Chapter 7

In between the mind and the heart: Kātip Çelebi"s concept of *ʿilm*

Selen Morkoç

ABSTRACT

Kātip Çelebi (1609-57) was a distinguished and prolific 17th-century Ottoman scholar, whose works exhibit openness towards the 'new science' of the early modern period. His geographical work *Cihannüma* (Displaying the World) shows his awareness of the new geographical knowledge and discoveries unfolding in Europe during his time. Meanwhile his major bibliographical work *Kashf al-ẓunūn* (Dispelling Doubts) presents a lengthy and sophisticated engagement with the Islamic concept of *ʿilm* in an attempt to reconstruct its theoretical foundations, to demonstrate its progressive nature, and to emphasise the necessity and usefulness of its rational and philosophical dimensions, which have come under attack in recent years. This chapter examines Kātip Çelebi's last work, *Mīzān al-ḥaqq* (The Balance of Truth), which captures his inner uncertainty about the significance of *ʿilm*. Its aims are, first, to show how Çelebi's conceptualisation and definition of *ʿilm* oscillated between the heart and the mind. Second, the chapter shows the way in which he understood and approached the relationship between reason and faith as complementary rather than opposing instruments of knowledge and elements of belief. In this intertwined conception, rational sciences and philosophy were considered as necessary to religious understanding. Third, the chapter discusses Çelebi's rational approach to answering the 21 controversial issues generated by the Kāḍīzāde and Sivāsī antagonism that were hotly debated within Ottoman circles. These included the legality of music and dance in religious practices and worship, and the morality of social habits new to the times, such as smoking, opium, and coffee drinking.

DREAM AND TRUTH

In his last work, *Mīzān al-ḥaqq* (The Balance of Truth), the celebrated 17th-century Ottoman scholar and bibliophile Kātip Çelebi (1609-57) presents a chronologically ordered biographical account of his life and works.[1] The account reveals his oscillation between rational and religious sciences (*ʿaklī* and *şerʿī ʿilimler*) at various stages of his short yet prolific career, pointing to the deep sense of uncertainty he felt concerning the right approach to truth. At the end of this biographical account, Çelebi relates the story of a significant dream he had, which seemed to have delivered him out of the state of uncertainty and showed him the correct path to truthful knowledge. Referring to the dream as 'Glad tidings', Çelebi wrote:

> While I was beginning the fair copy of the present treatise on the eve of Sunday 24 Muharram 1067 [22 November 1656], the Glory of the World (Peace be Upon Him) appeared in a dream to my unworthy self. He was in an open field, garbed as a warrior, girded for battle and wearing a sword. He was in a remote spot, surrounded by his aides and helpers. I stood in his august presence and asked him about certain problems of the sciences, and he answered me. The one thing I clearly remember is that he was standing and I was half standing, half sitting. In the course of my questioning him, I kissed his blessed knees and said, 'O Prophet of God, suggest a name with which I may occupy myself'. He replied, 'Occupy yourself with the name of the Prophet', in a great voice, so my ears were full of it and I awoke with it still ringing in my head.[2]

Çelebi's dream occurred at a late stage in his career when he was preoccupied with pursuing and teaching rational sciences (*ʿaklī ʿilimler*) and mathematics, and hence he interpreted the Prophet's message as a call to return to focusing on traditional or religious sciences (*şerʿī ʿilimler*). The Prophet's advice to Çelebi to occupy himself with the Prophet's name meant to confirm to Çelebī that the only way for attaining truthful knowledge of God was through God's Messenger himself. At that critical moment, it became clear to Çelebi that the rational and philosophical sciences alone were inadequate means for attaining truthful knowledge of God, and that rational understanding must be complemented with transmitted religious wisdom if one was to be able to 'fly' towards the truth. 'Because two wings are necessary to fly', he wrote, 'one cannot take a distance with one wing. Rational and religious sciences are comparable to two wings'.[3]

Çelebi's oscillation between reason and tradition, the mind and the heart, in his pursuit of truth is reflective of a wider debate at the time concerning the right approach to truthful knowledge. His dream might have represented a decisive moment that revolved around his personal dilemma, yet his views can be taken to represent a prevailing current among various intellectual circles in Ottoman society. This study considers Çelebi's experiences to be an important 'barometer' for understanding intellectual developments in the early modern period. It examines his multiple engagements with the polarity of rational and religious sciences, in an attempt to unravel his complex understanding and articulation of the concept of *ʿilm*. At that time, *ʿilm* began to take on new dimensions, especially with the emergence of a new mode of knowing that was to become known later as 'modern science'. Çelebi was among the first Ottoman scholars who actively engaged with early modern sciences and attempted to incorporate their findings and methodology into the Islamic perspective. His attempts to expand the meaning of *ʿilm* beyond its traditional bounds while oscillating between his mind and his heart is the focus of this study.

