

KÂTİB ÇELEBİ AND *TÂRİH-İ HİND-İ GARBÎ*

Gottfried HAGEN

Habent sua fata libelli - books have fates of their own, as the Roman grammarian Terentianus Maurus stated in the 3rd century A. D. His intention was to say that texts were read differently in different times. In the age of printing and of large numbers of copies circulating the dissemination of texts and textual information tends to be conceived as an abstract phenomenon, because usually a direct connection between one of several hundreds or thousands of identical copies cannot be established. Another example of this conception is found in cartography when the interdependence of maps and charts is discussed. But in the age of manuscript books the course of reception has a very material aspect, too, since it is closely linked with the fate of individual manuscripts. Ottoman intellectual history prior to the 18th century is at the same time a history of libraries and individual bibliophiles collecting, selling, and exchanging books. Unfortunately history has rarely preserved traces of private libraries or has allowed us to trace individual manuscripts through the hands of several owners. The following paper will demonstrate the connection between Kâtib Çelebi's *Cihânnümâ* and the anonymous *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî* both of them books with fates of their own. It will show the complicated textual history of the former and the changing appreciation of the latter and it will for a considerable time follow the manuscripts concerned (together with some others) through the hands of their subsequent owners¹.

According to his own words Kâtib Çelebi began to study cartography and the art of maps after the breakout of the Crete War in 1645. We may assume that he first became acquainted with maritime cartography, such as

1

This is a revised and enlarged version of a paper presented at the XIth CIEPO conference held in Amsterdam in 1994. I'm greatly indebted to Prof. Th. D. Goodrich, who was not only ready to answer my questions, but made material accessible to me, without which this paper could not have been written. For similar help, I owe thanks to Fikret Sarıcaoğlu of İstanbul Üniversitesi. For the sake of convenience all names, Arabic, Persian or Turkish, are given in modern Turkish spelling.

Pîrî Reis's *Bahriye*, but soon he was so engaged in this science that he decided to write a geographical encyclopedia of his own. He started to collect material but already before he began to draw up his work he made an entry for it in his bibliographical dictionary *Keşfü'z-Zunûn* announcing that this book would - among others - include the description of the climes discovered in the ninth century². There can be no doubt that his source of knowledge in this respect was *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî*, so we can say that *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî* accompanied Kâtib Çelebi's geographical work since the very first steps.

The first version of the *Cihânnümâ*, which was written down about 1648, remained unfinished and does not contain a separate chapter on America. Nevertheless *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî* turned out to be one of the major sources, in one line with *Takvîmü'l-Buldân* by Ebû'l-Fidâ, *Menâzirü'l-Avâlim* by Mehmed Aşık, *Bahriye* by Pîrî Reis and *Tâcü't-Tevârîh* by Hoca Sa'deddîn. It is the introductory chapter on the seas, lakes and rivers which has been regularly consulted for the corresponding parts of the *Cihânnümâ*. Certain points indicate that Kâtib Çelebi had more than one manuscript of *Tarih-i Hind-i Garbî* at his disposal. He referred to a "recent" world map showing an isthmus connecting Asia and America³. This is found rarely on contemporary maps, but indeed appears on a *Gastaldi Map* of 1548⁴, from which the world maps in two manuscripts of *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî* (İstanbul University and the Newberry Library) derive⁵. On the other hand Kâtib

² In *Keşfü'z-Zunûn* Kâtib Çelebi described the *Cihânnümâ* as comprising a first part on the seas and Islands, the latter about the lands, rivers, mountains and roads in alphabetical order (ed. Yaltkaya and Bilge, İstanbul 1943, 622f.). I assume that the first intended to write a kind of extended version of Sipahizade's *Evzahü'l-Mesâlik*, which is in its turn an alphabetical arrangement of Ebu'l-Fida's *Takvîmü'l-Buldân*, a work of great importance for the Ottomans and highly esteemed by Kâtib Çelebi.

³ *Cihânnümâ*, Vienna cod. mxt 389. This has been shown by Taeschner to be a partial autograph, and it is since then called Wiener Konzept, therefore here abbreviated WK (see Flügel, *Catalogue*, II, no. 1282, and Taeschner, *Die Vorlage von Hammers, "Rumeli und Bosna"*, in *Mitteilungen zur Osmanischen Geschichte*, 2, 1923-26, pp 308 - 310, Taeschner, *Zur Geschichte des Djihannuma in Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen*, 29, 1926, pp 99 - 110.

⁴ Th. D. Goodrich: *The Ottoman Turks and the New World. A study of Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî and Sixteenth Century Ottoman Americana. Near and Middle East Monographs*. N. s. 3. Wiesbaden 1990, p. 45 figure 12. Instead of the rare Müteferrika printing I will use Goodrich's recent translation of *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî* as my reference. A copy of Kâtib Çelebi's *Levâmi'ün-Nûr* in the Topkapı Palace Library also, has a world map derived from this *Gastaldi Map* (Th. D. Goodrich, "Old Maps in the Library of Topkapı Palace in İstanbul". *Imago Mundi*, 45, 1993, pp. 120 - 133.)

