give a very broad estimate, their numerical value did not exceed 35 percent of the entire corpus of printed books. This observation tells us, on the one hand, that despite all unfounded declarations of a wholesale "Westernization" in the nineteenth century, the numerical representation of books representing the Western tradition remained low. On the other hand, we should also note that despite the lack of wide-scale diffusion, the fact that they were represented by the socio-political elite employed in state ranks added to the influence of these texts in shaping a new direction for the Ottoman policies in the long run.

3.4.3 Printing classical textbooks

With a quick glance at the list of printed books between 1831 and 1863, one can note the predominance of titles representing centuries' of intellectual accumulation in the empire. The list speaks for the continuity of what had for long been learned,

[872] İ. DH 339/22311, 11 Cemâziyelevvel 1272 (19 January 1856).

deliberated and taught. As discussed in earlier sections, copying by hand was a decentralized, uncontrolled activity relegated to the private sphere of an individual. Printing, however, suggested the presence of a filtering agent in the center, who deliberated the need for specific texts and acted on these choices by prioritizing the printing of some over the others. In the period between 1831-1863, the Ottoman state not only embraced a religious discourse next to a scientific one, but also embraced the traditional and the religious books as the legitimate output of a valuable technology. Tables B13, B14, B15 and B16 in Appendix B attest to their popularity in print. As the following section will demonstrate, some of the most popular classics of the Ottoman madrasa system were replicated and diffused to a wide audience from Istanbul to the provinces of the empire.

3.4.3.1 Scarcity and accuracy

When it came to the printing of classical textbooks, or material taught at the madrasas for centuries, the Ottoman officials needed a different type of legitimization. What mattered was the utility of the printing press in addressing the scarcity and the accuracy of texts, which had been a great problem in manuscript culture. In his *er-Risâletü'l-Müsemmâ bi-vesîleti't-tıbâ'a* dated 1727*,* İbrahim Müteferrika (d. 1745) had already explained the benefits of the printing press with reference to its role in preserving the written heritage of humanity by duplicating the scarce manuscript copies of important works in a shorter period of time with fewer textual errors, which would serve to expand education to all segments of society.[873]

[873] For more issues covered by this treatise related to the benefits of printing, see George Atiyeh, ed. *The Book in the Islamic World: The Written Word and Communication in the Middle East* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995), 286-292.

In the introduction to the 1785 edition of *Kâfiye mu'ribi*[874], Beylikçi Mehmed Raşid Efendi (d. 1798), who held a *berat* to run the printing press, also professed his intentions to define and legitimate the sphere of print. Realizing the lack of printed grammar books, he stated that he had consulted some educated people (*ashâb-ı ma'ârif*) to decide on Zeynîzâde Hüseyin Efendi (d. 1759)'s commentary on *Kâfiye* of Ibn Hâcib. He had been directly motivated by the need of students for this relevant text; they encountered much difficulty in trying to locate the scarce copies that contained plenty of errors.[875] The printing press, as a beneficial art (*san'at*), after all, was to guarantee the abundance of accurate copies at a low price.

The archival sources do not provide much detail about the process by which the particular madrasa textbooks were selected for print. There are vague references to some educated people (*ashâb-ı ma'ârif*) who were consulted, as noted above. Once the title was decided, however, there are more clues to suggest that the involved scholars or officials strained to obtain the most authentic copy possible as in "best reflecting the original text of the author" among a great number of possible options by means of surveying the libraries and comparing different versions. Reinhard Schulze has identified this phase as "verification" or "*tahqiq"*.[876]

There are many examples that testify to this concern and to the process. For instance, in 1803, the colophon of the first printed Islamic book, *Risâle-i Birgivî,* stated that the printed copy was based on a revised and collated (*mukâbele*) copy of

[874] Zeynîzâde Hüseyin Efendi, Kâfiye mu'*ribi (İstanbul: Abdurrahman Muhib Efendi ma'rifetiyle, 1234).*
[875] It would also be printed at the Imperial Press in 1253, 1254, 1266, 1267, 1276. This particular version of Kâfiye had been copied from a reliable copy replicated and reciprocated (mukâbele) from the autograph copy of the book currently available at Atıf Efendi library. It had then been line by line reciprocated by Mustafa Efendi and Adem Efendi of the ulama to produce a reliable edition. This book had indeed been the right choice, as it would continue to serve as a textbook in Ottoman schools, old and new, in also the nineteenth century.
[876] Reinhard Schulze, "The Birth of Tradition and Modernity in the 18th and 19th century Islamic Culture: The Case of Printing," *Culture and History* 16 (1997): 48.

the book copied from an autograph copy available in *Enderûn-ı Hümâyûn.*[877] In another case from 1831, the accurate copies of *Şerh-i Akâid Hâşiyesi* by Ebu İshak İsâmuddîn el-İsferâyînî (d. 1538), a well-studied textbook (*beyne't-talebe makbûl ve mütedâvil)* in the madrasas*,* was reportedly running scarce *(nüsha-yı sahîhası nedret üzere)* in the market.[878] As a result, different manuscript versions of the text were gathered at the Imperial Press and the printed edition was formed by collating (*nesh-i müte'addide tedârikiyle tashîh ve mukâbele*) different copies.[879] Moreover, in 1834, the director of the Imperial Press, el-Hâc İbrahim Saib Efendi noted that in preparing *Tuhfetu's-sukûk* of Debbağzâde Numan Efendi (d.1809) for print, they had sought the authentic *(nesh-i sahîha)* copy kept at the office of Şeyhülislam and had edited it through comparison with various authentic copies at hand *(nesh-i sahîha-i müte'addide-i menkûle tatbîkan tashîh olunarak)*.[880] The printed version in 1843 openly stated in the colophon that it constituted the most accurate version.[881] In a different case, the director of the Imperial Press explained that they wanted to resort to the autograph copy *(nüsha-i aslîsi)* of Mütercim Asım Efendi's (d. 1820) translation of *Kâmusu'l-Muhît* kept in the Hamidiye library before printing the second edition in 1850 in order to correct the mistakes visible in the first printed edition.[882] The preface to this second edition printed in 1855 revealed that they had indeed prepared the second edition through collation *(mukâbele)* with the autograph

[877] Muhammed Birgivî, *Risâle-i Birgivî* (İstanbul: Dârü't-Tıbâ'ati'l-Cedîdeti'l-Ma'mûre, Cemâziyelâhir 1218).
[878] This was a supra-commentary on Sadeddîn et-Teftâzânî's (d. 1390) *Şerhu'l-Akâid*, which was the most famous commentary on Necmeddîn Ebu Hafs Ömer b. Muhammed b. Ahmed en-Nesefî es-Semerkandî (d.1142)'s *Metnü'l-Akâid.*
[879] HAT 665/32362, 1247 (1831-32); Anonymous, "Fünûn," Takvîm-i Vekâyi' (7 Şaban 1249), 4.
[880] HAT 678/33034, 1249 (1833-34).
[881] Debbağzâde Numan Efendi, *Tuhfetü's-sukûk* (İstanbul: Dârü't-Tıbâ'ati'l-Âmire, Evâhir-i Rebîülevvel 1259).
[882] HAT 319/18713, 1232 (1816/17).

copy and necessary revisions.[883] This case also reveals that printing itself did not guarantee an error-free version of the text.

Hence early on, the main benefits of printing technology, along the lines proposed by Elizabeth Eisenstein for Western Europe, had been internalized by the Ottoman printers.[884] By virtue of its reproductive capacity, the printing press would even take over the function of the Ottoman libraries for the reproduction of manuscripts by hand, as argued by Yavuz Sezer.[885] At the same time, this awareness was not solely a result of the Ottoman familiarity with the European experience. Rather, it was a matter of the powers of the printing press in standardizing and replicating texts becoming more relevant to the Ottoman socio-political and cultural environment.

3.4.3.2 Canonical madrasa textbooks

While we mentioned the formation of a textbook canon of instrumental books in the previous sections shaped by the interests of the Ottoman state, there was already a pool of canonical textbooks as mobilized traditionally in the madrasa tracks. The journey of a classical manuscript into print was initiated in correlation to the circulation and perceived impact of the manuscript on the scholarly or popular circles. Out of a pool of about 1000 printed books between 1831-1863, a significant number consisted of titles associated with the courses taught at the madrasas such as jurisprudence, Islamic theology, logic and rhetoric. Other canonical titles on grammar and *ilmihâls* were shared with other venues of education in the nineteenth century, as elaborated in the previous sections.

---

[883] Ebu Tahir Mecdüddîn Muhammed b. Yakub b. Muhammed, *el-Okyanusü'l-basît fî tercemeti'l-Kâmusi'l-Muhît* (İstanbul, Muharrem 1272).
[884] Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change*.
[885] Sezer, "The Architecture of Bibliophilia," 265.

In the Islamic tradition, the canon or an authoritative text means that the "knowledgable consulted it, speacialists based findings upon it, scholars elaborated its points in commentaries, teachers clarified its subtleties, students committed its passages to heart."[886] The main text *(matn)* was most frequently accompanied with a commentary (*sharh)* with an aim to facilitate the comprehension of the student. The commentary was inserted into the space opened up in the main text; often marked in different ink colors, the reader was directed to shift back and forth between the two texts. Moreover, while the compact originals enabled the student to memorize it as almost a formula, the interpretive commentaries, ranging from providing dictionary meanings of phrases to doctrinal elaborations, helped to "clarify the crowded meanings."[887] Granting them an "unfinished" quality, the authoritative texts were repeatedly subjected to new commentaries over the centuries in intellectual layers.[888] In turn, the authors of works over which commentaries were written became recognized as the "authorities" in their field.[889]

The printing of these canonical texts initiated much change in the Islamic scholarly tradition starting from the last quarter of the nineteenth century.[890] Printing reproduced the "cluster-like" appearance of these original texts with the inclusion of their commentaries and super-commentaries in one volume. As such, with one edition, at least two related texts would be placed for the access of more than a thousand readers. Hence the impact of a classical text in the nineteenth century context, it may be argued, is not only measurable by the number of editions but also

[886] Messick, *Calligraphic State,* 16.
[887] Messick, *Calligraphic State,* 31.
[888] Messick, *Calligraphic State,* 33.
[889] Glenn Most, "Şerhlere Kuramsal Bir Bakış," in *Metnin Halleri: Osmanlı'da Telif, Tercüme ve Şerh, Eski Türk Edebiyatı Çalışmaları IX,* eds. Hatice Aynur, Müjgan Çakır, Hanife Koncu, Selim S. Kuru and Ali Emre Özyıldırım (İstanbul: Klasik Yayınları, 2014), 455.
[890] See, for instance, Ahmed el Shamsy's upcoming book on how printing remade the Islamic tradition: *Islam in the Age of Print: The Transformation of the Islamic Intellectual Tradition: 1820-1950.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press (forthcoming).

the derivative literature formed around it. Moreover, since the canonical texts were traditionally taught through their commentaries, the printing format further empowered the teaching method of the madrasas.[891] Many of them had also been copied together as *mecmû'as* as part of the manuscript tradition. Together with continuity, however, came adaptation to the new circumstances. One must also consider the fact that the changing understanding and centralization of textbooks in the nineteenth century along with the new medium of printing must have led to a qualitative change in scholarship. In fact, Khaled el-Rouayheb has argued that what seemed like decline in the traditional madrasa science of logic was in fact the appearance of more books in print, the good and the bad, with the press ensuring their survival to this day.[892]

In many fields constituting the madrasa curriculum, we can thus trace some clusters. In jurisprudence, for instance, İbrahim Halebî's (d. 1549) *Mülteka'l-ebhur* dominated the world of printed textbooks.[893] In 1842, a new edition was printed with the expectation that it would bring much profit.[894] The original text was printed four times until 1863.[895] Among the many commentaries available in manuscript, it was Şeyhîzâde Damad Efendi's (d. 1667) *Mecma'u'l-enhur fî şerhi Mülteka'l-ebhur* that had the remarkable impact through multiple printed editions.[896] An article in *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'* clearly explained that its printing served the students and the religious scholars.[897] Moreover, a comprehensive Turkish commentary had been executed by

[891] For the teaching methods in madrasas, see İzgi, *Osmanlı Medreselerinde İlim*.
[892] Khaled al-Rouayheb, *Relational Syllogisms and the History of Arabic Logic 900-1900* (Brill, 2010), 236.
[893] Şükrü Selim Has, "A Study of Ibrahim al-Halebi with Special Reference to the Multaqā" (Ph.D. diss., University of Edinburgh, 1981).
[894] İ.DH 54/2651, 23 Muharrem 1258 (6 March 1842).
[895] 1252, 1264, 1274, 1278
[896] 1240, 1241, 1247, 1248, 1252, 1257, 1258, 1264, 1273, 1274, 1276.
[897] Anonymous, Takvîm-i Vekâyi' (Selh-i Zilhicce, 1252), 5.

Midillili Mehmed Mevkûfâtî Efendi (d. 1655), which also got printed three times.[898] Mevkûfâtî Efendi noted in the preface that his intention in simplifying the text (*ıstılâhât ve ibârât ve tekellüfâtdan ârî elfâz-ı Türkî ile şerhe şürû')* was to benefit the educated and the lay readers (*havâs ve avâm müstefîd olalar)*.[899]

Also in jurisprudence, Molla Hüsrev (d. 1480) was a popular scholar whose works made it into print early on. His *Dürerü'l-hükkâm* initiated a new constellation.[900] This was a commentary on his earlier book, *Gurerü'l-ahkâm.* Ebu Said el-Hadimî's commentary was also very popular and was printed three times.[901] This cluster was complemented by another commentary by Abdülhalim b. Pir Kadem printed in 1853/54 and a by Süleyman b. Veli el Ankaravî printed in 1842/43. Molla Hüsrev also wrote *Mirkâtü'l-vüsûl ilâ ilmi'l-usûl*[902] on theoretical jurisprudence, which needed clarification through his own commentary, *Mir'âtü'l-usûl fî şerhi Mirkâti'l-vüsûl*[903] and both texts had multiple editions. Moreover, many different commentaries were also printed such as by Mevlânâ Mehmed İzmirî, Tarsusî Mehmed Efendi, Abdürrezzâk b. Mustafa el-Antakî, Hamid b. Mustafa el-Konevî. His primary aim was to enunciate the methodological underpinnings of Hanafi practical jurisprudence.[904]

The two most prominent books clusters of Islamic theology (*kalam)* that made it to print in the nineteenth century were Adudüddîn el-Îcî's (d. 1502) *el-Akâidü'l-adudiyye* and Ömer Nesefî's (d.1143) *Akâidü'n-Nesefî.* Celaleddîn ed-

[898] 1266, 1269, 1276.
[899] İbrahim Halebî, *Mültekâ Tercümesi Mevkûfâtî* (trans.) Mehmed Mevkûfâtî (İstanbul: Dârü't-Tıbâ'ati'l-Âmire, 1276), 2.
[900] 1257, 1258, 1260, 1268, 1277.
[901] 1266, 1269, 1270, 1277.
[902] 1262, 1267, 1273, 1275.
[903] 1202, 1217, 1262, 1272, 1273.
[904] Atçıl, 241-242. For information about the commentaries and translations of *Mirqāt*, see Recep Cici, *Osmanlı Dönemi İslam Hukuku Çalışmaları* (Bursa: Arasta Yayınları, 2001), 212-3; Ahmet Akgündüz, "Dürerü'l-hükkām," in Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi, Vol. 10 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1994), 28-29.

Devvânî (d. 1502) wrote a commentary on the former, known also as *Celâliye*.[905] Even though Abdülhakim Siyâlkûtî (d. 1657) also wrote a super-commentary which was printed in 1854/55, the most popular version in print turned out to be İsmail Gelenbevî's (d. 1791) super-commentary over Devvânî's commentary.[906]

The second major text by Ömer Nesefî (d. 1143) was printed in 1859/60, but it had many significant commentaries such as that of Sadeddîn et-Teftâzânî (d. 1390).[907] Ahmed b. Musa Hayalî (d. 1481) also wrote a super-commentary on et-Teftâzânî, printed in 1844/45 and 1862/63. Abdülhakim Siyâlkûtî then wrote a supra-commentary on Hayalî, which became the most sought out text in print.[908] There was Veliyüddîn's supra-commentary on İsâmüddîn İsferâyînî's (d. 1538) super-commentary, printed in 1857/58.

In logic, the one central text dominating printing that others positioned themselves around was *Îsâgûcî* of Esîrüddîn el-Ebherî (d. 1265). The original itself was not printed alone. Molla Fenârî (d. 1431), however, had a very influential commentary printed multiple times.[909] Kara Halil Tirevî's (d. 1711) super-commentary on Fenârî was also very popular.[910] Another super-commentary on Fenârî that got printed was Abdullah b. Hasan el-Ensârî el-Kankırî, printed in 1826/27 and 1863/63.

---

[905] 1263, 1271.
[906] 1233, 1260, 1272, 1277.
[907] 1260, 1266, 1279. Nesefî's *Akaid* became the chief *kalam* text to be taught over the seventeenth century. Teftâzânî noted that one would not find the "tautologies and wearisomeness" of speculative thought in Nesefî's text. Hence positive theology was preferred over systematic theology. Harun Küçük, "Natural Philosophy and Politics in the Eighteenth Century: Esad of Ioannina and Greek Aristotelianism at the Ottoman Court," *Osmanlı Araştırmaları* 41 (2013): 130; Mustafa Said Yazıcıoğlu, "XV. ve XVI. Yüzyıllarda Osmanlı Medreselerinde İlm-i Kelam Öğretimi ve Genel Eğitmin İçindeki Yeri*," İslam İlimleri Ensitüsü Dergisi* 4 (1980): 273-283.
[908] 1235, 1257, 1270, 1273.
[909] 1253, 1263, 1266, 1268, 1269, 1270, 1279.
[910] 1258, 1259, 1272, 1275, 1279.

Esîrüddîn el-Ebherî (d. 1265) had also authored *Hidayetü'l-hikme,* which was not printed on its own. Kadı Mîr Meybudî (d.1503) wrote a commentary, *Şerhu Hidayeti'l-hikme*,[911] which became the source for many super-commentaries. Gelenbevî İsmail Efendi's text was printed in 1853/54, but the most popular one was Muslihüddîn Lârî's (d.1572) supra-commentary.[912] Mehmed Akkirmanî (d. 1760), in turn, wrote a supra-commentary over Lârî's super-commentary printed in 1848/49. Kadı Mîr's commentary was translated into Turkish by Mehmed b. Mustafa el-Akkirmanî el-Kefevî under the title *İklîlü't-terâcim,* who noted that he had translated both the original and the commentary for the benefit of the public (*istifâde-i âmme-i ihvân olması için).*[913] It was printed in 1849/50.

Other than Molla Fenârî, Mahmud el-Mağnisavi's *Muğni't-tullâb* was a commentary with much appeal in the nineteenth century.[914] Moreover, İsmail Gelenbevî wrote a commentary printed in 1858/59. There were two commentaries actually written and printed in the nineteenth century; one was *Dürrü'n-Nâcî* by Ömer Feyzi Tokadî (d. 1849) with multiple editions.[915] İbrahim el-Yalvacî (d.1877) wrote a supra-commentary over Tokadî's commentary, which was also very popular.[916] The other was Ahmed Rüşdi Karaağacî's (d. 1835) *Tuhfetü'r-Rüşdü* printed in 1836/37 and 1855/56.

Another cluster of books on logic revolved around Ali b. Ömer el-Katibî el-Kazvinî (d.1277)'s *er-Risâletü'ş-şemsiyye fi'l-kavâ'idi'l-mantıkıyye.*[917] Kutbüddîn er-Râzî (d. 1264) wrote a famous commentary on the work.[918] On Râzî, multiple super-

[911] 1263.
[912] 1263, 1265, 1270, 1271, 1272.
[913] Fazlıoğlu, "Osmanlı bilim alanında Türkçe telif ve tercümeler," 171.
[914] 1260, 1267, 1271, 1278, 1280
[915] 1235, 1250, 1256, 1259, 1268; Kamil Kömürcü, "Mantıkçı Ömer Feyzi Tokadi ve Dürrü'n-Naci İsimli Eseri," *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 17, no. 2 (2013): 185-208.
[916] 1265, 1276, 1279.
[917] 1263, 1270, 1273, 1274, 1279.
[918] 1259, 1272, 1281.

commentaries were written such as by Seyyid Şerif el-Cürcânî[919], Sadeddin et-Teftâzânî (d. 1390)[920], İsâmüddîn İsferâyînî (d. 1657)[921], Celaleddîn ed-Devvânî, Siyâlkûtî (d.1657)[922] and Müftüzâde Erzincanî (d. 1808)[923]. Over Cürcânî, Siyâlkûtî wrote another supre-commentary.[924]

The contemporary commentary on Kazvinî by the religious scholar in Kilis, Hocazade Abdullah Kilisi's (d. 1886), is particularly important. He penned his *Hâşiye-i cedîde-i ale't-tasdîkât* in 1856 based on, in his own terms, "the new principles" of logic or *usûl-i cedîde.* He presented it to Şeyhülislam, as supported by the Ottoman governor in Aleppo. Şeyhülislam Arif Hikmet Efendi confirmed that it was a "beneficial book" (*istifâde olunur birşey idiğinden*).[925] It was further regarded as one of the most original commentaries in the nineteenth century due to the lack of reference to any previous logician.[926]

Gelenbevî İsmail Efendi's *el-Burhân* was also a very popular book in print.[927] Only Yusuf Şükri Harputî's commentary, entitled *Nâmûsü'l-îkân*, was printed in 1857/58. It is important to note here that the commentary tradition had turned to Turkish by nineteenth century even in a traditional field as logic, as discussed by Khaled el-Rouayheb.[928]

Rhetoric constituted another prolific field of traditional scholarship. An important cluster formed around *Miftâhu'l-ulûm* of Ebu Yakub es-Sekkakî (d. 1229),

---

[919] 1268, 1270,1273.
[920] 1272.
[921] 1259, 1269, 1275, 1279.
[922] 1238.
[923] 1254, 1276, 1279.
[924] 1238, 1259, 1268, 1276.
[925] Printed in 1275. For information on Kilisî, see Bursalı Mehmed Tahir, *Osmanlı Müellifleri,* I, 385-387. İ.DH 348/23000, 23 Şevval 1272 (27 June 1856). Many of his works would be authorized for print by the Ottoman state and would be printed at different pressses. His supra-commentary over Molla Fenârî's *Şerh-i Îsâgûcî,* for instance, would be printed in 1870 at the lithographic press of Hacı Halil Efendi. His *Hüseyniye Hâşiyesi* would also be printed at Urfalı Halil Efendi's press in 1872.
[926] al-Rouayheb, *Relational Syllogisms*, 243-245.
[927] 1221, 1253, 1272.
[928] al-Rouayheb, *Relational Syllogisms*, 229.

over whom Mehmed b. Abdurrahman el-Kazvinî (d. 1283) wrote a commentary entitled *Telhîsü'l-miftâh.*[929] Teftâzânî (d. 1390) wrote a commentary entitled *el-Mutavvel, or Muhtasarü'l-me'ânî,*[930] which became the center itself for multiple printed super-commentaries including that of Seyyid Şerif Cürcânî's (d. 1413)[931], Mustafa İsâmüddîn Üsküdarî's (d. 1789)[932], Fenârî Hasan Çelebi's (d. 1495)[933] and Siyâlkûtî's (d. 1657)[934]. et-Teftâzânî (d. 1390) also abridged his own commentary to be more comprehensible, which was printed in 1843/44.

This discussion has selected out the most frequently printed textbooks between 1831 and 1863 representing only a few fields of the traditional madrasa scholarship in the Ottoman Empire.

3.4.3.3 Contemporary commentaries on canonical texts

For contemporary scholars writing on the classical sciences, however, getting recognized and printed was more problematic. These fields were as immersed in official concerns with maximizing utility and benefit as with books on the new sciences. The contemporary compilations on the new sciences had almost always originated from Istanbul. However, due to the wide extent of the madrasa network, there were religious scholars from different parts of the empire presenting their various book to the Sublime Porte, as also encouraged by state agenda prioritizing textbooks.

An overview reveals sixty-eight petitions filed by provincial scholars between 1831-1863 introducing their books mostly on the religious sciences such as the

[929] 1260, 1275.
[930] 1241, 1259, 1260, 1267, 1269, 1271, 1276.
[931] 1241.
[932] 1259, 1268, 1276.
[933] 1270, 1276.
[934] 1227, 1241, 1266.

Qur'anic exegesis. Many of the provincial religious scholars, in presenting their books, did not target printing, but used these compilations as a means of getting monetary reward or promotion through state ranks. In 1851, Abdullah Efendi, a religious scholar from Harir in Kerkük had penned a treatise on Islamic theology and philosophy, yet what he wanted was to reclaim his previously assigned but then cut salary. The members of the Supreme Council found the work to be worthy to be placed in the Ragıp Paşa library.[935]

From the perspective of the Ottoman state, however, it has been clear by now that the primary criterion for print was the utility of the book as a textbook. Right around the declaration of the bylaws of the Academy of Sciences in 1851, a religious scholar from Sofia, Raşid Rüşdü Efendi presented his book on Islamic mysticism to the Council of Public Education. The answer was simple: it was not necessary for *rüşdiye* schools and hence reviewing his case even for monetary reward had to be negotiated.[936] Moreover, by 1859, similar books had apparently piled up awaiting official attention, as the authorities complained. Cercis Efendi, a religious scholar from Revandüz, had compiled a treatise on *fenn-i vaz' ve isti'âre*, which was not well-received since there were "too many books of that sort" already.[937]

Aside from the public benefit of a book, family ties and local networks of a provincial scholar could also make a difference. Nevertheless, they did not dominate the decisions of print. Şeyhülislam Arif Hikmet Efendi marked the public benefit of a book as the priority of the Ottoman state, when he complained about the petitioners exploiting the state mechanisms to carve out benefit for themselves. For instance, Kıyalızâde Ebu Suud Efendi, who belonged to the noble lineage of Ahmed Rufai,

[935] İ.MVL 215/7112, 9 Ramazan 1267 (8 July 1851). Placing those books found to be valuable and useful in Ragıb Paşa library was a pattern at the time.
[936] A.M 9/49, 19 Zilhicce 1267 (15 October 1851).
[937] İ.DH 437/28880, 5 Cemâziyelevvel 1275 (11 December 1858).

wrote and sent a book on Arabic rhetoric (*ilm-i me'ânî)* to the Ministry of Public Education in 1857, in return for which he was granted a monetary reward "due to his lineage."[938] Yet this book was not printed. Similarly, Mahmud Efendi, who belonged to a noble dynasty in Damascus and was also a member of the local council, had written a commentary on his father, Hamzazâde Nesib Efendi's Qur'anic exegesis, deemed to be a sign of his scholarly skills by the local governors/intermediaries. Şeyhülislam, on the other hand, remarked that the books had been written to show off his abilities, rather than for the benefit of students (*talebe-i ulûm)*.[939] In other words, these kinds of texts lacked the potential to become textbooks. As such, the Council of Public Education and the Supreme Council for Judicial Ordinances acted as judges in trying to separate the intentions of public benefit from self-interest as the motive for authoring/translating works.

3.5 Conclusion

Overall, this chapter has largely tuned into the official perspective to print between 1831 and 1863. We have seen how the educational reform policies redefined the relationship of the Ottoman state to the textbook. From a decentralized production and distribution of books studied by scholars in the previous centuries, the urgency of reform necessitated the centralization of all printing matters in the hands of the Ottoman state. The making of the textbooks of the nineteenth century was the joint enterprise of the educational policies, deliberations at various administrative councils and the printing press. The unique constellation of these factors in the nineteenth century, in other words, re-defined the context and need for the textbook.

---

[938] İ.DH 401/26566, 22 Receb 1274 (8 March 1858).

[939] "*...talebe-i ulûmun fâidemend olması için yapılmış birşey olmayıb mücerred ibrâz-ı kemâl garazıyla tasnîf kılınmış..."* İ.DH 457/30361, 12 Şevval 1276 (3 May 1860).

As new schools were established, the curricula were redesigned in a way to provide the necessary training for the future state ranks in the new military and civil administration. The urgency for proper education, in turn, pushed the officials to motivate scholars to translate textbooks and propelled a new vision of textbooks. Most of the time, the reformist statesmen themselves became the authors and the translators. The printing press, thereby, served the urgent purpose of bringing these texts to the service of students as soon as possible, as repeatedly praised in state documents. In that sense, we can claim that both the printing press and the new sciences gained recognition and legitimacy through the new educational policies of the Ottoman Empire.

The rising significance of books on the new sciences, however, should not blind us to the persisting and even more pronounced appearance of the madrasa books in the printed form. These traditional books did not need scholarly endorsements or a discussion of public benefit to legitimize their transfer to the printed medium. Their place and significance were already well-established. The quantitative data demonstrates that the impact of a single madrasa book was multiplied, on the one hand, by the fact that it now reached out to thousands of readers with a single printed edition. On the other hand, the numerous reprinted editions of these classical text both empowered the traditional and the religious discourse and made it more visible than ever. While the madrasa, as an institution, might have lost its focal significance in education, the demand and the supply of books pertaining to the madrasa curriculum was outstanding in relation to the total output of the press. This means that through the diffusion of books, one can detect a continued, softer impact of religious education making its voice still heard.

Hilmi Ziya Ülken has referred to the implicit movement to print these classics as a "silent reaction" against what the religious scholars perceived as an attack towards the core values of the Ottomans.[940] Accordingly, he argued, the scholars turned to strengthen their interest in the "east" (*şark*), but only in the fields of Islamic law, Qur'anic exegesis, theology and *menakıbs*, rather than the rational or the philosophical texts.[941] This was also in parallel to the development of printing in Western Europe, where it did not bring "radical transformation" and the consolidation of new information, which was incompatible with their worldview, was very slow.[942] A similar trend had also been visible in Europe, where the early stages of printing did not help the acceleration of the spread of new knowledge. Instead, it reinforced and further popularized old views and knowledge; 45 percent of book printed before 1500 were religious in content. [943] At the same time, such continuities should not blind us to the qualitative change in the setting and context whereby these books were received and interpreted.

All in all, approaching the Ottoman educational enterprise through the viewpoint of printed books in this chapter has revealed the continuities in the Ottoman intellectual tradition rather than ruptures or an embrace of the Western ways to the detriment of the traditional. Books were shared between educational institutions and discourses. Both forms of knowledge, as both discourses, coexisted within Ottoman polity at least until the early 1860s.

[940] Hilmi Ziya Ülken, *Türkiye'de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi* (İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2014), 80.
[941] Hilmi Ziya Ülken, *Uyanış Devirlerinde Tercümenin Rolü* (İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2011), 240.
[942] Lucien Febvre and Henri-Jean Martin, 281.
[943] R.A. Houston, *Literacy in Early Modern Europe* (UK: Routledge, 2014), 181.

CHAPTER 4

PRINTING FOR THE WIDER BOOK MARKET

4.1 Introduction

In the previous chapters, we have seen how the Ottoman state took an active role in shaping the corpus of printed textbooks in the early nineteenth century. The printing press, as such, had become a valuable vehicle in the dissemination of the official discourse informed by the traditional and the new sciences. Yet, printing was not a tool for the Ottoman state alone. The printing of books did not only follow a top-down procedure whereby the decision-makers on book titles were also policy makers. Conversely, the printing enterprise also operated through a bottom-up process through which the agency of non-state contractors and printers, informed by the demands of readers, expanded the spectrum of available printed books. Over time, their role would also be officially welcome by the state officials.

This chapter is essentially an attempt at analyzing the agency of the contractors and the private printers in opening up the flourishing printed book market to new titles. In the first section, the step-by-step incorporation of contractors into the printed book market will be examined through the specific case of the booksellers. This approach will illuminate the “before” and “after” of a profession devoted to books in relation to the printing press. It will also reveal that these agents were not simply "allowed" to gain more space in the printed book market, but they actively pursued their own financial interests by negotiating with and pushing the state officials towards "allowing" them more space. Nevertheless, their initiative was meaningful and successful to the extent that it also corresponded to the official agenda to diversify the pool of printed books, as discussed in Chapter Two.

The second half of the chapter will focus on the widening spectrum of printed books that had appeal to a wider audience. Such books corresponded roughly to 45 percent of the overall book titles printed between 1831 and 1863. Rather than delving into each and every book, the analysis will be limited to those titles that could be directly connected to the agency of the contractors and the private printers. It will be argued that the roles played by these agents were twofold. On the one hand, driven by profit, these agents operated with a vision of popular demand, which was, to a large extent, informed by those book titles already familiar to the audience in manuscript form. Hence the agents reinforced continuities in the intellectual accumulation of the Ottoman Muslim tradition by drawing from a pool of traditional texts that had been in wide circulation for centuries. The centrality of the religious titles to this corpus will shed light on the broader socio-cultural patterns in the nineteenth-century Ottoman society.

On the other hand, the sheer act of transferring these texts into the printed medium might have affected how these traditional texts were received and perceived by the wider audience. They certainly became more visible and accessible. Standardization, however, was another issue. The second half of this chapter will demonstrate that each book edition printed for the contractors by the private printers collated different texts together in different combinations. The book itself, in other words, had not yet acquired a standardized format. The rest of the chapter will hence present corpuses such as religious primers and popular stories to argue that rather than the idea of a "genre", the choices were guided by a more pragmatic understanding of which texts belonged together in the minds of the printers, and thus the readers. The texts will hereby be analyzed as a means of tapping into the men

who brought them into print and ultimately to the wider society that produced, bought, read and otherwise engaged with them.

4.2 Brokering books for wide readership

As discussed in Chapter Two, a group of commoners with a stake in the book production enterprise of the Ottoman Empire emerged in the 1830s and became legalized as book contractors with the imperial decree of 1840. These individuals were not a homogeneous group, and even in archival documents, they were classified under three names: artisans (*esnaf),* customers (*müşteri)* or booksellers (*sahaf).* Regardless of their identity, as investors in the expanding book market, they had to take into consideration the profitability of their books. Profitability entailed an assessment of the sales probability in advance. In turn, this assessment relied on their being able to read the dynamics of a manuscript book market that existed before and beyond the turn to print.

Any agent interested and involved in the expansion of the printed book market, whether they started out selling books or not, went through specific commercial stages according to the degree allowed by the Ottoman state. These stages were not uniform; a lower-ranking member of the *ulama,* an *imam,* for instance, could become an entrepreneur by commissioning books to sell and his involvement could be limited to that. However, the stages would become comparatively more coherent and distinct in the case of booksellers, who constituted a significant percent of the book agents; already the most experienced group with books, they shifted seamlessly from being traditional booksellers to entrepreneurs and finally into lithographers. Even among booksellers, these roles were not mutually exclusive and not every agent followed the same linear order in crafting a role for

themselves. Nevertheless, a closer look into the experience of booksellers in terms of how they adapted to the market conditions would be a means of reading the flexible responses to a commercializing economy of the mid-nineteenth century Ottoman Empire at a micro level.

4.2.1 Traditional booksellers

The Ottoman booksellers constituted the traditional basis of the manuscript book production and distribution mechanisms that shared many commonalities with their counterparts in earlier Islamic history.[944] Throughout Ottoman history, they had come from all walks of life and many of them had sold books in addition to their primary occupations. Among the 200 booksellers studied by İsmail Erünsal, many were members of the *ulama* class from all ranks including many *imams*, judges *(kadı)* or teachers (*müderris)* as well as a few *müezzins*, Sufi sheikhs and library officials.[945]

Based on the depictions of foreign travelers, one could easily construct an image of the Ottoman booksellers as conservative and passive actors. For instance, the British cleric Charles Boileau Elliott (1803-1875) portrayed the booksellers in the bazaar in the 1830s in the following manner: "a number of venerable old men are

[944] For a coverage of booksellers in the earlier Islamic and Ottoman societies, see, for instance, İsmet Binark, "Eski Devrin Kitapçıları: Sahaflar," *Türk Kütüphaneciler Derneği Bülteni*, 3 (1967): 155-162; Yahya Erdem, "Sahhaflar ve Seyyahlar: Osmanlı'da Kitapçılık," *Müteferrika*, 20 (2001): 3-18; Ömer Faruk Yılmaz, *Tarih Boyunca Sahhaflık ve İstanbul Sahhaflar Çarşısı* (İstanbul: Sahhaflar Derneği, 2005); İsmail Erünsal, "Osmanlılarda Sahhaflık ve Sahaflar: Yeni Belge ve Bilgiler," *Journal of Ottoman Studies*, XXIX (2007): 99-146; Arslan Kaynardağ, "Eski Esnaflarımızla-Bu Arada Sahhaflıkla İlgili bir Kitap: Letaif-i Esnaf," *Kütüphanecilik Dergisi* 3 (1992), 67-72; Fatmagül Demirel, "Osmanlı'da Bir Kitap Şirketi: Şirket-i Sahafiye-i Osmaniye," *Müteferrika* 25 (2004): 89-97; Mehmet Ö. Alkan, "Osmanlı'nın Bütün Sahafları Birleşiniz! 'Şirket-i Sahafiye-i Osmaniye' Osmanlı Döneminde Sahaflar ve Yayınladıkları Kitaplar," *Müteferrika* 29 (2006): 3-44; Erünsal, *Osmanlılarda Sahaflık ve Sahaflar* (İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 2013); Erünsal, *Orta Çağ İslam Dünyasında Kitap ve Kütüphane* (İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 2018).

[945] Erünsal, *Osmanlılarda Sahaflık ve Sahaflar,* 122-130. Sahaf es-Seyyid Mehmed Kemaleddin Efendi, i.e., was a wealthy bookseller, but also worked as a librarian at the library of Fatih Mosque. See Sabev, "Rich Men, Poor Men," 185.

seen, with spectacles on nose, pondering over the Qur'an or a horoscope, the one conveying to them as many ideas as the other; for, probably, they understand neither..."[946] The image gets worse with Walter Thornbury, who reported in 1858 that "the stationers and booksellers hardly show at all in Stamboul but in the bazaar and there in a very limited way, in a way, too, that makes the Englishmen wish they were away altogether."[947] Charles White also explained their "reputation for avarice and merciless extortion," which was so well-known that it was common "to exclaim 'he is worse than a *sahhaf*'".[948]

However, the booksellers were not passive agents in either the manuscript trade or the printed book market. They acted as brokers in assessing the needs of the manuscript market, commissioning titles to be copied by scribes, lending books to readers for copying purposes and also selling them to the readers.[949] Through these functions, they shaped the options available to the readers. With the expansion of the printing sphere, too, they quickly adapted to the new and carved out new roles for themselves, rather than turning into losers.

The first adaptation of booksellers to the newly emerging printed book market was by starting to sell the printed books. If they had indeed predominantly viewed the printing press in a negative light, as claimed by some European travelers such as Joseph Michaud in 1840 or Charles White in 1844, their probate inventories

---

[946] He also claimed that the booksellers did not allow a *gavur* to even look at a copy of the Qur'an. *"yet a Turkish servant will convey it to a private house for inspection with the secret concurrence of the booksellers whose conscience will be satisfied since he does not place it in gavur hands."* C. B. Elliott, 388. J.V.S Smith claimed that "the disinclination to sell Korans to foreigners is a matter of conscience." Smith, *Turkey and the Turks*, 141.

[947] Walter Thornbury, *Turkish Life and Character*, Vol. I (Smith Elder and Co.: London, 1860), 131.

[948] Yahya Erdem, İsmail Erünsal and Orlin Sabev in particular have drawn extensively from his writings.

[949] For a depiction of the active role of booksellers in the Cairene manuscript book market, see Schwartz, "Meaningful Mediums."

would have lacked the printed book titles.[950] Such generalizations have also been taken for granted by modern historians such as Orlin Sabev.[951] However, archival documents attest to the early involvement of booksellers as the main distributors of the printed books. Already in 1797, the books printed at the press of the Imperial School of Military Engineering were distributed (*zimmetli)* to booksellers to be sold.[952]

Since the Ottoman booksellers did not have book catalogues, the probate inventories, as studied by Erünsal, offer the best means of tapping into the kind of books traded by the booksellers including the printed ones.[953] The bookseller Muma-zâde Seyyid el-Hâc İsmail Efendi (1804)'s probate records, for example, revealed a synthesis of rare manuscript books such as *Cevâhirü'l-asdâf, Ma'nâlı Mushaf-ı Şerîf, Musavver Hamse-i Nizâmî, Tarih-i Selânikî* and *Risâle-i Beydebâ* together with books printed at the presses of Müteferrika, Raşid Efendi and Vasıf Efendi as well as the Imperial School of Military Engineering.[954] Similarly, Sahaf Seyyid Mustafa

[950] Erdem, "Sahaflar ve Seyyahlar: Osmanlı'da Kitapçılık," 724. The intermediary role of certain booksellers puts in doubt the famous observation by the British traveler Charles White in 1844 that they believed "the transcribers of books have their seats near the gate of the seventh heaven and that printing presses are made from the calcined wood of Al Zacum, the dread tree of the lowest pit." White, *Three Years in Constantinople*, 154-57.

[951] Relying on a few travelogues, Orlin Sabev has concluded that "even after a century later (than 1720s) it seems that printing was still considered *advocatis diaboli."* He points to a much later period in the nineteenth century as a time when "the Ottoman manuscript sellers accepted that it offered than positive benefits" in terms of profit. Sabev, "Rich Men, Poor Men," 178.

[952] Beydilli, *Türk Bilim ve Matbaacılık,* 182.

[953] The fact that the Ottoman booksellers did not have book catalogues had been a source for dissapointment for many European travelers. See, for instance, White, *Three Years in Constantinople*, Vol. 2*,* 157*;* Bianchi, "Catalogue général. Des livres arabes, persans et turcs, imprimés en Egypte depuis l'introduction de l'imprimerie dans ce pays," *Journal Asiatique,* seri IV, II (July-August 1843), 24-61. Sinan Çetin has argued that the greatest symptom of the commodification of a book market as well as the chief vehicle through which the book market became commodified in the Ottoman Empire was the introduction of the domestic book catalogues, first by Greek brothers, Andonios and Nikolaos Depstas in Galata in 1869. There was also the famous bookseller Arakel printing his catalogue in 1884. He has also claimed that 44 commercial catalogues were published by 11 different booksellers in Istanbul between 1882 and 1901. Çetin, "Booksellers and Their Catalogues," 6. Johann Strauss, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Kimler, Neleri Okurdu? (19. -20. Yüzyıllar)" in *Tanzimat ve Edebiyat: Osmanlı İstanbul'unda Modern Edebi Kültür,* trans. Günil Ayaydın Cebe, eds. Fatih Altuğ and Fatih Uslu (İstanbul: Türkiye İşbankası Kültür Yayınları, 2014), 22.

[954] Erünsal, *Osmanlı'da Sahaflık ve Sahaflar*, 164-165.

Efendi's inventory from 1823 contained many books printed at the presses of Müteferrika and the Imperial School of Military Engineering such as *Vankulu, Gülşen-i Hulefâ, Tarih-i Subhî, Tarih-i Vâsıf*, many grammar books as well as *Amentü şerhi, Mevlid* and sections from the Qur'an (*Eczâ-i Şerîfe*). The sales lists were often a mix of textbooks and other popular titles.[955] We should also remember Rüşdi el-Mevlevî (also referred to as Derviş Rüşdi Efendi), who had been in state service as a bookseller and sold the books printed at the Imperial Press since 1834.[956] Moreover, the newspaper ads announced the names of various booksellers in whose shops specific printed books were sold.[957] Over the course of the second quarter of the nineteenth century, the percentage of printed textbooks increased among the sold books as they became more profitable in line with the educational policies of the empire.[958] Even though the terminology would not be fixed until the end of the

[955] Sahaf Ahmed Efendi b. Mustafa for instance owned 20-50 copies of hundreds of books he kept in his shop. Sahaf Mustafa Efendi b. Abdullah had 920 copies of *İbn Akil* and 125 copies of *Adalı şerhi* on Arabic grammar. Hüseyin Hilmi Efendi b. Kürtoğlu Abdullah also owned many printed textbooks; 313 copies of *Kavâ'id-i Sarfiyye*, 362 copies of *Kavâ'id-i Fârisî*, 828 copies of *Şürût-ı salât* and 439 copies of *Ta'lîmü'l-evzân*. Sahaf el-Hâc Ömer Efendi b. Ömer had 1000 copies of *Baytarnâme*, 70 copies of *Kısas-ı Enbiyâ*, 176 copies of *Hediyyetü'l-kudât*. Although Erünsal has not given dates for these probate records, he is probably referring to the nineteenth century. Erünsal, *Osmanlılarda Sahaflık ve Sahaflar*, 88.

[956] HH 51, 60, 1278; A.MKT.NZD 273/41, 22 Cemâziyelevvel 1275 (28 December 1858); Erünsal, *Osmanlılarda Sahaflık ve Sahaflar,* 121.

[957] Some of the repetitive names encountered in *Journal Asiatique* articles of Bianchi between 1859-1863 as taken from *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'* and *Cerîde-i Havâdis* issues include the following: in the Booksellers' Bazaar, there were İnebolulu Muhammed Efendi, Silistreli Hacı Ahmed Efendi, Yusuf Efendi, Derviş Rüşdü Efendi (also the imperial bookseller), Abdullah Efendi, Akif Efendi, Baba Hüseyin Efendi, Kethüdâ Halil Hacı Hüseyin Efendi, Kasımpaşalı el-Hâc Muhammed Efendi, Hacı Hüseyin Efendi, Avratpazarlı Muhammed Efendi, Bolulu Mustafa Efendi, Halepli Hacı Hüseyin Efendi, Mısırlı Hacı Mustafa Efendi, Aksaraylı Mustafa Efendi, Hacı Said Efendi (described as one of the *ulemâ* residing at the madrasa of Sultan Bayezıd), Karahisârî Hacı Ali Efendi, Kayserili Muhammed Efendi, Hacı Rıza Efendi, Lütfullah Efendi, Hacı İsmail Efendi, Hacı Mustafa Ağa, Hacı Nuri Efendi; in Bayezıd square, Baba Efendi, Aksaraylı Hacı Hasan Efendi, Dede Abdullah, Hacı Muhammed Ağa, Nevşehirli Muhammed Efendi, Trabzonlu Muhammed Efendi, Hacı Ahmed Efendi; in Üsküdar, Hacı Muhammed Efendi, Yazıcı Osman Efendi; in Mahmutpaşa, Yazıcı Ali Efendi, Kağıtçıbaşı Osman Efendi, Hacı Mustafa Efendi. For the entire list, see *Journal Asiatique*, seri V, XIII (June 1859), 519-555; seri VI, II (August-September 1863), 217-271; seri IV, XX (August-September 1852), 245-250.

[958] Erünsal, *Osmanlılarda Sahaflık ve Sahaflar*, 164-165.

empire, *kitapçı* started to be employed with reference to the sellers of printed books.[959]

There were also merchants who were not exclusively identified as booksellers but who still participated in the book trade for profit. For instance, the 1840 probate of a certain slave trader (*esirci*) Mustafa Efendi, who was known to bring slaves from Egypt, contains 27 copies of *Mesnevî-i şerîf* and 59 copies of *Dîvân-ı Vehbî.*[960] İsmail Erünsal concluded that these books were probably Bulaq prints brought along by Mustafa Efendi. Other examples cited by Erünsal also exhibit widely popular titles which would sell very quickly.[961]

The case of Mustafa Efendi helps us to broaden our view of the printed book market in the Ottoman Empire joined by merchants, booksellers and contractors to include Egypt.[962] Many books, either commissioned in or brought from Cairo, did indeed make it to the bookshops of Istanbul, as is clear from the lists of Bianchi in *Journal Asiatique* and brought three or four-fold profit to the booksellers.[963] Among those books transported from Cairo, one could find Katip Çelebi's *Keşfü'z-zünûn,* printed in Egypt but sent to Istanbul and sold at Mısırlı el-Hâc Mustafa Efendi's shop in the booksellers' bazaar.[964] *Journal Asiatique* informed the audience of the sales of *Şerh-i Dîvân-ı Hâfız-ı Şîrâzî* by Muhammed Vehbî, which had been published in Egypt to be sold at the stationers' bazaar (*Kağıtçıbaşı Çarşısı)* in Bayezıd at the store

[959] Erünsal identified the first "*kitapçı gediği*" with reference to a bookshop in Vezirhan in 1842, whereas the booksellers in the Booksellers's Bazaar continued to acquire "*sahaf gediği*" Erünsal, *Osmanlılarda Sahaflık ve Sahaflar*, 85.
[960] Erünsal, *Osmanlılarda Sahaflık ve Sahaflar*, 130.
[961] Erünsal, *Osmanlılarda Sahaflık ve Sahaflar*, 131. Erünsal provides many other examples of people normally identified with different professions but selling books on the side. Hayriye merchant el-Hâc Şakir Efendi, for instance, owned over 1000 copies of *Kâmilü'l-kelâm, Delâilü'l-hayrât, Ma'rifetnâme, Tibyân Tefsîri* and *Amentü şerhi* in 1849-50/1266.
[962] The manuscript book trade was also not limited to Istanbul but covered a wide Islamic geography.
[963] Bianchi, "Catalogue général. Des livres arabes, persans et turcs, imprimés en Egypte depuis l'introduction de l'imprimerie dans ce pays" *Journal Asiatique*, seri IV, II (July-August 1843), 25.
[964] Bianchi, "Bibliographie Ottomane ou Notice des Ouvrages Publies,' *Journal Asiatique*, seri V, XVI (October-November 1860): 327.

of Dede Abdullah.[965] *Tefsîr-i Ebussuud Efendi*, which had been rare in manuscript form, was printed in Egypt and imported to Istanbul, where it was sold at the shop of Hacı Said Efendi in the booksellers' bazaar.[966] Similarly, *Ta'bîrnâme*, written by Şeyh Abdülghanî Nâbulusî, was printed in Egypt but sold in Istanbul. Moreover, following the printing of Ibn Khaldun's *Muqaddima* in Egypt, a number of copies had been sent to Istanbul, where they could be acquired at moderate prices from the shops of Aksaraylı Mustafa Efendi and Kayserili Muhammed Efendi.[967]

The booksellers in Istanbul were organized into a guild. One of the natural functions of guilds was to act together and serve as pressure groups when necessary.[968] Through imperial edicts, they were reminded of the prohibition regarding the printing of the Qur'an and the books of hadith, exegesis and jurisprudence and the trading of such printed books that came out in auctions.[969] Although Charles White (d. 1861) asserted in 1844 that there was no law forbidding selling books to foreigners, there must have been at least an implicit pact among booksellers on the proper conduct related to foreigners. [970] The colophon of a book

---

[965] M. Bianchi, "Bibliographie Ottomane ou Notice des Ouvrages Publies,' *Journal Asiatique*, seri V, XIII (June 1859): 534.
[966] M. Bianchi, "Bibliographie Ottomane ou Notice des Ouvrages Publies,' *Journal Asiatique*, seri XIV (October-November 1859): 289.
[967] M. Bianchi, "Bibliographie Ottomane ou Notice des Ouvrages Publies,' *Journal Asiatique*, seri V, XVI (October-November 1860): 334.
[968] The booksellers, just like any artisanal craft in the Ottoman Empire, functioned under the guild system. The state was an active agent overseeing the profit range of booksellers and appointing administrators and guiding the entire process for book auctions. *Sahhaflar Şeyhzâdesi,* on the other hand, was the chief representative selected by the members and approved by the judge. The booksellers had to have a *gedik* in order to run their shop and reportedly there were forty sellers with registered *gediks* between 1783-1855 in Istanbul. The practice became especially popular during the reign of Mahmud II as a means of protecting the business from unskilled and unrelated participants. Acquiring a *gedik* itself had become an item of trade in the period and some booksellers specialized in it. For further information, see Gabriel Baer, "Monopolies and Restrictive Practices of the Turkish Guilds," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 13, no.2 (Apr. 1970): 145-165; Engin Akarlı, "Gedik: A Bundle of Rights and Obligations for Istanbul artisans and trader 1750-1840," in *Law, Anthropology, and the Constitution of the Social: Making Persons and Things,* ed. Alain Pottage and Martha Mundy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Erünsal, *Osmanlı'da Sahaflık ve Sahaflar* (İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 2013): 218.
[969] Erünsal, "Osmanlılarda Sahhaflık ve Sahhaflar," 115.
[970] Erdem, "Sahhaflar ve Seyyahlar," Osmanlı XI, 722.

exalting the Prophet printed in 1852 stated that "whoever sells books to idolaters should be punished by God on Judgment Day."[971] In a joint petition, dated 1854, booksellers in Istanbul reminded the state officials that they had been already prohibited from buying and selling religious books printed by the "infidel".[972] These incidents attest to the function of booksellers as a pressure group against unwanted new agents in the printed book market, hence taking a stand, at least in theory, next to the Ottoman State. In practice, however, they also took advantage of the niches in the legal framework of the Ottoman state in shaping the printing enterprise, as will be clearer in Chapter Five.

Despite the expansion of the printed book market as facilitated by the booksellers, we should not assume that it was to the detriment of the scribal market at least until the end of the nineteenth century. To the contrary, the Protestant missionary Henry Otis Dwight (d. 1917) disparagingly noted the persistence of scribal copying in the 1890s: "...these venerable craftsmen work in a pathetically sturdy faith of ultimate success in their brave struggle to compete with the printing press and with all that this century means to the rest of the world."[973] Moreover, Selim Nüzhet Gerçek would note in the 1920s that the manuscript copies of İbn Sînâ's books sold really fast, while the printed copies remained unsold for years.[974] Generalizing these observation for all contexts, however, would disregard all mobility, risk-taking and experimentation displayed by the booksellers from the

[971] "*işbu risâle her kim risâleyi müşrikîne füruht ederler iseler Cenâb-ı Hak rûz-i mahşerde cezâsını ondan buyursalar gerek…" Akd-i Fahr-i Kâinât min Hadîcetü'l-Kübrâ* (İstanbul, Tabhâne-i Âmire, 1268).
[972] "*…kâfir basması kütüb-i İslâmiyyenin ahz ve i'tâsı külliyen memnû' olarak bu vechile cümlemize kethüdâmız ma'rifetiyle tenbîh olunmuş ise de..."* İ.MVL 293/11827, 22 Ramazan 1270 (18 June 1854). Also see HR. MKT 60/90, 22 Ramazan 1269 (29 June 1853). The petition of the booksellers was further mentioned in HR. MKT 52/34, 25 Safer 1269 (8 December 1852).
[973] Henry Otis Dwight, *Constantinople and its Problems: Its Peoples, Customs Religions and Progress* (London: Oliphant, 1901), 245. This reference is also made by Erdem, 728.
[974] Gerçek, *Türk Matbaacılığı I,* 8.

beginning to the end of the nineteenth century. While some must have contended with the traditional lines of their profession, many others clearly adapted to the new social and economic conditions of the nineteenth century at both a collective and an individual level simultaneously pushing the boundaries of profitability and legality.

4.2.2 Entrepreneurial booksellers

Among the booksellers, a particular subgroup emerged in the mid-1830s that may be termed as the "entrepreneurial" group, who were eager to not only sell the printed books, but also to commission their printing. As such, they represented the second stage of involvement in the printing enterprise. Their advantage compared to other groups of contractors must have resided in their significant know-how on the reading choices, hence the demands of customers. They were most likely to have been motivated by financial profit, but the pious desire to spread religious messages should not be discredited either. In the process, they at least partially became the decision makers in shaping the demand for printed books. That said, the number of books commissioned by the same person would not surpass a few titles. Many times, the agent would bring one book to the Imperial Press to have it printed and then wait for some years to sell it to first close off his debt to the Imperial Press and eventually make some profit. Hence the turnover was not that great. Nevertheless, since the printed book market was already limited, their comparative impact is worth discussion.

As elaborated in Chapter Two, the 1840 imperial edict had two consequences that pushed the non-state agents of the printing enterprise to the margins; one, while state monopoly over printing had been abolished, the commissioning of each book had been fixated on a single contractor until all his printed copies had been sold

(zilyedlik). Second, the Imperial Press continued to be designated as the exclusive venue by the Ottoman authorities for commissioning books until 1857. Together they elicited the contractor "candidates," who could not get a contract with the Imperial Press, to appeal to the unauthorized private printers around Istanbul. These illicit practices can be encountered in a number of archival documents.[975] At the same time, many of the printed popular texts lacked the relevant information in their colophons or elsewhere about the date and place of their print.[976] These observations strengthen the claim that having turned to illicit printers, the booksellers or other contractors preferred to omit printing information through which any one of them could be tracked.

As an alternative source, the probate inventories of booksellers from the period, are helpful in linking the booksellers to the printed books. İsmail Erünsal has identified a number of booksellers who commissioned books at different presses; Sahaf Geredeli Ali Efendi, for instance, had commissioned books at Cerîde-i Havâdis press in 1855.[977] Another contractor at this press was Sahaf Hasan Efendi, who owed 3.598 kurus to Churchill also in 1855. Moreover, the fact that he owned 300 to 1000 copies of printed books in his estate, as revealed by his probate records, has also led Erünsal to assume that he had them commissioned.[978] Around the same date, hundreds of printed textbooks and folk stories were discovered in the probate records of Sahaf el-Hâc Ali Efendi in an unbounded format (*Eczâ)* as with manuscripts.[979]

---

[975] For instance, İ.MVL 356/15604, 9 Şaban 1272 (15 April 1856).
[976] The early Arabic private printers in Cairo, too, usually did not list press names, and these were not stable between printings in cases when they did. “they operated through what appear to be shifting groups of people, or consortiums, that may have taken turns on lithographic stones, as opposed to fixed businesses with brick and mortar printing facilities.” Schwartz, "The Political Economy of Private Printing,” 27.
[977] Erünsal, *Osmanlılarda Sahaflık ve Sahaflar*, 86. He refers to his probate inventory to draw this conclusion. (KA. 1706 p. 87a (15 Şevval 1271 [1 July 1855]).
[978] Erünsal, *Osmanlılarda Sahaflık ve Sahaflar,* 86. ŞS. Rumeli Sadareti 526, p.19b-20.
[979] Erünsal, *Osmanlılarda Sahaflık ve Sahaflar*, 86.

The book contractors, too, transcended the local networks and turned to Cairo. Hatice Aynur's study matching twelve poetry collections (*dîvâns*) printed at the Bulaq press to particular contactors in Istanbul further strengthens the argument that they might have been meant for the book market in Istanbul.[980] Moreover, a petition filed by el-Hâc Halil Efendi[981] concerning his book trade with the master of the booksellers' guild in Cairo, Edirnevî el-Hâc Kamil Efendi illustrates this relationship.[982] Halil Efendi was not only a merchant from Unkapanı (*Kapan-ı Dakîk)*, as he introduced himself in the petition; he commissioned books at other presses, but also printed his own books and received commissions. Apparently, he had commissioned Kamil Efendi to print books such as *Delâil-i şerîf şerhi Kara Dâvud, Altıparmak, İzhâr şerhi Adalı, Avâmil tuhfesi, Sarf cümlesi, Kâfiye şerhi Molla Câmî, Dürr-i yektâ* and *Tûtînâme* in Cairo.[983] This selection notably covered textbooks, but also contained two popular books appealing to wider readership. As such, the inclusion of contractors into the system would gradually diversify the printed book titles, which had been largely limited to textbooks until 1840. The discussion in the next sections will further elaborate on the direction of these books commissioned by booksellers or other agents.

---

[980] The list follows: *Dîvân-ı Ârif* (Reisülküttâb Mehmed Arif, pr. 1842/1258, pr. İst, 1855/1272) by Bekir Efendi el-Morevî and Mehmed Emin Efendi İzmirî, Mahrûse-i Mısır *rûznâmçe nâzırı*; *Dîvân-ı gülşen-i efkâr* (Vâsıf-ı Enderûnî; pr. 1841/1257, pr. İst 1841, 1842) by Hasan Efendi Kırımî and Osman Nuri Efendi; *Dîvân-ı İsmail Hakkı* (pr.1841/1257, İst. 1288) by Hüseyin Efendi Trabzonî; *Dîvân-ı Niyâzî* (pr. 1254, pr. İst, 1254, 1259) by Sahhaf Mahmud Efendi; *Dîvân-ı gülşen-i efkâr, Dîvân-ı Niyâzî, Dîvân-ı Leyla Hanım* (pr. 1260/1844, pr. Ist. 1267/1851)*, Müntehabât-ı Mîr Nazif* (pr. 1261, pr. İst, 1261) and *Eş'âr-ı el-Hâc Âkif Efendi* (pr. 1846/1262 pr. İst, 1259 and 1262) by Mehmed Kamil Efendi b. Abdi Edirnevî, "*Re'isi's-sahhâfine ve'l-arzuhalciyyeti bi-Mısra'l-Mahrûsati*"*Dîvân-ı gülşen-i efkâr* by Osman Efendi İstanbulî; *Dîvân-ı gülşen-i efkâr, Dîvân-ı Fâzıl-ı Enderûnî (*pr. 1258, pr. İst.) by Ömer Ağa İslambulî, *Müntehabât-ı Mîr Nazif* by Salih Hafız Efendi and *Dîvân-ı Haşmet* (pr. 1257/1841) by Şerif Mustafa Efendi. Hatice Aynur, "Bulak Matbaası'nda Basılan Türkçe Divanlar," *Journal of Turkish Studies-Türklük Bilgisi Araştırmaları: Fahri İz Armağan* 14 (1990): 44.

[981] Details about Sahaf Uncu Halil Efendi are discussed in Chapter Two.

[982] Erünsal, *Osmanlılarda Sahhaflık ve Sahhaflar,* 500; ŞS. Rumeli Kazaskerliği 551, 23 Safer 1265 (18 January 1849), p.59.

[983] Note that these books were a good combination of textbooks such as *Sarf cümlesi* and those titles appealing to wider readership such as *Tûtînâme.* Such a combination was typical of most printed booksellers in the period.

Moreover, towards the end of the nineteenth century, as argued by Sinan Çetin, booksellers would become "small private enterprises" by capitalizing on the ready demand for new printed books in the market and would establish an entirely new network with their clients, together with the help of new tools such as their book catalogues, independent of the strategies of the Ottoman state.[984]

4.2.3 *Sahaf*-cum-lithographers

A third level of involvement with the printed book market, not only for the booksellers but any profit-oriented agent in general, was marked by the establishment of their private presses around the 1850s. Unauthorized printing was visible much earlier, as will be clarified in Chapter Five, but overall, the status of private presses would become official after 1857. While different agents such as typesetters or members of the Sufi orders also acquired status as official printers, in the long term it would be the booksellers, who would last until at least the last quarter of the nineteenth century with a growing corpus of printed books as the owners of private presses, hence *sahaf*-cum-lithographers.[985]

An important question in understanding this transmission is the motive of these agents: Why did some agents start to print their own books at a time when commissioning was a lucrative alternative? First, following the printing regulation of 1857, the printing market visibly had expanded and become more inclusive. Aside from all contractors and printers, the authors also emerged as agents of the printed book enterprise with the gradual recognition of the book copyrights. This expansion signified also the expansion of a customer base, since the private printers would not

[984] Çetin, "Booksellers and Their Catalogues," 15.
[985] The printing role adopted by the booksellers is briefly mentioned by Orlin Sabev and Erünsal, *Osmanlılarda Sahaflık ve Sahaflar,* 81.

only print the books of their choice but also as commissioned by other agents.

Another factor could be the ease of operating the lithographic press. As the discussion in Chapter Five will further illuminate, there were unauthorized presses in many khans, houses and even hospitals of Istanbul, which were tied to each other through a network of supplies, specialized staff and customers. On the one hand, the press equipment itself was simple and easy to assemble; on the other hand, the same technicians including the calligraphers and the typesetters circulated between the different presses and worked as free-lance. The flexible part-time staff employment helped to cut down the cost of printing.[986] The director of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire,* Recai Efendi was especially disgruntled about how these private presses did not even hire a proper editor for the correct publishing of important texts in 1857; he demanded the state officials to force them to employ a full-time editor.[987]

Even if the legal pool for drawing commissions had expanded, however, the "uncertainty associated with unstable demand" regarding the sales of the final texts posed a great financial risk for both the contractor and the lithographer.[988] This was exactly why in many cases, for the non-state agents, printing could not initially constitute a continuous enterprise. The early lithographers should rather be viewed as part-time printers, who tried to diversify their involvement with the printed book and maximize their profit. Booksellers, thus, continued to sell books.

A broader list of such printers turning "licit" after the 1857 regulation had been laid out in Chapter Two. Despite their limited output until 1863, the *sahaf*-cum-lithographers, in particular, printed a varied pool of books, as can be tracked through the Özege catalogue. They mixed bestselling textbooks with those books appealing

[986] The similar formations in the Cairenese printing scene has been termed as "consortiums" by Kathryn Schwartz. Schwartz, "Meaningful Mediums," 261-262.
[987] İ.MVL 370/16264, 19 Receb 1273 (15 March 1857).
[988] Schwartz, "The Political Economy of Private Printing," 29.

to a wider audience on commission. This could be a way of ensuring a broader customer basis and thus profit. Urfalı Uncu Halil Efendi, for instance, had printed 17 titles until 1863. Aside from the two textbooks, his output comprised of popular religious titles. From a manual about how to perform the pilgrimage to prayer books, from how to interpret dreams to *ilmihâls*, he apparently served a traditional and religious market. Bosnalı Muharrem Efendi printed 22 titles with at least six of them being textbooks. The rest of the list was again inclusive of *ilmihâls*, prayer books and other popular titles. Karahisârî Ali Rıza Efendi had printed 20 titles, one half as textbooks and the other as popular religious texts. Other printers had far less printed output; Sahaf Mehmed Şükrü Efendi printed one textbook, Mısırlı Mustafa Efendi printed a textbook and a popular text.

Printing religious books and devotional texts on the part of the private printers did not run counter to an agenda to make profit. In the case of the presses operated by Sufi sheikhs such as the one at Özbekler Lodge, the desire to make profit through printing in order to meet the needs of the lodge could overlap with performing good deeds through the focus on religious texts. Of the two printers who can be directly connected to a Sufi lodge in this period, Buhârîzâde Mehmed Salih Efendi of Özbekler lodge explicitly stated his purpose in printing books as "feeding the poor in their lodge" (*bi'l-cümle fukarâ ile geçinip*).[989] The other Sufi, Necib Efendi of Karyağdı Lodge, had printed two textbooks before he set out to print Bektashî texts after 1863.

Over the course of the nineteenth century, the *sahaf*-cum-lithographers made good fortune through the commercialization of the book market. Conducting a

[989] İ. DH 455/30173, 3 Cemâziyelâhir 1276 (28 November 1859). He printed only three books until 1863: *Delâilü'l-hayrât, Hudâ Rabbim* and *İlmihâl.* The vast majority of his publications after 1863, as can be tracked from the Özege inventory, also include a religious collection.

comparative study of the probate estates of a group of booksellers from the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries, Orlin Sabev concluded that the late nineteenth century bookseller-turned printers had come to profit far more from the trade of printed books than on the manuscripts.[990] The probate records of the bookseller Seyyid Mustafa Esad Efendi (d. 1892), for instance, who was also the son of the bookseller Karahisârî Ali Rıza Efendi, revealed 633,296 kuruş as the sum of money he left to his heirs after the deduction of debts and court fees.[991] Another son of Ali Rıza Efendi, Mehmed Sadeddîn Efendi (d. 1877)'s probate record also revealed that he had specialized in wholesale book trade and distributed 48 different book titles many of which had been printed by his father and himself. These unsold copies corresponded to titles varying from textbooks to popular books such as *Âşık Garip hikâyesi* (300 copies), *Kara Dâvud* (200 copies) and *Yıldıznâme* (300 copies).[992]

In the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the bookseller printers would further diversify their practices to become true publishing houses mirroring the overall changes that led to the competitive publishing domain of the Ottoman Empire. Starting from 1874, some of these booksellers would unite to print books under a private printing company entitled *Şirket-i Sahafiye,* which would turn it into a formal enterprise by 1881 as *Şirket-i Sahafiye-i Osmâniyye*.[993] The formation of this new firm could be regarded as a modification of the booksellers' guild, which had essentially regulated the relations around the manuscript market. As the market

[990] Orlin Sabev, "Rich Men, Poor Men," 179; Orlin Sabev, "İki Örnek Işığında Osmanlı Matbaacılarının Maddi Durumu (İbrahim Müteferrika ve Seyyid Mustafa Esad Efendi)," *İkinci İktisat Tarihi Kongresi 2 (Elazığ, 24-25 Haziran 2010)*, eds. Mustafa Öztürk and Ahmet Aksın (Elazığ, 2013), 709.
[991] Sabev, "Rich Men, Poor Men," 184.
[992] Erünsal, *Osmanlılarda Sahaflık ve Sahaflar*, 87.
[993] Mehmet Ö. Alkan, "Osmanlı'nın Bütün Sahafları Birleşiniz! 'Şirket-i Sahafiye-i Osmaniye' Osmanlı Döneminde Sahaflar ve Yayınladıkları Kitaplar," *Müteferrika* 29 (2006): 4.

would fully commercialize around the printed book towards the end of the nineteenth century, this new union would also serve as a new mode of protecting their interests.

4.3 Commissioning for the wider market

To flesh out the many interferences of non-state actors in the printing market as described above, it is necessary to turn to the books themselves. This study reveals that in general the agency of these actors mobilized two textual groups; textbooks and books appealing to wider readership. The market for textbooks had already been prioritized and appropriated by the Ottoman state, as elaborated in Chapter Three. While these books constituted a lucrative market also for the contractors, their contribution in this field remained mostly as quantitative.[994] When the private lithographers, too, started printing their own books, they also contributed to the expansion of already popular madrasa textbooks.[995] Their long-lasting impact on the

[994] Some of the textbooks they commissioned include: *Şerh-i Akâid hâşiyesi İsâm, Şerhü'l-Makâsıd, Hadîs-i erbaîn şerhi, Hadîs-i erbaîn şerh-i Usfûrî, Tecvîd-i edâiye, Tuhfetü's-sukûk, Mültekâ şerhi Damad, Mültekâ şerhi Mevkûfâtî, Behçetü'l-fetâvâ*, *Fetâvâ-yı Feyziyye, Hâşiye ale'd-Dürer*, *Şerh-i Dürr-i muhtâr, Netîcetü'l-fetâvâ, Kudûrî*, *Mir'ât, Mir'ât hâşiyesi, Emsile şerhi, Emsile şerhi Zehretü'l-kulûb, Esâsü'l-Binâ, Nahiv cümlesi, Sarf cümlesi, İzhâr mu'ribi, Tuhfe-i Avâmil*, *Kavâ'id-i Fârisiyye*, *İmtihânü'l-ezkiye, Keşfü'l-i'rab, Gâyetü'l-enzâr, Adalı hâşiyesi, Ahterî-i kebîr, Gülistân, Pend-i Attâr, Kefevî ve Veliyüddîn Şerh-i Akâid hâşiyeleri, Hayalî hâşiyesi, Fenârî hâşiyesi Kara Halil, Şemseteyn Kul Ahmed Îsâgûcî hâşiyeli, Mehmed Emin hâşiyesi Kara Halil, Tasdikât hâşiyesi Siyâlkûtî, Mantık Cümlesi ma'a Şemsteyn, Tasavvurât ma'a Tasdîkât, Tasavvurât hâşiyesi Seyyid, Hâşiye-i Gelenbevî aliyyü'l-Celâl, İmkân Risâlesi (Gelenbevî), Abdulgafur Siyâlkûtî, Molla Câmi, Muhtasarü'l-meânî, Telhîsü'l-miftâh, Mutavvel-i Seydî, Mutavvel hâşiyesi Hasan Çelebi, Muğni't-tullâb, İsti'âre alakası, Karatepeli, Karatepeli İsti'âre hâşiyesi.* There were also contemporary texts commissioned in mathematics such as *İmtihân risâlesi*, *Nuhbetü'l-hesâb* and *Telhîsü'l-a'mâl.*

[995] Those textbooks printed by the lithographic presses of entrepreneurial booksellers were more limited, as the printing costs understandably brought along more risks. Moreover, the commissioning system already seemed to be working, as clear from the large number of commissioned books. Nevertheless, the following textbooks were printed: *Tuhfe-i Vehbî, Sübha-i sıbyân, Usûl-i ilm-i hesâb, İnşâ-i cedîd, Cerîde-i müsevvid-i Konevî* and *Akâid-i adudiye* by Bosnalı el-Hâc Muharrem Efendi*; Ferâiz-i sâlih, Kâmûs-ı Fransevî, Lugat-ı Firiştezâde, Lutfiyye, Lugat-ı Firiştezâde, Pend-i Attâr, Sübha-i sıbyân, Takrîrü'l-isti'âre, Terceme-i Endülüsî and Tuhfe-i Vehbî* by Karahisârî Ali Rıza Efendi*, Ta'lîmü'l-müte'allim* by Sahaf Mehmed Şükrü Efendi, *Tuhfe-i Vehbî* by his son Sahaf Mehmed Esad Efendi and Hattat Tevfik Efendi*; Risâle-i elifbâiyye* and *Durûb-ı emsâl* by Aşir Efendi, *Nuhbetü'l-etfâl* by Necib Efendi and *Mir'âtü'l-akâid* of Molla Câmî by Samatyalı Kağıtçı Hafız Ahmed Efendi.

diversification of the book market in general, however, would be by investing into books with an appeal to the wider community of readers.

As explained above, the basic drive behind the entry of non-state agents into the printing enterprise revolved around financial profit. In the process, they selectively appropriated the intellectual accumulation of the Ottoman Muslim culture. The appropriation, however, could not be random at least until 1863, when the financial risks and stakes were still too high for small-scale agents like them to afford. Instead, it was informed by the noticeable demand or inclination towards certain book titles within the populace; to that extent, the role of contractors corresponded to the commodification of the book market between 1831 and 1863. As we have seen in many cases, these calculations were not always precise and the contractors often remained indebted to the Imperial Press. Nevertheless, they served as "brokers" best suited to optimize the balance between the demand from the populace and the supply of the Ottoman state.

The following discussion will hence make shifts between an analysis of the non-state agents, the books they commissioned/printed and the relevant intellectual climate to demonstrate how the three components of the nineteenth-century Ottoman printing enterprise mutually shaped each other. For example, when an agent commissioned the printing of *Delâilü'l-hayrât,* he already knew about the context of this book for the Ottoman Muslim society and hence had taken a safe bet. In turn, the more copies of *Delâilü'l-hayrât* were printed, the more this book shaped and strengthened the mentality of the period. One must also consider that while a single book that was printed may not indicate a direction of thinking, as part of a wider constellation of similar books, it could represent an inclination, a preference and perhaps even a deliberate act of responding to the world around them. This is why

the possibility of connecting the distribution of books to the social and intellectual climate of the Ottoman geography at a particular time interval in history requires an evaluation of the wider discourse.

In this context, it may be argued that while the printing of textbooks as pioneered by the Ottoman state in the nineteenth century represented largely a top-down intervention on the cultural patterns of the Ottoman scholarly elite, the printing choices of the contractors reflected the cultural basin of a wider segment of the Ottoman population. There were cases when the state printed the more popular titles on its own account rather than on commissions, but the motivation here would be the expected profit. In demanding permission from the Sultan to print some of the most popular religious books including *Envârü'l-âşıkîn, Tarîkat-ı Muhammediyye, Hadîkatü's-suadâ* and *Şerhu'ş-şifâ,* the officials made sure to note that they would "sell really quickly" (*müddet-i kalîle zarfında füruht olunacağı)* due to "apparent demand" (*talebi ziyâdece)*.[996] Again, for reasons of profit, the agents commissioned textbooks. Overall, however, while both agents represented two different channels of placing books into the printed market circulation, in both cases, they flooded it with predominantly traditional and religious titles. Whether it was in the form of classical madrasa textbooks, or popular texts both widely circulating also in the manuscript market, the traditional, in other words, the familiar books would be embraced by the printers, the contractors and the customers alike.

4.3.1 Textual diversity and the wider context of the nineteenth century

The nineteenth century intellectual context of the Ottoman Empire witnessed both

[996] For *Envârü'l-âşıkîn,* see İ. DH 91/4534, 11 Şaban 1260; for *Tarîkat-ı Muhammediyye,* see İ. DH 91/4555, 22 Şaban 1260; for *Hadîkatü's-su'adâ,* see İ.DH 117/5944, 21 Safer 1262 (26 August 1844): for *Şerhu'ş-Şifâ,* see İ.DH 123/6241, 11 Receb 1262 (5 July 1842).

continuities with the earlier centuries and changes that followed from increased contact with elements of European culture. Even the continuities manifested themselves in a significantly transformed environment. Old texts gained new meanings together with a changing public.[997]

On the one hand, the socio-intellectual landscape of Ottoman Istanbul after the 1830s was most vivid in Galata and Pera inhabited by Muslim Turks, Greeks, Bulgarians. Armenians, Jews, Arabs, "Franks" and the Levantines, as in previous centuries. Around the 1840s travelers noted the presence of various lithographic presses in the area as well as booksellers putting lithographic prints of various sizes put out for sale.[998] In the meantime, both the venues of reading such as the coffeehouses and the reading rooms and the types of printed material such as newspapers and journals would expand after the 1860s. For instance, while the Armenian Dikram Sarafim Efendi's reading room (*Kırâathâne-i Osmânî*) in Divanyolu would become a meeting point for the young Ottoman intelligentsia in 1857,[999] the printshops such as *Journal de Constantinople* and *Tasvîr-i Efkâr* would also serve as meeting points for reading and intellectual exchange.

A convenient criterion for measuring the pace of change concerns the type of circulating books. Şükrü Hanioğlu's sampling of probate inventories has revealed that within the *askerî* class in the early nineteenth century, 76 percent of books owned were religious titles mirroring the tendencies of the earlier centuries.[1000] In the

[997] For a wider discussion of the emergence of the Ottoman public, see Murat Şiviloğlu, "The Emergence of Public Opinion in the Ottoman Empire," (PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 2015), 102.
[998] See, for instance, Charles White, *Three Years in Constantinople,* Vol II.; Gerard de Nerval, *Voyage en Orient* (Paris, Le Divan, 1927).
[999] Uğur Kömeçoğlu, "Homo Ludens ve Homo Sapiens Arasında Kamusallık ve Toplumsallık: Osmanlı Kahvehaneleri," in *Osmanlı Kahvehaneleri: Mekan, Sosyalleşme, İktidar,* ed. Ahmet Yaşar (İstanbul: Kitab Yayınevi, 2009), 70; Strauss, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Kimler, Neleri Okurdu?" 23.
[1000] As can be seen in the popularity of Qur'an, *Mültekâ, Delâilü'l-hayrât, Vasiyyet-i Birgivî, Fetâvâ-yı Ali Efendi, Dürer* and *Gülistân.*

1850s, however, a distinction emerged between the higher and the lower ranking officials; while the low ranking officials continued to read the classical catechisms, others owned more titles on Europe registered as "frankish letters" or "books in French."[1001] Moreover, the library records of the Translation Bureau revealed a variety of texts checked out by officials between 1856-1868, who would rise to the highest ranks in the empire.[1002] The most popular genres appeared to be history (71 out of 110 titles), geography, dictionaries and economics. The authors they read varied from Europeans[1003] to classical Ottomans.[1004] For example, Sadullah Paşa had checked out Buffon's *History* as well as the histories of Mehmed Esad Efendi and Hoca Sadeddin.[1005] In fact, these titles revealed an *adab* conglomeration of literature, grammar, history and geography, which were studied by the scribal officials of the earlier centuries. Still, the foreign titles among the list is telling.

