Portre ve Otoportre: İbrahim Müteferrika’nın Akl Oyunları
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Öz ■ Bu makalede, Osmanlı kültür tarihinde ilk Türk matbaasını kurucu olarak ün kazanmış olan bir aynı ele alınmaktadır. Söz konusu kişi Macar asılı bir Protestan (iddialara göre Üniteryen) olup, 18. yüzyılın sonlarına dek Edirne’ye sigınıp, daha sonra ihtida edip İbrahim Müteferrika adını alarak Müslüman-Osmanlı kimliğini benimsemistir. Çalışmada, İbrahim Müteferrika ile ilgili günümüze ulaşan az sayıdaki anlatıldardan aktarılanlarla yetinilmemiş, Müteferrika’nın portresi ve otoportresi, Osmanlı olmadan önceki kimliğine dair önemli hususlar hakkında bize ipuçları veren Edirne sonrası hayatından hareketle çizmiştir. Müteferrika’nın hayatı hakkında bilgi veren sadece üç anlatılı bilinmektedir: Müteferrika’nın kendi yazdığı hayat hikâyesi, Müteferrika’nın çağdaşı César de Saussure’ün ve Charles Peyssonnel’in kaleme aldığı mektup ve raporlar. Bununla birlikte, gerek Saussure ve Peyssonnel tarafından çizilen portreler, gerek Müteferrika’nın çizdiği otoportre, bu portrelerde beliren farklı imgelerin karşılıklı olarak oldukça faydalıdır. Söz konusu üç anlatıdan hareketle Müteferrika’nın tam olarak ne zaman ihtida ettiği, Müslüman olmadan önce hangi Hristiyan mezhebine bağlı olduğunu ve kendi isteğiyle mi, yoksa içinde bulunduğu olumsuz şartlardan dolayı mı Müslüman olduğunu gibi gizem meseleleri hakkında yeni ve iddialı yorumlar yapılmıştır. Müteferrika’nın, ihtidasıyla ilgili gerçekleri gizemli bir hale getirerek yeni konumuna daha uygun düşen, yani yeni hükümardarına yararınmak için gerçekekteki farklı, düzmece bir otoportre çizmiş olduğu düşünülebilir.
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I remember clearly from my childhood a scene of a Bulgarian television series released in the early 1980s and devoted to the prominent Bulgarian revolutionary
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Kapitan (Captain) Petko Voyvoda (1844–1900) who fought for the liberation of Thrace and the Rhodopes from Ottoman rule. In the scene in question Ottoman soldiers tried to reveal the identity of a Bulgarian man disguised as Muslim by pulling his pants down to see if he was circumcised. The scene, invented or not, could be considered plausible and illustrates some important components of a particular identity, on the one hand, and how this identity was confirmed or Disconfirmed, on the other. In this case the identity issue operated within the dichotomy between Christian/uncircumcised-Muslim/circumcised opposition. Yet, this “identity test” was only applicable for male identities. In other contexts there are, for sure, other features that contribute to the formation and verification of identity. In the Ottoman context there were numerous identities, and some of them have been extensively studied during the last decade or so. However, defining of collective Ottoman identity, if such a thing can be posed for the 18th century, implies the existence of collective non-Ottoman identity/identities that could be contrasted with a collective Ottoman identity as a distinct, specific, unique and, above all, homogeneous entity. Yet, if such a category existed before the idea of Ottoman citizenship evolved as “a common political identity” (in Kemal Karpat’s words) in the late 19th century, then further studies are needed to reveal what constituted an assumed pre-19th-century Ottoman identity, to what extent it was constant.


Recently some authors have argued that, besides Turkishness and Islam, the concept of Rum, i.e. the claim of the Ottoman dynasty/state that it inherited the Eastern Roman Empire, is hitherto ignored aspect of Ottoman identity. See: Salih Özbaran, Bir Osmanlı Kimliği: 14.–17. Yüzyıllarda Rum/Rumi Aidiyet ve İmgele (İstanbul: Kitap
or modified over time, and whether it was conscious or subconscious. A recent publication, concerning an early 18th-century female Ottoman subject, raises the question of personal identity and identification. The publication reveals a court case dating from May 1700, in which the kadi of Adana had to clarify the real identity of a certain Ayşe Hatun, whose second husband, after divorcing her, sold her as a slave. Ayşe Hatun was resold as a slave twice before she managed to be set free by pretending to be Fatma Hatun, the late wife of the then governor (vali) of Adana. The real identity of the poor impostor Ayşe/Fatma Hatun was confirmed through her own confession and the testimony of 136 (sic) witnesses. This case is a good illustration of how a given person could be forced by unfavorable circumstances to change or forge her identity. It also demonstrates that identity is a matter of dichotomy and confirmation. That is, one’s identity is a combination of two simultaneous processes of self-identification and identification by the others. These two identifications sometimes converge, sometimes they don’t. Furthermore one’s self-portrait/portraits and the portraits drawn by the others could be the same as well as totally different.