EARLY MODERN OTTOMANS

Kātip Çelebi is viewed by many Ottoman historians as one of the leading supporters of the emerging rationalism and new intellectual trends that changed Europe in the 17th and 18th centuries.[4] Born in Istanbul, Kātip Çelebi was also known as Hacı Khalīfa, yet his proper name was Mustafa bin Abdullah. As the title Çelebi in his name suggests, he came from a well-established Istanbul family of the upper middle class.[5] His father was a member of the cavalry of the Porte (*silāḥdār*) as well as a scribe in the fiscal administration (*Anadolu muḥāsebesi*). These official posts afforded him the financial means to hire private tutors for his son's education outside the traditional *madrasa* system.[6] Early in his career in the chancery, Çelebi spent considerable time travelling as he joined the Hemedan,

Erzurum, Tercan, Revan, and Baghdad campaigns. He spent most of his later life, however, in his native city of Istanbul working as an accountant and a clerk in the Ottoman bureaucracy. After inheriting a considerable amount of wealth from his family later in life, Çelebi was able to leave his official job and devote himself entirely to his intellectual pursuits.[7] His exceptional skills in categorising and cataloguing might have been a result of his occupational background.

Çelebi was a polymath as well as a scholar, genuinely concerned with both the status of knowledge and the socio-religious problems of the Ottoman society. In addition to being an author, he was an avid collector of books. Ottoman historian Gottfried Hagen estimates that Çelebi had the largest private library in Istanbul in his time.[8] In his short life of 48 years, Çelebi managed to write 21 books, the largest and most important of which was his massive seven-volume catalogue of Islamic books and sciences entitled *Kashf al-ẓunūn* (Dispelling Doubts). The fact that he came from outside the traditional *madrasa* system might explain his broad perspective and tendency to synthesise knowledge from the many sources and disciplinary fields available to him. He explained the wide horizon of thinking which his works reveal by describing '[t]he supreme zeal he owned', which 'did not allow him to suffice with one single scientific field'.[9]

Çelebi lived in a period of significant change which presents contrasting characteristics according to the viewpoint from which it is considered. From the politico-economic and military perspectives, the 17th century was a period of social confusion, economic crises, and military stagnation in Ottoman history. It is identified with the start of the decentralisation of the Ottoman Empire, which is presumed to have taken place between the death of Süleyman the Magnificent in 1566 and the Treaty of Karlowitz in 1699. These changes, as Karen Barkey argues, can be seen as a result of an international crisis that was omnipresent across Eurasia and was due to changing economic and military relations between the East and the West.[10]

The pre-modern Ottoman perception of history, as Hagen argues, was built on the dynastic myth supporting holy war against the infidel, which promoted expanding physical territories for the spread of the Islamic faith. Its premise was that ultimate justice leads to a stable rule. This world view was very much in contrast with the social realities of the 17th-century Ottoman context. The Celali uprisings in Anatolia, the downfall of young Sultan Osman II in 1622, the series of wars with Venice over Crete (1645-69), and the failed siege of Vienna of 1683 were some of the events that signalled political problems.[11] The dynastic myth gave way to an alternative view of history influenced by Ibn Khaldun's sociology, which compared states with the human body and its developmental stages (birth, growth, death).[12] Historians such as Muṣṭafā Naʿīmā (d. 1716) adopted this view. Although the end of the state was never a matter for discussion, the age of Süleyman the Lawgiver was perceived as the golden age of the Ottomans. The self-centred view of the state gave way to the perception of Ottomans as one polity among many within the empirical geography of the world. Ottoman scholars of the 17th century offered advice literature for the statesmen, suggesting ways to restore peace to the society.[13] Hagen proposes that famous literary figures of the 17th century, such as Evliya Çelebi (the author of the *Seyaḥatnāme*) and Kātip Çelebi (a clerk with privately acquired education), represent a shift of class in the intellectual activities.[14] These upper-middle-class scholars contributed to the emergence of 'secularist and modernist tendencies' in the society through their work.[15] Çelebi penned his last work, *Mizān,* within this context.

From a socio-cultural and intellectual perspective, however, Çelebi's period appears somewhat different. In *Early Modern Ottomans: Remapping the Empire*, Virginia Aksan and Daniel Goffman propose 'early modernity' as a historical framework for understanding the socio-cultural and

intellectual developments of the period. They understand 'modernity' broadly as a mode of self-consciousness which manifested at the individual, social, and state levels and defined the early modern Ottoman period, from the fall of Constantinople to the establishment of *tanzīmāt*. These two events are taken to mark two important moments of change in Ottoman history: one 'when the Ottoman state began consciously to envision itself as a world-conquering empire', the other 'when the Ottomans began consciously and deliberately to emulate the west'.[16]

Problematic as this projection might be, viewing Ottoman history within the 'early modern' framework introduces different preoccupations and conditions that bring Ottoman history closer to the Europeans. Thus, Aksan and Goffman's edited volume attempts to show that during this period the Ottomans were active agents who contributed to the construction of the early modern European world. The multi-ethnic and multireligious structure of the Ottoman Empire allowed utilisation of commercial and cultural diasporas of communities for economic and political purposes. New genres of writing, the renewal of political, diplomatic, and legal strategies, and the emergence of an upper-middle-class aristocracy mark the distinctive outcomes of the early modern Ottoman context.[17] Earlier historian Rifaʿat Abou-El-Haj also argued, like Aksan and Goffman, that the 17th century was a period of increasing complexity and positive changes in the social structure and could be appropriately characterised as the 'early modern period' of the Ottoman Empire.[18]