On the other hand, one must acknowledge the importance of religion, which has, despite the strong hold of the theories of modernization and secularization in conventional scholarship, has recently made a come-back as an empowered discourse.[1006] Arguing that the concept of religion was an import from the post-Enlightenment construction in the particular experience of Europe, many scholars of Islam have come to question the validity and even the adequacy of "religion" to

[1001] Şükrü Hanioğlu, *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2008), 38-41.
[1002] Sezai Balcı, *Babıali Tercüme Odası* (İstanbul: Libra, 2013), 208-227.
[1003] Such as Cooper, Buffon, Gibbon, Hammer, Racine, Machievelli, Walter Scott, Voltaire.
[1004] Such as Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, Esad Efendi, Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali, Feridun Bey, Hoca Sadeddin, İbn-i Hallekan, Katip Çelebi, Osmanzâde Ahmed Ta'ib, Naîmâ, Raşid, Selânikî and Sa'd-i Şîrâzî. See: Sezai Balcı, *Babıali Tercüme Odası,* 215.
[1005] Sezai Balcı, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Tercümanlık ve Bab-ı Ali Tercüme Odası," (PhD diss., Ankara University, 2006), 140.
[1006] See, for instance, Anscombe, "Islam and the Age of Reform," 159-189. Moreover, also at a global scale, the power of the religious discourse, especially under the initiative of the missionaries, has been emphasized.

explain Islam.[1007] Shahab Ahmed, in particular, as inspired by Talal Asad[1008], has built a strong case for the lack of a distinction between religion and culture, sacred and the profane or the religious and the secular for Islam.[1009] Accordingly, Islam represented a discourse that pervaded through the entire society, one that encompassed more fields than the text of the Qur'an, hadith and jurisprudence.[1010] This multiplicity inherent in Islam was interpreted as "ambiguity" by Thomas Bauer, who claimed that it characterized the culture of Muslim societies until the modern era.[1011] Both Ahmed and Bauer have also assumed that the onset of modernity in the nineteenth century had reduced Islam to particular texts, especially those of legal nature, which resulted in the "religionization of Islam".[1012]

Viewing these arguments from the perspective of the nineteenth-century Ottoman context, one would expect to find a crystallization and homogenized re-interpretation of the Islamic creed and identity to speak of the "reduction of Islam" down to particular texts. The Ottoman printed book market between 1831 and 1863, however, even with its limited output, exhibits that the ambiguities underlying the textual diversity of the earlier period also continued in printed format in the nineteenth century. Around 45 percent of the printed books in this period consisted of titles that fell outside of the direct school curricula, varying from religious books to poetry collections, from popular stories to history books. As explained in the

[1007] Ahmed Karamustafa, for instance, is among the scholars to question the legitimacy of adopting the term "religion" for Islam and opts for using "*din"* as a more meaningful category. Ahmed T. Karamustafa, "Islamic *Din* as an Alternative to Western Models of 'Religion'," in *Religion, Theory, Critique Classic and Contemporary Approaches and Methodologies*, ed. Richard King (New York: Columbia University Press, 2017).
[1008] Talal Asad, *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam* (Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), 27-54.
[1009] Shahab Ahmed, *What is Islam? The Importance of Being Islamic* (Princeton University Press, 2015), 397.
[1010] Frank Griffel, "Contradictions and Lots of Ambiguity: Two New Perspectives on Premodern (and Postclassical) Islamic Societies," *Bustan: The Middle East Book Review* 8, no. 1 (2017): 16.
[1011] Thomas Bauer, *Die Kultur der Ambiguität* (Berlin: Insel Verlag Berlin, 2011).
[1012] Bauer, *Die Kultur der Ambiguität,* 192-223.

previous section, this diversity owed its presence largely to the contractors as well as state actors, who calculated that popular titles would bring profit.

The match between the rather popular character of books and the printed medium is not a uniquely Ottoman trait. Even though the contexts cannot be quantitatively compared, a qualitative focus on the book markets of Britain and France exhibits a similarly popular literary format, under the chapbooks of Britain and the *Bibliotheque bleue* of France, until the 1830s, appealing to all levels of society transcending social, gender and age barriers.[1013] Also in Russia, the distribution of popular books consisting of popular literature such as novels, adventure stories, detective novels and lubok literature of pocket size cheap books by the commercial publishers was so pervasive that the elite Russians turned against them and the cultural diversity that came along at the turn of the twentieth century.[1014]

What particularly stands out in the Ottoman pool of printed books until 1863, even among the diversity, however, is the predominance of books of religious nature. In fact, the religious themes transcended the basic religious genres and permeated also the printed history books, poetry collections and prose literature. When poetry collections (*dîvân*) were printed, for instance, it would be the poems of Sufi poets such as *Dîvân-ı Esrar Dede*[1015] or *Dîvân-ı Erzurumlu İbrahim Hakkı*[1016] preferred over the others. Or printed history books included the early Islamic history focusing

[1013] Margaret Spufford, *Small Books and Pleasant Histories* (London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1981), 197; Cathy Lynn Preston and Michael J. Preston (eds.), *The Other Print Tradition: Essays on Chapbooks, Broadsides, and Related Ephemera* (New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc, 1995).
[1014] Jeffrey Brooks, *When Russia Learned to Read: Literacy and Popular Literature 1861-1917* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1985).
[1015] Esrar Dede, *Dîvân-ı Belâgat-unvân-ı Esrar Dede Efendi* (İstanbul: Takvîm-i Vekâyi‘ Matbaası, 1257).
[1016] Erzurumlu İbrahim Hakkı, *Dîvân-ı Erzurumlu İbrahim Hakkı* (İstanbul: Dârü’t-Tıbâ‘ati’l-Âmire, 1263).

on the biography of the Prophet such as *Mevâhibü'l-ledünniye.*[1017] "Religious books," in the meantime, never really constituted a singular and homogeneous concept neither for the Ottoman officials nor the scholars. Rather than such a general category, the books in both the public and the private collections were categorized under more differentiated titles such as "Qur'anic exegesis," (*kütübü't-tefâsir*) "hadith," (*kütübü'l-hadîs*) "jurisprudence," (*kütübü'l-fıqh*) and "mysticism and morals," (*kütübü't-tasavvuf ve'l-mev'iza*).[1018] Even under these subtitles, books could represent different worldviews; for example, the canonical books of the mainstream ulama could meet the fluid texts celebrating the Sufis including the "heterodox" Bektashis.[1019]

As such, the Ottoman printed book market should perhaps be viewed as an extension of the globally empowered religious discourse in the nineteenth century resulting from the increased global interactions between different religions.[1020] Nile Green has argued that this form of religion had not been reduced to a single interpretation. Looking into the adoption of printing by Muslims in the Indian subcontinent, Francis Robinson had previously explained the agency of the great religious scholars, who had turned to translate the Islamic classics from Arabic and Persian into the vernacular Urdu as a way to counter the Christian powers.[1021] Nile Green, by contrast, minimized the function of what he called the "Reformist" Islam and empowered the "Customary" group, which, he argued, controlled and even flooded the market with their "bewildering supply" of religious productions

[1017] Ahmed bin Muhammed el-Kastalanî, *Mevâhibü'l-ledünniye,* trans. Mevlana Abdülbaki (İstanbul: Tab'hâne-i Amire, 1263).
[1018] See, for instance, *Defter-i Kütüphâne-i Atıf Efendi* (İstanbul: Sultan Hamam Caddesinde 14 Numaralı Matbaa, 1892); *Defter-i Kütüphâne-i Hekimoğlu Ali Paşa* (İstanbul: Alem Matbaası, 1893); *Defter-i Kütüphâne-i Yahya Efendi* (İstanbul: Atik Zabtiye Sokağında 63 Numaralı Matbaa, 1892).
[1019] See the discussion below for a corrective view of "heterodox".
[1020] Green, *Terrains of Exchange,* 3.
[1021] Francis Robinson, "Technology and Religious Change: Islam and the Impact of Print," *Modern Asian Studies* 27, no. 1 (1993): 240-241.

promising "miracles, intercessions and patronage."[1022] Accordingly, the religious products of the printing press in Bombay, in particular, would not only be the "modern" and the "Protestant" Islamic texts represented by the religious scholars but also the "enchanted" type, which were "neither uniform in characteristics nor cosmopolitan in outlook, but highly differentiated and parochially communitarian."[1023] In this diversity, the hagiographical story books, for instance, with their narrative appeal, appealed to more readers than the "moralizing or scientific reformist tracts ever could."[1024] As such, printing served the "enchantment" of the book market in colonial Bombay; the customary Sufi hagiographies which consisted of overlapping genres of *menâkıb, tezkire* and *tabaqât*; stories of Prophets, also supernatural folktales such as *Hâtem-i Tâî*.[1025] Other printed texts included Scripture portions with Urdu commentaries, Persian classics such as Rûmî's *Mesnevî.*[1026] As a result, both the "enchanted" and the "disenchanted" productions could be seen "as competitively co-existing or sequentially displacing one another without the expectation that one of them will ultimately triumph."[1027]

The "enchanted" categories in the Ottoman textual production were no less than what colonial Bombay offered. In fact, noting the complexity of its religious manifestations, Rıza Yıldırım has identified mediveal Anatolia as a "heterogenous landscape of religiosity."[1028] The elements constituting this wide spectrum of shifted and realigned throughout the centuries, but its complexity never died out. It was

[1022] Nile Green, *Bombay Islam: The Religious Economy of the West Indian Ocean, 1840-1915* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Pres, 2011), 9.
[1023] Green, *Bombay Islam*, 11.
[1024] Green, *Bombay Islam*, 91.
[1025] Green, *Bombay Islam*, 100-101.
[1026] Green, *Bombay Islam*, 115-116.
[1027] Green, *Terrains of Exchange*, 9.
[1028] Rıza Yıldırım, "Sunni Orthodox vs Shi'ite Heterodox? A Reappraisal of Islamic Piety in Medieval Anatolia," in *Islam and Christianity in Medieval Anatolia*, eds. A.C.S. Peacock, Bruno De Nicola and Sara Nur Yıldız (New York: Routledge, 2016), 291.

again this diversity that precluded the possibility of reducing the centuries-long complex practices in Anatolia into binaries such as "orthodoxy" and "heterodoxy," which have been conventionally employed to describe the opposing socio-religious affiliations. The "Köprülü-Ocak line" of scholars, as described by Derin Terzioğlu, had assumed the pairing of a particular "orthodoxy" with Sunni Islam and thereby the Ottoman state and "heterodoxy" with "various syntheses of Islamic precepts with pre-Islamic Turkic beliefs among the masses of rural and illiterate Turkmen".[1029] Recent research has revealed, on the contrary, that no Sufi affiliation could be "restricted to a single social, political or cultural milieu" and that "the social and religious profile of the adherents of any one group/movement/order could vary from region to region and from period to period."[1030]

Nevertheless, through a process of confession building starting from the late fifteenth and the sixteenth centuries the Ottoman state adopted Sunnism as the religious discourse. Contributing to this formation was the rivalry between the Ottoman and the Safavid states. Overall, the adoption of a Sunni creed meant that the rituals and practices associated with Sunnism would define the Muslim communities. As projecting from above by state officials or as mobilized from below via popular agents, this identity would be popularized. In the meantime, the spiritual ambiguities lingered and the spectrum depicted above contained many fluid identities between a strict Sunni and a strict Shi'ite one. In textual discourse, for instance, the most popular literary narratives of medieval Anatolia such as *Maktel-i Hüseyin*, *Ebu*

[1029] Derin Terzioğlu, "Sufis in the Age of State-Building and Confessionalization," in *The Ottoman World,* ed. Christine Woodhead (UK: Routledge, 201), 87: Yıldırım, "Sunni Orthodox vs Shi'ite Heterodox?," 288. This dichotomy has also been discredited in the early 1990s by Ahmet T. Karamustafa. See *God's Unruly Friends: Dervish Groups in the Islamic Middle Period 1200-1550* (Utah: University of Utah Press, 1994).
[1030] Terzioğlu, "Sufis in the Age of State-Building," 87. Also see Alexander Knysh, "Sufism," in *The New Cambridge History of Islam, Volume 4: Islamic Cultures and Societies to the End of the Eighteenth Century*, ed. Michael Cook (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 104.

Müslimnâme, *Saltuknâme*, and *Battalnâme* also contained "ali-tinged piety" and depicted Ali as "the archetype of ideal saint and warrior," which was at the time acceptable.[1031] Those who did not openly identify with the Shi'ites but shared elements were labeled as heretics by the Ottoman state. Interestingly, the Bektashis, who could normally also be perceived as heretics, became officially recognized and supported by the Ottoman state to serve as an umbrella for uniting and neutralizing potentially disruptive religious elements such as the Abdals, Kalenderîs and Haydarîs, as claimed by certain historians.[1032]

The point is that the numerous religious manifestations within the wider populace were transformed into more clear, neat and convenient identities by the respective states, not once, but many times over the centuries, in parallel to the ideological challenges faced by political entities. Terzioğlu and Krstic have employed confessionalization as a framework by which to understand how the Ottoman state implemented various measures on specific religious communities to subsume them under the preferred, official categories, namely the Sunni identity.[1033] Accordingly, the state trained particularly the heterogenous and decentralized Sufi groups of the empire through a "carrot-and-stick" approach, allocating persecutions or posts and benefits.[1034] Mirroring these policies was the growth of a "religio-legal literature" that served to legitimize the formation of a sunni-based state authority against the potential deviances. In the meantime, among the rich spectrum of Sufi orders, many "self-professedly Sunni sufis" formed an alliance with the Ottoman ruling class in consolidating this Sunni synthesis. However, no synthesis could be conclusive; the political recentralization of the nineteenth century would offer a new

[1031] Yıldırım, "Sunni Orthodox vs Shi'ite Heterodox?," 301.
[1032] Yaycıoğlu, "Guarding Traditions and Laws-Disciplining," 1555.
[1033] Terzioğlu, "Sufis in the Age of State-Building," 87.
[1034] Terzioğlu, "Sufis in the Age of State-Building," 96.

context for the reshuffling of the alliance between state authority and the Sufi groups.[1035]

The Ottoman Empire had endured great physical and psychological pressure intensifying after the last quarter of the eighteenth century due to the consecutive losses in military campaigns, the rising domestic revolts and an ineffective administrative and financial structure. Concomitant to reform, the reliance on religious messages on behalf of the Ottoman state constituted a way of addressing this "existential crisis".[1036] Over the years, revisionist scholars have approached the "religious turn" from different angles; some have stressed the continued relevance and significance of the traditional ulama in higher-official ranks, some have turned to characterize the educational policies and the army[1037], others have pointed to the rising significance of particular Sufi orders at least until the mid-century and the competition to gain the favor of the sultans and the hearts of the believers.[1038] Many of the Ottoman civil officials had themselves ascribed to particular Sufi orders.[1039] While the Ottoman state tried to legitimize its military and administrative policies with reference to the religious discourse, it would be particularly the Sunni identity that was reinforced. Hence against the various attacks of the early decades of the nineteenth century on its legitimacy from the salafi Wahhabis to Shi'ite Iran, the Ottoman state once again had to redefine its Sunni identity. In the meantime, any

[1035] Terzioğlu, "Sufis in the Age of State-Building," 97.
[1036] Anscombe, "Islam and the Age of Ottoman Reform," 165-166.
[1037] Somel, *The Modernization of Public Education;* Tobias Heinzelmann*, Cihaddan Vatan Savunmasına: Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Genel Askerlik Yükümlülüğü (1826-1856)* trans. Türkis Noyan (İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2009).
[1038] Christiane Gruber pointed particularly to the salafi threat of the Wahhabis in explaining the turn to religious roots between 1750-1875 centered ın the Qur'an, the Prophet and ritual worship. Christiane Gruber, "A Pious Cure All: The Ottoman Illustrated Prayer Manual," in *The Islamic Manuscript Tradition,* ed. Christiane Gruber, 121; Butrus Abu Manneh, Muhammed Varol, *Islahat, Siyaset, Tarikat.*
[1039] Some of the closest uleama to Sultan Abdulmecid, for instance, Şehri Hafız Efendi or Sultan Abdülmecid's mother Esma Sultan, his sister Adile Sultan and had been initiated into the Khalidi order. Abu Manneh, "The Islamic Roots of the Gülhane Rescript," 183.

religious organization not fully subjected to its direct social, economic and religious authority were suspected[1040], while others could be incorporated and sponsored.[1041]

Two central axes of the Ottoman policy towards the Sufis until 1863 concerns the Nakshbandîs and the Bektashis. The centrality of the Nakshbandî Sufi order for the Ottoman state has been emphasized by some modern historians such as Christiane Gruber as the best amalgamation of the *sunna* of the Prophet, *shari'a* and mysticism. Their presence on Ottoman lands had been rejuvenated under first the Mujaddidi sub-order at the end of the seventeenth century and then the Khalidi sub-order in the 1820s, both of which acquired indisputable prestige between 1826 and 1876. The Khalidi disciples acted as champions for restructuring the empire through the joint discourse on the "necessities of time," the principles of the shari'a and the political leadership. [1042] As noted by Ali Yaycıoğlu, they would become the champions of "Islamic activism" as an important part of the Ottoman reform movement particulalry during the *Nizam-ı Cedid* period. Sheikh Khâlid al-Baghdâdi (d. 1827) of the Nakshbandî Khalidi order and his disciples were especially favored at the palace also in their capacity to negate the influence of Shi'ite Iran among the Kurds in Iraq.[1043] Their lodges were protected, sponsored and frequented by various state officials. At the same time, they were carefully monitored by Mahmud II (r. 1808-1839) under his centralization policies and many disciples were even sent on an exile from Istanbul, Damascus and Baghdad. [1044]

[1040] Varol, *Islahat, Siyaset, Tarikat,* 89.
[1041] They could be rewarded through food rations, repairs of their lodges and special salaries. Varol, *Islahat, Siyaset, Tarikat,* 197.
[1042] Butrus Abu Manneh, *Studies on Islam and the Ottoman Empire in the Nineteenth Century (1826-1876)* (Gorgias Press, 2011), 7; Yaycıoğlu, "Guarding Traditions and Laws," 1545.
[1043] Manneh, "The Islamic Roots of the Gülhane Rescript," 183.
[1044] Varol, *Islahat, Siyaset, Tarikat*, 82.

Outside of Istanbul, Ottoman Iraq was the battle ground, both militarily and ideologically, for much of the sectarian conflicts between the Ottoman Empire and Iran.[1045] Following the enthronement of Nadir Shah, the Shi'ite ulama in Iran had relocated themselves in the shrine cities such as Najaf and Karbala. On the one hand, they engaged in missionary activities.[1046] On the other, they turned to strengthen the Shi'ite identity through historical communal rituals such as the Muharram performances. Moreover, both the Sunni and the Shi'ite scholars turned to textual production, penning religious manuals, polemical texts and translating the corpus of Shi'ite confessional texts from Persian into Arabic. They also participated in debates (*münâzara*) in an effort to prove the superiority of one sect over the other. [1047] As many of these texts would make it to the printed medium in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, printing would serve the "inter" and "intra" religious polemics between different religious groups.[1048]

At the other extreme position were the Bektashis, who, as depicted above, themselves consisted of different religious and social groups.[1049] They had also been officially affiliated with the Janissary corps by the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries. While the traditional narrative has lumped them together with Alevids and

---

[1045] Itzchak Weismann, "The Naqshbandiyya-Khalidiyya and the Salafi Challenge in Iraq," *Journal of the History of Sufism* (2004), 9; Itzchak Weismann, "Genealogies of Fundamentalism: Salafi Discourse in Nineteenth-Century Baghdad," *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 36 (August 2009): 279. For a study of the different ways how the Ottoman state tried to assert central rule over the sectarian disputes in Iraq, see Faruk Yaslıçimen, "Osmanlı Devleti'nin İran Eksenli Irak Siyaseti ve 19. Yüzyılda Bürokratik Bilgi Üretimi," *Gelenek ve Modern Arasında Bilgi ve Toplum,* ed. M. Hüseyin Mercan (İstanbul: Yedirenk, 2013), 301-338.
[1046] Yusuf Ünal, "More Than Mere Polemic: The Adventure of the *Risalah-i Husniyah* in the Safavid, Ottoman and Indian Lands" (Masters Thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2016), 68.
[1047] Ünal, "More Than Mere Polemic," 9.
[1048] Ünal, "More Than Mere Polemic," 81.
[1049] Rıza Yıldırım, "Bektaşi Kime Derler?: 'Bektaşi' Kavramını Kapsamı ve Sınırları Üzerine Tarihsel Bir Analiz Denemesi," *Türk Kültürü ve Hacı Bektaş Veli Araştırmaları Dergisi* 55 (2010): 23-58; Ahmet T. Karamustafa, "Kalenders, Abdals, Hayderis: The Formation of the Bektasiye In the Sixteenth Century," in *Süleyman the Scond and His Time,* eds. Halil İnalcık and Cemal Kafadar (İstanbul, 1993): 121-129; Ahmet T. Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends,* 83-84; Gülay Yılmaz, "Bektaşilik ve İstanbul'daki Bektaşi Tekkeleri," *Journal of Ottoman Studies* 45 (2015): 97-136; Yaycıoğlu, "Guarding Traditions and Laws," 1542-1603.

Kızılbash in terms of their faith and rituals in an undifferentiated fashion, the articulation of their faith, their organization, alliances and perception by the Ottoman state greatly differed through the centuries. To fast forward to the nineteenth century, we find the abolition of the Bektashi order in 1826 together with the abolition of the Janissaries. The efforts to sunnitize the Bektashis revolved around two practices; for one, the Bektashi lodges were handed over primarily to the Nakshbandî Khalidis but also to Mevlevîs, Kadirîs and Melamîs.[1050] Second, the Bektashis were exiled to places with an overwhelmingly Sunni population such as Kayseri, Birgi and Hadim.[1051] To replace the Bektashi influence, the spiritual edification of the army had also been ascribed to the Mevlevîs.[1052] As such, while the lodge-based Bektashis came to an end, the elements of their faith lingered in loose groups. Despite the legal bans, Bektashism was practiced after the 1840s following the death of Mahmud II. Similar to the "religio-legal" literature of the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries, an anti-propaganda literature targeted the Bektashis in the process following the abolition of the Janissaries. Commissioned texts such as Esad Efendi's *Üss-i zafer,*[1053] Şirvanlı Fatih Efendi's *Gülzâr-ı fütûhât*[1054], and Hafız Hızır İlyas' *Tarih-i enderûn*. Especially the first two accounts described the Bektashis as enemies of Islam, who were worse than infidels.[1055] As such, they served as propaganda to build public opinion against a non-Sunni group.

[1050] Fahri Maden, "Bektaşi Tekkelerinin Kapatılması (1826) ve Bektaşiliğin Yasaklı Yılları" (PhD diss., Gazi University, 2010), 192-193.
[1051] Maden, "Bektaşi Tekkelerinin Kapatılması," 170; Fahri Maden, *Bektaşi Tekkelerinin Kapatılması (1826)* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2018).
[1052] Maden, "Bektaşi Tekkelerinin Kapatılması," 182; Yasemin Bozoğlu Erdinç, 'The Relationship Between the Mevlevî Order and the Ottoman State in the Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries" (Masters Thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2002), 111.
[1053] Vak'anüvis Mehmed Esad Efendi described the act of Mahmud II in abolishing the Janissaries as "*bu ne şelil hüsn-i tedbîr ve bu ne gûne feth u teshîrdir." Üss-i zafer,* 178.
[1054] Şirvanlı Fatih Efendi, *Gülzâr-ı fütûhât,* ed. Mehmet Ali Beyhan (İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2001). The account contained many accusations against the Janissaries and defended the role of Sultan Mahmud II as a "*müceddid"* for abolishing them. In turn, he called the Janissaries "*seg-i akur-ı cehim*."
[1055] Maden, "Bektaşi Tekkelerinin Kapatılması," 62.

Hence the balance of politics as implemented by the Ottoman state often necessitated the shift in empowering orders such as the Nakshbandîs and Mevlevîs against the Bektashis. It is indeed in recognition of this diversity and richness of these trajectories taken by the Muslims that studying what the Muslims printed in the nineteenth century takes an interesting turn. The century itself had its own particular dynamics introducing another turn to piety and the re-drawing of the boundaries of orthodox Islam in the Ottoman Empire. Various religious texts representing these complexities evolving through the centuries were placed into the printed medium. Tables B17, B18 and B20 in Appendix B provide an overview, which does indeed reveal that despite the devotional variety and complexity of the early nineteenth-century Ottoman intellectual context, it was those books serving the Sunni agenda of the state that got printed until 1863 even at the popular level. There were only two exceptions; the treatise of Kaygusuz Abdal and the dîvân of Haşim Efendi. Together with the diversification of the actors and venues of printing after 1863, the themes and identities represented in print would also expand to cover many Bektashi and other polemical texts.

Regardless of its relatively small size, a sample of 1000 titles printed between 1831 and 1863 allows us to contemplate not only the agency of authors in penning their books in the light of their particular worldviews but also the agency of the non-state mediators of print, who filtered this intellectual accumulation and made a selection based on their take on what would be widely read. Hence the discussion in the next section will cover the span of printed books with an appeal to a wider readership to the extent that their publishing stories can be linked to the outside agents.

4.3.2 Commissioned book titles

In pursuit of linking non-state agents directly to particular books, the research has followed two specific routes. On the one hand, this study has sought to identify the commissioned books starting from the 1830s. Unlike the books printed in Cairo, however, the printed editions in the Ottoman system lack information about the book contractors and simply mention the name of the reigning sultan and the superintendent of the Imperial Press.[1056] Instead, the archival documents were consulted, wherein commissioned books were revealed in general lines as artisan (*esnaf)* or bookseller (*sahaf)* property, rarely containing more details as to their exact identity. On the other hand, this chapter turned to the publications of private lithographers, who started to publish their names in the colophons after being granted official status after 1857. However, as stated in the previous sections, their agency should be considered in conjunction with those contractors who may have appealed to them to print their books. Hence rather than acting on their own initiative in choosing book titles and preparing them for print, the private printers could have simply replaced the Imperial Press in offering technical assistance. Similarly, one might not always need the physical evidence to connect many of the books printed at the Imperial Press with an appeal to wider audience to private contractors. Based on the assessment of the printing capacity and the finances of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire* as discussed in Chapter Two, it is clear that printing such books was not among the priorities of the Ottoman State, unless a contractor paid for the expenses. Even in the few cases where the initiative could arise from the Imperial Press, it

[1056] For the identification of commissioned books at the Bulaq press, see Schwartz, "Meaningful Mediums" and Hatice Aynur, "Bulak Matbaası'nda Basılan Türkçe Divanlar," *Journal of Turkish Studies-Türklük Bilgisi Araştırmaları: Fahri İz Armağan,* 14 (1990): 43-74.

would revolve around those popular titles that would be sure to sell quickly and bring profit.

Aside from these relatively well-defined categories, there were books in the blurry territory. Many books listed in the printed book catalogues of Özege lacked both the colophons and the inner pages, where publishing information should have been inscribed. It is a possibility for the colophons for some pages to have been torn out. It is another possibility that due to the transitional characteristic of print culture where the colophon, posing continuity with the manuscript culture, was making an exit.[1057] In the light of the discussions in Chapter Two and Chapter Five, however, it is more likely to link these books to the active networks of illicit printing whereby the contractors had turned to illicit venues. The unidentified editions, thereby, could simply represent a way of concealing a printer's true identity.

In the light of available evidence, the contribution of contractors to the diversification of printed book titles can be best studied in terms of whether their books were first time prints or already popular titles in the printed medium. In other words, they either commissioned entirely new titles and hence diversified the printed book market or they commissioned already popular ones and increased the number of circulating copies. The evidence underlines their impact especially in the religious sphere. As explained in the previous section, however, the religious sphere was very diverse. Various books on the Islamic creed (*akâid)* were complemented by many titles with Sufi affiliation. The latter group, however, was also diverse employing various concepts such as neoplatonic metaphysics, gnosticism and Sunnism from

[1057] For a survey of the development of inner page in early printed books at the Imperial Press and Bulaq, see Hatice Aynur, "Arap Harfli Türkçe Kitaplarda İç Kapağın Gelişimi: 1826-1923," in *Yücel Dağlı Anısına,* eds. Evangelia Balta, Yorgos Dedes, Emin Nedret İşli and M. Sabri Koz (İstanbul: Turkuaz Yayınları, 2010): 78-101.

İmâm Gazâlî to İbnü'l-Arabî.[1058]

To give some examples, the Celvetî sheikh İsmail Hakkı Bursevî's (d. 1725)[1059] text on the Islamic creed, *Halîliyye-i İsmail Hakkı*[1060], also known as *Tuhfe-i Haliliyye,* was initiated into the printed medium at the demand of a customer in 1840.[1061] Similarly, his *Kitâbü'l-Hitâb*, which covered faith and worship, was printed at the Imperial Press in 1841 as commissioned by Ömer Lütfi Efendizâde Azmi Bey, as the first and the only copy of the book before 1863.[1062] It would be the bookseller el-Hâc Mustafa Efendi, who would print it again in 1875. The same pioneering role was taken up by a customer in 1846 in the printing of Ali el-Kârî (d. 1605)'s *Şerhü'l-Emâlî.*[1063] This was a popular commentary on *Kasîdetü'l-Emâlî* (also known as *el-Emâlî* and *Bed'ü'l-Emâlî*) of Sirâcüddîn Ebu'l-Hasen Ali el-Ûşî (d. 1179), a clear and comprehensible text based on the principles of faith/creed of *ehl-i sünnet.*[1064] Moreover, in 1850, a translation of el- Kârî's commentary by Ahmed Asım Ayıntabî (d. 1820), entitled *Merahu'l-me'âlî fî Şerhi'l-Emâlî,* was printed as demanded by customers in 1200 copies and sold by the press to the customer at

[1058] Knysh, "Sufism," 83.
[1059] Printing the works of İsmail Hakkı would be of special significance for the Sufi circles of the nineteenth century as he had been embraced by the disciples of many Sufi tracks except for Şems/Mevlevîs and Bayramî Melamîs. Ali Namlı, "İsmail Hakkı Bursevi," in *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi,* Vol. 23 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2001), 103.
[1060] It was printed in 1256 and 1260. Many other works of İsmail Hakkı would be printed in this time interval including *Hadîs-i erba'în şerhi, Ferâhu'r-rûh, Furûk-ı Hakkı, Mecâlisü'l-vaʿz ve't-tezkîr, Mi'râciye* and *Pend-i Attâr şerhi*. He can easily be declared as a bestselling printed author. Writing in *Basîret* in 1292, Basiretçi Ali Efendi noted that just as everybody knew that every book written by İsmail Hakkı was worthy of contemplation, this specific book was recommended for containing "the issues of creed, the truth" (*mesâil-i imân ve hakâyık ve fürû'uyla vesâireden ibâret)*. Basiretçi Ali Efendi, *İstanbul Mektupları* (İstanbul: Kitapevi, 2001), 497.
[1061] The book was printed at 2 kuruş 10 para cost and 3 kuruş 30 para profit per copy. İ.DH 32/1510, 17 Cemâziyelevvel 1256 (17 July 1840). Not only was it printed at the demand of the customer but also announced on Takvîm-i Vekâyi' that it was out for an affordable price. Takvîm-i Vekâyi' no. 197, 1256. It would also be printed in 1260.
[1062] İ.DH 37/1764, 17 Safer 1257 (10 April 1841).
[1063] İ.DH 126/6449, 12 Ramazan 1262 (3 September 1846); İ.DH 125/6371, 13 Şaban 1262 (6 August 1846). The text was printed in 1262, 1263 and 1278.
[1064] The book, called was extremely popular as clear from the widespread copies of the work found in Berlin, Paris, Stockholm, Rampur, Buhara and Cambridge. For further information on Ali el-Kârî, his works as well as the commentaries and glossaries on his texts, see Durmuş Özbek, "El-Uşi ve 'Kasidetü'l-Emali'," *Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 5 (1994).

almost 40 percent profit.[1065]

In cases where the book was considered central to the consolidation of a Sunni religious discourse, as in the case of *Risâle-i Birgivî,* the state took the initiative and pioneered the printing before the appearance of a customer; Kadızâde Ahmed Efendi's (d. 1580) *Ferâidü'l-fevâid fî beyâni'l-akâid,* also known as *Amentü şerhi,* was printed at the Imperial Press as early as 1805.[1066] The earliest trace of customer commissioning may be tracked to 1846.[1067]

The contractors and private printers also turned to the printing of more specialized catechisms. For instance, as a catechetical text directed at merchants, the first and only printed copy of Darendeli Hamza Efendi's (d. 1694) *Risâle-i bey' ü şirâ'* was commissioned to be printed in 1846.[1068] Moreover, Seyyid Abdülhamid b. Mustafa Reşid's short treatise compiling the Qur'anic verses and *hadith* solely on ritual prayer (*salât)* entitled *Envârü'l-imân* had already been printed at Tophâne İstihkâm Alayları press in 1853/1269.[1069] The bookseller Urfalı Uncu Halil Efendi also printed the same book in 1857.[1070] In addition, the first and the only printed copy of a handbook on ritual prayer called *Necâtü'l-musallî* (w. 1802/03), written by Ahmed Şevki b. Abdullah, was commissioned by customers in 1847 at the Imperial Press.[1071]

[1065] İ.DH 218/12867, 13 Ramazan 1266 (23 July 1850).
[1066] 1220, 1223, 1232, 1240, 1244, 1253, 1262. For evidence of the text being printed as state-property, see HAT 287/17267-A, 1247.
[1067] 1220, 1223, 1232, 1240, 1244, 1253, 1262. İ.DH 125/6371, 13 Şaban 1262 (6 August 1846); İ.DH 129/6617, 21 Zilkade 1262 (10 November 1846).
[1068] 1200 copies were commissioned and printed at 2,5 kuruş cost and 1,5 kuruş 15 para profit. İ.DH 123/6287, 11 Receb 1262 (5 July 1846).
[1069] Seyyid Abdülhamid b. Mustafa Reşid, *Envârü'l-imân* (İstanbul: Tophâne İstihkâm Alayları Litografya Destgâhı, Gurre-i Receb 1269).
[1070] Seyyid Abdülhamid b. Mustafa Reşid, *Envârü'l-imân* (İstanbul: el-Hâc Halil Taş Destgâhı, 1274). It was also printed at the Imperial Press in 1849/1266 and 1852/1269. Seyyid Abdülhamid b. Mustafa Reşid would be more famous for his *Zübde-i ilmihâl* printed in 1845/1262 and 1858/1275.
[1071] İ.DH 148/7647, 3 Cemâziyelâhir 1263 (5 July 1846). 1200 copies of the book were printed at 6 kuruş 10 para cost and 2 kuruş 30 para profit per copy. Bianchi reported that the book was sold at 15 piastres at the shop of Yazıcı Ali Efendi at Mahmud Paşa quarter. Ahmed Şevki b. Abdullah, *Necâtü'l-musallî* (İstanbul: Dârü't-Tıbâ'ati'l-Âmire, 1263).

Recognition of the Prophet as the center of Ottoman-Islamic piety had been a popular trend since the sixteenth century through both textual and visual production.[1072] Aside from *hilye* and *hadith,* the relics of the Prophet had an important ceremonial role for the Ottoman Sultans. Among the devotional texts venerating the Prophet, perhaps the best example is *Kitâb-ı Muhammediyye fî kemâlâtı Ahmediyye* by Yazıcıoğlu Mehmed (d.1451), better known as *Muhammediyye.* This book was his Turkish translation in verse of his own book in Arabic, *Megâribü'z-zamân*. It contained catechetical information as well as topics such as the creation, the life of the Prophet and the apocalypse with reference to the *hadith* and the Qur'anic verses as well as the local traditions and older religious practices. It had become a type, even a genre, according to Amil Çelebioğlu, as an extremely popular book in wide circulation.[1073] Tobias Heinzelmann has located 416 manuscript copies of *Muhammediyye* in libraries in and outside of Turkey.[1074] Printed editions soon spread all through the Islamic world.[1075] While the first edition was printed at Bâb-ı Seraskerî Press in 1842, three of the printed editions could be directly connected to the agency of contractors at the Imperial Press; 1845[1076],

[1072] Gruber, "A Pious Cure All," 132.
[1073] Hatice K.Arpaguş, *Osmanlı ve Geleneksel İslam* (İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, 2014): 113-134; Amil Çelebioğlu, *Muhammediye,* (İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1996). The probate records also demonstrate that between 1695 and 1786 in various parts of the empire including Rusçuk, Sofia and Salonica, *Muhammediyye* constituted one of the most frequently owned books. Orlin Sabev, "Okuyan Taşralı bir Toplum: Rusçuk Müslümanlarının Kitap Sevgisi (1695-1786)" *Balkanlar'da İslam Medeniyeti Uluslararası Üçüncü Sempozyum Tebliğleri,* Bükreş Romanya/1-5 Kasım 2006, vol. II (Istanbul: IRCICA, 2011), 578.
[1074] Tracing the distribution of manuscript production over the centuries, he noted that the number of copies declined after 1845 when lithographic copies of the books began to be printed; the rate was especially sharp for *Muhammediyye* declining from 24 copies between 1800-1849 to 2 copies between 1850-1899. Tobias Heinzelmann, *Populare religiöse Literatur and Buchkultur im Osmanischen Reich: Eine Studie zur Nutzung der Werke der Brüder Yazıcıoğlu* (Würzburg: Ergon Verlag Würzburg in Kommission, 2015), 264.
[1075] According to the records in the catalogues, *Muhammediyye* was printed multiple times in İstanbul both at the state and the bookseller presses; 1258 1261, 1262, 1264, 1265, 1267, 1269, 1270, 1271, 1272, 1273, 1275, 1278, 1279, 1280.
[1076] 700 copies were printed at 46 kuruş cost and 24 kuruş profit per copy. İ.DH 98/4928, 11 Safer 1261 (19 February 1845).

1846[1077] and 1847.[1078] Moreover, it was printed by the bookseller-cum-lithographers including Uncu el-Hâc Halil Efendi in 1855 and 1866, Bosnavî el-Hâc Muharrem Efendi in 1856 and 1863 and el-Hâc Ali Rıza Efendi in 1862 and 1867.

Following *Muhammediyye* was *Envârü'l-âşıkîn* by Yazıcıoğlu Ahmed Bîcan (d. 1466) as a free-lance Turkish prose translation of his brother's *Megâribü'z-zamân*; hence another book on the life of the Prophet with similar contents. There were 93 manuscript copies of *Envârü'l-âşıkîn* in libraries in and outside of Turkey.[1079] While *Envârü'l-âşıkîn* had much popularity in the printed market similar to its popularity in the manuscript tradition, most of the editions were printed at the Imperial Press.[1080] We can tell that the printing as state-property (*tabhâne malı*) was due to the explicit demand for the book; the director of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire* stated in 1844 that the 1200 copies would be sold very quickly.[1081] A copy of the book printed at the Bulaq press in 1852 had been commissioned by Binbaşı İzmirî Emin Efendi, who had become an established contractor along Istanbul-Cairo axis.[1082]

Another book related to the popular conception of the Prophet involved Kadı İyâz's (d. 1149) *eş-Şifâ*. It was a very popular book taught at madrasas and mosques leading to hundreds of derivative texts. It had become customary to read it against the threat of the enemy or illnesses in North Africa. The material sanctity of the book was similar to that of *Muhammediyye* or *Delâilü'l-hayrât.* There were officials in the

[1077] 700 copies were printed at 50 kuruş cost and 20 kuruş profit; hence total of 70 kuruş each copy. İ.DH 123/6250, 10 Receb 1262 (4 July 1846).
[1078] 1200 copies printed at 42 kuruş cost and 28 kuruş profit per copy. İ.DH 137/7018, 9 Safer 1263 (27 January 1847).
[1079] Heinzelmann, *Populare religiöse Literatur,* 22.
[1080] 1261, 1267, 1275, 1278 editions were all printed at the Imperial Press.
[1081] İ.DH 91/4534, 11 Şaban 1260 (26 August 1844). Each copy was estimated to cost 18 kuruş, but ended up with 20.5 kuruş cost on top of which 12 kuruş was added per copy as profit. The final price was 32,5 kuruş. İ.DH 104/5232, 5 Cemâziyelevvel 1261 (12 May 1845).
[1082] Yazıcıoğlu Ahmed Bîcan, *Envârü'l-âşıkîn* (Unidentified: Evâsıt-ı Rebîülevvel 1269).

Ottoman Empire appointed as *şifâ-hans* and it was read over and over again in many cities and mosques of the empire for the salvation of the Ottoman army and the navy.[1083] Perhaps it was the material sanctity that deterred the process, but *Şifâ* was printed for the first time only in 1848 and that was on demand from customers in İstanbul.[1084] Moreover, the demand for its commentary by Ali el-Kârî, entitled *Şerhu'ş-şifâ* (w. 1602), was recognized by state officials in 1846 and it was printed as state-property.[1085]

There were also specifically Sufi texts such as prayer books or books on the code of conduct of specific Sufi orders. To start with the general treatises on mysticism, we find the earliest printed edition of the translation of Imâm Gazâlî's (d. 1111) *Kimyâ-yı sa'âdet* being commissioned in 1844.[1086] An interesting case concerned the 1858 printed edition of *Kenzü'l-miftâh,* written by a Nakhsbandi-Khalidi sheikh, Mehmed Vehbî el-Erzincanî (d. 1848) also known as Terzi Baba.[1087] This was the first and the only printed edition of the book before 1863. The colophon of the book stated that Osman Efendi ibnü'l-Hâc Mehmed Efendi had commissioned the book to the bookseller Bosnavî Muharrem Efendi for print with the hope that he would be serving the Sufi masters (*evliyâ*) as well as benefiting other people by enabling them to carry these prayers on themselves like an amulet (*muska)* day and night. This is one of the rare examples where we can connect commissioning directly

[1083] M. Yaşar Kandemir, "eş-Şifa," in *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi,* Vol. 39 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2010), 135. İbrahim Hanif's commentary on Ali el-Kârî's commentary on *Şifâ* was printed at Bulaq press in 1841/1257.
[1084] İ.DH 165/8646, 11 Safer 1264 (18 January 1848). 1200 copies were printed with 54 kuruş 38 para cost and 25 kuruş 2 para profit each. This amounts to 50 percent profit for the Imperial Press. Yaşar Kandemir noted in the Diyanet encyclopedia article that the text was printed in 1264, but I have not encountered a hard copy. M. Yaşar Kandemir, "eş-Şifa," 135.
[1085] The book was printed in 1262 and 1264 but the 1262 edition is not acknowledged in secondary literature. See İ.DH 123/6241, 11 Receb 1262 (5 July 1846); the printing was completed in twenty months: İ.DH 165/8646, 11 Safer 1264 (18 January 1848).
[1086] 1200 copies were authorized for print at estimated 4 kurus 10 para cost. İ.DH 82/4119, 18 Zilhicce 1259 (9 January 1844). Other books by Gazâlî were also printed such as the translation of his *Minhâcü'l-âbidîn* in 1280
[1087] Mehmed Vehbî el-Erzincanî, *Kenzü'l-miftâh* (İstanbul: Bosnavî el-Hâc Ali Efendi, 1275).

to pious reasons. Moreover, since Terzi Baba was a contemporary sheikh, the book must have been printed shortly after his death.

Nevertheless, similar notions of appreciation were expressed by the bookseller Karahisârî Ali Rıza Efendi, who printed *Tercüme-i Mektubât-ı İmâm-ı Rabbânî* in 1853. This was the translation of the 1183 letters of Ahmed Fârukî es-Serhendî Hâce and Hoca Muhammed Masum by Müstakimzâde Süleyman Efendi (d. 1788), a Sufi with Nakshbandî Mujaddidi affiliation.[1088] Karahisârî interfered in the text and called it a "treasure of rarities" (*Bu defîne-i nevâdir ve hazîne-i cevâhir bir kitâb-ı nefis-i ma'ârif-i enîsdir*) in the colophon. This might signify his potential Sufi affiliation, even though this identity is not reflected in the wider collection of his printed books. He did, however, also introduce himself in the preface with humility as "servant of the ulama, friend of the poor ones among the booksellers" (*hâdimü'l-ulemâ, muhibbü'l-fukarâ-i sahaf).*[1089] He further explained that he had printed the book in order to serve the students, who had difficulty copying it by hand.

Meanwhile, the production of prayer books topped and rivaled the Qur'an in popularity.[1090] Verses from the Qur'an had been inscribed into these books with the aim to provide protection from harm.[1091] Among the literary output, prayers in praise

[1088] Müstakimzâde Süleyman Efendi found *evrâd* and *salavât* texts especially important and wrote commentaries on many of them such as *Risâle-i fi's-salavâtı'ş-şerîfe, Şerh-i Evrâd-ı Kâdiriyye, Şerh-i Evrâd-ı İmâm-ı Süheylî, Şerh-i Evrâd-ı Seyyid Yahya, Şerh-i Salavât-ı Meleveyn.* Hür Mahmut Yücer, 265. Müstakimzâde was a disciple of Şeyh Muhammed Masum (d. 1685), who had been initiated into Mujaddidi order by Yekdest. Müstakimzâde's *Şerh-i Evrâd-ı Kâdiriyye* was also printed in 1260 and 1282.

[1089] Müstakimzâde Süleyman Efendi, *Tercüme-i Mektubât-ı İmâm-ı Rabbânî*, 3 vols. (İstanbul: Karahisârî Ali Efendi Taş Destgâhı, Safer 1270). The edition contains the *taqarız* of Yusufzâde, the commentator on Buhari, as well as the father of the translator.

[1090] Studies of Medieval Europe reveal that the liturgical manuscripts were the kind of books owned and used the most by the laity from the 13th century onwards. Whether they could read or not, everyone was in possession of a prayer book as" liturgical books did not make high demands on reading ability anyway, as their texts were familiar from constant repetition and they were written out in the largest lettering." Among these "books for everybody," the Book of Hours was especially popular and often took the form of a "portable manual. See M.T. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066-1307* (Oxford, Blackwell Publishers, 1993), 111.

[1091] Gruber, "A Pious Cure All," 124.

of the Prophet, or *salavâts* had a prominent place and were widespread especially among the Sufi circles. They served as "sovereign means of vision of the Prophet and communion with him," as Muslims were commanded to call down blessings upon the Prophet in the Qur'an.[1092] Some of them had been identified by sheikhs as *vird* and thereby brought into circulation in both oral and written form. Many *mecmû'as* have been compiled out of the *salavâts* over the centuries.[1093] Writing commentaries over the *virds* of well-esteemed sheikhs such as Abdulkâdir-i Geylânî, Ahmed er-Rifâî, İbnü'l-Arabî, Ahmed el-Bedevî had also become an established practice. The aim was for them to serve as vehicles for *sohbet* in the Sufi gatherings and to facilitate their comprehension.[1094] Some of these *virds,* their translations and ultimately the commentaries got printed in many parts of the Islamic world in the nineteenth century.

The most famous *salavât* compilation was that of Süleyman el-Cezûlî (d. 1465), the founder of the Cezûliyye branch of the Şâzeliyye order in Morocco containing 130 *salavâts*, entitled *Delâilü'l-hayrât ve şevârikü'l-envâr fî zikri's-salât ale'n-nebiyyi'l-muhtâr.* Already in the fifteenth century, the context for this *mecmû'a* was to increase the collective solidarity of his people at the face of the Portuguese threat.[1095] However, its impact transcended the limits of particular Sufi orders and was recited by an eclectic group of Muslims throughout the world and copied as far as in Sumatra. Even in the Ottoman context, *Delâil* was envisioned as spiritual

[1092] Alexandra Bain, "The Late Ottoman *En'am-ı şerif: Sacred Text and images in an Islamic prayer book,"* (PhD diss., University of Victoria, 1999), 68.
[1093] Hür Mahmut Yücer, "Tarikat Geleneğinde Salavat-ı Şerife ve Müstakimzade'nin Şerh-i Evrad-ı Kadiri Adlı Eseri," *Tasavvuf: İlmi ve Akademik Araştırmalar Dergisi 6,* no.15 (2005): 255.
[1094] Nedim Tan, "Mustafa el-Bekri'ye Ait olan *el-Feyzü'l Ahmediyyü'r-revi* Adlı Eserin Tercümesi: *Tercüme-i Şerh-i Salat-ı Ahmed Bedevi," Tasavvuf: İlmi ve Akademik Araştırmalar Dergisi* (2013): 221.
[1095] Witkam discusses the evolution of the illustrations of Mekka over the centuries in addition to Medina. See Jan Just Witkam, "The Battle of the Images: Mecca vs. Medina in Iconography of Manuscripts of al-Jazuli's Dala'il al-Khayrat," in *Theoretical Approaches to the Transmission and Edition of Oriental Manuscripts*, eds. J. Pfeiffer and M. Kropp (Beirut, 2001), 67-82.

defense, as Şeyhülislam Arif Hikmet Efendi noted that it would be copied together with the Qur'an as well as Buhârî, Müslim, *Şifâ*, *Şemâil* and *Mesnevî* to ensure the victory of the Ottoman army and navy in the Crimean War.[1096] The first edition was printed by the Ottoman state in 1842 due to the scarcity of its copies.[1097] The most popular commentary was written by Kara Davudzâde Mehmed Efendi (d. 1756), entitled *Tevfîku muvaffıkı'l-hayrât li-neyli'l-berekât fî hizmeti menba'i's-sa'âdât.*[1098] His commentary did not follow the classical method; he had significantly expanded the work with additions from other Sufi sources. As such, it turned into a separate new composition of ethics, advice, various *menkıbes,* and *siyer* including *israiliyât* and hence much appealing to wide readership.[1099] The printing of Kara Davud's commentary came earlier than the original text, in fact, as a response to the demands of the customers even before the right to commission books was officially granted. In 1838, 1200 copies of Kara Davud previously printed at the Imperial Press had been demanded by booksellers.[1100] There was even more demand the next year for 2400 copies.[1101] Moreover, the 1846[1102], 1850[1103] and 1853[1104] editions of the commentary with 1200 copies each were commissioned by customers.

[1096] İ.DH 308/19645, 25 Zilhicce 1270 (18 September 1854).
[1097] İ.DH 43/2147, 2 Receb 1257 (20 August 1841). Other editions followed in: 1260, 1272, 1275, 1276.
[1098] 1254, 1255, 1256, 1262, 1266, 1269, 1271, 1275, 1280.
[1099] Hatice Arpaguş, 31. Süleyman Uludağ, "Delailü'l-Hayrat," in *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi,* Vol. 9 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1994), 114. Bianchi announced that it was on sale at the Imperial Press for 140 piastres.
[1100] HAT 637/31382, 20 Zilkade 1254 (4 February 1839). 1200 copies had been printed at the Imperial Press at the cost of 25 kuruş each and 25 kuruş profit, resulting in 50 kuruş price. In 1255, permission was requested to sell the book at 60 kuruş with extra profit. İ.DH 3/111, 23 Receb 1255 (2 October 1839).
[1101] Mad. Müd. 8257, 7 Şevval 1255 (14 December 1839).
[1102] 1200 copies were printed. İ.DH 125/6405, 22 Şaban 1262 (15 August 1846).
[1103] 1200 copies were printed at 59 kuruş 3 para cost and 40 kuruş 37 para profit each, adding to 100 kuruş price per copy. A.AMD 19/28, 23 Şaban 1266 (4 July 1850).
[1104] İ.DH 218/12866, 13 Ramazan 1269 (20 June 1853). Each copy cost 59 kuruş 3 para and aded 40 kuruş 37 para profit.

The printing of other prayer books followed with the commentary of İsmail Hakkı Bursevî on the *salavât* of Ibn Meşîş (d. 1227), a concise articulation of the main concepts of Sufism, entitled *Şerhu Salavât-ı ibn Meşîş*, in 1840 at Bâb-ı Seraskerî press and in 1862/1279 at Bulaq press.[1105] It was again İzmirî Emin Beyefendi who had commissioned this book in Bulaq. In the colophon of the book, it explained that this "scarce" book had been printed with the aim of serving and benefiting those people who wanted to read it.[1106] It is also interesting to note that *Salavât-ı Meşîş* would become part of a prayer compilation consisting also of *Hizbü'l-Bahr, Hizbü'l-Azîm* and *Delâilü'l-hayrât* in 1891.[1107] Another Sufi text of prayer, *Salât-ı Seyyid Ahmed Bedevî*, was printed at Sahaf Urfalı Halil Efendi's press as commissioned by Midillili Seyyid Osman Nuri Efendi in 1855 as the first and only printed edition.[1108] It was originally compiled as a translation of Ahmed el-Bedevî's (d. 1276) prayers by the Sufi sheikh, Mustafa el-Bekrî (d. 1749).[1109] It had been translated into Turkish by the scribe to the Dârüssaâde Ağası, Hasan Fehmi el-Mağnisavî en-Nakşibendî el-Kâdirî in the nineteenth century.[1110] Moreover, the first

[1105] İbn Meşîş, or Abdüsselam b. Meşîş el-Hasenî, was Şâzeliyye sheikh from North Africa. His *evrâd* disseminated among the Sufi networks as *es-Salavâtü'l-Meşîşiyye*, a short text with many commentaries. Süleyman Uludağ, "Abdüsselam b. Meşiş el-Haseni," in *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi,* Vol. 1 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1988), 302.
[1106] İsmail Hakkı Bursevî, *Şerh-i Salavât-ı ibn Meşîş* (İstanbul: Bâb-ı Seraskerî Litografya Destgâhı, 1279). As previously noted, İzmirî Emin Beyefendi had also commissioned the printing of *Dîvân-ı Ârif* at Bulaq press and *Envârü'l-âşıkîn* at the Imperial Press in 1269. Most likely that he sold the books in the Istanbul market.
[1107] *Delâil-i şerîf* (İstanbul: Matbaa-i Âmire, 1308).
[1108] Due to a hand-written inscription of the title on one of the printed copies, the same book was mentioned as two different texts in the Özege catalogue. The handwritten inscription was not a title, but in fact a description of the contents of the book: *Salât-ı Seyyid Ahmed Bedevî (Evsâf-ı kemâlât-ı Muhammediyye'yi hâvî salât-ı şerîfe)* (İstanbul: el-Hâc Halil Efendi Taş Destgâhı, 1272).
[1109] The founder of the Bekri branch of Halvetî order, Mustafa Bekri Efendi (d. 1749) had also compiled a a prayer book entitled *Salât-ı Kemâliyye,* commented by Rıfai Sheikh Nuri Efendi (d. 1856). He is believed to have compiled over sixty *virds*. Just over *İbn Meşîş salavât,* he had written four commentaries. This particular text was a translation of Ahmed el-Bedevî's (d. 1276) *el-Feyzü'l-Ahmediyyü'r-revi alâ salâtı Seyyid Ahmed el-Bedevî*, also known as *"salât-ı nuriyye"* with changes in the text. See Hür Mahmut Yücer, "Tarikat Geleneğinde Salavat-ı Şeride ve Müstakimzade'nin Şerh-i Evrad-ı Kadiri Adlı Eseri," *Tasavvuf: İlmi ve Akademik Araştırmalar Dergisi* 6, no. 15 (2005): 263.
[1110] Hasan Fehmi Efendi, also a prominent Nakshbandi of the ninteenth century, had even more influence on the text, as he added Qur'anic verse and hadith, verses from Bûsîrî, İbnü'l-Fârız and Ali b. Muhammed Vefâ and Persian stylistic elements to the extent that it partly became his own

printed edition of *Hizbü'l-A'zam ve'l-virdü'l-efham,* which was a compilation of prayers found in the Qur'an and the *hadith* by Ali el-Kârî (d. 1605), was commissioned in 1846.[1111] A second edition would be printed at the press of the bookseller Bosnavî Muharrem Efendi in 1860 together with its translation by İbrahim Halil Efendi (d. 1855), the son of Anadolu *kazaskeri* Fındıkzâde on the margins.[1112]

The commissioned religious texts so far have revealed an emphasis on Sufi texts representing different orders including the Nakshbandîya, Kâdiriyye, Mevlevîyye and Şâzeliyye. Moreover, the prose treatise of the Bektashi poet, Kaygusuz Abdal (d.1444), *Risâle-i Kaygusuz Abdal,* was printed in 1858. This constituted an early example of a more diverse output to come especially with the polemical literature of the 1870s.[1113] More traces of Bektashi elements would be found in poetry.

These frequently recited texts, hence, had been brought to the printed medium with the purpose of facilitating their access to their readers. Although they represented different Sufi traditions, a clear Sunni focus was also obvious. At the same time, the religious themes also permeated other fields such as history books. One of the canonical texts starting with a biography of the Prophet was *Ravzatü'l-ahbâb* by Cemal el-Hüseynî (d. 1521), which had been translated into Turkish by Mahmud Mağnisavî Benlizâde in 1695. The third chapter of the book contained much praise for Ali and the twelve imams. The first and only edition of the book

---

compilation. Nedim Tan, "Mustafa el-Bekri'ye Ait olan *el-Feyzü'l Ahmediyyü'r-revi* Adlı Eserin Tercümesi: *Tercüme-i Şerh-i Salat-ı Ahmed Bedevi," Tasavvuf* (İstanbul, 2013): 221-244.

[1111] 1500 copies were commissioned. İ.DH 131/6756, 22 Zilhicce 1262 (11 December 1846).

[1112] Ali el-Kârî, *Hizbü'l-A'zam ve'l-virdü'l-efham* (İstanbul: Bosnavî Muharrem Efendi, 1276).

[1113] For example, Firişteoğlu Abdülmecid's translation of Fazlullah Hurufî's *Câvidânnâme-i sagîr* under the title *Aşknâme* would become the first book to be printed on Horufis in 1871. Harputlu İshak Efendi would pen *Kâşifu'l-esrâr ve dâfi'u'l-eşrâr* as a rebuttal to this book, which was printed in 1873. Ahmed Rıfat Efendi, in turn, would write another book to inform about the Bektashis, entitled *Mir'âtü'l-makâsıd,* printed in 1876. See Salih Çift, "1826 Sonrasında Bektaşilik ve Bu Alanla İlgili Yayın Faaliyetleri," *Uludağ Fakültesi İlahiyat Fakültesi* 12, no. 1 (2003): 249-268. Also see Yusuf Ünal, "Not a Mere Polemic".

before 1863 was commissioned by a customer in 1852.[1114] Interestingly, this important book was printed with the added prestige of scholarly endorsements (*takâriz)* by important state officials such as the Director of the Imperial Foundations, Ziver Efendi, the Director of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire*, Recai Efendi and the Editor-in-Chief at the Imperial Press, Ali Efendi.

Another important book brought to the Ottoman book market via contractors was *Reşehât-ı aynü'l-hayât,*[1115] a hagiography of the Naksbandi sheikh Ubeydullah Ahrar (d. 1490) about his struggle for the supremacy of *shari'a* written in Persian by Fahreddin Ali Safi Kâşifî (d. 1532).[1116] All libraries of İstanbul allegedly had a copy of the book, but it reached widest circulation with its printing in the nineteenth century.[1117] While the first three editions were printed in Egypt (1236, 1256, 1269), the 1840 and 1853 editions had been commissioned by el-Hâc Nuri Efendi İslambolî and Binbaşı İzmirî Emin Efendi respectively. Nuri Efendi was one of the booksellers of Istanbul as listed by Bianchi in *Journal Asiatique* and Emin Efendi by now appeared as a serious book contractor and trader between İstanbul and Cairo.[1118]

[1114] *Ravzatü'l-ahbâb* was written by Cemal el-Hüseynî in 1494 and translated from its Persian original by Mahmud Mağnisavî Benlizâde in 1695. See Mehmet Aykaç, "Cemal el-Hüseynî," in *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi,* Vol. 7 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1993), 304. It was printed at the Imperial Press in 1268 for customers in 1200 copies. See İ.DH 251/15443, 10 Receb 1268 (30 April 1852). The cost per copy was 41 kuruş and the profit was 20 kuruş. Cemal Hüseynî-i Şîrâzî, *Ravzatü'l-ahbâb fî siyeri'n-nebî ve'l-âl ve'l-ashâb,* trans. Mahmud Mağnisavî Benlizâde (İstanbul: Tab'hâne-i Âmire, Evâhir-i Cemâziyelâhir 1268).

[1115] 1268.

[1116] Butrus Abu Manneh has drawn emphasis to the connection between the Sunni-orthodox beliefs of the Ottoman elite in the sixteenth century and the translation of not only *Reşehât* but also many other religious texts from Persian and Arabic such as Imâm Gazâlî's *Ihyâ.* Butrus Abu Manneh, "A Note on 'Rashahat-ı 'Ain al-Hayat' in the Nineteenth Century," in *Naqshbandis in Western and Central Asia,* ed. Elisabeth Özdalga (İstanbul: Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul Transactions, 1999), 62.

[1117] Manneh, *Studies on Islam and the Ottoman Empire,* 143-144; Necdet Tosun, "Reşehat," in *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi,* Vol. 35 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2008), 9. Moreover, Nile Green remarked that the Persian printed book market was very popular in India with 9 printed editions between 1890 and 1911. Green, *Bombay Islam,* 100.

[1118] M. Bianchi, "Bibliographie Ottomane ou Notice des Ouvrages Publies," *Journal Asiatique*, seri XIV (October-November 1859): 289.

There was apparently much demand for history books. The only printed copy of *Tercüme-i Ravzatü's-safâ* was commissioned in 1841.[1119] Moreover, the famous hadith scholar from Herat, Muîn el-Miskîn's (d. 1502) *Me'âricü'n-nübüvve* was translated into Turkish twice; Celalzâde Mustafa (d. 1567), a famous historian and stylist of his age, had translated the book earlier than Altıparmak Mehmed Efendi (d. 1623), a Halvetî Sufi in Cairo.[1120] However, perhaps due to the Sufi ties of the latter, his book entitled *Tercüme-i Me'âricü'n-nübüvve fi medârici'l-fütüvve* was the one printed in Istanbul through commissioning in 1841.[1121] *Siyerü'l-kebîr* of İmam Muhammed eş-Şeybânî (d. 805), as translated into Turkish by Ayıntâbî Mehmed Münib Efendi (d. 1823), had already been at the Imperial Press in 1825 for the expansion of the benefits.[1122] It was also commissioned by a customer in 1844.[1123]

Tarihu'l-ümem ve'l-mülûk of Muhammed Taberî (d. 923) was probably the most popular history book in the Islamic world. It was a history of prophets in line with the social, and political events surrounding their lives.[1124] In earlier centuries, it had also been a popular part of a wider book constellation of books including *Hamzanâme, Seyyid Battal, Siyer-i şerîf, Envârü'l-âşıkîn* and others sold by booksellers.[1125] Hence its printing was expectedly connected to a contractor in

[1119] This book written as a biography of the Prophet by Seyyid Hamîdüddîn Muhammed b. Burhâniddîn and translated by Balatîzâde Kemâlî Mehmed Çelebi. 1200 copies were commissioned at 45 kuruş cost and 4 kuruş profit. See İ.DH 49/2402, Gurre-i Zilkade 1257 (December-January 1847-48).
[1120] Celalzâde's translation was called *Delâil-i nübüvvet-i Muhammedî ve şemâil-i fütüvvet-i Ahmedî.* Bianchi mistakenly attributed this title to Altıparmak's translation, when he announced in *Journal Asiatique* that it was on sale for 150 piastres at the store of Aksaraylı Hacı Hasan Efendi in Sultan Bayezıd and Bolulu Mustafa Efendi in the Booksellers' Bazaar.
[1121] İ.DH 47/2337, 26 Ramazan 1257 (11 November 1841). 1200 copies were printed at 38 kuruş 5 para cost each. The total price of the book was 80 kuruş. That is again almost 60 percent profit.
[1122] C.MF 129/6446, Evâsıt-ı Safer 1241 (29 September 1825).
[1123] 1200 copies were printed at 20 kuruş cost with 7 kuruş profit. İ.DH 83/4154, 1 Muharrem 1260 (22 January 1844).
[1124] Mustafa Fayda, "*Târîhu'l-ümem ve'l-mülûk,"* in *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi,* Vol. 40 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2011), 92-94.
[1125] Meredith Moss Quinn, "Books and Their Readers in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul" (PhD diss., Harvard University, 2016), 141-149.

1844.[1126] As elaborated in Chapter Two, there was much contention between the booksellers and the state officials in getting the popular travelogue of Evliya Çelebi, *Müntehabât-ı Evliya Çelebi* not only printed but actually sold.[1127] Another book of history along the lines of a travelogue was *Tarih u Fezâil-i Kuds-i Şerîf* by Hıfzı Beliğ, a narrative of his three year travels around Jerusalem, commissioned and published in 1849.[1128] Moreover, an anonymous book entitled *Feth-i Kostantiniyye ve tâ'rîf-i Ayasofya* containing various legends about the conquest of Constantinople and the construction of Hagia Sophia, was printed at Beyoğlu İstihkâm Alayları press in 1857. Interestingly, on a separate page containing the table of contents of the book, there was a printed note stating that it was sold at İnebolulu Muhammed Efendi's bookstore in the booksellers' market.[1129] This rarity suggests that it had indeed been commissioned by this bookseller at an alternative state press. Furthermore, Ali Ekber Hıtâî had penned a travelogue about his travels to China in Persian, which was then translated into Turkish during the reign of Sultan Murad III under the title *Tercüme-i tarih-i nevâdir-i Çin-i Mâçîn.* The book detailed the Silk Road as well as the geography, people, customs and systems along his route.[1130] The introduction to the printed edition in 1853 started out with the following phrase: "this story of the marvelous and the rare and strange things" (*hikâyet-i acîbe ve nevâdir-i garîbe).*[1131]

[1126] 1000 copies were placed on contract. İ.DH 84/4232, 7 Safer 1260 (27 February 1844).
[1127] For the wider discussion, refer to Chapter Two.
[1128] 1200 copies were printed at 4 kuruş 21 para cost and 2 kuruş 19 para profit. İ.DH 197/11189, 17 Şaban 1265 (8 July 1849). Hıfzı Beliğ, *Tarih u Fezâil-i Kuds-i Şerîf* (İstanbul: Matba'a-i Âmire, 1265).
[1129] *Feth-i Kostantiniyye ve ta'rîf-i Ayasofya* (İstanbul: Beyoğlu İstihkâm Alayları Litografya Matbaası, 1273).
[1130] Sadettin Eğri, "Hıtây Sefâretnâmesı ve Kanunnâme-i Çin i Hıtây'da İpek Yolu İzlenimleri," *Turkish Studies* 7/2 (Spring 2012): 414-416.
[1131] Nusret Ali Khan ed-Dihlevî, *Tercüme-i tarih-i nevâdir-i Çin-i Mâçîn* (İstanbul: Tophâne İstihkâm Alayları Litografya Destgâhı, 1270).

There was probably a thin line between the "marvelous" (*acâyib)* stories of the travelers and the actual prose stories of the "marvelous" such as Ahmed Süheylî's (d. 1632) *Nevâdir-i Süheylî or Acâibü'l-meâsir ve garâibü'n-nevâdir.* It was a compilation of prose stories selected from among the Turkish-Islamic history and integrated with new ones by the author. It had also been a popular text in manuscript circulation with over 34 copies.[1132] The first printed edition of the book was the result of commissioning in 1840.[1133] The marvelous seems to have been a common thread for some of the other printed books; *Tûtînâme* had been commissioned right away in 1840.[1134] It had been a popular story of a Sufi poet from India, Hâce Ziyâüddîn Nahşebî (d. 1350). Apart from the marvelous element of a talking parrot, the story came close to the advice literature. Moreover, in 1857, as "a book akin to *Tûtînâme*," as the archival document suggested, *Kâmilü'l-Kelâm* had been introduced to the printed medium for the first time upon commissioning.[1135]

The same trend of the contractors diversifying the printed book market continued in the field of poetry collections. It is important to note that all of following editions were the first and the only printed editions before 1863. Here, too, those poems with mystical themes dominated. Yet two particular collections stood apart. One was the *dîvân* of Seyyid Nesîmî (d. 1407), who was a controversial Sufi poet with Horufi affiliation and much influence on later poets such as Fuzûlî (d. 1556) and Usûlî (d. 1538). [1136] His *dîvân* was printed for the first time upon the

[1132] Şerife Yalçınkaya, "Ahmet Süheyli," in *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi,* Vol. 38 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2010), 32-33.
[1133] 1256, 1276. İ.DH 27/1319, 21 Şevval 1256 (16 December 1840) .
[1134] İ.DH 17/786, 10 Cemâziyelevvel 1256 (10 July 1840).
[1135] İ.DH 133/6868, 29 Muharrem 1263 (17 January 1847). It was also printed in 1271.
[1136] He was very much associated with Horufism and hence received much criticism form Sunni circles. In time, he would also be appropriated as a leading poet of Alevi-Bektashis and his execution in Aleppo led to his image as a martyr. Hüseyin Ayan, *Nesîmî, Hayatı, Edebî Kişiliği, Eserleri ve Türkçe Divanının Tenkitli Metni,* 567/1-2 (Ankara: TDK Yayınları, 2002), 933. Ahmet Karamustafa recites how Haydari dervishes with beards, long hair and covered with sacks wandered around reciting poems of Nesîmî, "whom they took to be the first hero of their religion." Karamustafa, 152. Also see

demand of contractors in 1844.[1137] Moreover, there was much scholarly acclaim for his collection as clear from the scholarly endorsements placed at the end of the edition.[1138] The second one was the *dîvân* of Mustafa Haşim Efendi el-Üsküdarî (d. 1783), containing many Bektashi elements. This text was printed in 1836 with no publication information at any part of the book. As a highly influential Halvetî mystic, Niyâzî-i Mısrî (d. 1694)'s *dîvân* was also printed for the first time in 1844 through commissioning.[1139]

The role of contractors in guiding the printing of *dîvâns* is generally more evident for titles belonging to the eighteenth century. Nine out of the twenty-one *dîvâns* printed from the eighteenth century were commissioned by customers, namely those of Esrar Dede (d. 1797)[1140], Nazım Yahya (d. 1727)[1141], Mehmed Emin Belîğ

Ferenc Csirkes, "Messianic Oeuvres in Interaction: Misattributed Poems by Shah Esma'il and Nesimi," *Journal of Persianate Studies* 8 (2015): 155-194.

[1137] 1200 copies of dîvân were printed at 9 kuruş cost and 11 kuruş profit. İ.DH 84/4201, 24 Muharrem 1260 (24 February 1844). Printing was completed in three months. İ.DH 88/4395, 7 Cemâziyelevvel 1260 (25 May 1844). It would also be printed in 1869/1286.

[1138] These people included the famous poet Kıbrısîzâde İsmail Hakkı Efendi, Ayıntablı Raşid Efendi, Ayaşi Salih Hayri Efendi and the famous poet Halet Efendi and the editor of Takvîm-i Vekâyi', Cemaleddin Efendi. Seyyid İmadüddin Nesimî, *Dîvân-ı Nesimî* (İstanbul, Evâhir-i Rebîülevvel 1260).

[1139] *Dîvân-ı Niyâzî* was printed twice in 1260 and in 1275. See İ. DH 87/4361, 3 zilhicce 1260 (14 Demeber 1844). 1200 copies were printed as customer property at 3.5 kuruş cost and 1 kuruş profit. Niyâzî-i Mısrî was also one of the most extensively printed author of the early 19th century; Aside from his *Dîvân, Risâle-i es'ile ve ecvibe*, his commentary on Yunus Emre's kaside, *Risâle-i tasavvuf, Usûl-i Tarîkat ve Rümûz-u Hakîkat* were also printed.

[1140] His real name was Mehmed b. Ahmed er-Rumî el-Mevlevî, a disciple of Mevlevî Sheikh Galib. The dîvân also contained chronograms by Recâi Efendizâde Şefik Bey as the corresponding secretary of the Imperial Council (*mektubî-i hazret-i sadâret-penâhîden).* 1200 copies were printed at 8 kuruş cost and 2 kuruş profit each copy. İ.DH 44/2185; İ.DH 47/2333, 25 Ramazan 1257 (10 November 1841). Also see Hasan Ali Kasır, "Esrar Dede Hayatı, Edebi Kişiliği ve Divan'ının Karşılaştırmalı Metni" (PhD diss., Erzurum University, 1996) and Hasan Aksoy, "Esrar Dede," in *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi,* Vol. 11 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1995), 434.

[1141] The title of the dîvân was *Dîvân-ı belâgat-unvân-ı Nazîm.* He was a Mevlevî poet connected to Neşati Dede, the sheikh of Edirne Mevlevîhâne. 1000 copies were printed at 30 kuruş cost and 15 kuruş profit per copy. İ.DH 50/2461, 23 Cemâziyelevvel 1257 (13 July 1841). The editor of the dîvân for printing was Cemaleddîn Efendi and Lütfi Efendi, both members of *ulama* working at the Imperial Press. See MVL 349/119, 12 Receb 1272 (19 March 1846) and MVL 48/1, 11 Cemâziyelâhir 1263 (29 May 1847).

(d. 1759)[1142], Mehmed Nesîb, Neccârzâde Rıza (d. 1746)[1143], İbrahim Hakkı Erzurumî (d. 1780)[1144], Zâtî Süleyman Efendi (d. 1761)[1145], Benlizâde İzzet Bey (d. 1809)[1146] and Şeyh Mustafa Zekâi (d. 1812).[1147] Except for Belîğ, all of these poets were known for their Sufi affiliations. This pattern suggests that the literary baggage of the eighteenth century was the most active in memory, circulation and hence in demand among contractors, and readers. Moreover, the audience had more taste for Sufi poetry than others. Among the dîvâns compiled in the nineteenth century, I have identified the connection of only two *dîvâns* to contractors; that of Halid el-Bağdâdî

[1142] He was a dîvân poet, famous for his kasîdes addressing important people of the period. He had a role in the vernacularization of language along with the poets Nedîm and Sâbit. 1200 copies were printed in 1258 at 6 kuruş 35 para cost and 3 kuruş 5 para profit per copy at a total of 10 kuruş. İ.DH 60/2974, 21 Rebi'ülahir 1258 (22 May 1842). İskender Pala has remarked that he was more appreciated in the context of the post-Tanzimat period by Şinâsi, Muallim Nâci and Nâmık Kemâl. See İskender Pala, "Mehmed Emin Beliğ," in *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi,* Vol. 5 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1992), 417.

[1143]Neccârzâde Mustafa Rızâ Efendi was a religious scholar, poet, calligrapher and musician with links to Celvetî, Nakshbandî-Mujaddidi and Mevlevî orders. He taught *Mesnevî* at his lodge and thereafter it became a tradition among the Mujaddidis to read Mesnevî. He made his living by copying books as a scribe for a long time and had many customers due to the beauty of his calligraphy. See Halil İbrahim Şimşek, "Mesnevihan Bir Müceddidî Şeyhi: Neccarzâde Mustafa Rıza'nın Hayatı ve Tasavvufî Görüşleri," *Tasavvuf* 14 (Ankara 2005): 188. His dîvân was printed under the title *Tuhfetü'l-irşâd* in 1258. The director of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire*, Mehmed Said Efendi, was responsible for compiling the divan together for print by adding *Hüve'l-Mu'în, Hacnâme* other some other poems to his dîvân by copying them from other sources. His poems were devoted to the praise of the Prophet. The 1262 edition of his Dîvân was printed together with *Vâridât-ı gaybiyye, Zuhûrât-ı Mekkiyye* and *Hâtimetü'l-vâridât.*

[1144] 1200 copies were on a contract with customers. İ.DH 131/6743, 19 Zilhicce 1262 (8 December 1846); İ.DH 138/7101, 18 Rebîülevvel 1263 (6 March 1847). In the second document, it turned out that 1500 copies had been printed as customer property at 8 kuruş cost and 5 kuruş profit.

[1145] Süleyman Zâtî Efendi was a Celvetî poet from Bursa, the deputy to İsmail Hakkı Bursevî. 1200 copies of his dîvân were printed at 4 kuruş cost and 4 kuruş profit per copy and hence 8 kuruş total price. İ.DH 41/2009, 9 Cemâziyelevvel 1257 (29 June 1841); İ.DH 41/2021, 14 Cemâziyelevvel 1257(4 July 1841) marked the completion of the printing. His *Sevânihu'n-nevâdir fî ma'rifeti'l-anâsır* was also printed in 1257 at the Imperial Press. See Selami Şimşek, "Süleyman Zati," in *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi,* Vol. 38 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2010), 111.

[1146] Printed in 1258. 600 copies of his dîvân were printed at 6 kuruş cost and 2 kuruş profit. İ.DH 57/2799, 6 Rebîülevvel 1258 (17 April 1842). Benlizâde İzzet Bey was a dîvân poet rising through the ranks of civil bureaucracy, serving as Beylikçi before his death in 1808. He had attended the circles of Hoca Süleyman Neşet Efendi (d. 1808) and Hoca Nusret Efendi for learning Arabic and Persian. His student Resayi Efendi compiled his dîvân together for print. His *Münşeât* was also printed at the Imperial Press in 1847. See Sait Okumuş, "Benlizade İzzet Mehmed Bey'in Sakinamesi," *Turkish Studies* 4/2 (Winter 2009): 867-877.

[1147] The dîvân of Sheikh Mustafa Zekâi (d. 1812) of Halvetî/Sinaniye order was printed in 1200 copies at 4 kuruş cost and 6 kuruş profit. İ.DH 54/2661, 26 Muharrem 1258 (9 March 1842).

(d.1826)[1148] and Keçecizâde İzzet Molla (d. 1829).[1149] Moreover, Halet Efendi's (d. 1822) *dîvân* was specially demanded by some people for print in 1842.[1150] Most of these commissions fall between 1841 and 1845. The private printers, too, turned to the printing of mystical *dîvâns* despite in a few examples. Sahaf Urfalı Hacı Halil Efendi printed *Dîvân-ı Ahmed Rasim* in 1855. [1151] The *dîvân* was printed together with his *Ahidnâme-i İlâhî.*[1152] Sahaf Mehmed Esad Efendi printed *Dîvân-ı Necmi* by Ömer Necmi (d. 1889) in 1863 and 1867.[1153]

The discussion of the various titles introduced in this section has raised two issues; for one, we have seen we have seen the qualitative and quantitative diversification of the printed book market. We must remember, however, that the agency of contractors did not preclude the involvement of the Ottoman state as also the printer of wider-market books. To the contrary, if the books sold well, the state recognized that printing them could help stabilize the press treasury. Second, we have seen how the diversification has predominantly mirrored the traditional and the

[1148] 1200 copies of his *dîvân* were printed at 3 kuruş cost and 2 kuruş cost profit per copy and completed in three months. İ.DH 83/4154, 1 Muharrem 1260 (22 January 1844); İ.DH 86/4321, Selh-i Rebîülevvel, 1260 (21 March 1844). The Diyanet encyclopedia article written by Hamid Algar refers only to the Bulaq edition of this dîvân in 1260. They have missed out the İstanbul edition. The translation of his *Risâle-i Hâlidiyye* by el-Hâc Şerif Ahmed b. Ali was also printed in 1257. Other dîvâns may also have been published at the request of the customers.

[1149] It was his *Dîvân-ı hazân-ı âsâr* that got printed in 1257. It was dedicated to the founder of the Nakshbandîyya order, Bahâeddîn Nakşibend. 1200 copies were printed at 6 kuruş cost and 2 kuruş 10 para profit per copy and took six months to complete printing. See İ.DH 46/2260. 25 Şaban 1257 (12 October 1841); İ.DH 57/2799, 6 Rebîülevvel 1258 (17 April 1842). Interestingly, a document from 1255 states that even though the printing of his dîvân had started earlier in 1255 during the directorate of Mehmed Esad Efendi, they had to stop one third into the text due to some errors that needed editing. See Mad. Müd. 8257, 1255. *Gülşen-i aşk,* written as a parallel to Şeyh Galib's *Hüsn ü aşk* was also printed in 1265, and *Mihnetkeşân* in 1269.