The current paper will deal with an intellectual who became famous in Ottoman cultural history as the founder of the first Ottoman-Turkish printing house (1726). He was a Hungarian-born Protestant (allegedly Unitarian), who left his homeland Transylvania in the late 17th century, took refuge in the Ottoman Empire and converted to Islam, gaining a new Ottoman and Muslim identity under the name Ibrahim Müteferrika. I intend to reveal Müteferrika’s portrait and self-portrait by dwelling not only on the few available narratives dealing with it, but also on those aspects of Müteferrika’s post-Transylvanian activities in which one could see some important idiosyncrasies of his pre-Ottoman identity. The narratives provide a basis for different and even controversial interpretations of the following more or less unclear issues: how did Müteferrika exactly become an Ottoman subject; what was his religious affiliation before his conversion to Islam; and how did he convert to Islam: of his own free will or under the pressure of unfavorable circumstances?

My main hypothesis is that Müteferrika himself created likely a much more favorable self-image through mystifying the circumstances that led to his conversion. This story could serve also as an act of servility before his new Muslim rulers. In other words, one could assume that Müteferrika had created an alternative and fictitious self-portrait, which seems to have been much more accepted than the real one.

Ibrahim Müteferrika’s Ottoman Adventure

In the late 1680s the Ottoman protection of Transylvania was terminated when it was occupied by Austrian troops. Later, in the early 1690s the local Hungarian notables led by Imre Thököly, in alliance with the Ottoman army, unsuccessfully tried to restore the independence of the Transylvanian principality. During the turmoil of the Hungarian revolt a young Hungarian-born Protestant whose original name was unknown went through the major shift of his life. He left his native Kolozsvár (today’s Cluj-Napoca), took refuge in the Ottoman Empire and converted to Islam, gaining a new Ottoman and Muslim identity under the name Ibrahim Müteferrika. This is what we know as fact about the origin of this man, who enjoyed a diplomatic career at the Ottoman court, but what made his name memorable even far away from the Ottoman borders was his activity as the first Ottoman Muslim printer. Unknown are Ibrahim Müteferrika’s original name, social background, post-graduate activities, his behavior during Imre Thököly’s revolt, as well as the way of his becoming an Ottoman subject and conversion to Islam. This is due to the lack of documentary or narrative evidence dating from his pre-Ottoman period or from the years of the above-mentioned turmoil. Even so, it is possible to get some general notion about Müteferrika’s portrait as a youth because a certain part of his pre-Ottoman identity was still visible in his post-Transylvanian personality. For the time being, three narratives revealing Müteferrika’s pre-Ottoman period are known, namely those of Müteferrika’s contemporaries César de Saussure and Charles Peyssonnel, as well as of Müteferrika himself, all from his Ottoman period. Given this peculiarity one should be careful in judging their reliability. As it will be seen below, despite their ultimate truth claims some of these narratives could be considered later interpretations, and need to be used with caution. Even so, the very fact that we have Saussure’s and Peyssonnel’s portraits, on the one hand, and Müteferrika’s self-portrait, on the other, allows a critical cross-examination of the emerging images.

César de Saussure, who was a Hungarian nobleman, met Müteferrika on Ottoman soil, when the former followed Prince Ferenc Rákóczi during his exile to the
Ottoman Empire from 1717 onwards, and the latter was appointed liaison officer to the prince on behalf of the Ottoman government. The two compatriots must have become at least good acquaintances and Saussure’s narration of Müteferrika’s life, provided in a letter, written in French on 21 February 1732 and addressed to a Swiss friend, claims to be as trustworthy as possible. Saussure’s account reads as follows:

He was an 18-20-year old young Hungarian who had studied to become a Calvinist minister one day. Due to unhappy concurrence of circumstances the Turks enslaved him in 1692 or 1693 during the war led by Thököly. He happened to live quite long a time in the house of a hard-hearted and cruel master and became a Muslim since he was unable to submit himself to the fate as a slave anymore Ibrahim, this is the name he took, was smart and clever; he spent many years in learning the language and the law of the Turks, making huge progress and becoming a capable effendi. He was lucky to get to know the Grand Vizier Ibrahim Pasha, who was later killed during the 1730 revolt that led Mahmud I to the throne. This vizier had successfully used Ibrahim Effendi in various state affairs. [Ibrahim Effendi] had soon displayed his great and manifold talent and intimated his desire to introduce the arts and sciences to the Turks. To this end he had suggested to set up a printing shop in Constantinople… Müteferrika himself provides autobiographical notes in an untitled treatise written in 1710, that is, after he had already spent nearly twenty years in an Ottoman/Muslim milieu. Scholars are convinced that that unique manuscript, which is, in fact, not only untitled, but also unsigned, is Müteferrika’s autograph, and entitle it conditionally Treatise on Islam (Risâle-i İslâmiye) since it defends the doctrine of Islam