Çelebi, with the rich diversity of his scholarship that is characterised by open-mindedness and desire for change, can be seen to represent the intellectual milieu of early modernity in the Ottoman context. His *Mīzān al-ḥaqq,* in particular, contains textual evidence of the social-cultural and intellectual dynamics of the period. Viewing his work from this perspective, both republican historian Adnan Adıvar and Hagen consider Çelebi and his work as a turning point in Ottoman intellectual history, with his 'worldly' interest towards systematising and categorising information. Adıvar goes so far as to consider Çelebi to be a forerunner of Westernisation. In fact, Çelebi is one of the few Ottoman scholars whose works have been translated into Western languages after the Classical Period of Islam.[19] However, Hagen rightly interprets Çelebi's quest for useful knowledge as a utilitarian effort to address economic, military, and political problems of the Ottoman State.[20]

ʿ*ILM*: THE MIND AND THE HEART

In his preface to the *Mīzān*, Çelebi explains the main reason for writing the book:

> Since the beginning of creation it has been acknowledged among the wise that intelligence and tradition are like a pair of twins, while the reports of intelligence and tradition are like two race-horses, and that logical proof is a staircase and a ladder to the heights of certainty, so that in matters of inquiry and speculation it is the basis of all men's speech and the referee of all things. Some men there are who, seduced by the Slinking Whisperer, have laid aside proof and through ignorance and folly have deliberately set up surmise and conjecture as a rival to proof. In more questions than one they have fallen victim to the diseases of contention and vain bigotry. Like the fanatical wars in olden time, the futile wrangling of these stupid people has well-nigh led to bloodshed. For this reason these few lines have been drafted in order to demonstrate the method of proof in the questions at issue, and the name *Mīzān al-ḥaqq fi'khtiyār al-aḥaqq* ('the Balance of Truth in Choosing the Most True') has been given to them, so that ordinary people may know what the matters of strife and dispute are, and what manner of fruit they yield.[21]

Mīzān was Çelebi's last work, in which he shed light on various aspects of his life and presented insights from all of his previous works. His preface reveals his deep concern about a prevailing trend that was dismissive of rational sciences and led to religious division and social turmoil. Çelebi strongly defended rational sciences and their indispensability in truth seeking. He considered reason and tradition as being not only two complementary modes of acquiring knowledge but also inherent in human make-up. He perceived the science of logic (*manṭiq, mīzān*) and proof (*burhān*) as offering viable ground for solving issues of contention. He saw logic as an instrumental science that helps scholars assert the truth: it is the balance and measure of all other sciences and is thus highly valued in critical judgement. Through the science of logic and proof scholars can achieve more rigorous and respectful works.[22]

Çelebi's zealous defence of the use of reason resulted from complex events. In 1629, the 20-year-old Çelebi started attending Kāḍīzāde Mehmed Efendi's (d. 1635) sermons and lectures on Islamic theology (*kalām*) and jurisprudence (*fiqh*). Kāḍīzāde was at that time leading a puritanical movement against religious innovations, especially Sufi thought and practices, and the degree of influence Kāḍīzāde's fundamentalist ideas had on the young impressionable Çelebi is not clear. Although later in life Çelebi and Kāḍīzāde took seemingly opposing paths to knowledge, Kāḍīzāde's ideas must have played a role in Çelebi's oscillation between the mind and the heart, the rational and traditional approaches to knowledge.[23] One of the motivations behind Çelebi's *Mīzān* was indeed the social turmoil the Kāḍīzādeli movement had generated. The movement arose from the fiery Friday sermons Kāḍīzāde delivered as the preacher at Hagia Sophia Mosque and gained strong momentum over the years. Across the road at the nearby Sultan Ahmed Mosque, his opponent preacher, Abdülmecīd Sivāsī Efendi (d. 1639), delivered his own provocative sermons. Sivāsī Efendi and his followers defended a tolerant Sufi understanding of Islam, while Kāḍīzāde and his followers promoted an intolerant, fanatical approach against all innovations in religion (*bidaʿ*, sing. *bidʿa*), and called for a revival of traditional Islam, as lived and practised during the time of the Prophet Muhammad. For nearly 20 years between 1630 and 1650 the acrimonious sermons raged on, often resulting in violent clashes between the followers of both preachers in the streets of Istanbul.[24]

This social and religious division had a lasting impact on Çelebi's thought and approach to both religion and knowledge. In his critical edition of *Mīzān,* Uludağ argues that what differentiates Çelebi from the Ottoman scholars of his time was his devotion to reconciling Islamic law (*sharīʿa*) with Sufism (*ḥikma*), rationality (*ʿaql*) with tradition (*naql*), and religion (*dīn*) with philosophy (*falsafa*). This is to say, it was Çelebi's self-appointed mission to find a harmonious ground for reconciling what he recognised as contrasting yet valid claims to truth, in order to bring together knowledge of the mind and knowledge of the heart, the *ʿulamāʾ,* the philosophers, and the Sufis.

