TAD, C. 39/S. 67, 2020, s.215-235

A SIXTEENTH CENTURY INTELLECTUAL AND STATESMAN: KEMALPAŞAZADE

BİR ON ALTINCI YÜZYIL ENTELEKTÜELİ VE DEVLET ADAMI: KEMALPAŞAZADE

Hatice SEZER*

Makale Bilgisi
Başvuru: 01.08.2019
Kabul: 02.03.2020

Article Info
Received: August 01, 2019
Accepted: March 02, 2020

Abstract

Kemalpaşazade is one of the most influential intellectuals of the sixteenth century. He is both a religious scholar and a prominent state official. In this study, the main goal is to detect the ways Kemalpaşazade's status as a statesman affected his intellectual disposition. In order to understand this, at the beginning, the study covers both a biography of Kemalpaşazade illustrating the upbringing of the statesman, and an analysis of the sixteenth century medrese education system displaying the characteristics of religious scholarly atmosphere. Later on, an analysis of Kemalpaşazade's narration in his Tevarih-i Ali Osman in comparison with the history of Aşıkpaşazade who was not a statesman will be made to display the extent Kemalpaşazade had written in support of the state authority. In the last part so as to understand whether he supported the state ideology, some among his fatwas and the factors underlying the emergence of these fatwas will be the main subjects under consideration.

Keywords: *Kemalpaşazade, intellectual, statesman, tevarih, state ideology.*

* *Araştırma Görevlisi, Bülent Ecevit Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi, Siyaset Bilimi Anabilim Dalı; Bilkent Üniversitesi Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Doktora Öğrencisi, h.sezer@bilkent.edu.tr.*

Özet

Kemalpaşazade on altıncı yüzyılın en önemli entelektüellerindendir. Hem bir din alimi hem de önde gelen bir devlet adamıdır. Bu çalışmada temel amaç Kemalpaşazade'nin devlet adamı konumunun entelektüel tutumunu nasıl etkilediğini teşhis etmektir. Bunu anlamak için, çalışmanın başında Kemalpaşazade'nin bir devlet adamı olarak yetişmesini açıklayan özgeçmişi ve on altıncı yüzyıl ilmiyesinin karakteristiğini yansıtmak amaçlı dönemin medrese sistemi incelenecektir. Sonrasında, Kemalpaşazade'nin Tevarih-i Ali Osman'daki anlatımı, devlet otoritesini ne derece desteklediğini anlamak için, bir devlet adamı olmayan Aşıkpaşazade'nin Osmanlı tarihiyle kıyaslanarak ele alınacaktır. Son bölümde Kemal Paşazade'nin devlet ideolojisiyle ilişkisini anlamak için bazı fetvaları ve bu fetvaların ilan edilme nedenleri ele alınacak ana konuları teşkil etmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Kemalpaşazade, entelektüel, devlet adamı, tevarih, devlet ideolojisi.*

1-Introduction

The Ottoman/Turkish intellectual life has been criticised for being associated with the state authority. While the intellectual is defined as an individual independent from authority cultivating a new moral of critical thinking,[1] this critique addresses mainly the intellectuals of the modernization period, c.a. from seventeenth century onwards. The intellectual life preceding this period was constituted by the learned, i.e. *literati,* whose main vocation was "to know," to support the consolidation of social order and transfer the cultural and religious values from one generation to another.[2] In this study a sixteenth century intellectual Kemalpaşazade's (1468-1536) (also known as İbn-i Kemal) intellectual life will be under consideration. While Kemalpaşazade was both a renowned scholar and a prominent statesman, one of the aims is to detect the ways his status as a statesman affected his intellectual disposition. Given the above mentioned characteristic features of the pre-modern intellectual, a secondary aim is to understand whether the proximity of Kemalpaşazade with the state authority would pose a threat to his intellectuality.