---

5 Coloman de Thály, ed., Lettres de Turquie (1730–1739) et Notices (1740) de César de Saussure (Budapest, 1909), 93–4 (Un jeune Hongrois âgé de 18 à 20 ans, qui avait fait ses études pour un jour Ministre Calviniste eut le malheur être pris et fait esclavagé par les Turcs en 1692 ou 1693 dans la guerre de Tököly. Il traina pendant longtemps une vie assez misérable, étant tombé entre les mains d’un Maître dur et cruel, jusqu’à ce que ne pouvant plus supporter la servitude, il se fit Musulman. Ibrahim, c’est le nom qu’il prit, ayant de l’esprit et du génie ; il s’appliqua pendant plusieurs années à l’étude de la langue et de la Loi Turque ; il y fit de si grands progrès qu’il devint un habile Effendi. Il eut le bonheur de se faire connaître d’Ibrahim Pacha Grand Vizir qui fut étranglé en 1730 à l’occasion de la Rébellion qui mit sur le trône Mahmoud I. Ce Vizir employa avec succès en différentes affaires Ibrahim Effendi, qui connut bientôt le grand et vaste génie du premier Ministre, et le désir qu’il avait d’introduire parmi les Turcs les Arts et les Sciences. Pour cet effet, il lui proposa d’établir à Constantinople une Imprimerie. Le Vizir approuva son dessein, lui donna charge de l’exécuteur, et lui fit les avances nécessaires pour cela.)
and criticizes strongly the Papacy and its doctrine. In this treatise Müteferrika provides autobiographical details, which differ from Saussure’s version. Müteferrika notes that he was born in the Transylvanian town of Kolozsvár, and that since his childhood he had been learning the contents and the interpretations of the Torah, the Psalms of David, and the New Testament. However, when he graduated and became competent in preaching, he had to read and explore the Torah secretly since his lecturers banned its study. Müteferrika claims that in the course of this exploration he had come across a line, predicting Mohamed’s prophecy, and thus he had clearly seen that Islam is the right faith. Then he had gone to his former lecturers, with the Old and the New Testament in hand, and argued with them about their doctrinal teachings. In other words, Müteferrika claims that soon after his graduation from the college and certainly before his passage to Ottoman milieu he had found himself inclined to believe in Mohamed’s prophecy rather than in Christian doctrine. However, he is completely silent in his treatise about when and how he had become an Ottoman subject and an educated Muslim. Saussure’s narrative, therefore, remains the only source that the scholars used for the story of his conversion. The Hungarian Catholic priest Imre Karácson was the first interpreter of the Saussure and Müteferrika texts. He tried to make the accounts more comprehensible by filling in the gaps with allegedly outright inventions. Karácson’s version of Müteferrika’s biography is as follows: Müteferrika was born in 1674 in Kolozsvár in a poor Calvinist Hungarian family; when he was eighteen-year old, during the Thököly revolt of 1690–91, he was captured by Turkish soldiers who held him to ransom; since their hopes failed they took him to Istanbul and sold him at the slave market.

In an extensive article the Turkish scholar Niyazi Berkes criticizes strongly both Saussure and Karácson. According to Berkes, the incomprehensibility of Saussure’s account speaks in itself that he either did not know Müteferrika well enough or presumably intentionally failed to reveal the whole truth about Müteferrika’s past. As for Karácson, Berkes stresses that his writing is often accepted uncritically by other scholars, and reveals Karácson’s intentional

---

inventions. Berkes questions the claim that Müteferrika had been captured by Turkish soldiers and reminds that Imre Thököly's revolt against the Habsburgs was supported by the Ottoman Empire. Instead Berkes supposes that Müteferrika had been taken captive by the Ottomans not as their enemy, but as one of Thököly's supporters who needed protection after the revolt was suppressed by the Austrians. In 1687 the Habsburgs occupied Transylvania and favored Catholicism at the expense of the Protestant denominations. According to Berkes, Müteferrika's claims that his former lecturers banned the study of the Old Testament at his college are plausible under these circumstances. Yet Berkes assumes that Müteferrika had studied at a Unitarian college and that the so-called Treatise on Islam reveals that his author had been not simply Protestant, but Unitarian, although Müteferrika himself does not specify his pre-Muslim religious affiliation. Berkes suggests that like many other Unitarians, who escaped the persecutions of Counter-Reformation through converting to Islam, Müteferrika, too, had converted to Islam of his own free will. In his monograph on the Development of Secularism in Turkey Berkes repeats once again that Saussure's accounts of Müteferrika's biography could not be considered trustworthy. Yet, according to Berkes, Saussure deliberately invented the story of Müteferrika's capture in order to excuse his compatriot's apostasy. Berkes holds the same opinion in other works as well.