[1150] İ.DH 57/2804, 7 Rebîülevvel 1258 (18 April 1842). The printing of 600 copies of his *dîvânçe* together with *Ziynetü'l-mecâlis* at 6 kuruş cost and 3 kuruş profit per copy.

[1151] Ahmed Rasim Üsküdarlı Fodlacızâde (d. 1854) was a contemporary bureaucrat serving as a *mühürdâr*, but he was also known for his Nakshbandî roots.

[1152] *Ahidnâme-i İlâhî* consisted of Ahmed Rasim's mystical poems that were not part of his dîvân.

[1153] Ömer Necmi had links to various Sufi orders in his life time. Erhan Paşazade, "Necmi Ömer Efendi'nin *Divan*, *Tuhfe-i Vahdet* ve *Kaside-i Elfiyye* isimli eserlerinin transkripsiyonlu metni ve Divanı'nın incelenmesi" (Masters Thesis, Cumhuriyet University, 2002).

religious views of a particularly Sunni version of Islam. At the same time, some exceptions appear such as the printing of Nesîmî's *dîvân.*

4.4 "Printing together" for the wider market

We have seen so far how the contractors and the private printers contributed to the expansion of the printed book market between 1831 and 1863 either by introducing new titles or increasing the available printed number of the already popular texts. Yet this was not the limit to their even early impact. Since their incorporation into the printing enterprise had occurred relatively early in the history of publishing in the Ottoman Empire, they also had a role in shaping the presentation of the new printed medium. Especially with particular titles, it is better to refer to "books" as compilations in varying constellations rather than as the presentation of singular texts. The "other" texts that joined the main title either on the margins or came after, however, were not random choices but were selected according to their perception as "belonging together" in collective consciousness and public usage. An understanding of "relatedness" apparently guided the printing concerns.

The relatedness of different texts and how they were compiled together within the same *mecmû'as* has equally troubled the scholars of manuscript culture. In the context of personal *mecmû'as,* the selection and ordering of specific texts might have been random or based on pragmatic reasons. Scholars of printing have globally argued for the transitional period between the scribal and the print cultures, where many of the manuscript practices were continued into the printed form. The use of lithography had greatly facilitated this transitional process. In the meantime, the

tradition of keeping different texts under one book had apparently also been passed onto the printed medium.[1154]

In the world of printed books, however, there was a higher mechanism of selecting and sorting the texts, editing and presenting them to the audience in a new format. While it would be the scribes or the readers who would be collating their own *mecmû'as,* in the printed book market, some central authority such as the editor or the printer, as the new agents of the book, took on this function of collating texts for everyone else. When thousands of copies of a given text would disseminate around the empire, so would that singular type of collation that had been shaped by the editor or the printer.

For printed textbooks, the pool of texts that could be printed together with the main text was almost predetermined; it drew from the larger pool of the commentary tradition including the supra-commentaries and the translation of the given text. The same practice was extended to the practice of printing texts with an appeal to a wider market. It would be largely the contractors who introduced these diverse titles, but it is not possible to tell who held the agency in determining which texts belonged together. It is most likely to be the contractors, but that could also mean ascribing too much agency to the commercial minded contractor. Can we expect him to be equally able to match different texts together? Another important question, of course, concerns the continuities with the manuscript culture; how similar were the trees of constellation for specific texts in manuscript and in print?

[1154] Johann Pedersen is one of the early scholars to reflect on how multiple texts, related or unrelated, were printed together in one volume. See *The Arabic Book* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984). The original was published in Danish in 1946. See *Den Arabiske Bog* (Fischers Forlag, 1946).

At this point of research, many of these questions will remain unanswered. Nevertheless, the contribution of these new agents by giving a new form to old texts will be explored. They might have tried to compress a few similar texts together which appealed to a similar audience and hence maximize the potential market with each conglomeration. As such, this printing strategy could also be read as a marketing strategy, which would not be alien to an audience informed for centuries by a *mecmû'a* culture.

Adopting this perspective to the printed books at least until 1863 may also serve to transcend the anachronistic baggage that comes by viewing books printed in earlier centuries through what we as moderns define as genres. Alternatively, I would argue that the nineteenth century printers or editors conceived the "genres" in a dynamic sense,[1155] constituted by "joint prints" (*beraber basım,* or *cild-i vâhid)* with different pairings in each edition.[1156] As a result, while the printed medium allegedly ensured a degree of fixity and standardization to texts, the practice of converging them, as in scribal culture, also allowed a degree of flexibility and choice for the printers.

While illuminating how commissioned texts made use of printing together, we shall see how it became difficult to talk about genres in the early history of Ottoman print culture. Not every text printed together belonged to the same specific

[1155] For some insight into the formation of genres in the Ottoman tradition, see Hatice Aynur, "Sehi, Latifi ve Aşık Çelebi Tezkirelerine Göre Türler," *Nazımdan Nesire Edebi Türler, 25 Nisan 2008, Bildiriler,* ed. Hatice Aynur (İstanbul: Turkuaz Yayınları, 2009), 58-59. Selim S. Kuru and Murat İnan back the observation that particular Persian literary texts provided models for Ottoman literary figures until mid-16th century. Selim S. Kuru and Murat U. İnan, "Reintroducing Hafez to Readers in Rum: Sudi's Inroduction to His Commentary on Hafez's Poetry Collection," *Journal of Turkish Studies* 35/1 (June 2011): 11. Also see Fatih Altuğ, "Başka *Türlü* Bir Yaklaşım Mümkün mü?'," *Nazımdan Nesire Edebi Türler, 25 Nisan 2008, Bildiriler,* ed. Hatice Aynur (İstanbul: Turkuaz Yayınları, 2009), 32-45.
[1156] Günil Özlem Ayaydın discusses the different ways of printing together with reference to works of literature in the nineteenth century Ottoman Empire. Günil Özlem Ayaydın, "19. Yüzyılda Osmanlı Toplumu ve Basılı Türkçe Edebiyat: Etkileşimler, Değişimler, Çeşitlilik" (PhD diss., Bilkent University, 2009), 105-115. For the use of the expression "*cild-i vâhid*", see İ.DH 89/4450, 3 Receb 1260 (19 July 1844); İ.DH 84/4228, 6 Safer 1260 (26 February 1844).

type of religious production. The idea was probably to turn the book into a useful format for the reader. For instance, in a very rich and condense constellation, an anonymous popular catechetical work, *Cevâhirü'l-İslâm,*[1157] was printed together in 1856 with two other very popular catechisms, *Mızraklı İlmihâl, Şürûtu's-salât*[1158] as well as Üstüvâni Mehmed Efendi's *Mesâil-i fıkhiyye*.[1159] Moreover, a few popular prayer books entitled *Abdest du'âları*[1160]*, Risâle-i sûfiyye*[1161] and *Du'ânâme-i Ebussuud*[1162] were also added to be printed at the press of es-Seyyid Arif Efendi, who was identified as the brother of Hocazâde Mehmed Rıza Efendi. Interestingly, in 1857, the same constellation of books were printed at the press of Seyyid Mehmed Naim Efendi. To show that it was not always in the same constellation, we can name

[1157] *Cevâhirü'l-İslâm* (İstanbul: Arif Efendi Litografya Destgâhı, Rebîülevvel 1273); Tijana Krstic explains that this text had been used to teach children and converts the articles of faith and the basics of religious practice since the sixteenth century. See Tijana Krstic, "From *Shahada* to *'Aqida:* Conersion to Islam, Catechisation and Sunnitisation in Sixteenth-Century Ottoman Rumeli," in *Islamisation: Comparative Perspectives from History,* ed. A.C.S. Peacock (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2017), 247. The text was printed in: 1261, 1264, 1268, 1273, 1274, 1275.

[1158] This was a genre of catechisms specifically on the ritual prayer. Different works were penned. One popular version was written by Molla Fenârî. The main text was about the conditions of Islam and creed and continued with ablution and salat. With reference to the historian Şem'i Efendi, Ahmet Kaylı ascribes the authorship of this book to Molla Fenârî (d. 1430), written for his grandchild, although much of literature, even the commentators on the text after the seventeenth century have mistakenly attributed it to Birgivî. Another option could be Yahya Nasuh b. İsrail, who wrote this *ilmihâl* to explain religious rituals such as prayer and ablution.

[1159] Üstüvânî Mehmed Efendi (d. 1661) was one of the leaders of the Kadızâdeli movement. *Üstüvânî risâlesi,* also known as *Kitâb-ı Üstüvânî, Mesâil-i fıkhiyye, Şerh-i Üstüvânî* was compiled posthumously by one of his unidentified students. The text explained the conditions of creed and Islam and it was written in clear Turkish. His student noted that these were the notes he learnt from his teacher: "*zabt ettiğim hükm-i mubîn-i imân ve İslâm ve vuzû-i namaza müte'allik mesâyil-i dîn olanlardan ba'zı ihvân-ı ahiret-i sâlihîn tahrîrini iltimâsları ile...*" Muammer Göçmen, "Üstüvani Mehmed Efendi," in *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi,* Vol. 42 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2012), 397.

[1160] *Abdest du'âları* was similarly an anonymous two-page summary of the prayers to cite during ablution.

[1161] This was Niyâzî-i Mısrî's treatise on Sufism, which is also in a Q&A format and which went by different titles. This treatise is in part an apologia for/defense of Sufis and Sufism and in part a Sufi catechism. It is part of a wider corpus of texts that Sufi masters wrote to prove the compatibility of their beliefs with the Sunni creed.

[1162] *Du'ânâme-i Ebussuud* was a prayer book by Ebussuud Efendi (d. 1574) also known as *Risâle fî ed'iyeti'l-me'sûre, Risâle-i mergûbe* and *Mecmû'a-i de'avât*. It included prayers in Arabic with Ottoman Turkish explanations assisting with memorization. It was penned upon the request of Vezir Semiz Ali Paşa and explained the importance of praying. It was translated into Turkish and printed in 1260 and 1277. Ahmed Akgündüz, "Ebusuud Efendi," in *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi,* Vol. 10 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1994), 371. Also see Gruber, "A Pious Cure All: The Ottoman Illustrated Prayer Manual," 118.

an unidentified copy from 1848, wherein *Cevâhirü'l-İslâm* was printed with a book of advice, *Pendnâme-i Azmi.*[1163] As pointed out before, the lack of identification probably pointed to a commissioning at an unauthorized venue.

As we zoom on *Şürûtu's-salât,* it appears as a genre describing the ritual prayer with texts authored by different scholars. Different versions got printed as well. One was in verse format and another version was in prose. While printed for the first time separately in 1804, it had multiple editions printed in İstanbul. [1164] The 1845 and 1850 editions were printed together with a Sufi text, *Risâle-i sûfiyye*. Some other editions were paired with books of rules on Qur'anic recitation (*tecvîd);* the ritual prayer, after all, was about silent recitation of the Qur'anic verses. Hence it was not a surprise to find a version of the book in verse printed with *Manzûm tecvîd* in 1856 at the Imperial Press.[1165] Similarly, the unidentified 1854 edition had *Mahrec Tecvîd* printed at the end. In 1858, *Şürûtu's-salât* was printed on the margins of *Mızraklı İlmihâl* at both Tophâne-i Âmire İstihkâm alayları press and Bosnavî el-Hâc Muharrem Efendi press separately. New texts were added into the constellation in

[1163] *Pendnâme-i Azmi* by Pir Mehmed Azmi (d. 1582) was a short poetic treatise in wide circulation both as part of other works and individually; it has created its own space as a literary text by becoming associated with different authors and identified with different titles from time to time. Twenty-one manuscript copies identified. It was first 'published' by the author at the end of his translation of Hüseyin Kâşifî's *Ahlâk-ı Muhsinî*, called *Enîsü'l-ârifîn,* hence a book on morality. Kocaer argues that this was a selection of advice from the already orally circulating advice literature as well as written and continued its presence in different forms. Part of *adâb* literature of the period; hence what we term today separately as morality, *adâb-ı muâşeret* in fact pointed a more general *adâb* content for the contemporaries. See Sibel Kocaer, *"Pendname-i Azmi'nin* Osmanlı Nasihatname Geleneğindeki Yeri" (Masters Thesis, Bilkent University, 2009), 1.

[1164] 1219, 1261, 1266, 1270, 1275, 1276, 1278. The turnover of the Imperial Press revealed that from 1848 to 1849, 27 copies of *Şürût-ı Salât* had been printed in extra at 12 kuruş price each. ML. VRD 1860. Moreover, bookseller Hacı Hüseyin Efendi demanded through a petition for permission to print the book together with *Delâil-i şerîf, Ahmediyye, Müzekki'n-nüfûs, İlmihâl and Elifbâ.* MF. MKT 8/149, 5 Zilhicce 1289 (3 February 1873).

[1165] This is the same *mesnevî* as Alim Yıldız has transcribed as an anonymous "rare" *Şürûtu's-salât*. See Alim Yıldız, "Müellifi Meçhul bir Şürut-u Salat Mesnevisi," *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* XIII-2 (2009): 175-187.

1845, when it was printed together with *Du'â-yı abdest* alongside *Cevâhirü'l-İslâm* and *Nasihatü'n-nisvân*[1166] on the margins as printed at the Imperial Press.[1167]

The 1861 edition of *Şürûtu's-salât* was different than the earlier versions in print and it was printed at the press of another bookseller, Alaiyevî Ali Efendi, this time together with a Sufi text, *Manzûme-i Hazret-i Veysel Karanî*[1168] in verse.[1169] *Manzûme-i Hazret-i Veysel Karanî*, on the other hand, was printed separately at the lithographic press of el-Hâc Ali Efendi, probably with reference to the previous Alaiyevî Ali Efendi, at an unspecified date. The publisher noted on the last page that the text had been "nicely translated" *(güzelce tercüme olmuş olub)* and then printed.[1170] On a different note, the bookseller Bolulu İbrahim Efendi printed *Şürûtu's-salât* as a separate title in 1859. There are also other printed editions of the book in which no printing location has been identified.

As we zoom into *Mızraklı İlmihâl,* also known as *Miftâhu'l-cenne,* it is hard to give exact information. [1171] While it has been identified in secondary scholarship as a text used in *sıbyan* schools and Sufi circles since the sixteenth century, no manuscript copy has yet been identified. [1172] Nevertheless, it ran 26 printed editions

---

[1166] This was a short text, unidentified in secondary literature, of incidents related to women around the Prophet such as his wives and daughter as reported by Ali b. Talib

[1167] In a rare form, the printing place is pointed as Matba'a-i Âmire in 1845.

[1168] There were many hagiographies about Veysel Karanî in Islamic and Ottoman folk literature. This specific text is anonymous like many others.

[1169] *Şürûtu's-salât* (İstanbul: Alaiyevî Ali Efendi, Rebîülâhir 1278). This started out with the stipulations of Islam.

[1170] *Manzûme-i Hazret-i Veysel Karanî* (İstanbul: el-Hâc Ali Efendi Destgâhı). There is no trace of a printed *menkıbe* of Veysel Karanî in verse before, so the translation might have indeed been conducted by the printer, Ali Efendi. The date for this edition is not specified, but the calligrapher is Mustafa Şükri. The only other printed book about Veysel Karanî's *menâkıb* would be Cemaleddîn Muhammed's *Menâkıb-ı Üveys-i Karanî* (w. 1616), translated by Ohrili Hüseyin Mazhar and printed in 1333/1917 in Istanbul. There are other *menâkıbs* in manuscript form circulating.

[1171] 1258, 1261, 1263, 1264, 1268, 1273, 1274, 1275.

[1172] It covered a wide range of basic religious knowledge such as creed, the requirements of religion, topics of worship and morality without any particular order. Many short sentences and repetitions were employed to facilitate not only reading but also memorization. It was taught at *sıbyan* schools, mosques, *köy odaları* and homes and hence shaped the religious understanding of a wider public. İsmail Kara, *Mızraklı İlmihal* (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2012). Zehra Öztürk, "Osmanlı Döneminde Kıraat Meclislerinde Okunan Halk Kitapları," *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi* 9 (2007): 419;

between 1841 and 1922.[1173] The archival documentation shows that 1845 edition was commissioned by the booksellers.[1174]As different from the former constellations, the 1842 edition was printed at the press of Bâb-ı Seraskerî together with a catechism, *Hudâ Rabbim*[1175] and a work of advice literature, *Pendâme-i Azmi. Hudâ Rabbim* was also printed by the private Sufi lithographer Buharizâde Mehmed Salih Efendi in 1862.

Another constellation revolved around *Kırk Suâl* by Mevlânâ Firâkî Abdurrahman Çelebi (d. 1580), a Zeyniye sheikh.[1176] In many editions of the text, it was printed together with a commentary on *Elli dört farz-ı şerîf* by Hasan el-Basrî with unidentified printing information. Again, this serves as a strong cue for illicit printing. The 1854 edition was printed at Tophâne İstihkâm Alayları lithographic press, which had become a venue for many of the unauthorized contractors, as the discussion in Chapter V will reveal. Moreover, there was much demand for the book from the private printers; es-Seyyid Mehmed Naim Efendi, who had formerly printed *Cevâhirü'l-İslâm,* printed the 1858 edition of *Kırk suâl* together with *Elli dört farz-ı*

M. Kamil Yaşaroğlu, "Mızraklı İlmihal," in *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi,* Vol. 30 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2005), 6.

[1173] It was also printed at Bulaq press in 1848-9/1265 together with the same accompanying texts of *Risâle-i sûfiyye*, *Ed'iyye-i Ebussuud* and *Cevâhirü'l-İslâm*.

[1174] İ.DH 113/5722, 5 Zilhicce 1261 (5 December 1845). 3 kuruş 35 kuruş was the cost of the book per copy and 2 kuruş 5 para profit per copy. It was printed in 1200 copies and sold at 6 kuruş to the contractor.

[1175] *Huda Rabbim* is considered to be a catechism written in verse by Erzurumlu İbrahim Hakkı (d. 1780). However, there is much scholarly debate about the identity of the author of this verse between İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı; other options are Sun'ullah-ı Gaybî (d. 1676) and Muhammed Nuru'l-Arabî (d. 1887). See Bilal Kemikli, "Popüler Dinî Kültüre Dâir Bir Manzûme ve Üç Şâir: Hudâ Rabbim Manzûmesi Etrafında Tartışmalar," *İslâmî Araştırmalar,* XIV/ 3-4 (Ankara 2001): 492-500. The book has also been identified as '*Manzûm İlmihâl*' in certain manuscript copies. The idea in presenting such information in verse was probably due to the potential ease in memorizing them, while showing off one's literary talents on the side. Written in Sunni-Hanefi track. This small pamphlet had many circulating copies in manuscript. 12 copies were identified by Adnan Memduhoğlu. See Adnan Memduhoğlu, "İbrahim Hakkı Erzurumi'nin Manzum İlmihali," *Siirt Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 2, no.2: 11-52: 30-31; Harun Kırkıl, "Türk Edebiyatında Manzum İlmihal ve Fıkıh Kitapları ile Son Devre Ait Manzum bir İlmihal: Manastırlı Mehmed Rıfat Bey ve Manzum İlmihali," *İslam Hukuku Araştırmaları Dergisi* 7 (April 2006): 433-476.

[1176] The text was inspired by the well-known exchange between the Prophet and the Jewish delegation. It was printed in 1256, 1270, 1276. In 1851, an edition was printed in Vienna entitled *Hikâyât-ı Kırk Suâl.*

şerîf. Moreover, the 1859 edition was printed at the press of the bookseller Bosnavî el-Hâc Ali Efendi.

Elli dört farz[1177]*,* on the other hand, was compiled by Sheikh Hasan al-Basrî (d. 728)[1178] on the fifty-four requirements of Islam. It had been translated by Şeyh Abdullah Salâhî Uşşâkî (d. 1783)[1179] with the intention to disseminate it and benefit the entire world. The book had been commissioned by private customers at least in 1843 and 1844, in 1200 and 2400 copies respectively. Considering the one year gap between the commissions and the even higher amount in the second order reveals how much the book was in demand.[1180] It was also printed in the margins of 1859 edition of Ahmed İlmî's *İlmihâl.* Hence these works apparently belonged together in the minds of the printers or their editors. In another entry from 1859, the biography of the translator, Abdullah Uşşâkî, was introduced by Sahhaflar Şeyhzâdesi Ahmed Nazif Efendi before the actual text.[1181]

Some specialized catechisms, which had formerly been commissioned by different agents, were also printed together with similar texts. Abdurrahman Zarirî (d. 1748) has been identified with a general catechetical work entitled *Tafsîl-i tarîk-i*

[1177] 1259, 1260, 1264, 1276, 1276, 1302.
[1178] Hasan al-Basrî is recognized as the founder of the Sufi movement in general, as can be gathered from the later Sufi litrature. His sermons and exemplary uprightness appealed to a wide population in Basra and Kufa initially, spread to Syria and Baghdad. He rejected worldly delights and luxury, criticized social injustices and oppressive rulers. "The emergence of an elitist charismatic piety, which was gradually translated into superior moral authority and eventually into a substantial social force." Knysh, ”Sufism,” 64-65.
[1179] The latter was a Halvetî-Uşşaki Sheikh, the founder of the Salâhiyye branch of Halvetî-Uşşaki order. He was identified in the text as among *"füzelâ-yı rûm"* as he was born in Kesriye, today's Greece. See Semih Ceyhan, "Salahi Efendi," in *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi,* Vol. 36 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2009), 19.
[1180] In the earlier edition, the Imperial Press declared 2 kuruş cost and 1 kuruş profit, making the final price per copy sold to the contractor 3 kuruş. See İ.DH 78/3914, 3 Şaban 1254 (22 October 1838). In the 1260 edition, the cost per copy was 65 para and the profit was 55 para, making the final price per copy for the customer again 3 kuruş. See İ.DH 90/4510, 29 Receb 1260 (14 August 1844). These editions that show up in the archives do not appear in the printed book catalogues.
[1181] Abdullah Salâhî, *Elli dört farz şerhi* (İstanbul: Tophâne-i Âmire İstihkâm Alayları Litografya Destgâhı, Safer, 1276).

mukarrebîn (w. 1743) even though the authorship is debated.[1182] Hakan Erdem has recently argued, on the basis of a manuscript copy of the book, that Zarirî had introduced himself in the preface as the compiler (*câmi'u'l-evrâk)* of the book instead of as the author. He had compiled the lectures of his instructor, Felekzâde Antepli Ahmed ibn Hamza, who had encouraged him to compile a draft so that others would not have difficulty memorizing it.[1183] The draft had then been authorized by Felekzâde under the title *Tarîk-i mukarrebîn* and then expanded further by Zarirî. Nevertheless, Zarirî can be perceived as "the author as an editor," which constituted one of the forms of authorship available in the Ottoman literary sphere.[1184] The manuscript had eleven manuscript editions.[1185] *Tafsîl-i tarîk-i mukarrebîn* was printed at Ali Rıza Efendi's press in 1856 together with his *Tezkiretü's-salât* (w. 1744/5).[1186] *Tezkiretü's-salât* was a translation of *Fıkhu'l-Keydânî.*[1187] It was very popular due to its simple categorization of *salat* and was studied in several madrasas of Anatolia and Central Asia. Zarirî explained that had been asked to teach them the essentials of *salât,* which he thought would be best

[1182] Ali Osman Yalkın, "Abdu'r-Rahmân-ı Darîr'in Tafsîl-i Tarîk-i Mukarrebîn ve Sebîli'l-Müttebi'în Adlı Eseri Üzerine bir Tanıtım," *TÜRÜK Uluslararası Dil, Edebiyat ve Halkbilimi Araştırmaları Dergisi 4 (*2014): 287-295; Ali Osman Yalkın, "Abdu'r-Rahmân-ı Darîr'in Tafsîl-i Tarîk-i Mukarrebîn ve Sebîli'l-Müttebi'în" (PhD diss., Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi, 2017). *Tafsîl* explained the differences between 'dîn ü millet,' faith and practice (*imanla amel*) as well as the madhabs, faith, forbidden and encouraged acts in religion and many others.

[1183] Hakan Erdem, "Osmanlı Kültüründe Yazarlık ve İntihal Sorunları," in *Risale-i Nur'da Yapılan Tahrifat,* ed. Hüseyin Siyabend Aytemur (İstanbul: Hivda, 2015), 231.

[1184] Erdem, "Osmanlı Kültüründe Yazarlık," 231.

[1185] Yalkın, "Abdu'r-Rahmân-ı Darîr'," 3-7.

[1186] Abdurrahman Darîrî, *Tafsîl-i tarîk-i mukarrebîn* (İstanbul: Ali Rıza Efendi Taş Destgâhı, 1273). Also printed in 1853/1269 at the Imperial Press. See Sultan Kalkan, "Abdu'r-Rahmani'd-Darir *Tezkiretü's-Salat*," (Masters Thesis, Süleyman Demirel University, 2012). *Tezkiretü's-salât* had been written in simple Turkish and also printed as a separate text at the Imperial Press in 1269.

[1187] Zarirî stated in the introduction: "*Lâkin Fıkhu'l-Keydânî kitâbından ziyâde makbûl ve hem zabtı âsân ve ümmîlere menfa'atli bir kitâb bulmadım. Anın içün ol kitâbı Türkî lisân üzre tercüme itmeklige kasd eyledim*." *Fıkhu'l-Keydânî* was written by Lütfullah an-Nasafî, also known as Fazıl Keydânî, who lived in later 13th and early 14th centuires in Transoxania. It is also known by the titles of *Şurûtu's-salât, Metâlibu'l-musallî, el-Meşrû'at ve Gayrî-i Meşrû'at, Mukaddimetü's-salât, Risâle-i Hulâsa-i Keydânî, Hulâsatü'l-Fıkh, Bustânü's-salât.* See Ali İhsan Akçay, "Salah Tracts in Verse Within Turkish Literature *Khulasat Al-Kaidani* and Turkish Translations in Verse," *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 1, no. 15 (Special Issue, October 2011). Both Molla Fenârî and İsmail Hakkı Bursevî wrote commentaries on the work.

achieved by writing a book about it. Ali Osman Yalkın argues that there was another edition of *Tafsîl-i tarîk-i mukarrebîn* printed at Ali Rıza Efendi's press without *Tezkire.*

Interestingly, specific themes on women and marriage also appeared in print early on. *Mürşidü'n-nisâ* by Mustafa Fehim b. Osman Akşehrî[1188] was printed in 1848, and then together with *Mürşidü'l-müteehhilîn* of Muhammed b. Kutbeddîn el-İznikî[1189] (d. 1480) in 1856, 1860 and 1863. The latter two editions were printed at the presses of the booksellers Uncu Halil Efendi and Bosnavî el-Hâc Muharrem Efendi respectively. Both works provided compact, practical information about marriage, hence this was a thematic constellation. Here again, we might draw the conclusion that on the one hand, the earlier editions of the book may have been commissioned by the booksellers to the Imperial Press; on the other, even if it was the state that took the initiative, then the popularity of the book in sales probably led the two sahaf-cum-printers to also print it. Moreover, taken with the commissioning of *Nasîhatü'n-nisvân* in 1845, we can see a special concern with the spiritual education of women.[1190]

Other widely read books that came in constellations included those detailing the pilgrimage routes. Among the printed texts, Derviş Mehmed Edîb b. Mehmed Efendi's *Nehcetü'l-menâzil* was the earliest with reference to his own pilgrimage conducted in 1779. The director of the Imperial Press at the time, Abdurrahman

[1188] The work was enhanced with the *takrîz* of the famous scholars el-Hâc Ömer Akşehrî, Mustafa el-Vidinî as well as the vekîl-i ders, Şeyhülislam es-Seyyid Hasan Fehmi el-Akşehrî, all noted for Akşehir origins.
[1189] Muhammed b. Kutbeddîn İznikî was the son of the famous Sufi and scholar Kutbuddîn İznikî (d. 1416). He wrote the work originally in Arabic under the title *Mürşidü'l-müteehhilîn,* which was then translated into Turkish in the eighteenth century by Müstakimzâde Süleyman Sadeddîn (d. 1788). He was a prolific scholar with ties to Nakshbandî-Mujeddidi order. The translation was the printed version. The handwritten noted on the 1280 edition stated that Halid Efendi had bought the book in Ayasofya for 5 kuruş in 1283.
[1190] The first *rüşdiyes* for women would not be open until 1858.

Muhib Efendi, explained to the Sultan that the number of manuscript copies of this necessary book had been very scarce.[1191] The book was printed at the Imperial Press in 1817 together with Hekimbaşı Mustafa Behçet Efendi's *Tertîb-i eczâ,* which was written as a medical guide for the pilgrims.[1192] This case is also one of the rare clues we have to the functioning of the collation system; the document revealed that Muhib Efendi was the one asking Mustafa Behçet Efendi to bring together the recipes of medication useful for the pilgrims. In the meantime, pilgrimage books would be a mine for both contractors and private printers. The bookseller Urfalı Halil Efendi, for instance, printed three different titles: *Menâsik-i hacc-ı şerîf* of Adanavî eş-Şeyh es-Seyyid Mustafa Niyâzî[1193] in 1857 and 1865, *Menâsik-i hac* of Şeyh Sinan er-Rûmî[1194] on the margins of *Nebzetü'l-menâsik* by Şeyh Murad Molla Nakşibendi (d.1848) in 1857.[1195] On the margins of the 1855 edition of Mustafa Niyâzî Efendi's *Menâsik* was the *Menâsik* of Murad Molla printed. Moreover, in 1859, at el-Hâc Ali Rıza Efendi's press, *Menâsikü'l-hac* was printed.[1196] In another constellation, *Muhtasarü'l-menâsik* by Ahmed Tahir Efendi was printed together with *Menâfi'ü'l-*

[1191] HAT 1319/51424, 1235 (1819-20). Interestingly, Muhib Efendi was told that *Menâsik-i hac* was not a book needed in the libraries; it was sufficient to disseminate them among the populace. What the Sultan meant here was probably with reference to the practical nature of the book.
[1192] This book was translated into French by Bianchi under the title *Itineraire de Constantinople a la Mecque, traduction de l'ouvrage turc: Kitab Menasik el-Hadj* (Paris 1826).
[1193] Also printed at the Imperial Press in 1272 and 1282.
[1194] Sinaneddîn b. Yusuf b. Yakub (d. 1581) was the son of the Sünbüliye sheikh Yakub el-Germiyânî, who had also written *Tezkiretü'l-Halvetîyye*, a short history of the Halvetî sheikhs of the Sünbüliyye branch. The success of the work led him to request the prominent position of Şeyhü'l-Haram in Medina. He also received acclaim as a specialist on performing the pilgrimage and penned this guide that was re-copies multiple times in later generations. See John Curry, *The Transformation of Muslim Mystical Thought in the Ottoman Empire: The Rise of the Halvetî Order, 1350-1650* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010), 86, ft. 100.
[1195] Also printed at the Imperial Press in 1263.
[1196] *Menâsikü'l-hacc-ı şerîf* (İstanbul: Ali Rıza Efendi Destgâhı, 1275). Although the compiler is unidentified, this edition had a table of contents as well as a table of estimated distances between districts at the end. The author explained in the introduction that he had studied the available pilgrimage books for the past twenty years. Now for the contemplation of every segment of the believers (*umûm-ı nâsın her tâifesine ifhâm için),* he had summarized and compiled (*zübdesin ahz edib*) two Arabic works on the issue, *İhyâ-yı hac and Kurretü'l-uyûn.* He noted that if the reader of Arabic did not understand the details carefully, he would make a mistake in the process and also lead others following him also into error and the pilgirimage would not be complete. Hence there was much public benefit preparing the book

hüccâc by Mustafa Hami Paşa and *Fazîletü'l-mücâvere fî Mekketi'l-mükerreme* by Hasan Basrî as translated by Mustafa Hami Paşa.[1197]

As we turn to books venerating the Prophet, we find that Beyzâde el-Hâc Mustafa's (d. 1785) *Mevlidü'n-Nebî* was printed in 1847/48. Yet, this text was a part of *Mecmû'a-yı Beyzâde,* a larger compilation of his texts brought together posthumously by his disciple and one of the later sheikhs of his Sufi lodge, Mehmed Murad Molla (d. 1848). It was printed upon the demand of booksellers in 1200 copies.[1198] The *müfti* of Ahiçelebi, Abdurrahman Efendi wrote a book entitled *Siyerü'l-Ahmediyye fî şerhi Vilâdeti'l-Muhammediyye* as a commentary on the Halvetî Sheikh Şemseddin Sivâsî's (d. 1597) *Mevlid-i şerîf*[1199] in 1867/68, which he sent to the Porte together with a cover letter from the local governors of Filibe and Edirne praising the work.[1200] It was printed in 1869/70 at Sahaf Esad Efendi's printing press together with Sivâsî's original text.

There was a massive printed literature revolving around *Kasîde-i Bürde.* The poet Muhammed b. Said Bûsîrî (d. 1296) belonged to the Şâzeliyye order and was

---

[1197] At the time he wrote the text, Mustafa Hami was a doctor in the Ottoman army in Iraq and Hejaz. (*Irak ve Hicaz Ordu-yı Hümâyûn Piyâde Birinci Alayı Tabîb-i Evveli*). Even though he presented the book to Serasker Paşa in 1853, the Council of the Medical School decided on the editing of some sections, but confirmed its benefit for especially the pilgrims. İ.MVL 328/14011, 18 Cemâziyelâhir 1271 (8 March 1855). It was printed in 1200 copies in 1272 at 4,5 kuruş cost and 20 para profit per copy adding to 5 kuruş sales value. See İ.DH 335/21967, 23 Rebîülâhir 1272 (2 January 1856). Mustafa Hami's many other books also got printed in later years such as *Ta'lîmü'l-hendese li's-sıbyân, Menafi'ü'l-insân, Miftâhu'l-hikem, Panzehirnâme, Sağîr Coğrafya Atlası, Sıhhatnümâ, Sıhhatnümâ-yı kebîr, Telgraf Risâlesi, Vezâif-i etfâl and Zübdetü'l-ulûm.* Babakaleli Ahmed Abdülaziz Efendi's *Tuhfetü'l-mü'minîn fî menâsiki hüccâcü'l-müslimîn* was printed in 1281.

[1198] Şeyh Beyzâde Mustafa Efendi was the first *post-nişîn* of Murad Molla dervish lodge. The cost of printing at the press was 4 kuruş and they added 3 kuruş profit, amounting to 40 percent profit for state. İ.DH 164/8555, 26 Muharrem 1264 (3 January 1848). The *mecmû'a* also contained Beyzâde's *Menâsikü'l-hac*, *salavât, kasâid, taqarız,* as well as his letters and the copies of the *icâzetnâmes* he issued to his disciples.

[1199] Interestingly, when Sivâsî's *Mevlid* was printed separately by *Şirket-i Hayriyye-i Sahafiye* at an unidentified date (probably after 1880s), at the end of the text, the publishers added the note that various *mevlids* including '*Arnavudça Mevlid, Kırım Mevlidi, Kız Mevlidi, Re'fet Efendi Mevlidi'* were at sale at Hakkakçılar Çarşısı Numara 45. While the practice of printing together similar *mevlids* was common early on, apparently a new sales technique of announcing the printed texts of similar nature had developed. The publisher carefully underlined that the visitors would be very content about their visit.

[1200] MVL 1069/64, 5 Ramazan 1284 (31 December 1867). As a reward, he was promoted in rank.

known for his many *kasîdes* addressing the Prophet. The alleged healing power ascribed to the text for curing Bûsîrî from paralysis was behind much of its popularity.[1201] *Kasîde-i Bürde* contained 160 verses praising the Prophet, his birth, his miracles, ascension to Heaven (*mi'rac*), jihad and prayers. The verses were very lyrical and hence popularly recited in public gatherings throughout the Muslim world. 110 commentaries, 58 *tahmîs* and 16 *tesdîs* in addition to countless *nazîres* were written over it.[1202] In Süleymaniye Library alone, there were over 500 copies of relevant texts.[1203] İbrahim b. Muhammed el-Yalvacî's (d. 1876) translation entitled *el-Mecmû'atü'l-kübrâ mine'l-kasâidi'l-fuhrâ* was among the most popular texts printed initially in 1846 at the Imperial Press, but then taken up by the bookseller Bosnalı Muharrem Efendi in 1859 and Bekir Efendi in 1867. In all three editions, Yalvacî's translation was printed together with a changing alignment with over twenty other *kasîdes* and *münâcâts* addressing the Prophet by various poets aside from Bûsîrî in Arabic and Turkish.[1204]

[1201] Mahmut Kaya, "Kasidetü'l-Bürde," in *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi,* Vol. 24 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2001), 569. The Prophet told el-Bûsîrî to recite his poem and then covered Bûsîrî with his mantle as a result of which his paralysis was cured. This episode brought much fame for the *kasîde*.

[1202] Mahmut Kaya, "İmam Busiri ve Kaside-i Bürde,"

[1203] Bünyamin Ayçiçeği, "Busiri'nin Kasidetü'l-Bürde'sinin Diyarbakırlı Mehmed Said Paşa (ö. 1308/1892) Tarafından Yapılan Mensur ve Manzum Tercümesi," *Divan Araştırmaları Dergisi* 15 (2015): 41.

[1204] İbrahim b. Mehmed El-Yalvaci, *el-Mecmû'atü'l-kübrâ mine'l-kasâidi'l-fuhrâ* (İstanbul: Matba'a-i Âmire, 1263). This edition contained twenty-nine texts including: *Risâletü havâssı'l-ebyâti'l-kasîdeti'l-bür'eti ve'l-mudarriyeti, Kasîdetü'l-Bürde ma'a tercemetühâ, el-Kasîdetü'l-hâiyye, el-Kasîdetü'l-mudarriye ma'a tercemetühâ, Ebyâtü münâcâtü'l-mudarriye, Kasîdetü'l-Muhammediyye, Münâcât-ı Ebussuud, el-Kasîdetü'l-Tantarâniyye ma'a tercemetühâ, Kasîdetü Ebi Bekir es-Sıddık, Münâcât-ı Ömer el-Fârûk, Kasîdetü'l-hilyeti'ş-şerîfe, Nasîhatü Hazreti Ali, el-Kasîdetü'l-istiğfâriyye* by Ebu Medyen*, Medihatü'l-İmâmi'l-A'zam* by Yalvacî, *el-Kasîdetü'n-Numâniyye ma'a tercemetühâ by* Ebu Hanife*, Beyân-ı fazîletü'l-kasîdetü'l-meymûnet'l-mübâreke* by Yalvacî*, Münâcâtü'l-meymûne* by Cemâleddin el-Karamanî*, Münâcât-ı İbrahim b. Edhem, Kasîdetü Hasan b. Sâbit ma'a tercemetühâ* and *el-Kasîdetü'l-hatimiyye*. Most of these texts were one or two pages long. When the same title, *el-Mecmu'atü'l-kübrâ mine'l-kasâidi'l-fuhrâ* was printed at Bekir Efendi's press in 1867/1284, the supplementary texts were different than the 1846/1263 edition at the Imperial Press. İbrahim b. Mehmed el-Yalvaci, *el-Mecmu'atü'l-kübrâ mine'l-kasâidi'l-fuhrâ* (İstanbul: Bekir Efendi, 1284).

Among the more general titles on Sufism, Eşrefoğlu Rûmî (d. 1469)'s *Müzekki'n-nüfûs* was also one of the earliest didactic works in Turkish explaining mystical ethics, morality and the ways to deal with the "self" (*nefs)* for the instruction of his disciples.[1205] He had been first initiated into the dervish lodge of Hacı Bayram Veli just like Yazıcıoğlu brothers and then to the Kâdiri order.[1206] It served as an entrance to the mystical circles of Anatolia.[1207] Among the two editions that fall into my time interval, the earlier 1847 edition was printed at the Imperial Press, while 1864 edition was at Karahisârî Ali Rıza Efendi's press.[1208] The edition at the Imperial Press could easily have been commissioned. The latter initiative by the booksellers had extra components. For example, a page serving as an intermediary title page, different from the manuscript book titles yet not in the form of a proper title page, announced that the two texts had been printed together; *Müzekki'n-nüfûs* and *Sevâkıb tercümesi* on the margins. [1209] Hence the two canonical texts from the prominent Sufi tracts of the fourteenth century had been printed together by the savvy bookseller. This combination had not been utilized by the Imperial Press before. Finally, the

[1205] Abdullah Uçman, "Müzekki'n-Nüfus," in *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi,* Vol. 32 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2006), 246. Eşrefoğlu stated in the introduction that his aim was to benefit the commoners (*kitâbın fâidesi âm ola).* Eşrefoğlu Rumi, *Müzekki'n-Nüfus* (İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 1996): 16.
[1206] Eşrefoğlu Rumi, *Müzekki'n-Nüfus* (İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 1996), 16.
[1207] 1263, 1269, 1281, 1286-87.
[1208] *Müzekki'n-nüfûs* would continue to be demanded for permission to print by sahaf-cum-printers such as Sahaf Hüseyin Efendi together with *Delâil-i şerîf, Şürût-ı salât, Ahmediyye* and *İlmihâl* in 1289/1872 and by Hacı Osman Efendi together with *Muhammediyye, Dürretü'n-nâsihîn, Tûtînâme, Burhân-ı Kâtı', Mevlid-i şerîf, Ahterî-i kebîr, Delâil-i hayrât, Leylâ ve Mecnûn* and *Ferhat ve Şirin* in 1290/1873. See MF.MKT 8/149, 5 Zilhicce 1289 (3 February 1873) and MF. MKT 12/125, 26 Cemâziyelevvel 1290 (22 July 1873).
[1209] The full name for the latter book was *Sevâkıb-ı Sultân-ı Ulemâ Mevlânâ Muhammed Celâleddîn er-Rûmî Tercümesi*. It was a translation by Derviş Mahmud Mesnevihân Dede in 1590 of the famous *Menâkibü'l-ârifîn* of Ahmed Eflâkî Dede (d. 1360). The original text, *Menâkibü'l-ârifîn* contained the most comprehensive information on Mevlânâ Celâleddîn Rûmî and Mevlevîs in Persian. Abdülvehhâb es-Sâbûnî had re-written the book in Persian with supplements under the title *Sevâkıbü'l-menâkıb*, and it was translated into Turkish in an incomplete form by Derviş Mahmud Mesnevihan Dede under the title *Tercüme-i Sevâkıb* in 1590. See Tahsin Yazıcı, "Menâkibü'l-Ârifîn," in *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi,* Vol. 29 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2004), 115; Hesna Haral, "Osmanlı Minyatüründe Mevlana'nın Yaşam Öyküsü: *Menâkibü'l-Ârifîn* ve *Tercüme-i Sevakıb-ı Menakıb* Nüshaları" (PhD diss., Mimar Sinan University, 2014).

bookseller el-Hâc Ali Rıza Efendi printed *Tercüme-i Risâle-i Suâl-i İblis* in 1856/1273.[1210] On the margins, *Hikaye-i bî-namâz* was printed.

The famous *salavât* book, *Delâilü'l-hayrât,* too, had been printed together with its commentary by Kara Davud on the margins in many editions. Hence the records are misleading to show no printed copies of *Delâil* alone after 1844. For example, in the 1858 and the 1864 editions printed at Bosnavî el-Hâc Muharrem Efendi's press, *Delâil* was together with the commentary of Kara Davudzâde.[1211] In the 1853 edition printed at the press of the Imperial School of Military Engineering contained a critical apparatus inserted into the margins of Davudzâde's text, reflecting the desire for an accurate copy.[1212] On the margins of the same text was placed the Turkish translation of the text by Yusuf Şükrü Harputî. The variant words and phrases in different editions had then been noted under the heading "copy" (*nüsha).* Interestingly, the 1855 edition printed in the same location, even though it was noted that it was prepared from "an authentic copy", did not contain a critical edition. However, we find the bookseller Bosnavî Muharrem Efendi taking the 1853 edition as the base for his own 1858 printed edition. Even though he had a more recent one available, it appears that he chose the more authentic option. Another edition Bosnalı Muharrem Efendi would print later in 1864 would have the supplementary commentary by Muhammed Mehdi el Farsi in Arabic entitled *Metâli'u'l-müsirrât bi-cilâi Delâili'l-hayrât.*[1213]

[1210] *Tercüme-i Risâle-i Suâl-i İblis* (İstanbul: el-Hâc Ali Rıza Efendi, 1273).
[1211] Ebu Abdullah Muhammed b. Süleyman b. Abdurrahman el-Cezuli, *Delâilü'l-hayrât ve şevâriku'l-envâr fî zikri's-salâti ale'n-nebiyyi'l*-muhtâr (İstanbul: Bosnalı Muharrem Efendi Taş Destgâhı, 1275). A private editional critique needs to be conducted to see the variations between the printed editions of this book.
[1212] Tobias Heinzelmann, "Authors, Commentators and Copyists: Variance and the Authenticity of Texts," *Manuscript Cultures* (Germany, 2016): 121.
[1213] Catalogue based research would not reveal that this second commentary on *Delâil* was printed. Muhammed Davudzâde, *Şerhu Delâili'l-hayrât* (İstanbul: Bosnavî el-Hâc Muharrem Efendi Basmahânesi, 1281).

The fact that *Delâilü'l-hayrât* was an all-time favorite in print is also evident in the horizontal distribution of its editions among different bookseller-printers. Buharîzâde Mehmed Salih Efendi printed the commentary of Kara Davud together with the original in 1856 and Karahisârî Ali Efendi printed both in 1863. There would also be petitions in later years by booksellers to print *Delâil* at their own presses.[1214]

The practice of printing together was very common among folk story books, despite the frequently missing identification in varying constellations.[1215] In general, neither the number of titles nor the number of edition per title among non-religious books is too many. Nevertheless, both the story books and the *mesnevîs* were popular in print. One can tell that many of the unidentified lithographic editions were in fact commissioned by customers. Many such books also existed on the borderline between licit and illicit. In 1854, for instance, some inappropriate texts, referred to as "epic" *(destan),* were being printed and sold on the streets and the bazaars of Istanbul.[1216] Since the publishing of such stuff was deemed "harmful" and "shameful material" (*böyle şeylerin neşr u i'lânı muzır ve ayıp olduğundan*), the printers and the printing venue had to be quickly illuminated. Çalgıcı Radi, apparently, was the producer of the text. Similarly, interrogations revealed folk stories such as *Kerem ve Âşık Garip Hikâyeleri* and *Şarkı mecmû'ası* to have been illegally commissioned to

[1214] Sahaf Hacı Hüseyin Efendi applied for a license to print *Delâil-i şerîf* together with *Şurût-ı salât, Ahmediyye, Müzekki'n-nüfûs, İlmihâl and Elifbâ* in 1289 (MF. MKT 8/149, 5 Zilhicce 1289 [3 February 1873]). Also licensed to print it.were: Remzi Efendi (*mâliye mektûbî-i hulefâsından*) (MF. MKT 11/136, 11 Cemâziyelevvel 1290 [7 July 1873]) and Hacı Osman Zeki Efendi (MF. MKT 12/125, 26 Cemâziyelevvel 1290 [22 July 1873])

[1215] There is also a wide literature around the impact of the lithographic press on these folk stories. From Tıflî stories to Nasreddin Hoca, scholars have argued that there was first a transition from the oral culture to the written medium and finally to the printed medium through which the contents were gradually reshufled, censored and finally fixated. See, for instance, David Selim Sayers, *Tıfli Hikayeleri* (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2013); Mustafa Duman, *Resimli Taşbaskısı Nasreddin Hoca Kitapları* (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2018). Pertev Boratav, *Nasreddin Hoca*

[1216] HR. MKT 92/15, 10 Safer 1272 (2 November 1854).

be printed at foreign printers.[1217] These were only a few examples; keeping the unregistered books in mind, one should be careful not to take the number of story books that appear in catalogues at face value.

Some examples of folk stories that were printed together was *Hikâye-i Ferhad ile Şirin* and the stories of *Râz-ı Nihân* and *Mahfirûze Sultan* in 1854 at an unidentified lithographic press. Another joint edition of these two stories followed in 1860 without further information. *Hikâye-i Ferhad ile Şirin* was also printed together with *Âşık Garib Hikâyesi, Hikâye-i Tâhir ile Zühre* and *Mihr ile Hurşîd Hikayesi.* There are many other editions of this constellation without publication information. Similarly, *Hikâye-i Şah İsmail and Gülizar* was printed in 1854 together with *Hikâye-i Derdi yok ile Zülf-i siyâh* at the Imperial Press. *Letâif-i Nasreddin Hoca*[1218] was an exception as a popular book, because it was printed as state-property at the Imperial Press at a time when textbooks almost singularly shaped the printed output in 1833.[1219] Yet there were also many printed editions of the book without publication information. The 1850 edition of *Letâif-i Nasreddin Hoca* was printed with *Râz-ı Nihân* and *Mahfirûze Sultan* on its margins. In many unidentified printed editions, *Arzu ile Kanber* was printed interchangeably with *Dîvân-ı Âşık Ömer* or/and*, Dîvân-ı Kerem.*

Among story books, the stories in *Kıssa-i Ebu Ali Sînâ ve Ebu'l-Hârisi*[1220]

[1217] MVL 857/4, 2 Rebîülevvel 1280 (17 August 1863).
[1218] Despite debates on the existence of a historical figure as Nasreddin Hoca, he is believed to have lived around the 13th century under the Saljuks. Three of his anecdotes were recited in *Saltuknâme* in 1480. His stories spread through a wide region including Southern Siberia, North Africa to all places where Turkish language was spoken as anonymous folk literature.
[1219] There was a request for authorization to print 1000 copies of the book at 1,5 kuruş cost and 1,5 kuruş profit. HAT 287/17267-A, 1248 (1832-33).
[1220] The book constituted a large body of stories/legends revolving around the famous Muslim scholar İbn Sînâ and his brother. Tülün Değirmenci argues that it was definitely written by a *meddâh*, as it contained all the orthographic errors expected of an uneducated person. See Değirmenci, 29-30. It was also recorded in other titles such as *Hikâyât-ı Ebu Ali Sînâ.* Tülün Değirmenci discussed the circulation of *Kıssa-i Ebu Ali Sînâ ve Ebu'l-Hâris* among different readers through its marginalis. The notes revealed that it was read not only at Selim Ağa's konak by Duhânî Rüstem-i Zâl. Tülün

were later re-organized by Ziyaeddîn Seyyid Yahya (d. 1629) under the title *Gencîne-i hikmet.*[1221] The constellation of these stories in printed editions was with *Hikâye-i bülbülnâme* of Birrî Mehmed Efendi (d. 1636)[1222] and *Dâsitân-ı Hâtem Tâî,* stories all of which originated in the east. In an edition from 1840 printed at Bâb-ı Seraskerî lithographic press, for instance, all these texts came together.[1223] *Bülbülnâme* was printed in the margins. In the 1856 edition, *Dâsitân-ı Hâtem Tâî* was printed on the margins of *Gencîne-i hikmet.*[1224] Clearly, the constellations were not necessarily thematic, as seen here; *Bülbülnâme* could be regarded as a Sufi text rather than a folk story, but here it was matched with stories of eastern origin.

Mesnevîs were relatively more popular in the printed format[1225] and were also printed together at times.[1226] To give a few examples, Enderunlu Fazıl's (d. 1810)

Değirmenci, "Bir kitabı kaç kişi okur? Osmanlı'da okurlar ve okuma biçimleri üzerine bazı gözlemler," *Tarih ve Toplum Yeni Yaklaşımlar* Issue 13 (Fall 2011): 25.

[1221] Ziyaeddîn Yahya explained that it was rumored that the Sultan had rejected this book. When he saw the book, he realized that it was not compiled according to correct rules and included made-up stories by Derviş Hasan (*kâ'ide-i te'lîfden hâriç olduğundan mâ'adâ hikâyât-ı nâ-merbût ve ekseri ...mukâvelesi olmağla reddolunmuş olduğu nümâyân)* (Erzurum, 1291). There are six manuscript copies of *Gencîne-i ahlâk* in libraries. In one copy, *Kıssa-i Ebu Ali Sînâ* was followed by Derviş Hasan's text and *Hikâyet-i Nasreddin Hoca*. Moreover, İbn Sînâ's stories was also printed at the Bulaq press in 1254 and 1281, followed by the 1840 edition in İstanbul. *Gencîne-i Ahlâk* was printed in 1254, 1264, 1273. Hasan Kavruk, *Eski Türk Edebiyatında Mensur Hikayeler* (İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Yayınları, 1998), 117. Doğan Kaya, "İbn-i Sina Hikayesinin Yeni bir Yazma Nüshası," *Kebikeç,* 12 (2001): 205-211.

[1222] Birrî Mehmed Efendi's text was in reference to Ömer Fuadî's *Bülbüliyye.* Fuadî was a Sufi poet of Şabânîye order and *Bülbüliyye* was his mystical commentary on Ferîdüddîn Attâr's *Bülbülnâme*, reflecting on Divine Love and guiding the reader into contemplation of the Creation. Birrî was a Mevlevî. See Hasan Kavruk, *Türkçe Mesnevilerde Sebeb-i Telif* (Malatya, 2003), 307-309.

[1223] *Dâsitân-ı Hâtem-i Tâî* (İstanbul: Tab'hâne-i Âmire Bâb-ı Seraskeriye, 1256).

[1224] *Gencîne-i Hikmet* (İstanbul: Evâhir-i Şevval, 1273). Printed with vowels. In another edition of the book printed at an unidentified press in 1264, the title of the book was recorded as *Hikâye-i Hâtimetü'l-Hükemâ ve Reisü'l-ukalâ Ebu'l Hâris Hasan b. Abdullah İbnü's-Sînâ.*

[1225] Among these *mesnevîs* are: *Nevhatü'l-uşşâk* by Dâî Mehmed b. Receb (d. 1659) printed in 1261/1845; Enderunlu Fazıl's *Defter-i aşk* (1253), *Rakkâsnâme* (1255), *Hûbannâme* (1253, 1255), *Zenannâme* (1253, 1255), *Çenginâme* after 1837; Sünbülzâde Vehbî's (d. 1809) *Şevkengîz* (1253, 1263) with *Defter-i aşk;* Vehbî's *Lütfiyye* first time in 1836; Nergisî (d. 1625)'s *Meşâkku'l-uşşâk* printed for the first time in 1245/1829; *Hazân-ı âsâr* by Keçecizâde İzzet Molla (1257), *Gülşen-i aşk* also by Keçecizâde (1265) as well as his *Mihnetkeşân* (1269); *Mantıku't-tayr* of Ferîdüddîn Attâr (d. 1194); Bursalı Lâmiî Çelebi (d. 1532)'s *İbretnümâ* printed in 1273/1857; Fütûhî Hüseyin Çelebi's *Tuhfetü'l-mecâlis* in 1277/1862; *Hikâye-i Leylâ ve Mecnûn* and *Hadîkatü's-su'adâ* (1273); *Bülbülnâme* (1265, 1272) and *Nevhatü'l-uşşâk* (1261).

[1226] For instance, *Hikâye-i Leylâ ile Mecnûn* was printed in 1254 simply under the title "Hikâye" with vowels, pointing to its orientation towards public reading and oral performance. The 1309/1891 edition would be printed together with *Melik Şah ile Güllühan'ın hikâyesi* on the margins and *Âşık Ömer dîvânı.*

Hûbannâme[1227]*, Zenannâme*[1228]*, Defter-i aşk*[1229] and *Çenginâme,*[1230] together forming a small volume of 2650 couplets, were printed together in differing combinations in each edition.

The variety of books was complemented with literature on dream lore, fortune-telling, astrology and physiognomy. These texts could be printed together in varying combinations. *Ta'bîrnâme-i Muhyiddin Arabî*[1231] was printed together with *Seğirnâme*[1232] in 1853 at Tophâne-i Âmire İstihkâm Alayları Press. In 1856, again together with *Seğirnâme* at Kayolzâde Abdullah Efendi's Press. Both of these locations were popular presses, where contractors turned as an alternative to the Imperial Press. In 1858, *Ta'bîrnâme-i Muhyiddin Arabî* was printed together with *Kıyâfetnâme*[1233] and *Tuhfetü'l-mülûk.*[1234] A different *Ta'bîrnâme,* that of İbn Şîrîn, was printed together in different constellations; with *Seğirnâme* alone in an unidentified copy and then also with *Kıyâfetnâme, İhtilâcnâme* as well as *Tuhfetü'l-mülûk* at İbrahim Efendi's Press in Süleyman Paşa Hanı in 1859. *Ta'bîrnâme* was also printed by Sahaf Urfalı Hacı Halil Efendi together with *Kıyâfetnâme* in 1860. Another such text was *Saatnâme* of Hibetullah b. İbrahim as printed by Bosnalı Hacı Muharrem Efendi in 1863.[1235]

[1227] 1253, 1255.
[1228] 1255, 1263.
[1229] 1253.
[1230] 1255.
[1231] 1270, 1275, 1276, 1277.
[1232] *Seğirname*, a book on physiognomy, was also published in 1261.
[1233] *Kıyâfetnâme* refers to an ancient form of "science," linking a person's physical attributes to their character. İbrahim Hakkı Erzurumî (d. 1780)'s *Kıyâfetnâme* was the most popular in the Ottoman Empire. See Mine Mengi, "Kıyafetnâme," in *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi,* Vol. 25 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2002), 513-514.
[1234] *Tuhfetü'l-mülûk fî irşâdı ehli's-sülûk* was Mehmed Zeynelâbidîn's commentary on Ebu Saîd-i Hâdimî translated by Mehmed Münib Hacı Dervişzâde, printed at Tab'hâne-i Âmire on commissioning in 1268. İ.DH 243/14789, Selh-i Muharrem 1268 (October-November 1851).
[1235] This was an astrological text on the hours of the day in wide manuscript circulation from Crimea to Algeria. Although there is no information on the author, it is believed to have been written in the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century.

Lastly, *Ferâsetü'l-hikemiye fî kıyâfeti'l-insâniye* by Hüseyin Şakir Efendi was printed by Hocazâde Rıza Efendi's lithographic press in 1860.[1236] This latter text was the translation of the 148th section of İbnü'l-Arabî's *el-Fütûhâtü'l-Mekkiyye* into Turkish by Hüseyin Şakir Efendi, who was the tomb keeper of one of the Nakshbandî sheikhs in İzmir, Seyyid Hamza. In 1859, he presented his translation first to the governor of İzmir, Mehmed Kamil, who introduced Şakir Efendi as "a Nakshbandî sheikh and a religious scholar from İzmir" in the letter he sent to Sami Paşa at the Ministry of Public Education. He also noted that the work was "worthy of print at the Imperial Press" (*Tab'hâne-i Âmire'de tab' ve temsîle becâ göründüğünden).*[1237] It is interesting that the book ended up being printed at Rıza Efendi's press instead of the Imperial Press. Also worth noting is the ongoing recognition of İbnü'l-Arabî in the Ottoman context by the mid-nineteenth century.

4.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, we have seen that pressured by the financial constraints, the commissioners were given room to contribute to the printed book market. Just as important as the fact that the Ottoman state "allowed" this broadening is the fact that the non-state actors had the motivation and the "agency" to push for their own integration into the market that happened through a few steps. The booksellers constituted a tangible case that illuminated the process. As their own profession was transformed in the process, we have seen how the traditional professions and actors were not always the "losers" while the Ottoman state embraced new technologies and

[1236] Hüseyin Şakir, *Ferâsetü'l-hikemiye fî kıyâfeti'l-insâniye* (İstanbul: Hocazâde Rıza Efendi Litografyası, Ramazan 1276).
[1237] İ.DH 438/28922, 12 Şaban 1275 (17 March 1859).

competed with the new actors. To the contrary, the traditional actors could adapt to the new circumstances and in turn, become competent new players.

On the other hand, these new contractors and printers changed the distribution of the printed book titles by introducing new ones reflecting the tastes of a broader public base. If printing meant the dissemination of a particular agenda under the agency of the Ottoman state, it also became the way for the already popular textual accumulation to be transmitted into new medium that was a more accurate reflection of the identities and choices of a wider readership. In the meantime, the fact that the contractors resorted to the method of collating and printing different texts together, as with the *mecmû'as,* indicated that the standardization of texts, as assumed by the simple adoption of printing technology, was not yet possible. As such, I would claim that what the early printers contributed was a flexible definition of the "book" as an aggregate of more than a single text. Whether the texts that were printed together actually mirrored the same conglomerations in the manuscript culture can be the subject of another study, but one may safely argue that the contractors were informed by the hybrid and complex culture that had originally produced these texts. At the same time, these practices did not always respect the newly forming legal boundaries. When they transgressed them, the contractors and printers chose to go silent and sacrifice the printing information in the colophons. Overall, however, if the Ottoman state stood at the heart of the expansion of the printed textbook market, the contractors stood at the heart of the dissemination of popular books.

CHAPTER 5

NETWORKS OF ILLICIT BOOK TRADE AND ATTEMPTS AT SURVEILLANCE

5.1 Introduction

In the previous chapters, we have seen that the printing of books in the Ottoman Empire could be periodized into different time intervals according to the varying degrees of involvement by the Ottoman state and the non-state actors. Each period was also characterized by a separate legal framework to determine the related code of conduct. The discussion of legality, however, is never entirely complete without determining the boundaries of "illegality". Similarly, printing as regulated by the Ottoman state should be better perceived as a spectrum whereby the decisions about what should be printed were always complemented by considerations about what *not* to print, what *not to allow* to be printed and even what *not* to have circulating. This chapter, thereby, examines the construction of "illegality" as a discourse in the Ottoman printing enterprise with a specific focus on religious texts as informed by the social, religious and political context of the Tanzimat period.

In a larger sense, it builds on the notion of legality as a fluid territory with varying applicability depending on the time, place and context. As the state representatives, themselves not monolithic, were challenged by non-state actors, they administered various measures of agency in pioneering, legitimizing, approving, overlooking and at times forbidding the printing and dissemination of specific texts. In the meantime, distinctive categories such as "approved" or "forbidden" books and "legal" or "illegal" actors were shaped, but did not remain fixed. Over time, as political, economic and ideological conditions fluctuated, the weight and meaning

ascribed to certain books through the influence of different historical actors could also change and the priorities of the state could be re-defined.

In the history of Ottoman publishing, the expansion of the printing sphere through the second half of the nineteenth century was paradoxically accompanied by the extension of mechanisms, institutions and agents for its monitoring and control. Censorship during the Hamidian era (1876-1908) is well known. The law codes and the newly established surveillance institutions in the printing sphere of the Hamidian period are relatively well studied in secondary literature.[1238] What has been brushed over in vague terms, however, is the preceding Tanzimat period; for a properly historicized approach to the development of the joint spheres of printing and surveillance, the political, economic and cultural dynamics until the 1860s need to be better scrutinized.

This chapter will illuminate a number of cases in which the state authorities encountered illicit networks of printing. It will be argued that despite being individually handled by the Ottoman authorities, these cases helped pave the way for the more comprehensive Ottoman legal response in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. More specifically, this chapter will also tackle the Ottoman approach to the printing of religious texts such as the Qur'an and the Qur'anic verses and demonstrate how the official lines regarding their printing and dissemination were transgressed by the state officials as much as by the non-state actors. The discussion will involve a

[1238] See Polat, "Subject to Approval," Filiz Dığıroğlu, "II. Abdülhamid Dönemi Matbuat Politikaları: Mushaf Basımı ve Dini Neşriyat," in *Sultan II.Abdülhamid Han ve Dönemi,* eds. Fahreddin Gün and Halil İbrahim Erbay (Istanbul: TBMM Milli Saraylar, 2017), 621-654; Fatmagül Demirel, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Kitap Basımının Denetimi," 89-104; Fatmagül Demirel. *II.Abdülhamid Döneminde Sansür* (İstanbul: Bağlam Yayıncılık, 2007); İpek K. Yosmaoğlu, "Chasing the Printed Word: Press Censorship in the Ottoman Empire, 1876-1913," *The Turkish Studies Association Journal,* Vol. 27, no. ½ (2003): 15-49; Ali Birinci, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Matbûat ve Neşriyat Yasakları Tarihine Medhal," *TALİD* 4, No.7 (2006): 300-310; Server İskit, *Türkiye'de Matbûat İdareleri ve Politikaları* (Ankara: Başbakanlık Basın ve Yayın Genel Müdürlüğü, 1943); Orhan Koloğlu, *Osmanlı Dönemi Basınının İçeriği* (İstanbul: Istanbul Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi, 2010), 94-114.

synthesis of the broader socio-political dynamics in the regions with micro narratives illuminating the significance of human agency.

In all this, we will see that the illicit networks around the printing and dissemination of books were equally woven by Ottoman and foreign agents at both state and civic levels and incorporated students, booksellers, merchants and printers, who tried to turn the loose ends of regulations to their advantage. As such, this chapter will serve to further diversify the scope of non-state agency under the Ottoman printing enterprise.

5.2 Discourse on the approval and surveillance of printing

When Robert Walsh (d. 1852), an Irish clergyman, historian and physician visiting Istanbul in 1822, depicted the chaos in the city during the Greek Revolt, he especially noted the attitude of the Turks towards the Greek printing press:

> ..they (Turks) entered the printing establishment; it was supposed that their range would be directed against the presses and the types, as the engines by which the revolutionary opinions of the Greeks were circulated and the places where their religious books were issued but it was attributing too much to the intellect of a Turk to suppose him capable of such a reflection or that he had the capacity to calculate the power of knowledge.[1239]

At the time, Walsh did not believe the Ottomans to be mentally capable of ascribing the cause of revolutions to books or perceiving knowledge to be intrinsically linked to power and hence to the printing press. The pairing of knowledge and power that dominated the discourse on the press in Europe had already been established in the

[1239] Robert Walsh, *A Residence in Constantinople,* Vol. I (London: Frederick Westley and A.H. Davis, 1836), 324. Not far from the expectations of Walsh, the colonial commentator in India in 1823, Leicester Stanhope, wrongly believed that the spread of unregulated printing industry would shatter the superstitions of customary religious forms. Green, *Bombay Islam,* 93.

previous centuries. This is why a European observer of the early nineteenth century would approach the Ottoman context with the same assumptions and expectations.

Ironically, the Greek revolt starting in 1821 was one of the central events leading to a significant restructuring of the Ottoman administration.[1240] Walsh also believed that such traumatic political incidents had the power to trigger a new awareness, "a dawning of intellectual perception and a suspicion that knowledge had something to do with the affairs of men."[1241] He noted a follow-up incident in 1822:

> Mr. Leeves, as agent of Bible society, was sending off a number of copies of Scriptures in American, Syriac and Oriental languages to Diyarbakır and Musul put in small cases to proceed by caravan. He was told that the books must be examined...he was told that Porte was now beginning to think that books might do harm or good according to their contents and they would suffer no more to pass without close examination which was confided to Armenian patriarch...The Turks now suspected every European nation and particularly the English, as promoters of knowledge and the power of the press...[1242]

Hence the changing political sensitivities had begun to reorient the Ottoman relationship with the control of knowledge extending to the control of books. The implementation of book surveillance would indeed be meaningful in the presence of a centralizing state, which would rely on the standardization, multiplication and dissemination functions of the printing press.[1243]

As seen in Chapter Three, the articulation of the function of the printing press in the official Ottoman discourse was connected to the higher aim of the expansion of knowledge and education. Many times, this view was complemented with the need to officially monitor them. Licensing and surveillance, in other words, would develop almost synchronically in the Ottoman Empire in the mid-nineteenth century,

---

[1240] See Philliou, *Biography of an Empire.*
[1241] Walsh, *A Residence in Constantinople*, Vol. 1, 28.
[1242] Walsh, *A Residence in Constantinople*, Vol. 1, 29.
[1243] For a discussion of these functions of the printing press in the context of early modern Western Europe, see Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change.*

as it did in Western Europe in the mid-sixteenth century. This is why even for texts regarded as beneficial, such as *Mecmû'atü'l-Fevâid*, a book proposed for print by the editor of *Cerîde-i Havâdis,* Churchill in 1851, the necessity of surveillance before printing was emphasized.[1244] On a more definitive note, the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances (*Meclis-i Vâlâ-yı Ahkâm-ı Adliyye)* declared in 1854 that even though printing was an invention worthy of much praise for its benefit for the growth and expansion of all human sciences, many problems also originated from it, which had to be taken under control.[1245]

Such terms as surveillance and censorship came only gradually into Ottoman discourse. The definition of an "illicit" text was similarly fluid in the first decades of the nineteenth century. In its place, the authorities would often resort to blanket accusations such as "corrupting and confusing the minds of the populace" (*ifsâd ve iğfâl-i ezhân-ı ahâli)* with reference to a wide spectrum of religious and political books that could disrupt the stability and the security of the Ottoman state or the religious beliefs of the Muslims. There was only the idea in Ottoman governance early on that preventing mischief (*mafsada)* in itself served common good, which "encouraged the political authorities preemptively to repress behavior perceived as a threat to public order."[1246] The threat, here, would be the circulation of corruptive texts.

[1244] İ.MVL 224/7614, 24 Muharrem 1268 (19 November 1851). This was a book that would contain beneficial information such as maps and geography without discussing state affairs. "*kable't-tab' müsveddelerinin birer kere Meclis-i Ma'ârife irâe olunması..."*

[1245] *" ...san'at-ı tabâ'at hadd-i zâtında şâyân-ı tahsîn ve sitâyiş bir ihtirâ' olup bi'l-cümle ma'ârif-i insâniyye fürû'unun takaddüm ve intişârında menâfi'-i külliyesi olduğu müsellem ve derkâr ise de pek büyük netâyic-i vâhimeyi mucîb olan nice kazâyâ-i azîme ondan zuhûr etmiştir."* HR.TO 418/227, 22 Cemâziyelevvel 1270 (20 February 1854).

[1246] Engin Akarlı, "*Maslaha* from 'Common Good' to 'Raison D'etat' in the Experience of Istanbul Artisans, 1730-1840,'" in *Hoca, 'Allam, Puits de Science: Essays in Honor of Kemal K. Karpat,* (ed.) Kaan Durukan, Robert W. Zens and Akile Zorlu-Durukan (Istanbul: The Isis Press, 2010), 66.

Similar ambiguous lines explained the disinterest shown by the Ottoman officials to the circulation of Christian missionary texts. Adolphus Slade noted in 1829, for instance, that when a number of Bibles circulated across the Ottoman territories: "Bibles are given to the Turks...a Turk takes one of them as he would a Treatise on Fluxions, or a Life of Lord Bacon and with about as much interest; as neither the pasha or the mufti interferes with his possession of it, it does not gain additional value as a prohibited article."[1247] Apparently, as long as the state remained neutral to threat, the Ottoman subjects, too, remained indifferent. From a reverse angle, it would be after a perceived threat about the people's reaction that the state would become keener to draft legislation. Moreover, as the state would try to enforce them, subjects would also become more aware of the new territories waiting to be transcended. However, for the duration of the early nineteenth century, this paradox was largely absent from the Ottoman political and public discourse.

The category of "illicit" books entered the terminology of the Ottoman state beginning predominantly in the 1840s in two different forms; books of illicit nature printed outside of the Ottoman territories but imported therein and books secretly printed within the Ottoman territories. Both categories exhibited similar networks of dissemination and challenges for the Ottoman authorities. However, depending on their place of origin, different mechanisms of book surveillance were adopted. For those texts entering the Ottoman territories from outside, surveillance units were formed at the borders and coasts. Formerly critical of the lack of book surveillance at Ottoman customs, the European travellers were not happy this time either. Charles Macfarlane, who visited Istanbul twice in 1826-27 and then in 1847, acknowledged the adoption of stricter surveillance practices rather with discomfort and disapproval;

[1247] Adolphus Slade, *Records of Travels in Turkey, Greece and of a Cruise in the Black Sea with the Capitan Paşa in the years 1829, 1830 and 1831* (Philadelphia: E. L. Carey and A. Hart, 1833), 234.

the unpleasant "march of Frank civilization" had brought the end of the "few real comforts the traveler enjoyed in the Ottoman dominions". While he had been able to move from one place to the other without intervention before, now "dirty little Turks with sticks in their hands" could only be prevented with bribe.[1248] Many other travellers attested to the practice of bribing the customs officials, largely consisting of Armenians at the customs-house at Galata, in order to transport their trunks.[1249] The Ottoman bureaucratic correspondence indeed reveals that it had become customary to subject all items passing through the customs to examination already in 1844.[1250] The cases varied from the confiscation of the books of an Austrian bookseller brought from Trieste at the Ottoman customs in 1849[1251] to a problem regarding the inspection of book boxes at customs sent by the Catholic priests in Vienna to Istanbul in 1854.[1252]

This chapter, however, focuses on those books printed within the Ottoman territories, for which licensing (*ruhsat)* served as a method of surveillance. Licensing came after a consideration of the suitability of the book in question prior to its printing; hence it was recognized as "prior censorship" in the European practice. Austrian authorities, for example, presented a list of five-thousand forbidden books between 1835 and 1848 including works by Fichte, Rousseau, Spinoza, Heine,

---

[1248] Charles Macfarlane, *Turkey and Its Destiny: The Result of Journeys Made in 1847 and 1848 to Examine into the State of that Country,* Vol.1 (Philadelphia: Lea and Blanchard: 1850), 90-91.
[1249] Albert Smith, *A Month at Constantinople* (London: David Bogue, 1851), 308; Francis Herve, *A Residence in Greece and Turkey*, Vol. II (Whittaker and Ave Maria Lane, 1837), 54; John Oldmixon, *Gleanings from Piccadilly to Pera* (London: Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans: 1854), 325; Julie Pardoe, *The City of the Sultan and Domestic Manners of the Turks*, Vol. 1 (London: Henry Colburn, 1837), 11; William Makepeace Thackeray, *Notes of a Journey from Cornhill to Grand Cairo* (London: George Routledge and Sons, 1888), 116.
[1250] See, for instance, A.MKT 8/83, 15 Muharrem 1260 (5 February 1844): "*...o makûle hâricden gelen mükâtebat ve evrâk-ı sâirenin derbend ve gümrük ve karantina mahallerine vürûdunda memûrları ma'rifetiyle yoklanılıp...*"
[1251] HR.MKT 282/14, 22 Şaban 1275 (27 March 1859).
[1252] The priests demanded for the boxes not to be opened at customs: "*gümrüklerde açılıp eczâları perişan ve harap olmakta olduğundan..."* Yet this proposal was rejected for it would violate the state regulations. See İ. HR 117/5721, 21 Rebîülâhir 1271 (11 January 1855).

Lessing, Goethe and Schiller.[1253] For the Ottoman authorities, licensing also served as the chief device to grant approval and authorization over the printing of texts.

However, there was no "one" way of granting a license. In the early stages of print, books that served a specific public or educational function were presented to the Sultan mostly by the directors of the Imperial Press.[1254] Royal appreciation was best expressed by granting license *(ruhsat-ı seniyye)* for printing. With the establishment of the Directorate of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire* in 1831, the process became more standardized; the Imperial Press, as the trusted state organ, would first submit the book in consideration for print to the attention of the Sultan including an estimation of its cost and profit. This practice was standard for books to be printed as both state-property and customer-property.[1255] If the Sultan indeed granted a license, he would again be notified once the printing was completed asking for permission to sell the book or to return the printed copies to the contractors at listed prices. However, one should note that even if the book was initially authorized for print, there could be official interferences to make changes.[1256]

Licensing was also practiced in different forms in an effort to circumscribe the practices of the private printers. In 1842, the Directorate of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire* was alerted to the need to take the local foreign presses in intramural Istanbul, Galata, Beyoğlu and Üsküdar under control due to the

---

[1253] Robert Justin Goldstein, *Political Censorship of the Arts and the Press in Nineteenth-Century Europe,* (Palgrave Macmillan: New York, 1989), 35.
[1254] For example, see HAT 223/12436, 1212 (1797-1798). A supplement to the translation of *Atlas* was presented by the director of the Imperial Press to Sultan Selim III. In other cases, when the first volume of *Kâmus Tercümesi* was well-received by the Sultan, he authorized the printing of the next volumes as well. See HAT 1319/51401, 1235 (1819-20). The Imperial Translator İshak Efendi's *Rekz ve Nasbü'l-hıyâm,* as a text with much benefit to soldiers and engineers, was presented to the Sultan for permission to print it. See HAT 290/17363, 1242 (1826-27). Many other examples followed such as HAT 922/40090, 1245 (1829-30).
[1255] See Chapter Two about the difference of these categories.
[1256] One example is the *Dîvân* of İzzet Molla. The printing process was interrupted after being warned by the Sublime Porte about its improper contents. The document clarified that it was not proper to print those texts which contained praise for unworthy groups or individuals. Mad. Müd. 8257, 12 Şevval 1255 (19 December 1839).

newspapers and other papers they published. Acting in the place of a license, these presses were tied to an annual tax, which would serve as a means of declaring their submission to the Directorate.[1257] The idea behind licensing here was clearly the recognition of the Imperial Press as the central institution managing the printing enterprise. They would also have to submit a copy of every piece of material prior to printing.

Surveillance and licensing became more complicated after the formal recognition of non-state private printers with the 1857 printing regulation. It demanded from the applicants, regardless of their affiliation, to first get a license for their printing presses and then for each book title that they wanted to publish. After 1857, the Ministry of Public Education became the center where these books and the related petitions for printing permissions gathered. Even before 1857, however, despite formally addressing the Sultan, most petitions to open presses were handled by the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances or the Council of Public Education, as institutions with the greatest authority in the licensing process.

As politically and religiously sensitive issues began to rise, the authorities also turned to post-print surveillance methods such as the confiscation of printed and distributed copies. Both of these methods appear as common practices in the Hamidian age, but as we shall see in this chapter, they also predated the authoritarian policies of Abdülhamid II. Nevertheless, the contrast of the Ottoman measures with the European ones was surprising to any contemporary foreign observer. In Europe, the most popular means of exerting control over publications was direct censorship which could be applied before or after the publication.[1258] In Russia, censorship

[1257] *"Tab'hâne-i Âmireye merbûtiyetini i'lân etmek..."* İ.MVL 36/648, 27 Zilkade 1257 (10 January 1842).
[1258] Goldstein, *Political Censorship of the Arts,* 39.

reached a zenith under Tsar Nicolas I (1825-55) with the formation of at least twelve different censorship units.[1259] In his memoirs, C.B. Elliott stated:

> In Petersburg, a chief censor reads or professes to read all books published in Europe; what he disapproves are excluded from the country and what he does not approve, including what he does not read, are not tolerated. The whole intellectual appetite of this prodigious empire is gauged by one man's capacity and the supply limited by his caprice.[1260]

The printing laws in Europe also stipulated the severe punishment of violations. While Napoleon III's 1852 punitive censorship laws were particularly infamous, even before him, penalties such as whipping, jailing, banishment and closure of print shops and bookstores had been frequently implemented, and 900 French authors, printers and booksellers, including Voltaire, and Denis Diderot, had been jailed in Bastille alone between 1600 and 1756.[1261] In Europe of the 1820s to 1840s, there were as many critics of the press as its adherents; conservatives even compared it to a "plague or a poison" that " threatened the health of European society".[1262] Such codes, however, as in all countries where printed material was banned, further reinforced the emergence of clandestine publishing.[1263]

For the Ottoman case, despite the presence of different forms of surveillance and even confiscations, as the next sections shall reveal, it was yet too early to speak of established patterns of punitive measures of post-print censorship. As Robert

---

[1259] Goldstein, *Political Censorship of the Arts,* 41.
[1260] Elliott, 258.
[1261] Goldstein, *Political Censorship of the Arts,* 35.
[1262] Goldstein, *Political Censorship of the Arts,* 27.
[1263] Clandestine publishing and smuggling were perhaps most widespread in Russia, which maintained prior censorship longer than any other major country in Europe and where dissidents were forced to develop ever more ingenious methods of resistance. One indication of the widespread nature of such operations in Russia was uncovered in 1849, when a police search uncovered 2581 illegal books in one St. Petersburg bookstore. See Robert Justin Goldstein, 68. For a pioneering study of clandestine publishing, see Robert Darnton, *The Corpus of Clandestine Literature in France 1769-1789* (W.W. Norton & Company, 1995) and Robert Darnton, *The Business of Enlightenment: A Publishing History of the Encyclopedie 1775-1800* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987).