In this study, Kemalpaşazade is selected as one of the central figures in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries Ottoman intellectual life. He is known as an *alim* (religious scholar) who was engaged in various scientific areas, and had written pieces on the areas ranging from *tefsir* (Quranic

---

1 Şerif Mardin, "Aydınlar Konusunda Ülgener ve Bir İzah Denemesi", *Türkiye'de Din ve Siyaset*, Eds. M. Türköne, T. Önder, İletişim, 2011, p256-257.

2 Ibid, p 253.

exegesis) and philosophy to linguistics and history.[3] Apart from these in religious matters his fatwas (a nonbinding but authoritative religious order) and *risale*s (religious tracts) helped him gain fame. He was called *Müfti's Sakaleyn* (the mufti of the two worlds) due to the belief that not only human beings but the djinns were also asking for his fatwas.[4] Nihal Atsız detected that Kemalpaşazade has two hundred and nine written works. Nineteen of these works were written in Turkish, seven of them in Persian and a hundred eighty three of them were in Arabic.[5]

While Kemalpaşazade was a renowned scholar, he was also a prominent statesman as the *Şeyhülislam* (chief authority in religious affairs) serving during the reigns of Selim I (r. 1512-1520) and Süleyman I (r. 1520-1566). It can be assumed that the religious scholars, i.e. *ulema*, had not possessed the modern intellectuals' individual and critical disposition, yet one question that comes to mind is to what extent Kemalpaşazade's writing of his scholarly works, i.e. *Tevarih-i Ali Osman* (Histories of the House of Osman) was influenced by his outlook as a statesman. This question is inevitably connected to the fact that in the Ottoman Empire there was no strict separation between the worldly and religious affairs. In reading the works of religious scholars, at first sight, it might be difficult to detect whether the authors' statements reflect their individual outlook or are a reflection of their status as a servant of the state. Still, the religious scholars were not merely obeying the orders of the state. During the sixteenth century the upper class *ulema*, i.e. Kemalpaşazade, were an inseparable part of the Ottoman elite and the *Şeyhülislam* possessed the same symbolic power with the Grand Vizier.[6] This is why the *ulema* functioned as a type of checking mechanism with regard to the relevancy of the state policies with the religious law (*Şeriat*).

This study comprises of three main sections. In the first section, in order to develop a sense of Kemalpaşazade's status as a statesman information with regard to Kemalpaşazade's biography is provided.

The second section of the study deals with the structure of the Ottoman *medrese* (theological school) system. This section provides information about the connection between both the religious scholarly education and the religious scholars in the sixteenth century and the state authority. While

---

3 M.A.Yekta Saraç, *Şeyhülislam Kemal Paşazade: Hayatı, Şahsiyeti, Eserleri ve Bazı Şiirleri*, Risaye Yayıncılık, İstanbul, 1995, s 25.

4 M. Fayda, "İbn-i Kemal'in Hayatı ve Eserleri*", Şeyhülislam İbn Kemal Sempozyumu*, Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1986, pp 53-63, p 59.

5 Ibid, p 59.

6 Amit Bein, *Osmanlı Uleması ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti: Değişimin Failleri ve Geleneğin Muhafızları*, Trans. Bülent Üçpunar, Kitap Yayınevi, İstanbul 2012, p 13.

Kemalpaşazade was a *medrese* graduate, a brief study with regard to the sixteenth century *medrese* education system would add another dimension in understanding the impact of his official status on his scholarly outlook.

The third section of the study is allocated to a study of Kemalpaşazade's *Tevarih-i Ali Osman* and to some of the prominent fatwas issued by him. This section begins with an analysis of the development of history writing in the Ottoman Empire in order to see what trend of history writing the *Tevarih-i Ali Osman* fits in. After familiarizing the reader with the style of history writing represented in Kemalpaşazade's *Tevarih-i Ali Osman*, this section both provides insights from Kemalpaşazade's own work and compares his history with the history of Aşıkpaşazade, a fifteenth century historian who did not belong to the upper class *ulema* and who did not possess an official position. This comparison will enable the reader to develop a sense of how men from different social statuses write differently with respect to the same historical events. In the last part of this section, some of the fatwas issued by Kemalpaşazade and the motives behind the preparation of these fatwas will be taken into consideration. At this point, the level of cooperation between the religious scholarly thought and state affairs is to be illustrated.