Çelebi saw ignorance and misunderstanding as the main sources of the deepening religious division and escalating violence in Ottoman society. He also saw truthful knowledge (*ʿilm*) as a powerful tool to overcome this division. If people were truthfully informed, he thought, they would overcome their differences. In the introduction to *Mīzān*, he set out to demonstrate the benefits of rational sciences, including philosophy (*falsafa*), logic (*manṭiq*), geometry (*handasa*), geography (*jughrāfiya*) and astronomy (*nujūm*), in an attempt to find solutions to the problems of his period. He pointed to the fact that rational and natural sciences were not valued in the Ottoman *madrasas*, arguing that ignoring these branches of knowledge could only result in misunderstandings, false teachings, and wrong decisions in the social realm.[25] He suggested that in order to make accurate

decisions and sustain justice (*ʿadāla*) high-ranking officials should have sound understanding of rational sciences (*maʿqūlāt*) and mathematics (*riyāḍiyyāt*).[26]

The productive duality of the heart (*qalb*) and the mind (*ʿaql*), traceable in the *Mīzān* as well as other Çelebi's works, especially in the introduction to *Kashf al-ẓunūn,* is not unique to Çelebi's approach.[27] It is strongly present in one of Çelebi's key sources on the nature, subjects, and classification of *ʿulūm*, *Miftāḥ al-saʿāda* (The Key of Happiness), by eminent 16th-century Ottoman scholar Taşköprülüzāde. This duality can be traced back to the influential Muslim theologian and Sufi master Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī (d. 1111). In his widely celebrated work *Iḥyāʾ ʿulūm al-dīn* (Reviving the Sciences of Religion), al-Ghazālī presented a parable which narrates the story of an artistic competition between Chinese and Byzantine artists, held to demonstrate the superiority of their artwork to a king. The king gave each group one side of a portico to decorate and separated the two sides by a veil. While the Byzantine artists used their exquisite colours and painterly skills to decorate their side, the Chinese artists worked diligently on polishing up their side. When the veil was lifted, the Byzantine artists' work was stunning, yet the polished side of the Chinese reflected the Byzantine painting with all its beauty, adding depth and shine to its lustre and glamour. The king was equally impressed with both sides.[28] In this well-known example, which was quoted by many Muslim scholars, the Chinese side represented knowledge of the heart, while the Byzantine side represented knowledge of the mind. In the Islamic tradition, the heart became the Sufi's instrument of acquiring knowledge through polishing and purifying, whereas the mind became the other scholars' means of building knowledge through deliberate thinking, studying, reasoning, and reflecting. In the *Mizān*'s 21 chapters, Çelebi strove to demonstrate the values of both rational and revelatory modes of knowing, as he repeatedly cross-examined the discoveries of his rational thinking with the intuitive revelations of his heart.

Çelebi's uncertainty and oscillation between the mind and the heart can be attributed to his complex exposures to local and foreign sciences. Locally, around 1639, at the age of 30, Çelebi attended Kadı Mustafa Efendi's lectures (d. 1653), whom he viewed as a master in both rational and transmitted sciences. He also studied with and attended the classes of Kürt Abdullāh Efendi (d. 1654), Keçi Mehmed Efendi (d. 1644), Veli Efendi, and ʿAbdürrahīm Efendi (d. 1656). Broadly, his wide scope of interest shows exposure to early modern European sciences, and an awareness of both its technological and social benefits.[29] He attempted to use the emerging new approach to knowledge to rethink traditional approaches, and warned his traditionalist colleagues against their growing dismissive attitude, narrow scope, and close-mindedness. This is particularly evident in two of his major works: *Cihannüma* (Displaying the World) and *Kashf al-ẓunūn* (Dispelling Doubts). Due to this exposure, Çelebi's approach to *ʿilm* developed an eclectic and reconciliatory nature. Uludağ explains that Çelebi's approach to *ʿilm* was deductive in nature; he was interested in major and general principles more than in details and particulars. Although Çelebi regarded tradition and transmitted knowledge highly, he was also critical of the notion of authority in religious science, with sometimes even an uncompromising stance toward traditional views on *ʿilm*.[30]

Through his writings, Çelebi shows a conscious recognition of the indisputable neutrality of *ʿilm* and its function in promoting harmonious religious understanding and social cohesion. This appreciation of the nature and function of *ʿilm* as indubitable truthful knowledge reflects the early modern understanding of science. Yet, in contrast to the rational understanding of *ʿilm* in the *Mīzān's* introduction, Çelebi's epilogue presents a more reconciliatory understanding of *ʿilm*

as a moral disposition that binds the intuition of the heart (*kashf*) with the deliberation (*nazar*) of the mind. What is discovered by the mind must, for Çelebi, be confirmed by the heart. The mind and heart duality gradually became synonymous with the polarity of science and religion, and early modern European intellectual history was marked by the emergence of this polarity. Despite the pronounced distinction between the rational and transmitted approaches to knowledge in the Islamic tradition, the boundary between the two remained obscure in the 17th-century Ottoman context. To further explore Çelebi's interest in the mind and the heart and to probe his attitude towards the emerging trends of acquiring *ʿilm,* we need to examine his writings demonstrating his engagement with *ʿilm* as science, as religion, and as moral values.