Darnton has argued, censorship operated in different ways in different societies.[1264] There was no exact counterpart of a censor in the Ottoman bureaucratic terminology either until almost the last quarter of the nineteenth century. When the Protestant missionary, Rufus Anderson remarked in 1844 that the Ottoman government was beginning to introduce "censorship" that would limit the printing of books in Turkish, he was employing his own embedded Western categories.[1265] Reverend Henry van Lennep would hit it right on with his observation about the utilitarian component of censorship in Istanbul in 1869: "censorship of press is an European invention to which people do not submit and which the officials themselves enforce only as far as is necessary to secure Bakshish".[1266] For censorship to be an operative concept, it had to be preceded by corresponding law codes and strict penal mechanisms.

Based on this conceptual framework, the rest of this chapter will probe into how the categories of legality and illegality regarding the printing and circulation of religious books developed in the unique circumstances of the Ottoman Empire in the Tanzimat period. It will trace the entanglement of a network of different agents including the state, private printers, calligraphers, contractors, merchants, students and booksellers through specific cases rather than the abstract legal arrangements. These cases also demonstrate the entanglement of the Muslim and the non-Muslim elements, the Ottoman and the foreign subjects in relations of "complicity, collaboration and negotiation" that would intensify in the late 1850s.[1267] These

[1264] Robert Darnton, *Censors at Work: How States Shaped Literature* (London: British Library, 2014). Also see Robert Darnton, *Poetry and Police: Communication Networks in Eighteenth Century Paris* (London, Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2010).
[1265] Rufus Anderson, *Report to the Prudential Committee of a visit to the missions in the Levant* (Boston: American Board, 1844), 19.
[1266] Reverend Henry van Lennep, *Travels in Little Known Parts of Asia Minor* Vol.1 (London, 1870), 8.
[1267] Darnton, *Censors at Work,* 234.

networks and relations, accordingly, is what eventually determined and colored the Ottoman legal sphere in the next few decades.

5.3 Illicit books on the Islamic creed

The available scholarship treats a large body of books related to the Islamic creed under the general rubric of religious books. This chapter argues, however, that the priorities of the Ottoman authorities in the nineteenth century reveal a more diversified approach to this broad categorization. Religious books, as subjects of printing decisions, did not constitute a monolithic category; in other words, the printing and importing of some books were more prohibited than others.

It is widely believed that the fatwa granted by Şeyhülislam Yenişehirli Abdullah (r. 1718-1730) together with the imperial edict *(fermân)* of Sultan Ahmed III (r. 1703-1736) issued in 1727 banned printing the Islamic canon (books on Islamic jurisprudence, the traditions of the Prophet and Qur'an) in the Ottoman realms. Recently, Kathryn Schwartz has questioned this assumption, arguing that the limitations could have been directed only at İbrahim Müteferrika (d. 1747).[1268] An edict from 1797, for instance, reminded the Muslim booksellers that it was forbidden to trade printed copies of the Qur'an as well as works of *hadith,* exegesis and jurisprudence. The same warnings were repeated in 1800 via the Regulations of Booksellers (*Sahhaflar Nizâmı).*[1269] Further evidence from Ottoman bureaucratic correspondence attests to the existence and implementation of this prohibition on the printing of religious texts.

[1268] The fatwa granted by Şeyhülislam Yenişehirli Abdullah specifically stated that he was authorized to print books excluding those on the religious sciences. For a recent appraisal of the controversial discourse on the permissibility of print in the Ottoman Empire, see Kathryn Schwartz, "Did Ottoman Sultan Ban Print?" 10.
[1269] Erünsal, "Osmanlılarda Sahhaflık ve Sahhaflar," 115.

The eighteenth-century dynamics aside, a more differentiated policy in categorizing books on the Islamic creed could be observed in the nineteenth century. Neither the category of religious books nor their handling by state authorities were monolithic. Most scholarly work on religious book surveillance has focused on the formal mechanisms of an Ottoman "print regime" in the last quarter of this period.[1270] Even for the early decades of the century, however, a closer look reveals the assertion of state monopoly in different ways over the printing of different types of religious books that preclude the possibility of treating them as a bloc. The "fine tunings" of the nineteenth century Ottoman political and religious discourse, as discussed in the previous chapters, has allowed for the differentiation of religious books and related printing decisions.[1271] Hence this section turns to historical actors and cases to illuminate the contexts in which the lines depicting the permissibility of print were stretched.

On a spectrum of the printability of religious books, the printing of the Qur'an can be placed at one end; it was banned until 1873. Yet, before this date, illicit copies were either smuggled from outside of the Ottoman territories or were at least partially printed in Istanbul. By the same logic, we might expect the dissemination of individual verses of the Qur'an (*Eczâ-i Şerîfe)* to be equally prohibited by the state authorities. According to a long-standing custom, the Qur'an was divided into thirty sections (*cüz*), each of which consisted of twenty pages. The idea behind the practice was to recite a *cüz* everyday so that within a month one completed the recitation of

[1270] Ayşe Polat has adopted the term "print regime" with reference to the late nineteenth century. See Polat, "Subject to Approval." For more information on state organs of surveillance, see Ali Birinci, "Matbuat Yasaklari," 303-305. For a survey of surveillance institutions under Abdülhamid II, see Filiz Dığıroğlu, 'II. Abdülhamid Dönemi Matbuat Politikaları: Mushaf Basımı ve Dini Neşriyat,' in *Sultan II. Abdülhamid Han ve Dönemi* (eds.) Fahreddin Gün and Halil İbrahim Erbay (Istanbul: TBMM Milli Saraylar, 2017): 621-654.

[1271] Fine tuning alludes to Selim Deringil's usage of the phrase in *The Well Protected Domains: Ideology and the Legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire 1876-1909* (London-New York: I. B. Tauris, 1999).

the whole text. It was these individual portions such as Verse 67 (*Al-Mulk*) or Verse 78 (*An-Naba*) popularly called "*Tebâreke* " and "*Amme*" respectively that were illegally printed. Non-state agents were indeed strictly forbidden from printing these verses in the 1850s. Interestingly, however, the state officials outsourced the printing of some of these verses to private printers, who did not at the time have a legal presence. We shall see that once the state transgressed the limits of its own practice and fluctuated between loosening and tightening control over the right to print, the underground trafficking for and smuggling of both the verses of the Qur'an and the Qur'an itself intensified.

The Islamic cathechisms or *ilmihâls* could be placed on the opposite end of the spectrum as they were among the earliest printed religious texts. İmam Birgivî's *Vasiyetnâme*, also known as *Risâle-i Birgiv*î was the first printed *ilmihâl* in 1803.[1272] Followed by *Dürr-i yektâ*, a contemporary catechism written by İmamzâde Es'ad Efendi in 1827, the two texts reached multiple editions.[1273] The relative flexibility in allowing their printing and official channels of dissemination early on relied on their symbolic value for representing an appropriate Sunni-Hanafi religio-political synthesis; they reminded Muslims of their religious duties part of which was obedience to authority. The reform agenda of the Ottoman state in the early nineteenth century, after all, necessitated the support of the ulama and the persuasion of wider community. Even texts containing *hadiths* could be mobilized for the same grand purpose; Şeyhülislam Yasincizâde Abdülvehhab Efendi's (d. 1833) *Hulâsatü'l-burhân fî itâati's-sultân*, printed in 1831, was meant to support the political authority

[1272] Ali Birinci, "Birgivi Risalesi: İlk Din Kitap Niçin ve Nasıl Basıldı?" *Türk Yurdu* 112 (December 1996): 13-14.
[1273] *Vasiyetnâme* printed in: 1218, 1220, 1247, 1249, 1255, 1261, 1264, 1265, 1276 1280, 1281, 1282, 1285. *Dürr-i Yektâ* printed in: 1243, 1249, 1252, 1256, 1257, 1259, 1260, 1264, 1267, 1275, 1277, 1279, 1282, 1284, 1288, 1294, 1306, 1308, 1318, 1328.

and reforms of Mahmud II.[1274] As such, this branch of religious texts was utilized as a way to garner popular support for political authority and reform. The centralization of the state enabled the transmission of these messages in a solid and clear fashion through the printing press.

The printability of popular religious books was somewhat more ambiguous. As always, official motives were a shifting mix of religious, political and economic concerns. Various decisions were made on the printing and circulation of respective texts. For instance, İsmail Hakkı Bursevi's commentary on Yazıcızâde Ahmed Efendi's *Muhammediyye*[1275] was prevented from being printed at Cerîde-i Havâdis press in 1850. The reasoning followed that since the book contained Qur'anic verses and *hadith,* the officials including the director of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire* did not deem the act appropriate *(hürmetsizlik)*.[1276] The same text, however, would be printed at the Imperial Press in 1857-1858. Even more paradoxically, the original text, *Muhammediyye,* had already been printed at a state press in 1842.[1277] Apparently, as discussed in Chapter Two, the blocking of non-state actors by the Directorate of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire* from the handling of popular religious texts was motivated by a concern to keep the income of the Imperial Press intact rather than addressing religious sensitivities.

[1274] Tufan Buzpınar, "II. Mahmud Dönemine Ait Öncü bir Hilafet Risalesi '*Hulâsatü'l-Burhân fî itâati's-Sultân'*, " *Hilafet ve Saltanat: II. Abdülhamid Döneminde Halifelik ve Araplar* (İstanbul: Alfa Yayınları, 2016); Abdullah Taha İmamoğlu and Veli Karataş, "İrade-i Seniyyeyi Hadislerle Desteklemek: II. Mahmud Dönemi Şeyhülislamlarından Yasincizade Abdülvehhab Efendi ve *Hulâsatü'l-Burhân fî itâati's-Sultân* adlı Risalesi", *Artuklu Akademi* 1 (2016/3): 21-54.

[1275] While *Muhammediyye* by Ahmed Yazıcızâde was printed many times, 1258/1842, 1262, 1264, 1265, 1267, 1268, 1270, 1271, 1273, 1278, 1280, 1283, 1284, 1290, its commentary by İsmail Hakkı Bursevi was printed in Istanbul in 1274.

[1276] İ.MVL 196/6021, 9 Cemâziyelevvel 1266 (23 March 1850).

[1277] 1842 edition had been printed at *Bab-ı Seraskeri* press. See Thomas Heinzelmann, *Populare Religiose Literatur und Buchkultur im Osmanischen Reich: Eine Studie zur Nutzung der Werke der Brüder Yazıcıoğlu* (Würzburg: Ergon Verlag Würzburg in Kommission, 2015), 451.

Other contradictory policies followed; the Sultan authorized the printing of a commentary on the forty sayings (*hadith)* of the Prophet, *Hadis-i erba'în* by the Arabic instructor at the School of Learning (*Mekteb-i Ma'ârif-i Adliyye),* Süleyman Efendi in 1839.[1278] Conversely, *Hilye-i Hakanî* of Hâkânî Mehmed Bey (d. 1606), portraying the appearance of the Prophet, was printed at the Imperial Press in *ta'lîk* letters in 1848. The circulation of its copies in the booksellers' market from "hand to hand" *(elden ele),* however, was found to be disrespectful and the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances ruled to have it sold only at the Imperial Press.[1279]

Moreover, by 1844, it was deemed improper for non-Muslims (*kefere)* to handle the printing of Islamic books.[1280] Similar restrictions applied to popular religious books printed in Europe, such as the popular prayer book, *Delâil-i şerîf,* which was brought to Istanbul by the Iranian merchant, Hacı Ali Ağa in 1853 for trade purposes. Detained at customs, the decision was to notify the Iranian embassy and return the books on the grounds that religious books printed in Europe could not be sold in the Ottoman territories.[1281]

In addition to these categories of religious literature, there was the category of polemical religious books that originated in other countries and which were smuggled into the Ottoman territories. These books were largely considered as unfit for ideological and political purposes. One source for such books was Iran. While

[1278] HAT 492/24135, 3 Zilkade 1254 (18 January 1839).
[1279] İ.MVL 118/2922, 26 Rebîülevvel 1264 (2 March 1848).
[1280] In 1844, Şeyhülislam Arif Hikmet Efendi expressed the unanimous decision on the religious impermissibility *(hürmetsizlik)* of printing religious books by non-Muslims. İ.MVL 293/11827, 22 Ramazan 1260 (5 October 1844). This view seems to mirror the claims by European travelers that the Ottoman booksellers did not want to sell the Qur'an to foreigners in the previous centuries. See Yahya Erdem.
[1281] A.MKT.NZD 89/61, 5 Zilhicce 1269 (9 September 1853). Although *Şerhu Delâil-i hayrât* was printed at the Imperial Press in 1254/1838, 1255/1839, 1266/1850, 1272 and 1280/1863. Interestingly, Seyyid Abdullah proposed at the Ottoman parliament in 1877 for *Delâilü'l-hayrât* to be exclusively printed by the Ministry of Public Education just like the Qur'an. See İskit, *Türkiye'de Matbûat İdareleri ve Politikaları*, 139.

relations with Iran evolved into a matter of "foreign policy" in the aftermath of Erzurum Treaty signed in 1823 and its follow-up in 1848, polemical issues surrounding sectarian conflicts erupted from time to time involving the sphere of printed books.[1282] In one interesting case from 1863, the Ottoman diplomats held the Iranian state responsible for the dissemination of inflammatory material against the Sunni creed such as *Esrârü'ş-şehâde*[1283]*, Fıkh-ı Rızâ*[1284] and *Aynü'l-hayât* printed by the newly established lithographers in Iran.[1285] They argued that while the purpose of the craft of printing was to teach "brotherhood and the duties of humanity" (*uhuvvet ve vezâif-i insânniye),* Iran had "insulted many hundred millions of people of the Qibla" and "reopened old wounds" between the two states. If these printed texts had circulated only in Iran, the Ottoman state could have ignored them. But because they tried to smuggle the texts into their territories, the Ottoman state could not tolerate it.[1286]

In a diplomatic move, the Iranian officials deflected the accusations and attributed the circulation of such books to the carelessness of the press officials; the Iranian state could not be held responsible for the beliefs of its subjects.[1287]

[1282] Bruce Masters, "The Treatises of Erzurum (1823 and 1848) and the Changing Status of Iranians in the Ottoman Empire," *Iranian Studies* 24, no. 1/4 (1991): 6.

[1283] It was explained in another document (MVL 866/105, 22 Cemâziyelâhir 1281 [22 November 1864]) that this book containing illicit content was printed in Iran; copies had to be searched and confiscated. While no other detail is provided, it probably contained polemical issue against the Sunni creed.

[1284] This was an apocryphal book attributed to the eighth imam Ali b. Musa Rıza.

[1285] İ. HR 213/12380, 29 Zilhicce 1281 (25 May 1865). The Ottoman *tezkire* to the Iranian embassy stated: *"... İraniyyede te'sîs olunan litografya tezgâhlarının mezheb-i ehl-i sünnet hilâfında yazılmış olan kitâbları basıp bir yandan memâlik-i mahrûse-i şâhâneye idhâl etmeyi ihtiyâr eylemeleri..."*

[1286] *"... nice yüz milyon ehl-i Kıbleyi efkâr-ı küfrünü irtikâb etmiş ve… muzırriyâtın intibâ' ve intişârı manzûr-ı nazar-ı iğmâz olarak henüz iltiyâm bulmaya yüz tutmuş olan bir hûn-ı cerîhaların tekrar açılmasına sebebiyet verilmesi..."* İ. HR 213/12380, 29 Zilhicce 1281(25 May 1865)..

[1287] Through the Ottoman-Iranian treatises of Erzurum in 1823 and 1848, Iran was declared to be as a separate, "friendly nation", thereby joining the ranks of France, Britain, Holland, Sweden, Prussia and Spain. The language employed in the drafting of the document contained much praise of the descendants of Caliph Ali, and fraternal love between the Muslim monarchs. Moreover, the Persians were no longer forced to mention the first four caliphs with respect. Masters, "The Treatises of Erzurum," 10-11.

Polemical books, as such, constituted a contested space and became tool in negotiations between the two empires.[1288] Their impermissibility in this case was tied to their meaning for the wider sectarian political and historical conflicts. This particular conflict was resolved towards 1864 through a consensus that the two states of Islam (*millet-i İslâmiyye*) would form an alliance and refrain from ways that would harm the minds of each other's populace. In this vein, neither state was to publish or disseminate texts against each other.[1289]

Interestingly, Christian religious Scriptures entering the Ottoman territories from Europe (*Frengistan)* also constituted a concern for Ottoman authorities. While the Ottoman authorities often remarked on the freedom of non-Muslim communities of the empire to print and have their liturgical texts circulating, in 1822, the judge of Bab-ı Atik objected to the transmission of two to three thousand copies of Bible, Psalms of David, the New Testament, the Acts of Apostles and a pamphlet in Persian. Perhaps it was the missionary agenda behind these books, but they were deemed to contain harmful content for the general populace, specifically for the Muslims.[1290] The judge warned that no Muslim should buy or read these texts; if detected at the customs, they would have to be returned to their place of origin and if found on the streets of Istanbul, they would have to be confiscated and burnt.[1291] Reverend Robert Walsh annexed the imperial edict of 1825 prohibiting buying the Turkish Bible to his appendix.[1292] By 1840, provincial governors were still being

[1288] For a discussion of the polemical texts between Iran and the Ottoman Empire in general and *Risâlah-i Husniyah* in specific, see Ünal, 77-86.
[1289] İ. HR 213/12380, 24 Muharrem 1282 (19 June 1865).
[1290] C.MF 105/5244, 3 Zilkade 1237 (22 July 1822); C.ADL 20/1196, 29 Zilkade 1237 (17 August 1822); C. DH 5/236, 25 Muharrem 1240 (19 September 1824): *"... bu suret…akâid-i avâm-ı nassın bir nevi' ihlâl ve ifsâdına mûcib bir keyfiyyet olduğundan..."*
[1291] Beydilli, *Türk Bilim ve Matbaacılık,* 326-327.
[1292] Robert Walsh, *A Residence in Constantinople,* Vol. 2 (London: Frederick Westley and A.H. Davis, 1836), 501. In fact, the first printed Turkish Bible was funded by the British and Foreign Bible Society based on Ali Bey's (Wojciech Bobowski,1666) manuscript in 1827 in Paris. It became the basis for further Armeno-Turkish and Greco-Turkish translations. See Scott Rank, "Disputing

warned to take the necessary precautions specifically about the transmission of these texts.[1293]

Other polemical texts posing direct challenge to the Islamic creed concerned the authorities. A case from the Ottoman Beirut in 1849, for example, reveals that an American subject, Asmiş (?) was reported for printing translated books that contained blasphemous words against Islam such as committing shirk to God (*şirk koşmak)* and unappropriate phrases (*isbât-ı vücûd gibi nâ-sezâ kelimât)*. The Ottoman local governor unsuccessfully contacted the American consulate for the shut-down of this press.[1294]

Similarly, there were specifically anti-Muslim texts sent to the Ottoman territories from London. In 1857, the books ordered by an American priest residing in Vezirhan, which contained claims in Turkish on the superiority of Christianity over other religions, were deemed to be illicit by the Ministry of Public Education. Since the target audience appeared to be Muslims, the copies would either be burnt or returned to the owner in London.[1295] In 1861, more books in Turkish against Islam were discovered in Tahtakale and Mahmutpaşa mosque; aside from being banned, the sales locations were shut down and the distributors were sent for interrogation.[1296] In addition, *Miftâhü'l-esrâr: A Treatise on the Divinity of Christ and the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity*[1297], a missionary polemical text on the Holy

Religion, Empire and Modernity: Christian-Muslim Polemics in the Ottoman Print Sphere, 1861-1915" (PhD diss., Central European University, 2015), 94.

[1293] C.DH 229/11442, 29 Zilhicce 1255 (4 March 1840).

[1294] A.MKT.NZD, 11 Cemâziyelevvel 1265 (4 April 1849).

[1295] HR.MKT 201/62, 28 Zilkade1273 (20 July 1857).

[1296] A.MKT.NZD 427/27, 27 Cemâziyelâhir 1278 (30 December 1861).

[1297] This was the first book printed in London at the printing house of Williams Watts. It was written by Karl Pfander, whose publishing activities caused much stress for the American Board of Missionaries already active in the Ottoman Empire. They feared that the Ottoman authorities would conflate this polemical work with the missionary activities of the American Board and all their work so far would be undone. Hence, they refused his request to publish *Miftahu'l-esrâr: A Treatise on the Divinity of Christ and the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity.* See Rank, "Disputing Religion," 3.

Trinity by Karl Pfander, printed in London and sent to Istanbul was reported as harmful and hence prohibited after an examination at customs in 1862.[1298]

All in all, the various categories mentioned above reveal a multiplicity of actors and contexts which make it impossible to generalize an Ottoman approach to the publication and circulation of religious books. The next section will zoom into one of these categories, the printing of the Qur'an and its segments with reference to the interplay of different agents in the making and un-making of related state decisions.

5.3.1 The printing of the Qur'an

It was prohibited to print the Qur'an in the Ottoman lands until 1873. The fact that the printing of the Qur'an became legitimate in Istanbul later than in other parts of the Islamic world, however, does not mean that the Ottoman subjects remained unacquainted with printed Qur'ans until that date.[1299] Foreign printed editions, particularly those from Iran, flowed into the Ottoman territories through trade networks especially after the second half of the nineteenth century. The Ottoman authorities not only banned printing, but also tried to prevent the entrance of printed copies into their territories.[1300]

[1298] A.MKT.NZD 415/51, 29 Şevval 1278 (29 April 1862).

[1299] Even though we are warned by Michael Albin not to take the dates as entirely accurate, the Qur'an was printed in Kazan in 1801, in Iran in 1816, in Indonesia in 1848 and in Bombay in 1850. While printing the portions of the Qur'an (*Eczâ)* was allowed in Egypt in 1833 for the training of soldiers and the students, it was printed as a whole only in 1864. See Michael W. Albin, "Printing the Qur'an" in *Encyclopedia of the Qur'an* (referenceworks, brillonline.com, accessed 31 October 2018); Polat, "Subject to Approval," 30; Natalia Kasprzak Suit, "Quranic Matters: Media and Materiality" (PhD diss., University of North Carolina, 2014), 29; Brett Wilson, "The Qur'an After Babel: Translating and Printing the Quran in Late Ottoman and Modern Turkey," (PhD diss., Duke University, 2009), 28.

[1300] Foreign printed Qur'ans would not be legally permitted to circulate within Ottoman lands until 1910. Polat, "Subject to Approval," 34. For another survey of the monitoring of printed Qur'ans, see Necmettin Göker, *Din-Devlet İlişkileri ve Siyaset Bağlamında Mushaf Basımı* (İstanbul: M.Ü. İlahiyat Fakültesi Vakfı Yayınları, 2015).

Most scholarly research that discusses the Ottoman ban on the printing of religious books including the recent works of Brett Wilson and Ayşe Polat has limited scope exclusively to the Qur'an. There is no denial about the centrality of the Qur'an in Islamic scholarship and the Ottoman sensitivity to treasure and protect it.[1301] In consideration of the broader dynamics of a growing printing enterprise at both state and private levels, however, the printing ban on the Qur'an emerges as one strategic maneuver among many others taken by state authorities. Hence the discussion on this ban will be only as part of the broader spectrum of printing strategies employed by the Ottoman state until the 1860s.

The acknowledgment by state officials of a market on the illicit circulation of printed Qur'ans appeared in the 1850s. One such an early case came to the attention of state authorities in Skopje in 1851, when a madrasa student, İlyas was caught while trying to sell nine copies of printed Qur'ans he had bought from an Iranian (*Acem*).[1302] He defended himself by claiming that he did not know the practice was illicit. He might have been lying to avoid punishment, of course, but the frequency and the intensity of legal warnings increased from this point onwards in an attempt to remind all kinds of Ottoman officials (customs officers, local governors, etc.) to control and prevent the circulation of printed Qur'ans.

Two arguments in support of the ban on the printing of the Qur'an appear most relevant from the perspective of contemporary actors. For one, there were pious concerns about the ritual purity of a foreign technology: reproducing the Qur'an was traditionally a form of worship and the idea of sacred letters being smashed on paper

[1301] See, for example, Francis Robinson, "Technology and Religious Change: Islam and the Impact of Print" *Modern Asian Sudies* 27, no.1 (Feb., 1993): 229-251.
[1302] A.MKT.NZD 30/40, 15 Cemâziyelevvel 1267 (18 March 1851). The exact phrase used to refer to his lack of knowledge on the impermissibility of printed Qur'ans is "*matbû' Kelâm-ı kadîmi memnûniyetinden haberi olmadığı*". As a result of the case, he was awarded (!) with the sales value of nine printed Qur'ans (35 kuruş each), that is 315 kuruş as *sadaka*.

through the use of iron press and other heavy machines from Europe could be sacrilegious, as voiced by Ahmed Cevdet Paşa.[1303] James de Kay similarly noted the objection of the ulama to the printing of the Qur'an because "it was unlawful to squeeze the word of God, as must necessarily be done by the printer and bookbinder."[1304] Religious concerns guided the printing decisions. Indeed, in 1855, the director of the Imperial Press, Recai Efendi, referred to an "insolent person from among the greedy (*ashâb-ı tama'dan)* with the malicious intent to trade," who had printed the *Nebe* section from the Qur'an. It contained many textual errors such as the removal of certain words and letters and the addition of others. Moreover, even if the printed texts had been completely unblemished by errors, it still would not have been allowed to be printed as writing the Qur'an on small paper was considered disrespectful and religio-legally reprehensible (*mekrûh*). As Şeyhülislam Arif Hikmet Efendi confirmed, printing and disseminating such texts would be a form of defamation.[1305]

As a second argument, the imported Qur'ans were perceived as an economic, political and religious threat by the *ulama* and state officials, or as "symbols of foreign sovereignty akin to flags and medals," in the words of Selim Deringil.[1306] By the Hamidian period, this would turn into an "obsession with foreign intrigue

[1303] Ahmed Cevdet Pasa would also note that the books of jurisprudence would eventually be printed under the guidance of the Qur'anic surah stating that the actions are determined by intentions. Similar to how the Qur'an could be binded also in the manuscript form without damaging the pages, books of jurisprudence could also be printed for the purpose of benefiting the students. Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, *Tarih-i Cevdet,* Vol. 1 (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2018), 83.
[1304] De Kay, 147. Similar remarks on the prejudice of 'Muhammedan countries' "against mechanical reduplication of Kuran and other similar works were also extended to scientific or useful books". See James Porter, Vol.1, 50. J.V.S. Smith also noted that the 'Muhammedans' agreed the Koran had to be written with a pen and it was impious to imprint the name of Allah with type: "The Koran is defined to be executed by a pen, till the idea that it is profane to squeeze the sacred text in a press, like a tortured criminal, is overcome by a higher civilization." Smith, *Turkey and the Turks*, 138.
[1305] MVL 291/8, 8 Zilkade 1271 (23 July 1855). *"...fetvâhânede tilâvet olundukda bazı kelimât ve hurûfunun ıskât ve tenkîsi ve bazı âharın zam ve ilâvesi ve mevâzi'-i müte'addidede harekâtının hatası ba'de'l-müşâhede sıhhati takdirinde dahi..."*
[1306] Deringil, *The Well Protected Domains,* 54-56.

surrounding the Qur'an."[1307] In his coverage of the foreign printed Qur'ans, Brett Wilson has ascribed greater weight to the political factors behind the ban on their circulation by dating the first reference to textual errors in the context of the objections to the printing of the Qur'an to 1861.[1308] As the case mentioned above from 1855 reveals, however, the Ottoman religious sensitivities were a concern from earlier on. Ayşe Polat's study of the elaborate printing mechanisms for the Qur'an after 1889 has also highlighted the genuine official emphasis on the ritual purity of printing methods.[1309] It can be argued, therefore, that the issues of power and the authority of the Ottoman Sultan to be discussed here were an extension of the emphasis on ritual purity.

Acknowledging the religious emphasis, however, is not to underestimate the weight of associated political factors. Due to the religious and political rivalry between the Ottoman Empire and Iran, Iran quickly came to the center of an illicit trafficking of printed Qur'ans. Once we consider the wider sectarian and polemical literature that entangled the two states as discussed in the previous section, however, the Ottoman concern with prohibiting the smuggling of printed Qur'ans from Iran becomes more meaningful. In such cases, the attempt at treating illicit networks as a whole proves to be more significant.

In early November of 1852, fourteen copies of three separate types of Qur'ans were discovered in the hands of Iranians by the police; one type had been printed at the lithographic press of an unspecified person in Istanbul who had come from Iran and had later gone to Egypt. Two other types had been imported from Iran.[1310] One place such books were sold was probably the tobacco shop of an Iranian in

[1307] Deringil, *The Well Protected Domains,* 54.
[1308] Wilson, "The Qur'an After Babel," 59.
[1309] Polat, "Subject to Approval," 35.
[1310] İ.DH 261/16162, Gurre-i Safer 1269 (14 November 1852).

Mahmutpaşa, where eight copies had been recovered.[1311] The Iranian in question could be Hacı Hasan Ağa, as identified in a document from 2 January 1853.[1312] The 1852 decree further noted that in case such trafficking did not stop, the state of Iran would have to be officially notified through the Ottoman embassy in Tahran.[1313] The Ottoman ambassador in Tahran at the time, Ahmed Vefik Efendi (d. 1891), took the message to the court of Nadir Shah in March 1853.[1314] More aware of the black-market of printed Qur'ans than ever, in May 1853, the director of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire* was advised to warn the booksellers not to trade the printed Qur'an ever again.[1315]

While the Iranian authorities did not accede to their official sanction of the smuggling of printed Qur'ans into the Ottoman territories, there was sufficient political intrigue to motivate them in that direction. As initiated with the Erzurum Treaty of 1823, the permanent resident diplomats of each state negotiated over a number of issues varying from commercial tax rates to the cross-border attacks of the tribes. The tensions mounted in 1853, when there was military activity on the border. Apparently, a secret alliance had been formed between Iran and Russia during the Crimean War. In turn, the Sublime Porte ordered the Ottoman provinces to get started with war preparations. The diplomats of both sides intervened, however, and

[1311] İ.DH 262/16282, 2 Safer 1269 (15 November 1852). A.AMD 41/27, 15 Safer 1269 (28 November 1852) also contains information on this issue. In a commercial treaty signed between the Ottomans and Iran in 1853, the Ottomans had agreed not to open the tobacco packs entering its territories in compliance with the demands of the merchants. This could be the reason why books were smuggled in tobacco boxes. See Masoumeh Daei, "19. Yüzyıl İran ile Osmanlı Arasında Tömbeki Muamılâtı ve Gümrük Taifeleri," in *Sultan Abdülaziz ve Dönemi Sempozyumu,* Vol. 2 (Ankara: TTK, 2014), 10.
[1312] A.MKT.NZD 70/16, 21 Rebîülevvel 1269 (2 January 1853).
[1313] İ.DH 261/16162, Gurre-i Safer 1269 (14 November 1852).
[1314] A.AMD 42/61, 2 Cemâziyelâhir 1269 (13 March 1853).
[1315] A.MKT.MHM 756/32, 21 Şaban 1269 (30 May 1853).

the Ottomans acceded to the demands of the Iranian ambassador Hacı Mirza Ahmed Han in 1853 to divert them from an alliance with Russians.[1316]

Iranian agents were involved in not only the smuggling but also the printing of the Qur'ans in Istanbul. Brett Wilson refers to the emergence of a black market due to the ban.[1317] By 1860, the Ottoman officials acknowledged that the Qur'ans were smuggled in tobacco boxes and sold in secret; repeated official warnings ordered the customs to confiscate these copies.[1318] The presence of so many illicit copies circulating around the empire indicates that they had become a less expensive alternative to the manuscript copies.[1319] The sales values of the Qur'an varied immensely for both the manuscript and the printed editions depending on the calligraphy.[1320] Among these agents was Iranian Hacı Taki.[1321] He had been discovered only after the interrogation of Hafız Ahmed, Şeyhülislam in specific wanted to learn who had encouraged him on such an act, whether he had partners and how many copies he had printed so far, they had to be confiscated.[1322] He had helped Hafız Ahmed and his partner Mehmed Ağa to print the Qur'an in Ahmed's home in

[1316] İbrahim Caner Türk, *Kırım Harbi Esnasında Osmanlı-İran Münasebetleri* (İstanbul: Arı Sanat Yayınevi, 2013), 40-51.
[1317] Wilson, "The Qur'an After Babel," 56.
[1318] HR.MKT 361/93, 20 Cemâziyelâhir 1277 (3 January 1861).
[1319] In a petition, Ibrahim Efendi addressed the state officials in early 1865 that he was a *hâfiz* from Şebinkarahisar who had always been preoccupied with the Quran but because of his poverty, never had owned one. He begged the officials to blessed him with one. See MVL 464/52, 10 Ramazan 1281 (6 February 1865). However, İsmail Erünsal has noted that the sales prices of manuscripts were cheaper than the prices of printed books. See Erünsal, *Osmanlılarda Sahaflık ve Sahaflar,* 192.
[1320] Erünsal, *Osmanlılarda Sahaflık ve Sahaflar,* 194-195. The prices of printed Qur'ans could also vary according to the calligraphy. In 1878, the average price of a printed Qur'an found in the probate states of Sahaf Mustafa Efendi b. Abdullah was 35 kuruş. It could be as low as 10 kuruş or high as 50 kuruş as Şekerzâde edition was valued in 1886. Manuscript copies could also be sold as cheap as 20-35 kuruş. For an inventory of the Qur'an prices in bookseller estates, Erünsal, *Osmanlılarda Sahaflık ve Sahaflar,* 432-450.
[1321] The list of tenants at Validehan in 1851 as published by Filiz Dığıroğlu reveals two Iranian merchants by the names, Hacı Ağa Taki and Muhammed Ağa Taki. The latter Muhammed Taki had to release his place due to his unpaid debts in 1856. Filiz Dığıroğlu, "İstanbul-Tebriz Ticaret Hattında Valide Han (XIX-XX. Yüzyıl)," *Türk Kültürü İncelemeleri Dergisi* 31 (Fall 2014): 87.
[1322] A.MKT.NZD 180/35, 22 Receb 1272 (29 March 1856).

Kocamustafapaşa in 1856.[1323] They both admitted to their crime but the real culprit was Hafız Ahmed who had a contract with Taki Efendi (*akd-i mukâvele eden)*. In 1860, the trade of the printed Qur'an also encompassed a wide spectrum of the populace; Hüsnü Efendi, one of the tomb keepers of Sultan Mahmud II's tomb, not only traded stolen books but also two copies of the printed Qur'an.[1324]

More documents attest to the growth of the illicit trade of printed Qur'ans.[1325] Throughout 1861, there were repeated occasions in provinces, in schools, where printed copies were found and confiscated. By October 1861, it was recognized that the printed Qur'ans and verses entering Istanbul had not been properly monitored since the 1850s. Ironically, the more urgent the need to survey these books became, the more aware the authorities became of the deficits in surveillance. The threat now was empire-wide. Printed Qur'ans were being seized in Iraq, Beirut, Samsun, Varna, Crete and Istanbul and sent to the Ministry of Public Education and the Office of the Şeyhülislam (*Meşîhat*).[1326] The prohibition of the buying and selling of these prints had to be declared to all provinces.[1327] In turn, the governors confirmed that they would keep monitoring and preventing the penetration of printed Qur'ans and verses into their districts.[1328] Hence a correlation between the number of illicit cases and legal repercussions could indeed be noticed.

[1323]A. MKT. NZD 185/11, 8 Ramazan 1272 (13 May 1856); A.MKT.MVL 89/9. 27 Zilkade 1273 (19 July 1857). Hafız Ahmed was punished with one year of imprisonment whereas Taki was taken to the Iranian embassy. Ahmed and Mehmed were both released on the basis of a guarantor in one year. Hafiz Ahmed mentioned here was probably the same Hafiz who operated a lithographic press at the Imperial Press. See Chapter II for a more extended discussion.

[1324] MVL 836/53, 7 Receb 1276 (30 January 1860).

[1325] A.MKT.MHM 206/93, 12 Receb 1277 (31 January 1861); A.MKT.MHM 208/12, 15 Receb 1277 (27 January 1861).

[1326] Wilson, 54-56.

[1327] A.MKT.UM 502/90, 26 Rebîülevvel 1278 (1 October 1861); MVL 621/19, 17 Cemâziyelevvel 1278 (20 November 1861). Other copies of the Quranic excerpts were confiscated; A.MKT.MHM 235/33, 6 Rebîülevvel 1278 (11 September 1861).

[1328] i.e. governor (*mutasarrıf*) of Van and Hakkari, MVL 620/38, 9 Cemâziyelevvel 1278 (12 November 1861). governor (*mutasarrıf*) of Yemen confirmed the notification as well; MVL 762/2, 3 Şaban 1278 (3 February 1862): İzmit-A.MKT.UM 509/80, 11 Rebîülâhir 1278 (16 September 1861); A.MKT.UM 513/50, 19 Rebîülâhir 1278 (24 September 1861); Damascus-MVL 760/79, 18

The mounting number of violations, signifying the ineffectiveness of the Ottoman measures, would lead to an increasing frequency of reports on illicit Qur'ans addressing the State Council (*Şûrâ-yı Devlet)* in the late 1860s and early 1870s.[1329] Just as Hafız Ahmed, who was identified as a madrasa student earlier, the involvement of people from religious ranks in the illicit trafficking of printed Qur'ans was striking. In a case from 1871, the head of the calligraphers (*reisü'l-hattâtîn*) in Shumen (Şumnu), Mehmed Nuri Efendi, would specifically complain about their role in flooding the provinces with printed Qur'ans for the purposes of trade.[1330] The High Council of State (*Şûrâ -yı Devlet)* would hold the local councils and officers accountable for such forbidden acts and order them to put more emphasis on measures of surveillance.

As a result, viewing the print regime from 1831 onwards, one can follow how the gradual intensification of illicit trafficking of religious texts led to the growing helplessness of the Ottoman state. Aside from other reasons, this pressure from non-state agents and printers might have contributed to the official decision to finally print the Qur'an in 1873.

Cemâziyelevvel 1278 (21 November 1861); Tırhala-A.MKT.UM 513/84, 22 Rebîülâhir 1278 (27 October 1861); Sivas-A.MKT.UM 515/47, 19 Rebîülâhir 1278 (24 October 1861) and A.MKT.UM 518/50, 25 Rebîülâhir 1278 (30 October 1861); Canik-A.MKT.UM 515/47, 25 Rebîülâhir 1278 (30 October 1861); Ioannina A.MKT.UM 516/38, 20 Rebîülâhir 1278 (25 October 1861); Amasya-A.MKT.UM 516/42, 25 Rebîülâhir 1278 (30 October 1861); Cyprus-A.MKT.UM 517/9, 25 Rebîülâhir 1278 (30 October 1861); Urfa-A.MKT.UM 551/34, 11 Cemâziyelevvel 1278 (14 November 1861).

[1329] Some of these documents include Ş.D. 2396/21, 8 Şevval 1288 (21 December 1871); Ş.D. 2864/24, 21 Zilkade 1288 (1 February 1872); MF.MKT 2/69, 26 Rebîülâhir 1289 (3 July 1872).

[1330] Ş.D. 2079/18, 10 Rebîülevvel 1288 (30 May 1871).

5.3.2 The printing of *Eczâ-i Şerîfe*

In secondary scholarship, the dissemination of the thirty divisions of the Qur'an known as *Eczâ-i Şerîfe* is seldom separated from the dissemination of the Qur'an.[1331] This is also true for Brett Wilson, who acknowledges *Eczâ-i Şerîfe* as a separate category, but does not draw a distinction in their pattern of dissemination throughout the empire.[1332] In archival documents, too, these individual verses are frequently mentioned together with the entire Qur'an, but there are also cases where they appear to be individually named and printed. Pursuing these individual cases through the broader lens of this dissertation would serve to contribute to our understanding of human agency driving the trafficking of illicit books in the Ottoman context.

Used as props to facilitate the learning of the Qur'an, there was increasing demand for these verses such as *Amme* and *Tebâreke* for the expanding network of the new schools towards the mid-nineteenth century. Since *Eczâ-i Şerîfe* were part of the Qur'an, they were subjected to the same concerns as the printing of the Qur'an itself. The recipient of state officials while declaring bans was a diverse group of agents involving the contractors, booksellers and printers. These agents were placed to take advantage of any commercial opportunity as the fickle, commerce-savy and unrepenting agents of what was termed in Chapter Two as the "early-commercialization" of the printing establishment between 1840-1863. Already in 1819, printed *En'âm-ı Şerîf*[1333] and *Amme cüzü* had taken their place among the books of Sahaf Hafız Süleyman Efendi b. Halil, as the probate records reveal.

[1331] The probate records attest to their popularity among booksellers, identified as "*eczâ-i Mushaf-ı şerîf*" or "*cüz evrâkı*" at the turn of the nineteenth century, as documented by Ismail Erünsal. Erünsal, *Osmanlılarda Sahaflık ve Sahaflar*, 162.

[1332] Wilson, 54-70.

[1333] *En'âm-ı Şerîf* is a prayer book consisting of *Surah al-An'am,* the sixth chapter of the Qur'an and occasionally a selection of others. Alexander Bain, however, has mistakenly claimed that there was no printed edition of *En'âm-ı Şerîf* in the nineteenth century. See Alexandra Bain, "The Late Ottoman *En'âm-ı şerîf:* Sacred Text and images in an Islamic prayer book*"* (PhD diss., University of Victoria, 1999), 49.

Similarly, in 1823, the record of Sahaf Seyyid Mustafa Efendi revealed many printed verses.[1334] The discrepancy between policy and practice had already initiated a contested space between the Imperial Press and private actors.[1335]

Similar to the Qur'ans, the pace of the dissemination of the Qur'anic verses also intensified after the 1860s.[1336] The repeated warnings were a sign that the state was not able to control this trafficking. The provinces had especially become a significant market for these illicit texts. For instance, *Amme, Tebâreke* and *Qad Samea*[1337] verses (*surahs)*, reported to have been printed in 1860 at the lithographic press carried by the head of land registers (*tahrîr reisi),* Tevfik Bey, to Ioannina, were prohibited by the Ministry of Public Education.[1338] 21 copies of *Eczâ* were caught in Sinop along with 54 Qur'ans in 1861.[1339] The students were once again central to this trade; 700 copies of Qur'ans and Qur'anic verses were discovered in the hands of students in Niksar in 1861.[1340] Facing a conundrum over what to do with so many illicit copies, the state officials were once again sensitive about not simply confiscating the books from the owners. Since paying for them would also be too expensive, the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances ultimately opted for letting them keep the printed copies for this one time. The case served as yet another

---

[1334] Erünsal, *Osmanlılarda Sahaflık ve Sahaflar*, 164.
[1335] In the context of Bombay, Nile Green argues that the printing of what he calls "scripture portions" was commonplace in the 1840s onwards, especially as a reaction to the introduction of the Christian missionaries printing vast numbers of Bible portions. Nile Green, *The Religious Economy of the West Indian Ocean, 1840-1915* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Pres, 2011), 99.
[1336] A.MKT.NZD 372/82, 9 Rebîülâhir 1278 (14 October 1861); A.MKT.MHM 236/27, 19 Rebîülevvel 1278 (24 September 1861).
[1337] *Qad Samea'* is the 28th chapter of the Qur'an, also known as "*Mücâdele"*.
[1338] A.MKT.MHM 195/49, 4 Safer 1277 (22 August 1860); A.MKT.NZD 325/38, 8 Safer 1277 (26 August 1860).
[1339] A.MKT.NZD 345/85, 28 Şaban 1277 (11 March 1861).
[1340] MVL 613/46, 11 Rebîülevvel 1278 (16 September 1861): *"fi'l-hakîka bazı mekâtib ile muhâcirin etfâllerinde yedlerinde bulunanların tebdîliyle sâirlerinin alâ-hâlihî terki tecvîz olunamayağından ve kâffesinin tebdîli dahi haylice akçeye mütevakkıf idiğinden meclis-i vâlâları kararı vechile mezkûr Mesâhif ve Eczâ-i Şerîfenin bi'z-zarûre alâ-hâlihî terkiyle…"*

precedent for further warnings to customs officials to refrain from permitting the entrance of such printed books into Ottoman territories.

Apparently, the official permission for the printing and dissemination of the Qur'anic verses would precede the permission for the printing of the Qur'an in 1872. It could be related to the accumulation of these illicit copies that led to the softening of lines at state level. It could also signify the level of confusion among the state dignitaries as to proper conduct. But in 1863, a notice from the Council of Public Education noted that 1000 copies of the printed *Amme, Tebâreke* and *Qad Samea* would be sent to the elementary (*sıbyan*) schools in Sivas.[1341] There was more context provided in the description of yet another dispatch of the printed copies of *Eczâ-i Kur'âniyye,* this time to Tiran and İlbasan villages in 1865. The Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances explained that the ignorance of the residents about the creeds of Islam was due to the lack of mosques, schools and properly trained preachers about the rules of Islam (*şerâit-i İslâmiye)*. Together with the appointment of teachers, the printed *Eczâ-i Şerîfe* would be sent in order to save the locals from ignorance about Islam.[1342] We would see more of similar cases where printed *Amme* and *Tebâreke* would be sent to schools in the Balkans such as Skodra in 1865.[1343] Moreover, in 1868, the officials would prepare a special spot (*mahal-i mahsûs*) to print them, probably due to the previously discussed religious considerations.[1344]

[1341] MF.MKT 2/51, 25 Şevval 1279 (15 April 1863).
[1342] MVL 1016/99, 15 Rebîülevvel 1282 (8 August 1865). İlbasan and Tiran were historically known for their large Bektashi adherents. The dispatch of the Qur'anic verses to this region could insinuate the Ottoman efforts to sunnitize them. Varol, *Islahat, Siyaset, Tarikat,* 69.
[1343] MVL 1010/33, 16 Zilkade 1281 (12 April 1865).
[1344] A. MKT. MHM 427/14, 4 Şaban 1285 (20 November 1868). The dissemination of the printed Qur'anic verses, in this light, can be perceived as part of the wider project of Ottoman Sunnitization.

Moreover, after the 1870s, the Ministry of Public Education would send numerous printed copies to the newly founded schools in the provinces[1345].

5.3.3 Illicit networking of *Eczâ-i Şerîfe* in Istanbul: a case study

Clearly, the Ottoman state mechanisms were caught in a tough position between permitting and forbidding of the printing and the dissemination of the Qur'anic verses right around 1863. A series of case studies around this date unearth this ambiguity and contradiction between discourse and practice as clear in the course of the tracking and handling of different agents.

The state officials pursued an operation that tied together people who did not necessarily act in coordination. Different actors comprised of printing house owners, printers, apprentices, calligraphers, booksellers, students, merchants and even state officials, came to navigate an astounding trafficking network that extended from the unauthorized printing presses in the intricate khans of Istanbul to the Armenian hospital, from the rented rooms in Galata to state institutions including the Imperial Band (*Musika-i Hümâyun*) and the Imperial Arsenal Sapper Regiments (*İstihkâm Alayları*). The process by which the collective operations of a small clique of actors, Ottoman Muslims, Ottoman non-Muslims, and foreigners connected to one another through a network of commissioning, producing and selling, reflected the intricate details and narrative of a complex illicit book enterprise in the mid-nineteenth century Istanbul.

[1345] Some of the examples include: İ. MTZ. GR 13/427, 7 Cemâziyelevvel 1288 (25 July 1871); MF. MKT 5/152, 3 Şaban 1289 (6 October 1872); MF. MKT 13/108, 17 Şaban 1290 (10 October 1873); MF. MKT 14/100, 7 Şevval 1290 (28 November 1873).

To start with an earlier case from 1856, we find the alliance of the bookseller Mısrî Mustafa [1346] and the trustee (*kayyım)* of Yeni Cami, Abdi Efendi to sell the *Amme* and *Tebâreke* they commissioned at the presses of Kör Muhiddin in Kasımpaşa and Maltalı Federiko in Kalekapısı. The two printers should be familiar from the discussion of the alliance between Muslim and foreign printers in Chapter Two. When caught by the Ottoman officials, all parties other than Muhiddin were immediately acquitted; as a foreigner, Federiko was excused on the grounds that he did not know the texts were forbidden. Abdi and Mustafa, on the other hand, had intended to exchange the books and apparently, trade was not a crime. Muhiddin, on the other hand, would be sent on exile to Izmir, because as a Muslim, he had printed impermissible texts on purpose. He would also have to promise to never again print such Qur'anic verses at any place than the Imperial Press.[1347] Two important points arise here: one is the fact that their religion made a difference in terms of punishment in the case of impermissible Islamic texts. Second, it appears that the state officials did not have a problem with the printing of Qur'anic verses as a rule, as long as the printer was the Imperial Press. Just two months before the declaration of the 1857 printing regulation that legitimized the private printers, the Ottoman state had singled out the central Ottoman printing enterprise as the only location for the printing of religious texts.

To complicate this picture even more, a mind-blowingly wide network that operated around Mercan in Istanbul in the late 1850s and early 1860s was revealed

[1346] Mısrî or 'Mısırlı' Mustafa Efendi showed up among the booksellers named by Bianchi in his list of books printed in the Ottoman Empire in 1859. Accordingly, he sold *Billur Azim* on the sacred battles and conquests of Caliph Ali for 25 kuruş. He also sold Katip Çelebi's *Keşfü'z-zünûn* that was printed in Egypt for 620 kuruş. See M. Bianchi, "Bibliographie Ottomane ou Notice des Ouvrages Publies,' *Journal Asiatique*, seri V, XVI (October-November 1860): 327.

[1347] A.MKT.MVL 89/46, 4 Cemâziyelevvel 1273 (31 December 1856); A.MKT.MHM 101/46, 13 Rebîülevvel 1273 (11 November 1856). We can see that Muhiddin would not learn from his "mistakes", as there are other archival documents attesting to his role as an illicit printer into 1872. See Ş.D. 205/36, 22 Zilhicce 1288 (3 March 1872).

by the report of a madrasa student to the office of the Şeyhülislam *(Meşîhat)* in 1862. The report was directed for further investigation to the Grand Vizierate, the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances, the Council of Public Education and the Police (*zabtiye*). Hüseyin Efendi, a member of the Council of Public Education, was appointed to conduct the interrogations and the testimonies of the suspects revealed further networks. Before the verdict was finalized in 1863, more than 82,000 copies of the verses of *Amme, Tebâreke* and *En'âm-ı Şerîf* were tracked down after questioning over twenty-five individuals and three state institutions.

What may be described as "the domino effect" was initiated when a student at Kalenderhane madrasa, Beşir Efendi encountered a page from *Delâil-i Şerîf* printed on a scrap of paper that a grocer had used to wrap around a piece of cheese.[1348] Feeling obliged to investigate the case, he questioned the grocer, who claimed to be illiterate and provided Beşir Efendi with more waste paper including *Mevlid-i Şerîf, En'âm-ı Şerîf* and other parts from the Qur'an brought to him by a tall, dark Armenian. One piece of paper printed with parts of *Mevlid-i Şerîf* bore the mark of the printer Hocazâde Rıza Efendi. When Beşir Efendi went to the coffeehouse across from the market to make further inquiries, he heard from printers identified as Zenci Abdülbaki and Halil Efendi that they had co-printed some books with Rıza Efendi, who was also a teacher (*müderris)* and drafter (*müsevvid*) at the Fetvahane, in the coffeehouse of Dilsiz at Acemoğlu square in Bayezid. It is no surprise that the coffeehouse served as the first source of his information; often times in the document

[1348] MVL 857/4, 2 Rebîülevvel 1280 (17 August 1863). The use of printed religious texts as waste paper in groceries must have been a common practice as Ahmed Cevdet Paşa also noted. He noted that this practice was indeed very disrespectful and setemmed from the illicit printing practices of portions of the Qur'an. Ahmed Cevdet, *Tezâkir 40-Tetimme,* 128.

there would be reference to having "received the news" (*haber almak*), which relates to the anonymous network of rumors that served as a major news source.[1349]

With the help of this oral network, Beşir Efendi and his friend Tokatlı Mehmed Efendi, another student the Darülhadis madrasa, embarked on their own detective work and decided to pay a visit to Hocazâde Rıza Efendi's printing house in Mercan, Evveli Çıkmaz Khan. Another resident at this khan, the Armenian Pabuççu Agop showed them the coal cellar, where they located evidence for the printing of *Amme* on lithographic stone.[1350] They then alerted *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire* officials, who directed them to the Council of General Education. Thus the first network involved two madrasa students in pursuit of three printers through a grocer and two Armenian intermediaries at a market, a coffeehouse and a khan.

The case was next taken up by a member of the Council of Public Education, İsmail[1351], who began the systematic interrogation of all the suspects and moved from one network to another. The aim was clearly to get hold of as many suspects as possible. He first located Hocazâde Rıza Efendi, who later confessed to have teamed up with the printers Mehmed and Abdülbaki, his apprentice Osep and the calligraphers, Abdülhalim and Mehmed Raşid to print 3500 copies of illicit Qur'anic verses. The person who bought most of his printed books was Bekir Efendi, probably

[1349] The available literature reveals that the coffeehouses had an important function in the various social networks manifest in the everyday practices of ordinary people; they served as a crossroads of various oral networks and rumor. Cengiz Kırlı, *Sultan ve Kamuoyu: Osmanlı Modernleşme Sürecinde 'Havadis Jurnalleri' (1840-1844)* (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2008).
[1350] I have located one book printed in the name of Hocazâde Rıza Efendi in 1860. Hüseyin Şakir, *Ferâsetü'l-hikemiye fî kıyafeti İnsaniye*, (İstanbul: Hocazâde Rıza Efendi litografyası, 1276).
[1351] This is probably Mühürzâde İsmail Hakkı Efendi (d. 1863), who rose through the ranks of civil bureaucracy and served in various councils of the Tanzimat including the Supreme Council in 1844. See *Salâame-i Devlet-i Aliyye-i Osmâniyye, Sene 1278* (İstanbul: Darü't-Tıbâ'ati'l-Âmire, 1278), 40; *Salnâme-i Devlet-i Aliyye-i Osmâniyye, Sene 1279* (İstanbul: Darü't-Tıbâ'ati'l-Âmire, 1279), 117; Mehmed Süreyya, *Sicill-i Osmani* (İstanbul: Sebil Yayınevi, 1995), 369-370.

Bosnalı Bekir Efendi who is identified in a later document as a student at Hakim Çelebi madrasa in Koska confessing to trading these illicit copies.[1352]

We can tell from this document early on that the staff of a private printer, despite varying according to the size of the enterprise, depended on coordination between at least four people; two printers, one or two calligraphers, an apprentice and the owner of the press, who also acted as a printer, bookseller and a contractor when necessary. The role of the calligrapher was especially important as he transcribed the letters on a lithographic stone through a special paper (*eczâlı kağıt).*[1353] The term "consortium" as employed by Kathryn Schwartz with respect to a group of lithographic press in Cairo during the 1850s and 1860s may also be utilized to describe the fluid nature of the members circulating "between the industries of manuscript and print".[1354]

The interrogations got more interesting, when it was revealed that the Minister of Public Education, Kemal Efendi had commissioned Rıza Usta (a different person from the Rıza mentioned above) from *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire* around 1861 to print 4000 copies of *Amme* and *Tebâreke* at the press of Valide Mektebi. [1355] The calligrapher Kanbur Ahmed İlhami testified to having written the texts. He had also printed an extra 200 copies for İsmail Efendi, the *kapıçuhadarı* of the Council of Public Education, who did not pay half his due debt. Six lithographic stones with Qur'an and *Eczâ-i şerîfe* written on them, which belonged to Hocazâde Rıza Efendi, were discovered in Malatyalı Osman Efendi's room in Pastırmacıhan, from where

[1352] MVL 857/4, 2 Rebîülevvel 1280 (17 August 1863).
[1353] MVL 857/4, 2 Rebîülevvel 1280 (17 August 1863).
[1354] Schwartz, "Meaningful Mediums," 261.
[1355] "Rıza" mentioned here was different that the former Hocazâde Rıza Efendi. Due to his partnership with Aşir Efendi, we may identify him as Hafız Ali Rıza Efendi, who had been dismissed from his job at *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire* in 1852 because of his inappropriate acts. See Chapter Two. Alternatively, he can be Rıza Aga, the *kapıçuhadarı* of *Takvîmhâne-i Âmire* in 1856. He had resigned at this time due to his old age. See İ.MVL 375/16452, 26 Receb 1273.

they were taken to Deli Muhammed's room, where two extra stones with *Tebâreke* and *En'âm* were written.[1356]

In addition to Kemal Efendi, the former deputy Minister of Public Education, Hayrullah Efendi had officially commissioned and licensed Aşir Efendi, one of the early lithographers at the Imperial Press, to print 2400 copies of *Eczâ* sometime around 1848. He had been allowed to keep half of the profit. Apparently, as the demand for such texts mounted with the rise in the number of schools and the Imperial Press could not keep up with printing, they had opted to outsource the production. The problem here was that the printing of these texts was not yet officially allowed; hence the high-ranking state dignitaries happened to be in the same network as individual printers who easily turned to illicit printing practices to make a living. Hence in the year 1861, many high state dignitaries pioneered the printing of the Qur'anic verses, which at the time, apparently had not been authorized by the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances. Clearly, definitions of "licit" and "illicit" were blurry and changing rather quickly according to the economic, social and political concerns and needs of the Ottoman state.[1357]

Further examples of this blurred boundary between state and private agents also moved in the opposite direction whereby the private contractors manipulated the state presses for illicit printing. Archival documents testify that already in 1852, the presses affiliated closely with the Ottoman state such as the Military School and the Medical School had been printing unauthorized Islamic books *(kütüb ve resâil-i İslâmiye)* just as Cerîde-i Havâdis and the foreign printers in Galata.[1358] In 1863, traders and booksellers such as the *müezzin* of Yeni Cami, Salih Efendi[1359], Hacı

[1356] MVL 857/4, 2 Rebîülevvel 1280 (17 August 1863).
[1357] MVL 857/4, 2 Rebîülevvel 1280 (17 August 1863).
[1358] İ.MVL 233/8097, 29 Rebîülevvel 1268 (22 January 1852).
[1359] He commissioned 4000 copies of *En'âm* to be printed at the Sappers Regimens.

Mustafa Efendi, a student at Küçük Ayasofya madrasa, Ali Efendi[1360] and a resident of Otakçı Han in Sultan Bayezıd, Alaiyyeli Ali Efendi[1361] commissioned the official press at the Sapper Regiments (*İstihkâm Alayları)* to print thousands of illicit copies of the Qur'anic verses. They also commissioned copies at the Imperial Band *(Musika-i Humâyun)*. Hence despite the hardening lines on the illicit nature of certain texts, official institutions aside from the Imperial Press continued to meet private demand under what they considered to be "private trade" (*ticâret-i mahsûsa*).[1362]

Another major network revolved around Sahaf Uncu Halil Efendi, who ran a printing press at his house in Sarıgüzel as well as commissioning books at other printers in addition to his other lines of work.[1363] Resolute in the claim that he would never print anything illicit, he also initially denied his role in this market. Yet his brother Hacı Ali Efendi confessed to having printed *Amme* and *Tebâreke* at their own printing house with the calligraphy of Eyüplü Mustafa Efendi as well as commissioning another thousand copies of *En'âm* to be printed at Boşnak Hacı Ali Efendi's press in Deveoğlu Han in 1857 with the calligraphy of Abdülhalim, who had originally belonged to the network of Hocazâde Rıza Efendi. The copies were sold to schools and students alike. Hacı Ali Efendi had given 200 copies, for instance, to the madrasa student İştipli Mehmed Efendi for him to sell. Sahaf Halil's son, Arif Efendi revealed a further link that this group had with another network.[1364] Arif testified that he had helped Rupen, the Armenian, to fix the lithographic stone and get new lithographic paper for the printing press of the Armenian hospital. All suspected

[1360] Ali Efendi commissioned 5000 copies of *Amme* and 3000 copies of *Tebâreke* at the Sappers Regimens.
[1361] Alaiyevî Ali Efendi has his own name in the colophons of some books after 1861. He seems to have acquired permission by then and become a legal partner. Jale Baysal, *Müteferika'dan Birinci Meşrutiyet'e Kadar Osmanlı Türklerinin Bastıkları Kitaplar* (İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1968), 49.
[1362] MVL 857/4, 2 Rebîülevvel 1280 (17 August 1863).
[1363] Refer to Chapter Two for further details on Sahaf Uncu Halil Efendi.
[1364] There is indeed a book printed under Arif Efendi's name, *Cevâhirü'l-İslâm* in 1857/1273.

locations were searched by the Ottoman officials; Uncu Halil's press, his house in Eyüp and its garden, Hacı Ali's house and printer Muhiddin's house, but nothing related to *Eczâ* was found.

Hereby the path to an Armenian network was illuminated. It centered on the editor of the Armenian newspaper, Hoca Andon, who had sent Rupen to Sahaf Halil Efendi in the first place in order to get technical help on his printing material. Not only Arif but also Muhiddin Efendi, probably the same Kör Muhiddin from 1856, had been associated with Hoca Andon in terms of technical assistance. Muhiddin Efendi had a network consisting of Baba İsmail, Tombul Mustafa, the apprentice Osman and the aforementioned calligrapher Eyüplü Mustafa Efendi. Aside from allying with both Uncu Sahaf Hacı Halil and Rupen the Armenian, he confessed to having printed 3000 copies of Qur'anic verses. He and Rupen together identified Sahaf Halil Efendi as the central figure regulating the supply of paper, stone and staff.

Hoca Andon was linked to Artin, Bedros, Maruke and Aya in addition to Rupen at the Armenian press in the hospital.[1365] Rupen was the one who gave Hoca Andon away with his testimony. Andon had sent Rupen to Istanbul Ağası khan in Yorgancılar to get special paper (*eczâlı kâğıt)* from Sahaf Halil's son, Arif in Sarıgüzel. Andon, on the other hand, denied all accusations and even argued that Rupen and the rest of his staff had printed the texts in his absence as evidenced by the broken door to his press. The Ottoman officials contacted the Armenian Patriarchy for further inquiries about the printing press in the hospital. Upon the discovery of the two lithographic stones, Andon was dismissed from his job.

[1365] This hospital is Yedikule Surp Pirgiç Hospital established in 1834. In 1859, the hospital bought the presses of Arabyan to start printing the calendar of the hospital. It was then rented out and shut down. See Nuran Yıldırım, "Surp Pırgiç Ermeni Hastanesi" in *Zeytinburnu Kültür Vadisi* (Istanbul: Zeytinburnu Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2018), 687.

Alaiyyeli Ali Efendi deserves special attention because of the 47,000 copies of *Amme, En'âm* and *Tebâreke* he commissioned at many presses including Sappers Regimens and Maltızlı Federiko. He appears that in addition to being a printer himself, he was also a merchant with a significant volume of illicit books in circulation.[1366] The Ottoman official, however, noted that he had previously been detained at the customs office due to his attempts to sell printed verses of the Qur'an outside of Istanbul. He had been "strictly" warned by the Ministry of Public Education not to repeat his offense. His name was further mentioned in another line of interrogation for having sold *Amme and Tebâreke* to Mümeyyizzâde Ata Efendi, who, in turn, had allegedly left seventeen copies with Çolak Hasan Efendi located at the madrasa in Fatih.[1367]

Moreover, the only foreign printer mentioned in his statement was Maltızlı Federiko, whose press was located on the street of Mevlevîhâne in Beyoğlu. He had been in the printing business of Istanbul since 1845, printing passports and *tezkires* but probably after the declaration of the 1857 printing regulation, he had applied for an license *(ruhsatnâme)* via his embassy. He had even visited the deputy Minister of Public Education fifteen times without success.[1368] Because of the delay, he had been advised by the translator of his consulate to start printing came out. Since the Islamic texts he printed had already been printed, he reasoned that he could not have known the practice was illegal. The texts under interrogation, namely *Mızraklı İlmihâl, Kerem ve Âşık Garip Hikâyeleri* and *Şarkı mecmû'ası,* were fetched by the police of Beyoğlu (*Beyoğlu zabıtası*).

[1366] See Chapter Two for a more detailed contextualization of Alaiyyeli Ali Efendi.
[1367] MVL 857/4, 2 Rebîülevvel 1280 (17 August 1863).
[1368] The presses operated by the foreign residents of the Ottoman Empire had to register their presses within the six months of the promulgation of 1857 printing regulation. Refer to Chapter Two for further details on both Federiko and the 1857 regulation.

Eventually, the line of inquiry uncovered a variety of actors many of whom appeared to know each other. Every person İsmail Efendi interrogated illuminated some other network for the authorities. Each arrest generated its own file, full of information on locations, numbers and names that underlined the extent of the trafficking.[1369] This fascinating trafficking operation revealed not only the illicit textual and physical remains such as the lithographic stones but also a wide variety of agents who moved seamlessly from one network to another. The dual role of the private press agents became clear: while on the one hand they took on the role of printers for contractors that included the state officials, on the other hand, they themselves acted as contractors for the printing of books at these state institutions. The traffic was clearly two-ways also in terms of state involvement. Moreover, there were many other transitions of roles: between a contractor and a printer, a state official and an illicit text broker, a member of the ulama and an agent of illicit printing or that between a merchant, a bookseller and a printer.

At the end of this long investigation of the network of people involved in the illicit trade of *Eczâ-i Şerîfe,* all parties including the printers, the traders, the masters and the apprentices and the calligraphers were taken under custody. Some of them had printed the texts, some had them printed, some had acted as intermediaries, but most had acted in this way due to their lack of knowledge on the ban. The recognition of the "lack of knowledge" as a valid mitigating reason by the state was itself proof of the state's recognition of its lack of consistent and authoritative control of the illicit book market. Similar to the case from 1856, the selling of such books was not subjected to any punishment. Again, being a foreign subject was found to be

[1369] I find Robert Darnton's analysis of networks of printing particularly relevant. Robert Darnton, *Poetry and Police: Communication Networks in Eighteenth Century Paris* (London, Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2010).

a good enough reason to evade responsibility. In between 1856 and 1863, however, the 1857 printing regulation had been issued, stipulating the conditions for printing as well as the 1858 penal code. As Anscombe has described, in this period, there was "an obvious preference for resolution of problem over harshness of retribution, an absolute continuity with sharia."[1370] In most cases, punishments came out less harsh than the pre-Tanzimat practices. Comparatively, the penal codes on theft were more established than the penal laws on book printing and illicit trading. From 1862 onwards, it would be common to find the accused be punished with penal servitude *(kürek)*.[1371]

In this case, too, despite the new legal code, the punishment remained minimal even after the discovery of such an extensive network of participants in the illicit trafficking. In this case as well, the authorities chose "not to apply punishment as required by the law" (*hükm-i kanûnun icrâsına gidilmeyerek)*, and the uncovered agents were all bailed out with the exception of two. Due to their repeated violation of warnings by state officials, it was only Hocazâde Rıza Efendi, who was apparently from among the *müderrisîn* and *müsevvid* of the office of the Şeyhülislam, and Alaiyyeli Ali Efendi, also of the *ilmiyye* rank, who were punished. Their presses were closed, and they were fined ten pieces of gold each. A later notice, however, dated 1864/65, sentenced them to a fine of five *beyaz beşlik* which doubled to ten *beyaz beşlik* according to the law due to their denial of guilt. Serasker Paşa was

[1370] Anscombe*, State, Faith and Nation,* 102-103.
[1371] The lithographer Konyalı Mehmed Efendi had been punished with 15 years of *kürek* because of his involvement in buying stolen books. The punishment was then decreased by 12 years! MVL 836/53, 11 Şaban 1276 (4 March 1860); MVL 413/15, 7 Rebîülevvel 1279 (2 September 1862). In another incident of book theft, the book-binder Kirkok had been sentenced to four years of *kürek* in the arsenal due to his theft of Kitapçı Halil Efendi's 100 volumes of books from his book shop in İstanbul Ağa khan. The reference was to the 19th article of the penal code. MVL 846/61, 26 Receb 1278 (27 January 1862).

warned not to allow any other state institutions such as the Imperial Band and the Sappers Regiments to publish such books again.[1372]

A similarly mild attitude was exhibited when dealing with the Qur'anic verses that had been confiscated as illicit. Instead of the strict measures that would be adopted after the 1870s, the Ottoman officials struggled to find ways to compensate for the confiscated texts. For instance, Emir Salih, an immigrant from Bahçesaray, Crimea in 1863, had brought with him thirty copies of the Qur'an and 126 copies of *Amme*, both of which he had acquired in Bahçesaray in exchange for the land he owned. They were seized at customs and he was in a dire situation. Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances decided that while the books could not be returned to him, he had to be compensated for their worth.[1373]

In the light of these cases, it is possible to once again argue that the printing regulations on the verses of the Qur'an between 1831-1865 were experimental, ambiguous and inconsistent. The regulations reflected the relationship between the Imperial Press and the individual private presses as one of contestation and negotiation. These agents remained connected to one another through the network of commissioning, producing and selling. The understanding of individual actors and networks involved in the illicit trafficking of religious books will contribute to our understanding of the development of print culture as a whole of mid-nineteenth century in Istanbul.

[1372] MVL 857/4, 5 Zilhicce 1281 (1 May 1865).
[1373] İ.MVL 484/21939, 4 Zilkade 1279 (23 April 1863). Brett Wilson also referred to this incident in his book.

5.4 Conclusion

This chapter has attempted to understand the management of various cases of illicit book trafficking with a focus on especially religious texts illicitly printed in or smuggled into the Ottoman lands. The motive for increased surveillance of the printing of religious books was to reserve the monopoly for the Imperial Press. It depended on both financial and ideological reasons.

Meanwhile, these cases have demonstrated the agency of not just the Ottoman state as the top of socio-political hierarchy but also of numerous individual actors. The friction in these relations, as illuminated also through the micro cases, has rendered the Ottoman strategies ad hoc and flexible, varying according to the nature of the exact text in question, its target audience and its estimated impact. Overall, this chapter has demonstrated that the printed book did not only signify an efficient means of disseminating idealized images of state to the desired audience. The printed book, for all its advantages and benefits, also posed risks to Ottoman legitimacy and influence throughout the empire, if fall in the “wrong hands”.

CHAPTER 6

EPILOGUE: A BROADER PERSPECTIVE ON OTTOMAN PRINT CULTURE

When Necib Asım (d. 1935), an Ottoman soldier, statesman, historian and lover of books, wrote his *Kitâb* in 1893, he described the "book" from various angles without a chronological or thematic order.[1374] He switched from the history of the book to its contemporary status and from the manuscript to the printed form. He lived in a time when manuscript culture was still flourishing, as he narrated buying manuscripts from the booksellers with ease. Nevertheless, he was in a position to assess the ascendancy of the printed book; he explained it with reference to either the rarity of texts or the popular demand for them. He was also quite conscious of the physical transformation of the book; he historicized, for instance, the development of the title page and pagination to his own time. More importantly, he reflected on the transformation of the book in a book, a rare move for his time.

Indeed, the history of the book has gone through many stages until our day, starting with oral culture and extending to the hand-copied, the printed and finally the digital book. Textual transitions, however, are not linear, and one form does not replace the other. Instead, they seem to have existed in concentric circles well into the nineteenth century.[1375] Recent scholarship has suggested that "the age of the great divides" between orality and literacy and between the manuscript and the printed book is over.[1376] The juncture of all these different forms in the Ottoman context, however, is most visible in the first half of the nineteenth century, which this

[1374] Necib Asım, *Kitâb* (Konstantiniyye: Matba'a-i Safâ ve Enver, 1311).
[1375] New scholarship has argued that print also increased scribal production by providing new opportunities for its expansion. See Aileen Douglas, *Work in Hand: Script, Print and Writing, 1690-1840* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017).
[1376] Graff, *The Legacies of Literacy,* 108.

dissertation has defined as "the second formation of the printing enterprise." While orality and the manuscript forms of the book did not constitute the central narrative, many examples of these "concentric circles" can be found: for instance, there were paid employees of the Ottoman state who continued to read out loud Buhâri's *Sahîh* (*Buhâri-i şerîf cüzhanlık*)[1377] or Süleyman Çelebi's *Mevlid* (*mevlidhân*)[1378] at public gatherings. There are still scholars such as Reinhard Schulze, who argue that after the 1840s, a text was deemed valuable only if it was printed; after that point, he thought that the thousands of manuscripts receded back as the "obsolete tradition from which the ahistorical, timeless originality of important texts needed to be distinguished."[1379] Various catalogues, however, attest to the continued significance of manuscript copying for the Ottoman scholarly tradition also in the nineteenth century.[1380]

When Elizabeth Eisenstein singled out the printing press as the major force behind the intellectual movements of early modern Europe, she emphasized the three features of print culture: fixity, standardization, and dissemination.[1381] Among the various objections to her argument, two strands have been particularly consequential to this day. One strand underlined the continuities with the manuscript culture, and the other challenged these qualities, which had been unduly taken as "inherent" to the printed book. While the first line of scholarship tried to establish those aspects of print culture that resonated with and even continued from manuscript culture, the second group questioned the major assumptions and argued for the "constructed" nature of the printed book.

[1377] A.MKT.MHM 129/16, 18 Rebîülevvel 1274 (6 November 1857).
[1378] İ.DH 496/33693, 13 Rebîülevvel 1279 (8 September 1862); A.MKT 68/16, 6 Rebîülevvel 1263 (22 February 1847).
[1379] Reinhard Schulze, "The Birth of Tradition and Modernity in the 18th and 19th century Islamic Culture: The Case of Printing," *Culture and History* 16 (1997): 29-72.
[1380] See various catalogues edited by Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu et al; *Osmanlı Matematik Literatürü Tarihi* (Vol. 1-2), *Osmanlı Coğrafya Literatürü Tarihi* (Vol. 1-2), *Osmanlı Askerlik Literatürü Tarihi* (Vol. 1-2), *Osmanlı Astronomi Literatürü Tarihi* (Vol. 1-2).
[1381] Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change,* 43-162.

Placing both strands of critical scholarship into the Ottoman context, one can expand the limits of a discussion revolving around mainly the Western intellectual sphere. The preliminary findings of this dissertation can serve, though not systematically, to illuminate some concepts. The parallels between the manuscript and the printed book are visible also in the Ottoman book culture. In terms of their appearance, the printed book resembled the manuscript so much that one modern scholar has identified the early editions of İbrahim Müteferrika as "printed manuscripts."[1382] In fact, İbrahim Müteferrika produced a fusion of different elements from both of these visual cultures, one which varied in every book he printed. There are different explanations for this continuity. On the one hand, both Müteferrika and his audience had been raised in a manuscript culture; together with the "strength of inherited tradition," the visual elements were carried to the new platform either naturally or as part of a marketing strategy.[1383] On the other hand, by preserving many elements of the manuscript production, he may have tried to avoid the negative reaction of the scribes and their guilds, who were wary of a potential threat to their trade.[1384]

In any case, the first hundred years of printing in the Ottoman Empire, as in Europe, have been identified by modern scholars as the "incunabula" period.[1385] The books printed in Europe during the fifteenth and the sixteenth centuries would not look familiar to a modern reader; they lacked title pages with information on the author, title, place of publication, publisher, and date, all of which remained in the

[1382] Gencer, "İbrahim Müteferrika."
[1383] Gencer, "İbrahim Müteferrika," 175.
[1384] Gencer, "İbrahim Müteferrika," 180.
[1385] For a review of books on the incanubula of printed books, see Meral Alpay, "Türkçe Basma Kitapların Beşik (Inkunabel) Devri," *Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı / Journal of Art History* (1973): 587-599; Gencer, "İbrahim Müteferrika".

colophons as in manuscripts.[1386] Similarly, the books printed by Müteferrika reflected the visual and functional patterns of the manuscripts including the ornamental headpieces (*serlevha*s), colophons, and catchwords. The catchwords, referring to the single word in the lower left verso side of each page, were inserted in all seventeen books he published. At the same time, there was an evolution of style with every new book.[1387] The transition from hand-painted to printed headpieces appeared only with the ninth book, whereas the ever-present *besmele* (the formula, "in the name of God, the Beneficent and Merciful") was later joined by a title.[1388]

Rather than ending at the end of the eighteenth century, the incunabula continued well into the mid-nineteenth century.[1389] This period also exhibited a high degree of continuities with manuscript culture. The first continuity involved the tradition of collating different texts together; in the manuscript tradition, a *mecmû'a* was a codex of different texts collated by the scribe. Regardless of the length of a text, whether a 700-page classical legal compendium or a single sheet of prayer, this system of collating different texts together in a single volume continued in print, as revealed by many titles within the pool of books printed between 1831 and 1863. As late as the 1870s, even when elements of European print culture were more decisively adopted into Ottoman publishing, this tradition continued, as exemplified in how Faris Al- Shidyaq published a series of Arabic literary classics at his own press.[1390] Moreover, marginalia became as important in print as it was for the

[1386] Graff, 111.
[1387] Gencer, "İbrahim Müteferrika," 166-176.
[1388] Gencer, "İbrahim Müteferrika," 168.
[1389] For further studies on the Ottoman incunabula extending into the nineteenth century, see Hatice Aynur, "Arap Harfli Türkçe Kitaplarda İç Kapağın Gelişimi: 1826-1923," in *Yücel Dağlı Anısına*, ed. Evangelia Balta, Yorgos Dedes, Emin Nedret İşli, and M. Sabri Koz (İstanbul: Turkuaz Yayınları, 2015), 78-101; Mehmet Ali Akkaya, *Türk Beşikdevri Basmalarında Yazma Kitap Geleneğinin Etkileri ve İç Kapağın Gelişimi* (İstanbul: Hiperlink, 2015).
[1390] Geoffrey J. Roper, "Al-Jawaib Press and the Edition and Transmission of Arabic Manuscript Texts in the Nineteenth century," in *Theoretical Approaches to the Transmission and Edition of*

manuscript.[1391] Just as the manuscripts contained additional texts written in the margins of a particular book, a commentary or an entirely different text could be printed in the margins outside of the rectangular frame. Interestingly, even in many printed texts, especially textbooks, one could find hand-written marginalia into the 1860s, pointing to the coexistence of both cultures.[1392]

In printing together, the textual combinations were relatively more predictable in some fields like the Islamic sciences, where canonical works were often printed together with their commentaries. For other genres, the idea seemed like the formation of practical guidebooks. Different prayer books, for instance, were often collated together. Folk stories, especially, appeared alongside similar tales. At the same time, the rather flexible understanding about which texts fit together further complicated the classification of genres. There seems to have been a pragmatic purpose and perhaps a sales strategy behind the printing of certain texts together. Printing together also allowed more texts to enter into wider circulation. Hence what could be recognized as a continuation of manuscript culture in print was adapted to the new context of a commercialized print culture. Moreover, curious as such compilations are, this practice tells us that what nineteenth-century audiences understood from a book was more intertextual and referential than the singular titles associated with modernity.

Oriental Manuscripts, eds. Judith Pfeiffer and Manfed Kropp (Würzburg: Ergon Verlag Würzburg in Kommission, 2007), 237-239.

[1391] For the significance of marginalia in the Ottoman manuscript culture, see Berat Açıl (ed.), *Osmanlı Kitap Kültürü: Cârullah Efendi Kütüphanesi ve Derkenar Notları* (İstanbul: İLEM, 2015); Elif Sezer Aydınlı, "Unusual Readers in Early Modern Istanbul: Manuscript Notes of Janissaries and Other Riff-Raff on Popular Heroic Narratives," *Journal of Islamic Manuscripts* 9, no: 2-3 (2018); Elif Sezer, *The Oral and The Written in Ottoman Literature: The Reader Notes on the Story of Fîrûzşâh* (İstanbul: Libra Yayınevi, 2015).