2-Kemalpaşazade: The Scholar and the Statesman

Kemalpaşazade's place of birth is a matter of discussion. Some people such as Hüseyin Hüsamettin call it Amasya, some such as Şerafettin Turan Edirne yet others like İsmet Parmaksızoğlu and Mustafa Fayda think he was born in Tokat.[7] His maternal family were pursuing a career within the *ilmiye* (religious scholarly organization), and his paternal family were from among the ranks of the *ümera* (high ranking military officers).[8] Kemalpaşazade started his career as a soldier following the path of his paternal family. He was already assigned a *zeamet* (a fief with a better income than the smallest fiefdom called *timar*). As part of the Ottoman military organization Kemalpaşazade had also partaken in the special unit of Bayezid II (r.1481-1512) in Edirne.[9]

When Kemalpaşazade was around the age of twenty five, he decided to change his career path. Instead of pursuing a career within the ranks of the *ümera*, he moved to the ranks of the *ulema* (religious scholars). Yekta Saraç

---

7 M.Fayda, "İbn-i Kemal'in Hayatı ve Eserleri", p 53-54.
8 M.A. Yekta Saraç, *Şeyhülislam Kemalpaşazade…*, p 19.
9 Şamil Öçal, *Kışladan Medreseye: Osmanlı Bilgini Kemalpaşazade'nin Düşünce Dünyası,* İz Yayıncılık, İstanbul 2013, p 44.

explains the reason why as follows: While attending one of the campaigns of Bayezid II, in a meeting held by Çandarlı İbrahim Paşa (1429/30-1499), the famous general Evranos (grandson of Evrenos *gazi*) was also present. Later on an ordinary man from the *ulema*, i.e. Molla Lütfi (d. 1494) entered in and sat before the general. Kemalpaşazade was surprised in how come a man who was payed as much as thirty *dirhem* (silver coins) can dare sit before a general. Kemalpaşazade was told that the *ulema* are among the honoured ones due to their wisdom.[10]

In this narrative the astonishment displayed by Kemalpaşazade, whose maternal family had pursued a career in the *ilmiye*, seems interesting. With this information in mind, we have the right to think that he must have been already familiarized with how the *ulema* were treated in the Ottoman socio-political order. Still it is stated that Kemalpaşazade contemplated upon this event, and then decided that no matter how much he struggles he cannot be as powerful as Evranos Paşa in warfare. However, if he works a lot he can surely reach the status of that *alim*.[11] At this point one explanation with regard to Kemalpaşazade's decision for a career change might be that of the difficulty he sensed in advancing in the ranks of the military organization. Still, this idea needs to be verified with further research.

Kemalpaşazade was well-educated in various sciences since his childhood. While his father was serving for *Şehzade* (Prince) Ahmed (1466-1513) in Amasya, Kemalpaşazade took some lessons from the *ulema* of Amasya on grammar, syntax, logic and vocabulary. He was able to speak both Arabic and Persian.[12] After moving into the ranks of the *ilmiye*, he continued his studies in Amasya. In 1501, being supported by Müeyyedzade (1456-1516) he was assigned *müderris* (teacher, religious scholar) to Edirne *Taşlık Medresesi*. Müeyyedzade was a close associate of Bayezid II and the *kazasker* (chief military judge) of Anatolia at the time. It is said that he had influenced Kemalpaşazade in the writing of the *Tevarih-i Ali Osman.*[13] What is more Müeyyedzade is the person who convinced Bayezid II to assign Kemalpaşazade the duty of writing an Ottoman history in Turkish, i.e.

---

[10] M.A. Yekta Saraç, *Şeyhülislam Kemal Paşazade…,* p 20-21.
[11] Ibid, p 20-21.
[12] Ibid, p 20.
[13] Hasan Aksoy, "Müeyyedzâde Abdurrahman Efendi", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Ansiklopedisi*, Volume 31, Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, İstanbul 2006, pp 485-486, p 485.