⁵ Goodrich, 1990, p.43 figure 10, 11.

Çelebi quoted a marginal note from Revan 1488⁶ and several toponyms found only in the maps of that work⁷. It is this manuscript that serves as the basis of my study.

This manuscripts has a great number of later additions and commentary in the margins which allow us to follow its fate for more than a century with some interruptions. Two of the writers have been identified: a marginal note in the fly leaf mentions a former Anadolu Muhasebecisi Eflâki Mustafa Efendi, who is said to have died in 1032 (begins 5.11.1622) and the Şeyhülislâm Behâî Mehmed Efendi⁸. The writer of this marginal note is no other than Kâtib Çelebi himself. This is not only corroborated by comparison of handwritings but also by the formulation “ekallü’l-halîke” immediately before the lacuna where the name of the owner has been erased. It which rhymes with “Mustafa (or Hacı) Halife”, and as “ekallü’l-halîke Mustafa Halife” did Kâtib Çelebi indeed introduce himself in the introduction to his *Levâmiü’ n-Nur* as quoted in the bibliography in the second version of his *Cihânnümâ*⁹.

From this marginal comment the date of acquisition by Kâtib Çelebi can be established. Behâî Efendi is called the former şeyhülislâm, which gives us the year 1651 as terminus post quem, but he is not called merhûm, which could mean that he was still alive. Thus the note must be written not only before Behâî Efendi’s death in 1654, but also before his second term of office as şeyhülislâm from Ramazan 1052 (begins 6.8.1652), which ended only with his death¹⁰.

Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî has two different functions for the first *Cihânnümâ*. The first is to provide plain information to be found elsewhere only with difficulties or not at all. In this sense Kâtib Çelebi borrowed a lengthy passage explaining some technical terms of mathematic geography¹¹

6 WK 14b, Goodrich 1990. 360 marg. 44. Unfortunately all the marginalia have been carefully omitted in the facsimile edition of this manuscript, published in Ankara 1987. Thanks to the efforts of Prof. Goodrich these valuable sources for Ottoman intellectual history have been made accessible for all.

7 E.g. Yeşil Burnu and Esperança Burnu WK 13b-14a.

8 Goodrich, 1990, p.349, marg. 1.

9 *Cihânnümâ*, printed edition, Istanbul 1732 (henceforth abbreviated CP), 9.

10 For his biography see the detailed account in Uşakîzâde’s *Zeyl-i Şakayık*, ed. H. J. Kissling, Wiesbaden 1968, nr. 118, pp. 182 - 189. For the relations between him and Kâtib Çelebi see my doctoral dissertation: *Ein Osmanischer Geograph bei der Arbeit. Entstehung und Gedankenwelt von Kâtib Çelebi’s Cihânnümâ*, Freie Universität, Berlin 1996.

11 The definition of the seven climes is in *Cihânnümâ* somewhat more detailed, but the sketch from *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî* (Goodrich 1990, p.93) is found in *Cihânnümâ*

, some data on the Red and the Caspian Seas, the Persian Gulf¹², the Nile¹³ and the description of the Great Mosque of Cordoba¹⁴. The coastline of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans he described according to the map he found in his source¹⁵.

To provide occasions for scientific discussion - and consequently demonstrating Kâtib Çelebi's superiority - is the second function. The introduction of *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî* bears the characteristics of a cosmography, a literary genre very popular among the Ottomans¹⁶. A cosmography in this sense is not meant to display a high level of scholarship but to collect curious and strange things (acâib ve garâib) from geography and natural sciences, thus composing a picture of the whole world as a manifestation of the omnipotence of God. *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî* shows the predilection for interesting and amusing anecdotes common in this type of works. Though the structure of the first *Cihânnümâ* was that of a classical cosmography, too, with in this frame work Kâtib Çelebi generally restricted himself to bare and often boring topographical facts. But sometimes when he found an anecdote connected to a certain place he used it as a kind of pretext to interrupt the enumeration. These anecdotes are often taken from *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî*. For example Kâtib Çelebi quoted the famous tale, how Alexander the Great sent out a ship to explore the seas. This goes back to the very popular *Harîdetü'l-Acâib*, a cosmography usually (though wrongly) attributed to the 15th century scholar Ibnü'l-Verdi¹⁷. After one year's journey Alexander's men met another ship, took over one man of its crew and returned to Alexander. There the stranger reported that he came from a great empire on the other side of the sea, and the author of *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî* concluded that this empire might be the New World, a suggestion Kâtib

(WK) 31v, and later in the printed *Cihânnümâ* after p. 51, as well as in the printed edition of *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî* (Goodrich 1990, p.344).

12 WK 15b, 16a, 17b, Goodrich 1990, p.101, 96, 102. That Kâtib Çelebi did not take into consideration the marginalia by Behâî Efendi in *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî* (Revan ms., cf. , Goodrich 1990. 358 marg. 32), who denied the existence of a whirlpool in the Persian Gulf, could mean that he at this time had another copy before him.