[1392] See, for instance, İsmail Gelenbevî, *Hâşiye-i Gelenbevî ale'l-Celâl* (İstanbul: Matba'a-i Âmire, 1286).

Another continuity with the manuscript culture consisted of the layout of the printed books. As in a manuscript, the typical pattern for a book printed at the Imperial Press until 1863 was to start on the second page, where the title would be placed under the ornamental headpiece. While there was experimentation with the title page, it would not become standardized until the end of the nineteenth century.[1393] It seems more like a pattern in books of a technical nature to have had separate title pages before the beginning of the text as early as 1836. It was also more likely for a table of contents to precede the text in books designed as textbooks, whether for the new schools, the military, or the madrasas. These tables also represented an element of continuity with the manuscripts. The design of the ornamental headpiece would change from one printing press to the other, and from one genre to the next. A book on the military sciences, for instance, could have the title inserted within a decoration of a canon foundry,[1394] while a poetry book could have flowers.[1395] Yet this pattern was not fixed. *Ameliyât-ı muhâsara*, for instance, printed in 1848/49, had a title page with the design of a battle ship, whereas the first page of the text where *besmele* was inscribed had a floral design.[1396]

Among other continuities was the use of *besmele.* It was present in most of the books, including those on more technical subjects published at the lithographic presses of different venues such as *Bâb-ı Seraskerî* or the Military School. This, however, was not the rule; practical texts such as the military manuals could omit *besmele* and start solely with a title.[1397] Moreover, the name of the author would

[1393] For studies on the development of the title page in the Ottoman printed book culture, see Aynur, "Arap Harfli Türkçe Kitaplarda."; Akkaya, *Türk Beşikdevri Yazma Kitap*.
[1394] Hüsrev Mehmed Paşa, *Top bölüğü ta'lîmi* (İstanbul: unidentified, 1252).
[1395] See, for example, Ahmet Hayati Elbistanî, *Tuhfe Şerhi* (İstanbul: Darü't-Tıbâ'ati's-Sultâniye, 1215).
[1396] Mehmet Selim Paşa, *Ameliyât-ı muhâsara* (İstanbul: İstihkam Alayları Litografya Destgâhı, 1265).
[1397] One example of a text without *besmele* is Hüsrev Mehmed Paşa, *Top bölüğü ta'lîmi*.

most frequently be placed in the first few paragraphs of the text. The printing information, such as the name of the printer, the acknowledgment of the patronage of the reigning sultan, and the date of printing, would be all placed in the colophon.

Similarities were also reflected in the preparation of the book for print. In the manuscript culture, the scribe, after copying a text, often had to check its adherence to the original. The comparing of the manuscripts was called "collation" (*mukâbele*).[1398] Interestingly, this practice turned into a profession also in the printing enterprise: a "collator" (*mukâbeleci*) worked at the Imperial Press.[1399] Moreover, the earliest printed edition of İmam Birgivi's *Risâle-i Birgivî* in 1803/1218 emphasized that it had been prepared through "collation" with a copy made from its autograph available in *Enderûn-i Hümâyun.*[1400] This process reveals that the press officials were equally careful about underlining continuities with manuscript culture, in which the autograph copy was deemed to be the most reliable.

As some traditional aspects of manuscripts were continued until the 1860s, other elements found new contexts. Calligraphers and scribes, who are often presented as the rivals of the printing press because of their fear of losing their trade, paradoxically became the key actors in lithography. Lithographic printing demanded a calligrapher or a scribe to write the text or draw the visuals on a lithographic stone with the help of special equipment. The task was almost identical to manuscript reproduction. The calligrapher or the scribe almost always revealed his own name, and sometimes his real profession as the last bit of information in the colophon.[1401] There were quite a few individuals whose names consistently showed up in books

[1398] Johann Pederson, *The Arabic Book*, trans. Geoffrey French (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 47.
[1399] See, for instance, C. MF 123/6140, Selh-i Safer 1258 (March-April 1842); C. MF 172/8592.
[1400] Muhammed Birgivi, *Risâle-i Birgivî* (İstanbul: Dârü't-Tıbâ'ati'l-Cedîdeti'l-Ma'mûre , 1210).
[1401] For instance, Mehmed Raif Efendi, who had written *Ahidnâme-i İlâhî* in 1855, described his real job as a scribe at a court in İstanbul.

printed by the different presses. This observation reinforces the view that a limited number of technical staff actually circulated between different presses.[1402]

Moreover, scholarly endorsements (*takriz*), which constituted a popular practice in manuscripts, also became a major part of the printed book.[1403] They might have even served as a factor legitimizing the printing of a book in the first place. The more the senior scholars or bureaucrats praised a text, the more its printing would be justified. At least fifty books with endorsements have been identified in this study.[1404] These examples further defy any necessary correlation with genres. One could find endorsements on books of different genres as early as 1797. The case of Kuddusî Musa Efendi, a high-ranking religious scholar, may serve to exemplify how the state officials perceived this link between endorsements and printing. His treatise (*risâle*) had been translated by a member of the Imperial *Divan*, the *beylikçi.* In

[1402] Some of the scribes working for lithographic editions included Bedevî Abdullah Hulusi Mürüftevî, Ahmed Rakım Efendi, Bursevî Halil Şükrü, es-Seyyid Hüseyin Hilmi, Abdullah Zühdi Efendi, Şumnulu Mehmed Vasfi, Muhammed Arif Hilmi, and Harputî Katipzade Yusuf b. Mehmed b. Yusuf.

[1403] For secondary literature on scholarly endorsements, see Guy Burak, *The Second Formation of the Islamic Law: The Hanafi School in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015); Guy Burak, "Sansür, Kanonizasyon ve Osmanlı İmza-Takriz Pratikleri Üzerine Düşünceler," in *Eski Metinlere Yeni Bağlamlar- Osmanlı Edebiyatı Çalışmalarında Yeni Yönelimler (Eski Türk Edebiyatı Çalışmaları X)*, eds. Ali Emre Özyıldırım, Hanife Koncu, Hatice Aynur, Müjgan Çakır, and Selim Sırrı Kuru (Istanbul: Klasik Yayınları, 2015), 96-117; Guy Burak, "Reliable Books: Islamic law, canonization, and manuscripts in the Ottoman Empire (sixteenth to eighteenth century)," in *Canonical Texts and Scholarly Practices: A Global Comparative Approach*, eds. Anthony Grafton and Glenn Most (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 14-33; Christine Woodhead, "Puff and patronage: Ottoman takriz-writing and literacy recommendation in the seventeenth century," in *The Balance of Truth. Essays in Honour of Professor Geoffrey Lewis*, eds. Çiğdem Balim-Harding and Colin Imber (Istanbul: Isis Press, 2000), 395-406; Nagehan Gür, "Sanatı sanatla ihya etme: Osmanlı yönetici elit sınıfının elitleşme çabası ve takriz yazını," *Archivum Ottomanicum* (2016): 165-178; Nagehan Gür, "Klasik Türk Edebiyatında Takriz" (PhD Diss., Balıkesir University, 2014).

[1404] Some include: *Tevessül* (Şeyhülislam Mekki Efendi), *İthâfü'l-udebâ* (Hamedan Efendi); *Dîvân-ı Aynî*; *Kutbi Sirozî Mustafa Efendi's* commentary on *Burhân* (1251); *Emsile-i cedîde* (Mirlivâ İbrahim Paşa, 1263); *Nafi'ü'l-Âsâr* (Andünnafi Efendi, 1267); *en-Nef'u'l-Muavvel* (1279); *Mahzen-i esrâr-ı Şu'arâ* (1273); *Kavâ'id-i Osmâniyye* (1267); *Nuhbetü'l-etfâl* (1269); *Kudsiye* (Şeyh İsmet Efendi, 1274); *Mîzânu'l-adl* (Şinasi, 1275); *Dîvân-ı Eşref* (1277); *Eser-i Şevket* (1268); *İlm-i tabakât-ı arz* (Ali Fethi Efendi, 1269); *Miftâhu'l-fünûn* (Ohannes Efendi, 1277); *Me'debetü'l-Hitân* (Cemaleddin Efendi, 1250); *Kâfiye mu'ribi* (1200); *Delâilü'l-hayrât* (1255); *Nesîmî Dîvânı* /1260); *Ravzatü'l-ahbâb* (1268); *Mehâh-ı miyâh* (1271); *Âdâbu'z-zâkirîn* (1268); *Tuhfetü'ş-Şahan* (1258); *Fatîn Tezkiresi* (1271); *Dîvân-ı Pertev Paşa* (1256); *Bülbülnâme* (1265); *Ravz-ı verd* (1269); *Üss-i zafer* (1243); *Hilyetü'n-Naci* (1250).

1834-35, the sultan responded affirmatively to a demand to have it printed. However, he stated that even though the author was already a high-ranking scholar, the book would have more impact if it contained high praise from other ulama inserted in the form of an endorsement.[1405] In other words, the sultan required the book to be published with an endorsement, which qualitatively differs from its earlier forms, where the author specifically requested other scholars to pen an endorsement that would officially introduce him into scholarly or literary circles. Conversely, the endorsement was deemed a significant part of the printing decisions.[1406] It would become even more integrated into the print culture at the turn of the twentieth century. Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın (b.1875), a journalist as well as a literary and a political figure in the late Ottoman period, noted that to publish a book, one still had to get an approval piece from one of the famous litterateurs of the period in addition to a permit from the Ministry of Education. With a good introductory endorsement, no house could reject the book.[1407]

In addition to many parallel practices observed between the making of a manuscript and a printed book, there were also new elements introduced, which would then evolve into more commercialized forms in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Among these new elements were the errata (*hata-sevab cedveli*), which was a notification of typographic errors together with corrections. It was

[1405] HAT 463/22677, 1245: *"…ulemâdan bir adamın te'lîfi olmak üzere şâyi' olmakdan ise hasbe'l-hâl dersa'âdetlerine heyet-i mecmû'a-i ulemâ taraflarından lisân-ı şer' ile bi't-te'lîf neşri iltimâs olunmuş suretine konulmasında ve taraf-ı fetvâpenâhîden dahi mu'ârız-ı teslîm ve kabülde takrîz olunmasında tesîr başka olacağından…*"
[1406] HAT 464/22754, 1250: "*zikrolunan nüsha-i cedîde ulûm-ı adîde mesâilini câmi' olarak müftü-i mûmâileyh muktezâ-i mezîd-i ilm ü fazileti üzerine güzel te'lîf edip Bağdat ulemâsı taraflarından dahi mu'ârız-ı sitâyişte takrîz kılınmış…*"
[1407] Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın, *Edebiyat Anıları* (Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 1975), 25-26.

placed either at the beginning or at the end of printed texts.[1408] The presence of errata itself speaks to the fact that the book in printed form was not perceived as a fixed text in its final format but was subject to constant change. It also represented the last attempt of the printer to control the reception of the book, as Ann Blair argued for the errata lists of early modern Europe.[1409] Another novelty was the inscription of short blurbs preceding the beginning of the text, where information would be provided about the author of the book and each layer of authority in the chain of transmission such as the commentator or the translator. The blurbs usually contained biographical information about these figures.[1410] As such, they functioned as title pages. Yet biographical information could also be provided in a separate section under the heading "*terceme-i hâl*."[1411]

These observations have largely pointed to the significance of the manuscript tradition in the visual and functional elements of the printed book. The second strand of scholarship in the aftermath of Eisenstein, namely the critique of what has been described as the inherent features of print culture, can also be discussed in the Ottoman context to pose a challenge to the fixity and thus reliability of the printed book. First of all, the manuscripts, by definition, were subject to varying editions. As Walter Andrews has described, a "manuscript" represented the text as the sum total of editions that varied in the process of reproducing or abridging it. As such, texts should not be perceived in isolation from their own history and their own

[1408] Some examples include *Hadîkatü'l-vüzerâ* (1271), *Nazmü'l-cevâhir* (1241), *Eser-i Şevket* (1268), *Makâlât-ı Tıbbiyye* (1259), *Kozmografya Risâlesi* (1273), *Tulumba Risâlesi* (1270), *Endülüs Tarihi* (1276), and *Fetâvâ-yı Feyziye* (1266).
[1409] Ann Blair, "Errata Lists and the Reader as Corrector," in *Agent of Change: Print Culture Studies after Elizabeth L. Eisenstein*, eds. Sabrina Alcorn Baron, Eric N. Lindquist, and Eleanor F. Shevlin (Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts Press, 2007), 21-41.
[1410] See, for instance, *Tuhfetü'ş-Şahan* (1258), *Dîvân-ı Bursevî Kaygulu* (1273), and *Terceme-i Muhtasar-ı Velâye* (1272).
[1411] Some examples include *Dîvân-ı Asım İsmail Efendi* (1268), *Dîvânçe-i Esad Paşa* (1268), and *Dîvân-ı Kethüdazâde Arif* (1271).

transformation in time. They appear as the joint products of the authors, different scribes, commentators, and even marginalia authors.[1412] In the process of transmitting different versions of the same text into a single book, they remained open to being re-organized and printed in differing versions. For instance, *Surah al-Anam* was a popular choice to reproduce in manuscript as early as the thirteenth century. By the sixteenth century, it was listed among the first text to be copied after the Qur'an. Extra Qur'anic texts were added, as were prayers and calligraphic images. By the eighteenth century, the texts were further joined by miniature paintings.[1413]

Even the same author could produce different versions of his own text. Mehmed b. Mehmed er-Rumi, for instance, had four autograph copies of his work, all of which differed from one another. In other words, the author never actually saw the text as one continuous, uninterrupted version, but constantly interfered with his own text to make it better. This intervention was caused by an understanding of the text as unfixed in the first place.[1414] We already know that scribes manipulated autograph copies with deliberate or unconscious acts, but to add the author into this deviation complicates the process further. Which version of the text was the intended final version? No matter what editors might have been trying to prove in their prefaces or in official documents by adhering to the rules of accuracy, textual studies have revealed major discrepancies between the autograph originals and both the manuscript and printed copies.

[1412] Walter Andrews, "Osmanlı Metin Çalışmaları: Geçmişe Meydan Okuma Geleceği Tasarlama," in *Eski Metinlere Yeni Bağlamlar - Osmanlı Edebiyatı Çalışmalarında Yeni Yönelimler (Eski Türk Edebiyatı Çalışmaları X)*, eds. Ali Emre Özyıldırım, Hanife Koncu, Hatice Aynur, Müjgan Çakır, and Selim Sırrı Kuru (Istanbul: Klasik Yayınları), 40.
[1413] Bain, "The late Ottoman *En'âm-ı şerîf*," 164.
[1414] Abdurrahman Sağırlı, "Mehmed b. Mehmed er-Rumi'nin *Nuhbetü't-Tevarih ve'l-Ahbar'ı ve Tarih-i Al-i Osman*'ı" (PhD diss., İstanbul University, 2000).

For these reasons, establishing the reliability of a text had been a real concern within the manuscript culture. For instance, Guy Burak has approached the formation of a canon of "reliable books" by Ottoman religious scholars in the field of jurisprudence, in contrast to the otherwise decentralized mode of manuscript culture.[1415] Similarly, it was the realization that these concerns would perhaps be better addressed with the employment of the printing press in the nineteenth century that led to its increased usage. A few examples can illuminate this insight; in 1834, *Tuhfetü's-sükûk,* which had been compiled by Debbağzade Numan Efendi (d.1809), was prepared for print at the Imperial Press. An official correspondence revealed that this process of preparation included the gathering and comparison of the different accurate copies of the text available, including a reliable copy (*nesh-i sahiha*) that had been kept in the *fetvâhâne*.[1416] Moreover, in the printed version of the book in 1843, the colophon stated that it constituted the most accurate version.[1417] Similarly, when a printed edition of Şeyhizâde Damad Efendi's commentary on *Mültekâ* was announced in *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'*, it was emphasized that the printed edition was based on an autograph copy of the commentator.[1418] The concern to stay true to the autograph copy of the author was evident also in later years. In the 1879 printed edition of *Risâletü'l-kıyas* written by İsmail Gelenbevî, the editor made sure to add a line of confidence stating that it was copied from Gelenbevî's autograph copy of the book.[1419] Interestingly, such statements would usually be placed in the blurb preceding the text, as mentioned above as a novelty of the printed book.

[1415] Burak, "Reliable Books," 31.
[1416] HAT 678/33034, 1249.
[1417] Debbağzâde Numan Efendi, *Tuhfetü's-sükûk* (İstanbul: Darü't-Tıbâ'ati'l-Âmire, Evâhir-i Rebîülevvel 1259).
[1418] *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'*, no: 145, 1252.
[1419] İsmail Gelenbevî, *Risaletü'l-Kıyas* (İstanbul: Unidentified, 1297).

Nevertheless, the output revealed that printing did not guarantee fixity or standardization at least until the 1860s. While both lithography and typography were used in the period from 1831 to 1863, there did not seem to be a particular reason to choose one over the other. In general, however, some titles seem to have been printed in either form interchangeably. *Tuhfe-i Vehbî*, for instance, was printed with typography at the Imperial Press in 1833, but many of its later editions were printed with lithography at both the Imperial Press and the private presses. *Dîvân-ı Niyâzî*, in another example, was printed in 1844 with typography and in 1858/59 with lithography.

Lithography offered the greater advantage in cases where visual representations, drawings, diagrams and maps had to be printed. However, it also became associated with many of the textual variations in printed form. As discussed in various parts of this dissertation, the private lithographers scattered around the city often printed cheap editions anonymously. Especially until their official recognition in 1857, they printed texts at the request of contractors at low rates without integrating the formal mechanisms of editing. The output, as a result, was radically different in each run. Multiple editions of the same book, as this study has demonstrated, appeared differently according to whether they were printed with typography or lithography. As the various tables under Appendix B show, however, the type of technology was not determined by a thematic criterion. Generalizations are difficult; even the most scholarly books could be printed with lithography such as Molla Hüsrev's *Mirkat* in 1850-51. One could not even trace a chronological evolution of a particular printing style at least until 1863.

The variation in lithographic prints has been most studied with regard to folk stories. Pertev Boratav, for instance, has shown how *meddah* stories differed in each

printed edition.[1420] He credited the oldest lithographic prints of folk stories from 1862-63 to Iranian agents, and he noted how in time, as they started to be printed with typography, they were cleansed of "superstitions" (*hurâfe*s) and censored.[1421] Moreover, he claimed that the lithographers were so "ignorant" that the number of mistakes mounted with each new edition. The typographic press ultimately had to make the corrections.[1422] In another case, Ahmet Rasim was paid fifty gold pieces by a bookseller with the instruction to correct the lithographic print of *Kerem ile Aslı* in terms of its wording and grammar, and to make it more suitable for contemporary times. Both the style and language had to be rendered compatible with modern stories and novels.[1423] Similarly, David Sayers's detailed study of *Tıflî Stories* has meticulously traced the transformation of their copies from manuscript to lithography and typography.[1424] Sayers has revealed that the manuscripts and lithographic copies varied in both their page size and their number of words. Hence, they were largely inconsistent in their commercial goals: publishing was ad hoc and personalized. It would only be with typography that standardization would become a concern and the book would turn into a meta with serial production.[1425]

Overall, the affinity between the manuscripts and the lithographic prints places print culture on shaky grounds. We see that the different agents of print determined how technology was utilized to create a specific effect. Fixity and standardization were not products of lithographic printing. As Adrian Johns argued for England, it was the social codes of conduct, the positive reception of the printed book, and special efforts to build an image of the press as providing the most

[1420] Boratav, *Halk Hikayeleri*, 146.
[1421] Boratav, *Halk Hikayeleri*, 149.
[1422] Boratav, *Halk Hikayeleri*, 150.
[1423] Boratav, *Halk Hikayeleri*, 151.
[1424] Sayers, *Tıfli Hikayeleri*, 11.
[1425] Sayers, *Tıfli Hikayeleri*, 14.

accurate version of the texts in multiple copies that in the long run made the press a more integral part of a society's intellectual culture. As with all technologies, the printing press represented a neutral space, a tabula rasa. In the hands of different agents, it turned into a convenient tool that standardized texts, multiplied them, and, ultimately, facilitated their dissemination to a greater number of people.

This dissertation has been guided by an understanding that the agents who had access to the printing press were at least as important as the readers who had access to the printed books. Having adopted a viewpoint fixed on the production of printed books, it has argued and demonstrated that the printed medium was collectively shaped not only by the Ottoman state but also by private individuals. And each intervention into the state of a text in manuscript form reflected different sets of interests and agendas depending on the actor involved.

The central actor with a clear agenda in regulating the printing enterprise was the Ottoman state. Starting from the eighteenth century, it was the state that authorized and sponsored the early initiatives of İbrahim Müteferrika and other agents of print. The disconnected nature of these attempts, the pauses and the gaps, however, signify that the eighteenth century was a period of experimentation, an initial accumulation of know-how and technological expertise that produced but a small output of actually printed books. The restructuring of the state through the reform agenda at the turn of the nineteenth century then placed the press at the intersection of the socio-cultural, economic, and political currents in the empire. More specifically, the policies of Mahmud II and the Tanzimat period constituted the backdrop for the consolidation of the printing enterprise. None of the issues raised in this dissertation in connection to the printing press—including the demand or supply of books, commercialization, diversification of titles, the categories of licit and illicit

books, and the legal framework—could have been possible outside of this framework. From 1831 onward, the state visibly regulated the transfer of technology, employed the relevant staff, decided on publishing policy (no matter how ad hoc), and acted as the chief broker of books. This remained true for the greater part of the period until 1863. But by 1840, it also felt the financial and ideological necessity to open the platform to other actors. Thereafter, while the Ottoman state continued to serve as the primary agent and player in the printing enterprise, it did not have absolute control, often having to negotiate, trade, struggle, and ally with other agents, all of whom wanted a piece of the growing market of the printed book.

These new actors—including the authors, contractors, and printers—rose from all walks of life to gradually carve out a physical, commercial, and legal space for themselves. They were not passive actors waiting for the state to endow them with agency, but active agents who set the terms of their own involvement by taking the books of their choice to the Imperial Press for printing. Over time, their persistent demand for greater involvement, and, in turn, the increasing need of the Ottoman state for both more books and more printers, led the system to open up and welcome the new agents. The first were the contractors, who, awakened to the potential for profit, pushed their way into legal recognition by selecting book titles, negotiating terms of contract with press officials, and then distributing the printed copies by selling them either themselves or in bulk to booksellers or students. Next came the private printers, who turned the existing demand for printed books into profit by operating their presses, first underground, and then legally, in the open. It is important to note that in both cases, the legal recognition followed the recognition of agency. The 1857 printing regulation, in this sense, became the greatest contract between the different agents of the printing enterprise and the Ottoman state, which

tried to position and legitimize itself as the dispenser of printing permits. Even if the Ottoman sources do not permit these actors and their networks to be distinctively placed on a circuit of "communication," as Robert Darnton has proposed, this dissertation has demonstrated that they were interrelated and indeed closely connected at least through a chain of demand and supply.

But what was actually printed? It was first and foremost textbooks that legitimized the use of the printing press. In other words, the propensity of a book to serve as a textbook was what really initiated and legitimized the transfer of many books from manuscript form into the printed medium. This relationship between textbooks and printing was based on notions of necessity, benefit, and utility. One source from which the state officials drew in deciding which books to print was the pool of contemporary translations on the new sciences, whose value and utility lay in their potential use in schools. However, the great majority of printed textbooks originated elsewhere—from a pool of classical textbooks reflecting the centuries-long intellectual accumulation of the madrasa tradition. Not only in terms of the number of printed book titles but also in terms of the number of their printed editions, the weight of this category surpassed any other category present in the printed book market. Even within the traditional textbook category, however, there was a clear dominance of religious themes and books on the Islamic sciences. The fact that the institutionalization of education was still in its early stages meant that the curricula for many of the new schools would not be settled before the 1860s. This fluidity enabled classical texts of a religious nature to penetrate into the new schools in large numbers thanks to the reproductive powers of the printing press. As a result, contrary to the arguments about nineteenth-century secularization, religious discourse was further empowered in the Tanzimat period, not sidelined. Moreover,

the textualization of the pool of classical religious titles in printed format had wider and longer-lasting implications for the transformation of the scholarly *medrese* tradition. While this matter requires further study, two aspects stand out about it: the process of selecting which copy of a given work was to be printed, a process that revolved around such issues as the accuracy and authority of variant copies; and, once a work had been printed, the new relationship madrasa students would build with the printed canonical book.

Another key factor in determining what books were printed was the private book contractors and printers, who were included within the legal sphere of printing after 1840. Driven by the quest for profit, they were averse to risk in selecting the kinds of books they channeled into the printed medium. If a book was printed but did not sell, the potential cost to them would be unbearable. As such, they turned to a pool of books that had proven their popularity among readers for centuries. They served to diversify the printed-book market by introducing titles that had been widely owned and likely read for centuries. Just as with the textbooks printed by the state, it would be the religious and mystical titles that were selected for printing. Many times, these selections were informed by contractors' familiarity with the manuscript book market. The contractors acted as brokers for introducing the titles in demand among a wide readership; their role, to the extent that it can be determined from historical sources, was to assess the direction of the demand of popular audiences.

A network consisting of authors, contractors, printers, and state officials was hence woven around religious titles as a category that had significant appeal on the ground while simultaneously being authorized and pushed from above. Accordingly, the religious sphere constituted the space where the ruling elite intersected with the wider populace in terms of their priorities and reading choices. It is thus no surprise

that religious books, both scholarly and popular, corresponded to a meaningful category that united different agents for different purposes, at least until 1863. These agents ranged from the religious scholars who presented their books on the Islamic sciences from different provinces of the empire, to the academic societies and state councils that consistently argued for the necessity of such books. They also included the private printers who left traces of their own religious inclinations on their books and Sufi sheikhs who appealed to state officials to get their prayer books printed.

Even with the relatively high rate of religious textual production, the supply of such books never completely satisfied the demand. Manuscript copying actively continued until at least the end of the nineteenth century. Another sign of the demand surpassing the supply was the rise of illicit printing practices among the contractors, private printers, and even state officials, reaching a peak around the 1860s. These practices were, to a large extent, related to the monopolies that tied particular book titles to particular contractors until 1857. Driven by readers' demand for books and printers' demand for profit, a black market for books thrived, as unprivileged customers transgressed the official boundaries and appealed to a group of printers, who would be gradually subsumed under the category of "illicit" printers by the Ottoman officials.

These practices were also visible in the religious book market. The number of illicitly printed Qur'ans and the even greater number of volumes containing printed chapters of the Qur'an (*Cüz*), despite repeated bans, involved all conceivable actors of the printing enterprise, including the state. Apparently, the market was lucrative, and the demand was high. Clearly, by this point, the sensitivity of the Ottoman state towards the printing of sacred texts such as the Qur'an was no longer shared by the wider readership. In this sense, the licit book categories, as conceived by the

Ottoman state, did not match the categories in the minds of the readers—if, that is, such categories even existed in the minds of Ottoman readers. Documents from the period attest to the fact that in many cases, Ottoman subjects were entirely unaware of the bans regarding certain printed books, or at least pretended to be. The same argument could be extended to illicit books of a political nature. What the Ottoman state perceived as "harmful" for the reader was not categorically perceived as such by either the printers or the readers. Moreover, as printing acquired greater power and prestige in subsequent decades, the gap between the licit categories determined by the Ottoman state and the types of books demanded and sought by Ottoman readers would only grow. It is at this point that the state would feel compelled to enforce more sanctions regarding printing practices. In paradoxical fashion, the more the boundaries formulated by the Ottoman state were transgressed and violated, the more rigid the Ottoman policy became in re-formulating and implementing those boundaries. At the same time, the legal definition of activities contravening state regulations as illicit was not immediately formed; rather, it emerged over decades of encounters between licit and illicit actors, and finally culminated in the 1857 printing regulation.

In fact, a book's place on the spectrum of what was considered permissible to print was never fixed. This is because the same book titles, in the hands of different agents, could serve different purposes. While the printing of *Sarf cümlesi* served the intention of the state to meet the need for textbooks, the same book could also be conceived as a tool for profit by the contractors or private printers. The oscillation between the licit and the illicit was even more striking: Evliya Çelebi's *Müntehabât*, for instance, could be printed without reservation in 1843 only to be banned from both printing and circulation in 1848. Hence, just like the printing press, the printed

books were meaningful only within the social and political context that produced or accompanied them.

All in all, what do these observations tell us about the wider inclinations of Ottoman state and society? Perhaps most importantly, they show that the printing press, as a technology, was molded as needed and as desired by contemporary Ottoman actors and readers. It did not matter that the press was a European invention that in retrospect would produce thousands of transformative texts that would challenge the status quo, shake the predetermined views of readers, and incite them to action. What mattered was that at the right moment of need, the printing press was adopted as a useful tool by the Ottoman state and relevant actors in a way that was in line with their basic values and priorities. It was at this juncture, where technology converged with the domestic agenda, that the printing press in the Ottoman context turned into a meaningful Ottoman enterprise.

APPENDIX A

DIRECTORS OF THE IMPERIAL PRESS

Table A1. The Official Ottoman Printers between 1727-1792

Printers	**Time Interval**
İbrahim Müteferrika and Mehmed Said	1729-1745
Kadı İbrahim Efendi and Ahmed Efendi	1747; 1755-
Beylikçi Raşid Mehmed Efendi and Ahmed Vasıf Efendi	1784-1792/3

Table A2. The Directors of the Imperial Press: 1797-1831

Directors	**Time Interval**
Abdurrahman Efendi	1797
Seyyid Hüseyin Beyefendi	1807
Ali Efendi and Hafız Mehmed Emin Efendi	1808
Abdurrahim Muhib Efendi	1817
İbrahim Sa'ib Efendi	1821

Table A3. The Directors of *Takvîm-i Vekâyi'hâne-i Âmire*: 1831-1857

Directors	**Date of Official Appointment**
Mehmed Esad Efendi	November 1831
Seyyid Nazif Efendi	October 1835
Numan Mahir Efendi	November 1837
Atıf Bey	March 1838
Recai Mehmed Emin Efendi	April 1838
Esad Safvet Efendi	June 1839
Sami Mustafa Efendi	August 1840
Akif Paşazade Nail Bey	April 1841
Yesarizade Mustafa İzzet Efendi	December 1842
Said Mehmed Bey	November 1843
Recai Mehmed Efendi	June 1849
Akif Paşazade Nail Bey	January-February 1853
Recai Mehmed Efendi	January-February 1855
Lebib Efendi	July 1857

APPENDIX B

BOOKS PRINTED BETWEEN 1831-1863

Table B1. Printed Books on Grammar of Arabic, Persian, Turkish and French

	BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Arabic	el-Emsile	Çerkeşîzâde Osman Vehbi			1250		
	Şerhu'l-Emsile	Dâvûd-i Karsî			1263, 1272, 1273, 1274		
	Emsile şerhi	Mehmed Tâhir b. Hüseyin Hüsnî			1251, 1253		
	Şerhu'l-Emsile	Mehmed d b. Mustafa Akkirmânî			1252		
	el-Emsiletü'l-muhtelife				1266		
	Emsile şerhi		Eskicizâde el-Hâc Ali b. Hüseyin el-Edirnevî		1247, 1251		
	Kavâ‘idü'l-i‘lâl ve'l-idgâm	Eskicizâde el-Hâc Ali b. Hüseyin el-Edirnevî			1267		

	BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
	Emsile şerhi	Çörekcizâde Ahmed Nüzhet (Köse Efendi)			1256, 1262, 1269, 1276		
	Emsile-i cedîde	İbrahim Hüseyin Rüşdü			1263, 1268	lithography (1263)	52p.
	Tekmîletü'l-Emsile ve'l-Binâ	Mustafa Sıdkı			1266		
	Terceme-i Şerh-i Emsile ve Binâ	Muhammed b. Halil el-Maşişî, el-Kavukçu			1257, 1280		1257: 61p.
	Emsile-i muhtelife şerhi	İbrahim b. Mehmed el-Yalvacî			1262		
	Müstağni'ş-şürûh	Ahmed Ziyaeddin Gümüşhanevi			1275	lithography	32p.
	el-Kâfiye	Cemâleddîn İbnü'l-Hâcib			1253, 1254, 1266, 1267, 1274, 1276, 1280		1280: 29p.; 1274: 80p.
	Kâfiye-i mu‘ribi	Çörekcizâde Ahmed Nüzhet-Köse Efendi			1269		

	BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
	Mu‘ribü'l-kâfiye (el-Fevâidü’ş-şâfîye alâ i‘râbi'l-kâfiye)	Cemâleddîn İbnü'l-Hâcib	Hüseyin b. Ahmed Zeynîzâde		1200, 1220, 1223, 1235, 1241, 1251,1253, 1254, 1265, 1266, 1267, 1269, 1271, 1274, 1276, 1279, 1280		
	Şerhu’r-Radî ale’l-Kâfiye	Cemâleddîn İbnü'l-Hâcib	Radıyyüddin el-Esterâbâd		1275		
	Hâşiye alâ Şerhi'l-Kâfiye	İbnü'l-Hâcib	Radıyyüddin el-Esterâbâd	Seyyid Şerîf el-Cürcânî	1275		
	Şerhu'l-Kâfiye fi'n-nahv	Cemâleddîn İbnü'l-Hâcib	İsâmüddîn İsferâyînî		1256		483p.
	el-Fevâidü'z-ziyâiyye fî halli müşkilât-ı Kâfiye	Cemâleddîn İbnü'l-Hâcib	Molla Câmî		1242, 1253, 1254, 1269, 1279		1253: 336p.
	Şerhu'l-Ebyâti'l-Kâfiye ve'l-Câmî	Cemâleddîn İbnü'l-Hâcib	Molla Câmî	Ali b. Osman el-Akhisarî	1278		
	Hâşiye alâ şerhi'l-kâfiye li'l-Câmî	Cemâleddîn İbnü'l-Hâcib	Molla Câmî	Radiyüddîn Abdulgafûr Lârî	1253, 1272		

	BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
	Hâşiyetü'l-Hâşiye ala'l-Fevâidi'z-Ziyâiyye	Cemâleddîn İbnü'l-Hâcib	Molla Câmî --- Radiyüddîn Abdulgafûr-i Lârî	Abdülhakim b. Şemseddîn Siyâlkûtî	1277		
	Hâşiyetü'l-İsâm ale'l-Câmî	Cemâleddîn İbnü'l-Hâcib	Abdurrahman Câmî	İsâmüddîn İsferâyînî	1235, 1256, 1259, 1276		1259: 347p.
	Hâşiye ale'l-Fevâidi'z-ziyâiyye	Cemâleddîn İbnü'l-Hâcib	Abdurrahman Câmî	Ebu'l-Berekât Muhammed b. el-Arif Sivasî Muharrem Efendi	1254, 1257, 1259, 1266, 1269, 1271, 1274, 1280	lithography (1269, 1274)	1274: 269p.; 1271: 340p; 1259: 2vols.; 1257: 341p; 1269: 223p.
	Muharrem tekmilesi	Ebu'l-Berekât Muhammed b. el-Arif Sivasî Muharrem Efendi		Abdullah Eyyûbî	1259, 1266, 1274		
	İmtihânü'l-ezkiyâ	Kadı Beyzâvî (Lübbü'l-elbâb fî ilmi'l-iʿrâb)	Birgivî		1270		
	Hâşiyetü Adalı ale'l-İmtihân	Kadı Beyzâvî (Lübbü'l-elbâb fî ilmi'l-iʿrâb)	Birgivî	Adalı Şeyh Mustafa b. Hamza	1260, 1270, 1271	lithography (1271)	1271: 568p.

	BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
	İ‘râbü'l-Kâfiye	Cemâleddîn İbnü'l-Hâcib	Hacı Baba b. İbrahim b. Abdülkerim et-Tosyavî		1271		
	İzhârü'l-esrâr	Birgivî			1219, 1280		
	Netâicü'l-efkâr (İzhâr şerhi Adalı)	Birgivî		Adalı Şeyh Mustafa b. Hamza	1243, 1251, 1255, 1257, 1263, 1277, 1280		1255: 208p.
	Menâfî‘u'l-ahyâr	Birgivî	Adalı Şeyh Mustafa b. Hamza	Mustafa b. Muhammed	1279		
	Gâyetü’l-enzâr	Birgivî	Adalı Şeyh Mustafa b. Hamza	Mustafa b. Dede Ahıskavî	1263		244p.
	Hâşiye-i Hasan Mısrî alâ Netâici'l-efkâr	Birgivî	Adalı Şeyh Mustafa b. Hamza	Hasan Mısrî ve Siyahîzâde	1266	lithography	252p.
	İzhâr Mu‘ribi (Hallü esrâri'l-ahyâr alâ i‘râbı İzhâri'l-esrâr)	Hüseyin b. Ahmet Zeynîzâde			1218, 1223, 1228, 1233, 1235, 1241, 1251, 1255, 1257, 1262, 1265, 1267, 1268, 1269, 1271, 1272, 1273, 1276, 1278, 1279		

	BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
	Suâl ve cevâb-ı Emsile, Binâ, Maksûd, İzzî				1252		
	Risâle fi's-Sarf	Hüseyin b. Ahmed Zeynîzâde			1263, 1272		
	Zübde fî ilmi's-Sarf	Abdülkerim b. Hüseyin Amasyevî			1277		
	Zuhrat al-ihvân	Halil b. Hasan al-Kamardaravi			1275		
	Fevâidü'l-veledeyn	Ahmed Nüzhet Çörekçizâde			1253, 1254, 1256, 1262, 1269		
	Keşfu'l-i'râb	Mustafa İzzet			1266		
	el-Avâmilü'l-cedîd	Halil b. Ahmed	Birgivî		1234, 1257, 1272, 1273, 1277, 1280		1257: 9p.; 1280: 8 p.
	Avâmil tuhfesi	Kirkor Efendi			1275		
	Tuhfetü'l-Avâmil (Tuhfetü'l-İhvân)	Birgivî	Şeyh Mustafa b. İbrahim		1226, 1250, 1255, 1256, 1267, 1274, 1280		1226: 128p.
	el-Avâmilü'l-mie	Abdülkâhir el-Cürcânî					

	BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
	Ta‘lîku'l-fevâdıl alâ i‘râbi'l-Avâmil (Mu‘ribü'l-Avâmil)	Birgivî		Hüseyin b. Ahmet Zeynîzâde	1220, 1231, 1234, 1237, 1243, 1250		
	Binâ				1256		
	Şerhu'l-Binâ		Mehmed d b. Mustafa Akkirmânî		1257, 1278		
	Esâsü'l-Binâ	Ahmed Rüşdü Karaağacî			1250, 1265, 1275		
	Garâibü'l-i‘lâl ve'l-iştikâk ale'l-Binâ	İbrahim b. Mehmed el-Yalvacî			1260, 1262, 1268, 1275, 1278	lithography (1275)	1262: 32p.;1267: 32p.
	Nahvi Arabî				1263		
	el-İzzî fi’t-tasrîf	İzzeddîn Zencânî			1233, 1253, 1254, 1278, 1244, 1251, 1280		
	Şerhu Tasrîfi’z-Zencânî	İzzeddîn Zencânî	Sadeddîn et-Teftâzânî		1253		
	Şerhu'l-İzzî	İzzeddîn Zencânî	Seyyid Şerîf el-Cürcânî		1266, 1280		
	Hâşiye alâ Şerhi'l-İzzî fi't-tasrîf li't-Teftâzânî	İzzeddîn Zencânî	Sadeddîn et-Teftâzânî	Dede Cöngî	1278		

	BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
	Maksûd Şerhi				1266		
	İm‘ânü'l-enzâr (Şerh-i Maksûd)	Ebu Hanife	Birgivî		1253, 1260, 1269		1253: 40p.; 1260: 37p.
	Ruhu'ş-şurûh fî şerhi'l Maksûd	Ebu Hanife	Tireli Ayşî Mehmed Efendi		1253, 1269		
	Matlûbu şerhi'l-Maksûd	Ebu Hanife			1275		160p.
	Risâle fi's-sarf	Hüseyin b. Ahmet Zeynîzâde			1271		
	Risâle-i Es’ile ve Ecvibe	Harputlu İshak Efendi			1272, 1273, 1274, 1277, 1278		
	Muhâtabât-ı Ma‘lûfîye	Nasıf b. Mü'min el-Ma‘lûf			1264		
	Ferâidü'l-Fevâid	Ebu'l-Kâsım Semerkandî			1274, 1276		
	Hâşiye on Ferâidü'l-Fevâid	Ebu'l-Kâsım Semerkandî	İsâmüddîn İsferâyînî	Müftüzâde Muhammed Sadık Erzincanî	1253, 1279		

	BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
	Nahiv Cümlesi (Kâfiye, İzhâr, Avâmil)				1234, 1241, 1249, 1253, 1254, 1256, 1260, 1262, 1263, 1267, 1268, 1269, 1271, 1273, 1274, 1276		
	Sarf Cümlesi (Emsile, Binâ, Maksud, İzzî, Merâh)				1233, 1243, 1249, 1252, 1254, 1266		
	eş-Şâfiye	Cemâleddîn İbnü'l-Hâcib			1276		
	Şerhu'ş-Şâfiye	Cemâleddîn İbnü'l-Hâcib	Seyyid Abdullah	Çârperdî	1276	lithography	304p.
	Şerhu'ş-Şâfiye fi't-tasrîf	Cemâleddîn İbnü'l-Hâcib		Abdullah b. Muhammed el-Hüseynî			
	Mecmû'atü'l-kavâ'id (Es'ile ve ecvibe-i mecmû'atü'l-kavâ'id)	Harputlu İshak Efendi			1277, 1278		
	Mürşidü't tullab				1278		

	BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Persian	Fârisî tekellüm risâlesi				1262, 1265	lithography (all)	1262: 49p.; 1265: 55p.
	Ta‘lîm-i Fârisî	Ahmed Kemal Paşa			1264, 1265, 1267, 1270, 1274, 1280	lithography	1264: 30p.; 1265: 32p.; 1267: 32p.; 1274: 32p.
	Kavâ‘id-i Fârisiyye tercümesi	Mefâtihu'd-dürriye	Murad Nakşibendi (Trans)		1251, 1253, 1256, 1262, 1269, 1274, 1275, 1278, 1279, 1280		
	Şerh-i Kavâ‘id-i Fârisiyye	Mefâtihu'd-dürriye	Murad Nakşibendi (Trans)	Mehmed Tevfik Efendi	1267		
	Ferâidü'd-dürriyye fî kavâ‘id-i Fârisiyye				1257		
	Kavâid-i Fârisiyye Nizâmü’l-kalem	Hüseyin b. Ahmed Zeynîzâde			1269	lithography	62p.

	BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
	Tezkiretü'l-müştekkat	Ahmed Hamdullah b. İsmail Hamit Ankaravî			1265	lithography	20p.
	Kavâ'id-i Fârisiyye	Mahmud Rıfat			1275		
	Tasfîratü'l-Fârisiyye	Hafız Osman Vehbi			1267	lithography	39p.
	Nasâyıh-i Fârisiyye	Süleyman Veysi			1271, 1273, 1274	lithography	1271: 151p.
	Farsça-Türkçe-Arapça mükâleme	Şakir Hoca			1269		
	Mesâil-i dürriyye	Yusuf Ziyaeddîn			1269		
	Netîcetü'l-kavâ'id	Şaki Efendi			1269, 1276	lithography (all)	1269: 16p.; 1276: 14p.
Turkish	Tercümân-ı Türkî ve Arabî				1266	lithography	103p.
	Medhal-i Kavâ'id	Ahmed Cevdet Paşa			1268, 1280	lithography (all)	1268: 55p., 1280: 55p..

	BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
	Abrege de grammaire turque	Ali Paşa			1853		
	Mikyâsü'l-lisân	Abdurrahman Efendi			1280		
	Elifbâ				1272		
	Ta‘lîmü'l-müte‘allim				1273		
	Nuhbetü'l-etfâl				1274	lithography	68p.
	Risâle-i imtihân				1266		
French	Grammaire francaise (Sarf-ı Fransevî)	Yorgaki Rasis			1254, 1845	lithography (1254)	197p.
	Sarf ve Nahv-i Fransevî	Kirkor Margosyan			1275		
	Dialogue Francais-Turcs	İshak Harputî			1278		

Table B2. Printed Dictionaries

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Tuhfe-i Vehbî	Sünbülzâde Vehbî		1208, 1213, 1219, 1223,1224, 1230, 1232, 1238, 1241, 1245, 1249, 1250, 1251, 1252, 1253, 1256, 1258, 1261, 1263, 1267, 1268, 1270, 1272, 1273, 1274, 1275, 1276, 1277, 1278, 1280	lithography (1263, 1267; 1270; 1272; 1273; 1275; 1276; 1277; 1278)	1213: 55p.; 1223: 60p.; 1241: 65p.; 1249: 71p.; 1253: 61p.; 1268: 61p.; 1270: 47p.; 1275: 91p.; 1278: 48p.
Tuhfe-i Vehbî şerhi	Sünbülzâde Vehbî	Ahmet Hayati Elbistanî	1215, 1237, 1251, 1254, 1262, 1266, 1271		
Tuhfe-i Vehbî hâşiyesi	Sünbülzâde Vehbî	Hakkâkzâde Mustafa Hilmi	1275		
Tuhfe-i Vehbî (Müntehâb-ı Lebîb)	Sünbülzâde Vehbî	Mehmed Lebîb Efendi	1262, 1263		

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Tuhfe-i Vehbî hâşiyesi	Sünbülzâde Vehbî	Ali Mahvî	1249, 1275, 1278, 1280		1249, 1280: marginalia
Tibyân-ı nâfî‘ der terceme-i Burhân-ı kâtı‘	Muhammed Hüseyin b. Halef-i Tebrîzî	Ahmed Asım Ayıntabî	1214, 1268, 1278		
Nuhbe-i Vehbî	Sünbülzâde Vehbî		1220, 1242, 1246, 1251, 1252, 1259, 1265	lithography (1265)	115p.
Nuhbe-i Vehbî şerhi	Sünbülzâde Vehbî	Ahmed Reşid Yayaköylü (Kırkağacî)	1259		446p.
Tuhfe-i Şâhidî	Muğlalı Şâhidî İbrahim Dede		1264, 1269, 1271, 1275	lithography (1269, 1271)	1264: 63p.; 1269: 63p.; 1271: 63p.
Şerh-i Lugat-ı Şâhidî	Muğlalı Şâhidî İbrahim Dede	Murad Nakşibendi	1256		
el-Kâmûsü'l-muhîti'l-okyânûsi'l-basît fî tercemeti'l-Kâmûsi'l-muhît	Fîrûzâbâdî	Mütercim Ahmed Asım	1230-1233, 1250, 1268		
Nazmü'l-cevâhir	Hasan Ayni Ayıntablı		1241, 1250	typography (1241)	112p.(both)

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Ahterî-i kebîr	Muslihuddîn Mustafa b. Şemseddîn Ahterî		1242, 1256, 1263, 1271, 1275, 1283, 1289	typography	711p.
Miftâh-ı lisân	Yusuf Halis Tahir Ömerzâde		1266	lithography	52p.

Sübha-i sıbyân	Mehmed b. Ahmed er-Rûmî		1216, 1224, 1246, 1249, 1251, 1259, 1264, 1269, 1274, 1276, 1277	lithography	1216: 33p.; 1224: 33p.; 1233: 33p.; 1246: 35p.; 1249: 52p.; 1251: 35p.; 1257: 35p.; 1259: 39p.; 1264: 39p.; 1255: 39p.; 1258: 39p.; 1269: 39p.; 1274: 39p.; 1276: 39p.

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Hediyyetü'l-ihvân fî şerhi Sübhati's-sıbyân	Mehmed Necîb		1256	typography	265p.
Guherriz	Dürri Süleyman Efendi		1267	lithography	20p.
Kâmus-ı Fransevi	Şemseddin		1275	litography	455p.
Kitap der Hakk-ı Sıbyan ve Sabavet: Mükâlemât-ı latife ve emsâl-i sağîra ve tevârih-i muhtasara	Arnaud Berquin	Nassif Ma'luf	1266	lithography	103p.
Eser-i Şevket	es-Seyyid Mehmed Şevket		1268	typography	744p.
Kitâb-ı tercümân-ı Türkî ve Arabî ve Fârisî			1274		
Lugat-ı Ferişteoğlu	Abdullatif b. Melek Ferişteoğlu		1268, 1277, 1278, 1279	lithography (all)	
Müntehabât-ı eş‘âr-ı Fârisiyye			1264, 1266	lithography	1266: 24p.
Mecmû‘a-i Fevâid-i Musâhebe	Eram Güzeloğlu		1269, 1280		24p.
el-Külliyyât	Ebu'l-Bekâ Eyyub el-Kefevî		1278		
Müntahabât-ı Lugat-ı Osmâniyye	James Redhouse		1268-1269; 1280-1282	lithography: all	2 vols

Table B3. Printed Books of Qur'an Readings and Exegesis

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Amme tefsîri (Nebe)			1264, 1275		
Tefsîr-i Yasin		Ali Hammamizâde	1262, 1268, 1270, 1273		1262: 49p.
Tefsîr-i suratü'r-Rahman		Ali Hammamizâde	1261		
Tefsîr-i Ve'd-duha		Ali Hammamizâde	1271		
Fezâil-i Fâtiha-i şerîf			1273		
Netîcetü't-Tefâsir (Suretü'l-Yusuf)	Yakub b. Mustafa el-Celveti		1266	typography	116p.
Hâşiyetü'l-Kadı li-Abdülhakim Siyâlkûtî Envârü't-tenzîl	Kadı Beyzavi (Envarü't-tenzîl)	Abdülhakim Siyâlkûtî	1266, 1270		
Ruhu'l-beyân fî tefsîri'l-Kur'ân	İsmail Hakkı Bursevî		1255		
Tuhfetü'l-eşrâf fî şerhi'l-Keşşâf	Zemahşerî	Kutbuddin Râzî	1259		
Dürrü'l-yetîm	Birgivî		1257		
Tercüme-i Dürr-i yetîm	Birgivî	Eskicizâde Ali b. Hüseyin el-Edirnevi	1253, 1257, 1280	typography	1253: 89p; 1280: 156p.
Tercüme-i Cihet-i vahdet	Birgivî	Ali b. Hüseyin Eskicizâde	1274		
Tecvîd	Şeyh Mustafa		1251, 1260, 1263, 1275, 1277		
Tecvîd-i Eskicizâde	Eskicizâde Ali b. Hüseyin el-Edirnevi		1280		8p.

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Tecvîd-i edâiye	Hamza Miskin		1251, 1253, 1257, 1280		
Tecvîd-i Karabaş	Abdurrahman Karabaş		1249, 1251, 1253, 1260, 1263, 1275, 1277, 1280	lithography (1260)	1260: 24p.;
el-Virdü'l-müfîd fî Şerhi't-Tecvîd	Mehmed Esad Sahhaflar Şeyhzâde		1264		
Mahrec Tecvîdi (Manzum Tecvîd)	Şumnulu Hafız Hilmi Efendi		1265, 1270		
Tercüme-i Cezerî (el-Mukaddimetü'l-Cezeriyye, el-Cezeriyye, Mukaddime fi't-tecvîd)	İbnü'l-Cezerî	Ahmed b. Muhammed Hanefî Mağnisî	1280	lithography	29p.
Kavâ‘id-i Tecvîdiyye (Risâle-i Tecvîdiyye)	Hüseyin Efendi		1263		
Nazmü'l-ehem	Diyarbakırlı Şeyhi Mehmed		1275	lithography	17p.
et-Teysîr şerhi	Ebu Amr ed-Dânî		1261		
Tuhfetü'l-ihvân	Abdülaziz en-Nakşibendi el-Ağtaşî		1260, 1280		1226: 96p.
Zübdetü'l-irfân şerhi	Hamid b. Abdülfettah el-Paluvî	Amin b. Abdullah el-Ayyûbî	1270	typography	96p.

Table B4. Printed Books on History and Biography

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Risâle-i Mühimmâtü'l-gazi fî Meyadîni'l-megazi		Mehmed Fikri b. Hüseyin Kayseri	1274	typography	109p.
Tarih-i Seyyâh der beyân-ı zuhûr-ı ağavâniyân ve inhidâm-ı binâ-i şâhân-ı Safeviyân	Tadeusz Jan Krusiński,	İbrahim Müteferrika	1142, 1277	typography	1277: 174p.
Tarih-i Timur-ı Gûrkân	İbn Arabşah	Nazmîzâde Murtaza Efendi	1142, 1277	typography	1277: 243p.
Ravzatü'l-Hüseyn fî hulâsati ahbâri'l-hâfikayn	Naîmâ		1175, 1259, 1280	typography	1280: Vol 1 (442p.); Vol 2 (450p.), Vol. 3 (435p.)
Tarih-i Gülşen-i Ma'ârif	Feraizizâde Mehmed Said		1252	typography	1693p. (2 Vols.)
Mukaddime-i İbn Haldun	İbn Haldun	Abdullatif Suphi Paşa	1260	typography	
Mukaddime-i Tekmiletü'l-İber	İbn Haldun	Abdullatif Subhi Paşa	1278	typography	51p.
Miftahu'l-İber	İbn Haldun	Abdullatif Subhi Paşa	1276	typography	209p.
Tercüme-i Mukaddime-i İbn Haldun	İbn Haldun	Pirizâde Mehmed Saib	1270, 1275	typography	1275: Vol. 1 (372p.), Vol.2 (356p.)

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Mukaddime-i İbn Haldun (fasl-ı sâdis)	İbn Haldun	Ahmed Cevdet	1277	typography	316p.
Tarih ve fezâil-i Kuds-i şerîf	Hıfzi Beliğ		1265	typography	101p.
Tercüme-i tarih-i nevâdir-i Çin-i Maçin			1270	lithography	20p.
Feth-i Konstantiniyye ve ta‘rîf-i Ayasofya			1273	lithography	63p.
Nuhbetü't-tevârih ve'l-ahbâr	Mehmed b. Mehmed er-Rûmî		1276	typography	251p.
Heyet-i sâbıka-i Konstantiniyye	Konstandiyos	Yorgaki Aleko Petropulo	1277	typography	39p.
Tayyibetü'l-ezkâr	Şikarizâde Ahmed Efendi		1271	lithography	46p.
Müntehabât-ı Evliya Çelebi	Evliya Çelebi		1257, 1259, 1262, 1264	typography	1262: 143p.
Seyahatnâme-i İbn Battuta	İbn Battuta		1262	typography	91p.
Tarih-i Âl-i Osmân bi-Solakzâde	Solakzade Mehmed Hemdemî		1271	lithography	83p.
Tarih-i Nişancı Mehmed Paşa	Mehmed b. Ahmed Ramazanzâde		1270, 1279	typography (1279)	348p.
Esmârü'l-hadâik (Esmarü't-tevârih)	Mehmed Şem‘i Efendi		1267	lithography	80p.
Künhü'l-ahbâr	Mustafa Ali Efendi		1277	typography	328p.

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Tâcü't-tevârih	Hoca Sadeddîn		1279-1280	typography	Vol. 1 (582p.), Vol 1 (600p.)
Selimnâme	Hoca Sadeddîn		1279-1280	typography	18p.
Tercüme-i Ravzatü's-safa	Mirhund Muhammed b. Handşah	Mehmed Kemali	1258	typography	396p.
Üss-i zafer	Mehmed Esad		1243	typography	259p.
Tercüme-i Nuhbetü'l-menkul		Abdülmuhsinzade Halil Çelebi	1254	typography	73p.
Seyahatnâme-i Hümâyûn (Abdülmecid Rumeli'de)	Anonymous		1262	typography	32p.
Tarih-i Mustafâ Necîb (Vak‘a-i Selimiyye; Sultan Selim-i Sâlis asrı vakâyi‘ine ve müteferriatına dâir asr-ı mezkûr ricâlinden ve ashâb-ı dikkatten Mustafa Necib Efendi'nin kaleme almış olduğu tarihtir)	Mustafa Necib		1280	typography	118p.
Devlet-i Aliyye-i Osmânî tarihi	Hayrullah Efendi		1271		
Endülüs tarihi	Louis Viardot	Ziya Paşa	1276, 1280	typography	1280: 547p.
Tarih-i Cevdet	Ahmed Cevdet		1271-1301		

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Letâif-i Enderûniyye (Tarih-i Enderûn)	Hızır İlyas		1276		503p.
Avrupa meşhur ministroların tercüme-i halleri	Sahak Abro		1271	typography	262p.
Miladın 1799 ve tarih-i hicriyyenin 1213 senesi düvel-i avrupanın ahvali beyanıdır			1272	lithography	4p.
Bahs-i evvel Venedik ve Cenevizli gemicilerin keşf eylediği Cezayir ve saniya Kristof Kolomb'un Amerika'yı bulması beyanıdır			1273	lithography	56p.
Tarih-i ümem ve'l-mülûk (Tarih-i Taberî-i Kebîr)	Taberî		1260, 1275	typography	
Tercüme-i Şerhi'l-Uyûn fî şerh-i risâle-i İbn Zeydûn / Tarih-i İbn Zeydûn	İbn Nübate el-Mısri	Karahalilzade Mehmed Said	1257	typography	470p.
Napoleon Bonaparte'nin müzekkerelerinden müstahreç zevâbıt-ı harbiye		Mehmed Said Paşa	1254	typography	176p.
Tarih-i Napolyon	Vartan Paşa		1278		361p.
Tezkire-i Napolyon: hûlâsa-i meâli tercümedir	Napoloeon Bonaparte		1277	typography	48p.
Katerina Tarihi	Castera Joan Henri	Yakovaki	1278	lithography	308p.
Büyük Petro zamanında Rusya'da cereyan eden ahvâli dâhiliye.			1270	lithography	299p.
Mükâleme mazbatası			1270		

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
İbn Sînâ'nın terceme-i hâli	Abdülkerim Efendi		1279		
Sefînetü'ş-şu‘arâ	Devletşah-ı Semarkandî	Süleyman Fehim Efendi	1259	typography	352p.
Hadâiku'l-hakâik fî tekmileti'ş-Şekâik	Taşköprizâde Ahmed Efendi	Nev'izade Ataullah b. Yahya	1268	typography	771 p. (2 vols)
Tercüme-i Şekâiki'n-Numâniyye	Taşköprizâde Ahmed Efendi	Mehmed Mecdi Edirneli	1269	typography	528p.
Tezkire-i Hâtimetü'l-eş‘âr (Fatîn Tezkiresi)	Davud Fatin		1271	lithography	459p.
Vefeyâtü'l-a‘yân ve enbâü ebnâi'z-zamân	Rodosizâde Mehmed		1280		Vol 1 (353p.), Vol 2 (361p.)
Ayine-i Zürefâ	Mehmed Cemaleddîn Efendi		1259		
Hadîkatü'l-vüzerâ	Osmanzâde Taib Ahmed		1271	typography	133+86 +50+23 +4
Zeyl-i Hadîkatü'l-vüzerâ	Abdülfettah Şefkat-i Bağdadî		1271		
Halîkatü’r-rüesâ (Halifetü'r-rüesâ, Sefînetü'r-rüesâ)	Ahmed Resmi Efendi		1269	lithography	81p.

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Sefinetü'r-rüesâ	Süleyman Faik Efendi		1269	lithography	106p.

Table B5. Printed Religious Primers

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Tekmîle-i tercüme-i Tarîkat-ı Muhammediyye	Birgivî	Vedadî		1255, 1258, 1262, 1275, 1278, 1280	typography	1258: 6+534p.
el-Berîkatü'l-Mahmûdiyye fî şerhi't-Tarîkati'l-Muhammediyye ve'ş-şerî‘ati'n-nebeviyye fi's-sîreti'l-Ahmediyye	Birgivî	Hâdimî		1257, 1263, 1266	typography	1266: 1463p. (2 Vols)
Vasîletü'l-Ahmediyye, Tarîkat-ı Muhammediyye	Birgivî	Receb b. Mehmed		1261	typography	1060p. (2 vols)
Vasiyetnâme (Risâle-i Birgivî)	Birgivî			1218, 1220, 1247, 1249, 1255, 1261, 1264, 1265, 1268, 1276, 1280	lithography (1265, 1268, 1276)	1218: 86p.; 1220: 99p.; 1249: 49p.; 1261: 96p.; 1276: 87p.; 1280: 67p.

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Cevhere-i behiyye-i Ahmediyye fî şerhi'l-vasiyyeti'l-Muhammediyye	Birgivî	Kadızâde Şemseddîn Ahmed b. Mehmed Emin		1219, 1223, 1225, 1232, 1240, 1241, 1242,1251, 1255, 1258, 1262	typography (1255)	1255: 239p.
Şerh-i Vasiyetnâme-i Birgivî	Birgivî	Şeyh Ali Sadri el-Konevî		1268	lithography	155p.
Şerh alâ şerhi'l-Konevî alâ Vasiyyeti Birgivî	Birgivî-Konevî	Osmanpazarı Müftüsü Şumnulu İsmâil Niyâzi		1262, 1264, 1268		
Dürr-i yektâ	İmamzâde Mehmed Esad			1243, 1249, 1252, 1256, 1257, 1259, 1260, 1264, 1267, 1275, 1277, 1279	lithography (1276)	1243: 80p.; 1275: 56p.; 1276: 91p.; 1277: 79p.
Dürr-i yektâ şerhi	İmamzâde			1267	typography	210p.
Kırk suâl	Mevlânâ Firâkî Abdurrahman Çelebi			1256, 1270, 1851, 1276	lithography (1270, 1276)	1270: 144p.; 1276: 120p.
Şerhu'l-Kebâir (Rumûzü'l-künûz)		İsmâil Hakkı Bursevî		1257	typography	120p.

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Tuhfetü'ş-Şahan	Ebu'l-Bekâ Eyyub el-Kefevî			1253, 1258	typography (1258)	1258: 315p.
Haliliye-i Hakkı (Tuhfe-i Haliliye)				1256, 1260		1256: 91p.
Elli dört farz şerhi	Hasan al-Basri	Şeyh Salâhî Abdullah Uşşakî		1259, 1260, 1264, 1276, 1276	lithography (1276)	
İlmihâl	Ahmed İlmi			1241, 1249, 1250, 1255, 1259, 1260, 1263, 1264, 1267, 1275, 1279	lithography (1259, 1267)	1259: 87p.; 1267: 75p.; 1263: 40p.; 1267: 75p.
Feyzu'l-Bahreyn (Şerh-i İlmihâl)	Ahmed İlmi	Mehmed Hulusi		1260	typography	96p.

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Miftahu'l-cenne (Mızraklı ilmihâl)				1258, 1261, 1263, 1264, 1268, 1274, 1275	lithography (1263, 1274, 1275)	1258: 141p.; 1261: 128p.; 1263: 128p.; 1268: 116p.; 1275: 132p.
Risâle-i Rûmî Efendi	Rûmî Ahmed Akhisârî Efendi			1261, 1265	lithography (all)	16p. both
Cevâhirü'l-İslâm				1261, 1264, 1268, 1274, 1275, 1275	lithography (1261, 1264, 1268, 1274)	1261: 24p.; 1264: 14p.; 1275: 10p.
Ferâidü'l-fevâid (Amentü şerhi)	Kadızâde Ahmed b. Emin			1220, 1223, 1232, 1240, 1244, 1253, 1262	typography: 1220, 1223, 1232, 1240, 1244;	1232: 2+278p.; 1253: 318p.;
Necâtü'l-musallî	Ahmed Şevki b. Abdullah			1263	typography	221p.

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Zübde-i İlmihâl	Abdülhamid b. Mustafa Reşid			1262, 1275	lithography (all)	23p.
Envârü'l-imân	Abdülhamid b. Mustafa Reşid			1266, 1269, 1274	lithography (all)	1269: 47p.; 1274: 44p.
Necâtü'l-gâfilîn	Ahmed Ziyâeddîn ibn Mustafa Ziyâeddîn			1265, 1268	lithography	1268: 43p.
Kitâb-ı Tafsîl-i Tarîkatü'l-mukarribîn ve sebilü'l-müttekîn	Ahmed b. Hamza Ayıntablı Felekzâde	Abdurrahman ed-Darîr (compiled)		1269, 1273	lithography (all)	1269: 140p.; 1273: 219p.
Tezkiretü's-salât	Lutfullah en-Nesefî	Abdurrahman ed-Darîr		1269	lithography	142p.
Menâfi‘ü'l-hüccâc	Mustafa Hami Paşa			1272, 1280	typography (1272)	1272: 7+92p.;
Menâsık-i hac (Nebzetü'l-menâsik)	Murad Nakşibendi			1263, 1272, 1273, 1274	lithography (1263)	1263: 97p.; 1274: 127p.
Nehcetü'l-menâzil	Mehmed b. Edib Muhammed Derviş			1232		

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Faziletü'l-mücâvere fî Mekke-i Mükerreme	Hasan el-Basrî			1272, 1280	typography (1272)	
Tuhfetü'l-Harameyn	Nabi Yusuf			1265		112p.
Muhtasarü'l Menâsik	Ahmed Tahir			1280		
Menâsik-ı Hacc-ı şerîf	Mustafa Niyazi Şeyh Seyyid			1272, 1273, 1274	lithography	1272: 60p.; 1273: 106p.; 1274: 126p.
Menâsik-i Hac	Mustafa elhac Beyzade			1264		
Hüsnü't-tevessül fi'n-nehâr ve'l-leyli, şerhu salâti eş-Şeyh Şemasül	Şeyh Ahmed Şemasül	Ali Vasfi		1276		
Şürûtu's-salât				1261, 1276, 1278		
Şürûtu's-salât tercümesi				1219, 1261, 1266, 1270, 1275, 1276, 1278	lithography (1261, 1266, 1270, 1275)	1219: 23p.; 1261: 20p.; 1270: 22p.; 1275: 10p.
Şerhu Şir'ati'l-İslâm				1273		
Nasîhat-i nisvân				1261	lithography	26p.

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Mürşidü'n-nisâ	Mustafa Akşehri			1265, 1277, 1280	lithography	1265: 72p.; 1273: 87p.
Mürşid-i müteehhilîn	Kutbeddin el İzniki			1273, 1277	lithography	1273: 87p.
Ed'iye-i Me'sûre-Du'ânâme-i Ebussuud	Ebussuud Efendi			1260, 1277	lithography	20p.
Üstüvânî	Mehmed Üstüvani			1273, 1274, 1275	lithography	1274: 71p.; 1275: 61p.
Kitâb-ı Risale-i Ed'iyye (Du'ânâme)	Mehmed Tevfik			1267, 1269, 1272, 1274, 1275	lithography (1269, 1272)	32p.
Münyetü'l-musallî ve Gunyetü'l-mubtedî	Sedîdüddîn Kâşgarî			1265, 1277	typography (1265, 1277)	1265: 73p.; 1277: 73p.
Halebî-i kebîr (Gunyetü'l-mütemellî fî şerhi Münyeti'l-musallî)	Sedîdüddîn Kâşgarî	İbrahim Halebî		1239, 1253, 1256, 1265, 1277		
Halebî-i sağîr (Muhtasar Gunyeti'l-mütemellî)	Sedîdüddîn Kâşgarî	İbrahim Halebî		1239, 1242, 1253, 1256, 1265, 1265, 1268, 1275, 1277	typography (1275)	1275: 299p.

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Halebî tercümesi Babadağı (Halebî-i sağîr tercümesi)	Sedîdüddîn Kâşgarî	İbrahim Halebî	İbrahim b. Abdullah b. İbrahim el Babadağî	1242,1255, 1260, 1264, 1268, 1269, 1275, 1271, 1272, 1275, 1278	lithography (1272, 1275)	1255: 361p.; 1260: 361p.; 1272: 469p.; 1278: 361p.
Hilyetü'n-nâcî alâ Gunyeti'l-mütemellî (hâşiye on Halebî-i Sağir)	Sedîdüddîn Kâşgarî	İbrahim Halebî	Muhammed Mustafa b. Güzelhisârî	1231, 1244, 1250, 1251, 1256, 1262, 1269, 1277, 1251	typography (1250)	1250: 563p.
Risâle-i bey‘ ü şirâ’ şerhi	Dârendeli Hamza Efendi		Müftü İsmâil b. Osman b. Ebu Bekir b. Yusuf Niyâzi Hamza	1262	typography	2+91p.

Table B6. Printed Books on Advice Literature (*mev'ize, nasihat, ahlak)*

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Ahlâk-ı Ahmedî	Hüseyin b. Ali Kâşifî Mevlânâ (Ahlâk-ı Muhsinî)	Osmanzâde Ahmed Tâib (translated)	1256	typography	96p.
Rişte-i cevâhir	Ali b. Tâlib	Konevî Yusuf Nesih Dede	1257, 1277	typography	229p.
Zübdetü'n-nasâyih	Şeyhülislam Seyfeddîn Ahmed b. Yahyâ el-Herevî	Mehmed Rauf es-Seyyid	1260, 1269	typography	20p.
Dürretü'n-nâsihîn	Osman b. Hasan Hopavî		1261, 1262, 1263, 1267, 1269, 1275, 1274	typography	1261: 241p.; 1267: 315p.; 1275: 315p.; 1262: 261p.
Mecâlisü'l-va'z ve't-tezkîr	İsmail Hakkı Bursevî		1266		
Meclis	Hamamizâde		1251		
el-Mecâlisü's-Sinâniyye el-kabira	Hasan b. Ummî Sinan		1260		
Tercüme-i Eyyühe'l-veled	İmam Gazâlî	Süleyman b. Çerağ	1270	typography	30p
Saatnâme	Hibetullah b. İbrahim		1273, 1280	lithography (all)	1273: 128p.; 1280: 95p.
Tuhfetü'l-mecâlis	Hüseyin Çelebi Fütûhî		1277	lithography	138p.
Kitâb-ı Mürşid-i pend-i Ahmediyye	Ahmed Mürşidî		1280	lithography	482p.

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Nasîhatnâme-i İsmail Hakkı	İsmail Hakkı Bursevî		1278	lithography	
Pendnâme-i Azmî Efendi	Azmî Efendi		1258		
Nasîhat-i tasavvuf-ı Zarifî	Ömer Zarifî		1271	lithography	64p.
Pend-i Attâr	Feridüddîn Attâr		1251, 1257, 1260, 1266	lithography	
Şerh-i Pend-i Attâr	Feridüddîn Attâr	Şeyh İsmail Hakkı	1250, 1253, 1267	lithography	71p.
Ma Hazar	Feridüddîn Attâr	Murad Nakşibendi	1252, 1255, 1260, 1274	typography: 1260, 1274	1252: 267p.; 1274: 267p.
Pend-i Attâr tercümesi	Feridüddîn Attâr		1274, 1280	lithography	1274: 47p.; 1280: 47p.
Lütfiyye-i Vehbî	Sünbülzâde Vehbî		1252, 1266, 1267, 1270, 1272, 1276	lithography (1270, 1272, 1276)	1252: 53p.; 1266: 48p.; 1272: 48p.; 1276: 48p.
Hülasa-i Lütfiyye	Sünbülzâde Vehbî		1266	lithography	48p.
Hâbnâme	Süleyman Veysi		1263	lithography	1263: 33p.
Tercüme-i Nasâyih-i Eflâtûn-ı İlâhî	Mehmed Ali Fethi		1280	lithography	8p.
Mecmû‘atü'l-Letâif	Serrâc ibn Abdullah		1260	lithography	32p.
Risâle-i ahlâk	Mehmed Sadık Rıfat Paşa		1263, 1267, 1273, 1275, 1278, 1280	lithography (1263, 1267, 1275)	1263: 37p.; 1267: 39p.; 1275: 31p.;
Zeyl-i Risâle-i ahlâk	Mehmed Sadık Rıfat Paşa		1273, 1275		

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Mir’âtü'l-Kadı	Ali Galip Efendi (Necipefendizâde)		1266		
Hulâsatü'l-burhân fî itâ‘ati's-sultan	Şeyhülislam Yâsincizâde Abdülvehhâb		1247	typography	31p.
Zübdetü'l-Murad fî emri'l-cihâd		Mehmed Fikri b. Hüseyin Kayseri	1277		
Tercüme-i Siyasetnâme	Dede Efendi Minkârîzâde	Şeyhülislam Mehmed Arif	1275		
Düstûrü'l-amel	Katip Çelebi		1280	typography	21p.
Ma‘lûmat-ı nâfi‘a	Ahmed Cevdet Paşa		1279, 1280	lithography (1279)	1279: 16p.; 1280: 19p.
Risâle-i Koçi Bey	Mustafa Koçi		1277		
Benâm-ı havariyyum Bürûc-ı Fünûn	Aleksandır Beyzâde		1273		
Hutbe-i nikâh			1277		

Table B7. Printed State Regulations and Documents

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	DATE OF PRINTING
Usûl-i Atîka-i Teşrîfât-ı Devlet-i Aliyye-i Osmâniyye'ye Dair Risâle	Sahaflar Şeyhizâde Esad Efendi	
Kanunnâme-i asâkir-i mansûre-i Muhammediyye		1244, 1253
Kanunnâme-i cezâ-i askeriyye		1245, 1253
Kanunnâme-i askeriyye		1253
Kanunnâme (memurlar hakkında)		1254
Memûrîn cezâ kanunnâmesi		1254
Tarîk-i ilmiyeye dâir cezâ kanunnâmesi		1254
Tarîk-i ilmiye kanunnâmesi zeyli		1254
Kavânîn-i âl-i Osman der hulâsa-i mezâmîn-i defter-i dîvân	Aynî Ali Efendi	1863
Kanunnâme-i Hümâyûn-ı ticâret-i bahriyye		1280
Kanunnâme-i ticârat (turuk ticâreti)		1265
Fihrist-i Kanunnâme-i Hümâyûn		1262
Kur'a Kanunnâmesi		1262
Asâkir-i Berriye-i Şâhâne cezâ kanunnâme-i Hümâyûnudur		1274
Şerh-i Kanunnâme-i Arazî (Mekteb-i Mülkiye-i Şâhâne beşinci senesine mahsûstur)	Kuyucaklızâde Mehmed Âtıf	1274
Ticâret Kanunnâme-i Hümâyûnuna Zeyl		1276
Ticâret Kanunnâme-i Hümâyûnuna Zeyl		1279
Şerh-i Kanunnâme-i Ticâret		1278
Cezâ Kanunnâme-i Hümâyûnuna Müceddeden Zeyl ve İlâve Olunan Ba'zı Fıkarât		1277
Cezânâme		1253
Cezâ Kanunnâme-i Hümâyûnu		1256, 1274, 1277
Kanunnâme-i Bahriye-i Cihâdiye		1254

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	DATE OF PRINTING
Nizâmât-ı Cedîde-i Askeriyyeye müte‘allik kanunnâme-i hümâyûn kaleme alınıp neşr ve i‘lân olununcaya kadar muvakkaten kanun hükmünde tutulmak üzere tanzîm olunan ta‘lîmnâmedir		1260
Nizâmât-ı Cedîde-i Askeriyyeye müte‘allik kanunnâme-i hümâyûn kaleme alınıp neşr ve i‘lân olununcaya kadar muvakkaten kanun hükmünde tutulmak üzere tanzîm birle bundan akdem tab‘ ve temsîl olunan ta‘lîmâtın zeylidir		1261
Süvâriyânın Hidmet-i Dâhiliye Kanunnâmesi		1275
Tapu nizâmnâmesi		1275
Ta‘lîmât-ı Umûmiyye		1262
Gülhâne Hattı ve Ba‘zı Nizâmât ve Ta‘lîmât		1267
Turuk ve ebniye nizâmnâmesidir		1278
Ta‘lîmât-ı Sıhhiyye		1266
Mecmû‘a-i Kavânîn ve Nizâmât		1267
Kanun-ı Piyâde-i Dâhiliyye		1251
Kanunnâme-i hümâyûn-ı ticâret-i bahriyye		1280
Devlet-i Aliyye ile düvel-i mütehâbbe beynlerinde teyemmünen mün‘akid olan mu‘âhedât-ı atîka ve cedîdeden me’mûrîn-i saltanat-ı seniyyeye mürâca‘atı lazım gelen fıkarât-ı ahdiyeyi mutazammın risâledir		1275
Bu defa Anadolu ve Rumeli taraflarında li-ecli'l-ihtiyât cem‘ ve tertîb olunmuş ordu-yı hümâyûn ma‘iyyetine memûr asâkir-i nizâmiyye ve redîfe-i şâhâne alay ve taburlarından firâr edenlerin ve üst taraflarında olan ita‘atsizlik edenlerin hakkında olacak cezâları mübeyyin kanunnâme		1269
Bi'l-umûm mahâkim-i şer‘iyye hakkında müceddeden kaleme alınan nizâmnâmedir		1276

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	DATE OF PRINTING
Beledî ispençiyarlık san‘atının icrâsına dâir nizâmnâme		1279
Defter-i kütübhâne-i Dâmad İbrahim Paşa	Abdurrahman Nacim	1279
Sâlnâme-i Devlet-i Aliyye-i Osmâniyye		1257
Sâlnâme-i Devlet-i Aliyye-i Osmâniyye. 1. Def‘a		1263
Sâlnâme-i Devlet-i Aliyye-i Osmâniyye. 2. Def‘a		1264
Sâlnâme-i Devlet-i Aliyye-i Osmâniyye. 3. Def‘a		1265
Sâlnâme-i Devlet-i Aliyye-i Osmâniyye. 4. Def‘a		1266
Sâlnâme-i Devlet-i Aliyye-i Osmâniyye. 5. Def‘a		1267
Sâlnâme-i Devlet-i Aliyye-i Osmâniyye. 6. Def‘a		1268
Sâlnâme-i Devlet-i Aliyye-i Osmâniyye. 7. Def‘a		1269
Sâlnâme-i Devlet-i Aliyye-i Osmâniyye. 8. Def‘a		1270
Sâlnâme-i Devlet-i Aliyye-i Osmâniyye. 9. Def‘a		1271
Sâlnâme-i Devlet-i Aliyye-i Osmâniyye. 10. Def‘a		1272
Sâlnâme-i Devlet-i Aliyye-i Osmâniyye. 11. Def‘a		1273
Sâlnâme-i Devlet-i Aliyye-i Osmâniyye. 12. Def‘a		1274
Sâlnâme-i Devlet-i Aliyye-i Osmâniyye. 13. Def‘a		1275
Sâlnâme-i Devlet-i Aliyye-i Osmâniyye. 14. Def‘a		1276
Sâlnâme-i Devlet-i Aliyye-i Osmâniyye. 15. Def‘a		1277
Sâlnâme-i Devlet-i Aliyye-i Osmâniyye. 16. Def‘a		1278
Sâlnâme-i Devlet-i Aliyye-i Osmâniyye. 17. Def‘a		1279
Sâlnâme-i Devlet-i Aliyye-i Osmâniyye. 18. Def‘a		1280
Takvîm-i Sâl	Osman Sâib Efendi	1271
Takvîm-i Sâl	Osman Sâib Efendi	1272
Takvîm-i Sâl	Osman Sâib Efendi	1270
Takvîm-i Sâl	Osman Sâib Efendi	1273

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	DATE OF PRINTING
Takvîm-i Sâl	Osman Sâib Efendi	1274
Takvîm-i Sâl	Osman Sâib Efendi	1275
Takvîm-i Sâl	Osman Sâib Efendi	1276
Takvîm-i Sâl	Osman Sâib Efendi	1277
Takvîm-i Sâl	Osman Sâib Efendi	1278
Takvîm-i Sâl	Osman Sâib Efendi	1279
Takvîm-i Sâl	Osman Sâib Efendi	1280
Ahkâm-ı Sâl		1273
Ahkâm-ı Sâl		1277
Ahkâm-ı Külliye-i Sâl		1267
Ahkâm-ı Tâli‘-i Sâl		1272
Ahkâm-ı Tâli‘-i Sâl		1278

Table B8. Printed Military Manuals

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Asâkir-i piyâdegânın a‘mâl ve harekâtına dâir olan usûl			1245		
Asâkir-i mansûre-i Muhammediyye'nin isti‘mâliçün nefer ta‘lîmi	Hüsrev Mehmed Paşa		1248	lithography	110p.
Kılavuz ta‘lîmi			1248, 1265	lithography	1248: 73p.; 1265: 131p.
Top alayı ta‘lîmi	Hüsrev Mehmed Paşa		1250		
Top bölüğü ta‘lîmi	Hüsrev Mehmed Paşa		1250, 1252	lithography	50p.
Topçu ta‘lîmnâmesi			1259		
Alay ta‘lîmi	Hüsrev Mehmed Paşa		1245		
Alay ta‘lîmi			1247	lithography	33p.
Alay ta‘lîmi			1252		
Alay ta‘lîmi			1263		
Hizmet-i askeriye der zamân-ı sefer	Hüsrev Mehmed Paşa		1254		
Ta‘lîm-i asâkir-i piyâdegân ma‘a topçiyân	Hüsrev Mehmed Paşa		1250	lithography	41p.
Müzekkere-i zabitân	Hüsrev Mehmed Paşa		1251	lithography	67p.
Nefer ta‘lîmi	Hüsrev Mehmed Paşa		1254		
Tabur ta‘lîmi (Nuhbetü't-ta‘lîm)	Hüsrev Mehmed Paşa		1247	lithography	13p.
Tabur ta‘lîmi ve tabur ta‘lîmine dâir olan eşkâlin ta‘rîfi			1264		
Tabur ta‘lîmi			1273	lithography	376p.
Ta‘lîmnâme-i süvâriyân	Mehmed Sai Paşa		1253		
Ta‘lîmnâme-i süvâriyân. Bölük Ta‘lîmi			1276		

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Avcı ta‘lîmi			1254		
Avcı ta‘lîmi			1265	lithography	102p.
Avcı ta‘lîmi			1266		
Şişhâneci ta‘lîmnâmesi	Ferdinand Philip Duc D'orleans	Hüseyin Avni	1270	lithography	563p.
Ta‘lîmnâme-i piyâdegân (cild-i evvel)	Hüsrev Mehmed Paşa		1245		
Ta‘lîmnâme-i piyâdegân (cild-i sâni)			1245		
Ta‘lîmnâme-i piyâdegân (cild-i sâlis)			1245		
Ta‘lîmnâme-i piyâdegân (cild-i evvel)			1254		
Ta‘lîmnâme-i piyâdegân. Bölük Ta‘lîminin Aksâmı ve Kavâid-i Umûmîyesi			1253		
Ta‘lîmnâme-i piyâdegân			1276		
Ta‘lîmnâme-i piyâdegân			1256		
Ta‘lîmnâme-i piyâdegân			1276		
Piyâde ta‘lîmnâmesi	Safvet Paşa		1279-80		
Piyâde alay ta‘lîmnâmesi			1276	lithography	391p.
Hidemât-ı zâbitân-ı sağirân			1255		
Sübha-i zâbitân			1255		
Teftîş-i ahvâl-i askeriyye ta‘lîmâtnâmesi			1277		
Hizmet-i seferiye-i askeriyye			1278		

Table B9. Printed Books on Natural Sciences and Engineeing

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Ünmûzecü'l-ulûm li-erbâbi'l-fühûm	Tarsusî Mehmed Efendi		1275		
Tertîbü'l-ulûm	İbrahim Hakkı Erzurumî		1250, 1255		
Lağımcı manevrası	Hafız Paşa		1249	typography	28p.
Usûl-i istihkâmât	Beloin	İshak Hoca	1250		463p.
Usûlü's-siyâga	İshak Hoca		1831-1833		148p.
Ameliyât-ı muhâsara		Mehmed Selim Paşa	1265	lithography	111p.
Ameliyât-ı lağım		Mehmed Selim Paşa	1265	lithography	111p.
İlm-i harbin birinci makâlesi			1267		
Sevku'l-ceyş	Magnan	Ohannes ve Hüseyin Avni	1267	lithography	215p.
Fenn-i harb: Ta'biyetü'l-ceyş	Magnan	Ohannes ve Hüseyin Avni	1268	lithography	391p.
Mecmû'a-i manevra	Schtramm	Hüseyin Avni	1267, 1271	lithography	73p. each
Desâis-i harbiyye ve hud'a-i askeriyye	Halid Namık Paşazâde Halil		1269	lithography	256p.
Mecmû'a-i istihkâmât-ı hafîfe		Mehmed Said	1270	lithography	366p.
Risâle-i menâzım-ı askeriyye			1262		
Telhîsu resâili'r-rümât	Mustafa Kani ibn Mehmed		1263		
Risâle-i manevra-i fünûn-ı bahriyye	Vakur		1255, 1270	lithography	
Fenn-i istihkâmât-ı hafîfe	Difour	Ömer Nâilî	1278		
Usul-i istihkâm-i kılâ	Seyyid Ali Paşa		1259		
İlmiyât ve ameliyât-ı fenn-i top risâlesi	Bahri Bey	Torosi	1270	lithography	306p.