Tevarih-i Ali Osman.[14] From this time onwards Kemalpaşazade ascended through the ranks of the *ilmiye*. In 1506, he became the *müderris* of *Halebiye Medrese* and *Üç Şerefeli Medrese* in Edirne. In 1517, after becoming the *kazasker* of Anatolia, he attended the campaign of Egypt with Sultan Selim I (1470-1520). In 1525, he reached the highest office in the ranks of the *ilmiye* which is the office of the *Şeyhülislam.*[15]

In evaluating Kemalpaşazade's writings and approach to various events taking place around the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, his biography should be taken into consideration. Keeping in mind that Kemalpaşazade had written the official history of the Ottoman sultans as a state servant, his writing and scholarly disposition must have been influenced by the state ideology.

3- On the Ottoman *Medrese* System during the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries

In order to obtain a hint with regard to the aims of this education system, at this point some highlights will be provided on the Ottoman *medrese* (theological school) system, where the *ulema* of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries received education. According to Şamil Öçal, there were two basic factors underlying the establishment of the Ottoman *medrese* system. One of these was to educate people who would work for the Ottoman bureaucratic system, and who would both design and check the functioning of the judiciary basis of the Empire. The other reason was to ensure the continuation of the Sunni Islamic understanding which represented the religious affiliation of the majority of the Ottoman Muslim society.[16] It should be noted here that around the fifteenth century Ottoman bureaucracy, the *ulema* and the scribes were not as yet differentiated. This is why the *medrese* graduates were assigned to the positions in chancery[17] which made them an indispensable part of the Ottoman administrative system. The *medrese*s mainly condensed in the capital of the state and were established with the support of the high ranking statesmen. These are counted as proof that *medrese*s and the political authority were closely related.[18]

---

[14] Yekta Saraç, *Şeyhülislam Kemal Paşazade…,* p 22.
[15] Ibid, p 23-25.
[16] Şamil Öçal, *Kışladan Medreseye…*, p 21.
[17] Şerif Mardin, "The Just and the Unjust", *Daedalus,* Volume 120(3), Summer 1991, pp 113-129, p 117.
[18] Şamil Öçal, *Kışladan Medreseye…,* p 22.

It is to be remembered here that in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, during the lifetime of Kemalpaşazade, the number of Ottoman *medrese*s all over the country had reached approximately to a thousand in number. Apart from the *medrese*s, in every village and neighbourhood there were schools for children (*sıbyan mektepleri*). Dalkıran suggests that this displays how widespread the official education was at the time.[19] The increase in the number of *medrese*s must have been related with the support of the authorities. Nabil Al-Tikriti also suggests that it was during the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries that against the Timurid influence on the Ottoman *medrese* system being effective since the interregnum years (1402-1413), a new Ottoman *mentalité* emerged which prioritized the core principles of Sunni Islam. Accordingly, from Mehmed II's reign onwards a curriculum was designed and *medrese* education started to be monitored by the state authorities.[20] While it is not suggested that at the time a well-regulated education system did exist, the argument is that at the time the *medrese* system was utilized by the state authority to disseminate both the official ideology of the state and the religious orthodoxy, i.e. Sunni Islam, while at the same time raising the future bureaucrats for the state.

In the sixteenth century while some among the *ulema* functioned as state officials, the students raised up in the *medrese*s had aspired to be the *kadı*s (judge), *müftü*s (official expounder of the Islamic law), *kazasker*s or *Şeyhülislam*s of the future.[21] The duties of a religious scholar working in the Ottoman administrative system were thus officially regulated. It is also suggested that in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, instead of producing unique works, the *ulema* had mostly interpreted the ideas of the former Islamic scholars.[22] This is why in the Ottoman world there was already a settled understanding on the characteristic features of Islam. The *ulema* were mostly to support that settled understanding.