10 In another article Berkes draws attention to an Ottoman document from July 1690 published in: Ahmet Refik, Türk Hizmetinde Kral Tököli İmre, 1683–1705 (İstanbul: Muallim Ahmed Halit Kütüphanesi, 1932), 13–4. According to it the Ottoman authorities gave a mill on the river Mures in Transylvania into possession of a certain Ibrahim, who was a scribe in service of Imre Thököly. The latter himself asked his Ottoman ally to do so because of Ibrahim’s numerous services rendered to him. Berkes suggests that the said scribe could be associated with Ibrahim Müteferrika; see Niyażi Berkes, “104 Sayılı Belleten’de Çıkan “İlk Türk Matbaası Kurucusunun Dinî ve Fikri Kimliği” Adlı Yazı İçin Bir Not,” Belleten 28/109 (1964): 183.


Berkes’s suggestions, especially about Müteferrika’s Unitarianism, had great influence over later studies on Müteferrika. Some scholars, however, do not share Berkes’s assumption that Müteferrika’s conversion was of his own will, and not under the pressure of unfavorable circumstances. A. D. Zheltyakov, for instance, considers Berkes’s assumption plausible, but yet unproven. A. H. Halidov rejects firmly Berkes’s claims and holds the opinion that Saussure’s account is trustworthy. The Hungarian scholar Lajos Hopp also prefers Saussure’s version at the expense of Berkes’s assumption.

Müteferrika’s affiliation to Unitarianism seems to be confirmed by a German newspaper, Neue Zeitungen für Gelehrten Sachen (Leipzig), a source unknown to Berkes and only recently revealed by Kemal Beydilli. On 31 July 1727 the newspaper informs us that the convert who is running the press in Istanbul was formerly a Transylvanian Socinian or Unitarian. Another German source, dating from the 1750s and providing an engraving depicting the Müteferrika press in 1728,

---


18 Hopp, “İbâhîm Müteferrika (1674/75?–1746). Fondateur de l’imprimerie turque”.

also points out that the press was run by a Socinian, Jacobin from Transylvania (Siebenbürgen). Socinianism, a Nontrinitarian (in other words, Unitarian) doctrine which was developed in Poland in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, was embraced also by the Unitarian Church of Transylvania. Gérald Duverdier has published a source dating from 1738, which could also serve as an evidence about Müteferrika’s Unitarian past. It is a report written by Charles de Peyssonnel, who was assigned French liaison officer to the Ottoman Grand Vizier during the 1737–39 war of the Ottomans (supported by France) against Austria and Russia. The report, released after Berkes’s claims, portrays Ibrahim Müteferrika as follows: “On the other side my neighbor is Ibrahim Effendi. You probably know him, he is the founder of the Turkish printing press, Hungarian by nationality, formerly a [unitarian] minister, [and] now [he is] Turkish. He is a very good man and I don’t know how he changed religion. He is the spirit of the project, hardworking rather than skillful. He has retained some ability to speak Latin, therefore I conversate with him without an interpeter.”

It is uncertain whether the brackets, specifying Müteferrika’s pre-Muslim denomination, had been put by Charles de Peyssonnel himself or by Gérald Duverdier, who refers to Berkes’s 1962 publication in Belleten as “an essential article that explains Ibrahim’s openmindedness by his Unitarian training.”

20 Here “Jacobin” might refer to Ibrahim Müteferrika’s support to Thököly’s revolt by analogy of the Jacobite revolts in Great Britain in the late seventeenth and the first half of the eighteenth century that aimed to restore the rule of the Stuart king James II of England and his heirs.


24 Duverdier, “Savary de Brèves et Ibrahim Müteferrika”, 358, footnote 49. I had some discussions with Baki Tezcan (University of California, Davis) on this issue sparked by a draft paper of him questioning Berkes’s thesis. According to Tezcan the brackets in question were put by Duverdier; Baki Tezcan, “İbrahim Müteferrika ve Risâle-i İslâmiyye”, Kitaplara Vakfedilmiş Bir Ömre Tuhfe: İsmail E. Erünsal’a Armağan, eds. Hatice Aynur, Bilgin Aydın, and Mustafa Birol Ülker (İstanbul: Ülke Yayınları, 2014), 454-6.
Peyssonnel’s report suggests that during these conversations Müteferrika had probably revealed his pre-Muslim denomination, but not the reason of his conversion to Islam. This is rather suspicious a reminder of what he wrote and passed over in silence in his Treatise on Islam: a lot is written against Papacy, but nothing about the circumstances that made him change religion. One could think that he was deliberately abstaining from revealing the mystery of the major shift of his life!