13 WK 21a-22a, Goodrich 1990 125 ff.

14 WK 33a, Goodrich 1990, p.152.

15 The distance of 5.600 miles between Spain and Yucatan is not in the manuscripts used by Goodrich, though Kâtib Çelebi claims to have taken it from *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî*, cf. WK 14b.

16 See; Günay Kut: "Türk Edebiyatında Acaibü'l-Mahlukat Tercümelere Üzerine", V. *Milletlerarası Türkoloji Kongresi*, I, İstanbul 1985, ss. 183 - 193.

17 See R. Sellheim, "Materialien zur arabischen Literaturgeschichte. Pd. 1.", *Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland*, XVII, A/I, Wiesbaden 1976, ss-176 - 186.

Çelebi denied since in the New World people did not know great ships¹⁸. Another example is the tradition, that a long time ago there had existed a channel between the Red Sea and the Mediterranean. It is not utterly rejected, but Kâtib Çelebi kept his distance declaring that the responsibility (for the truth) was on the narrator¹⁹.

Still another example is the tradition, that in earlier times the place of the Red Sea had been a flourishing kingdom but had been flooded by a rival king who cut through the dam which protected it against the ocean at Bâbü'l-Mendeb²⁰. Here, Kâtib Çelebi argued that such anecdotes were told about other straits, too: at the Street of Gibraltar found in *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî*²¹, and at the Bosphorus, for instance in the legends around the foundation of Constantinople in Cenâbî's chronicle²².

These and other passages of the same type originally reflected the literary ambitions of their authors: they meant to amuse and to entertain. In the *Cihânnümâ* all literary elements are omitted, the anecdotes deprived of all colourful ornamentation and restricted to the retelling of facts. Though he takes over the information, Kâtib Çelebi intends to write a decidedly scientific, not a literary work. The use Kâtib Çelebi made of his source is thus to a considerable extent distinct from the intention of the anonymous author.

Kâtib Çelebi declared that he abandoned the first *Cihânnümâ*, when he realized that he would not find sufficient material in oriental geographic literature to describe the lands of the infidel. Nevertheless he continued to collect new material and add corrections to his fragmentary work. In the Vienna manuscript from which I'm usually quoting, the original fair copy of the first *Cihânnümâ* written by a professional scribe is corrected, partially re-written and continued by Kâtib Çelebi himself. Because of that this manuscript from which obviously no copy was ever made obtains a crucial

18 WK 13a-b, Goodrich 1990, p. 120. Kâtib Çelebi's argument is taken from marginalia 4 in the Revan ms. (Goodrich 1990, p. 360). This marginal note is not, as one might suppose, written by Kâtib Çelebi himself.

19 Referring to the project of a channel between the Red Sea and the Mediterranean, WK 16b, Goodrich 1990, p. 98 following Mas'ûdî.

20 WK 16b, Goodrich 1990, p. 971.

21 Goodrich 1990, p. 114.

22 Kâtib Çelebi had consulted this book for his account of the history of Istanbul. For further appearances see: S. Yerasimos, *La fondation de Constantinople et de Sainte Sophie Dans les Traditions Turques*. Bibliothèque de l'Institut Français d'Etudes Anatoliennes d'Istanbul, Paris 1990, p. 124.

position in the complicated textual history of the *Cihânnümâ*²³. Some material in this draft must certainly have been added when the second version of the *Cihânnümâ* was already under work. In this part no quotation from *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî* can be found. We may just remark that Kâtib Çelebi meanwhile had changed his views on the Alexander anecdote. While in the first version he seems to have adopted the opinion of İbnü'l-Verdî, who located the episode in the Caspian Sea, he now accepted the arguments by Kadızâde Rûmî against this view²⁴.

In 1653 Kâtib Çelebi got hold of a contemporary European geographical work, the *Atlas Minor* by Gerhard Mercator. With the help of a French renegade he translated it into Turkish and in December 1654 started to re-write the *Cihânnümâ*, working upon it until his death in October 1657. This second *Cihânnümâ* shows that meanwhile Kâtib Çelebi had developed a more elaborate concept and a more critical approach to geography. This time he used Mercator and some other European books as primary sources. Compared with them *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî* was reduced to the second rank. The summarized description of America is taken from Mercator instead of *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî*²⁵, the description of the oceans and seas in the introduction from Cluverius' *Introductio in Universam Geographiam*²⁶. A page with a description of Peru is already found in the Vienna autograph²⁷. If this part is not taken from the *Ortelius Atlas*, which Kâtib Çelebi acquired from the estate of Kara Çelebizâde Mahmud Efendi (died 1653), it must come from yet an unidentified European source²⁸. Only when these sources did not

23 For a survey of the contents and a discussion of sources and changing approach to geography see again my doctoral thesis quoted above.