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Top Cedveli			1271	lithography	49p.
Nazariyât ve hizmet-i topçiyân	Muhlis Bey	Davidoğlu Karabet	1279	lithography	
Esnâ-yı muhâberede vapur makinalarının gülle isâbetinden muhâfazası		Mehmed Salih	1270		
Manevra-i fünûn-ı bahriyye	Korik		1270		
Terceme-i navigasyon		Halil Efendi	1270, 1273	lithography	543p.
Füyûzât-ı mıknatısıyye (Mekâtib-i Rüşdiye şakirdânı için)	Müteferrika		1144, 1266		
Hikmet-i tabî‘iyye	Kıbrıslı Sabit Efendi		1849- 1854		
İlm-i hikmet-i tabî‘iyye			1277	lithography	307p.
Mesâil-i hikmet	Hayrullah Efendi		1265	typography	119p.
İrtifâ‘ cedveli risâlesi		Hakkı	1267		
İlm-i tabakât-ı arz		Mehmed Ali Fethi	1255, 1269	typography	142p.
Mebâhis-i fenn-i buhar		Mehmed Salih Paşa	1270	lithography	310p.
Telgraf risâlesi (Muhabere memurine ile şakirdlere mahsus)		Mustafa Hami Paşa	1273	lithography	33p.
Kavâ‘id-i fünûniyye			1274		
Paratoner risâlesi	Asitaneli Ali Paşa		1279	lithography	25p.
Usûl-i kimya	Lassaigne	Derviş Mehmed Emin Paşa	1263, 1264, 1269	lithography (1269)	
Alât-ı kimyeviyye risâlesi		Bostanizâde Mustafa es-Seyyid el-Hâc	1266	lithography	18p.
Cerr-i eskâl	Mehmed Eşref		1278		

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
İlm-i cerr-i eskâl	Bostanizâde Mehmed Tahir Paşa (Küçük Tahir Paşa)		1279	lithography	304p.
Ayn-ı hayât	Abdurrahman b. İbrahim el-Adanavî es-Sivasî		1272		

Table B10. Printed Books on Mathematics

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Tercüme-i Usûlü'l-hendese	John Bonnycastle	Hüseyin Rıfkı Tamânî	1212, 1220, 1246, 1269, 1271	lithography (1272)	1269: 272p.;
Mecmû'atü'l-mühendisîn	Hüseyin Rıfkı Tamânî		1217, 1220, 1246, 1260, 1269, 1273, 1274	lithography (1273)	1246: 294p.; 1260: 496p.; 1273: 292p.;
İmtihânü'l-mühendisîn	Hüseyin Rıfkı Tamânî		1217, 1220, 1246, 1260	typography (1217)	1217: 115p.
Mecmû'a-i ulûm-i riyâziyye	İshak Hoca		1247-1250	typography (1217)	vol 1 (512p.); Vol. 2 (486p.), Vol. 3 (649p.); Vol. 4 (536p.)
İlm-i kutû'-i mahrûtiyyât	Seyyid Ali Paşa		1257	typography (1217)	207p.
Risâletü'l-hisâb	Pierre Vernier		1262	lithography	192p.
Müsellesât-ı müsteviyye	Bostanizâde Mehmed Tahir Paşa (Küçük Tahir Paşa)		1264	lithography	87p.
Müsellesât-ı müsteviyye ve küreviyye	Bostanizâde Mehmed Tahir Paşa (Küçük Tahir Paşa)		1279	lithography	214p.

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
İlm-i cebir ve mukâbele (Usûl-i cebir)	Bostanizâde Mehmed Tahir Paşa (Küçük Tahir Paşa)		1266, 1278	lithography	1266: 219p; 1278: 348p.
Zeyl-i usûl-i cebir	Vidinli Tevfik Paşa		1278	lithography	348p.
Ta‘lîm-i hesâb (Hesâb risâlesi)	Tarsusizâde Osman		1264, 1270, 1275, 1280	lithography (all)	38p. (all)
Hazinetü'l-hisâb	Sirot	Mustafa Sıdkı Paşa	1279		
Usûl-i hendese-i resmiyye	Mogino	Çamiçoğlu Ohannes	1265		
Nuhbetü'l-hisâb	Ahmed Tevhid		1270	lithography	71p.
Telhîsü'l-a‘mâl	Ahmed Tevhid		1270	lithography	136p.
Zübdetü'l-hisâb			1272	lithography	80p.
Teshîlü'l-hisâb	Mehmed Tevfîk		1274		
Şerhu Risâleti'l-küre	Muhammed b. Ali Humeydî	Mehmed b. Ahmed el-Âmidî	1275		
Usûl-i ilm-i hesâb	Safvet		1275		
Logaritma cedveli (Logaritmanın esâsı ve ta‘rîfi ve sûret-i isti‘mâli beyânındadır)	J. Lalande	Saffet Paşa	1269, 1278	lithography (1278)	2+46+203p.
Usûl-i fenn-i tatbîk ve kutû‘-ı mahrûtiyyât	Bourdon ve Sirot	Mahmud Mesud	1278	lithography	312p.
İlm-i hesâb	Mustafa Fethi Paşa		1279	lithography (all)	374p.
Tuhfetü'l-muhâsibîn	Bekir Sıdkı Bey		1280	lithography	48p.

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Aksü'l-merâyâ fî ahziz-zevâyâ	İshak Efendi		1250		
Eşkâlü't-te'sîs	Muhammed b. Eşref Semerkandî		1268, 1274	lithography (all)	
Şerhu eşkâli't-te'sîs	Muhammed b. Eşref Semerkandî	Kadızâde-i Rûmî	1268, 1274	lithography (all)	
Hâşiye alâ şerhi eşkâli't-te'sîs	Semerkandî-Kadızâde	Ebu'l-Feth Muhammed b. Said Hüseynî	1268, 1274	lithography (all)	
Hulâsatü'l-hisâb	Bahâeddîn Muhammed el-Âmilî		1268, 1277, 1279	lithography (1268)	46p.
Risâle der ilm-i hisâb (Mîzânü'l-hisâb)	Ali Kuşçu		1266, 1269		

Table B11. Printed Books on Medicine

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Kolera risâlesi (İllet-i cedîde risâlesi)	Mustafa Behçet		1247	typography	12p.
Ahkâmü'l-emrâz	August François Chaumel	Osman Sâib Efendi	1252	typography	177p.
Terceme-i İthâfü'l-üdebâ		Hamdan b. Osman Cezairî"	1254		
Makalât-ı tıbbiyye	de Bois	Hayrullah Efendi	1259	typography	149p.
Me'debetü'l-hıtân	Karslızâde Mehmed Cemaleddîn		1252		
Frengi risâlesi			1262	lithography	45p.
Menâfi'ü'l-etfâl	Anonymous		1262	lithography	48p.
Kolera risâlesi	İsmail Paşa		1263	lithography	31p.
Risâle-i jimnastik	İsmail Paşa		1263	lithography	54p.
Hayvanâtda zuhûr eden ilel-i sâriyenin indifâ'ı zımnında tertîb olunan ba'zı usûl ve tedâbirin ta'rîfine dâir risâle	Potlewski		1263	lithography	15p.
Panzehirnâme	Mustafa Hâmî Paşa		1271	lithography	83p.
Sıhhatnümâ	Mustafa Hâmî Paşa		1271	typography	80p.
Riyâzet-i bedeniyye-i tıbbiyye	Schrebber	Mustafa Hâmî Paşa	1276		
Tertîb-i eczâ	Mustafa Behçet Efendi		1232, 1274	lithography	1274: 11p.
Fevâidü'l-minhati fî kavâ'idi's-sıhhati	Mehmed Reşid		1280		
Heyza ve maraz-ı esved	Abdülhak Molla		1247		12p.
Kaplıca risâlesi	Charles Ambroise Bernard		1265	lithography	99p.
Kavânîn-i cerrâhiye	Miralay Kaymakam Hafız Bey		1269-1271		

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Künûz-i sıhha	Mustafa Resmi Çerkesi	Mehmed Raşid Efendi	1277		
Hezâr Esrâr	Mustafa Behçet		1278	lithography	214p.
Dürûrü'l-muhât	Hayrullah Efendi		1260	lithography	43p.
İllet-i Efrenc	Ahmed Said		1277		
Latince Fransızca ordu hastane ihtiyaç kodeksi	Charles Ambroise Bernard		1844		
Usûl-i zarb bi'l-yad ve sam bi'l-vasıta	Charles Ambroise Bernard		1843		
Risâle-i Nusret Efendi, Mâ-hazar	Ebubekir Nusret Hoca Harputî		1245, 1268, 1269, 1275, 1276, 1279	lithography (all)	1268: 94p.; 1269: 149p.; 1275: 147p.; 1276: 148p.; 1279: 72p.
eṭ-Ṭıbbü'n-nebevî (Ṭıbbü'n-nebî)	İbn Habîb en-Nîsâbûrî		1276	lithography	32p.
Havâss-ı Biberiye	Zeynelâbidîn b. Halîl	Zeki Ali	1269	lithography	24p.
Kitâbü devâi'l-ebdân	Ebu'l-Kâsımı Muhammedü'n-Nîsâburî	Hasan b. Ömer es-Sungûrî	1277	lithography	42p.
Hacamat risâlesi	Osman b. Musa Eskişehrî		1277	lithography	9p.
Risâle-i çay	Yusufî	Ebu'l-Hayr Ahmed Efendi	1269, 1272, 1273, 1274	lithograpy (1273)	

Table B12. Printed Books on Geography and Astronomy

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
el-Medhal fi'l-coğrafya	Hüseyin Rıfkı Tamânî	İshak Hoca	1247, 1266, 1274, 1277, 1292	typography	1247: 88p; 1266: 88p.; 1274: 88p.
Ta‘lîmü'l-küre		Müneccimbaşı Osman Sâib	1264, 1266, 1275	lithography (1275)	1275: 21p.
Mebâdî-i fenn-i coğrafya/Risâle-i coğrafya	Auguste Michelot, Achille Meissas	Bogos Tiryakioğlu	1262, 1263, 1264, 1266	lithography (1263,1264)	1263: 61p.; 1264: 61p.
İsti‘mâl-i küre-i arz (Küre-i arz isti‘mâli üzerine lâzım gelen ma‘lûmât)	Safvet		1267	lithography	73p.
Coğrafya			1270, 1272		
Risâle-i muhtasar coğrafya		Kamil Sezâi	1270	lithography:	72p.
Coğrafya Risâlesi		Şirvanlı Ahmed Hamdi	1273, 1279	lithography	1273: 86p.; 1279: 74p.
Fenn-i coğrafya		Mehmed el-Enverî	1273	lithography	407p.
Fenn-i topografya	J. J. Guilloud	Mustafa	1277	lithography	525p.
Coğrafya Risâlesi and atlas		Kolağası Şevket Bey	1280		
Avrupa Risâlesi	Seyyid Mustafa Sami		1256, 1268	typography	40p.

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Seyahatnâme-i Londra			1269	typography	92p.
Bahs-i evvel Venedik ve Cenevizli gemicilerinin keşf eylediği Cezayir ve sâniyen Kristof Kolomb'un Amerikayı bulması beyânındadır,		Seyyid Mehmed Raif	1273	lithography	56p.
Tercüme-i Risâle-i Sudan	es-Seyyid Muhammed b. Ali b. Zeynelâbidîn		1262	typography	91p.
Hıtâynâme	Ali Ekber Hıtaî		1270		
Seyahatnâme-i hudûd		Muhammed Hurşid Efendi	1275	lithography	399p.
Muhtasar Coğrafya Avrupa	Adriano Balbi	Osman Sâib Efendi	1257	lithography	69p.
Asya Kıt‘ası	Adriano Balbi	Osman Sâib Efendi	1258	lithography	84p.
Coğrafya Kıt‘a-i Afrika		Osman Sâib Efendi	1263	lithography	65p.
Kıt‘a-i Afrika	Malte Brun	Hayrullah Efendi	1268	lithography	220p.
Risâle fi'l-ameli bi'r-rub‘i'l-mukantar	Akhisargeyveli Ahmed Nâilî		1244, 1274	lithography	32p.
el-Nâ'iliyya fi'l-ameli'l-caybiyya	Akhisargeyveli Ahmed Nâilî		1244, 1274		
Cedâvil-i felekiyye, Mahsûbe li-mekke ve'l-medîne	Müneccimbaşı Ahmed Tahir Efendi		1264		
Kifâyetü'l-kanûn fi'l-amel bi'r-rubʿi'ş-şimâlî el-maktûʿ	Sıbtu'l-Mardînî		1273		
İlm-i heyet	J. J. Guilloud	Baytar Mehmed Refet Paşa	1275, 1277	lithography (both)	1275: 487p.; 1277: 487p.

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Fenn-i heyet		Mustafa Safvet	1267	lithography	72p.
Risâle-i kozmografya	Auguste Michelot	Bogos Tiryakioğlu	1274	typography	28p.
Fenn-i kozmografya	Bostanizâde Mehmed Tahir	Bostanizâde Mehmed Tahir	1280	typography	126p.
Kitâbü fî İlmi'l-felek	Anonymous		1267		
Risâle-i teşkilü'd-devâir		Müneccimbaşı Ahmed Tahir	1275	lithography	3p.
Efkârü'l-ceberût fî Tercemeti Esrâri'l-melekût	Bâkîhanlı	Hayatızâde Seyyid Şeref Halil	1265	typography	236p.
Risâletü'l-Kura	Muhammed b. Ali al-Hamîdî		1275	lithography	95p.

Table B13. Printed Books on Jurisprudence

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
el-Ferâizü's-Sirâciyye	Muhammed b. Muhammed es-Secâvendî		1272		
Şerhu's-Sirâciyye	Sirâceddîn Secâvendî	Seyyid Cürcânî	1269		161p.
Mürşidü'l-varisîn fî ahvâli'l-erbaʻîn	Mehmed Mekkî		1256, 1276, 1277, 1273	lithography	31p.
Câmiʻu'l-feyz (Kitâbü'l-ferâiz el-müsemmâ bi-câmiʻi'l-feyz)	Yusuf Ziyaeddîn b. Yakub		1273	lithography	102p.
Ahkâmü'l-merʻiyye fi'l-arâzi'l-emîriyye	Ahmed Arif Hikmet		1265, 1267, 1269	lithography (1269)	1265: 53p.; 1267: 53p.; 1269: 48p.
Dürerü'l-hükkâm fî şerhi Gureri'l-ahkâm	Molla Hüsrev	Molla Hüsrev	1257, 1258, 1260, 1268, 1277		
Tercüme-i Düreri'l-hükkâm fî şerh-i Gureri'l-ahkâm	Molla Hüsrev	Süleyman b. Veli el-Ankaravî	1258		
Hâşiye ale'd-Dürer	Molla Hüsrev	Ebu Saîd el-Hâdimî	1266, 1269, 1270, 1277		1269:496 p.; 1277: 496p.
el-Keşf bi-rumûzi'l-Gureri'l-ahkâm ve tenvîr-i Düreri'l-hükkâm	Molla Hüsrev	Abdülhalîm b. Pîr Kadem	1270	typography	898 p. (2 vols)

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Mülteka'l-ebhur	İbrahim Halebî		1252, 1264, 1274, 1278		
Mevkûfâtî Mültekâ Tercümesi	İbrahim Halebî	Midillili Mehmed Mevkûfâtî Efendi	1250, 1254, 1294; 1256, 1284; 1266, 1269, 1276		
Mültekâ Şerhi Şeyhzâde Damad (Mecma‘u'l-enhur fî şerhi Mülteka'l-ebhur)	İbrahim Halebî	Şeyhzâde Damad	1240-1241, 1247-1248, 1252, 1257, 1258, 1264, 1273, 1274, 1276		
Edebü'l-Kazâ			1268		
Mirkâtü'l-vüsûl ilâ ilmi'l-usûl	Molla Hüsrev		1262, 1267, 1273, 1275	lithography (1267, 1275)	1267: 39p.; 1275: 39p
Mir’âtü'l-usûl fî şerhi Mirkâti'l-vusûl	Molla Hüsrev	Molla Hüsrev	1202, 1217, 1262, 1272, 1273		1202: 370p; 1262: 370p
Hâşiye alâ Mir’âti'l-usûl	Molla Hüsrev	Mevlânâ Mehmed İzmirî	1258, 1262, 1262		
Hâşiye alâ Mir’âti'l-usûl	Molla Hüsrev	Tarsûsî Mehmed Efendi	1267		
Hâşiye alâ Mir’âti'l-usûl	Molla Hüsrev	Abdürrezzâk b. Mustafa el-Antâkî	1279		
Hâşiye alâ Mir’âti'l-usûl	Molla Hüsrev	Hamid b. Mustafa el-Konevî	1267		259p.
Mir’âtü'l-Kâdî	Ali Galip Necib Efendizâde		1266	lithography	20p.
Cerîde-i ferâiz	Salih b. Abdullah		1263, 1264, 1269, 1272	lithography (all)	1264: 163p.;

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
					126: 163p.9:
Fetâvâ-yı Abdurrahim	Şeyhülislam Menteşzâde Abdurrahim Efendi		1243	typography	584p.
Netîcetü'l-fetâvâ ma‘an nükûl	Mehmed Arif Dürrizâde	Mehmed b. Ahmed b. Mustafa el-Kedusî	1237, 1265	typography	639p.
Fetâvâ-yı cami‘u'l-icâreteyn		Mehmed Arif Efendi (compiled)	1252	typography	427p.
Behcetü'l-fetavâ ma‘an nükûl	Şeyhülislam Yenişehirli Abdullah	Fetva Emini Mehmed Fıkhî el-Aynî (compiled)	1266		
Fetâvâ-yı Ali Efendi ma‘an nükûl	Şeyhülislam Ali Çatalcalı	Salih b. Ahmed Kefevî (compiled)	1245, 1258, 1266, 1272, 1278	typography	737p.
Fetâvâ-yı Feyziyye ma‘an nükûl	Şeyhülislam Feyzullah Efendi		1266		
Tuhfetü's-sükûk	Debbağzâde Numan		1248, 1258, 1259	typography (1248, 1259)	1248: 417p.; 1259: 417p.
Dürrü's-sükûk	Mehmed Aziz Çavuşzâde		1277, 1278	typography	1277: 228p.
Mecâmi‘u'l-hakâik	Ebu Saîd Hâdimî		1273		
Menâfi‘ü'd-dekâik fî şerhi Mecâmi‘i'l-hakâık	Eb Saîd Hâdimî	Mustafa Hulûsi Güzelhisârî	1273		1273: 336+47p.
Müstahlasü'l-hakâik fî şerhi Kenzi'd-dekâik	Ebu’l-Berekât en-Nesefî	Ebu’l-Kāsım el-Leysî Semerkandi	1267		

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Cerîde-i müsevved-i Konevî	Mustafa el-Fehmi Ereğli		1275	lithography	109p.
Şemsü'l-hakîka	İshak Harputî Hoca		1278	typography (1248, 1259)	290p.
Tercüme-i milel ve nihal	Mehmed b. Abdülkerim eş-Şehristanî	Nuh b. Mustafa el-Mısrî	1263-1287, 1279	typography (1248, 1259)	1279: 174p.
Kitâbü'l-Azîzî fi'l-Muhtasari'l-Kudûrî	Kudûrî		1271		
el-Lübâb fî şerhi'l-Kitâb	Kudûrî	Abdülganî b. Tâlib el-Meydânî	1275		
Kitâbü'l-fürûk	İsmail Hakkı Bursevî		1251, 1271		1251: 235p; 1271: 160p.
ed-Dürrü'l-muhtar fî Tenvîrü'l-ebsâr	Muhammed b. Ali al-Haskefî	Şemseddin Timûrtâşî	1277		
Şir‘atü'l-İslâm	İmamzâde Muhammed b. Ebi Bekr	Yakub b. Seyyid Ali	1273		584p.

Table B14. Printed Books on Islamic Creed

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Risâle-i İtikâdiyye	Kasapbaşızâde İbrahim			1258	typography	15p.
Şerhu'l-Emâlî li-Aliyyi'l-Kârî	Ali b. Osman el-Ûşî	Ali b. Sultan ibn Muhammed el-Karî		1262, 1263, 1278	typography (1262)	1262: 56p.
Merahu'l-me‘âlî fî şerhi'l-Emâlî	Ali b. Osman el-Ûşî	Ali b. Sultan ibn Muhammed el-Karî	Ahmed Asım Ayıntabî (trans.)	1266	typography (1262)	22p.
Risâle fî beyâni'l-kazâ ve'l-kader	Ebussuud Efendi			1264	lithography	9p.
Risâle fî beyânı evsâfı ümmi'l-kitâb ve levh-i mahfûz ve levh-i ma‘nevî	Ahmed b. Süleyman Kemal Paşazâde			1264	lithography	28p..
Risâle-i İrade-i Cüz’iyye	Mehmed bin Mustafa el Akkirmani			1264	lithography	28p.
Manzûme-i (Akaid) İshak Efendi	İshak Tokadi Efendi			1268		
Şerhu'l-Akâidi'l-Adudiyye	Adudüddîn el-Îcî	Celâleddin ed-Devvânî		1263, 1271	lithography (1271)	1263: 110p; 1271: 120p.
Siyâlkûtî ale'l-Celâl	Adudüddîn el-Îcî	Celâleddin ed-Devvânî	Abdülhakim b. Şemseddîn Siyâlkûtî	1271		

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Hâşiye alâ şerhi'l-Celâl	Adudüddîn el-Îcî	Celâleddin ed-Devvânî	Ahmed Hayali	1233, 1260, 1272, 1277		
Manzûme-i se zebân-ı akâid-i Adudiyye	Adudüddîn el-Îcî		Mehmed Ferid (trans.)	1277	lithography	32p.
Metnü'l-akâidi'n-Nesefî	Ömer Nesefî			1276	typography	7p.
Şerh-i Akâid-i Sadeddîn	Ömer Nesefî	Sadeddîn et-Teftâzânî		1260, 1266, 1279		
Hâşiye alâ şerhi'l-Akâidi'n-Nesefiyye	Ömer Nesefî	Sadeddîn et-Teftâzânî	İsâmüddîn İsferâyînî	1249, 1276		1249: 305p; 1276: 223p.
Hâşiye alâ şerhi'l-Akâidi'n-Nesefiyye	Ömer Nesefî	Sadeddîn et-Teftâzânî	Ahmed Hayalî	1260, 1279		1260: 198p.
Zübdetü'l-efkâr (Hâşiye alâ şerhi'l-Akâidi'n-Nesefî li't-Teftâzânî)	Ömer Nesefî--- Sadeddîn et-Teftâzânî	Ahmed b. Musa Hayalî	Abdülhakim b. Şemseddîn Siyâlkûtî	1235, 1257, 1270, 1273		1257: 382p.
Hâşiyetü'l-Veliyüddîn alâ hâşiyeti İsâmüddîn alâ şerhi'l-Akâid li-Nesefiye	Ömer Nesefî--- Sadeddîn et-Teftâzânî	İsâmüddîn İsferâyînî	Veliyüddîn Carullah Efendi	1274		
Hâşiye alâ Hâşiyeti İsâmüddîn	Ömer Nesefî--- Sadeddîn et-Teftâzânî- İsâmüddîn İsferâyînî	Veliyüddîn Carullah Efendi	Muhammed İbn Mustafa Akkirmânî	1274		
Câmi‘u'l-mütûn	Ahmed Ziyaeddîn Gümüşhanevî			1273	typography	153p.

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Kitâbü'l-âbir fi'l-ensâr ve'l-muhâcir	Ahmed Ziyaeddîn Gümüşhanevî			1276		52p.
Kitâbu mir'âti'l-akâid	Molla Cami			1277	lithography	48p.
Şerhu'l-Makâsıd	Sadeddîn et-Teftâzânî			1277		
Müzilü'l-hifa	Murad Molla Nakşibendi			1256	typography	129p.
Akâid-i diniyyeye mute'allik mesâil-i itikâdiyye				1252	lithography	47p.
Es'ile-i hikemiye	İshak Harputî Hoca			1278	typography	166p.
Hıfz-ı imân risâlesi	Mehmed Emin b. Hasan el-Hâc Ofî			1272	lithography	51p.
Menba'ü's-saâde	Yusuf ibn Osman Harputî			1269		
Risâle-i taavvüz	Mustafa b. Halil ez-Zağravi	Mustafa Cem'i Efendi		1275	typography	28+222p.
Tercüme-i Risâle-i Suâl-i İblis aleyhi'l-la'ne				1272, 1276	lithography (1276)	1272: 16p.
Hikâye-i Bî-namaz	Anonymous			1272, 1276	lithography (1276)	16p.
Tercüme-i Kelâm-ı erba'in-i Hazret-i Ali el-Murtazavî	Mehmed Ali Fethi Rusçuklu			1276	lithography	8p.

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Tercüme-i Risâle-i Validiyye	Ubeydullah Ahrâr	Ali Harputî Beyzâde		1276		
Tercüme-i Risâleti'l-İsâmiyye	İsâmüddîn İsferâyînî	Ahmed el-Mevlevî		1256		
İlcâmü'l-avâm an ilmi'l-kelâm	Muhammed Gazalî			1278		
Mecmû‘atü'l-Kava‘id (Mecmû‘atü'r-Resâil)	İbrahim Gözübüyükzâde			1249, 1259, 1274	lithography (1274); typography (1249)	1274: 56p.; 1249: 59p.
Risâletü'l-Besmele	Ebu Said Muhammed el-Hadimî			1261	typography	84p.
Risâletü'l-Kurra	Muhammed b. Ali el-Humeydî			1275		
el-Mevâkıf	Adudüddîn el-Îcî			1266		
Şerhu'l-Mevâkıf	Adudüddîn el-Îcî	Seyyid Şerîf el-Cürcânî		1239, 1266, 1286		1266: 635p.
Şerhu'l-Mevâkıf	Adudüddîn el-Îcî	Sadeddîn et-Teftâzânî				
Şerhu'l-Mevâkıf	Adudüddîn el-Îcî	Sadeddîn et-Teftâzânî	Abdülhakim b. Şemseddîn Siyâlkûtî	1266		
Şerhu'l-Mevâkıf	Adudüddîn el-Îcî	Sadeddîn et-Teftâzânî	Hasan Çelebi	1266		
Risâle-i Hulâsat-ı Zübdetü'l-akâid	Mustafa Hami Paşa			1276	lithography	103p.

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Risale-i lam-i ahd	Ebu Said Muhammed el-Hadimî			1267	lithography	16p

Table B15. Printed Books on Logic

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
İhtilâfü's-Seyyid ve's-Sa‘deddîn	Abdullah Mescizâde Hüseyin			1278		
Nazîre-i unvanü'ş-şeref li el-Mukrî	İsmail b. Mukrî	Abdullah Vassaf el-Akhisarî		1275		
er-Risâletü'l-Velediyye	Saçaklızâde Muhammed el-Maraşî			1261, 1268, 1274		
Velediyye Şerhi	Saçaklızâde Muhammed el-Maraşî	Ömer b. Hüseyin el-Âmîdi		1261, 1268		1261: 155p.; 1268: 155p;
er-Risâletü'ş-şemsiyye fi'l-kavâ‘idi'l-mantıkıyye	Necmeddîn Ali b. Ömer el-Kâtibî el-Kazvinî			1263, 1270, 1273, 1274, 1279		
Tahrîrü'l-kavâ‘idi'l-mantıkıyye fî şerhi'r-Risâleti'ş-Şemsiyye	Necmeddîn Ali b. Ömer el-Kâtibî el-Kazvinî	Sadeddîn et-Teftâzânî		1272		
Hâşiyetü İsâm ale't-Tasavvurât	Necmeddîn Ali b. Ömer el-Kâtibî el-Kazvinî	Müftüzâde Muhammed Sadık Erzincanî		1254, 1259, 1276		
Tasavvurât ve Tasdikât-ı Şemsiyye	Necmeddîn Ali b. Ömer el-Kâtibî el-Kazvinî	Mevlânâ Kutbüddîn er-Râzî		1266, 1269	lithography (all)	1266: 88p; 1269: 89p.

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Hâşiyetü's-Seyyid ale't-Tasavvurât	Necmeddîn Ali b. Ömer el-Kâtibî el-Kazvinî	Mevlânâ Kutbüddîn er-Râzî	Seyyid Şerif Cürcânî	1260, 1268, 1270, 1273		
Siyâlkûtî alâ Tasavvurât	Necmeddîn Ali b. Ömer el-Kâtibî el-Kazvinî	Mevlânâ Kutbüddîn er-Râzî-Cürcânî	Abdülhakim Siyâlkûtî	1238, 1259, 1268, 1276		
Tahrîrü'l-kavâ'idi'l-mantıkıyye fî şerhi'r-Risâleti'ş-Şemsiyye	Necmeddîn Ali b. Ömer el-Kâtibî el-Kazvinî	Mevlânâ Kutbüddîn er-Râzî		1259,1272		1259: 182p; 1272: 180p.
Hâşiye alâ şerhi'l-Kutbi li'ş-Şemsiyye fi'l-mantık/Haşiyetun alâ şerhi'ş-Şemsiyye	Necmeddîn Ali b. Ömer el-Kâtibî el-Kazvinî	Mevlânâ Kutbüddîn er-Râzî	Müftüzâde Muhammed Sadık Erzincanî	1254, 1276		
Hâşiye ale't-Tasdikât li-Müftizade	Necmeddîn Ali b. Ömer el-Kâtibî el-Kazvinî		Müftüzâde Muhammed Sadık Erzincanî			
Hâşiye alâ şerhi'ş-Şemsiyye-tasdikât	Necmeddîn Ali b. Ömer el-Kâtibî el-Kazvinî	İsâmüddîn İsferâyînî		1259, 1269, 1275, 1279		
Hâşiye-i cedîde ale't-Tasdikât	Necmeddîn Ali b. Ömer el-Kâtibî el-Kazvinî	Abdurrahman Kilisî		1275		
Tasavvurât ve Tasdikât				1264, 1272		

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
el-Fevâidü'l-Fenâriyye (Îsâgûcî şerhî)	Esîrüddîn el-Ebherî	Fenârî		1253, 1263, 1266, 1268, 1268, 1269, 1270, 1279		1253: 110p.; 1263: 97p; 1268: 94p.; 1270; 91p. 1279: 80p
Fenârî hâşiyesi (Hâşiyetü'l-Fenârî-on his Fevâidü'l-Fenâriyye)	Esîrüddîn el-Ebherî	Fenârî	Kara Halil	1258, 1259, 1272, 1275, 1279		
Mehmed Emin hâşiyesi	Esîrüddîn el-Ebherî-Fenârî	Kara Halil	Mehmed Emin	1259		
Nefâisü arâisi'l-enzâr ve letâifü fevâidi'l-efkâr	Esîrüddîn el-Ebherî	Fenârî	Abdullah b. Hasan el-Ensarî el-Kankırî	1242, 1279		1242: 271p.
Îsâgûcî ve şerhi	Esîrüddîn el-Ebherî	Fenârî	Kul Ahmed b. Muhammed	1253, 1263, 1269		1263: 104p; 1269: 102p.
Muğni't-tullâb	Esîrüddîn el-Ebherî	Mahmud b. Hafız Hasan el-Mağnisavî		1260, 1267, 1271, 1278, 1280, 1304		1260: 63p; 1280: 48p.

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Şerh-i Îsâgûcî (Gelenbevî alâ Îsâgûcî)	Esîrüddîn el-Ebherî	İsmail Gelenbevî		1275, 1283		
ed-Dürrü'n-nâcî alâ metni Îsâgûcî	Esîrüddîn el-Ebherî	Ömer b. Salih el-Feyzi Tokadî		1235, 1240, 1250, 1256, 1257, 1259, 1268, 1276, 1280		1240: 183p, 1257: 183p; 1259: 168p; 1276: 155p; 1280: 154p.
Hâşiyetü Dibâcetü'd-Dürr-i nâcî	Esîrüddîn el-Ebherî	Ömer b. Salih el-Feyzi Tokadî	İbrahim b. Muhammed el-Yalvacî	1235, 1250, 1256, 1259, 1268		
Tuhfetü'r-Rüşdi	Esîrüddîn el-Ebherî	Ahmed Rüşdi		1252, 1272		1252: 287p.
Levâmiu'l-esrâr fî şerhi Metaliu'l-envâr	Sirâceddin el-Urmevî	Kutbuddin Râzî	Seyyid Şerîf el-Cürcânî	1277		
Rütûb-ı mantıkıyye	Fenârî			1269		
Reddiyetü'l-miyar	Ahmed Sıdkı b. Ali Bursevî			1277		
Şerhu alâ Hidâyeti'l-hikme	Esîrüddîn el-Ebherî	Kadı Mîr Meybudî		1265, 1270	lithography (1270)	1265: 64p; 1270: 134p

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
İklîlü't-terâcim	Esîrüddîn el-Ebherî	Kadı Mîr Meybudî	Mehmed b. Mustafa Akkirmanî (Transl.)	1266		
Hâşiye şerhu Hidâyeti'l-hikme	Esîrüddîn el-Ebherî	Kadı Mîr Meybudî	Mehmed b. Mustafa Akkirmanî	1265		
Hâşiye-i Lârî ale'l-Kadı Mîr	Esîrüddîn el-Ebherî	Kadı Mîr Meybudî	Muhammed Muslihiddîn el-Lârî	1263, 1265, 1270, 1271, 1272	lithography (1271)	1265: 64p. 1271: 112p..
Hâşiye alâ Hâşiyeti'l-Lârî alâ şerhi Hidâyeti'l-hikme	Esîrüddîn el-Ebherî -Kadı Mîr Meybudî	Muhammed Muslihiddîn el-Lârî	İsmail Gelenbevî	1270		
Hâşiye alâ hâşiyeti'l-Lârî alâ şerhi Hidâyeti'l-hikme	Esîrüddîn el-Ebherî -Kadı Mîr Meybudî	Muslihuddîn Lârî	Mehmed b. Mustafa Akkirmanî	1265		
İrâde-i cüz'iyye risâlesi	Mehmed b. Mustafa Akkirmanî	Süleyman Efendi (Trans.)		1264		
Burhân-ı Gelenbevî	İsmail Gelenbevî			1221, 1253, 1272	typography (1272)	1253: 144p; 1272:144p.
Hâşiyetü'l-Burhân				1221, 1253		
Nâmûsü'l-îkân	İsmail Gelenbevî	Yusuf Şükrü Harpûtî		1274	lithography	243p.
Risâletü'l-imkân li'l-fâzıl el-Gelenbevî	İsmail Gelenbevî			1263		
Fethü'l-vehhâb fî şerhi Risâleti'l-âdâb	İsmail Gelenbevî	Muhammed Hasan Paşazâde Said		1263		109p.

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Risâletü'l-ikdi'l-cevherî	Halid el-Bağdadi			1259		
Mizânü'l-adl	Abdülkerim b. Hüseyin el-Amasyevî			1276		
Âdâbu'l-bahs (el-Âdâbü'l-Aduddiyye, er-Risâletü'l-Adudiyye)	Adudüddîn el-Îcî			1267, 1274		
Şerhu'r-Risâleti'l-Adudiyye	Adudüddîn el-Îcî	Ebu'l-Kasım el-Leysî es-Semerkandî		1267		
Semekandî, Desûki, Hıfnânî hâşiye				1275		
er-Risâletü'l-vaz'iyye	Adudüddîn el-Îcî			1267, 1275		
eş-Şerhu'l-İsâmî li'r-Risâleti'l-vaz'iyye	Adudüddîn el-Îcî	İsâmüddîn İsferâyînî		1274		
Şerhu'r-Risâleti'l-vaz'iyye	Adudüddîn el-Îcî	Ali Kuşî		1259, 1267, 1272		
el-Hâşiyetü'l-Cedîde alâ Ali Kuşî	Adudüddîn el-Îcî	Ali Kuşî	Seyyid Hâfız es-Sirozî	1259, 1272		1259: 134p; 1272: 133p.
Hüseyniyye		Hüseyin b. Piri Adanavi (Antakî)		1267		
Hâşiye alâ şerhi'l-Hüseyniyye fi'l-âdâb	Hüseyin Şah Çelebi en-Niksarî el-Amasî	Hüseyin b. Piri Adanavi (Antakî)	Müftüzâde Muhammed Sadık Erzincanî	1254, 1255, 1266, 1272, 1279		

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Şerh alâ Risâle fî ilmi âdâbi'l-bahs ve'l-münâzara	Taşköprizade Ahmed Efendi	İsmail Hakkı Bursevî		1273		
et-Ta‘rifât	Seyyid Şerif Cürcânî			1253, 1263, 1275		
Şerh-i Risâle-i istidlâliyye	Osman b. Mustafa et-Tarsusî	Ahmed Sıdki b. Ali		1258	lithography	1258: 15p; 1287: 73p.
Miftâhu'l-fünûn	Pasquale Galuppi	Ohannes		1277		
Minhacü'l-İhticac	Mustafa Kamil Yemlihazâde			1273		22p.
Risâletü'l-Vâz‘iyye, Feride, Îsâgûcî, Velediyye						
Risâletü'l-Vâz‘iyye, Hâşiye-i Dede Efendi, Feride, Îsâgûcî, Velediyye				1280		
Şerḥu alâ Ciheti'l-vahde li'l-Fenârî	Molla Fenârî	Sadreddinzâde Şirvânî		1262, 1271, 1277		1277: 30p.

Table B16. Printed Books on Rhetoric

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Risâle fi'l-beyân ve'l-i‘câz	İsâmüddîn İsferâyînî	Müneccimbaşı Ahmed Dede Efendi		1256		
Telhîsü'l-miftâh	Ebu Yakub es-Sekkâkî (Miftâhu'l-ulûm)	Mehmed b. Abdurrahman el-Kazvînî		1260, 1275	lithography (1260)	1260: 72p.; 1275: 60p.
Muhtasaru'l-Me‘ânî (Muhtasaru'l-Mutavvel, el-Mutavvel fi'l-me‘ânî ve'l-beyân)	Mehmed b. Abdurrahman el-Kazvînî	Sadeddîn et-Teftâzânî		1241, 1259, 1260, 1267, 1269, 1271, 1276		1259: 252p; 1260: 442p.
et-Tensîsu'l-muntazar fî şerhi ebyâti't-Telhîs ve'l-Muhtasar	Mehmed b. Abdurrahman el-Kazvînî	Sadeddîn et-Teftâzânî	İsâmüddîn Mustafa b. Abdullah Üsküdarî	1259, 1268, 1276		
Hâşiye alâ şerhi'l-Mutavvel	Mehmed b. Abdurrahman el-Kazvînî	Sadeddîn et-Teftâzânî	Abdülhakim b. Şemseddîn Siyâlkûtî	1241, 1266		1266: 616p.
Hâşiye ale'l-Mutavvel	Mehmed b. Abdurrahman el-Kazvînî	Sadeddîn et-Teftâzânî	Seyyid Şerîf Cürcânî	1241, 1271		
Hâşiye ale'l-Mutavvel	Mehmed b. Abdurrahman el-Kazvînî	Sadeddîn et-Teftâzânî	Fenari Hasan Çelebi	1270, 1276		

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Hâşiye alâ Şerhi't-Telhîs	Mehmed b. Abdurrahman el-Kazvînî	Sadeddîn et-Teftâzânî	Muhammed b. Ahmed Desûkî	1276		
Risâle-i es'ile ve ecvibe	Akşehirli Ömer Efendi					
Ferâidi'l-fevâid	Ebu'l-Kâsım el-Leysî es-Semerkandî			1276		
Şerhu Risâleti'l-isti'âre	Ebu'l-Kâsım el-Leysî es-Semerkandî	İsâmüddîn İsferâyînî		1253, 1265, 1270, 1276		
Haşiye alâ Şerhi İsâmüddîn alâ Risâleti isti'âre	Ebu'l-Kâsım el-Leysî es-Semerkandî	İsâmüddîn İsferâyînî	Hasan b. Muhammed ez-Zîbârî	1276		
Haşiye alâ Şerhi Ferâidi'l-fevâid li-tahkîki me'âni'l-isti'âre	Ebu'l-Kâsım el-Leysî es-Semerkandî	İsâmüddîn İsferâyînî	Müftizâde Mehmed Seyyid Erzincanî	1253, 1279		
Takrîrât alâ Risâleti'l-istiâre	Ebu'l-Kasım el-Leysî Semerkandî	İsâmüddîn İsferâyîn	Gözübüyükzâde İbrahim Efendi	1266, 1274	lithography (1274)	1274: 23p.
Manzûme fi'l mecaz ve'l isti'âre	Sibt an-Nasir Mansur, al-Batlavi			1276		
Terceme-i Mîzânü'l-edeb	İsâmüddîn İsferâyînî	Mehmed Tahir Selam		1257		
Beyânü'l-ünvân	Ahmed Cevdet Paşa			1273		
Arûz-ı Endelüsî	Ebu'l-Ceyş el-Endelüsî el-Ensârî			1274	lithography	47p.

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Risâle fi'l-Aruz	Molla Cami			1274	lithography	
Tercüme-i Endelüsî	Ebu'l-Ceyş el-Endelüsî el-Ensârî	Muhsin-i Kayser		1261, 1270, 1276	lithography (1276)	1276: 49p.
Şerh-i Arûz-i Endelüsî	Ebu'l-Ceyş el-Endelüsî el-Ensârî	Muhsin-i Kayser	İsâmüddîn Mustafa b. Abdullah Üsküdarî	1261, 1270, 1274, 1276	lithography (1276)	1276: 95p.
Arûz-ı Endelüsî (el-Mizân)	Ebu'l-Ceyş el-Endelüsî el-Ensârî	Hafız İsmail Hakkı b. Sumnavî		1273		152p.
Şerhu Teysîri'd-dâfi‘ li'd-dâhiye fî tahsîli'l-arûz ve'l-kâfiye	Abdullatif b. Ali b. İbrahim			1261		
Şerhu'l-Alâka	Mahmud el-Antâkî	Mahmud el-Antâkî		1261, 1274, 1277	lithography (1277)	1261: 120p; 1274: 120p; 1277; 64p
Şerhu'l-Alâka	Mahmud el-Antâkî	Serezli Hafız Seyyid Efendi	Mustafa Şevket Efendi	1261, 1269, 1274		
Şerhu Risâleti'l-isti‘âre li-Mahmud el-Antâkî	Mahmud el-Antâkî		Hasan b. Mustafa Karatepeli	1270, 1273, 1274, 1277		1270:56+27p.
Şerhu'l-Alâka	Mahmud el-Antâkî		Musannifek eş-Şahrûdî	1274		
el-Hazaka bi-envai'l-alaka	Mahmud el-Antâkî		Ahmed b. Abdülmun‘im ed-Demenhûrî	1276		

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	LAST COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Şerhu'l-Alâka			Muhammad b. Osman al-Adavi	1273		

Table B17. Printed Books on Sufism and Occult Sciences

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Âsitâne-i aliyye ve bilâd-i selâsede kâin el'an mevcud ve muhterik olmuş tekkelerin isim ve şöhretleri ve mukâbele-i şerîfi günleri malûm olmak için keşide-i silk-i sütûr olmuş bir eser-i mu'teberdir			1256		
Tevfîku muvaffıkı'l-hayrât şerhu Delâili'l-hayrât	Cezûlî	Kara Davudzâde Mehmed Efendi	1248, 1254, 1255, 1266, 1280	lithography (1266, 1280)	1254: 895p.; 1266: 810p.; 1280: 818p.
Delâilü'l-hayrât ve şevârikü'l-envâr	Cezûlî		1260, 1275, 1276	lithography (1260, 1275, 1276)	
Mesâlik-i Delâil-i şerîf			1280	lithography	16p.
el-Asarü'l-mecidiyye fî'l-menâkıb-ı halidiyye	Mehmed Emin Abdullah Hafız		1256, 1257		
Menâkıb-ı çehâr yâr-ı güzîn	Şemseddîn Ahmed Sivasî/Halvetî		1258, 1264, 1278	typography	1258: 550p.; 1264: 55+550p.

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Kitâb-ı Muhammediyye	Yazıcıoğlu Mehmed Efendi		1258, 1262, 1264, 1265, 1267, 1268, 1270, 1271, 1271, 1273, 1278, 1280	lithography (all)	1262: 448p.; 1265: 537p.; 1267: 448p.; 1271: 447p.; 1273: 447p.; 1278: 447p.
Envârü'l-âşıkîn	Yazıcızade Ahmed Bican		1261, 1267, 1269, 1275, 1278	lithography (1275)	1261: 492p.; 1267: 492p.; 1275: 409p.; 1278: 462p.
Mecmûʻa-i Beyzâde	Beyzâde Mustafa b. Ali	Murad Nakşibendi	1258, 1262, 1264, 1265, 1267, 1268, 1270, 1271, 1271, 1273, 1278, 1280		1264: 136p.

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Du‘â-Leyâli-i mübârekede vâ‘iz ve du‘âhanların eyleyecekleri dualar			1267		
Mevhibetü'l-vehhâb fî Ta‘bîrâti'l-elkâb ve münâcât-i rabbi'l-erbâb	Mehmed Fevzi el-Hâc Kureyşîzâde		1274	lithography	125p.
Tercüme-i Risâle-i Validiyye	Hace Ahrar	Ali Harputi Beyzade	1276	lithography	8p.
Tercüme-i Ravzatü's-safâ	Mirhund Muhammed bin Handşah	Mehmed Kemalî	1258	typography	6+396p.
Câmi‘u'l-envâr	Müftüzade Mehmed Emin		1278	lithography	32p.
Kitâbü'l-hitâb	İsmail Hakkı Bursevî		1256	typography	357p.
Hizbü'l-Bahr şerhi		Ebu'l-Hasan Ali b. Abdullah el-Mağribî eş-Şâzelî	1264	lithography	6p.
Terceme-i el-Hizbü'l-a‘zam ve'l-virdü'l-efham.	Ali el-Kârî	İbrahim Halil Fındıkzade	1262, 1276	lithography	1276: 191p.
Şerhu'l-Usûli'l-aşere	Necmüddîn Kübrâ	İsmail Hakkı Bursevî (trans.)	1256	lithography	85p.
Kitâbü's-sülûk (Tuhfe-i Vesîmiyye)	İsmail Hakkı Bursevî		1240		56p.
Şerh-i Salâvat-ı İbn Meşîş	İbn Meşiş	İsmail Hakkı Bursevî	1256		
Risâle fi't-tasavvuf (Risâle-i Es’ile ve ecvibe; Usûl-i tarîkat ve rumûz-i hakîkat)	Niyazî-i Mısrî		1260	typography	12p.
Şerh-i Evrâd-ı Kâdirî	Müstakimzâde Süleyman Sadedddîn		1202, 1260	typography	34p.
Mansûr-ı Bağdâdî (Hallâc-ı Mansûr Menâkıbnâmesi)	Niyazî-i Kadîm		1261	lithography	49p.

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Risâle-i Molla İlâhî	İlahî Molla (Abdullah İlahî)		1261	lithography	123p.
Tercüme-i Âdâb-ı tarîkatı nakşibendiyye-i halidiyye risâlesi	Ziyaüddîn Halidî Bağdadî	el-Hâc Şerif Ahmed ibn Ali (trans.)	1262	typography	56p.
Hasbihalü's-sâlik fî akvemi'l-mesâlik	Hüseyin Hamdi Efendi		1263	lithography	88p.
Müzekki'n-nüfûs	Eşrefoğlu Abdullah er-Rumî		1263, 1269	lithography	1263: 49p.
Risâle-i Gavsiye Tercümesi	Abdülkadir Geylanî	Muhammed Abdüllatif b. el-Hâc Feyzullah el-Eyyubî (trans.)	1266	lithography	16p.
Âdâbü'z-zâkirîn necâtü's-sâlikîn	Karamollazâde Şeyh Abdülhamid el-Ayıntabî el-Fuhulî		1268	lithography	14p.
Tuhfetü'l-mülûk fî irşâdi ehli's-sülûk	Muhammed el-Hâdimî	Dervişzâde Mehmed Zeynelabidîn Karamanî (comment); Mehmed Muhib(trans.)	1268	lithography	48p.
Tercüme-i Nefehâtü'l-üns	Molla Câmî	Lâmiî Çelebi (trans.)	1270	typography	711p.
Risâle-i Hazret-i Mısrî	Hasan Rıza		1271	lithography	16p.

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Ahidnâme-i İlâhî	Ahmed Rasim Efendi Üsküdarlı		1272	lithography	13p.
el-Mecdu't-tâlid fî menâkıbi'ş-Şeyh Hâlid	Haydarizâde İbrahim Fasîh		1272		
Terceme-i Muhtasarü'l-velâye	Ebu Abdullah Semerkandî	Neccarzâde Şeyh Mustafa Rızaeddîn	1272	lithography	63p.
Makâlat-ı Sıddıkiye	Ömer Fâik		1272	lithography	34p.
Hâtimetü'l-vâridât		Neccarzâde Şeyh Mustafa Rızaeddîn	1262		
Menkıbetü'l Evliyâiyye fî ahvâli'r-Rızâiyye		Ömer Nüzhet Efendi	1272	lithography	67p.
Mir'âtü'l-makâsıd fî def'i'l-mefâsid	Seyyid Ahmed Rıfat		1273		
Dürrü'l-müntehab min bahri'l-edeb fî tercemeti silsileti'z-zeheb	Muhammed Murad el-Buharî	Muhammed Rüstem Raşid	1274		
Kenzü'l-miftâh	Şeyh Hayyat Vehbi el-Erzincanî		1274	lithography	69p.
Kenzü'l-fütûh	Hayyat Vehbi Erzincanî		1275		
Ta'rîfü's-sülûk	Hasan Nazif Dede	Hayri	1276	lithography	58p.
Mektubât-ı Hazret-i Abdülkadir Geylani	Abdülkadir-i Geylanî	Süleyman Refet Paşa	1276		42p.
Delâilü Seyyidînâ Abdulkadiri kuddise sırruh	Abdülkadir-i Geylanî		1270, 1273	lithography: 1273	40p.
Ma'rifetü't-tarîk	Haşim Belhî ed-Dihlevî		1276	lithography	206p.
Tertib-i Süluk-i Nakşibendiye	Mevlânâ Ziyaeddîn Halid-i Bağdadî	Beyzâde Ali Efendi	1276		

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Terceme-i risâletü's-sülûk	Muhammed Azam Ferzendanî	Beyzâde Ali Efendi	1276	lithography	5p.
Münâzara-i rûz u şeb	Ahmed Fasîh Dede el-Mevlevî		1278	lithography	16p.
Hadîka-i Ma‘neviyye	Muhammed Şaban Kâmî-i Âmidi		1279	lithography	16p.
Risâle-i fî senâi'n-nefs ve zemmiha ve keyfiyyet-i tecelli ve nutk-ı Arif			1280		
Mecmû‘atü'l-letâif ve ma‘mûretü'l-maârif	İsmail Rusuhi Ankaravî		1221, 1242, 1251, 1257		
Hudâ Rabbim	İbrahim Hakkı Erzurumî				13p.
Salât-ı Seyyid Ahmed Bedevî (Evsâf-ı Kemâlât-ı Muhammediyye'yi Hâvî Salât-ı Şerîfe)	Mustafa el-Bekrî	Darüssaade Ağası kâtibi Hasan Hüsnü Fehmi	1272	lithography	20p.
Tercüme-i Mektûbât-ı İmâm-ı Rabbânî (Terceme-i Mektûbât-ı Kudsiyye)	Ahmed Fârukî es-Serhendî İmâm-ı Rabbânî	Müstakimzâde Süleyman Sadeddîn	1270-1277	lithography	3 vols.
Reşehât-ı aynü'l-hayât tercümesi	Mevlânâ Ali b. Hüseyin es-Safî	Muhammed b. Muhammed Şerif el-Abbasî	1279		
Minhâcü'l-âbidîn	İmam Gazâlî	İlyas b. Abdullah el-Nihanî	1280		384p. +4p.
Tercüme-i Vasiyetnâme-i İmam-ı Azam	Numan b. Sabit	Şeyh İbrahim Nureddîn Kastamonili (Cecelizâde)	1264		

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Risâle-i Ubeydiyye-i Naşibendiyye		Ali Behçet	1260		
Tercüme-i Nasâyih-i Eflâtûn-ı İlâhî	Plato	Mehmed Ali Fethi	1280	lithography	8p.
Risâle-i Kaygusuz Veli / Budalanâme	Kaygusuz Veli		1272	lithography	61p.
Tenbîhü'l-gabî fî rü'yeti'n-Nebî	Sünbülî Yusuf Sinan b. Yakub Halvetî		1264	lithography	50p.
Tercüme-i Risâle-i Emânetullah li'ş-Şeyh İmam Gazâlî	İmam Gazali	Mehmed Emin Tokadi	1264, 1269	lithography	1264: 22p.
Vasiyetnâme	Ahmed Kuddusi Şeyh		1256	lithography	6p.
Ruhu'l-ârifîn	Ahmed Ziyaeddin Gümüşhanevi		1275	lithography	84p.
Risaletü fî beyani'ş-şerî'a ve't-tarika ve'l-harika ve'l-ma'rife	Ahmed Ziyaeddin Gümüşhanevi		1275	lithography	
Tercüme-i Kimyâ-i sa'âdet	İmam Gazali		1260	lithography	120p.
Hall u Rumûz	Ahmed Rüşdi Karaağacî		1252	typography	129p.
Ferâsetü'l-hikemiyye fî kıyâfeti'l-insâniyye			1276	lithography	
Esmaü'l-Hüsnâ şerhi (Ferâidü'l-leâli fî beyân-ı esmâi'l-müte'âli)	İbrahim Nureddîn Efendi		1258, 1269		
Zübdetü'n-nasâyih	Mehmed Rauf es-Seyyid		1260, 1269		
el-Füyûzâtü'r-Rabbâniye fi'l-evrâdi'l-Kâdiriyye			1271		
Risâle-i müferricü'l-kürûb bi's-salâti ale'n-Nebiyyi'l-Habib	Ahmed bin Süleyman Nakşibendi halidi		1268		
Risale-i Mahbub	Sadık Şeyh		1280	lithography	13p.

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Risale-i Mir'atü'n-Nefs	Karamollazâde Şeyh Abdülhamid el-Ayıntabî el-Fuhulî		1268	lithography	16p.
Tertib-i Nefis	Ahmed Şakir Paşa		1269		
Silsile-i Şerife ve Hatm-i Hacegan ve Dua ve Tertib-i Şügul			1275	lithography	24p.
Risâle-i Sufi	Niyazî-i Mısrî		1261, 1268, 1274, 1275	lithography: all	1261: 26p.; 1268: 29p.; 1274: 13p.; 1275: 13p.
Mecmû'a-i Hutbe-i Şerif			1276	lithography	96p.
Risâle fî Tenzih İllah ve Tecelli ve Takdisi'l Kalb ve's-Sır ve Insan-ı Kamil ve'l-Kurb ve'l-maliyye ve fihi Müteşabihat ve sathiyyat			1280	lithography	6p.
Risale-i Kudsiyye fi't-tarikati'l-aliyyeti'n-nakşibendiyeti'l-halidiyyei'l-müceddidiye	Mustafa İsmet Şeyh Yanyavi		1274	lithography	88p.
Tefe'ülnâme			1262, 1269, 1272, 1273, 1277	lithography	1262: 31p.; 1273: 72p.
Falnâme-i Cafer Sâdık	Cafer Sâdık		1270, 1271	lithography	1270: 48p.; 1271: 32p.

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Risâle-i Abdulganî Efendi fî Havâss-ı eyyâmil-usbû‘	Abdülganî b. Abdülcelîl		1271	lithography	16p.
Melhame	İbrahim Cevri Çelebi		1272	lithography	178p.
Ta‘bîrnâme			1269, 1270, 1272, 1273, 1279	lithography	48p.
Ta‘bîrnâme-i Muhyiddîn Arabî			1270, 1275, 1276, 1277	lithography: all	1270: 48p.; 1275: 45p.; 1276: 48p.
Tercüme-i ta‘bîrnâme-i İbn Sîrîn (Kitâbü't-Ta‘bîri'r-rüyâ)	Muhammed İbn Sîrîn		1273		
Cevâhirnâme	Pir Muhammed		1273	lithography	36p.
Yıldıznâme	İmamzâde Muhammed Süleyman		1274, 1275	lithography	1274: 71p.
Kıyafetnâme	İbrahim Hakkı		1277	lithography	marginalia
Fenn-i Kıyâfet	Mustafa Hami Paşa		1280	lithography	30p.
Seğirnâme			1261	lithography	

Table B18. Printed Books on Hadith (Inclusive of Various Forms of Devotional Literature about the Prophet)

	BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING		PAGES
Hadîs	Nuhbetü'l-fiker fî mustalahı ehli'l-eser	İbn Hacer Askalanî	Ahmed Fatih Efendi (Trans.)	1261, 1263		1261: 112p.
	Risâletü'l-Mülhemat	Ahmed Fatih Efendi		1261		38p.
	Letâifü'l-hikem	Ahmed Ziyaeddin Gümüşhanevî		1275		
	Râmûzü'l-ehâdîs	Ahmed Ziyaeddin Gümüşhanevî		1275		568p.
	Câmi‘u'l-Hadîs			1276		
	Şerhu Usûli'l-Hadîs li'l-Birgivî	Birgivî	Davud-i Karsî	1272, 1274, 1275		
	Şerhu'ş-Şifâ	Kadî Iyâz	Alî el-Kârî	1264		
	Terceme-i Nuhbetü'l-menkûl fî kavlihî Teâlâ ve ma Muhammedün İllâ Resûl	Halil Abdülmuhsinzâde		1254	typography	73p.
	Şerh-i Hadîs-i erba‘în Hazz Zâkirîn		Mustafa Vahyi Nakşibendi	1279	lithography	45s, lito.
	Şerhu'l-Erba‘în Hadîsen	İmam Nevevi	İsmail Hakkı Bursevî	1253		
	el-Meva‘izü'l-Usfûriye (Hadîs-i erba‘în şerhi)		Muhammed b. Ebubekir el-Usfûrî	1263, 1274, 1277	lithography (1277)	1277: 86p.
	Ahsenü't-tahdîs fî Rivâyeti'l-Hadîs	Feyzullah Nakşibendi el-Hâc Hafız		1279		
Şemâil	Hilye-i Hâkânî	Mehmed Hakanî Bey		1264	lithography	55p.

	BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING		PAGES
	Şemâil-i Muhammediyye	Muhammed Tirmizî		1264	lithography	128s, lito.
Mevlid	Mevlidü'n-Nebî	Beyzâde Mustafa		1264		136p.
	Mevlid-i Şerîf	Süleyman Çelebi		1270, 1271	lithography	1270: 54p.; 1271: 80p.
	Risâle-i Mevlid-i şerîf-i irfâniyye	Kami Şeyh Şaban Amidi		1279		
	Mi'râciye-i İsmail Hakkı	İsmail Hakkı Bursevî Şeyh		1269	lithography	32p.
Kasîde	el-Kasîdetü'l-bürde	İmam Bûsîri		1268	lithography	12p.
	Tevessül	İmam Bûsîri	Mehmed Mekkî Şeyhülislam	1251	typography	561p.
	Şerh-i Kasîde-i Bürde	İmam Bûsîri	Ömer Harputî	1274		228p.
	Tahmîs-i Kasîde-i Bürde ve Mudâriye	İmam Bûsîri	Nahîfî Süleyman b. Abdurrahman	1258	lithography	77p.
	el-Kasîdetü'l-Bürde	İmam Bûsîri	Rusçuklu Maksud Resa Mustafa (*tahmis*)	1259, 1262, 1272	lithography	44p.
	el-Kasîdetü'l-Bürde	İmam Bûsîri	İbrahim b. Mehmed Yalvacî	1276	lithography	37p.
	Kasîde-i Bürde şerhi	İmam Bûsîri	Kayacıklı Süleyman Efendi	1277		232p.
	Kasîde-i Kamîsiyye	İmam Bûsîri	Şeyh Şaban Kami-i Amidi	1280		
	Asidetü'ş-şehde, Şerh-i Kasîde-i Bürde	İmam Bûsîri	Ömer Naimi el-Harputi	1266, 1274	lithography (1274)	1274: 192p.

	BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING		PAGES
	Risâle-i havâssi'l-ebyat		İbrahim b. Mehmed el-Yalvacî	1265	lithography	65p.
	Dürr-i mergûb	İmam Bûsîri	Abdurrahman Üskübî	1279	lithography	47p.
	Sürürü'l-Kulübi'l-İrfaniyye bi-Tercümeti'l-Kasideti'n-Numâniyye	Numan b. Sabit İmam-ı Azam ebu Hanife	Halil b. Yahya	1268	typography	207p.
	Şerhü'l-Kasîdeti'n-Numâniyye	Numan b. Sabit İmam-ı Azam ebu Hanife		1268	lithography	
	el-Kasîdetü'n-Numâniyye	Numan b. Sabit İmam-ı Azam ebu Hanife		1279	lithography	207p.
	Na‘t-ı Şerîf-i Hazreti Nebi-i Ekrem ve Menkabet-i Çeharyâr		Lebib Efendi	1276	typography	11p.
	Tahmîs-i Servet Ber-Mi‘râciye-i Sâbit	Sabit Efendi	Hasan Servet Efendi	1265	lithography	22p.
	Kasidatü'l-isnâ aşariya şerhi	Ali b. Muhammed ar-Rizai	Ali b. Osman al-Akşehrî	1280		
	Akd-i Fahr-i Kainat min Hâdicetü'l-Kübrâ			1268, 1279	lithography (all)	1268: 59p.; 1279: 52p
	el-Mecmû‘atü'l-kübrâ mine'l-kasâidi'l-Fuhrâ fî hakkı Nabiyyinâ	Numan b. Sabit İmam-ı Azam ebu Hanife	İbrahim el-Yalvacî	1274, 1276, 1279	lithography (1274, 1276)	1274: 56p.; 1276; 72p.

	BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING		PAGES
	Risâle-i Âl-i Abâ		Dersiam Hüseyin Efendi	1268	lithography	38p.
Siyer	Delâil-i nübüvvet-i Muhammedî ve şemâil-i fütüvvet-i Ahmedî	Molla Miskin	Altıparmak Mehmed Efendi	1257	typography	(644p.)
	Meâlimü'l-yakîn fî sîret-i Seyyidi'l-Mürselîn	Ebu'l-Abbas Şehabeedin Ahmed el-Kastallanî	Bâkî	1261	typography	vol. 1(397p.) ; vol. 2 (379p.)
	Ravzatü'l-ahbâb (Terceme-i Ravzatü'l-ahbâb fî siyeri'n-nebî ve'l-âl ve'l-ashâb)	Cemâl Hüseynî-i Şîrâzî	Benlizâde Mahmûd el-Mağnisavî	1268	typography	vol. 1(514p.) ; vol.2 (314p); vol.3 (292p.)
	Tercüme-i Şerh-i Siyeri'l-kebîr	Muhammed eş-Şeybani	Mehmed Münib el-Ayıntabî	1241	typography	vol.1 (8+357p.); vol. 2 (373p.)

Table B19. Printed Books on Literature (Prose)

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Kitâb-ı Ashâb-ı Kehf ü Rakîm	Mehmed Emin Efendi (Adanavî)		1264	lithography	62p.
Letâif-i Hoca Nasreddîn			1244, 1253, 1266, 1270	typography (1244); lithography (1253, 1266)	1244: 40p; 1253: 41p., 1266: 45p.
Dürr-i letâif			1257	typography	41p.
Hikâye-i Leylâ ve Mecnûn	Fuzûlî		1254	typography	97p.
Destân-ı Hâtem Tâî			1256, 1272, 1273	lithography (1256); typography (1272)	1256: 143p.; 1272: 143p.; 1273: marginalia of Gencine-i Hikmet
Ebu Ali b. Sînâ hikâyesi	Ebu Ali b. Sînâ	Yahya Ziyaeddîn	1261, 1268		
Gencîne-i Hikmet	Ziyaeddîn Seyyid Yahya		1254, 1256, 1264, 1273	lithography (1254, 1273)	1254: 158p.; 1273: 158p.
Acâibü'l-meâsir ve garâibü'n-nevâdir (Nevâdir-i Süheylî)	Ahmed b. Hemden Süheylî		1256, 1276	lithography	360p.
Hümâyûnnâme	Beydebâ (Bidpây)	Alâeddîn Ali Çelebi	1252-54		
Simârü'l-esmâr	Beydebâ (Bidpây)	Osmanzade Taib Efendi	1256		184p.

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Kitâbü Nâfi‘ü'l-âsâr, Simârü'l-esmâr	Beydebâ (Bidpây)	Ramazanzâde Abdünnâfî İffet	1268	typography	166p.
Kâmilü'l-kelâm			1263, 1271	typography	167p.
Derdi Yok ile Zülf-i siyâh kıssası	Derviş Mahmud		1266	lithography	64p.
Hikâye-i Tâhir ile Zühre			1266		
Tûtînâme	Ziyâeddîn el-Bedâûnî el-Hindî/Nahşebî		1267, 1271, 1256	typography (1271)	1271: 206p.
Hançerli hanım hikâye-i garîbesi	Tıflî		1268		112p.
Letâifnâme	Tıflî		1268	lithography	153p.
Muhayyelât-ı Aziz Efendi	Giridî Ali Aziz		1268	typography	239p.
Afyon tiryâkileri			1273	lithography	24p.
Kevkeb-i Hikâyât			1257		
Kitâb-ı İbretnümâ	Bursalı Lâmiî Çelebi		1273	lithography	303p.
Risâle-i Tûtî ve Gulyabani ve Ejderha	Bursalı Lâmiî Çelebi		1273	typography	113p.
Hikâye-i Şah İsmail ve Gülizar			1271		
Hikâye-i Şâpûr Çelebi (Hikâye-i Erdeşîr ü Şâpûre)			1266, 1272	lithography (1272)	1272: 86p.
Seyfü'l-mülûk Hikâyesi (Padişah Asım b. Safvan)			1265	lithography	78p.

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Hikaye-i Mikyad			1273		
Hikaye-i Ferhad ile Şirin			1271, 1280	lithography (all)	1271: 64p.;1280: 56p.
Tercüme-i Elfü Leyletin ve leyle		Ahmed Nazif Efendi	1258-1260	typography	152p.
Muhâverât-ı hikemiyye	Fontenelle, Fenelon, Voltaire	Mehmed Münif Paşa	1276	typography	79p.
(Tercüme-i) Hikâye-i Robinson	Daniel Defoe	Ahmed Lütfi	1280	typography	113p.
Tercüme-i Telemak	Fénelon	Yusuf Kamil Paşa	1279	typography	276p.
Manzûme-i durûb-ı emsâl	Hıfzı Mehmed Efendi		1262	typography	25p.
Durûb-ı emsâl	Vâcid		1275	lithography	31p.
Durûb-ı emsâl-i Osmâniyye	Şinâsî		1280	typography	229p.
Tasnîf-i Beyne'z-zurefâ	Hüseyin Remzi		1272	lithography	15p.
Mahzen-i Esrâr-ı Şi'r	Abdünnafî İffet Efendi		1273	lithography	79p.
Peyâm-ı Sûr	Abdünnafî İffet Efendi		1274	lithography	23p.
Mahmûdü'l-eser fî tercemeti'l-Müstetrafi'l-müste'ser	Ahmed el-İbşîhî	Ekmekçizâde Ahmed Efendi-Sahaflar Şeyhizâde Esad Efendi	1261-1263	typography	757p.

Table B20. Printed Books on Literature (Verse)

	BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Dîvân	Dîvânçe-i Süleyman Fehîm-i Sânî	Süleyman Fehîm		1262	lithography	49p.
	Divân-ı Belâgat Unvân-ı Esrar Dede Efendi	Esrar Dede Mevlevî		1257	typography	160p.
	Dîvân-ı Hafız			1255, 1257, 1264	lithography (1264)	1255: 259p.; 1257: 259p.; 1264: 365p.;
	Dîvân-ı Halim Giray	Halim Giray		1257	typography	59p.
	Dîvânü Sultânü'ş-şu'arâ ve şeyhü'z-zurefâ a'nâ bihî Pertev Paşa rahimehüllâhi Te'âla	Pertev Paşa Mehmed Said		1256	typography	130p.
	Dîvân-ı Hızırağazâde Said Bey	Said Hızırağazâde		1257	typography	36p.
	Dîvân-ı Belâgat-unvân-ı Bursavî es-Seyyid	Mehmed Emin İffet		1257	typography	102p.
	Dîvân-ı Belâgat-unvân-ı Nazîm	Nazîm Yahya		1257	typography	500p.
	Dîvân-ı Gülşen-i efkâr-ı Vâsıf-ı Enderûnî	Osman Vâsıf Enderûnî (Enderunlu Vâsıf)		1257	typography	371p.
	Dîvân-ı Belâgat-unvan-ı Aynî	Aynî		1258	typography	436p.
	Dîvân-ı Belîğ	Mehmed Emin Belîğ		1258	typography	132p.
	Dîvân-ı Hâlet Efendi	Mehmed Said Hâlet Efendi		1258	typography	6p.

	BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
	Dîvân-ı İzzet Bey	Benizâde Mehmed İzzet Bey		1258	typography	99p.
	Dîvân-ı Nesîmî	İmadeddîn Seyyid Nesîmî		1260	typography	28p+133p.
	Dîvân-ı Niyâzî	Mehmed Niyâzî-i Mısrî		1260, 1275	typography (1260); lithography(1275)	1260: 84p; 1275: 78p.
	Dîvân-ı Ziyâeddîn Halidî	Ziyâeddîn Halid		1260	typography	99p.
	Dîvân-ı Seyyid Mehmed Nesîb	Mehmed Nesîb Seyyid		1261	typography	68p.
	Tuhfetü'l-irşâd (Dîvân-ı Rıza)	Rızaeddîn Mustafa Neccarzâde Şeyh		1262	typography	264p.
	Dîvân-ı Erzurumlu İbrahim Hakkı	Erzurumlu İbrahim Hakkı		1263	typography	230p.
	Dîvân-ı Fıtnat	Fıtnat		1264	lithography	51p.
	Dîvân-ı Müştak Baba	Müştak Efendi		1264	typography	107p.
	Dîvân-ı Leyla Hanım	Leyla Hanım		1267	lithography	111p.
	Dîvân-ı Sezâî-yi Gülşenî	Sezâî-yi Gülşenî		1264, 1267, 1276	lithography (1267)	1267: 159p.
	Asım Dîvânı	Küçükçelebizâde İsmail Asım		1268	lithography	65p.
	Dîvânçe-i Esad Paşa	Esat Muhlis Paşa		1268	lithography	47p.
	Dîvânçe	Servet Efendi (Pazarbaşızâde Osman)		1268		

	BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
	Nef‘î Dîvânı	Nef‘î Ömer		1269	typography	207p.
	Ravz-ı Verd	Ahmed Şakir Paşa		1269	typography	63p.
	Tertîb-i Nefs	Ahmed Şakir Paşa		1269	lithography	54p.
	Dîvân-ı Kethüdazâde-i Ârif	Kethüdazâde Mehmed Ârif		1271	typography	38p.
	Dîvân-ı Hâmî-i Âmedî	Hâmî Ahmed		1272	lithography	
	Dîvân-ı Rasim	Ahmed Rasim Üsküdarlı es-Seyyid		1272	lithography	87p.
	Dîvân	Mehmed Arif Reisülküttâb		1273	lithography	38p.
	Dîvân-ı sâlis ez-nutk-ı Cenâb-ı Hazret-i eş-Şeyh Bursevî Kaygulu Efendi kaddese sırrahu	Şeyh Kaygulu Halil Efendi		1272, 1273	lithography (all)	1272: 57p; 1273: 64p.
	Hâdiyü'l-uşşâk	Şeyh Kaygulu Halil Efendi		1257	lithography	444p.
	Dîvân	Bayburtlu Zihni		1273		
	Dîvân-ı Senîh-i Mevlevî	Süleyman Senîh		1275	typography	134p.
	Dîvân-ı Belâgat-unvân-ı Hilmi	Mustafa Hilmi Elmastraşzâde		1274	lithography	62p.
	Dîvân-ı Kuddûsî	Kuddûsî Ahmed		1275	lithography	242p.
	Müşfîknâme	Hafız İsmail Müşfîk Efendi		1270	lithography	67p.
	Dîvân-ı Bâkî	Mahmud Abdülbaki		1276	lithography	256p.
	Dîvânçe-i Râgıb Paşa	Râgıb Paşa		1276		60p.

	BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
	Mecmû‘a min nevâdiri'l-üdebâ ve âsâri'z-zurefâ	(Çaylak Mehmed Tevfîk)		1280		
	Dîvân-ı Muhammedî	Mehmed Nazif		1266	lithography	113p.
	Dîvân-ı Fuzûlî	Fuzûlî		1254, 1268	lithography	
	Dîvân-ı Zâtî	Süleyman Zâtî		1257	typography	59p.
	Dîvân	Osman Nevres		1257		
	Dîvân-ı Zekâyi	eş-Şeyh Mustafa Zekâyi		1258	typography	88p.
	Şerh-i Kasîde-i Yunus Emre li-Mısrî Efendi	Niyâzî-i Mısrî		1268, 1270	lithography	1268: 17p.; 1270: 15p.
	Dîvân-ı Haşim Efendi	Mustafa Haşim Üsküdari		1252		156p.
	Dîvânçe-i İzzet	Keçecizâde İzzet Molla		1257	typography	52p.
Mersiye	Mersiye-i İmam Hüseyin ve Cafer Tayyar ve İbrahim			1263	lithography	48p.
	Mersiye-i Cenâb-ı Şehinşâh-ı Kerbelâ	Süleyman Senîh		1272	typography	11p.
	Mersiye-i Lebîb	Lebîb		1276	typography	11p.
	Hadîka-i ma‘neviyye			1279	lithography	15p.
Mesnevî	Gülistân şerhi	Muslihiddin Sadi-i Şirazi	Sudi Bosnavi	1249, 1276		

	BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
	Gülistân	Şeyh Sadî		1255 1263, 1275		1255: 137p.; 1275: 256p.
	Hediyyetü'l-irfân der Şerh-i Bahâristân	Molla Câmî	Mehmed Şakir	1252, 1275	typography	1252: 607p.
	Defter-i aşk	Fâzıl Vehbi (Enderunlu)		1253	typography	20p.
	Rakkâsnâme	Hüseyin Fâzıl Enderunlu		1255	lithography	11p.
	Hûbannâme	Hüseyin Fâzıl Enderunlu		1253, 1255	lithography(1255); typography (1253)	1253: 34p.
	Zenânnâme	Hüseyin Fâzıl Enderunlu		1253, 1255	lithography(1255); typography (1253)	1253: 46p.
	Çenginâme			1253	typography	1253: 9p.
	Şevkengîz	Sünbülzâde Vehbî		1253, 1255	lithography(1255); typography (1253)	1253: 31p.
	Hazân-ı âsâr	Keçecizâde İzzet Molla		1257		

	BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
	Gülşen-i aşk	Keçecizâde İzzet Molla		1265	lithography	2p.
	Mihnetkeşân	Keçecizâde İzzet Molla		1269	lithography	239p.
	Nevhatü'l-uşşâk	Dâî Mehmed Said		1261	typography	95p.
	Destân-ı Leylâ ve Mecnûn	Muhammed b. Süleyman Fuzûlî		1254, 1264		1254: 97p.
	Hadîkatü's-Su‘adâ	Fuzûlî		1273	typography	359p.
	Bülbülnâme	Birrî Mehmed Dede		1265, 1272	lithography (1265)	1265:72p; 1272: (margins)
	Cezîre-i mesnevî	Sîneçâk Yusuf Dede Efendi		1269	lithography	181p.
	Aynü'l-füyûz	Yusuf Sîneçâk Dede	İbrahim Cevri (şerh)	1269		
	Hall ü hakîkat	Mevlânâ	İbrahim Cevri	1269	lithography	181p.
	Mantıku't-tayr tercümesi (Mantıku'l-esrâr)	Feridüddîn Attâr	Fedai Gülşehrî	1274	lithography	226p.
	Sergüzeşt-i fakîr ve hakîr-i pür taksîr Mir Ali Rıza el-İstolcevî	Ali Rıza Istolcalı		1272, 1275	lithography	1272: 16p.
	Sevânihu’n-nevâdir fî ma‘rifeti’l-anâsır	Süleyman Zâtî		1257	typography	29p.
	Ebyât-ı zâdegân	Kuyumcuzâde		1269	lithography	12p.

	BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Münşeât	Münşeât-ı Nesîb	Mehmed Nesib Seyyid İki Bayraklızâde		1260	typography	14p.
	Münşeât-ı el-Hâc Âkif Efendi	Akif Paşa		1259, 1262	typography	200p.
	Eş‘âr-ı el-Hâc Akif Efendi	Akif Paşa		1259, 1262	typography	40p.
	Eser-i Nâdir: Mecmû‘atü't-tarab alâ lisâni'l-edeb	Osman Nevres		1257		352p.
	Münşeât-ı Numan Mahir Bey	Numan Mahir		1261		150p.
	Müntehabât-ı eş‘ârım	İbrahim Şinasi		1279		
	Münşeât mecmû‘ası (İzzet Bey Münşeâtı)	Mehmed İzzet Bey		1263	typography	44p.
	Münşeât mecmû‘ası			1264	lithography	223p.
	İnşâ-i cedîd ve lugât-ı müfîd	İbrahim Fevzi		1267, 1274, 1277	lithography	1267: 95p.
	Münşeât	Nazif b. Mümin el-Maluf (Nassif Mallouf)		1268		
	Hulâsatü'l-münşeât	Ahmed Said		1269, 1271	lithography	1269: 124p.; 1271: 150p.
	Münşeât			1270		
	Nüzhetü'l-münşeât	Manastırlı Mehmed Rifat		1270		
	Mecma‘-i münşeât	Ahmed Said		1271		

	BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
	Müntehabât-ı Âsâr (Rusya Muharebesi Tarihi, Gülbün-i İnşâ, Avrupa Ahvâline Ait Risâle, İtalya Seyahatnâmesi, Ma‘rûzât, Risâle-i Ahlâk, Zeyl-i Risâle-i Ahlâk, Âsâr-ı Rifat Paşa, various official letters and other official documents Siyâset-i Esâsiyye ve Dâhiliyye	Mehmed Sâdık Rifat Paşa		1275	typography	321p.
	Mu‘arrif-i inşâ ve kitâbet	Hasan Vasfi		1280		
	İnşâ-i cedîd			1269, 1271, 1277	lithography (1269)	1269: 140p.
	İnşâ-i cedîd	Ahmed Lütfi		1275	lithography	
	İnşâ	Mehmed Sâdık Rıfat Paşa		1275		
	Münşeâtü's-Selâtîn / Feridun Bey Mecmû‘ası			1264 (vol 1), 1265 (vol.2)	typography	
	Münşeât-ı Türkiye (Mekteb-i Tıbbiyye-i Şâhâne'de tertîp ve ta‘lîm olunmuş olan Münşeât-ı Türkiyye dersleridir)	Ahmed Lütfü Efendi				
Kasîde	el-Kasîdetü’n-nûniyye	Hızır Bey b. Celaleddîn Sivrihisarî		1258	typography	23p.
	Zînetü'l-mecâlis	Recaizâde Ahmed Cevdet		1258	typography	42p.

	BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
	Tercî‘-bend	Abdullah Ramiz Paşa		1263	lithography	13p.
	Tercüme-i Şerh-i Dü Beyt-i Monla Câmî li-hâce Neş’et	Molla Câmî	Süleyman Neş’et	1263	typography	57p.
	Kasîde-i İmâm-ı Azam	Numan b. Sabit		1264	lithography	7p.
	Beng ü bâde	Fuzûlî		1268	lithography	24p.
	Şerhu Lâmiyyeti'l-Acem	Hüseyin b. Ali et-Tuğrâî	Lebîb Efendi	1271	typography	114p.
	Manzara-ı nâzırân	Burdur Kaymakam-ı esbak Raşid Efendi		1278	lithography	1p.
	Sulhnâme-i Hâlis	Yusuf Hâlis		1272	lithography	7p.
Music (*şarkı)*	Mecmû‘a-i kârhâ ve nakşhâ beste ve semâî ve şarkiyyât	Mehmed Nuri (Bol Ahenk)		1280	lithography	1280: 88p.
	Hâşim Bey mecmû‘ası (Mecmûa-i Kârhâ ve Nakşhâ ve Şarkiyyât)	Hâşim Bey		1269, 1280	lithography	1280: 474p.

Table B21. Uncategorized Printed Books

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Melceü't-tabbâhîn	Mehmed Kamil		1260, 1266, 1273, 1275	lithography (all)	1260: 132pp; 1266: 120pp; 1273: 120pp;
İlm-i tedbîr-i menzil	Jean Baptiste Say	Sahak Abro	1268	lithography	142pp
İpek böceği ta‘lîmnâmesi		Cevdet Efendi, Agop Gırcikyan	1264, 1269	lithograpy (both)	133pp
Revnak-ı bostân	Anonymous		1260	typography	63p.
Beyt-i dihkânî		Hayrullah Efendi	1264	typography	241p.
Menâkıb-ı hayvanât	Enderûnî Rasih Osman Efendi		1272		
Terceme-i hayâtü'l-hayevân	Musa Demîrî	Abdurrahman el-Hâc İbrahim es-Sivasî	1272		2 vols.
Mecmû‘a-i tesâvir-i Osmâniyye	Arif Mehmed Paşa		1279		
Defter-i meskûkât-ı Osmâniyye			1280		12p.
Meskûkât-ı İslâmiye (Subhi Bey'in Uyûnü'l-ahbâri fi'n-nukûdi ve'l-âsâri nam te’lîflerinden meskûkât-ı İslâmiye'nin ibtidâ-yı îcâd ve kat‘ı üzerine yazılan fasıldır)	Abdüllatif Subhi		1279	typography	15p.
Mücevherât risâlesi	Anonymous		1273		
Fenn-i mesâha ve Fenn-i Mi‘mârî	Mehmed Bey		1277		

Mehâhü'l-miyâh	Âşirefendizâde Mehmed Halid Efendi		1212, 1271	lithography	32p.

Table B22. Printed School Regulations and Exams

BOOK TITLE	AUTHOR	TRANSLATOR/ COMMENTATOR	DATE OF PRINTING	PRINT TYPE	PAGES
Risâle-i İmtihân li'r-ruʾûs	Hasan Fehmi el-Akhisarî		1275		
Risâle-i İmtihân li'r-ruʾûs	Ahmed Halil Fevzi el-Filibevî		1275		
Risâle-i İmtihân	Mehmed Emin el-Üsküdarî		1266		32p.
Risâle-i İmtihân	Akşehirli Ömer Efendi	Mehmed Esad Efendi	1250		
Resâilü'l-imtihân	İsmail Gelenbevî		1262, 1275		
Resâil-i imtihân	Akşehirli Hasan Fehmi		1262		
Mekteb-i İdâdiye-i Hazret-i Şâhânenin imtihân risâlesidir			1268		
İlm-i emvâl-i milliyeye dâir Mekteb-i Mülkiye'de tedrîs olunmakta bulunan derslerin eczâ-yı matbûʻasındandır			1280	lithography	
Mekteb-i Cedîd-i Harbiye-i Şâhâne'nin idâre-i dâhiliyesine dâir kanunnâmedir			1263		30p.
Mekteb-i Tıbbiyye-i Şâhâne'nin İdare-i Dahiliyesine Dair Kanunnâmedir			1273		
Şerh-i Kanunnâme-i Arazî (Mekteb-i Mülkiye beşinci sınıf)	Kuyucaklızâde Mehmed Âtıf		1274		
Münşeât-ı Türkiye (Mekteb-i Tıbbiyye-i Şâhâne'de tertîp ve taʻlîm olunmuş olan Münşeât-ı Türkiyye dersleridir)	Ahmed Lütfü Efendi		1275		
Erkân-ı Harbiye-i Bahriye Sınıfı Hakkında Nizâmnâme			1280		

APPENDIX C

SAMPLE BOOK PRICES AND PROFIT RATES

BOOK TITLE	YEAR	COPIES	COST	PROFIT	TOTAL	PROFIT PERCENTAGE
Amentü şerhi	1247	1200	12 kuruş	8 kuruş	20 kuruş	67
et-Taʿrifât (Seyyid)	1247	1200	7 kuruş	5 kuruş	12 kuruş	71
Letâif-i Hoca Nasreddîn	1247	1000	1,5 kuruş	1,5 kuruş	3 kuruş	100
Hâşiye alâ şerhi'l-Akâidi'n-Nesefiyye	1247	1200	11 kuruş	6 kuruş	17 kuruş	54,55
İlmihâl	1248	1200	40 para	20 para	1,5 kuruş	50,00
İlmihâl	1260	2400	43 para	37 para	2 kuruş	86,05
İlmihâl	1252	3600	80 para	20 para	2,5 kuruş	25,00
Tarih-i Gülşen-i Maʿârif	1252	1200	30 kuruş	30 kuruş	60 kuruş	100,00
Tuhfetü's-sükûk	1258	1200	25 kuruş	5 kuruş	30 kuruş	20,00
Gülistân	1263	1500	13,5 kuruş	8,5 kuruş	22 kuruş	62,96
Mültekâ şerhi Şeyhzâde Damad	1258	1200	62 kuruş	23 kuruş	85 kuruş	37,10
Mültekâ şerhi Şeyhzâde Damad	1264	1200	48,5 kuruş	38,5 kuruş	87 kuruş	79,38
Mültekâ	1252	1200	9 kuruş	9 kuruş	18 kuruş	100,00
Mültekâ	1258	1200	12 kuruş 35 para	4 kuruş 25 para	17,5 kuruş	35,92
İlmihâl şerhi	1260		3 kuruş	1 kuruş	4 kuruş	33,33
Mufassal ilmihâl	1252	3600	70 para	30 para	2,5 kuruş	42,86
Mızraklı ilmihâl	1261	1200	3 kuruş 35 para	2 kuruş 5 para	6 kuruş	54,84

BOOK TITLE	YEAR	COPIES	COST	PROFIT	TOTAL	PROFIT PERCENTAGE
Tecvîd	1249	1200	21 para	9 para	30 para	42,86
Tecvîd-i Karabaş	1253	620	2 kuruş 9 para	3 kuruş 9 para	5 kuruş 18para	144,94
Sarf Cümlesi	1248	2400	7 kuruş	3 kuruş	10 kuruş	42,86
Sarf Cümlesi	1252	3600	5,5 kuruş	5,5 kuruş	11 kuruş	100,00
Sarf Cümlesi	1255	2400	3,5 kuruş	4 kuruş	7,5 kuruş	114,29
Sarf Cümlesi	1256	2400	4 kuruş 24 para	92 para	6,5 kuruş	41,30
Sarf Cümlesi	1257	2400	3,5 kuruş	3,5 kuruş	7 kuruş	100,00
Sarf Cümlesi	1259	2400	3 kuruş 8 para	1 kuruş 32 para	5 kuruş	56,25
Sarf Cümlesi	1261	2400	4 kuruş	2 kuruş	6 kuruş	50,00
Birgivî şerhi	1255	1200	8 kuruş	8 kuruş	16 kuruş	100,00
Risâle-i Birgivî	1249	1000	3 kuruş 30 para	30 para	4,5 kuruş	20,00
Vasiyetnâme şerhi (İsmâil Niyâzi Efendi)	1264	1200	17 kuruş	9 kuruş	26 kuruş	52,94
Cevhere-i behiyye-i Ahmediyye fî şerhi'l-vasiyyeti'l-Muhammediyye	1258	1200	12 kuruş	3 kuruş	15 kuruş	25,00
Cevhere-i behiyye-i Ahmediyye fî şerhi'l-vasiyyeti'l-Muhammediyye	1255	1200	8 kuruş	8 kuruş	16 kuruş	100,00
Dürr-i yektâ	1249	1000	5 kuruş	1 kuruş	6 kuruş	20,00
Dürr-i yektâ	1252	2400	5 kuruş	1,5 kuruş	6,5 kuruş	30,00
Dürr-i yektâ	1253	1912	2 kuruş	3 kuruş	5 kuruş	150,00
Dürr-i yektâ	1256	2400	95 para	2 kuruş	4 kuruş 30 para	100,00

BOOK TITLE	YEAR	COPIES	COST	PROFIT	TOTAL	PROFIT PERCENTAGE
Dürr-i yektâ	1257	2400	2 kuruş 7 para	2 kuruş 13 para	4,5 kuruş	106,90
Dürr-i yektâ	1259	2400	86 para	46 para	3 kuruş 12para	53,49
Dürr-i yektâ	1260	900	5 kuruş	3 kuruş	8 kuruş	60,00
Sübha-i sıbyân	1249	1000	2 kuruş 10 para	50 para	3,5 kuruş	55,56
Sübha-i sıbyân	1251	3600	2 kuruş	1,5 kuruş	3,5 kuruş	75,00
Sübha-i sıbyân	1257	1200	2 kuruş	1 kuruş	3 kuruş	50,00
Sübha-i sıbyân	1260	2400	50 para	70 para	3 kuruş	140,00
Sübhati's-sıbyân şerhi	1256	1200	8 kuruş	5 kuruş	13 kuruş	62,50
Tuhfe-i Vehbî	1249	1000	4 kuruş	1 kuruş	5 kuruş	25,00
Tuhfe-i Vehbî	1235	2400	5 kuruş	3 kuruş 10 para	8,25kuruş	65,00
Tuhfe-i Vehbî	1252	2400	4 kuruş 10 para	50 para	5,5 kuruş	29,41
Tuhfe-i Vehbî	1253	3600	2 kuruş	3 kuruş	5 kuruş	150,00
Tuhfe-i Vehbî	1256	2400	5 kuruş	3 kuruş 10 para	8 kuruş 10 para	65,00
Tuhfe-i Vehbî	1261	1200	3 kuruş	1,5 kuruş	4,5 kuruş	50,00
Tuhfe-i Vehbî şerhi (Hayatî)	1262	1200	9,5 kuruş	5,5 kuruş	15 kuruş	57,89
Müntehâb-ı Lebîb	1263	1200	2,5 kuruş	2 kuruş	4,5 kuruş	80,00
Nahiv Cümlesi	1249	2400	5 kuruş	2 kuruş	7 kuruş	40,00
Nahiv Cümlesi	1255	1200	2,5 kuruş	2,5 kuruş	5 kuruş	100,00
Nahiv Cümlesi	1256	2400	5 kuruş	3 kuruş 7 para	8 kuruş 7 para	63,50
Hadîs-i erba‘în şerhi	1250	1200	10 kuruş	10 kuruş	20 kuruş	100,00
Pend-i Attâr şerhi	1250	1200	30,5 kuruş	29,5 kuruş	60 kuruş	96,72
Pend-i Attâr metni	1251	2500	3 kuruş	2 kuruş	5 kuruş	66,67

BOOK TITLE	YEAR	COPIES	COST	PROFIT	TOTAL	PROFIT PERCENTAGE
Pend-i Attâr metni	1260	2400	60 para	40 para	2,5 kuruş	66,67
Ma-hazar	1252	1200	9 kuruş	9 kuruş	18 kuruş	100,00
Ma-hazar	1260	1200	7 kuruş	8 kuruş	15 kuruş	114,29
Kitâbü'l-fürûk	1251	1200	6,5 kuruş	7 kuruş	13,5kuruş	107,69
İzhâr Muʻribi	1255	1200	7 kuruş	7 kuruş	14 kuruş	100,00
İzhâr Muʻribi	1257	1200	9 kuruş	14 kuruş	23 kuruş	155,56
İzhâr şerhi Adalı	1251	2400	11 kuruş	9 kuruş	20 kuruş	81,82
İzhâr şerhi Adalı	1264	2400	6,5 kuruş	3,5 kuruş	10 kuruş	53,85
Kâfiye muʻribi	1251	1200	19,5 kuruş	10,5 kuruş	30 kuruş	53,85
Kâfiye muʻribi	1257	1200	15 kuruş	12 kuruş	27 kuruş	80,00
Kâfiye muʻribi	1260	1200	13 kuruş 25 para	12 kuruş 15para	26 kuruş	90,83
Kâfiye muʻribi	1265	1200	13,5 kuruş	12,5 kuruş	26 kuruş	92,59
Hâşiye alâ şerhi'l-Akâid	1256		16 kuruş 4para	13,9 kuruş	30 kuruş	86,34
Kâfiye şerhi (Şeyh Radi)	1275			10 percent profit	72 kuruş	10,00
Kâfiye şerhi (İsâmüddîn)	1256		13,9 kuruş	16 kuruş 4 para	30 kuruş	115,83
Tuhfetü'l-Avâmil	1252	2400	9,5 kuruş	5,5 kuruş	15 kuruş	57,89
Tuhfetü'l-Avâmil	1254	1200	5 kuruş	4 kuruş	9 kuruş	80,00
Tuhfetü'l-Avâmil	1257	1200	5 kuruş 27 para	4 kuruş 13 para	10 kuruş	76,21
Camiʿu'l-icâreteyn	1252	1200	20 kuruş	15 kuruş	35 kuruş	75,00
Tecvîd-i edâiye	1253	620	2 kuruş 30 para	3 kuruş 30 para	6,5 kuruş	136,36
Şerh-i Maksûd	1253	1200	3 kuruş	3 kuruş	6 kuruş	100,00
Burhân-ı Gelenbevî	1253	1200	3 kuruş	3 kuruş	6 kuruş	100,00
Îsâgûcî ve şerhi (Fenârî ve Kul Ahmed)	1253	1200	2 kuruş 30 para	2 kuruş 10 para	5 kuruş	81,82

BOOK TITLE	YEAR	COPIES	COST	PROFIT	TOTAL	PROFIT PERCENTAGE
Halebî-i sağîr	1253	2400	8 kuruş	8 kuruş	16 kuruş	100,00
Halebî-i sağîr	1258	2400	8 kuruş 12 para	1 kuruş 28 para	10 kuruş	20,48
Tasavvurât hâşiyesi	1254	1000	12 kuruş	8 kuruş	20 kuruş	66,67
Tasdikât hâşiyesi	1254	1000	9 kuruş	7 kuruş	16 kuruş	77,78
Hâşiye alâ şerhi'l-Hüseyniyye	1255	1200	6 kuruş	6 kuruş	12 kuruş	100,00
Delailü'l-hayrât şerhi tercümesi	1254	1200	25 kuruş	25 kuruş	50 kuruş	100,00
Delailü'l-hayrât şerhi tercümesi	1255	2400	28 kuruş	32 kuruş	60 kuruş	114,29
Delailü'l-hayrât şerhi (Davud Efendi)	1255	2400	25 kuruş	25 kuruş	50 kuruş	100,00
Delailü'l-hayrât şerhi (Davud Efendi)	1266	1200	59 kuruş 3 para	40 kuruş 37 para	100 kuruş	69,28
Delâilü'l-hayrât şerhi (Davud Efendi)	1269	1200	59 kuruş 3 para	40 kuruş 37 para	100 kuruş	69,28
Delâilü'l-hayrât şerhi (Davud Efendi)	1275	1200		18 kuruş 1 para	124 kuruş	17,01
Delâilü'l-hayrât şerhi (Davud Efendi)	1260		16 kuruş	19 kuruş	35 kuruş	118,75
Delâilü'l-hayrât şerhi (Davud Efendi)	1262	2400	13,5 kuruş	21,5 kuruş	35 kuruş	159,26
Karatepeli	1255	1200	3 kuruş	2 kuruş	5 kuruş	66,00
Karatepeli	1260	1200	106 para	94 para	5 kuruş	88,68
Halebî tercümesi Babadağı	1255	1200	8 kuruş	8,5 kuruş	16,5 kuruş	106,25
Halebî tercümesi Babadağı	1260	1200	9 kuruş 29 para	6 kuruş 23 para	16 kuruş 12para	67,61
Halebî tercümesi Babadağı	1264	1200	11 kuruş	6 kuruş	17 kuruş	54,55

BOOK TITLE	YEAR	COPIES	COST	PROFIT	TOTAL	PROFIT PERCENTAGE
Tarîkat-ı Muhammediyye (ve şerhi)	1262	1200	40 kuruş 15 para	14 kuruş 25 para	55 kuruş	36,22
Tarîkat-ı Muhammediyye tercümesi	1256	1200	15 kuruş 27 para	14 kuruş 13 para	30 kuruş	91,39
Behcetü'l-fetâvâ	1266	1200	30 kuruş	30 kuruş	60 kuruş	100,00
Harirîye	1256		2 kuruş 10 para	3 kuruş 30 para	6 kuruş	166,67
Kavâ‘id-i Fârisiyye	1251	1200		4 kuruş 10 para	5,5 kuruş	340,00
Kavâ‘id-i Fârisiyye	1257		3 kuruş	2 kuruş	5 kuruş	66,67
Dîvân-ı Zâtî	1257		8 kuruş	4 kuruş	12 kuruş	50,00
Dîvân-ı İffet	1257	1000	4 kuruş	2 kuruş	6 kuruş	50,00
Terceme-i Mîzânü'l-edeb	1257	1000	10 kuruş 23 para	4 kuruş 17 para	15 kuruş	41,84
Fetâvâ-yı Ali Efendi	1258		45 kuruş 30 para	44 kuruş 10 para	90 kuruş	96,72
Hâşiyetü'l-İsâm ale'l-Câmî	1259	1200	11 kuruş	4 kuruş	15 kuruş	36,36
Dîvân-ı Hafız	1257	1200		7 kuruş 39 para	17 kuruş	88,37
Hazân-ı âsâr	1257	1200	6 kuruş	2 kuruş 10 para	8 kuruş 10para	37,50
Divân-ı Belâgat Unvân-ı Esrar Dede Efendi	1257	1200	8 kuruş	2 kuruş	10 kuruş	25,00
Delâil-i nübüvvet-i Muhammedî ve şemâil-i fütüvvet-i Ahmedî	1257	1200	38 kuruş 5 para		80 kuruş	109,84
Dîvân-ı Belâgat-unvân-ı Nazîm	1257	1000	30 kuruş	15 kuruş	45 kuruş	50,00
Hayalî Siyâlkûtîsi (Zübdetü'l-efkâr)	1257		18 kuruş	4 kuruş	22 kuruş	22,22
Hayalî Siyâlkûtîsi (Zübdetü'l-efkâr)	1263	1200	14 kuruş 4 para	7 kuruş 36 para	22 kuruş	56,03

BOOK TITLE	YEAR	COPIES	COST	PROFIT	TOTAL	PROFIT PERCENTAGE
Ravzatü's-safa tercümesi	1258	1200	36 kuruş	9 kuruş	45 kuruş	25,00
Emsile şerhi	1257	1200	3 kuruş 36 para	7 kuruş	10 kuruş 36para	179,49
Emsile şerhi	1251	1200	7,5 kuruş	7,5 kuruş	15 kuruş	100,00
Esmaü'l-Hüsnâ şerhi	1258	1200	4,5 kuruş	0,5 kuruş	5 kuruş	11,11
Dîvân-ı Rıza	1258	1200	11 kuruş	14 kuruş	25 kuruş	127,27
Dîvân-ı Zekâyi	1258	1200	4 kuruş	6 kuruş	10 kuruş	150,00
Fenârî hâşiyesi (Kara Halil)	1258	1200	11 kuruş	14 kuruş	25 kuruş	127,27
Fenârî hâşiyesi (Kara Halil)	1265	1200	7 kuruş	5,5 kuruş	12,5 kuruş	78,57
Mehmed Emin hâşiyesi (Kara Halil)	1259	1200		1 kuruş 33 para	6,5 kuruş	39,04
Menâkıb-ı çehâr yâr-ı güzîn	1258	1200	34 kuruş	9 kuruş	43 kuruş	26,47
Dîvân-ı Hâlet Efendi ve Zînetü'l-mecâlis manzûmesi	1258	600	9 kuruş	3 kuruş	12 kuruş	33,33
Dîvân-ı Belîğ	1258	1200	6 kuruş 35 para	3 kuruş 5 para	10 kuruş	45,45
Molla Câmî	1258	1200	12 kuruş 15 para	4 kuruş 25 para	17 kuruş	37,37
Molla Câmî	1254	1200	7 kuruş	7 kuruş	14 kuruş	100,00
Molla Câmî hâşiyesi (Abdulgafûr)	1253	1200	6,5 kuruş	5,5 kuruş	12 kuruş	84,62
Molla Câmî şerhi Muharrem Efendi zeyli	1259	1200	50 kuruş	10 kuruş	60 kuruş	20,00
Hadâiku'l-hakâik fî tekmileti'ş-Şekâik	1258	1200	75 kuruş	50 kuruş	125 kuruş	66,67
Hadâiku'l-hakâik fî tekmileti'ş-Şekâik	1269		30 kuruş	15 kuruş	45 kuruş	50,00

BOOK TITLE	YEAR	COPIES	COST	PROFIT	TOTAL	PROFIT PERCENTAGE
İrâde-i cüz'iyye, Siyâlkûtî hâşiye (Şeyh Halid) (cild-i vahid)	1259	1200	4 kuruş 36 para	4 kuruş 4 para	9 kuruş	83,67
Dürr-i Nâcî	1250	1000	9,5 kuruş	4,5 kuruş	15 kuruş	57,89
Dürr-i Nâcî	1259	1200	5,5 kuruş	5,5 kuruş	11 kuruş	100,00
Dürer	1260	1200	29,5 kuruş	25,5 kuruş	55 kuruş	86,44
Tasavvurât (Siyâlkûtî)	1259	1200	4 kuruş 30 para	2 kuruş 10 para	7 kuruş	47,37
Tasdikât Hâşiyesi (Siyâlkûtî)	1259	1200	5 kuruş 10 para	3 kuruş 30 para	9 kuruş	71,43
Şerhi ebyâti't-Telhîs	1259	1200	11 kuruş 26 para	8 kuruş 14 para	20 kuruş	71,67
Muhtasaru'l-Me'ânî	1259	1200	8 kuruş	4 kuruş	12 kuruş	50,00
Nuhbe-i Vehbî şerhi	1259	1200	23,5 kuruş	18,5 kuruş	42 kuruş	78,72
Elli dört farz tercümesi	1259	1200	2 kuruş	1 kuruş	3 kuruş	50,00
Elli dört farz tercümesi	1260	2400	65 para	55 para	3 kuruş	84,62
Münşeât-ı el-Hâc Âkif Efendi	1259	900	11 kuruş	3,5 kuruş	14,5kuruş	31,82
Tasavvurât ve Tasdikât	1259	1200	8 kuruş	5,5 kuruş	13,5 kuruş	68,75
Tasavvurât ve Tasdikât	1265		5,5 kuruş 7 para	2,5 kuruş 13 para	8,5 kuruş	49,78
Hâşiyetü's-Seyyid ale't-Tasavvurât	1260	1200	4 kuruş 5 para	2 kuruş 15 para	6,5 kuruş	57,58
Siyeri'l-kebîr	1260	1200	20 kuruş	7 kuruş	27 kuruş	35,00
Dîvân-ı Ziyâeddîn Halidî	1260	1200	3 kuruş	2 kuruş	5 kuruş	66,67
Envârü'l-âşıkîn	1260	1200	20,5 kuruş	12 kuruş	32,5 kuruş	56,10
Dîvân-ı Nesîmî	1260	1200	9 kuruş	11 kuruş	20 kuruş	122,22

BOOK TITLE	YEAR	COPIES	COST	PROFIT	TOTAL	PROFIT PERCENTAGE
Hâşiye alâ şerhi'l-Celâl (Gelenbevî)	1260	1200	22 kuruş	6 kuruş	28 kuruş	27,27
Celâl	1263	1200	3 kuruş 25 para	2 kuruş 15 para	6 kuruş	65,52
Revnak-ı bostân	1260	1200	2 kuruş 16 para	2 kuruş 24 para	5 kuruş	108,33
Zübdetü'n-nasâyih	1260	2400	25 para	35 para	1,5 kuruş	140,00
Dîvân-ı Mısrî	1260	1200	3,5 kuruş	1 kuruş	4,5 kuruş	28,57
Akâid Risâlesi (Mısrî)	1260		27 para	33 para	1,5 kuruş	122,22
Risâle fî't-tasavvuf (Mısrî)	1260		37 para	23 para	1,5 kuruş	62,16
Sinâniyya al-kabira	1260	1200	16,5 kuruş	11,5 kuruş	28 kuruş	69,70
Maksûd şerhi, Ruhu'ş-şurûh, İm‘ânü'l-enzâr (cild-i vâhid)	1260	1200	3 kuruş 22 para	2 kuruş 18 para	6 kuruş	69,01
Telhîsü'l-miftâh	1260	1200	74 para	186 para	6,5 kuruş	1103,70
Mutavvel	1260	1200	14 kuruş	12 kuruş	26 kuruş	85,71
Mutavvel (Siyâlkûtî)	1266	1200	20 kuruş 0,5 para	24 kuruş 39,5 para	45 kuruş	124,86
Muğni't-tullâb	1260	1200	82 para	78 para	4 kuruş	95,12
Muhammediyye	1261	700	46 kuruş	24 kuruş	70 kuruş	52,17
Muhammediyye	1263	1200	42 kuruş	28 kuruş	70 kuruş	66,67
Risale-i te‘avvüz	1261		9 kuruş	3 kuruş	12 kuruş	33,33
et-Teysîr şerhi	1261	1200	2,5 kuruş	2,5 kuruş	5 kuruş	100,00
Velediyye	1261	1200	2,5 kuruş	4,5 kuruş	7 kuruş	180,00
Mecâlisü'l-mevâ‘iz	1261	1200	6,5 kuruş	4,5 kuruş	11 kuruş	69,23
Dîvân-ı Seyyid Mehmed Nesîb	1261	1200	90 para	50 para	3,5 kuruş	55,56
Şerhu Risâleti'l-isti‘âre	1261	1200	2 kuruş	2 kuruş	4 kuruş	100,00

BOOK TITLE	YEAR	COPIES	COST	PROFIT	TOTAL	PROFIT PERCENTAGE
Risâletü'l-Besmele	1261	1200	100 para	50 para	3,5 kuruş 10para	50,00
Münşeât-ı Numan Mahir Bey	1261	1200	9 kuruş	3 kuruş	12 kuruş	33,33
Nevhatü'l-uşşâk	1261	1200	3,5 kuruş	2,5 kuruş	6 kuruş	71,43
Risaletü'l-Mülhemât	1262	1200	8 kuruş	1 kuruş	9 kuruş	12,50
Meâlimü'l-yakîn fî sîret-i Seyyidi'l-Mürselîn	1262	1200	42 kuruş 12 para	57 kuruş 28 para	100 kuruş	148,14
Risâle-i İmtihân	1262	1200	8,5 kuruş	3,5 kuruş	12 kuruş	41,18
Hâşiye alâ Mir'âti'l-usûl (Tarsûsî)	1267		8 kuruş 9 para	1 kuruş 31 para	10 kuruş	21,58
Risâle-i bey' ü şirâ' şerhi (Hamza Efendi Risâlesi)	1262	1200	3 kuruş	1 kuruş 15 para	4 kuruş15 para	45,83
Merahu'l-me'âlî fî şerhi'l-Emâlî	1266	1200	12 kuruş 30 para	7 kuruş 10 para	20 kuruş	56,86
Dürretü'n-nâsihîn	1262	1200	11 kuruş	4,5 kuruş	15,5 kuruş	40,91
Kösezâde mecâlisi	1262	1200	8 kuruş	6 kuruş	14 kuruş	75,00
Şerhu'ş-Şifâ	1264	1200	54 kuruş 38 para	25 kuruş 2 para	80 kuruş	45,59
Dîvân-ı Erzurumlu İbrahim Hakkı	1263	1500	8 kuruş	5 kuruş	13 kuruş	62,50
Şemsiyye, Kul Ahmed Îsâgûcî	1263	1200	5 kuruş	3,5 kuruş	8,5 kuruş	70,00
Mantık Cümlesi ma'a Şemsiyye	1263	1200	5 kuruş 10 para	3 kuruş 10 para	8,5 kuruş	61,90
Risâletü'l-imkân	1263	1200	5 kuruş	4 kuruş	9 kuruş	80,00
Necatü'l-musallî	1263	1200	6 kuruş 10 para	2 kuruş 30 para	9 kuruş	44,00
Tercüme-i Vasiyetnâme-i İmam-ı Azam	1264	1200	50 para	30 para	2 kuruş	60,00
	1264	1200	4 kuruş	3 kuruş	7 kuruş	75,00

BOOK TITLE	YEAR	COPIES	COST	PROFIT	TOTAL	PROFIT PERCENTAGE
Tarih ve fezâil-i Kuds-i şerîf	1265	1200	4 kuruş 21 para	2 kuruş 19 para	7 kuruş	54,70
Feridun Bey Mecmû‘ası	1266		180 kuruş	30 kuruş	21 kuruş	16,67
Netîcetü'l-fetâvâ	1265	1200	24,5 kuruş 17 para	13 kuruş 16 para	51 kuruş 13 para	105,92
Ahkâmü'l-mer‘iyye	1265	1200	2 kuruş 17 para	2 kuruş 3 para	4,5 kuruş	85,57
Fetâvâ-yı Feyziyye	1266		25 kuruş	20 kuruş	45 kuruş	80,00
Nuhbetü'l-hisâb	1270	600	95 para	40 para	3 kuruş 15para	42,11
Kadı hâşiyeli Siyâlkûtî	1270	1200	30 kuruş 25 para	9 kuruş 15 para	40 kuruş	30,61
Kâmûs tercümesi okyânûsi'l-basît	1272		134 kuruş	31 kuruş	165 kuruş	23,13
Kudûrî	1272	1200	5 kuruş 26 para	1 kuruş 14 para	7 kuruş	23,89
Müntehabât-ı Evliya Çelebi	1257		5 kuruş	2 kuruş	7 kuruş	40,00
Kâmilü'l-kelâm	1262	1200	8 kuruş	4,5 kuruş	12,5 kuruş	56,25

REFERENCES

PRIMARY UNPUBLISHED SOURCES

Sadâret Âmedî Kalemi Evrakı

Divan/Beylikçi Kalemi Defterleri

Mühimme Defterleri

Sadâret Mektûbî Mühimme Kalemi Evrakı

Sadâret Mektûbî Kalemi Mühimme Kalemi

Sadâret Mektûbî Kalemi Meclis-i Vâlâ Evrakı

Sadâret Mektûbî Kalemi Nezaret ve Devair Evrakı

Sadâret Mektubi Kalemi Evrakı

Sadâret Mektubi Kalemi Umum Vilayat Evrakı

Cevdet Dahiliye

Cevdet Askeriye

Cevdet Ma‘ârif

Cevdet Maliye

Dahiliye Nezareti Mektûbî Kalemi

Hatt-ı Hümâyun Tasnifi

Mektûbî Kalemi Belgeleri

Siyasî Kısmı Belgeleri

İrade Dahiliye

İrade Dosya Usulü

İrade Hariciye

İrade Meclis-i Mahsus

İrade Mesail-i Mühimme

İrade Meclis-i Vala

Mektûbî Kalemi

Hariciye Nezareti Tercüme Odası

Meclis-i Vâlâ

Ma‘ârif Nezâreti Mektûbî Kalemi

Maliyeden Müdevver Defterleri

PRIMARY PUBLISHED SOURCES: BOOKS

Abdullah Salâhî. (26 September 1859) [H. Safer 1276]. *Elli dört farz şerhi.* İstanbul: Tophâne-i Âmire İstihkâm Alayları Litografya Destgâhı.

Ahmed bin Muhammed el-Kastalanî. (November 1845) [H. Evâsıt-ı Zilkâde 1261]. *Meâlimü'l-yakîn fî sîret-i seyyidi'l-mürselîn.* (Mevlânâ Abdülbaki, Trans.). İstanbul: Tabhâne-i Amire.

Ahmet Cevdet, Paşa. (2018). *Târih-i Cevdet* (Vols. 1-5). (Ş. N. Aykut & A. Özcan & M. İpşirli, Trans. & Ed.). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Ahmet Cevdet, Paşa. (1953). *Tezâkir* (Vols. 1-12). (C. Baysun, Trans. & Ed.). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Ahmet Cevdet, Paşa. (1960). *Tezâkir* (Vols. 13-20). (C. Baysun, Trans. & Ed.). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Ahmet Cevdet, Paşa. (1986). *Tezâkir* (Vol. 40). (C. Baysun, Trans. & Ed.). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Ahmet Cevdet, Paşa. (1986). *Tezâkir* (Vols. 21-39). (C. Baysun, Trans. & Ed.). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Ahmed Lüfti, Efendi. (1984). *Vak'a-nüvis Ahmed Lütfi Efendi tarihi* (Vol. 9). (M. Aktepe, Trans. & Ed.). İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Matbaası.

Ahmed Lüfti, Efendi. (1988). *Vak'a-nüvis Ahmed Lütfi Efendi tarihi* (Vol. 10). (M. Aktepe, Trans. & Ed.). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Ahmed Lüfti, Efendi. (1989). *Vak'a-nüvis Ahmed Lütfi Efendi tarihi* (Vol. 11). (M. Aktepe, Trans. & Ed.). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Ahmed Lüfti, Efendi. (1989). *Vak'a-nüvis Ahmed Lütfi Efendi tarihi* (Vol. 12). (M. Aktepe, Trans. & Ed.). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Ahmed Lüfti, Efendi. (1990). *Vak'a-nüvis Ahmed Lütfi Efendi tarihi* (Vol. 13). (M. Aktepe, Trans. & Ed.). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Ahmed Lüfti Efendi. (1983). *Vak'a-nüvis Ahmed Lütfî Efendi tarihi* (Vol. 1). (M. Aktepe, Trans. & Ed.). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Ahmed Lüfti Efendi. (1983). *Vak'a-nüvis Ahmed Lütfî Efendi tarihi* (Vol. 3). (M. Aktepe, Trans. & Ed.). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Ahmed Lüfti Efendi. (1999). *Vak'a-nüvis Ahmed Lütfî Efendi tarihi* (Vols. 6-7-8). İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı-Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Ahmed Rasim. (1924) [H. 1342]. *Matbuat hatıralarından: muharrir, şair, edib.* İstanbul: Kanaat Kütüphanesi.

Ahmed Refik. (1988). *Onikinci asr-ı hicri'de İstanbul hayatı (1689-1785).* İstanbul: Enderun Yayınevi.

Ahmed Şevki b. Abdullah. (1847) [H. 1263]. *Necâtü'l-musallî*. İstanbul: Dârü't-Tıbâati'l-Âmire.

Ahmed Tevhid Efendi. (16 December 1853) [H. 15 Rebîülevvel 1270]. *Telhîsü'l-a'mâl.* İstanbul: Takvimhâne-i Âmire.

Ahmed Tevhid Efendi. (April 1854) [H. Evâhil-i Receb 1270]. *Nuhbetü'l-hesâb.* İstanbul: Tabhâne-i Âmire Litografya Destgâhı.

Ahmed Vefik Paşa. (1869-1870) [H. 1286]. *Fezleke-i tarih-i Osmanî.* İstanbul: Matbaa-i Amire.

Ali el-Kârî. (1859-60) [H. 1276]. *Hizbü'l-a'zam ve'l-virdü'l-efham* (İ.H. Fındıkzade, Trans.). İstanbul: Bosnavî Muharrem Efendi.

Anderson, R. (1844). *Report to the prudential committee of a visit to the missions in the Levant.* Boston: American Board.

Anonymous. (1890-1891) [H. 1308]. *Delâil-i şerîf*. İstanbul: Matbaa-i Âmire.

Anonymous. *Dâsitân-ı Hâtem-i Tâî*. (1840) [H. 1256]. İstanbul: Tabhâne-i Bâb-ı Askeriye.

Anonymous. (May 1857) [H. Evâil-i Ramazan 1273]. *Feth-i Kostantiniyye ve ta'rîf-i Ayasofya.* İstanbul: Beyoğlu İstihkâm Alayları Litografya Matbaası.

Anonymous. *Şürûtu's-salât.* (October-November 1861) [H. Rebi'ülahir 1278]. İstanbul: Alaiyevî Ali Efendi.

Anonymous. *Tercüme-i risâle-i suâl-i İblis*. (1856-1857) [H. 1273]. İstanbul: el-Hâc Ali Rıza Efendi.

Ayni, M.A. (1927). *Dârü'l-fünûn tarihi*. Istanbul: Yeni Matba.

Bartlett, Reverend Samuel Colcord. (1878). *Historical sketch of the missions of the American Board in Turkey*. Boston: The Board.

Basiretçi Ali Efendi. (2001). *İstanbul mektupları*. İstanbul: Kitapevi.

Beyhan, Mehmed Ali. (Ed.). (2003). *Cabi Ömer Efendi, Cabir tarihi (Tarih-i Sultan Selim-i Salis ve Mahmud-ı Sani)* Vols. 1-2. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Bird, I. (1872). *Bible work in bible lands: or events in the history of the Syrian mission*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

Birgivî Mehmed Efendi. (September-October 1803) [H. Cemâziyelâhir 1218]. *Risâle-i Birgivî*. İstanbul: Dârü't-Tıbâati'l-Cedîdeti'l-Mamûre.

Bursalı Mehmed Tahir. (1971). *Osmanlı müellifleri* (Vols. 1-3). (İ. Özen, Ed.). İstanbul: Meral Yayınevi.

Bursevî, İsmail Hakkı. (January-February 1863) [Evâsıt-ı Şaban 1279]. *Şerh-i Salavât-ı ibn Meşîş*. İstanbul: Bâb-ı Seraskerî Litografya Destgâhı.

Canton, W. (2018). *A history of the British and Foreign Bible Society* (Vol. 2). London: Forgotten Books.

Clarke, H. (1867). On public instruction in Turkey. *Journal of the Statistical Society of London*, *30*(4), 502-34.

Davud el-Karsî. (1864-1865) [H. 1281]. *Davud el-Karsî ale'l-Emsile.* Istanbul: Matbaatü'l-Mektebi'l-Harbiyeti's-Sultâniye.

Debbağzâde, Numan Efendi. (April 1843) [H. Evâhir-i Rebi'ülevvel 1259]. *Tuhfetü's-sukûk.* İstanbul: Dârü't-Tıbâati'l-Âmire.

De Kay, J. E. (1833). *Sketches of Turkey in 1831 and 1832*. NY: J. J. Harper.

Dwight, H. O. (1901). *Constantinople and its problems: its peoples, customs, religions and progress.* London and Edinburg: Oliphant, Anderson and Ferrier.

Ebu Tahir Mecdüddîn Muhammed b. Yakub b. Muhammed. (September-October 1855) [H. Muharrem 1272]. *el-Okyanusü'l-basît fî tercemeti'l-Kâmusi'l-muhît*. İstanbul: Takvimhâne-i Âmire.

Efdaleddin. (1916). Memalik-i Osmaniye'de tıbaatin kadimi. *Tarih-i osmani Encümeni Mecmuası*, *40*, 242-249.

Elliott, C. B. (1838). *Travels in the three great empires of Austria, Russia and Turkey* (Vol. 1). London: Richard Bentley, New Burlington.

Erzurumlu İbrahim Hakkı. (February-March 1847) [H. Evâil-i Rebîülevvel 1263]. *Dîvân-ı Erzurumlu İbrahim Hakkı*. İstanbul: Dârü't-Tıbâati'l-Âmire.

Esrar Dede. (25 October 1841) [H. 9 Ramazan 1257]. *Dîvân-ı belâgat-unvân-ı Esrar Dede Efendi*. İstanbul: Takvîm-i Vekâyi Matbaası.

Evliya Çelebi. (2011). *Evliya Çelebi seyahatnamesi* (Vol. 7). İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Evliya Çelebi. (May-June 1843) [H. Evâsıt-ı Cemâziyelevvel 1259]. *Müntehabât-ı Evliya Çelebi*. İstanbul: Tabhâne-i Âmire.

Feridüddin Attar. (September-October 1857) [H. Safer 1274]. *Mantıkü'l-esrâr, Terceme-i mantıkü't-tayr.* İstanbul: Necib Efendi Taş Destgâhı.

Giridî, Mustafa Naîmâ. (1865) [H. 1281]. *Ravzatü'l-hüseyn fî hulâsati ahbâri'l-hâfikayn (Naîmâ Tarihi)*. İstanbul: Matbaa-i Âmire.

Hayrullah Efendi. (March-April 1848) [H. Evâsıt-ı Rebîülâhir 1264]. *Beyt-i dihkânî.* İstanbul: Dârü't-Tıbâati'l-Âmire.

Hayrullah Efendi. (2002). *Avrupa seyahatnamesi*. Belkıs Altuniş-Gürsoy (Ed.). Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı.

Herve, F. (1837). *A residence in Greece and Turkey* (Vol. 2). Whittaker and Ave Maria Lane.

Hıfzî Beliğ. (May-Apriil 1849) [H. Evâsıt-ı Receb 1265]. *Tarih ve fezâil-i Kuds-i Şerîf*. İstanbul: Matbaa-i Âmire.

Hüseyin Rıfkı Tamanî. (10 April 1850) [H. 27 Cemâziyelevvel 1266]. *el-medhal fî coğrafya*. İshak Efendi (Ed.). İstanbul: Takvimhâne-i Âmire.

Hüseyin Rıfkı Tamanî. (9 August 1802) [H. 9 Rebîülâhir 1217]. *İmtihanü'l-mühendisîn.* İstanbul: Dârü't-Tıbâati'l-Âmire.

Hüseyin Rıfkı Tamanî. (1853) [H. 1269]. *Mecmû'atü'l-mühendisîn.* İstanbul: Dârü't-Tıbâati'l-Âmire.

Hüseyin Rıfkı Tamanî. (27 October 1797) [H. 6 Cemâziyelevvel 1212]. *Usûl-i hendese.* İstanbul: Mühendishâne.

Hüseyin Şakir. (March-April 1860) [H. Ramazan 1276]. *Firâsetü'l-hikemiyye fî kıyâfeti'l-insâniyye*. İstanbul: Hocazâde Rıza Efendi Litografyası.

El-Hüseynî, Cemal. (February-March 1852) [H. Evâhir-i Cumadelahir 1268]. *Ravzatü'l-ahbâb fî Siyeri'n-Nebî ve'l-âl ve'l-ashâb*. (Mahmud Mağnisavî Benlizâde Trans.). İstanbul: Tabhâne-i Âmire.

Mehmed Mevkûfâtî. (November-December 1859) [H. 1276]. *El-mevkûfât*. İstanbul: Dârü't-Tıbâati'l-Âmire.

İbrahim Peçevî. (29 June 1866) [H. 15 Safer 1283]. *Tarih-i Peçevî.* İstanbul: Matbaa-i Âmire.

İnal, İbnülemin Mahmud Kemal. (1930). *Son asır Türk şairleri* (Vols. 1-3). İstanbul: Orhaniye Matbaası.

İshak Efendi. (1841-1842) [H. 1257]. *Kutû-i mahrutiyyât.* İstanbul: Bâb-ı Seraskerî Matbaası.

İshak Efendi. (11 July 1831) [H. Evâhir-i Muharrem 1247]. *Mecmû'a-i ulûm-i riyâziyye* (Vol. 1). İstanbul: Dârü't-Tıbâati'l-Âmire.

Kadı Şemseddin Ebu'l-Abbas Ahmed. (14 March 1864) [H. 5 Şevval 1280]. *Vefeyâtü'l-a'yân ve enbâ'ü ebnâi'z-zamân*. (Rodosizâde Muhammed, Trans.). İstanbul: Tabhâne-i Âmire.

Kamil Sezai. (1854) [H. 1270]. *Risâle-i muhtasar-ı coğrafya*. İstanbul: Mekteb-i Tıbbiye-i Şâhâne.

Karatay, Fehmi Edhem. (1953). *İstanbul Üniversitesi kütüphanesi Arapça basmalar alfabe kataloğu*. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Karatay, Fehmi Edhem. (1951-1953). *İstanbul Üniversitesi kütüphanesi Arapça yazmalar kataloğu*. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Karatay, Fehmi Edhem. (1956). *İstanbul Üniversitesi kütüphanesi Türkçe basmalar alfabe kataloğu*. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1956.

Kay, James Ellsworth de. (1833). *Sketches of Turkey in 1831 and 1832 by an American*. New York: J. & J. Harper.

Karacson, Imre. (1910). İbrahim Müteferrika. *Tarih-i Osmani encümeni mecmuası*, *3*, 178-185.

Larpent, G. (1854). *Turkey: its history and progress from the journals and correspondances of Sir James Porter*. London: Hurst and Blackett Publishers.

Macfarlane, C. (1850). *Turkey and Its destiny: the result of journeys made in 1847 and 1848 to examine into the state of that country* (Vol. 1-2). Philadelphia, PA: Lea and Blanchard.

Macfarlane, C. (1829). *Constantinople in 1828: a residence of sixteen months in the Turkish capital and provinces: with an account of the present state of the naval and military power and of the resources of the Ottoman empire* (Vol. 2). London: Saunders and Otley.

Mahmut Cevat bin eş-Şeyh Nafi. (2002). *Maârif-i Umûmiye Nezâreti târihçe-i teşkîlât ve icrââtı: XIX. asır Osmanlı Maarif Tarihi*. Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları.

Mason, J. (1860). *Three years in Turkey: the journal of a medical mission to the Jews*. London: John Snow.

Mehmed Atâullah Efendi, Şânîzâde. (1873-74) [H. 1290]. *Şânîzâde tarihi*. İstanbul: Cerîde-i Havâdis Matbaası.

Mehmed Enverî. (1856-57) [H. 1273]. *Coğrafya*. İstanbul: Mekteb-i Bahriye Tabhânesi.

Mehmed Esad. (1986). *Mir'ât-ı Mühendishâne-i Berrî-i Hümâyûn*. İstanbul: İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi Bilim ve Teknoloji Tarihi Araştırma Merkezi.

Mehmed Esad. (1892-93) [H. 1310]. *Mir'ât-ı Mekteb-i Harbiyye.* İstanbul: Artin Asaduryan Şirket-i Mürettibiye Matbaası.

Mehmed Esad Efendi. (2000). *Vakanüvis Esad Efendi tarihi*. (Z. Yılmazer, Trans. & Ed.). İstanbul: Osmanlı Araştırmaları Vakfı.

Mehmed Rüşdü. (1858) [H. 1274]. *Nuhbetü'l-etfâl*. İstanbul: Necib Efendi Taş Destgâhı.

Mehmed Süreyya Bey. (1996). *Sicill-i Osmanî* (Vols. 1-6). (S. A. Kahraman, Trans. & N. Akbayar, Ed.). İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.

Mehmed Vehbî el-Erzincanî. (1859) [H. 1275]. *Kenzü'l-miftâh*. İstanbul: Bosnavî el-Hâc Ali Efendi.

Mustafa el-Bekrî. (1855-56) [H. 1272]. *Salât-ı Seyyid Ahmed Bedevî (Evsâf-ı kemâlât-ı Muhammediyye'yi hâvî salât-ı şerîfe)* (Hasan Hüsnü Fehmi, Trans.). İstanbul: el-Hâc Halil Efendi Taş Destgâhı.

Muhammed Davudzâde. (1864-65) [H. 1281]. *Tevfîku muvaffıkı'l-hayrât şerhu Delâili'l-hayrât.* İstanbul: Bosnevî el-Hâc Muharrem Efendi Basmahânesi.

Mustafa Âlî. (May-June 1861) [H. Evâsır-ı Zilkade 1277]. *Künhü'l-ahbar* (Vols. 1-2). İstanbul: Takvimhane-i Âmire.

Mustafa Paşa. (1873-74) [H. 1290]. *İlm-i hesâba dâir risâle*. İstanbul: Matbaa-i Âmire.

Mustafa Sâmi Efendi. (July-August 1840) [H. Evâil-i Cumadelula 1256]. *Avrupa risâlesi*. İstanbul: Takvim-i Vekâyi Matbaası.

Mustafa Sâmi Efendi. (2002). *Bir Osmanlı bürokratının Avrupa izlenimleri (Mustafa Sami Efendi ve Avrupa risalesi)* (M. Fatih Andı, Ed.) İstanbul: Kitabevi.

Müstakimzâde Süleyman Efendi. (November-December 1853) [H. Safer 1270]. *Tercüme-i mektubât-ı İmâm-ı Rabbânî* (Vols. 1-3). İstanbul: Karahisârî Ali Efendi Taş Destgâhı.

Mütercim Asım Efendi. (1787). *Asım tarihi*. İstanbul: Cerîde-i Havâdis Matbaası.

Necib Asım. (1893) [H. 1311]. *Kitab.* Konstantiniyye: Matbaa-i Safâ ve Enver.

Nusret Ali Khan ed-Dihlevî. (March 1854) [H. Evâhir-i Cemâziyelâhir 1270]. *Tercüme-i tarih-i nevâdir-i Çin-i Mâçîn.* İstanbul: Tophâne İstihkâm Alayları Litografya Destgâhı.

Oldmixon, J. (1854). *Gleanings from Piccadilly to Pera*. London: Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans.

Ömer Naili. (November-December 1861) [H. Evâil-i Cumadelevvel 1278]. *Fenn-i istihkâmât-ı hafîfe me'a atlas.* İstanbul: Mekteb-i Harbiye-i Şâhâne Matbaası.

Pardoe, J. (1837). *The city of the sultan and domestic manners of the Turks* (Vol. 1). London: Henry Colburn.

Prime, E. D. (1875). *Forty years in the Turkish Empire, or memoirs of Rev. William Goodell*. New York: Robert Carter and Brothers.

Rıza Tahsin. (1910-1911) [H. 1328] *Mir'ât-ı mekteb-i tıbbiyye* (Vol. 1). Dersaâdet: Kader Matbaası.

Sadık Rifat Paşa. (2006). Avrupa ahvâline dair risâle. *Marife*, *6* (3), 461-468.

Saffet Paşa. (February 1862) [H. Evâsıt-ı Şaban 1278]. *Logaritma.* İstanbul: Cerîde-i Havâdis Matbaası.

Safvet Bey. (February-March 1859) [H. Evâsıt-ı Receb 1275]. *Usûl-i ilm-i hesâb.* İstanbul: Mekteb-i Harbiye-i Şâhâne Litografya Destgâhı.

Şeyhzâde Mehmed Es'ad Efendi. (1827-1828) [H. 1243]. *Üss-i zafer*. İstanbul: bi-ma'rifeti el-Hâc İbrahim Sâib.

Seyyid Abdülhamid b. Mustafa Reşid. (April-May 1853) [H. Gurre-i Receb 1269]. *Envârü'l-imân*. İstanbul: Tophâne İstihkâm Alayları Litografya Destgâhı.

Seyyid Abdülhamid b. Mustafa Reşid. (1858) [H. 1274]. *Envârü'l-imân*. İstanbul: el-Hâc Halil Taş Destgâhı.

Slade, A. (1829). *Constantinople in 1828: a residence of Sixteen Months in the Turkish capital and provinces: with an account of the Present state of the naval and military power and of the resources of the Ottoman empire* (Vol. 1). London: Saunders and Otley.

Slade, A. (1833). *Records of travels in Turkey, Greece, etc. and of a cruise in the Black Sea, with the Capitan Pasha, in the years 1829, 1830, and 1831*. (Vol. 1-2). London: Saunders and Otley.

Slade, A. (1850). *Turkey and its destiny: the result of journeys made in 1847 and 1848 to examine into the state of that country*. (Vol. 2). Philadelphia: Lea and Blanchard.

Slade, A (1853). *Kismet: or, the doom of Turkey*. London: Thomas Bosworth.

Smith, A. (1851). *A month at Constantinople*. London: David Bogue.

Smith, J. V. S. (1854). *Turkey and the Turks*. Boston: J. French and co.

Southgate, H. (1840). *Narrative of a tour through Armenia, Kurdistan, Persia and Mesapotamia* (Vol. 1). New York: D. Appleton and Co.

Selânikî Mustafa Efendi. (December 1864) [H. Evâil-i Receb 1281]. *Tarih-i Selânikî*. İstanbul.

Tayyarzâde Ataullah Ahmed Atâ Bey. (1876-1877) [H. 1293]. *Tarih-i Atâ*. İstanbul: Basiret Matbaası.

Teotoros Lapçinciyan (Teotig). (2013). *Baskı ve harf: Ermeni matbaacılık tarihi*. (Sirvart Malhasyan, Trans). İstanbul: Birzamanlar Yayıncılık.

Thackeray, W. M. (1888). *Notes of a journey from Cornhill to Grand Cairo*. London: George Routledge and Sons.

Thornbury, Wa. (1860). *Turkish life and character* (Vol. 1), Smith Elder and Co.: London.

Tiryakioğlu, Boğos. (1849-1850) [H. 1266]. *Risâle-i coğrafya-kısm-ı sâni, Avrupa kıt'asının ta'rîf-i umûmisi*. İstanbul: Mekteb-i Tıbbiye.

Tokgöz, Ahmed İhsan. (2012). *Matbuat hatıralarım*. İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Toderini, G. (1990). *İbrahim Müteferrika matbaası ve Türk matbaacılığı*. (R. Kunt, Trans.). Istanbul: Yayın Matbaacılık.

Ubicini, M.A. (1856). *Letters on Turkey: an account of the religious, political, social and commercial conditions of the Ottoman Empire*. (L. Easthope, Trans.). London: John Muray.

Van Lennep, H. (1870). *Travels in little known parts of Asia Minor* (Vol. 1). London: John Muray.

Walsh, R. (1836). *A residence in Constantinople* (Vol. 1). London: Frederick Westley and A.H. Davis.

White, C. (1845). *Three years in Constantinople or domestic manners of the Turks in 1844* (Vols. 1-2). London: H. Colburn.

Yâsincizâde es-Seyyid Abdülvehhâb b. Osman. (January-February 1832) [H. Evâil-i Şaban 1247]. *Hulâsatü'l-burhân fî itaati's-sultân*. İstanbul: bi-ma'rifeti el-Hâc İbrahim Sâib.

Yazıcıoğlu, Ahmed Bîcan. (December-January 1852-1853) [H. Evâsıt-ı Rebi'ülevvel 1269]. *Envârü'l-âşıkîn*. Unidentified.

Yusuf Halis Tahir Ömerzâde. (1849-1850) [H. 1266]. *Miftâh-ı lisân*. Istanbul: Matbaa-i Cerîdetü'l Havâdis.

Zeynîzâde Hüseyin Efendi. (1818-1819) [H. 1234]. *Kâfiye mu'ribi*. İstanbul: Abdurrahman Muhib Efendi marifetiyle.

Ziyaeddîn Seyyid Yahya. (May-June 1857) [H. Evâhir-i Şevval, 1273]. *Gencîne-i hikmet*. İstanbul.

PRIMARY PUBLISHED SOURCES: NEWSPAPER AND JOURNALS

Journal Asiatique

Takvîm-i Vekâyi'

SECONDARY SOURCES

Abu-Manneh, B. (1982). The Naqshbandiyya-Mujaddidiyya in the Ottoman lands in the early 19th century. *Die Welt des Islams*, *22*(1-4), 1–36.

Abu-Manneh, B. (1990). The sultan and the bureaucracy: the anti-Tanzimat concepts of grand vizier Mahmud Nedim Paşa. *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies, 22(*3), 257-74.

Abu-Manneh, B. (Nov. 1994). The Islamic roots of the Gülhane rescript. *Die Welt des Islams, 34*(2), 173-203.

Abu-Manneh, B. (1999). A note on 'Rashahat-ı 'Ain al-Hayat' in the nineteenth century. In E. Özdalga, (Ed.), *Naqshbandis in Western and Central Asia* (pp. 61-66). İstanbul: Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul Transactions.

Abu-Manneh, B. (2003). Salafiya and the rise of the Khalidiyya in Baghdad in the early nineteenth century. *Die Welt des Islams, 43,* 349-372.

Açıl, B. (Ed.) (2015). *Osmanlı kitap kültürü: Cârullah Efendi kütüphanesi ve derkenar notları.* İstanbul: İLEM.

Adams, T. & Barker, N. (1993). A new model for the study of the book. In N. Barker (Ed.), *Potencie of life: Books in Society*. London: British Society.

Adıvar, A. (1943). *Osmanlı Türklerinde ilim*. İstanbul: Maarif Vekaleti.

Afyoncu, E. (2000). İbrahim Müteferrika. In *Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. (Vol. 21, pp. 324-327).

Ahmed, S. (2015). *What is Islam? The importance of being Islamic*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Ak, E. T. (2014). Osmanlı Devleti'nde Abdülaziz devri matbuat idaresi. In M. M. Hülagü (Ed.), *Sultan Abdülaziz ve dönemi sempozyumu 12-13 Aralık 2013 Bildiriler* (pp. 129-139). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Akan, S. (2015). *A Tanzimat intellectual: Sadık Rifat Paşa's economic thoughts.* (Unpublished master's thesis). Boğaziçi University, Turkey.

Akarlı, E. (2004). Gedik: a bundle of rights and obligations for Istanbul artisans and traders 1750-1840. In A. Pottage & M. Mundy (Eds.), *Law, anthropology,*

and the constitution of the social: making persons and things (pp. 166-200). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Akarlı, E. (2010). *Maslaha* from 'common good' to 'raison d'etat' in the experience of Istanbul artisans, 1730-1840. In K. Durukan, R.. W. Zens & A. Zorlu-Durukan (Eds.), *Hoca, 'Allam, puits de science: essays in honor of Kemal K. Karpat* (pp. 63-79). Istanbul: The Isis Press.

Akbaş, M. (2012a). The military march of physics-I: physics and mechanical sciences in the curricula of the 19th century Ottoman military schools. *Osmanlı Bilimi Araştırmaları, 13(*2), 65-84.

Akbaş, M. (2012b). The military march of physics-II: reachers and rextbooks of physics and mechanical sciences of the 19th Century Ottoman military schools. *Osmanlı Bilimi Araştırmaları, XIV*(1), 89-108.

Akbayar, N. (1985). Osmanlı yayıncılığı. In M.Belge (Ed.), *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye ansiklopedisi* (Vol. 6). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Akbulut, A. D. (2014). *The classification of the sciences in Nev'î Efendi's Netâyicü'l Fünun-an attempt at contextualization* (Unpublished master's thesis). Boğaziçi University, Turkey.

Akçay, A. İ. (October 2011). Salah tracts in verse within Turkish literature *Khulasa Al-Kaidani* and Turkish translations in verse. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, *1*(15) (Special Issue), 258-269.

Akgündüz, A. (1994). Ebusuud Efendi. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, (Vol. 10, p. 371). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Akgündüz, A. (1994). Dürerü'l-hükkām. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, (Vol. 10, pp. 28-29). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Akgündüz, M. (2004). *Osmanlı medreseleri: XIX. asır*. İstanbul: Beyan Yayınları.

Akkaya, M. A. (2003). *Türk beşikdevri basmalarında yazma kitap geleneğinin etkileri ve iç kapağın gelişimi* (Unpublished master's thesis). İstanbul University, Turkey.

Akkaya, M. A. (2015). *Türk beşikdevri basmalarında yazma kitap geleneğinin etkileri ve iç kapağın gelişimi.* İstanbul: Hiperlink.

Aksan, V. (2013). *Ottoman wars 1700-1870: an empire besieged*. London and NY: Routledge.

Aksoy, H. (1995). Esrar Dede. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, (Vol. 11, p. 434). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Akün, Ö. F. (1998). Hayrullah Efendi. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, (Vol. 17, p. 68). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Akyıldız, A. (1993). *Tanzimat dönemi Osmanlı merkez teşkilatında reform: 1839-1856*. İstanbul: Eren.

Akyıldız, A. (2003a). Maarif-i Umumiye Nezareti. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, (Vol. 27, pp. 273-274). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Akyıldız, A. (2003b). *Para pul oldu: Osmanlı'da kağıt para, maliye ve toplum*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Akyıldız, A. (2004). *Osmanlı bürokrasisi ve modernleşme.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Akyüz, Y. (1994). Tanzimat dönemi'nde eğitim biliminde ve öğretim yöntemlerinde gelişmeler. In *Tanzimat'ın 150. Yıldönümü Uluslararası Sempozyumu Ankara: 31 Ekim-3 Kasım 1989*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Akyüz, Y. (1999). *Türk eğitim tarihi (başlangıçtan 1999'a)*. İstanbul: Alfa.

Akyüz, Y. (2006). Türkiye'de öğretmen yetiştirmenin 160. yılında Darülmuallimin'in ilk yıllarına toplu ve yeni bir bakış. *Ankara Üniversitesi Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi*, *20*(20), 41.

Albin, M. W. Printing the Qur'an in *Encyclopedia of the Qur'an*. Referenceworks, brillonline.com, accessed 31 October 2018.

Alkan, M. (2006). Osmanlı'nın bütün sahafları birleşiniz! 'Şirket-i Sahafiye-i Osmaniye' Osmanlı döneminde sahaflar ve yayınladıkları kitaplar. *Müteferrika*, *29*, 3-44.

Alkan, M. (2015). Sultan Abdülmecid dönemi'nde Tanzimat modernleşmesi. In K. Kahraman & İ. Baytar (Eds.), *Sultan Abdülmecid ve dönemi*. İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür A.Ş Yayınları.

Alpay, M. (1973). Türkçe basma kitapların beşik (inkunabel) devri. *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı*, 587-589.

Altick, R. D. (1957). *The English common reader: a social history of the mass reading public 1800-1900.* Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Altuğ, F. (2007). *Modernity and subjectivity in the literary criticism of Namık Kemal* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Boğaziçi University, Turkey.

Altuğ, F. (2009). Başka *türlü* bir yaklaşım mümkün mü?. In H. Aynur (Ed.), *Nazımdan Nesire Edebi Türler, 25 Nisan 2008, Bildiriler* (pp. 32-45). İstanbul: Turkuaz Yayınları.

Anagnostopoulou, A. (2003). Tanzimat ve Rum milletinin kurumsal çerçevesi. In P. Stathis (Ed.), *19. Yüzyıl İstanbul'unda gayrimüslimler* (pp. 1-35). Istanbul: Tarih Vakfi Yurt Yayınları.

Anastassiadou, M. (2010). *Tanzimat çağında bir Osmanlı şehri Selanik (1830-1912)*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism.* London: Verso.

Andrews, W. Osmanlı metin çalışmaları: geçmişe meydan okuma geleceği tasarlama. In A. E. Özyıldırım, H. Koncu, H. Aynur, M. Çakır & S. S. Kuru (Eds.), *Eski metinlere yeni bağlamlar- Osmanlı Edebiyatı çalışmalarında yeni yönelimler (Eski Türk Edebiyatı Çalışmaları X*) (pp. 36-59). Istanbul: Klasik Yayınları.

Anscombe, F. (2010). Islam and the age of reform. *Past and Present*, *208*(1), 159-189.

Anscombe, F. (2014). *State, faith and nation in Ottoman and post-Ottoman lands.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Arpaguş, H. K. (2001). *Osmanlı halkının geleneksel İslam anlayışı ve kaynakları*. İstanbul: Çamlıca Yayınları.

Arpaguş, H. K. (2002/1). Bir telif türü olarak ilmihal tarihi geçmişi ve fonksiyonu. *Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, 22,* 25-56.

Aslanian, S. D. (2014). Port cities and printers: reflections on early modern global Armenian print culture. *Book History, 17,* 51-93.

Atiyeh, G. (Ed.). (1995). *The book in the Islamic world: the written word and communication in the Middle East*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Auji, H. (2016). *Printing Arab modernity: book culture and the American press in nineteenth-century Beirut.* Leiden: Brill.

Ayan, H. (2002). *Nesîmî, Hayatı, edebî kişiliği, eserleri ve Türkçe divanının tenkitli metni*. Ankara: TDK Yayınları.

Ayalon, A. (1995). *The press in the Arab Middle East: a history*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ayalon, A. (2004). *Reading Palestine: printing and literacy, 1900-1948*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Ayalon, A. (2016). *The Arabic print revolution: cultural production and mass readership*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Ayaydın, G. (2009). *19. yüzyılda Osmanlı toplumu ve basılı Türkçe edebiyat: etkileşimler, değişimler, çeşitlilik* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Bilkent University, Turkey.

Ayaydın, G. (2014). "Aşk Defteri"'nden aşk romanlar'ına Osmanlı-Türk anlatılarının sergüzeşti. In H. Argunşah (Ed.), *Türk Edebiyatına Açılan Pencere: İnci Enginun Armağanı* (pp.109-124). Ankara: Türk Kültürü Araştırma Enstitüsü.

Ayçiçeği, B. (2015). Busiri'nin Kasidetü'l-Bürde'sinin Diyarbakırlı Mehmed Said Paşa (ö. 1308/1892) tarafından yapılan mensur ve manzum tercümesi. *Divan Edebiyatı Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *15*, 27-102.

Aydın, E. E. (2014). Sultan Abdülaziz dönemi'nde alfabe tartışmaları: huruf-ı mukatta ve geç Tanzimat zihniyeti. In M. M. Hülagü (Ed.), *Sultan Abdülaziz ve Dönemi sempozyumu 12-13 Aralık 2013 Bildiriler* (pp. 139-152). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Aydınlı, E. S. (2015). *The oral and the written in Ottoman literature: the reader Nntes on the story of Fîrûzşâh.* İstanbul: Libra Yayınevi.

Aydınlı, E. S. (2018). Unusual readers in early modern Istanbul: manuscript notes of janissaries and Other riff-raff on popular heroic narratives. *Journal of Islamic Manuscripts, 9*(2-3), 109-131.

Aydüz, S. (December 1995). Osmanlı Devleti'nde müneccimbaşılık. *Osmanlı Bilimi Araştırmaları, 1,* 159-207.

Aygün, N. (Spring 2008). XIX. yüzyıl başlarında İstanbul merkezli Osmanlı deniz taşımacılığı. *Ankara Üniversitesi Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi*, *23*, 53-84

Aygün, N. (Spring 2016). Bir imamın kitap ticaretiyle münasebeti: Akçabatlı Derviş Mehmed (1847). *Karadeniz İncelemeleri Dergisi*, *20*, 117-136.

Aykaç, M. (1993). Cemal el-Hüseynî. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, (Vol. 7, pp. 304). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Aynur, H. (1990). Bulak matbaası'nda basılan Türkçe divanlar. *Journal of Turkish Studies-Türklük Bilgisi Araştırmaları: Fahri İz Armağan*, *14*, 43-74.

Aynur, H. (2009). Sehi, Latifi ve Aşık Çelebi tezkirelerine göre türler. In Hatice Aynur (Ed.), *Nazımdan nesire edebi türler, 25 Nisan 2008, Bildiriler*. İstanbul: Turkuaz Yayınları.

Aynur, H. (Summer 2009). Türki-i basit hareketini yeniden düşünmek. *Turkish Studies, 4*(5), 34-59.

Aynur, H. (2010). Arap harfli Türkçe kitaplarda iç kapağın gelişimi: 1826-1923. In E. Balta, Y. Dedes, E. N. İşli & M. S. Koz, *Yücel Dağlı Anısına* (pp. 78-101). İstanbul: Turkuaz Yayınları.

Babinger, F. (2004). *Müteferrika ve Osmanlı matbaası.* İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.

Badem, C. (2010). *The Ottoman Crimean war (1853-1856)*. Leiden: Brill.

Baer, G. (Apr. 1970). Monopolies and restrictive practices of the Turkish guilds. *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, *13*(2), 145-165.

Bain, A. (1999). The late Ottoman *En'âm-ı şerîf: sacred text and images in an Islamic prayer book* (Unpublished PhD thesis). University of Victoria, Canada.

Balcı, S. (2006). *Osmanlı devleti'nde tercümanlık ve Bab-ı Ali tercüme odası* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Ankara University, Turkey.

Balcı, S. (2013). *Babıali tercüme odası.* İstanbul, Libra.

Balta, E. (2010). *Beyond the language frontier, studies on the Karamanlıs and the Karamanlidika printing*. İstanbul: İsis Press.

Balta, E. (2018). *Karamanlıca kitaplar Yunan harflerle basılmış Türkçe eserlerin çözümlemeli bibliyografyası* 1718-1839. (Vol. 1). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Bauer, T. (2011). *Die kultur der ambiguität*. Berlin: Insel Verlag Berlin.

Bayly, C. A. (2004). *The birth of the modern world, 1780-1914*. Cornwall: Blackwell Publishing.

Baysal, J. (1968). *Müteferika'dan Birinci Meşrutiyet'e kadar Osmanlı Türklerinin bastıkları kitaplar*. İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi.

Berkes, N. (1962). İlk Türk matbaası kurucusunun dini ve fikri kimliği. *Belleten*, *26*(104), 715-737.

Berkes, N. (1998). *The development of secularism in Turkey*. London: Hurst and Company.

Berkes, N. (2002). *Türkiye'de çağdaşlaşma*. (A. Kuyaş, Ed.). İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Berkey, J. (2001). *Popular preaching and religious authority in the medieval Islamic Near East.* Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.

Beydilli, K. (1987). *İlk mühendislerimizden Seyyid Mustafa ve Nizâm-ı Cedîd'e Dair risalesi.* İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi.

Beydilli, K. (1995). *Türk bilim ve matbaacılık tarihinde Mühendishâne: Mühendishâne matbaası ve kütüphanesi*. İstanbul: Eren.

Beydilli, K. (1999). Küçük Kaynarca'dan Tanzimat'a ıslahat düşünceleri, *İlmi Araştırmalar*, *8,* 25-64.

Beydilli, K. (2004). Müteferrika ve Osmanlı matbaası: 18. yüzyılda İstanbul'da kitabiyat. *Toplumsal Tarih*, *128*, 44-52.

Beydilli, K. (2019). *İki İbrahim: Müteferrika ve halefi.* İstanbul: Kronik Yayınevi.

Beydilli, K. & Şahin, İ. (2001). *Mahmud Raif Efendi ve Nizam-ı Cedid'e Dair Eseri*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Binark, İ. (1967). Eski devrin kitapçıları: sahaflar. *Türk Kütüphaneciler Derneği Bülteni*, *3*, 155-162.

Binark, İ. (1977). Türkiye'ye matbaanın geç girişinin sosyal-psikolojik sebepleri. *Türk Kütüphaneciler Derneği Bülteni, 26*(1), 23-47.

Birinci, A. (1996). Server İskit. *Kebikeç*, *2*(3), 57-66.

Birinci, A. (December 1996). Birgivi risalesi: ilk din kitap niçin ve nasıl basıldı?. *Türk Yurdu*, *112,* 13-14.

Birinci, A. (2006). Osmanlı Devleti'nde matbû'at ve neşriyat yasakları tarihine medhal. *Türkiye Araştırmaları Lietratür Dergisi*, *7*(4), 300-310.

Birinci, A. (2011). *Osmanbey ve matbaası: ser-kurena Osman Bey'in hikayesine ve Matbaa-i Osmaniye'nin tarihçesine medhal*. İstanbul: Müteferrika.

Birinci, A. (2014). Osmanlı tıbaat ve matbuat hayatında Ermeniler (1567-1908). *Yeni Türkiye, 60,* 1-22.

Blair, A. (2007). Errata lists and the reader as corrector. In S. A. Baron & E. N. Lindquist & E. F. Shevlin (Eds.), *agent of change: print culture studies after Elizabeth L. Eisenstein* (pp. 21-41). MA: University of Massachusetts Press.

Blair, A. (2010). *Too much to know: managing scholarly information before the modern age.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Boogert, M. H. (2005). The sultan's answer to the Medici press? İbrahim Müteferrika's printing house in İstanbul. In A. Hamilton, M. H. van den Boogert & B. Westerweel (Eds.), *The republic of letters and the Levant* (pp. 265-292). Leiden: Brill.

Boratav, P. N. (1946). *Halk hikayeleri ve halk hikayeciliği.* Ankara: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.

Boratav, P. N. (1996). *Nasreddin Hoca*. Ankara: Edebiyatçılar Derneği.

Bostan, İ. (July 2011). Osmanlı bahriyesinin modernleşmesinde yabancı uzmanların rolü (1785-1819). *Turkish Journal of History*, 177-192.

Bouquet, O. (2015). Is it time to stop speaking about Ottoman modernization? In M. Aymes, B. Gourise & E. Massicard (Eds.), *Order and compromise: govenment practices in Turkey from the late Ottoman Empire to the early 21st century* (pp. 45-67). Leiden: Brill.

Boyar, B. (2006). The press and the palace: the two-way relationship between Abdülhamid II and the press, 1876-1908. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies,University of London*, *6*(3), 417-432.

Braude, B. (1982). Foundation myths of the millet system. In B. Braude & B. Lewis (Eds.), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: the central lands* (Vol. 1) (pp. 69-90). NY: Holmes & Meier.

Brockett, G. D. (2011). *How happy to call oneself a Turk: provincial newspapers and the negotiation of a Muslim national identity*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Brooks, J. (1985). *When Russia learned to read: literacy and popular literature 1861-1917*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Brummett, P. (2000). *Image and imperialism in the Ottoman revolutionary press: 1908-1911*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Budak, A. (2011). *Mecmua-i Fünun: Osmanlının ilk bilim dergisi*. Istanbul: Bilge Kültür Sanat.

Budak, A. (2012). *Münif Paşa: batılılaşma sürecinde çok yönlü bir Osmanlı aydını*. Istanbul: Bilge, Kültür Sanat Yayınevi.

Budak, A. (2014). *Osmanlı modernleşmesi gazetecilik ve pdebiyat.* Istanbul: Bilge Kültür Sanat.

Burak, G. (2015a). Sansür, kanonizasyon ve Osmanlı imza-takriz pratikleri üzerine düşünceler. In A. E. Özyıldırım, H. Koncu, H. Aynur, M. Çakır & S. S. Kuru (Eds.), *Eski metinlere yeni bağlamlar- Osmanlı Edebiyatı çalışmalarında yeni yönelimler (Eski Türk Edebiyatı Çalışmaları X*) (pp. 96-117). Istanbul: Klasik Yayınları.

Burak, G. (2015b). *The second formation of the Islamic law: the Hanafi school in theeEarly modern Ottoman Empire.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burak, G. (2016). Reliable books: Islamic law, canonization, and manuscripts in the Ottoman Empire (sixteenth to eighteenth century). In A. Grafton and G. Most (Eds.), *Canonical texts and scholarly practices: a global comparative approach* (pp. 14-33). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burçak, B. (Jan. 2008). Modenization, science and engineering in the early nineteenth century Ottoman Empire. *Middle Eastern Studie*s, *44*(1), 69-83.