Yet Müteferrika’s Treatise on Islam creates no impression that the change of faith and destiny was dramatic for him. There are several possible explanations of that. Firstly, it could be indeed a change of his free will. As a Unitarian/Socinian he probably was not hopeful about his Transylvanian future, although the Habsburgs promised freedom for all the existing denominations, and preferred to become an Ottoman subject and Muslim. Secondly, if Saussure’s account is correct, the period comprising twenty years between the early 1690s, when Müteferrika was allegedly captured, and 1710, when he wrote the treatise, supposedly alleviated the drama/trauma of his eventually unwilled conversion. And thirdly, Müteferrika himself maybe created a much more favorable self-image through mystifying the circumstances that led to his conversion. If Saussure’s interpretation is correct, Müteferrika’s claims in 1710 that he had believed in Mohammed’s prophecy while still living in Kolozsvár could be eventually considered an attempt to present his conversion in a favorable light as an act, which was not caused by prosaic reasons to improve the conditions of his life, but prepared on mental level before the early 1690s. This story could also express his servility before his new Muslim rulers. In other words, Müteferrika probably created an alternative and fictitious self-portrait, which is much more convenient than the real one. As Tijana Krstić plausibly claims, he saw this treatise as a “convenient means to jumpstart” his career as a müteferrika25 since only one copy of it survived, a fact that leaves the impression that the treatise was written for the sultan’s eyes only.26

25 Müteferrika was the name of a corps at the Ottoman court, whose members were especially attached to the person of the sultan and used for special missions. See Gustav Bayerle, Pashas, Begs, and Effendis: A Historical Dictionary of Titles and Terms in the Ottoman Empire (Istanbul: ISIS Press, 1997), 116–7.

Müteferrika’s *Treatise on Islam* confirms that as an “educated border crosser”, in Suraiya Faroqhi’s words,27 his adaptation to the new milieu was quite successful. This adaptation, however, did not mean breaking with his pre-Ottoman and pre-Muslim past. The very fact that after twenty years of his conversion to Islam he wrote a treatise dealing with dogmatic issues concerning the Holy Trinity is quite indicative of his intellectual portrait as a man who continued to commit himself to such issues, although in a framework considering Islam a superior religion. In his *Treatise on Islam* Müteferrika appears to have a claim on being a rigid Muslim. Some accounts, however, reveal him as not a very strict observer of the Muslim dogmas and who did not abandon some non-Muslim habits such as wine-drinking, for instance. In a report of 1737, Jean-Raymond Delaria, who was interpreter at the French embassy in Constantinople, relates that Müteferrika did not observe strictly all Islamic rules, despite his conversion, and that wine made talks with him more cordial.28 A connection with Müteferrika’s pre-Ottoman and pre-Muslim life could be found in some claims that he was one of the first Ottoman freemasons. Although hitherto almost completely neglected in the historiography on Müteferrika, such claims reveal at least another possible nuance of his portrait. Only recently did the Turkish author Orhan Erdenen quote the assertions of some prominent 20th-century Turkish freemasons like İlhami Soysal that Müteferrika was connected with the Ottoman branch of freemasonry.29 According to Soysal, after the establishment of the first lodge in London in 1717 and the approval of its statutes in 1723, a French lodge was established in Constantinople, Müteferrika being among those pro-western Ottoman dignitaries who joined it.30 As a matter of fact, Soysal’s claims are entirely based on earlier assertions made by Kemalettin Apak, another prominent 20th-century Turkish freemason.31 Apak, however, does not provide any evidence in support of his claims. Thierry Zarcone’s careful studies on Ottoman freemasonry show that the first Ottoman lodges were established in 1738 in Smyrna and Aleppo. The earliest evidences about such lodges in Constantinople are dating from 1748, that is, one year after Müteferrika’s death. As for Müteferrika’s alleged freemasonry Zarcone makes no

further references except for Apak’s book. In this respect there is no evidence that Müteferrika was a freemason. However, it is not impossible at all, especially in the light of Müteferrika’s pre-Ottoman Protestant past. In contrast to Catholicism, freemasonry was much more tolerant toward Protestantism and considered it just “semi-masonry”.

Despite Müteferrika’s disputable freemasonry, it is obvious that conversion did not delete completely his former identity. Rather, conversion brought to him a co-existence of two identities: a former pre-Ottoman and pre-Muslim identity and a new Ottoman and Muslim one. Müteferrika’s intellectual portrait was certainly a symbiosis of his former Protestantism and subsequent Islamic proselytism. As a matter of fact, such a cultural and psychological dichotomy is normal for the converts, and especially for the educated ones. Due to such a cultural dichotomy Müteferrika was able to be, in Gérald Duverdier’s words, a “smuggler of ideas” (passeur d’idées). In other words, Müteferrika remained a person connected on equal level with two worlds and two cultural contexts, doing his best in contributing to the new Ottoman context his pre-Ottoman mental furniture and cultural luggage.