24 İbnü'l-Verdî's *Harîdetü'l-Acâib* had been the original source of *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî*. Kadızâde Rûmî, the famous astronomer, in his commentary on Çagmîni's *el-Mulâhhas fî'l-Heyet* (cf. *Keşfü'z-Zünûn* 1819) had argued that all shores of this sea were well known, and there was no room for one year's journey (marginal note in WK 13b).

25 CP 105 - 108.

26 Kâtib Çelebi states that he used an edition printed in Paris in 1635.

27 WK 308a.

28 Among the known source is Giovanni Lorenzo d'Anania's, *L'Universale Fabrica del Mondo Ovvero Cosmographia*, Venezia 1582, a today widely unknown but very valuable book, and a commentary on Aristotle's *Meteorologika* (Cologne 1596) by the Jesuite Academy of Coimbra, the so called Collegium Conimbricense. The edition of the *Ortelius Atlas* used by Kâtib Çelebi is not identified (in the preface to the facsimile edition of the 1570 print (Amsterdam 1964) more than 40 of them are registered), but nevertheless I'm inclined to believe that Kâtib Çelebi had still other European books at his disposal.

provide the information required Kâtib Çelebi still fell back upon *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî*²⁹.

Still it maintained both functions explained above. But the only large scale quotation in the second *Cihânnümâ* in order to take over plain facts is the history of the great discoveries, i.e. the four expeditions made by Columbus and the circumnavigation of the globe by Magellan³⁰. The historical aspect in general is usually missing in European geographers, where as Kâtib Çelebi stated that "history is the salt of the sciences"³¹ and took pains to integrate large historical chapters in the description of every climate.

Anecdotes quoted only in order to discuss them critically are less rare. Once more the old Alexander story is re-told and investigated in connection with the Spanish expeditions to the New World, and once more rejected, but with much more elaborate arguments³². To some considerations concerning the changes between land and sea he added a similar chapter from *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî* containing several legendary examples, and interspersed with his own commentaries³³. Nobody will be surprised that Kâtib Çelebi did not accept the legendary Vakvâk-Islands, where a tree is said to bear fruit in the shape of human (female) bodies, as a geographical fact, though in theory he considered such a tree as possible³⁴. The bird of paradise (humâ kuşu), which Kâtib Çelebi had seen himself, did not meet the description given in *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî*³⁵.

At the same time Kâtib Çelebi took up many aspects to which he had paid no attention in the first version. The most interesting in our context is the passage regarding some political suggestions from *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî*. The author repeatedly made recommendations how to drive the Portuguese

²⁹ Kâtib Çelebi's reluctant attitude is expressed in the bibliography of the second *Cihânnümâ*, where it is said "since the information concerning these lands are not found in other books, they have been quoted as an appendix to the translation of the *Atlas Minor*" (p. 13).

³⁰ CP 108 - 114, Goodrich, pp.149-163 pass., pp.173, 206 - 220 pass. including marginalia 56, 58, 72. Minor examples: CP 89/Goodrich 1990, pp. 83, 137/208f., 152/121ff.

³¹ CP 66.

³² CP 114, Goodrich 1990, 118f. From his translation of the humanistic Chronicon of Johann Canon (O. Ş. Gökyay, *Kâtib Çelebi, Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler*, Ankara 1957, s.53) Kâtib Çelebi knew that Alexander the Great never had undertaken any expeditions to the west.

³³ CP 85f., Goodrich 1990 pp. 135 - 139.

³⁴ CP 152f. This passage on one hand reveals that Kâtib Çelebi's concept of nature was deeply imbued with notions of magic (especially the havass), and on the other that critical discussion must not inevitably lead to the dismissal of such concepts.

³⁵ CP 134, Goodrich 1990, p. 212.

from their bases in the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean and to secure a great power status for the Ottomans in this part of the world. Kâtib Çelebi pointed out that the Ottoman fleet had undertaken such efforts but had suffered severe defeats under Pîrî Reis and Seydî Ali Reis, so he denounced the suggestions as altogether not realistic³⁶. Several times the author of *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî* expressed his hope that the New World would once be ruled by the Ottoman sultans³⁷. Obviously this was too naive for Kâtib Çelebi to discuss it seriously. Consequently I decline to interpret these passages as more or less open directives for political action. Instead I understand them as political flattery to prominent readers. The close link between geographical knowledge and political action was a innovation, which only the second *Cihânnümâ* introduced into Ottoman geographical literature³⁸.

Kâtib Çelebi had studied his text carefully. A minor mistake as the author's mixing up the names Hispaniola and San Juan was carefully noted in the margin of the Revan manuscript together with a reference to the page where the usage was correct³⁹; a fact which proves that the codex had been foliated at this time, perhaps by Kâtib Çelebi himself⁴⁰. Another mistake appeared much more serious. Translating a description of the Baltic Sea the author of *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî* had misread the Arabic phrase "alâ sâhilihi ümmetün tıvâlün kümâh", which means "on these shores there lives a people of tall and brave warriors", as "there is a people with the height of stature of mushrooms" (sahilinde olan kavmin tûl-ı kâmetleri kemâh kadardır). Kâtib Çelebi first corrected this error in the margin of his manuscript of *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî*⁴¹. Still the error occupied him so much that he made some sarcastic remarks about it in the paragraph dealing with the Baltic Sea⁴²; and of course it had to be mentioned in a chapter on the difficulties of geography and the errors of his predecessors⁴³.