The role of the *ulema* in the shaping of the religious orthodoxy is not underestimated here. Around the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the most

---

[19] Sayın Dalkıran*, İbn-i Kemal ve Düşünce Tarihimiz*, Osmanlı Araştırmaları Vakfı Yayınları, İstanbul 1997, p 15.

[20] Nabil Al-Tikriti, "Ibn-i Kemal's Confessionalism and th eConstruction of an Ottoman Islam*", Living in the Ottoman Realm: Empire and Identity, 13th to 20th Centuries,* Eds. Christine Isom-Verhaaren, Kent F. Schull, Indiana University Press, 2016, pp 95-107, p 99.

[21] Şamil Öçal, *Kısladan Medreseye…,* p 22.

[22] Ibid, p 23.

influential school of Islamic thought in *medrese*s was the school of Fahreddin Razi (d. 1209). Many among the influential *ulema* such as Molla Lütfü (d.1494), Kemalpaşazade and his student Ebussuud Efendi (1490-1574) were members of that school of thought.[23] The *ulema* of the time as being state officials had an effect on the shaping of the policies of the state in accordance with the Islamic thought cultivated by the school of Fahreddin Razi.[24] Even though the *ulema* were the servants of the state, their Islamic tendencies were influential in forming the Islamic orthodoxy of the state.

An analysis of Kemalpaşazade's biography and the constitution of the *medrese* system during his life-time shed light both to his educational background and to the level of his dependency on the state authority as a sixteenth century scholar. As above stated there were mainly two things that the state authority had expected from the *medrese* graduates: first to become qualified bureaucrats who would serve the state, i.e. forming and checking the judiciary mechanism, second to support the principles of the Sunni Islam which was the official religion of the state.[25] Below I will try to evaluate the level of support displayed by Kemalpaşazade on the policies pursued by the state in his writings.

4- The Traces of the Scholar and the State Officer in the Writings of Kemalpaşazade

4.1- Development of Historiography from Fourteenth to Sixteenth Century in the Ottoman Empire

The *Tevarih-i Ali Osman* of Kemalpaşazade does not give detailed information as to the times before the establishment of the Ottoman Empire. He takes into granted that the Ottoman Empire is a continuation of the Anatolian Seljukids and that the Ottoman dynasty took over the place emptied by the Seljukid dynasty.[26] According to Ahmet Uğur writing a history of the Ottoman state independent from the histories of the antecedent states is a

---

[23] Sayın Dalkıran, *İbn-i Kemal ve Düşünce Tarihimiz*, p 14.

[24] Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, "İbn-i Kemal'in yaşadığı XV. Ve XVI. Asırlar Türkiyesi'nde İlim ve Fikir Hayatı", *Şeyhülislam İbn Kemal Sempozyumu*, Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1986, pp 31-41, p 34.

[25] Şamil Öçal, *Kışladan Medreseye…,* p 21.

[26] Şerafettin Turan, "Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman'ın Kıymeti", *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman*, Volume 7, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, Ankara 1991, p LII.

development in Ottoman history writing.[27] While Ottoman historiography's foundations date back to the reign of Murad II (1421-1451),[28] it was not until the times of Bayezid II (1481-1512) that there emerged histories dealing independently with the history of the Ottoman dynasty. Colin Imber associates the development with the "active encouragement" of the sultan.[29]