ʿILM: SCIENCE, RELIGION, AND MORALITY

Çelebi's interest in emerging early modern sciences is most evident in his massive geographical work *Cihannüma* (Displaying the World), which was motivated by his scientific curiosity to have up-to-date information on Europe and the new world.[31] In this unique work, Çelebi's approach to dealing with new geographical knowledge, as Hagen argues, brought innovative strategies to the Ottoman perception of science. Çelebi perceived geography as a scholarly pursuit that is different from the personal impressions or experiences of a traveller (including his own).[32] His engagement with geographical science aimed at changing the social function of geographical knowledge from being an educational and entertaining interest of the elite to a practical and popular understanding of the world.[33] Presented to Sultan Mehmed Khān IV (r. 1648-87), *Cihannüma* stands as an exemplary work displaying Çelebi's interest in the developments of Western sciences. In this work, a serious rift between scientific and religious modes of *ʿilm* begins to show. For example, with reference to the certainty of geographical knowledge, Çelebi explicitly argues that the earth is round in the shape of a globe, and not flat, as reported in a popular prophetic Hadith widely acknowledged at the time.[34] Çelebi sees that the significance of geography lies in the way it enables people to learn about the world in a short span of time. Going through the pages of a geography book, as he puts it, saves more than 1000 years of travel. Scholars and statesmen, he asserts, should have accurate information of the world in order to guide their subjects wisely.[35]

Cihannüma was an ambitious project that pushed the limits of Çelebi's geographical knowledge. Admitting the incompleteness of information available in Asian sources, he interrupted his writing to consult Mercator's *Atlas Major,* which he interpreted with the help of a Christian convert named Sheikh Mehmed Ikhlāṣī Efendi (d. 1639). Çelebi resumed his work on *Cihannüma* in 1654, and included additions from *Atlas Major,* but was unable to complete the work due to his premature death in 1657.[36] Although unfinished, Çelebi's *Cihannüma* paved the way to a new geographical understanding in the Ottoman context. His ambitious project work was later completed by Ibrāhīm Müteferriqa, who published it in the first state-sponsored printing press of the Ottoman Empire, the Müteferriqa Press, which he established in 1732. At that time geography and astronomy were closely related sciences, and new discoveries in both fields were changing Ottoman understanding of the shape of the universe. In the original text of *Cihannüma,* Çelebi did not delve into Copernicus's new theory of heliocentrism; in his addition, Müteferriqa did. He presented Copernicus's heliocentrism as another school of thought along with Ptolemy's geocentrism. He acknowledged its validity cautiously as a point of view; however, he considered it wrong.[37] His cautiously dismissive attitude towards heliocentrism reflected the official Ottoman position on the new theory.

Generally, Ottoman scholars showed little or no interest in the new astronomy. The historian of science Ekmeleddin Ihsanoğlu suggests that Müteferriqa's expressed interest in heliocentrism might have been due to his Christian background and his awareness of the religious debates unfolding in Europe. Ihsanoğlu argues that Ottoman astronomers were capable of following the developments in Europe with short gaps in time, but that they chose not to because their interests were confined to practical matters, such as timekeeping and the cycles of the calendar.[38] The general apathy towards heliocentrism among Muslim scholars in the early modern period remained unexplained. Despite his attempt to undermine the religious view concerning the shape of the earth by arguing for its spherical form, Çelebi did not show much concern for heliocentrism in *Cihannüma*. There he kept his focus on technical and practical earthly matters.[39]

Against the wide scope of Çelebi's preoccupations with big intellectual and scientific issues, he reveals deep concerns with narrow socio-religious debates. New social habits that flourished among early modern Ottomans, such as smoking, coffee drinking, social outings, listening to music, and dancing, generated unsettling debates, which often resulted in violent confrontations. The 17th-century Ottoman approach to religion can be described, as Hagen suggests, as 'a return to piety' in the form of a purification of religious thoughts and practices. Hence, the issue of *bidʿa* (pl. *bidaʿ*, innovation in religion) was central to the negotiation and making of 17th-century religious sensibility. In this sensibility, *ʿilm* took on new moral and religious dimensions which can be seen in Çelebi's engagement with the raging controversies.

The concept of *bidʿa* includes, in principle, all innovations in, or unpresented changes to, religious thoughts and practices that occurred after the times of Prophet Muhammad and his companions. In dealing with this issue, Çelebi considered innovations to be of two kinds, good and bad (*bidʿat-i hasene* and *bidʿat-i seyyi'e*), and recognised the variation in moral positions on innovations among various groups in the society. At that time, new trends were becoming widely appreciated and accepted as social habits. Çelebi recognised the currency of these new social habits (good or bad, depending on one's point of view) and warned against futile attempts to ban them as they became deeply embedded in the Ottoman culture.[40]