³⁶ CP 90f., Goodrich 1990. 84ff.

³⁷ CP 113, Goodrich 1990, p. 173. There are several examples of this kind in *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî*, which should in my opinion be read as flattery to prominent readers, but not as open or hidden directives for political action, as Murphey did (Recension of Goodrich 1990 in: *Archivum Ottomanicum*, 12. 1987-92. pp. 277 - 80.

³⁸ CP 16f., following Mercator. The extent the *Cihânnümâ* could actually serve this purpose is still another problem not to be discussed here.

³⁹ If a proof was necessary that Kâtib Çelebi read the book more than once here is.

⁴⁰ Goodrich 1990. p.58, 362f. had dated the foliation of the manuscript in the 9th century. The episode has not been transferred to CP 110.

⁴¹ Goodrich 1990., p 359, marg. 39, is Kâtib Çelebi's remark.

⁴² CP 76.

⁴³ CP 66.

In other places Kâtib Çelebi's criticism went beyond selected paragraphs and attacked the whole tendency of popular geography, whose first aim was to entertain and astonish its readers, and whose accounts are taken as facts by later authors and taken over into their books⁴⁴. He declared that the cosmographer Ibnü'l-Verdî had demonstrated his ignorance and absence of knowledge in geography and accused later author of carelessly circulating Ibnü'l-Verdî's errors and thus participating in his mistakes⁴⁵. This attack also aims at *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî* which in large parts of the first chapters draws on *Harîdetü'l-Acâib*. The fact that several manuscripts have miniatures also shows that *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî* belongs closer to the acâib genre than to a scientific geography in the "way" Kâtib Çelebi conceived it.

The information concerning the New World may be valid in *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî*, but we have to take Kâtib Çelebi's situation into account: In those passages he had the means to check himself he found so many flaws or obvious errors, that he had to consider the book as an unreliable source altogether. This lack in trustworthiness could to a great part explain why *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî* had so little influence among the later Ottoman geographers. We have to keep in mind that Kâtib Çelebi's immediate successor Ebû Bekir ed-Dimişkî, with whom we will have to deal immediately, was even more devoted to a decidedly modern of scientific concept of geography, which even lead him to belittle Kâtib Çelebi's achievements in this field⁴⁶.

To sum up, *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî* lost much of its value for Kâtib Çelebi because of several reasons: while Kâtib Çelebi had in the first *Cihânnümâ* compiled his information in a rather superficial manner, in his later years he applied higher standards of scientific work, which *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî* did not meet. Medieval muslim scholars used to be aware of the difference between scholarly and popular works⁴⁷, but Kâtib Çelebi adopted this view only in his later years. I don't think that this change has its reason in his acquaintance with up to date European works, but after all these books allowed him to reduce the use of doubtful sources to a minimum. The second reason is, that

44 CP 154.

45 This can be read as "crimes" as well ("cürm" instead of "cerem"). The same criticism in even harsher words is uttered in the article on *Harîdetü'l-Acâib* in *Keşfü'z-Züunûn* 701.

46 He wrote that "although Kâtib Çelebi had work in this science a little, he could not bring out a complete work" (quoted from E. İhsanoğlu; "Introduction of Western Science to the Ottoman World: A case study of modern astronomy (1660 - 1860)", *Transfer of Modern Science and Technology to the Muslim World*. (ed. E. İhsanoğlu), İstanbul 1992, ss. 67 - 120).

47 F. Rosenthal, "The Technique and Approach of Muslim Scholarship", *Analecta Orientalia*, 24, Rome 1947, p. 41.

at the same time Kâtib Çelebi had developed a predilection for first hand information and searched direct access to the sources of the books he had used in the first *Cihânnümâ*. Instead of *Takvîmü'l-Buldân* he consulted İbn Sa'id el-Magribî, in addition to *Menâzirü'l-Avâlim*, *Nüzhetü'l-Kulûb* by Hamdullah Müstevfî. A passage on the division of land and sea resembles the corresponding paragraph in *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî*, but is more detailed. I assume that Kâtib Çelebi took this directly from the commentary on Nasirüddîn Tûsî's *Tezkere* by Nizamüddîn en-Nîşâbü'rî⁴⁸. It is evident that Kâtib Çelebi also had *et-Tuhfetü's-Şâhiye* by Kutbüddîn Şirâzî in his hands, where he located the correct narration of the "mushroom people" mentioned above⁴⁹. The availability of primary sources further reduced the necessity of consulting *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî*.