During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the first pieces of Ottoman historiography were in the form of *menakıbname*s (hagiography), *destan*s (epics) and *gazaname*s (stories of holy warriors).[30] The earliest Ottoman historiographer Yahşi Fakih's lost *menakıb* and Ahmedi's *İskendername* are some of the renowned examples to these. *Tevarih-i Ali Osman*s as the proper histories of the Ottoman dynasty succeeded these types of pieces. The *Tevarih-i Ali Osman* of Aşıkpaşazade is known as one of the very first pieces providing with detailed analysis of the Ottoman history. Starting from the fourteenth century, the first representatives of Ottoman historiography like that of Ahmedi (c.1334-1412), Şükrullah (1388-1488), and Enveri (15th century) evaluated Ottoman history as part of the history of universe.[31] Some of these histories started their narration from the time of creation, continuing with the stories of the prophets, then moving into the histories of the caliphs, Umayyads, Abbasids and Seljukids. Only after narrating these they moved into the times of the Ottomans. Still, according to Uğur one problem was that before moving into the times of the Ottomans either the author had already passed away or he got tired and gave merely a brief account of the history of the Ottomans.[32] Aşıkpaşazade, on the other hand, allocated all of his history in the elaboration of the times of Ottoman dynasty.[33] It is to be noted here that, Aşıkpaşazade's work was not in the nature of an official history.

---

[27] Ahmet Uğur, *Kemal Paşa-zade İbn-Kemal*, Milli Eğitim Basımevi, Ankara 1996, p 30.

[28] Necdet Öztürk, Murat Yıldız, *İmparatorluk Tarihinin Kalemli Muhafızları: Osmanlı Tarihçileri. Ahmedî'den Ahmed Refik'e,* Bilge Kültür Sanat, İstanbul 2013, p 32.

[29] Colin Imber, "Ideals and Legitimation in Early Ottoman historiography", *Süleyman the Magnificent and His Age. The Ottoman Empire in the Early Modern World*, Eds. Metin Kunt, Christine Woodhead, Longman, London and New york 1995, pp 138-153, p 142.

[30] Abdülkadir Özcan, "Osmanlı Tarihçiliğine ve Tarih Kaynaklarına Genel Bir Bakış", *FSM İlmi Araştırmalar İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Dergisi,* Volume 1, Spring 2013, pp 271-293, p 271.

[31] Erhan Afyoncu, "Osmanlı Siyasî Tarihinin Ana Kaynakları: Kronikler", *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi,* Volume 1(2), 2003, pp 101-172, p 105.

[32] Ahmet Uğur, *Kemal Paşa-zade İbn-Kemal*, p 30.

[33] Erhan Afyoncu, "Osmanlı Siyasî Tarihinin Ana Kaynakları…", p 105.

The writing of official histories and earliest forms of palace historiography had emerged during the reign of Mehmed II (1451-1481) in the form of Iranian *şehname* (book of kings) literature eulogizing the deeds of the sultans. After the conquest of Istanbul Mehmed II hosted several poets from Persian lands in the palace.[34] Afyoncu states that *şehname* writing and chronicling constitute two different phase of official historiography in the Ottoman Empire. While chronicling (*vekayinüvislik*) has also started during the time of Mehmed II, the office of the palace chronicler (*vekayinüvis*) had first been established during Süleyman I's era (1520-1566) and had turned into a permanent state service only after the eighteenth century.[35]

The first official histories of Bayezid II's reign were İdris-i Bitlisi's (1452-1520) *Heşt Bihişt* in Persian and Kemalpaşazade's *Tevarih-i Ali Osman* in Turkish.[36] The books were not written in the form of *şehname*s. Bayezid II willing to have a complete and detailed account of the Ottoman dynasty's history ordered these two books dedicated only to the independent history of the Ottoman state.[37] Kemalpaşazade's book constituted of ten volumes. Eight volumes were written during Bayezid II's time and two volumes during the reign of Süleyman I (1520-1566) when the sultan ordered the continuation of his work. He also revised the volume on the life of Bayezid II. He used to write this volume at the time of Bayezid II's illness. At the time Kemalpaşazade was hasty to complete the work as soon as possible. This is why he could not cover the final stages of Bayezid II's life.[38] With the two additional volumes added during the time of Süleyman I, the *Tevarih-i Al-i Osman* concludes with the return of Süleyman I from the battle of Mohac (1526).[39]

4.2- The *Tevarih-i Ali Osman*

Kemalpaşazade's *Tevarih-i Al-i Osman* is composed of ten volumes. Each volume is devoted to an Ottoman sultan.[40] Similar to most of the other Ottoman history books, the *Tevarih-i Al-i Osman* is considered a political