In this respect, printing was his main contribution to Ottoman culture. His attempts at printing on Ottoman soil were quite persistent, but it is still unclear whether he was indeed proficient in printing. Here comes to mind again his pre-Ottoman past in Transylvania where he was certainly accustomed with printed books and probably had some experience in the printing process itself. T. Halasi Kun suggests that Müteferrika must have known the famous Transylvanian printer and punch-cutter Nicholas (Miklós) Kis (1650–1702). In the 1680s Kis was in-


33 Jose Maria Ceardenal and Caro Y. Rodriguez, Tarih Boyunca Masonluk (İstanbul: Kayhan Yayımları, 1999), 230–1.


36 Kun, “İbrahim Müteferrika,” 898.
volved in printing activities in Amsterdam, but in 1689 he came back to Kolozsvár and revived the local Protestant printing.\(^{37}\) In that year Müteferrika was still there and may easily have been one of Kis’s apprentices. Müteferrika himself was not proficient in punch-cutting because for his printing house in Constantinople he resorted to the help of a local experienced Jewish punch-cutter. The above-quoted report by Peyssonel claims that the spirit of the printing project, Müteferrika, was “hardworking rather than skillful.” However, Müteferrika must have been more or less inexperienced in printing technology at all with regard to his being quite keen on printing on Ottoman soil. At his printing shop, which was officially set up in 1727, Müteferrika printed four separate maps during the period 1719–29 and eighteen titles in sixteen books of twenty two volumes between 1729 and 1742. Müteferrika inclined to print books dealing with history, geography, and physics and this inclination had much to do with his western and Protestant educational and ideological background. In the 17th and 18th century history, geography, and natural philosophy became an important part of the curriculum of western universities.\(^{38}\) Müteferrika’s Protestant background is visible not only in his printing efforts, but also in his intellectual activities as a writer and translator of works on specific historical, astronomical, physical, military and dogmatic issues. In the above-mentioned Treatise on Islam he discusses at length the Holy Trinity, a topic of fiery controversy between the Catholic and Orthodox Church authorities, as well as other Christian denominations, on the one hand, and between Christian and Muslim theologians, on the other. Müteferrika also wrote a short but very influential treatise suggesting to the Ottoman authorities the virtue of pro-European military reforms. He printed this treatise in his printing house in 1732 under the title Reasonable Principles of Public Order (Usülü’l-Hikem fi Nizāmi’l-Ūmem). In the same year he printed another treatise on magnetism Features of the Magnets (Füyūzāt-ı Msknāttsiyye), translated and compiled by him on the basis of European books on the subject. On the order of the sultan in 1733 he translated Andreas Cellarius’s astronomical work Atlas Coelestis under the title Collection of Old and New Astronomy (Mecmû’a-i Hey’etü’l-Kadime ve’l-Cedide). This translation, however, was not printed. In 1729 Müteferrika printed his own translation of Juda Tedeusz


Krusiński’s account of Iranian history, written in Latin under the title *Traveler’s History About the Appearance of the Afghans and the Reasons for the Decline of the State of the Safavi Shahs* (*Tārīh-i Seyyāh der Beyân-i Zuhûr-i Aḡvâniyân ve Sebeb-i İndîhâm-i Bînâ-i Devel-i Şâhân-i Safeviyân*). Müteferrika also edited all the texts he printed, sometimes doing his own interpolations, most significantly those titled *Printer’s Addition (Tezyilü’t-Tâbi‘)* in Kâtib Çelebi’s famous geographical work *Mirror of the World (Cihânnûmâ)*, printed in 1732. Some scholars suggest that Müteferrika was the author of another proposal for military reforms, dating from the reign of sultan Ahmed III (1703–30).\(^3^9\) All the translations Müteferrika made were from Latin into Ottoman-Turkish. Thus, during the Ottoman period of his life he successfully and effectively made use of his pre-Ottoman proficiency in the Latin language. What Müteferrika brought from Transylvania to Constantinople was not only his mental furniture and proficiency in printing, but also probably a set of books. Among the goods listed in the probate inventory prepared soon after his death in the beginning of 1747,\(^4^0\) there are 36 Latin books, almost half of which dealing with geography, and the rest ones with geometry, astronomy, astrology, philosophy, logics, medicine, military issues, as well as grammar books, dictionaries and the Old and New Testament. It is difficult to speculate which of these books had been brought directly from Transylvania or in a broader sense Europe, and which ones had been acquired later.