Kâtib Çelebi claimed to deliver up to date scientific information, and he was very proud of his skills in astronomy. A strange astronomical observation made by Columbus' men in *Boca del Dragon* and related in *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî* was analyzed by him with great accuracy and with the use of the latest achievements of Ottoman astronomy⁵⁰.

But why did he then adopt the rather primitive and popular cosmological scheme of nine concentric spheres from the introduction of *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî*? Kâtib Çelebi had studied the works of Çagmînî, Kadızâde Rûmî, Takiyüddin and others⁵¹ and must have been aware that the scheme he presented to his readers did by no means meet standards he applied otherwise, although he had omitted all poetical and religious

48 Cf. Goodrich 1990, 82f., CP 70f. The explaining sketch in the *Cihânnümâ* (Revan 1624) fol. 19 v is not in *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî*.

49 The extent of these borrowings has not been established since neither of these books is in print.

50 Goodrich 1990, p.162, 363, marginalia 64, CP 111f. The signature under this marginalia almost illegible, maybe it should be read als "Kâtib". The text of the marginalia is in the *Cihânnümâ* somewhat expanded and introduced with the words "fakîr eyider".

51 Takiyüddin was a protege of the famous Hoca Sa'deddin and had been appointed director of the shortlived observatory in Pera in the 1570ies (Adnan Adıvar, *Osmanlı Türklerinde İlim*, 4th ed. by A. Kazancıgil und S. Tekeli, Istanbul 1982. ss 99 - 106). On his observations Katib Çelebi drew in his treatise *İlhâmü'l-Mukaddes Mine'l-Feyzi'l Akdes* (edition and discussion by B. Şehsuvaroğlu in: *Kâtib Çelebi, Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler*. Ankara 1957. ss. 141-176). On Kâtib Çelebi's knowledge of the others see his autobiography in *Mizanü' Hakk* (Istanbul 1306 H. (1888/9)) 138f.

ornamentation. After all, this passage constitutes a break in Kâtib Çelebi's concept that remains to be explained⁵².

There is still another point of interest to be mentioned in our context the indication of sources. Modern historians too easily presumed that indication of sources in pre-modern literature serves the same purposes as it does in our scientific writing. It did, though⁵³, but there are other aspects to be accounted for as well.

The comparison and relationship between *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî* and the *Cihânnümâ* may give us some clues in this respect. The indication of sources in *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî* is restricted to the first chapter in which the seas, lakes and rivers of the world are precepted according to Islamic literature. Among the authors quoted there are several classics of Islamic geography, as for instance el-Mas'ûdî and el-Idrîsî. Yet it is doubtful that the unknown author in fact read their works himself. It is more likely in my opinion that these quotations come from later compilations as the pseudo Ibnü'l-Verdî already mentioned. In any case the author did not regularly indicate which books he consulted but rather where the information ultimately comes from. The function of this information is primarily to provide the authority of well known geographers to the accounts given. More than for plain factual information this is important where "acaib", by definition incredible, are reported. And at last a source must be named when our anonymus disagrees with it⁵⁴. Sometimes obviously this goes without saying, the naming of the source as such already including a tacit "el-uhdetü alâ'r-râwî" or "relata refero".

This last aspect also holds true for Kâtib Çelebi who on the other side doesn't need to have any "acâib" confirmed by ancient authorities. Instead he also names his sources when he tries to integrate divergent information from several sources into one narrative. The only example of this kind in the first *Cihânnümâ* is the chapter on Istanbul⁵⁵, but others are found throughout the second *Cihânnümâ*. Additionally Kâtib Çelebi applies an increasingly "scientific" approach to his sources in the course of his work. Now indeed

⁵² CP 22, Goodrich 1990, 77ff.

⁵³ Rosenthal 1947. pp. 41 - 45 on arabic literature.

⁵⁴ This is the case especially with pseudo-Ibnü'l-Verdî (see Goodrichu, "The search for the sources of *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbi*", *Bulletin of Research in the Humanities*, 1982, pp. 269 - 294. 278.

⁵⁵ It is missing in the Vienna draft, presumably because Kâtib Çelebi was about to re-write it on the basis of his recently translated *Revnâqî' s-Saltanat*, originally a history of Byzantium (for the original see V. L. Menage, "Kâtib Çelebiana", in: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 1963, 173ff). Yet it is extant in all other manuscripts of the first version I have seen.

the indication allows us to follow his individual way of work, since he tends to name not only the ultimate source for the information but also the book from which he is quoting himself. Parallel with this goes the tendency towards primary sources as mentioned before.

Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî is one of the earliest Ottoman books to use western sources⁵⁶. Yet neither any title of the five books nor any one the four different authors appears in the text⁵⁷. The most plausible explanation in my opinion is that it was unnecessary to mention them since could not serve the purpose usually fulfilled by these informations in the sense we stated before.