[34] Abdülkadir Özcan, "Osmanlı Tarihçiliğine ve Tarih Kaynaklarına Genel Bir Bakış", p 274.
[35] Erhan afyoncu, "Osmanlı Siyasî Tarihinin Ana Kaynakları…", p 110.
[36] Ibid, p 110.
[37] Ahmet Uğur, *Kemal Paşa-zade İbn-Kemal,* p 30.
[38] Ibid, p 33.
[39] Ibid, p 34.
[40] Ahmet Uğur, *Kemal Paşa-zade İbn-Kemal,* p 32.

work. However, contrary to the attitude displayed in the histories of other Ottoman historians such as Aşıkpaşazade (1400-1484) and Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali (1541-1600), Kemalpaşazade is thought as among the ones who had written mostly in support of the policies of the state. Quoting from Kemalpaşazade's *Tevarih-i Ali Osman*'s first volume Ahmet Uğur states that in assigning the duty to Kemalpaşazade, Bayezid II summoned Kemalpaşazade to his presence and said that if there were no histories written, the works and deeds of all the big sultans and *melik*s (kings) would have been forgotten. This is why a book should be written which highlights the importance of Islam, and includes *menkıbe*s (epics) of all the Ottoman sultans who had secured the world from all sorts of troubles. The language of this book should be a clear Turkish so that all the people in the society whether educated or not should be able to utilize from it.[41]

While it is clear that the history was written with the order of the sultan and in support of the Ottoman dynasty, Dalkıran indicates that Kemalpaşazade did not back off from criticizing the sultans in several cases.[42] It is also noted that these critiques had mostly focused on the time of Mehmed II. In the volume dedicated to Mehmed II, Şerafettin Turan detects several examples to Kemalpaşazade's critical stance towards the policies of Mehmed II. Kemalpaşazade questions the appropriateness of the sultan's decision for attack in the battle of Jajcza in 1463, deeming it an early attack leading to failure.[43] With regard to the Ottoman-Venetian wars between 1463 and 1479, Kemalpaşazade questions the removal of Süleyman Paşa from his post of commander-in-chiefdom of Rumelia (*Rumeli Beylerbeyliği*) due to his inability to succeed in his attack on the castle of Lepanto. The post emptied by Süleyman Paşa was filled with commander-in-chief of Anatolia (*Anadolu Beylerbeyi*) Davud Paşa who had also been fired from this post, which is again evaluated as an inappropriate decision by Kemalpaşazade.[44] In the first case when Süleyman Paşa attacked the castle of Lepanto twice but could not succeed, he used to retreat and this became a reason for his removal from the office. Still, Kemalpaşazade states that Süleyman Paşa was not mistaken in

[41] Ibid, p 32.
[42] Sayın Dalkıran, *İbn-i Kemal ve Düşünce Tarihimiz*, p 56.
[43] Şerafettin Turan, "Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman'ın Kıymeti", p XLIX.
[44] Ibid, p XLIX.

taking precautions in matters of war. The force of his sword was also approved by all, yet he was deprived of good luck.[45]

In explaining the removal of Davud Paşa from his post of *Rumeli Beylerbeyliği*, Kemalpaşazade says that it was due to a conflict between Karamani Mehmed Paşa (serving as the vizier) and Davud Paşa that took place while the two encountered in Alexandria. Kemalpaşazade, while accusing Mehmed Paşa as becoming a vizier full of lies, cruelty, and full of grudge, states that although he had some problems with regard to speaking, he was skilful in the refinement of his words. According to Kemalpaşazade, the sultan was influenced by Karamani Mehmed Paşa's impressive rhetoric and play of words (*sihr-i beyan*) in deciding to dispel Davud Paşa from the post.[46] As Şerafettin Turan indicates Kemalpaşazade was also very critical of Mehmed II for making a person like that of Karamani Mehmed Paşa his vizier.[47]

These critiques do not indicate that Kemalpaşazade was thoroughly against Mehmed II. Most probably writing during the reign of Bayezid II, he was supposed to criticize some aspects of Mehmed II to extol the policies of Bayezid II. Apart from these criticisms, there are also places in the text where he is legitimizing the actions of Mehmed II. Even if this book is not devoted to legitimize the policies of Mehmed II, still as Kemalpaşazade writes at the beginning of the first volume, this was a book aiming to display the good deeds of Bayezid II and all the former Ottoman sultans.