Buzpınar, T. (2006). Mustafa Fazıl Paşa. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, (Vol. 31, pp. 300-301). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Buzpınar, T. (2016). *Hilafet ve saltanat: II. Abdülhamid döneminde halifelik ve Araplar*. İstanbul: Alfa Yayınları.

Ceyhan, S. (2009). Salahi Efendi. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, (Vol. 36, pp. 19). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Cezar, Y. (1986). *Osmanlı maliyesinde bunalım ve değişim dönemi.* Istanbul: Alan Yayıncılık.

Chartier, R. (1987). Impact of printing. In Philippe Aries (Ed.), *History of private life*, (Vol. 3). Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Chartier, R. (1994). *The order of books: readers, authors, and libraries in Europe between the 14th and 18th centuries*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Cici, R. (2000). İmamzâde Esad Efendi. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, (Vol. 22, pp. 211-212). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Cihan, A. (2004). *Reform çağında Osmanlı ilmiyye sınıfı*. İstanbul: Birey Yayıncılık.

Clanchy, M.T. (1993). *From memory to written record: England 1066-1307*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Cracraft, J. (2004). *The Petrine revolution in Russian culture*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Csirkes, F. (2015). Messianic oeuvres in interaction: misattributed poems by Shah Esma'il and Nesimi. *Journal of Persianate Studies*, *8*, 155-194.

Curry, J. (2010). *The transformation of Muslim mystical thought in the Ottoman Empire: the rise of the Halveti order, 1350-1650*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Cutajar, D. (1987). The lure of the Orient: the Schranzes, the Brockdorffs, Preziosi and other artists. *Hyphen*, *5*(3), 101-136.

Çadırcı, M. (2013). *Tanzimat döneminde Anadolu kentlerinin sosyal ve ekonomik yapısı*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Çakın, İ. (2004). Müteferrika matbaasının düşündürdükleri ve Avrupa'da basmacılığın etkileri: Gelecek için geçmişi anlamak. *Bilim Dünyası*, *5*(2), 153-167.

Çakır, C. (2001). *Tanzimat dönemi Osmanlı maliyesi*. İstanbul: Klasik Yayınları.

Çavaş, R. & Demirel, F. (2004). II. Abdülhamid dönemi'nde gümrüklerde el konulan (ve elbette yakılan) kitaplar. *Müteferrika*, *26*, 151-158.

Çelebioğlu, A. (1996). *Muhammediye*. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları.

Çetin, S. (2010). *Booksellers and their catalogues in Hamidian Istanbul, 1884-1901* (Unpublished master's thesis). Boğaziçi University, Turkey.

Çınar, A. O. (1992). *Es-Seyyid Mehmed Emin Behic'in Sevanihü'l-Levayih'i ve değerlendirilmesi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Marmara University, Turkey.

Çift, S. (2003). 1826 sonrasında Bektaşilik ve bu alanla ilgili yayın faaliyetleri. *Uludağ Fakültesi İlahiyat Fakültesi*, *12*(1), 249-268.

Çolak, G. (2011). *Osmanlı matbaacılığında Takvîmhâne-i Âmire'nin yeri ve önemi* (Unpublished master's thesis). İstanbul University, Turkey.

Darnton, R. (1982). What is the history of books? *Daedalus*, *111*(3), 65-83.

Darnton, R. (1987). *The business of enlightenment: a publishing history of the Encyclopedie 1775-1800*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Darnton, R. (1995). *The corpus of clandestine literature in France 1769-1789*. NY: W. W. Norton & Company.

Darnton, R. (1996). *Kiss of Lamourette: reflections in cultural history*. NY: W. W. Norton & Company.

Darnton, R. (2010). *Poetry and police: communication networks in eighteenth century Paris*. London, Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Darnton, R. (2014). *Censors at work: how states shapedlLiterature*. London: British Library.

Davison, R. H. (1963). *Reform in the Ottoman Empire*, *1856-1876*. NJ: Princeton University Press.

Değirmenci, T. (Fall 2011). Bir kitabı kaç kişi okur? Osmanlı'da okurlar ve okuma biçimleri üzerine bazı gözlemler. *Tarih ve Toplum Yeni Yaklaşımlar*, *13*, 7-43.

Demir, U. (2015). Yasaklanan ve sansürlenen bir kitabın macerası: Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi'nin ilk baskıları. *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, *46*, 193-212.

Demircioğlu, C. (2005). *From discourse to practice: rethinking 'translation' (terceme) and related practices of text production in the late Ottoman literary tradition* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Boğaziçi University, Turkey.

Demircioğlu, C. (2009). Osmanlı çeviri tarihi araştırmaları açısından 'terceme' ve 'çeviri' kavramlarını yeniden düşünmek. *Journal of Turkish Studies*, *33*(1), 159-177.

Demirel, F. (2004a). Osmanlı Devleti'nde kitap basımının denetimi. *İstanbul Üniversitesi Yakın Dönem Türkiye Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5, 89-104.

Demirel, F. (2004b). Osmanlı'da bir kitap şirketi: Şirket-i Sahafiye-i Osmaniye. *Müteferrika*, *25*(1), 89-97.

Demirel, F. (2006). Osmanlı Devleti'nde telif hakları sorunu. *Bilgi ve Bellek 3(*5), 93-103.

Demirel, F. (2007). *II. Abdülhamid döneminde sansür*. İstanbul: Bağlam Yayıncılık.

Deringil, S. (1999). *The well protected domains: ideology and the legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire 1876-1909*. London-NY: I. B. Tauris.

Deringil, S. (2012). *Conversion and apostasy in the late Ottoman Empire.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Derman, U. (1979). Yazı sanatının eski matbaacılığımıza akisleri. *Türk Kütüphaneciler derneği basım ve yayıncılığımızın 250. yılı bilimsel toplantısı: 11-12 Aralık 1979 Ankara bildiriler* (pp. 97-118). Ankara: Türk Kütüphaneciler Derneği.

Despain, J. (2014). *Nineteenth-century transatlantic reprinting and the embodied book*. London: Routledge.

Dığıroğlu, F. (Fall 2014). İstanbul-Tebriz ticaret hattında Valide Han (XIX-XX. Yüzyıl). *Türk Kültürü İncelemeleri Dergisi*, *31*, 69-112.

Dığıroğlu, F. (2014). *Dersaadet'de bir Acem kitapçı: kitap-füruş Hacı Hüseyin Ağa*. İstanbul: Turkuaz Yayınları.

Dığıroğlu, F. (March 2017). II. Abdülhamid döneminde dini yayıncılık: İslami metinleri üimler Üretir? -I. *Journal of History Studies*, *9*(1), 95-110.

Dığıroğlu, F. (2017). II.Abdülhamid dönemi matbuat politikaları: Mushaf basımı ve dini neşriyat. In F. Gün and H. İ. Erbay (Eds.) *Sultan II. Abdülhamid Han ve Dönemi* (pp. 621-654). Istanbul: TBMM Milli Saraylar.

Dığıroğlu, F. (June 2018). II. Abdülhamid döneminde dini yayıncılık: İslami metinleri kimler üretir? -II. *Marmara İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, *54*(54), 1-44.

Dığıroğlu, F. & Yıldız, G. (Fall 2018/2). Osmanlı Devleti'nin Şii neşriyata bakışı ve Acem kitapçılar. *Müteferrika,* 117-134.

Dinç, G. (2003). *Mekteb-i Tıbbiye matbaası'nda basılan Arap harfli Türkçe yayınlar aracılığı ile Tıbbiye'nin yayın faaliyetleri üzerine bir değerlendirme (1844-1928)* (Unpublished PhD Thesis). Istanbul University, Turkey.

Dobreva, M. (2015). Sofya'ya vagonlardan: 120'li-1870'li yıllarda İstanbul'da açılan Osmanlı okullarıyla ilgili belgeler. In F. M. Evecen, A. Akyıldız, & E. S. Gürkan (Eds.), *Osmanlı İstanbulu III* (pp. 91-132). İstanbul: İstanbul 29 Mayıs Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Douglas, A. (2017). *Work in hand: script, print and writing, 1690-1840*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Duman, M. (2018). *Resimli taşbaskısı Nasreddin Hoca kitapları*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Durmuş, İ. (1995). el-Emsile. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, (Vol. 11, pp. 166-167). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Eğri, S. (Spring 2012). Hıtây Sefâretnâmesı ve Kanunnâme-i Çin i Hıtây'da İpek yolu izlenimleri. *Turkish Studies*, *7*(2), 414-416.

Eisenstein, E. (1979). *The printing press as an agent of change*: c*ommunications and cultural transformations in early modern Europe.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

El Shamsy, A. (2016). Islamic book culture through the lens of two private libraries, 1850–1940. *Intellectual History of the Islamicate World, 4*, 61–81.

El Shamsy, A. (forthcoming). *Islam in the age of print: the transformation of the Islamic intellectual tradition: 1820-1950.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Eldem, E. (1999). French trade and commercial policy in the Levant in the eighteenth century. *Oriente Moderno, 18*(1), 27-47.

Eldem, E. (2006a). Capitulations and Western Ttade. In Suraiya Faroqhi (Ed.), *The Cambridge history of Turkey: the latter Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839* (pp. 282-335). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eldem, E. (2006b). Ottoman Galata and Pera between myth and reality. In Ulrike Tischler (Ed.), *From "milieu de memoire" to "lieu de memoire": the cultural memory of Istanbul in the 20th centu*ry (pp. 19-36). Münich: Martin Meidenbauer.

Eldem, E. (2013). Writing less, saying more: calligraphy and modernization in the last Ottoman century. In M. Gharipour and İ. C. Schick (Eds.), *Calligraphy and architecture in the Muslim World* (pp. 465-483). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Emecen, F. (1998). Hızır İlyas. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, (Vol. 17, p. 417) İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Erbay, H. İ. (2009). *Teaching and learning in the madrasas of Istanbul during the late Ottoman period* (Unpublished PhD Thesis). University of London, SOAS, UK.

Erdem, H. (2002). Recruitment for the Victorious Soldier of Muhammad in the Arab Provinces, 1826-1828. In I. Gershoni, H. Erdem, and U. Woköck (Eds.), *Histories of the Modern Middle East- New Directions* (pp. 189-206). Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Erdem, H. (2015). Osmanlı kültüründe yazarlık ve intihal sorunları. In H. S. Aytemur (Ed.), *Risale-i Nur'da yapılan tahrifat* (pp. 224-244). İstanbul: Hivda.

Erdem, Y. (1999). Sahaflar ve seyyahlar: Osmanlı'da kitapçılık. In *Osmanlı* (Vol. 12) (pp. 720-731). Ankara: Yeni Türkiye.

Erdem, Y. (2001). Sahhaflar ve seyyahlar: Osmanlı'da kitapçılık. *Müteferrika*, *20*, 3-18.

Erdinç, Y. B. (2002). *The relationship between the Mevlevi order and the Ottoman state in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries* (Unpublished master's thesis). Boğaziçi University, Turkey.

Erdoğdu, T. (1995). *Maarif-i Umumiye Nezareti teşkilatı: idari teşkilat açısından*. (Unpublished master's thesis) Istanbul University, Turkey.

Erdoğdu, T. (1996). Maarif-i Umumiye Nezareti teşkilatı I. *Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, *51*(1), 247-285.

Ergin, O. N. (1977). *Türk maarif tarihi*. (Vols. 1-5). İstanbul: Eser Matbaası.

Erginbaş, V. (2005). *Forerunner of the Ottoman Enlightenment: İbrahim Müteferrika and his intellectual landscape* (Unpublished master's thesis). Sabancı University, Turkey.

Erginbaş, V. (2014). Enlightenment in the Ottoman context: İbrahim Müteferrika and his intellectual landscape. In G. Roper (Ed.), *Historical aspects of printing and publishing in languages of the Middle East* (pp. 53-100). Leiden: Brill.

Ergün, M. & Duman, T. (January-February 1996). 19. yüzyılda askeri okullarının ders programları ve ders kitapları. *Yeni Türkiye Eğitim Özel Sayısı* 2-7, 494-511.

Erol, M. (August 2004). 19. yüzyılda basılan Karamanlıca eserler. *Toplumsal Tarih*, 128, 66-69.

Ersoy, O. (1959). *Türkiye'ye matbaanın girmesi ve ilk basılan eserler.* Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi DTCF Kütüphanecilik Enstitüsü.

Ertuğ, H. (1970). *Basın yayın hareketleri*. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Yayınları.

Erünsal, İ. (2007a). Osmanlılarda sahhaflık ve sahhaflar: yeni bazı belge ve bilgiler. *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, *29*, 99-146:

Erünsal, İ. (2007b). Tanzimat sonrası Türk kütüphaneciliği ile İlgili belgeler. *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, *31*, 229-339.

Erünsal, İ. (2008). *Osmanlı vakıf kütüphaneleri: tarihi gelişimi ve organizasyonu*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Erünsal, İ. (2010). II. Mahmud devrinde kütüphaneler: libraries in the era of Mahmud II. In C. Yılmaz (Ed.), *II. Mahmud yeniden yapılanma sürecinde İstanbul* (pp. 238-259). İstanbul: İstanbul 2010 Avrupa Kültür Başkenti.

Erünsal, İ. (2013). *Osmanlılarda sahaflık ve sahaflar*. İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları.

Erünsal, İ. (2015). *Osmanlılarda kütüphaneler ve kütüphanecilik.* İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları.

Erünsal, İ. (2018). *Orta Çağ İslam dünyasında kitap ve kütüphane*. İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları.

Evered, E. (2012). *Empire and education under the Ottomans: politics, reform and resistance from the Tanzimat to the Young Turks*. London: I. B. Tauris.

Eser, G. (2005). *Mekteb-i Harbiye'nin Türkiye'de modern bilimin gelişmesindeki yeri* (1834-1876) (Unpublished master's Thesis). İstanbul University, Turkey.

Fayda, M. (2011). Târîhu'l-ümem ve'l-mülûk. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, (Vol. 40, pp. 92-94). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Fazlıoğlu, İ. (1998). Hesap. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi,* (Vol. 17, pp. 252). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Fazlıoğlu, İ. (March 2003). Osmanlı bilim alanında Türkçe telif ve tercümelerin Türkçe oluş nedenleri ve bu eserlerin dil bilinci oluşmasındaki yeri ve önemi. *Kutadgubilig Felsefe-Bilim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *3*, 151-184.

Fazlıoğlu, İ. (2009). Seyyid Ali Paşa. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi,* (Vol. 37, p. 48) İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Fazlıoğlu, İ. (2017). Muhasebe dönemi'nde nazari ilimler. In H. İ. Üçer (Ed.), *İslam Düşünce Atlası*. İstanbul: Konya Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları.

Febvre, L. & Martin, H. (1976). *The coming of the book: the impact of printing 1450-1800*. London: Atlantic Highlands, Humanities Press.

Feener, M. (2010). New networks and new knowledge: migrations, communications and the refiguration of the Muslim community in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In R. W. Hefner (Ed.), *New Cambridge history of Islam, Vol. 6 Muslims and modernity, culture and society since 1800* (pp. 39-68). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Findley, F. (1980). *Bureaucratic reform in the Ottoman Empire: the Sublime Porte, 1789-1922.* NJ: Princeton University Press.

Findley, F. (1989). *Ottoman civil officialdom: a social history.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Findley, F. (2008). Tanzimat. In R. Kasaba (Ed.), *The Cambridge history of Turkey, Volume 4, Turkey in the modern world* (pp. 9-37). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Finkelstein, D. & McCleery, A. (Eds.). (2002). *The book history reader*. London: Routledge.

Fortna, B. C. (2001a). Education and autobiography at the end of the Ottoman Empire. *Die Welt des Islams*, *41*(1), 1-31.

Fortna, B. C. (2001b). Islamic morality in late Ottoman "secular" schools. *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies, 32*(3), 369-93.

Fortna, B. C. (2002). *Imperial classroom: Islam, the state, and education in the late Ottoman Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fortna, B. C. (2011). *Learning to read in the late Ottoman Empire and the early Turkish Republic*. London: Palgrave.

Fyfe, A. (2004). *Science and salvation: Evangelical popular science publishing in Victorian Britain*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Gencer, Y. (2010). İbrahim Müteferrika and the age of the printed manuscript. In C. Gruber (Ed.), *The Islamic manuscript tradition: ten centuries of book arts in Indiana University collections* (pp. 154-193). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Genç, M. (1999/1). 19. yüzyılda Osmanlı iktisadî dünya görüşünün klasik prensiplerindeki değişimler. *Divân: Disiplinlerarası Çalışmalar Dergisi, 4*(6), 1-8.

Genç, M. (2000). *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda devlet ve ekonomi*. İstanbul: Ötüken Yayınları.

Genç, M. (2013). Yed-i Vâhid. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, (Vol. 43, pp. 378-383). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Gerçek, S. N. (1928). *Türk matbaacılığı*. İstanbul: Ebuzziya Matbaası.

Gerçek, S. N. (1931). *Türk gazeteciliği 1831-1931*. İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası.

Gerçek, S. N. (1939). *Türk taş basmacılığı*. İstanbul: İstanbul Devlet Basımevi.

Gerçek, S. N. (1939). *Türk matbaacılığı I-Müteferrika matbaası*. İstanbul: Maarif Vekaleti.

Gibb, E. J. W. (1905). *A history of Ottoman poetry*. (Vol. 4). E. G. Brown (Ed.). London: Luzac.

Goldstein, R. J. (1989). *Political censorship of the arts and the press in nineteenth-century Europe*. NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Göçek, F. M. (1987). *East encounters West: France and the Ottoman Empire in the eighteenth century*. NY: Oxford University Press.

Göçek, F. M. (1996). *Rise of the bourgeoisie, demise of empire: Ottoman Westernization and social change*. NY: Oxford University Press.

Göçmen, M. (2012). Üstüvani Mehmed Efendi. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, (Vol. 42, pp. 397). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Gök, H. (2005). *Arşiv belgelerinin ışığında Kara Harp Okulu tarihi (1834-1883)* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Hacettepe University, Turkey.

Göker, N. (2015). *Din-devlet ilişkileri ve siyaset bağlamında Mushaf basımı*. İstanbul: M.Ü. İlahiyat Fakültesi Vakfı Yayınları.

Graff, H. J. (1987). *The legacies of literacy: continuities and contradictions in Western culture and society*. Bloomington and Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press.

Grafton, A. T. (Autumn, 1980). The importance of being printed. [Review of *The printing press as an agent of change: communications and cultural transformations in early-modern Europe*, by Elizabeth Eisenstein]. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, *11*(2), 265-286.

Grafton, A. T. & Most, G. W. & Settis, S. (Eds.) (2010). *The classical tradition.* Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Green, A. (2013). *Education and state formation: Europe, East Asia and the USA*. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Green, N. (2009). Journeymen, middlemen: travel, transculture and technology in the origins of Muslim printing. *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, *41*(2), 203-224.

Green, N. (2010). Stones from Bavaria: Iranian lithography in its global contexts. *Iranian Studies*, *43*(3), 305-331.

Green, N. (2010). Persian print and the Stanhope revolution: industrialization, Evangelicalism, and the birth of printing in early Qajar Iran. *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East*, *30*(3), 473-490.

Green, N. (2011). *Bombay Islam: the religious economy of the West Indian Ocean, 1840-1915*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Griffel, F. (2017). Contradictions and lots of ambiguity: two new perspectives on premodern (and Postclassical) Islamic societies [Review of *What's Islam? The Importance of Being Islamic,* by Shahab Ahmed]. *Bustan: The Middle East Book Review*, *8*(1), 1-21.

Gruber, C. (2009). A Pious Cure All: The Ottoman illustrated prayer manual. In C. Gruber (Ed.), *The Islamic manuscript tradition: ten centuries of book arts in Indiana University Collections* (pp. 117-153). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Güman, O. (2017). Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e ilmi hal literatürü. In S. Kaya & H. Şahin (Eds.), *Osmanlı'da Fıkıh ve Hukuk* (pp. 69-101). İstanbul: OSAMER.

Gür, N. (2016). Sanatı sanatla ihya etme: Osmanlı yönetici elit sınıfının elitleşme çabası ve takriz yazını. *Archivum Ottomanicum,* 165-178.

Gür, N. (2014). *Klasik Türk edebiyatında takriz* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Balıkesir University, Turkey.

Güran, T. (1988). Tanzimat döneminde Osmanlı maliyesi: bütçeler ve hazine hesapları, 1841-1861. *Belleten, 13*(17), 213-362.

Güran, T. (2011). Tanzimat dönemi Osmanlı maliyesi. *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, *49*, 79-95.

Güran, T. (2014). *19. Yüzyılda Osmanlı ekonomisi üzerine araştırmalar.* İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Gürkan, N. (2016). Yalvaçlı İbrahim Efendi. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, (Vol. 2, pp. 673-674). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Gürpınar, G. (2013). *Ottoman/Turkish visions of the nation 1860-1950*. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Haddad, J. (2017). People before print: *gens de lettres,* the Ottoman printing press, and the search for Turkish literature. *Mediterannean Studies*, *25*(2), 200-220.

Hagen, G. (2000). Some considerations on the study of Ottoman geographical writing. *Archivum Ottomanicum 18,* 183-193.

Hagen, G. (2003). *Ein osmanischer geograph bei der arbeit: entstehung und gedankenwelt von Katip Celebi's Cihannuma*. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz.

Hagen, G. (2003). Translations and translators in a multilingual society: a case study of Persian-Ottoman translations, late fifteenth to early seventeenth century. *Eurasian Studies*, *2*(1), 95-134.

Hagen, G. (2005). Legitimacy and world order. In H. T. Karateke & M. Reinkowski (Eds.), *Legitimizing the order: the Ottoman rhetoric of state power* (pp. 55-83). Leiden and Boston, MA: Brill.

Hagen, G. (2012a). The order of knowledge, the knowledge of order. In S. Faroqhi and K. Fleet (Eds.), *The Cambridge history of Turkey, Vol. 2, The Ottoman Empire as a world power, 1453-1603* (pp. 407-456). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hagen, G. (2012b). Atlas and papamonta as sources of knowledge and power. In H. Aynur and H. Karateke (Eds.), *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi'nin yazılı kaynakları* (pp.104-129). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Hall, K. R. (2016). The eighteenth and early nineteenth century evolution of Indian print culture and knowledge networks in Calcutta and Madras. In J. J. Connolly, P. Collier, F. Felsnstein, K. R. Hall & R. G. Hall (Eds.), *Print culture histories beyond the metropolis* (pp. 88-122). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Hamadeh, S. (March 2004). Ottoman expressions of early modernity and the 'inevitable' question of Westernization. *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, *63*(1), 32-51.

Hanioğlu, M. Ş. (2010). *A brief history of the late Ottoman Empire*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hanna, N. (2003). *In praise of books: a cultural history of Cairo's middle class, sixteenth to the eighteenth century*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Haral, H. (2014). *Osmanlı minyatüründe Mevlana'nın yaşam öyküsü: Menakıbü'l Arifin ve Tercüme-i Sevakıb-ı Menakıb nüshaları* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Mimar Sinan University, Turkey.

Has, Ş. S. (1981). *A study of Ibrahim al-Halebi with special reference to the Multaqā* (Unpublished PhD thesis). University of Edinburgh, UK.

Heinzelmann, T. (2009). *Cihaddan vatan savunmasına: Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda genel askerlik yükümlülüğü (1826-1856)*. (Türkis Noyan Trans.). İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi.

Heinzelmann, T. (2015). *Populare religiöse literatur and buchkultur im Osmanischen reich: eine studie zur nutzung der werke der brüder Yazıcıoğlu*. Würzburg: Ergon Verlag Würzburg in Kommission.

Heinzelmann, T. (2016a) Authors, commentators and copyists: variance and the authenticity of texts. *Manuscript Cultures, 9,* 118-122.

Heinzelmann, T. (2016b). Lithographic prints. *Manuscript Cultures*, *9*, 265-267.

Heinzelmann, T. (2016). *Tâ'liq*-Drucke in Bulaq and İstanbul zum kalligraphischen anspruch von typendruck und lithographie. In J. Zimmermann, et. Al (Eds.), *Osmanische Welten: Quellen und fallstudien. festschrift für Michael Ursinus* (pp. 209-241). Bamberg: University of Bamberg Press.

Heyworth-Dunne, J. (July 1940). Printing and translations under Muhammad Ali of Egypt: the foundation of modern Arabic. *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, *3*, 325-349.

Hirschler, K. (2011). *The written word in the medieval Arabic lands: a social and cultural history of reading practices*. Edinburgh University Press.

Houston, R.A. (2014). *Literacy in early modern Europe.* London and NY: Routledge.

Hsu, C. (1985). *The first thirty years of Arabic printing in Egypt, 1238-1267 (1822-1851): a bibliographical study with a checklist by title of Arabic printed works* (Unpublished PhD thesis). University of Edinburgh, UK.

İhsanoğlu, E. (1987). Cemiyet-i İlmiye ve Mecmua-i Fünun. In *Osmanlı İlmi ve Mesleki Cemiyetler* (pp. 221-245). İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi.

İhsanoğlu, E. (1989). *Başhoca İshak Efendi*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.

İhsanoğlu, E. (1992). Tanzimat öncesi ve Tanzimat dönemi Osmanlı bilim ve eğitim anlayışı. In H. D. Yıldız (Ed.), *150. Yılında Tanzimat* (pp. 335-395). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

İhsanoğlu, E. (1993). Başhoca İshak Efendi: pioneer of modern science in Turkey. In C. E. Farah (Ed.), *Decision making and change in the Ottoman Empire* (pp. 157-169). Kirksville, MO: The Thomas Jefferson University Press.

İhsanoğlu, E. (1994). *Cemiyet-i İlmiye-i Osmaniye'nin kuruluş ve faaliyetleri*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

İhsanoğlu, E. & Şeşen, R. & İzgi, C. & Akpınar, C. & Fazlıoğlu, İ. (Eds.). (1997). *Osmanlı Astronomi Literatürü Tarihi* (Vol. 1-2). Istanbul: Research Center for Islamic History, Art and Culture.

İhsanoğlu, E. (1998). Modernization efforts in science, technology and industry in the Ottoman Empire (18-l9th Centuries). In Feza Günergun & Shigehisa Kuriyama (Eds.), *The introduction of modern science and technology to Turkey and Japan: International Symposium October 7-11, 1996* (pp. 15-35). Kyoto: International Research Center for Japanese Studies.

İhsanoğlu, E. & Şeşen, R. & İzgi, C. (Eds.). (1999). *Osmanlı matematik literatürü tarihi* (Vol. 1-2). Istanbul: Research Center for Islamic History, Art and Culture.

İhsanoğlu, E. & Şeşen, R. & Bekar, M. S. & Gündüz, G. & Furat, A. H. (Eds.). (2000). *Osmanlı coğrafya literatürü tarihi* (Vol 1-2). Istanbul: Research Center for Islamic History, Art and Culture.

İhsanoğlu, E. & Aynur, H. (2003). Yazmadan basmaya geçiş: Osmanlı basma kitap geleneğinin doğuşu (1729-1848). *Osmanlı Araştırmaları XXII,* 219-255.

İhsanoğlu, E. & Şeşen, R. (Eds.). (2004). *Osmanlı askerlik literatürü tarihi* (Vol 1-2). İstanbul: Research Center for Islamic History, Art and Culture.

İhsanoğlu, E. & Unat, E.K. & Vural, S. (Eds.). (2004). *Osmanlıca tıp terimleri sözlüğü*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

İhsanoğlu, E. & Şeşen, R. & Bekar, M. S. & Gündüz, G. & Bulut, V. (Eds.) (2006). *Osmanlı tabii ve tatbiki bilimler literatürü tarihi* (Vol. 1-2). Istanbul: Research Center for Islamic History, Art and Culture.

İhsanoğlu, E. (2006). *Mısır'da Türkler ve kültürel mirasları*. Istanbul: Research Center for Islamic History, Art and Culture.

İhsanoğlu, E. (2010). *Darülfünun*. Istanbul: Research Center for Islamic History, Art and Culture.

İlkin, S. & Tekeli, İ. (1993). *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda eğitim ve bilgi üretim sisteminin oluşumu ve dönüşümü*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

İmamoğlu, A. T. & Karataş, V. (2016/3). İrade-i seniyyeyi hadislerle desteklemek: II. Mahmud dönemi şeyhülislamlarından Yasincizade Abdülvehhab Efendi ve *Hulâsatü'l-Burhân fî itâati's-Sultân* adlı risalesi. *Artuklu Akademi*, *1*, 21-54.

İnalcık, H. (1994). *The Ottoman Empire: the classical age 1300-1600.* London: Phoenix Press.

İnalcık, H. & Seyitdanlıoğlu, M. (Eds.). (2008). *Tanzimat: değişim sürecinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

İskit, S. (1934). *Türkiye'de neşriyat hareketleri tarihine bir bakış*. İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi.

İskit, S. (1937). *Husûsi ilk Türkçe gazetemiz Tercüman-ı Ahvâl ve Agah Efendi*. Ankara: Ulus Basımevi.

İskit, S. (1943). *Türkiye'de matbuat idareleri ve politikaları*. İstanbul: Basın ve Yayın Müdürlüğü.

İskit, S. (1949). *Türkiye'de matbuat rejimleri*. İstanbul: Ülkü ve Tan Matbaası.

İzgi, C. (1997). *Osmanlı medreselerinde ilim*. İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık.

Jeltjakov, A.D. (1979). *Matbaacılığın 250. kuruluş yıldönümüne armağan: Türkiye'nin sosyo-politik ve kültürel hayatında basın*. Istanbul: Nauka Yayınevi.

Johns, A. (2000). *The nature of the book: print and knowledge in the making*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kabacalı, A. (1989). *Türk kitap tarihi*. İstanbul: Gümüş Basımevi.

Kabacalı, A. (1990). *Başlangıçtan günümüze Türkiye'de basın sansürü*. İstanbul: Gazeteciler Cemiyeti Yayınları.

Kabacalı, A. (2000). *Başlangıcından günümüze Türkiye'de matbaa, basın ve yayın*. İstanbul: Literatür Yayınları.

Kaçar, M. (1994). *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Mühendishanelerin kuruluşu ve bilim ve eğitim anlayışındaki değişmeler* (Unpublished PhD thesis). İstanbul University, Turkey.

Kaçar, M. (1995). Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda askeri sahada yenileşme döneminin başlangıcı. *Osmanlı Bilimi Araştırmaları*, *1*, 209-225.

Kaçar, M. (1998). Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda askeri teknik eğitimde modernleşme çalışmaları ve Mühendishanelerin kuruluşu (1808'e kadar). *Osmanlı Bilimi Araştırmaları*, *II*, 69-137.

Kandemir, M. Y. (2010). eş-Şifa. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, (Vol. 39, pp. 135). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Kapıcı, Ö. (2013). Bir Osmanlı mollasının fikir dünyasından fragmanlar: Keçecizade İzzet Molla ve II. Mahmud dönemi Osmanlı siyaset düşüncesi. *Osmanlı Araştırmaları, 42*, 275-315.

Kara, İ. (2001). *Bir felsefe dili kurmak: modern felsefe ve bilim terimlerinin Türkiye'ye girişi.* İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları.

Kara, İ. (October 2002). Modernleşme dönemi Türkiyesi'nde 'ulum, fünun' ve 'sanat' kavramlarının algılanışı. *Kutadgubilig-Felsefe-Bilim Araştırmaları, 2,* 249-78.

Kara, İ. (2005). *Bir eğitim tasavvuru olarak mahalle/sıbyan mektepleri: hatıralar/yorumlar/tetikler*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları.

Kara, İ. (2012). *Mızraklı ilmihal*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları.

Kara, İ. (2013). *İlim bilmez tarih hatırlamaz: şerh ve haşiye meselesine dair Birkaç not.* İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları.

Kara, İ. (2018/2). (Fall 2018/2). Değişen din ve dünya anlayışlarının bir kitaba, *Mızraklı İlmihal*'e yansımaları üzerine birkaç not. *Müteferrika,* 185-194.

Kara, M. (2000). Ishak Efendi, Harputlu. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, (Vol. 22, pp. 531-532). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Karacaoğlu, E. (2016). Kırımlı Aziz İdris Bey'in hayatı, çalışmaları ve Cemiyet-i Tıbbiye-i Osmaniye'de irad ettiği nutuk hakkında. *Türkiye Klinikleri*, *24*(1), 11-19.

Karaçavuş, A. (2006). *Tanzimat dönemi Osmanlı bilim cemiyetleri* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Ankara University, Turkey.

Karakaya-Stump, A. (2012). The Vefā'iyye, the Bektashiyye and genealogies of 'heterodox' Islam in Anatolia: rethinking the Köprülü paradigm. *Turcica,* 44, 279-300.

Karakışla, Y. S. (1995). The emergence of the Ottoman industrial working class, 1839-1923. In D. Quataert & E. J. Zürcher (Eds.), *Workers and the working class in the Ottoman Empire and the Turkish Republic* (pp. 19-34). London and NY: I.B. Tauris.

Karal, E. Z. K. (1942). *Selim III.'ün hatt-ı hümayunları* (Vol. 2). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

Karal, E. Z. K. (1988). *Osmanlı tarihi: Nizam-ı Cedid ve Tanzimat devirleri (1789-1856)*. (Vol. 5). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

Karamustafa, A. T. (1993). Kalenders, abdals, hayderis: the formation of the Bektaşiye in the sixteenth century. In H. İnalcık & C. Kafadar (Eds.), *Süleyman the second and his time* (pp. 121-129). İstanbul: Isis Press.

Karamustafa, A.T. (1994). *God's unruly friends: dervish groups in the Islamic middle period 1200-1550*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.

Karamustafa, A. T. (2017). Islamic *din* as an alternative to Western models of 'religion'. In R. King (Ed.), *Religion, theory, critique classic and contemporary approaches and mMethodologies* (pp. 163-171). NY: Columbia University Press.

Karpat, K. (1978). Ottoman population records and the census of 1881/82-1893. *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, *9*(2), 237-74.

Karpat, K. (1985). *Ottoman population 1890-1914: demographic and docial characteristics*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Karpat, K. (2001). *The politicization of Islam: reconstructing identity, state, faith,*

and community in the late Ottoman state. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Karpat, K. (2002). *Studies on Ottoman social and political history: selected articles and essays*. Leiden: Brill.

Karateke, H. (2005a). Opium for the subjects? Religiosity as a legitimizing factor for the Ottoman Sultan. In H. T. Karateke & M. Reinkowski (Eds.), *Legitimizing the order: the Ottoman rhetoric of state power* (pp. 111-130). Leiden: Brill.

Karateke, H. (2005b). Legitimizing the Ottoman sultanate: a framework for historical analysis. In H. T. Karateke & M. Reinkowski (Eds.), *Legitimizing the order: the Ottoman rhetoric of state power* (pp. 13-52). Leiden: Brill.

Karateke, H. & Aynur, H (Eds.) (2012). *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesinin yazılı kaynakları*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Karateke, H. (2013). The challenge of periodization: new patterns in nineteenth-century Ottoman historiography. In H. E. Çıpa and E. Fetvacı (Eds.), *Writing history at the Ottoman court* (pp. 129-154). Bloomington and Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press.

Karateke, H. (2015). The Ottoman official gazette *Taqvim-i Veqayi*, 1831: an Ottoman annal in its own right. In B. Hickmann & G. Leiser (Eds.), *Turkish language, literature, and history: travelers' tales, sultans, and scholars since the eighth century* (pp. 191-207). London and NY: Routledge.

Kasır, H. A. (1996). *Esrar Dede hayatı, edebi kişiliği ve Divan'ının karşılaştırmalı metni* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Erzurum University, Turkey.

Kavruk, H. (2003). *Türkçe mesnevilerde sebeb-i telif*. Malatya: Özserhat Yayıncılık.

Kavruk, H. (1998). *Eski Türk edebiyatında mensur hikayeler.* İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Yayınları.

Kasaba, R. (Fall 1993). Treatises and friendships: British imperialism, the Ottoman Empire and China in the nineteenth century. *Journal of World History, 4*(2), 215-241

Kaya, D. (2001). İbn-i Sina hikayesinin yeni bir yazma nüshası. *Kebikeç*, *12*, 205-211.

Kaya, M. (2001). Kasidetü'l-Bürde. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, (Vol. 24, pp. 569). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Kaynardağ, A. (1992). Eski esnaflarımızla-bu arada sahhaflıkla ilgili bir kitap: Letaif-i Esnaf. *Kütüphanecilik Dergisi*, *3*, 67-72.

Kayaoğlu, T. (1998). *Türkiye'de tercüme müesseseleri*. İstanbul: Kitabevi.

Kaylı, A. (2010). *A critical study of Birgivi Mehmed Efendi's (d. 981/1573) works and their dissemination in manuscript form* (Unpublished master's thesis). Boğaziçi University, Turkey.

Kemikli, B. (2001). Popüler dinî kültüre dâir bir manzûme ve üç şâir: Hudâ Rabbim manzûmesi etrafında tartışmalar. *İslâmî Araştırmalar*, *14*(3-4), 492-500.

Kenanoğlu, M. (2004). *Osmanlı millet sistemi: mit ve gerçek*. İstanbul: Klasik Yayınları.

Khuri-Makdisi, I. (2003). *The eastern Mediterranean and the making of global radicalism, 1860-1914*. CA: University of California Press.

Kırkıl, H. (April 2006). Türk edebiyatında manzum İlmihal ve fıkıh kitapları ile son devre ait manzum bir İlmihal: Manastırlı Mehmed Rıfat Bey ve Manzum İlmihali. *İslam Hukuku Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *7*, 433-476.

Kılıç, A. (July-Aug.-Sept. 2006). Manzum sözlüklerimizden Sübha-i Sibyan Şerhi '*Hediyyetü'l-İhvan*'. *Turkish Studies*, *1*(1), 19-28.

Kılınç, B. (1998). Yirmisekiz Mehmed Çelebi's travelogue and the wonders that make a scientific centre. In A. Simoes, A. Carneiro & M. P. Diogo (Eds.), *Travels of learning* (pp. 85-89). Boston, MA: Kluwer.

Kılınçoğlu, D. T. (2015). *Economics and capitalism in the Ottoman Empire*. London and NY: Routledge.

Kırlı, C. (2000). *The struggle over space: coffeehouses of Ottoman Istanbul, 1780-1845*. (Unpublished PhD thesis). Binghamton University, USA.

Kırlı, C. (2008). *Sultan ve kamuoyu: Osmanlı modernleşme sürecinde 'Havadis Jurnalleri': 1840-1844*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Kırlı, C. (2015). *Yolsuzluğun İcadı: 1840 ceza kanunu, iktidar ve bürokrasi*. Istanbul: Verita.

Kızılca, G. K. (2011). *Voicing the interests of the public? Contestation, negotiation and the emergence of Ottoman language newspapers during the financial crisis of the Ottoman Empire, 1862-1875* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Binghamton University, USA.

Kızılca, G. K. (2013). Cultivating new rights in the search of a better life for the public: the oppositional press in the 19th century Ottoman Empire. In E. Kapferer, A. Koch and C. Sedmak (Eds.), *Strengthening intangible infrastructure* (pp. 197-208). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholar Publishing.

Kızılca, G. K. (Spring 2016). Osmanlı/Türk basın tarih yazımı üzerine eleştirel bir değerlendirme. *Ankara Üniversitesi İLEF Dergisi*, *3*(1), 71-90.

Kızılca, G. K. (2018). News publishing as a means for reflecting public opinion?: The idea of news during the Ottoman financial crises. In A. Gorman and D. Monciaud (Eds.), *Between politics, society and culture: the press in the Middle East before independence* (pp. 31-57). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Kocaer, S. (2009). *Pendname-i Azmi'nin Osmanlı nasihatname geleneğindeki yeri* (Unpublished master's thesis). Bilkent University, Turkey.

Kocabaşoğlu, U. & Birinci, A. (1995). Osmanlı vilayet gazete ve matbaaları üzerine gözlemler. *Kebikeç*, *2*, 101-122.

Kodaman, B. (1991). *Abdülhamid devri eğitim sistemi*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınevi.

Koloğlu, O. (1981) *Takvîm-i Vekâyi', Türk basınında 150. Yıl: 1831-1981*. Ankara: Ankara Basım Sanayi.

Koloğlu, O. (1986). *Miyop Çörçil olayı: Ceride-i Havadis'in öyküsü.* Ankara: Yorum Yayınları.

Koloğlu, O. (1987). *Basımevi ve basının gecikmesi ve sonuçları*. İstanbul: Gazeteciler Cemiyeti Yayınları.

Koloğlu, O. (1989). *İlk gazete ilk polemik: Vekayi-i Mısriye'nin öyküsü ve Takvim-i Vekayi ile tartışması*. Ankara: Çağdaş Gazeteciler Derneği.

Koloğlu, O. (1998). *Osmanlı basınının doğuşu ve Blak Bey ailesi*. İstanbul: Müteferrika.

Koloğlu, O. (2005). *1908 basın patlaması.* İstanbul: Baş-Haş Yayınları.

Koloğlu, O. (2006). *Osmanlı'dan 21. yüzyıla basın tarihi*. İstanbul: Pozitif Yayınları.

Koloğlu, O. (2010). *Osmanlı dönemi basınının içeriği*. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi.

Köprülü, F. (1966). *Edebiyat araştırmaları.* Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Kömürcü, K. (2013). Mantıkçı Ömer Feyzi Tokadi ve Dürrü'n-Naci isimli eseri. *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, *17*(2), 185-208.

Krstic, T. (2011). *Contested conversions to Islam: narratives of religious change in the early modern Ottoman Empire.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Krstic, T. (2017). From *shahada* to *'aqida:* conversion to Islam, catechisation and Sunnitisation in sixteenth-century Ottoman Rumeli. In A.C.S. Peacock (Ed.), *Islamisation: comparative perspectives from history* (pp. 296-316). Edinburgh: Edinburg University Press.

Krstic, T. (2019). State and religion. 'Unnitization' and 'Confessionalism' in Süleyman's time. In P. Fodor (Ed.), *The battle for Central Europe: the siege of Szigetvar and the death of Süleyman the Magnificient and Miklos Zrinyi (1566)*. (pp. 65-91). Leiden: Brill.

Küçükler, O. Z. (2016). *Osmanlı devleti'nde eğitimde modernleşme ve Encümen-i Daniş* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Ankara University, Turkey.

Kuran-Burçoğlu, N. (2001a). Saraydan ilk defa Kuran-ı Kerim basma iznini alan hattat: matbaacı Osman Bey. *Tarih ve Toplum*, 209, 312-320.

Kuran-Burçoğlu, N. (2001b). Matbaacı Osman Bey. In Gönül-Şinasi Tekin (Eds.), *Journal of Turkish Studies: Essays in Honour of Barbara Fleming* (pp. 97-112). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kuran-Burçoğlu, N. (2005). Osman Zeki Bey and his printing office, the *Matbaa-i Osmaniye.* In P. Sadgrove (Ed.), *History of printing and publishing in the languages and countries of the Middle East*. Journal of Semitic Studies: Supplement 15 (pp. 35-58). Manchester: Oxford University Press.

Kuru, S. (2013). The literature of Rum: the making of a literary tradition (1450-1600). In *Cambridge History of Turkey 2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kuru, S. S. & İnan, M. U. (June 2011). Reintroducing Hafez to readers in Rum: Sudi's introduction to his commentary on Hafez's poetry collection. *Journal of Turkish Studies, 35(*1), 11-34.

Kut, A. T. (1984). Ermeni harfleriyle basılmış Türkçe halk kitapları. *Halk Kültürü 1*, 69-79.

Kut, A. T. (1996). *Yazmadan basmaya Müteferrika Mühendishane Üsküdar*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi.

Kut, G. (1991). Matba'a in Turkey. In C. E. Bosworth (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Islam:* New Edition. (pp. 799-803). Vol. 6. Leiden: Brill.

Kutay, C. (1991). *Sultan Abdülaziz'in Avrupa seyahati.* İstanbul: Boğaziçi Yayınları.

Kutluer, İ. (2005). *Miftâhu's-saâde.* In Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi, (Vol. 30, pp. 18-19). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Küçük, B. H. (2012). *Early enlightenment in Istanbul* (Unpublished PhD thesis). University of California, San Diego, USA.

Küçük, B. H. (2013). Natural philosophy and politics in the eighteenth century: Esad of Ioannina and Greek Aristotelianism at the Ottoman court. *The Journal of Ottoman Studies, 41,* 125-158.

Küçük, B. H. (2016). New medicine and the hikmet-i tabiiyye problematic in eighteenth-century Istanbul. In T. Langermann and R. Morrison (Eds.), *Texts in transit in the medieval Mediterranean* (pp. 222-242). Pennsylvania, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Küçük, B. H. (2017). Early modern Ottoman science: a new materialist framework. *Journal of Early Modern History, 21*(5), 407-419.

Kütükoğlu, M. (1976-1977). 1869'da faal İstanbul medreseleri. *Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 7-8, 277-392.

Kütükoğlu, M. (2013). *Baltalimanı'na giden yol: Osmanlı-İngiliz iktisadi münasebetleri (1580-1850)*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Latour, B. (1999). *Pandora's hope: essays on the reality of science studies*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.

Levend, A. S. (1949). *Türk dilinde gelişme ve sadeleşme safhaları*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

Lewis, B. (1961). *The emergence of modern Turkey*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Maden, F. (2010). *Bektaşi tekkelerinin kapatılması (1826) ve Bektaşiliğin yasaklı yılları* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Gazi University, Turkey.

Mahdi, M. (1995). From the manuscript age to the age of printed books. In G. N. Atiyeh (Ed.), *The book in the Islamic world: the written word and communication in the Middle East* (pp. 1-15). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press [for] the Library of Congress.

Mardin, Ş. (April 1961). Some notes on an early phase in the modernization of communications in Turkey. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, *3*(3), 250-271.

Mardin, Ş. (2000). *The genesis of Young Ottoman thought: a study in the modernization of Turkish political ideas*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Martykanova, D. (2010). *Reconstructing Ottoman engineers: archeology of a profession (1789-1914)*. Pisa: Pisa University Press.

Masters, B. (1991). The treatises of Erzurum (1823 and 1848) and the changing status of Iranians in the Ottoman Empire. *Iranian Studies*, *24*(1/4), 3-15.

Melton, J. (1988). *Absolutism and the eighteenth-century origins of compulsory schooling in Prussia and Austria*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Memduhoğlu, A. İbrahim Hakkı Erzurumi'nin Manzum İlmihali. *Siirt Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, *2*(2), 11-52.

Mengi, M. (2002). Kıyafetnâme. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, (Vol. 25, pp. 513-514) İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Menchinger, E. L. (2014). *An Ottoman historian in an age of reform: Ahmed Vâsıf Efendi (ca. 1730-1806)* (Unpublished PhD thesis). University of Michigan, USA.

Menchinger, E. L. & Hagen, G. (2014). Ottoman historical thought. In P. Duara, V. Murthy and A. Sartori (Eds.), *A companion to global historical thought* (pp. 92-106). West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.

Menchinger, E. L. (2016). Intellectual creativity in a time of turmoil and transition. In A. Salvatore (Ed.), *Wiley-Blackwell History of Islam and Islamic Civilization* (pp. 459-478). NJ: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Menchinger, E. L. (2017). *The first of the modern Ottomans: the intellectual history of Ahmed Vasıf*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Meral, A. (2013). A survey of translation activity in the Ottoman Empire. *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, *42,* 105-155.

Meral, Y. (2014). Osmanlı İstanbulu'nda Yahudi matbaaları. In F. M. Emecen, A. Akyıldız & E. S. Gürkan (Eds.), *Osmanlı İstanbulu II* (pp. 455-469). İstanbul: İstanbul 29 Mayıs Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Meral, Y. (July-August 2015). Erken dönem İbrani matbaacılığında haham onayları ve cemaat içi sansür. *Dini Araştırmalar*, *18*(47), 96-118.

Meral, Y. (October 2015). Müteferrika öncesi Avrupalı seyyahların hatıratında Osmanlı'da Yahudi matbaaları ve Arapça kitap basım yasağı. *Kutadgubilig Felsefe-Bilim Araştırmaları*, (28), 237-254.

Meral, Y. (2016). İbrani matbaacılığında telif hakları: 16-18.yüzyıllar. *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *5*(2), 298-320.

Meral, Y. (2016). Yona ben Yakov Aşkenazi ve matbaacılık faaliyetleri. In F. M. Emecen, A. Akyıldız & E. S. Gürkan (Eds.), *Osmanlı İstanbulu IV* (pp. 787-808). İstanbul: İstanbul 29 Mayıs Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Meral, Y. (2017). Nasi-Mendes ailesi ve İstanbul'da Reyna Nasi matbaası. In E. Demirli, A. H. Furat, Z. M. Kot & O. S. Arı (Eds.), *Sahn-ı Semandan Darülfünun'a Osmanlı'da İlim ve Fikir Dünyası* (pp. 177-190). İstanbul: Zeytinburnu Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları.

Messick, B. (1993). *The calligraphic state: textual domination and history in a Muslim society.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Messick, B. (1997). On the question of lithography. *Culture and History, 16,* 158-176.

Murphy, C. M. (Trans.). (1995). Appendix: Ottoman imperial documents relating to the history of books and printing. In G. N. Atiyeh (Ed.), *The book in the Islamic world: the written word and communication in the Middle East* (pp. 286- 292). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Murphey, R. (2002). Forms of differentiation and expression of individuality in Ottoman society. *Turcica, 34*, 135-170.

Mystakidis, B.A. (1910). Hükümet-i Osmaniye tarafından ilk te'sis olunan matbaa ve bunun neşriyatı. *Tarih-i Osmani Encümeni Mecmuası*, *5*, 322-328;

Na'eh, Y. B. (2001). Hebrew printing houses in the Ottoman Empire. In G. Nassi (Ed.), *Jewish journalism and printing houses in the Ottoman Empire and modern Turkey* (pp. 73-97). İstanbul: Isis Press.

Namlı, A. (2001). İsmail Hakkı Bursevi. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, (Vol. 23, pp. 103) İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Neumann, C. K. (2000). *Araç tarih amaç Tanzimat: Tarih-i Cevdet'in siyasi anlamı*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.

Neumann, C. K. (2002). Book and newspaper printing in Turkish, 18th -20th centuries. In E. Hanebutt-Benz, D. Glass & G. Roper (Eds.), *Middle Eastern languages and the print revolution: a cross-cultural encounter* (pp. 227-248). Westhofen: Wva-Verlag Skulima.

Neumann, C. K. (2005). Üç tarz-ı mütalaa: yeniçağ Osmanlı dünyası'nda kitap okumak ve yazmak. *Tarih ve Toplum: Yeni Yaklaşımlar*, *1*, 51-76.

Nuhoğlu, H. (1999). Müteferrika matbaası ve bazı mülahazalar. In Güler Erten (Ed.), *Osmanlı* Vol. 7 (pp. 221-229). Ankara: Yeni Türkiye.

Ocak, B. (2003). *Bir yayıncının portresi, Tüccarzâde İbrahim Hilmi Çığıraçan*. İstanbul: Müteferrika.

Okumuş, S. (Winter 2009). Benlizade İzzet Mehmed Bey'in Sakinamesi. *Turkish Studies*, *4(*2), 867-877.

Omont, H. (1895). Documents sur l'imprimerie a Constantinople au XIII.siecle. *Revue des Bibliotheques,* 5, 185-200.

Onaran, B. (2018). *Padişahı devirmek: Osmanlı ıslahat çağında düzen ve muhalefet: Kuleli (1859), Meslek (1867)*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Oral, S. (1968). *Türk basın tarihi 1728–1922*. Ankara: Yeni Adım Matbaası.

Özbek, N. (2005). Philanthropic activity, Ottoman patriotism and the Hamidian regime, 1876-1909. *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, *37*(1), 59-81.

Öz, N. (2012). *Tabhâne ile Takvimhane'nin birleşmesi ve basılan eserler (1824-1840)* (Unpublished master's thesis). Marmara University, Turkey.

Özbek, D. (1994). El-Uşi ve 'Kasidetü'l-Emali'. *Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, *5*(261), 261-308.

Özmen, C. (2016). Translating science in the Ottoman Empire: translator-educators as 'agents of change' in the Ottoman scientific repertoires (1789-1839). *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, *48,* 143-170.

Özvar, E. (2017). Osmanlı dünyasında yazma eser üretkenliği. In H. Aydar & A. F. Yavuz, *Sahn-ı Seman'dan Darülfünun'a Osmanlı'da ilim ve fikir dünyası*

alimler, müesseseler ve fikri Eeserler XVII. yüzyıl (pp. 17-44). İstanbul: Zeytinburnu Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları.

Öztürk, Z. (2007). Osmanlı döneminde kıraat meclislerinde okunan halk kitapları. *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi*, *9*, 401-446.

Özyılmaz, Ö. (2002). *Osmanlı medreselerinin eğitim programları*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı.

Paker, S. (2014). Terceme, te'lif ve özgünlük meselesi. In H. Aynur, M. Çakır, H Koncu and S. S. Kuru (Eds.), *Metnin Halleri: Osmanlı'da telif, tercüme ve şerh* (pp. 37-71). (İstanbul: Klasik Yayınları).

Pala, İ. (1992). Mehmed Emin Beliğ. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, (Vol. 5, pp. 417). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Pamuk, Ş. (2000). *A monetary history of the Ottoman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pamuk, Ş. (2005). *Osmanlı ekonomisinde bağımlılık ve büyüme (1820-1913)*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları. (First published in 1984).

Pamuk, Ş. (2006). From debasement to external borrowing: changing forms of deficit finance in the Ottoman Empire, 1750-1914. In Ş. Pamuk and R. Avramov (Eds.), *Monetary and fiscal policies in South-East Europe, historical and comparative perspectives*, Conference Proceedings (pp. 7-22). Sofia: Bulgarian National Bank.

Pamuk, Ş. (2008). From bimetallism to the 'limping gold standard': the Ottoman monetary system in the nineteenth century. In P. L. Cottrell (Ed.), *East meets West- banking, commerce and investment in the Ottoman Empire* (pp 11-24). Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing.

Pamuk, Ş. & Karaman, K. (2010). Ottoman state finances in European perspective, 1500-1914. *The Journal of Economic History, 70,* 593-627.

Paşazade, E. (2002). *Necmi Ömer Efendi'nin Divan, Tuhfe-i Vahdet ve Kaside-i Elfiyye isimli eserlerinin transkripsiyonlu metni ve Divanı'nın incelenmesi*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Cumhuriyet University, Turkey.

Pederson, J. (1984). *The Arabic book* (G. French, Trans.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (Original work published 1946).

Pektaş, N. (2014). *The first Greek printing press in Constantinople (1625-1628)* (Unpublished PhD thesis). University of London, UK.

Pektaş, N. (2015). The beginnings of printing in the Ottoman capital: book production and circulation in early modern Constantinople. *Osmanlı Bilimi Araştırmaları, 16*(2), 3-32.

Philliou, C. M. (2011). *Biography of an empire: governing Ottomans in an age of revolution.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Polat, A. (2015). *Subject to approval: sanction and censure in Ottoman Istanbul (1889-1923)* (Unpublished PhD thesis). University of Chicago, USA.

Preston, C. L. & Preston, M. J. (Eds.). (1995). *The other printed tradition: essay on chapbooks, broadsides and related ephemera*. NY and London: Garland Publishing Inc.

Proudfoot, I. (1997). Mass producing houri's moles or aesthetics and choice of technology in early Muslim book printing. In P. G. Riddell and T. Street (Eds.), *Islam: Essays on Scripture, Thought and Society* (pp. 161-184). Leiden: Brill.

Proudfoot, I. (1998). Lithography at the crossroads of the East. *Journal of the Printing Historical Society*, *27*, 113-131.

Quinn, M. M. (2016). *Books and their readers in seventeenth-century Istanbul* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Harvard University, USA.

Rank, S. (2015). *Disputing religion, empire and modernity: Christian-Muslim polemics in the Ottoman print sphere, 1861-1915* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Central European University, Hungary.

Reinkowski, M. (2005). The state's security and the subjects' prosperity: notions of order in Ottoman bureucratic correspondence (19th century). In H. T. Karateke & M. Reinkowski (Eds.), *Legitimizing the order: The Ottoman rhetoric of state power* (pp. 195-212). Leiden: Brill.

Reinkowski, M. (2017). *Düzenin şeyleri, Tanzimat'ın kelimeleri: 19. yüzyıl Osmanlı reform politikasının karşılaştırmalı bir araştırması.* İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Robinson, F. (Feb., 1993). Technology and religious change: Islam and the impact of print. *Modern Asian Sudies*, *27*(1), 229-251.

Robinson, F. (1997). Ottoman-Safavids-Mughal: shared knowledge and connective systems. *Journal of Islamic Studies*, *8*(2), 151-184.

Roper, G. J. (2007). Al-Jawaib press and the edition and transmission of Arabic manuscript texts in the 19th century. In J. Pfeiffer and M. Kropp (Eds.), *Theoretical approaches to the transmission and edition of Oriental manuscripts* (pp. 237-239). Würzburg: Ergon Verlag Würzburg in Kommission.

Roper, G. J. (2013). *The history of the book in the Muslim World*. In G. Roper (Ed.), *The history of the book in the Middle East*. VT: Ashgate.

el-Rouayheb, K. (2004). Sunni Muslim scholars on the status of logic, 1500-1800. *Islamic Law and Society, 11*(2)*,* 213-232.

el-Rouayheb, K. (2008). The myth of 'the triumph of fanaticism' in the seventeenth-century Ottoman Empire. *Die Welt des Islams, 48,* 196-221.

el-Rouayheb, K. (2010). *Relational syllogisms and the history of Arabic logic 900-1900*. Leiden: Brill.

el-Rouayheb, K. (2015). *Islamic intellectual history in the seventeenth century: scholarly currents in the Ottoman Empire and the Maghreb.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sabev, O. (2006). *İbrahim Müteferrika ya da ilk Osmanlı matbaa serüveni (1726-1746)*. İstanbul: Yeditepe Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Sabev, O. (2009). Rich men, poor men: Ottoman printers and booksellers making fortune or seeking survival. *Oriens*, *37*(1), 177-190.

Sabev, O. (2010). A virgin deserving paradise or a whore deserving poison: manuscript tradition and printed books in Ottoman Turkish society. In J. Miller & L. Kontler (Eds.), *Friars, Nobles and Burghers – Sermons, Images and Prints* (pp. 389-409). Budapest: CEU University Press.

Sabev, O. (2011). Okuyan taşralı bir toplum: Rusçuk müslümanlarının kitap sevgisi (1695-1786). *Balkanlar'da İslam Medeniyeti Uluslararası Üçüncü Sempozyum Tebliğleri, Bükreş Romanya/1-5 Kasım 2006* (Vol. 2) (pp. 575-607). Istanbul: Research Center for Islamic History, Art and Culture.

Sabev, O. (2013). İki örnek ışığında Osmanlı matbaacılarının maddi durumu (İbrahim Müteferrika ve Seyyid Mustafa Esad Efendi). In M. Öztürk & . Aksın (Eds.), *İkinci İktisat Tarihi Kongresi 2 (Elazığ, 24-25 Haziran 2010)* (pp. 701-755). Elazığ.

Sabev, O. (2017). Katip Çelebi ve İbrahim Müteferrika. In T. Gökçe, M. Acıpınar, İ. Kokdaş & Ö. Küpeli (Eds.), *Uluslararası Katip Çelebi Araştırmaları Sempozyumu Bildirileri* (pp. 151-172). İzmir: İzmir Katip Çelebi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Sabev, O. (2018). *Waiting for Müteferrika: glimpses of Ottoman print culture*. Boston, MA: Academic Studies Press.

Sağırlı, A. (2000). *Mehmed b. Mehmed er-Rumi'nin Nuhbetü't-Tevarih ve'l-Ahbar'ı ve Tarih-i Al-i Osman'ı* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Istanbul University, Turkey.

Sajdi, D. (Fall 2003). A room of his own: the 'history' of the barber of Damascus. *The MIT Electronic Journal of Middle East Studies*, *3*, 19-35.

Sajdi, D. (Ed.). (2007). *Ottoman tulips, Ottoman coffee: leisure and lifestyle in the eighteenth century*. London, NY: I. B. Tauris.

Sajdi, D. (2009). Print and its discontents: a case for pre-print journalism and other sundry printed matters. *The Translator*, *15*(1), 105-38.

Sajdi, D. (2017). Chained: orality, authority and history. In S. S. Blair & J. Bloom (Eds.). *By the Pen and What They Write*. NH: Yale University Press.

Sakaoğlu, N. (1991). *Osmanlı eğitim tarihi*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Sarı, N. (2004). Mekteb-i Tıbbiye. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, (Vol. 29, pp. 3). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Sarı, N. (1987). Cemiyet-i Tıbbiye-i Osmaniyye ve tıp dilinin Türkçeleşmesi akımı. In Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu (Ed.), *Osmanlı İlmi ve Mesleki Cemiyetleri*. İstanbul: Research Center for Islamic History, Art and Culture.

Sarıcoğlu, F. & Yılmaz, C. (2008). *Müteferrika basmacı İbrahim Efendi ve Müteferrika matbaası*. İstanbul: Esen Ofset.

Sayar, A. G. (1986). *Osmanlı iktisat düşüncesinin çağdaşlaşması*. İstanbul: Der Yayınları.

Sayar, A. G. (2009). *Osmanlı iktisat düşüncesinin çağdaşlaşması, klasik dönemden II. Abdülhamid'e*. İstanbul: Ötüken.

Saydam, A. (2008). Osmanlıda özel matbaacılık: yayıncılıkta tekelin kaldırılması. *Toplumsal Tarih*, 64-71.

Sayers, D. S. (2013). *Tıfli hikayeleri*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Schick, I. C. (2009). Osmanlı döneminde matbuat kapitalizmi. *Virgül*, *126*, 58-64.

Schick, I. C. (2011). Print capitalism and women's sexual agency in the late Ottoman Empire. *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East*, *31*(1), 196-216.

Schulze, R. (1997). The birth of tradition and modernity in the 18th and 19th century Islamic culture: the case of printing. *Culture and History 16*, 29-72.

Schwartz, K. (2015). *Meaningful mediums: a material and intellectual history of manuscript and print production in nineteenth century Ottoman Cairo* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Harvard University, USA.

Schwartz, K. (2017). The political economy of private printing in Cairo as told from a commisioning deal turned sour, 1871. *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, *49*(1), 25-45.

Serçe, E. (2002). *İzmir'de kitapçılık (1839-1928)*. İzmir: İzmir Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kitaplığı.

Sefiraz, M. (2015). *Kurd, kitêb, çapxane weşangeriya kitêbên Kurdî di dewra Osmaniyan de (1844–1923)*. Stenbol: Peywend.

Seyitdanlıoğlu, M. (Summer 1996). Sadık Rıfat Paşa ve Avrupa Ahvaline Dair Risalesi. *Liberal Düşünce*, 115-124.

Seymen, İ. L. (1993). Erbab-ı mütaalaya hizmet: I. Meşrutiyet kitapçılığı ve Arakel Tozluyan Efendi'nin mektupları. *Müteferrika*, *1*, 67-111.

Sezer, Y. (2016). *The architecture of bibliophilia: eighteenth century Ottoman libraries* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Massachusetts Institute of Technology, USA.

Shefer, M. (2005). Old patterns, new meanings: the 1845 hospital of Bezm-i Alem in Istanbul. *Dynamis, 25,* 329-350.

Shefer-Mossensohn, M. (2008). A tale of two discourses: the historiography of Ottoman-Muslim medicine, *Social History of Medicine, 2*(1), 1-12.

Shefer-Mossensohn, M. (2011). An Ottoman physician and his social and intellectual milieu: the case of Salih bin Nasrallah Ibn Sallum. *Studia Islamica, 1,* 133-158.

Shefer-Mossensohn, M. (2015). *Science among the Ottomans: the cultural creation and exchange of knowledge.* Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Simonffy, A. V. (1944). *Ibrahim Müteferrika: bahnbrecher des buchdrucks in der Türkei*. Budapest: Dr. Vagna Und Bokor.

Smiley, W. (2014). The burdens of subjecthood: the Ottoman state, Russian fugitives and interimperial law, 1774-1869. *Intenational Journal of Middle Eastern Studies, 46(1)*, 73-93.

Somel, A. (2001). *The modernization of public education in the Ottoman Empire, 1839-1908: Islamization, autocracy and discipline*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Somel, A. (1997). Ottoman Islamic education in the Balkans in the nineteenth century. *Islamic Studies, 36*(2/3), 439-464.

Spufford, M. (1981). *Small books and pleasant histories*. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd.

Stepanyan, H. A. (2005). *Ermeni harfli Türkçe kitaplar ve süreli yayınlar bibliyografyası (1717-1968)*. İstanbul: Turkuaz Yayınları.

Strauss, J. (1993). İstanbul'da kitap yayını ve basımevleri. (E. Üyepazarcı, Trans.). *Müteferrika*, *1*, 5-17.

Strauss, J. (1995). The millets and the Ottoman language: the contribution of Ottoman Greeks to Ottoman letters (19th-20th centuries). *Die Welt des Islams*, *35*(2), 189-249.

Strauss, J. (2000). *The Egyptian connection in nineteenth century Ottoman literary and intellectual history*. Beirut: Orient-Institut der Deutschen Morgenlaendischen Gesellschaft.

Strauss, J. (2003). Who read what in the Ottoman Empire (19th--20th centuries)?. *Arabic Middle Eastern Literatures*, *6*(1), 39-76.

Strauss, J. (2014). Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda kimler, neleri okurdu? (19.-20. yüzyıllar). (Günil Ayaydın Cebe Trans.). In F. Altuğ & F. Uslu (Eds.),

Tanzimat ve edebiyat: Osmanlı İstanbul'unda modern edebi kültür (pp. 1-64). İstanbul: Türkiye İşbankası Kültür Yayınları.

Suit, N. K. (2014). *Quranic matters: media and materiality* (Unpublished PhD thesis). University of North Carolina, USA.

Şahin, A. (2018). *Osmanlı Devleti'nde rüşdiyye mektepleri*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Şafak, N. (2006). *Bir Tanzimat diplomatı Kostaki Musurus Paşa (1807-1891)* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Marmara University, Turkey.

Şakul, K. (2005/2). Nizâm-ı Cedid düşüncesinde Batılılaşma ve İslami modernleşme. *Dîvân İlmî Araştırmalar*, *19*, 117-150.

Şakul, K. (2006). Osmanlıların ilk maden kömürcülüğü girişimi: Yedikumlar kömür madeni mukataası, *Osmanlı Bilimi Araştırmaları*, *XVIII*(1), 39-52.

Şapolyo, E. B. (1969). *Türk gazetecilik tarihi ve her yönüyle basın*. Ankara, Güven Matbaası.

Şimşek, H. İ. (2005). Mesnevihan bir müceddidî şeyhi: Neccarzâde Mustafa Rıza'nın hayatı ve tasavvufî görüşleri. *Tasavvuf*, *14*, 159-178.

Şimşek, S. (2010). Süleyman Zati. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, (Vol. 38, pp. 111). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Şişman, A. (2004). *Tanzimat döneminde Fransa'ya gönderilen Osmanlı öğrencileri*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Şiviloğlu, M. (2014). *The emergence of public opinion in the Ottoman Empire (1826-1876)* (Unpublished PhD thesis). University of Cambridge, UK.

Şiviloğlu, M. (2018). *The emergence of public opinion in the Ottoman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tan, N. (2013). Mustafa el-Bekri'ye ait olan *el-Feyzü'l Ahmediyyü'r-revi* Adlı eserin tercümesi: *Tercüme-i Şerh-i Salat-ı Ahmed Bedevi*. *Tasavvuf: İlmi ve Akademik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, *14*(32), 221-244.

Tan, N. & Kırmızı, N. Abdülkadir Geylani ve İbnü'l-Arabi'ye nispet edilen bir metin: Gavsiyye risalesi hakkında bir literatür değerlendirmesi. *Kocaeli İlahiyat Dergisi, 1*(1), 19-39.

Tanpınar, A. H. (2012). *19. asır Türk edebiyatı tarihi*. Abdullah Uçman (Ed.). İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları.

Tekin, K. (2016). *Reforming categories of science and religion in the late Ottoman Empire* (Unpublished PhD thesis) Columbia University, USA.

Telci, C. (1999). Bir Osmanlı aydınının XVIII. devlet düzeni hakkında görüşleri: Penah Süleyman Efendi. In Gülen Eren (Ed.), *Osmanlı* (Vol.7) (pp. 177-188). Ankara: Yeni Türkiye.

Terzioğlu, D. (2012). Sufis in the age of state-building and confessionalization. In C. Woodhead (Ed.), *The Ottoman world* (pp. 86-99). UK: Routledge.

Terzioğlu, D. (2012-2013). How to conceptualize Ottoman Sunnitization: A historiographical discussion. *Turcica,* 44, 301-338.

Terzioğlu, D. (Aug. 2013). Where '*İlm-i Hâl* meets catechism: Islamic manuals of religious instruction in the Ottoman Empire in the age of confessionalization. *Past and Present,* 220, 79-114.

Timur, T. (August 2004). Matbaa, aydınlanma ve diplomasi: Said Mehmed Efendi. *Toplumsal Tarih,* 128, 54-61.

Toksöz, M. (2008). Reform ve yönetim: devletten topluma, merkezden bölgeye Osmanlı modernleşmesi. In H. İnalcık & M. Seyitdanlıoğlu (Eds.), *Tanzimat: değişim sürecinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu* (pp. 209-226). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Toksöz, M. (2012). The world of Mehmed Murad: writing histoires universelles in Ottoman Turkish. *Journal of Ottoman Studies 40,* 343-363.

Toksöz, M. (2015). Modernization in the Ottoman Empire: the 1858 land code and property regimes from a regional outlook. In E. Kolovos (Ed.), *Ottoman rural societies and economies halycon days in Crete VIII, A Symposium Held in Rethymno* (pp. 381-398). Rethymno: Crete University Press.

Toksöz, M. (March 2014). Geç dönem Osmanlı tarihçiliği üzerine düşünmek. *Toplumsal Tarih,* 243, 52-54.

Toksöz, M. (February 2016). Geç Osmanlı devleti'nde popüler tarih: Ahmed Midhat ve dünya tarihi. *Toplumsal Tarih,* 266, 50-64.

Tosun, N. (2008). Reşehat. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, (Vol. 35, pp. 9). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Tuğlacı, P. (February 1991). Osmanlı Türkiyesi'nde ermeni matbaacılığı ve ermenilerin Türk matbaacılığına katkısı. *Tarih ve Toplum*, *86*, 48-56.

Turgut, A. (1998). Abdullah Eyyûbî. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, (Vol. 1, pp. 102-103) İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Turna, N. (2008). Pandemonium and order: suretyship, surveillance and taxation in early nineteenth-century Istanbul. *New Perspectives on Turkey*, *39*, 167-189.

Turnaoğlu, B. (2017). *The formation of Turkish republicanism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Türesay, Ö. (2008a). II.Abdülhamid dönemi yayımcılığı, matbaa-i Ebuzziya ve bastığı kitaplar. *Müteferrika*, *34*, 3-48.

Türesay, Ö. (2008b). *Être intellectuel à la fin de l'Empire ottoman: Ebüzziya Tevfik (1849-1913) et son temps* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Institut National des Langues et Civilisations Orientales, France.

Türesay, Ö. (August 2014). Bir Osmanlı matbaacısının Sergüzeşti: Ebüzziya Tevfik Efendi'nin Matbaa-i Ebüzziya'sı. *Toplumsal Tarih*, *128*, 36-43;

Türk, İ. C. (2013). *Kırım harbi esnasında Osmanlı-İran münasebetleri*. İstanbul: Arı Sanat Yayınevi.

Uçman, A. (2006). Müzekki'n-nüfus. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, (Vol. 32, pp. 246). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Ueno, M. (2016). One script, two languages: Garabed Panosian and his Armeno-Turkish newspapers in the nineteenth-century Ottoman Empire, *Middle Eastern Studies*, *52*(4), 605-622.

Uludağ, S. (1988). Abdüsselam b. Meşiş el-Haseni. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, (Vol. 1, pp. 302). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Uludağ, S. (1994). Delailü'l-hayrat. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, (Vol. 9, pp. 114). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Unat, F.R. (1964). *Türk eğitim sisteminin gelişmesine tarihi bir bakış*. Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı.

Uzunçarşılı, İ. H. (1988). *Osmanlı Tarihi* (Vol. 4-2). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Ülken, H. Z. (2014). *Türkiye'de çağdaş düşünce tarihi.* İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Ülken, H. Z. (2011). *Uyanış devirlerinde tercümenin rolü*. İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Ülman, Y. I. (1998). Mekteb-i Tıbbiye-i Adliye-i Şahane'nin 1846-1847 öğretim yılı faaliyet raporu. *Yeni Tıp Tarihi Araştırmaları*, *4*, 145.

Ülman, Y. I. (2002). Mekteb-i Tıbbiye'nin 1850-51 öğretim yılı faaliyet raporu ve mezuniyet töreni. *Osmanlı Bilimi Araştırmaları*, *4*(1), 59.

Ünal, Y. (2016). *More than mere polemic: the adventure of the Risâlah-i Husniyah in the Safavid, Ottoman and Indian lands* (Unpublished master's thesis). Boğaziçi University, Turkey.

Ünüvar, K. (2004). *Economic and moral organization of the Ottoman society in the Tanzimat period: Sadık Rıfat Paşa's Ahlak Risalesi* (Unpublished master's Thesis). Boğaziçi University, Turkey.

Varol, M. (2013a). 19. yüzyıl İstanbul'unda bazı tekkelerin matbaacılık faaliyetleri. *Osmanlı Araştırmaları/Journal of Ottoman Studies*, *42,* 317-348.

Varol, M. (2013b). *Islahat, siyaset, tarikat: Bektaşiliğin ilgası sonrasında Osmanlı devleti'nin tarikat politikaları (1826-1866)*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları.

Vatin, N. & Zarcone, T. (1999). Istanbul'da bir Bektaşi tekkesi: Karyağdı (Eyüp) tekkesi. *Türk ültürü ve Hacı Bektaş Veli Araştırma Dergisi, 11*, 1-13.

Weismann, I. (2004). The Naqshbandiyya-Khalidiyya and the Salafi challenge in Iraq, *Journal of the History of Sufism*, 4, 229-240.

Weismann, I. (August 2009). Genealogies of fundamentalism: Salafi discourse in nineteenth-century Baghdad. *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, *36*, 267-280.

Wilson, B. (2009). *The Qur'an after babel: translating and printing the Quran in late Ottoman and modern Turkey* (Unpublished PhD Thesis). Duke University, USA.

Wishnitzer, A. (2009). *The transformation of Ottoman temporal culture during the long nineteenth century* (Unpublished PhD Diss.). Tel Aviv University, Israel.

Witkam, J. J. (2001). The battle of the images: Mecca vs. Medina in iconography of manuscripts of al-Jazuli's Dala'il al-Khayrat. In J. Pfeiffer & M. Kropp (Eds.), *Theoretical approaches to the transmission and edition of Oriental Manuscripts* (pp. 67-82). Beirut: Ergon Verlag.

Woodhead, C. (2000). Puff and patronage: Ottoman takriz-writing and literacy recommendation in the 17th century. In Ç. Balim-Harding & C. Imber (Eds.), *The balance of truth. Essays in honour of Professor Geoffrey Lewis* (pp. 395-406). Istanbul: Isis Press.

Yalçınkaya, A. (2016). *Learned patriots: debating science, state and society in the nineteenth century Ottoman Empire*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Yalçınkaya, Ş. (2010). Ahmet Süheyli. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, (Vol. 38, pp. 32-33). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Yalkın, A. O. (2014). Abdurrahman-ı Darir'in tafsil-i tarik-i mukarrebin ve sebili'l-Müttebi'in adlı eseri üzerine bir tanıtım. *TÜRÜK Uluslararası Dil, Edebiyat ve Halkbilimi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *4*. 287-295.

Yalkın, A. O. (2017). *Abdurrahman-ı darir'in tafsil-i tarik-i mukarrebin ve Sebili'l-Müttebi'in* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi, Turkey.

Yalman, A. E. (1914). *The development of modern Turkey as measured by its press* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Colombia University, USA.

Yaslıçimen, F. (2013). Osmanlı Devleti'nin İran eksenli Irak siyaseti ve 19. yüzyılda bürokratik bilgi üretimi. In M. H. Mercan (Ed.), *Gelenek ve modern arasında bilgi ve toplum* (pp. 301-338). İstanbul: Yedirenk.

Yaşaroğlu, M. K. (2005). Mızraklı İlmihal. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, (Vol. 30, pp. 6). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Yaycıoğlu, A. (2018). Guarding traditions and laws-disciplining bodies and souls: tradition, science, and religion in the age of Ottoman reform. *Modern Asian Studies*, *52*(5), 1542-1603.

Yazıcı, N. (1983). *Takvîm-i Vekâyi': belgeler*. Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Yazıcı, T. (1996). Gülistân. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, (Vol. 14, pp. 240-241). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Yazıcı, T. (2004). Menâkibü'l-Ârifîn. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, (Vol. 29, pp. 115). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Yazıksız, N. A. (2012). 'Bilmez efendi, çok yaşayan, çok gezen bilir' Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi'nin tab'ını istilzam eden bazı mukaddemat. In Uğur Demir (Ed.), *Evliya Çelebi atlası* (pp. 222-225). İstanbul: MEDAM.

Yıldırım, N. (2018). Surp Pırgiç Ermeni hastanesi. Zeytinburnu Kültür Vadisi. *Zeytinburnu Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları*, *54*(2), 682-692.

Yıldırım, R. (2010). Bektaşi kime derler? 'Bektaşi' kavramını kapsamı ve sınırları üzerine tarihsel bir analiz denemesi. *Türk Kültürü ve Hacı Bektaş Veli Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *55*, 23-58.

Yıldırım, R. (2016). Sunni orthodox vs Shi'ite heterodox? A reappraisal of Islamic piety in Medieval Anatolia. In A.C.S. Peacock, B. De Nicola & S. N. Yıldız (Eds.), *Islam and Christianity in medieval Anatolia* (pp. 287-307). NY: Routledge.

Yıldız, A. (2009). Müellifi meçhul bir şürut-u salat mesnevisi. *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, *13*(2), 175-187.

Yıldız, G. (2017). İstanbul'da bir Acem matbaası: kitapçı Tahir ve Ahter. *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, *50,* 175-218.

Yıldız, G. (2009). *Neferin adı yok: zorunlu askerliğe geçiş sürecinde Osmanlı Devleti'nde Siyaset, Ordu ve Toplum (1826-1839)*. İstanbul: Kitabevi.

Yılmaz, G. (2015). Bektaşilik ve İstanbul'daki Bektaşi tekkeleri üzerine bir inceleme. *Journal of the Ottoman Studies*, *45*, 97-136.

Yılmaz, Ö. F. (2005). *Tarih boyunca sahhaflık ve İstanbul Sahhaflar Çarşısı*. İstanbul: Sahhaflar Derneği.

Yosmaoğlu, İ. (2003). Chasing the printed word: press censorship in the Ottoman Empire, 1876-1913. *The Turkish Studies Association Journal*, *27*(1-2), 15-49.

Yücer, H. M. (2005). Tarikat geleneğinde salavat-ı şerife ve Müstakimzade'nin Şerh-i Evrad-ı Kadiri adlı eseri. *Tasavvuf: İlmi ve Akademik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, *6*(15), 253-288.

Zaman, M. Q. (2002). *Ulama in contemporary Islam, custodians of change*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Zaman, M. Q. (2012). *Modern Islamic thought in a radical age: religious authority and internal criticism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.