On the other hand for Kâtib Çelebi it would have made sense, because transparency of method, critical discussion and contrasting of divergent informations from different sources occurred in the *Cihânnümâ* with European as well as with Islamic sources. Indeed he does very often explicitly state that a quotation is taken from a european source. Still Kâtib Çelebi makes a difference between European and Islamic books. Only the latter are included as separate items in his great dictionary *Kesfü' z-Zunûn* whereas the former only occasionally appear⁵⁸. The bibliography in the second *Cihânnümâ* indicates which books have been used to what extent, but despite the introductory sentences its main purpose was to give a survey over Kâtib Çelebi's predecessors in the Islamic world, that is, the books his presumed readers could have been acquainted with. European books did not belong to this category, so only the Turkish translation of the *Atlas Minor* originally was listed in the bibliography. And even this appears as *Atlas Maior*, that is, the full size original, from which the information ultimately derives, though Kâtib Çelebi himself certainly had only seen the abbreviated *Atlas Minor*. The works by Lorenzo d'Anania and Philippus Cluverius have only later been added to the bibliography⁵⁹, an indication of Kâtib Çelebi's changing attitude in this respect, and perhaps also of an increasing acquaintance of his readership with European books.

⁵⁶ See B. Lewis, "The use by Muslim historians of non-Muslim sources", in *Historians of the Middle East*, B. Lewis P. M. Holt(eds.) London 1962, pp. 180 - 191.

⁵⁷ Goodrich has given a fascinating account of how he set out to identify these sources (Goodrich 1982).

⁵⁸ The most recent discussion of *Kesfü' z-Zunûn* is E. Birnbaum, "The Questing Mind: Katib Chelebi, 1609-1657. A Chapter in Ottoman Intellectual History.," *Corolla Torontonensis, In Honour of Ronald Morton Smith*, Ed. E. Robbins, Stella Sandhial, Toronto 1994, pp.133 - 158. Of the sources of the *Cihânnüma* the Jesuite commentary on Aristotle is mentioned in passing in the article 'ilmü'l-hikmet, in *Kesfü' z-Zunûn*, 684.

⁵⁹ CP 13 - 14, Revan 1624, 4r. Kâtib Çelebi's use of other sources is discussed in my dissertation as cited before.

The close connection between the *Cihânnümâ* and *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî* did not end with Kâtib Çelebi's death in 1657. A close friend of Kâtib Çelebi and famous bibliophile, the nephew of the renowned şeyhülislâm Zekeriyazâde Yahya Efendi, Vişnezâde Mehmêd İzzetî (or Arabî)⁶⁰ acquired several manuscripts from Kâtib Çelebi's estate in the middle of the year 1069 (spring 1659). Among them were the autograph of the second *Cihânnümâ*⁶¹ and the Revan manuscript of *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî*⁶². Later on he also got hold of *Levâmiü'n-Nûr* and of the Vienna autograph of the first *Cihânnümâ*⁶³. Mehmed İzzetî Efendi had gathered around him a circle of learned men and Ulema. Among them was the geographer and mathematician Ebu Bekir b. Behram ed-Dimişkî, who is famous today for his great translation of Willem Janszon Blaeu's *Atlas Maior Sive Cosmographia Blaviana*, this 11 volume atlas, printed in Amsterdam 1662 and presented to Sultan Mehmed IV. in 1668 by the Dutch ambassador, was translated by Ebu Bekir by command of the Sultan or his Grand Vizier Köprülüzâde Fâzıl Ahmed Paşa in 1675⁶⁴. Ebu Bekir apparently received the three manuscripts mentioned, i.e. both autographs of the *Cihânnümâ* and the Revan manuscript of *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî*, from his patron. In all three marginalia by his hand are found⁶⁵. According to a marginal note in the second *Cihânnümâ* autograph Ebu Bekir also had the autograph of Kâtib Çelebi's Arabic world history, *Fezleke't-Ekvali'l-Ahyar*, at hand⁶⁶. At least the two *Cihânnümâ*

⁶⁰ On him and his circle cf. H. Wurm, "Der Osmanische Historiker Hüseyin b. Ca'fer, gen. Hezarfenn, und die Istanbuler Gesellschaft des 17 Whdts," *Islamkundliche Untersuchungen*, 13, Freiburg i. Br., 1971, pp. 65-71.

⁶¹ On the flyleaf of this manuscript Mehmed İzzetî did not only note the date of purchase, but also copied Kâtib Çelebi's autobiography from his *Mizânü'l-Hakk* (pp. 129 - 145 in the edition Istanbul 1306 H. (1888/9)). To this he added an invaluable account of Kâtib Çelebi's death in October 1657.

⁶² The cate is clearly visible in the *Cihânnümâ* autograph (Revan 1624, 1a), while on the copy from the *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî* manuscript available to me only the year and part of the name is readable.

⁶³ For the autograph of *Levâmiü'n-Nûr* (Nuruosmaniye Nr. 2998) this is confirmed by Wurm 1971, 69. Mehmed İzzetî later added a passage in Revan 1624, 1a which undoubtedly refers to the unique autobiography of Kâtib Çelebi in the Vienna manuscript (mxt. 389, 4a).

⁶⁴ For the discussion of this initiative cf. Wurm 1971, pp.39 - 46.