**Ibrahim Müteferrika’s Public Image**

A gallery of self-portraits and portraits of Ibrahim Müteferrika emerges from the names and attributes he preferred to use in his signatures, on the one hand, and the names and attributes, which the others used in order to designate him, on the other. In the colophon of all his prints he used the following signature: [Printed by] Ibrahim, [one] of the müteferrikas at the imperial court, who is in charge to print [books] at the printing shop in the beautiful city of Constantinople.\(^4^1\)

---


41 “… İbrahim min müteferrikân-i dergâh-i ‘âli el-me’mûr bi-‘amelû’t-tab‘ be-dârü’t- tibâ’ati’l-m’amûre fi beldêtü’t-tayyibeti’l-Kostantiniye …”
depiction of the celestial bodies and spheres after Ptolemy’s system, attached to the printed version of Kâtib Çelebi’s *Mirror of the World* (1732), is signed as follows: [Drawn] by the hand of the poor Ibrahim the Geographer, [one] of the müteferrikas at the imperial court.\(^{42}\)

An undated marginal note on the first page of a manuscript copy of Kâtib Çelebi’s *Chronological Calendar* (*Takvimü’t-Tevârih*) dated 1093/1682, which I was lucky to come across during my research at Firestone Library, Princeton University, in 2006,\(^{43}\) and consisting of 12 lines including the names of the provinces and states under Safavi rule, is signed by Ibrahim Müteferrika, a drawer and a geographer.\(^ {44}\)

A map of the Anatolian provinces İçil, Karaman, Anatolia and Sivas, attached to the printed version of Kâtib Çelebi’s *Mirror of the World*, is signed as follows: Drawn by Ibrahim of Tophane.\(^ {45}\) Fikret Sarcaoğlu assumes that the latter could be, in fact, Ibrahim Müteferrika.\(^ {46}\) This assumption seems quite plausible, especially in light of Ibrahim Müteferrika’s probate inventory, according to which after his death all the unsold copies of the books he printed were stocked in a place called Tophane in the vicinity of the Sultan Selim Mosque in Constantinople.

To summarize, by putting such signatures Ibrahim Müteferrika drew a self-portrait in which he described himself as a müteferrika, a printer, a geographer, and a drawer (or a map-maker). The official Ottoman authorities, however, considered him exclusively a müteferrika. Ahmed III (1703-1730)’s firman of 1139/1727, providing state permission for setting up a printing shop, names him “Ibrahim, one of the müteferrikas at my imperial court”.\(^ {47}\) In the payment bills given to Ibrahim Müteferrika while being appointed a liaison officer to Prince Ferenc Rákóczi and his suite, he is called Müteferrika Ibrahim or Müteferrika Ibrahim.

\(^{42}\) “… ‘Ala ıyedül-hak İbrâhîm el-Coğrafi ṁ müteferrikân-i dergâh-i ʿâli …” See *Kitâb-ı Cihânnümâ li-Kâtib Çelebi* (Kostantiniye, 1145/1732), between 25 and 26.

\(^{43}\) Princeton University, Firestone Library, Rare Books and Manuscripts Room, Robert Garrett Collection, 3033 T. I would like to express my gratitude to the Friends of the Princeton University Library Research Grants Committee for providing me a fellowship to conduct my research.

\(^{44}\) “İbrâhîm Müteferrika, ressâm, coğrafi”.


\(^{47}\) “… Dergâh-i mu’allam müteferrikalarından İbrâhîm …” See *Tercümetü’s-Sihâb-i Cevherî [Lugat-i Vankulu]* (Kostantiniye, 1141/1729), p. [4].
Ağa.\textsuperscript{48} On the other hand, in two documents issued by the financial department of the imperial court, dating 1140/1727, which are related to the food supplied by the imperial kitchen to the staff of Ibrahim Müteferrika’s printing shop during the printing of its first book, the printer is called “Ibrahim Efendi, who is in charge to print the Vankulu Dictionary.”\textsuperscript{49} It is worth noting that the title “efendi” was usually given to educated persons, and especially to scribes and medrese-graduates, who pertained to the learned religious class, the \textit{ulema}.\textsuperscript{50} Besides Muslim preachers and jurists it denoted also the book sellers.\textsuperscript{51} Since Ibrahim Müteferrika’s printing shop was a private undertaking he had also the right to sell the books he printed. Formally, being the first Ottoman Muslim to execute the profession of printer, in legal terms he must have been considered a book seller rather than a printer. As a matter of fact, the early printers ended up also being book sellers. The nonofficial accounts of Ibrahim Müteferrika’s personality tend to shift his public image from a müteferrika to a printer. In the very beginning of his printing undertaking, the official chronicler at the imperial court Küçükçelebizade Ismail Asım Efendi, who took accounts for the period 1133/1720–21–1140/1727–28, names him Ibrahim the Interpeter, \textit{[one] of the müteferrikas at the imperial court}. \textsuperscript{52} A decade or so later, however, in the Grand Vizier Muhsinzade Abdullah Pasha’s statement of 1737 Ibrahim Müteferrika is called “Ibrahim Efendi the Printer”.\textsuperscript{53} It is a significant indication that after ten years of printing activity Müteferrika


\textsuperscript{50} See Gustav Bayerle, \textit{Pashas, Begs, and Effendis}, 44.