Çelebi introduced a moral criterion based on human nature to determine the acceptability of new social practices: *mülāyemet ve münāferet* (harmony and contrast). *Mülāyemet* means being suitable for, or in harmony with, one's human nature, whereas *münāferet* means being against or in opposition to it. One kind of practice can lead to gentleness and positive social interaction, the other to agrivation and disgust. In his search for social and religious harmony, Çelebi articulated his position with reference to this polarity. On the issue of smoking, for example, he explains that the reason behind its ban in communal spaces, such as *madrasas* and mosques, is its discordance with human nature, a discordance which results in harmful effects. However, if a person is addicted to smoking, he adds, it would be harmful for this person to quit, as smoking ultimately becomes second nature. Thus he endeavours to show the difficulty of taking a categorical position (permissible/not permissible, *ḥalāl/ḥarām*) on such social habits, concluding that people should be left to make their own moral decisions concerning their choices.[41] The limits to this moral freedom, in his view, lie in the communal moral commitment to preserving the integrity and healthiness of the body and the soul. In contrast to his tolerant view on smoking, however, Çelebi's view on the use of opium for pleasure is strict. He supports its ban because it destroys human nature, and it is an Islamic attribute not to compromise the healthy primordial human

nature (*fiṭrat-i selīme*). Accordingly, per Çelebi, one should never accept an invitation to take up this addictive habit.[42]

Similarly, Çelebi argues that coffee might be useful for one person and harmful for another, depending on the disposition of their nature. Originating from Yemen, Çelebi writes that Sheikhs and Sufis alike consumed coffee with the conviction that it was appropriate for their religious training, mental alertness, and suppression of sensual desires. He provides a historical account of the consumption of coffee in the Ottoman Empire from its discovery until the opening of coffee houses around Istanbul. He has reservations about the wide spread of this new social culture, noting that coffee houses breed laziness and immorality among members of the public, which resulted in the closing down of these places and the final ban on the consumption of coffee during his time.[43]

Listening to music and religious dance were also two critical social phenomena that were hotly debated during Çelebi's time. In the first half of the 16th century, Taşköprülüzāde commented on the powerful effect of music on humans, noting its capacity to evoke different thoughts and emotions, both positive and negative. He explained the core reason behind the influence of music on humans as being the remembrance of heavenly tunes that coincided with the origination of the soul (*al-mabada' al-awwal*) in the act of creation. He interpreted the Pythagorean idea of the music of the spheres created by their ordered harmonious movements as a celestial expression of the reverence these objects pay to the creator, and believed that humans tend therefore, as a part of their inherent disposition, to admire and respond to order and harmony.[44] Çelebi reiterates Taşköprülüzāde's thoughts on music to emphasise its perennial significance but also argues that the ban on music according to the *sharīʿa* has sound rational grounds. According to him, every human being has a soul that is different from their ego. Virtuous people are those who are able to supress their ego: they tend to perceive music as a tool to recall the *al-mabada' al-awwal*. By contrast, for those who are unable to supress their ego, and whose ego dominates their soul, music can only provoke animal instincts and sensual pleasures. The impact of music on ears is similar to the impact of dance on sight, Çelebi adds. And for this reason, he finds the religious ban on dancing and music to be reasonable despite their popularity amongst the members of the upper class of Ottoman society.[45]

The Sufi practice of *samāʿ* as a coming together of music and dance, according to Çelebi, following Taşköprülüzāde, can be acceptable or banned depending on its effect on the heart. In the execution of *samāʿ* the appropriateness of time, space, and people is crucial. The *samāʿ* ritual should not interfere with people's daily chores; the space used should be calming and peaceful; and the *samāʿ* community should consist of religious folk.[46] Çelebi believes in the usefulness of *samāʿ* in the *zikr* (remembrance) ceremony of the Sufis. A Sufi Sheikh using *samāʿ* is like a doctor using poison as medicine to cure a patient, according to Çelebi; rhythmic body movements help organise thinking, while music helps organise the body movements. He concludes that the appropriateness of *samāʿ*, therefore, depends on its visible (*ẓāhir*) and invisible (*bāṭın*) motives.[47] Despite his sophisticated evaluation of music, dance, and *samāʿ* in the Ottoman context, Çelebi admits that debates for and against them would not come to an end, as their sensitive nature is open to immoral exploitation.

Visiting graveyards and tombs of saints is another innovation upon which Çelebi touches. As much as he warns about the danger of falling into polytheist inclinations (*shirk*), he believes that pantheism has its own degrees, and those who belong to lower levels may use the mediation of a saint in their prayers as long as they do not worship the mediator. He believes that, as the

relationship of the soul (*rūḥ*) with the body (*badan*) continues after death, according to Islam, there are signs of spirituality at the graves of the saints, and that praying at such places has more merit than praying elsewhere.[48] Çelebi continues his moderate attitude by adding that he dislikes the lowly attitude of people who expect curative remedies from graves. He adds that such people are open to exploitation, as some others make a living out of their weaknesses. He finally submits that the science of medicine is the only place to seek cure.[49]

Çelebi concludes his remarks on morality by stating that the principle of enjoining right and forbidding wrong is a necessity according to the followers of the *sunna*. However, he complains that in his period everyone tries to impose their opinions and moral criteria on others. As this has resulted in social divisions, endless debates, and violent confrontations, he suggests that it should be done only by knowledgeable people of religion, with the caution that Muslims should not disclose the faults of their religious fellows.[50]

CONCLUSION

In summary, Çelebi, through his open-mindedness and multifaceted works, represented the early modern enlightened Ottoman scholar, who recognised the healing merit and uniting power of *ʿilm* in a rapidly changing society witnessing serious religious divisions. He explored the scientific, religious, and moral dimensions of *ʿilm* and its agency in restoring peace, justice, and tolerance to Ottoman society. He saw himself as an enlightened individual capable of both inspiring social change and introducing better ways for restoring order in his society, through engagements with the various facets of *ʿilm*.[51] Oscillating between his heart and his mind, he recognised the merits of both religious and rational sciences as two complementary and necessary paths to truthful knowledge and social harmony.