⁶⁵ His are the marginalia 66 - 68 in Goodrich's translation (1990. 363 ff). This is indicated by the handwriting identical with the notes in the *Cihânnümâ* autographs, and by the fact that the author of these comments clearly had a knowledge of the history of discoveries far beyond that of Kâtib Çelebi.

⁶⁶ Fol. 155r (not extant in CP). The unique manuscript is today kept in Beyazıt Nr. 10318. I had no opportunity to make sure if it has any marks of owners or marginal comments.

manuscripts were used by Ebu Bekir to supplement his translation of Blaeu's Atlas⁶⁷.

That both autographs of the *Cihânnümâ* were in the hands of Ebu Bekir had a considerable effect for the dissemination of the work. As his remark quoted above clearly indicates. Ebu Bekir did not consider the *Cihânnümâ* a complete work of its own right. Instead, he intended to use it as a source in order to bring about the really actual and complete universal geography for the Ottomans⁶⁸. The first *Cihânnümâ* was copied several times before Kâtib Çelebi abandoned it, and these versions (as there are at least two of them) were widely circulated, but of the Vienna draft owned by Ebu Bekir obviously no copy was ever made. As for the second *Cihânnümâ*, there are only very few copies which do not include the additions by Ebu Bekir immediately before the text breaks off⁶⁹. From this we may conclude that the second *Cihânnümâ* found wider circulation only after Ebu Bekir's death.

Ebu Bekir died in 1691. For the next 40 years the fate of the both *Cihânnümâ* autographs and the *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî* manuscript remains unknown. A few years prior to 1730 the future şeyhülislâm Damadzâde Ahmed Efendi suggested in a conversation with İbrahim Müteferrika to publish Kâtib Çelebi's work in print. İbrahim Müteferrika relates that no complete manuscript was found - a clue to the fact that the history of the text was already forgotten - , but finally Damadzâde Ahmed Efendi obtained two "original manuscripts", i.e. obviously the two autographs of the *Cihânnümâ*. And perhaps it was from the same source that İbrahim Müteferrika received the Revan manuscript of *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî*, which served as the base of his printed edition⁷⁰. This edition left the press in spring 1730, two and a half years before the *Cihânnümâ*, which was printed in July 1732⁷¹. But İbrahim Müteferrika had the *Cihânnümâ* manuscripts at his disposal already when he

⁶⁷ On Ebu Bekir's relation to the *Cihânnümâ* cf. F. Sarıcaoğlu, "Cihânnümâ ve Ebubekir b. Behram ed-Dımeşkî-İbrahim Müteferrika", *Prof. Dr. Bekir Kütükoğlu'na Armağan*, İstanbul 1991, ss.121 - 142, ss.130 - 137.

⁶⁸ I suppose that the continuation of the *Cihânnümâ* which was added to the printed edition by İbrahim Müteferrika was not conceived as such by Ebu Bekir, but is a later extract from his greater works by the editor.

⁶⁹ Revan 1624, 159b. The only datable copy of these is Leiden, cod. warn. 1109 which must have been written before Lewinus Warner's death in 1666.

⁷⁰ This assumption in Goodrich 1990, p. 22.

⁷¹ W. Watson, "İbrahim Müteferrika and Turkish Incunabula", *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 88, 1968, pp. 435 - 441. 437f., 439f.

prepared the edition of *Tarih-i Hind-i Garbî* because the table of climes he included was taken from the second *Cihânnümâ* autograph⁷².

It is of some symbolical value, that now material from *Cihânnümâ* served to supplement *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî*, which means that the relation between the two works was reversed, as far as it makes evident that between them lies turning-point in Ottoman geographical literature.

After the time of İbrahim Müteferrika the fate of all the manuscripts we have been dealing with is veiled in the dark of history, until they re-appear, some of them in the Topkapı palace collections, and one in the private collection of the rather spleeny Austro-Polish Count Wenzeslaus Rzewuski⁷³, who made it available to Hammer-Purgstall⁷⁴, until some years later it was acquired by the Austrian National Library where it is kept today.

⁷² It is the *Liber I*, cap. vi *De parallelis et Climatibus of Cluverius' Introductio*. The table is found in the autograph of the second *Cihânnümâ* (ms. Revan) fol 10r, in the printed *Cihânnümâ* after page 51, in the printed *Târîh-i Hind-i Garbî* after fol. 8 (cf. Goodrich 1990, p. 344, figure 103).

⁷³ He was the financier of the famous "Fundgruben des Orients" edited by Hammer-Purgstall. His biography as given in C. von Wurzbach, *Biographisches Lexikon des Kaisertums Österreich*, 60 vols, 1856 - 1890, Vol. 27, Vienna 1874, does not give any clues as to when and how Rzewuski could have acquired this manuscript.

⁷⁴ Hammer published a partial translation of it under the title: *Rumeli und Bosna*. Vienna 1812. For the identification of the original see Taeschner 1923, p.26.