\textsuperscript{52} \textit{Tarih-i Çelebizade Efendi} (Kostantiniye, 1153/1741), fol. 119b.

\textsuperscript{53} “Basmaci İbrahim Efendi” (See Ahmed Refik, \textit{Memalik-i Osmaniyede Král Rakoczi ve Tévabi’} (1109–1154) (İstanbul, 1333/1917), 8).
deserved recognition exactly as a printer. It is confirmed also by some foreign observers such as the above-mentioned Saussure, for instance, who in a letter of 13 August 1735 named him exactly in the same way: “Ibrahim Efendi the Printer.”

Ibrahim Müteferrika’s printing activity won him a new recognition as a printer in the Ottoman intellectual milieu. Moreover, he became publicly known mainly as a printer. A late 18th-century manuscript copy of the printed version of his own work *Reasonable Principles of Public Order* (1732) preserved in the Oriental Department of the National Library in Sofia, Bulgaria, is titled *Reasonable Principles of Public Order by Ibrahim Efendi the Printer*.

Probably the most affirmative indication of Ibrahim Müteferrika’s public image is his probate inventory of 1 April 1747. Probate inventories usually point out the name of the deceased persons and their main personal characteristics: in the case of women reference is usually made to their husbands’ or fathers’ name while in the case of men their profession, rank or service is used as identification. In Ibrahim Müteferrika’s case, disregarding the fact that he served as a müteferrika at the imperial court, his probate inventory names him simply “the late Ibrahim Efendi the Printer”. Having in mind that probate inventories were official judicial documents, it is a remarkable indication of how Ibrahim Müteferrika’s public image involving not only non-official Ottoman and non-Ottoman but also official Ottoman attitudes towards him shifted in the course of time. Hence in the last years of his life and posthumously, Ibrahim Müteferrika won public recognition neither as a geographer or map-maker, as he obviously insisted to introduce himself in his signatures, nor as a müteferrika, the state service he happened to execute during his lifetime. As a convert of Hungarian-Transylvanian origin he was not recognized according to his ethnic or geographical origin either, as was the case with two other compatriots and namesakes of him, Peçevi Ibrahim Efendi and Zigetvarlı Köse Ibrahim Efendi, who happened to convert to Islam and become Ottoman subjects in the 17th century.

What made Ibrahim Müteferrika publicly recognizable were his activities as a printer and his printing efforts became the main expression of his individuality

56 “Basmaci merhûm Ibrâhîm Efendi” (İMŞS: Ksmet-i Askeriye Mahkemesi, Defter 98, fol. 39a).
in Ottoman society. He apparently never broke down fully the link with his pre-Ottoman and pre-Muslim past and managed to combine in some harmony two seemingly opposing identities. His conversion seems to be rearrangement of his consciousness rather than transformation since behind the mysterious smile of his Ottoman and Muslim image one could clearly figure out his Transylvanian and Protestant past. There are better ways to determine his multiple identities than by pulling down his pants. What is needed is to further scrutinize the mind games he bequeathed.

*Portrait and Self-Portrait: Ibrahim Müteferrika’s Mind Games*

Abstract The paper deals with an intellectual who was famous in Ottoman cultural history as the founder of the first Turkish printing house (1726). He was a Hungarian born Protestant (allegedly Unitarian), who left his homeland in Transylvania in the late seventeenth century, took refuge in the Ottoman Empire and converted to Islam, gaining a new Ottoman and Muslim identity under the name Ibrahim Müteferrika. The paper reveals Müteferrika’s portrait and self-portrait by dwelling not only on the few available narratives dealing with it, but also on those aspects of Müteferrika’s post-Transylvanian activities in which one could see some important idiosyncrasies of his pre-Ottoman identity. To date, there are only three narratives revealing Müteferrika’s biography: of Müteferrika’s contemporaries César de Saussure and Charles Peyssonnel, as well as of Müteferrika himself. However, Saussure’s and Peyssonnel’s portraits, on the one hand, and Müteferrika’s self-portrait, on the other, allow us to contrast the images appearing from them. All three biographical narratives provide a basis for different and even controversial interpretations of the following more or less unclear issues: how exactly did Müteferrika become an Ottoman subject; what was his religious affiliation before Islam; and how did he convert to Islam: of his own free will or under the pressure of unfavorable circumstances? Müteferrika himself may have created a much more favorable self-image through mystifying the circumstances that led to his conversion. This story could serve also as an act of submission before his new Muslim rulers. In other words, Müteferrika probably created an alternative and fictitious self-portrait, which is much more plausible than the real one. Keywords: Ibrahim Müteferrika, Ottoman identity, conversion, eighteenth century, self-portrait
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