NOTES

1 For the Arabic titles cited in the chapter, I have used the Arabic convention of transliteration. Other Ottoman-Turkish terms follow the convention of Ottoman-Turkish transliteration. This work appears in an epilogue entitled 'Utterance of the Blessing and a Couple of Advices' (*Nimete şükür ve bir kaç öğüt*). Kātip Çelebi, 2007, *Mizānü'l-Hakk fi İhtiyari'l-Ehakk*, trans. Orhan Şaik Gökyay and Süleyman Uludağ (Istanbul: Kabalci), 222. For all quotations from the Turkish text of *Mīzān al-ḥaqq*, I used the most recent (2007) critical edition.

2 I made slight changes to Geoffrey Lewis's English translation based on the 2007 critical edition. Çelebi, 2007, 222; and Geoffrey Lewis, 1957, *The Balance of Truth* (London: Allen and Unwin), 145-6.

3 *'Çünkü uçmak için iki kanat lazımdır, bir kanatla menzil alınmaz. Aklī ve şer'ī ilimler iki kanat mesabesindedir.*' Çelebi, 2007, 229-30.

4 This view is first purported by the early republican Turkish historian Adnan Adıvar (2000) in his *Osmanlı Türk'lerinde İlim* (Istanbul: Remzi).

5 In Ottoman Turkish the word '*çelebi*' meant a person of letters, a courteous and civilised person; see *Osmanlice Turkce Sozluk*, 2017, <http://www.osmanlicaturkce.com/?k=çelebi&t=%40>, accessed 23 January 2017.

6 Gottfried Hagen, 2007, 'Kātip Çelebi: Mustafa b. Abdullāh, Hācı Halīfe (b.1609; d. 1657)', *Historians of the Ottoman Empire*, <https://ottomanhistorians.uchicago.edu/en/historian/katib-celebi>, accessed 25 January 2017.

7 Adıvar, 2000, 138.

8 'Parts of his library were sold in 1069, presumably after the death of his wife. Several volumes were purchased by Levinus Warner and today constitute a part of the Legatum Warnerianum at Leiden Library.' Hagen, 2007.

9 *Mīzān al-Ḥaqq* embodies an autobiographical section in which Çelebi narrates important events of his life in the third person: '[Y]ek fenle kanaate ulüv-i himmet rıza vermemişti'. Çelebi, 2007, 127.

10 Karen Barkey, 1994, *Bandits and Bureaucrats: The Ottoman Route to State Centralisation* (New York: Cornell University Press), 48.

11 Gottfried Hagen, 2004, 'Afterword: Ottoman Understandings of the World in the Seventeenth Century', in Robert Dankoff, ed., *An Ottoman Mentality: The World of Evliya Çelebi* (Leiden: Brill), 237-8.

12 See Mustafa Na'īmā, 1967, *Tārīḫ-i Na'īmā* (Naima Tarihi), ed. Zuhuri Danisman (Istanbul: Zuhuri Danisman Yayinevi).

13 Cornell Fleischer, 1983, 'Royal Authority, Dynastic Cyclism and "Ibn Khaldunism" in Sixteenth-Century Ottoman Letters', *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 18: 198-220.

14 Hagen, 2004, 253-4.

15 Hagen, 2004, 254.

16 Virginia H Aksan and Daniel Goffman, 2007, 'Introduction: Situating the Early Modern Ottoman World', in Virginia Aksan and Daniel Goffman, eds., *The Early Modern Ottomans: Remapping The Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 6-12.

17 Aksan and Goffman, 2007.

18 See Rifa'at Ali Abou-El-Haj, 1992, *Formation of the Modern State: Ottoman Empire from the 16th to 18th Century* (Albany: SUNY).

19 *Jihannüma* is his most widely translated work. See Joseph von Hammer, 1812, *Rumeli und Bosna Geographisch Beschrieben von Mustafa Ben Abdalla Hadschi Chalfa* (Vienna: Kunst- und Industrie-Comptoirs); M Norberg, 1818, *Gihan Numah. Geographia orientalis ex Turcico in Latinum versa* (Göteborg: Londini Gothorum, literis Berlingianis); Jean-Louis Bacqué-Grammont, 1996, 'Les routes d'Asie centrale d'après le Cihān-Numā de Kātib Çelebi', *Cahier d'Asie Centrale* 1(2): 311-22; and Jean-Louis Bacqué-Grammont, 1997, 'La description de Chypre dans le Cihān-nümā de Kātib Çelebi', *Epetērida tou Kentrou Epistēmonikon Erevnōn* 23: 189-214.

20 Adıvar, 2000, 151; Hagen, 2007.

21 The translations provided here and below are based on Gökyay and Uludağ's work (Çelebi, 2007, 145), with minor modifications. The original Turkish reads: 'Ta yaratılışın başlangıcından bu yana, ilim erbabı arasında akıl ile naklin ikiz, akla uygun olan naklin rahvan bir at olduğu herkesçe müsellemdir. Lakin zirvesine çıkmak icin delil ve burhan mesleği bir merdiven ve basamak olarak, bahs ve nazar, araştırma ve inceleme vadilerinde cumhur ona dayanmış ve her hususta ona başvurmuştur'.

22 'Onun için muhakkik olan alimlerin coğu bu ilmin farz oldugu kanaatine varmışlardır.' Çelebi, 2007, 147.

23 Çelebi, 2007, 224.

24 Madeline C Zilfi, 1986, 'The Kadızādelis: Discordant Revivalism in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 45(4): 252-5.

25 'Here I translated "eşyanın hakikatine dair olan ilim [science concerning the truth of things]" as "natural sciences"'. Çelebi, 2007, 150.

26 His attitude in the introduction towards ignorant people of high rank (who are opposed to the rational sciences) is very harsh: he compares them to asses or cows, as both lack the capacity to think and speculate. Çelebi, 2007, 150, 152.

27 '*Qalb*' in Turkish is spelt as '*kalp*'. '*Aql*' in Turkish is spelt as '*akıl*'.

28 Al-Ghazālī, 2010, *Kītāb Sharḥ 'ajā'ib al-qalb* (The Marvels of the Heart), trans. Walter James Skellie (Louisville: Vons Vitae), 57-62. Al-Ghazālī was among the scholars Kātip Çelebi regarded highly and frequently quoted in his works. To illustrate, Ghazzali's *T'Tahāfut al-falāsifa* is one of Çelebi's major sources in *Mīzān.* Çelebi, 2007, 148-9.

29 Hagen notes that Celebi certainly knew prominent Western and Ottoman intellectuals of his time such as Antoine Galland (d. 1715), Ferdinando Marsili (d. 1730), Levinus Warner (d. 1665) and historian Hüseyin Hezārfenn (d. 1691). He further writes that 'K.Ç. shows great sympathy for political figures associated with attempts at political reform … He knew Kemānkeş Qara Mustafā Paşa (executed in 1644) and expressed sympathy for Tarhūncu Ahmed Paşa (d. 1653). *Mīzān* includes a cryptic homage to Köprülü Mehmed Paşa (d. 1661)'. Kātip Çelebi, 2007, 225; Hagen, 2007.

30 Çelebi, 2007, 132-3.
31 During the first Ottoman campaign to Crete Island (1646), Çelebi developed an interest in map-making by marking land and sea. Several following campaigns to conquer the island as well as the competition with the Venetian rivals also prompted Çelebi to rethink Ottoman naval strategies and their geographical knowledge of the seas. Çelebi, 2007, 226.
32 Hagen, 2004, 227-9.
33 Hagen, 2004, 230-1. His translations from Western geographers in this regard were a matter of concern for Westerners: Venetian colleagues worried that Ottomans could use geographical information against them in their efforts towards state expansion.
34 This Hadith was attributed to Prophet Muhammad's companion, Ibn Abbas, who stated that the earth was flat, resting on the horns of an ox. Çelebi argues that the 'ox' should in fact be understood as the zodiacal sign of Taurus and contests its contemporary literal interpretations without dismissing the Hadith itself. See Kātip Çelebi, 2013, *Kitāb-ı Cihannüma* (Displaying the World), ed. Fuat Sezgin (Istanbul: Boyut Yayınları).
35 Çelebi, 2013, 16.
36 Adıvar, 2000, 144-5.
37 Çelebi, 2013, 34-45. Müteferriqa took a neutral stance against all models and mentioned that Ptolemy's proposal had been accepted widely by Muslim scholars in the past. He perceived models of the universe as a convention depicted by concentric circles; putting the Earth or the Sun in the centre, for him, was a matter of representation.
38 Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, 1992, 'Introduction of Western Science to the Ottoman World: A Case Study of Modern Astronomy (1660-1860)', in Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, ed., *The Transfer of Modern Science and Technology to the Muslim World* (Istanbul: Research Centre for Islamic History, Art, and Culture), 108.
39 Hagen, 2004, 229, 233.
40 Çelebi, 2007, 192.
41 Çelebi, 2007, 44.
42 Çelebi, 2007, 174-6.
43 Çelebi, 2007, 45, 46.
44 Taşköprülüzāde, 1975, *Mevzuat'ül-Ulüm* (Istanbul: Er-tu), 304.
45 Çelebi, 2007, 31.
46 Taṣköprülü-zāde, 1975, 1187.
47 Çelebi, 2007, 31.
48 Çelebi, 2007, 194-5.
49 Çelebi, 2007, 196.
50 Çelebi, 2007, 202-3.
51 I agree with Gottfried Hagen and Ethan L Menchinger (2014, 'Ottoman Historical Thought', in Prasenjit Duara et al., eds., *A Companion to Global Historical Thought,* New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 98) that '*adālet*' means more than justice and can only be translated insufficiently into English: '*[A]dālet* means both the moderation of personal temper and the administration principle of balancing the different social classes in a permanent equilibrium'.