In order to further illustrate this point, a comparison of how differently Aşıkpaşazade and Kemalpaşazade handle the same event in their histories will be presented here. Aşıkpaşazade, writing about what follows after the conquest of İstanbul, makes negative remarks on Mehmed II's policies of re-

---

[45] İbn Kemal, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman*, Ed. Şerafettin Turan, Volume 7, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, Ankara 1991, p 422: "Süleyman Paşa ol hızmeti dahi başaramıyacak, her ne maslâhat ki tuttıysa başa varmayıcak, Hazret-i hudâvendigâr anı 'azl idüb sipahsâlârlık yerinden ayırdı, Rumeli Beğlerbeğliğin, Anadolu Beğlerbeğisi Davud Paşa'ya virdi. Mezkûr Süleyman Paşa'nun tedbîr-i umûr-ı harbde kusûru yoğidi, zarb-ı şimşîrde dahi makbûl-ı cümhûrdı, ammâ uğurı yoğidi."

[46] Ibid, p 473: "İskenderiye seferinden dönülicek Hazret-i hüdâvendigâr, Davud Paşa'yı 'azl idüb Rumeli Beğlerbeğiliğin İskender Paşa'ya virmişdi... 'Azlinin sebebi, Mehmed Paşay-ı Karamâni'ye muhâlefet etdiğüydi; İskenderiye üzerinde anınla karşılaşub ba'zı husûsda husûmet etdiğüydi. Ol vezîr-i pür-tezvîr, gaddâr ve pür-kîndi, gerçi lisânında noksan vardı ammâ kemâlinde suhen- âferîndi; sihr-i beyânla Sultân-ı cihânı teshîr idüb gönlüne girmişdi..."

[47] Şerafettin Turan, "Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman'ın Kıymeti", p XLIX.

establishing the order within the city. After the conquest, in order to increase the population in the city, Mehmed II is said to declare that whoever comes to the city will be given houses, vineyards and orchards. These possessions will be given as *milk* (private property). Many people from the different regions of the Ottoman state were driven into the city. However, later on the sultan imposed *mukataa* (tax given for a land, place, belonging, etc) on the belongings that were given to those people. The people unable to pay for the *mukataa* fled away from the city.[48] It was thanks to Kula Şahin's (an Ottoman general) advice to the sultan that Mehmed II accepted granting the properties as *milk* again, when Kula Şahin said "Oh my great sultan! Your ancestors have conquered many lands. In none of them they have imposed *mukataa.* This does not become my sultan."[49]

Despite Kula Şahin's warnings, the sultan had a vizier who was in Aşıkpaşazade's words son of an infidel [sic], who tried to manipulate the sultan's decisions on tax imposition. His ancestors were living in Constantinople. This vizier was Rum Mehmed Paşa (d. 1470). Aşıkpaşazade says that the infidels [sic] had a talk with Rum Mehmed Paşa, telling him that the Ottomans are re-establishing the order in the city which is not acceptable, and they tried to find a way to corrupt the order. Rum Mehmed Paşa said he can ask the sultan to re-impose the *mukataa*.[50] In Aşıkpaşazade's writings the *mukataa* imposed on people makes no sense and becomes a policy that serves the evil purposes of the 'infidels' who wanted to reclaim the city.

On the other hand, Kemalpaşazade provides a logical explanation with regard to the imposition of *mukataa*. When his courtiers asked Mehmed II why he took such a decision, according to Kemalpaşazade, Mehmed II answered as follows: My wish was not to collect money, but maybe to make

---

[48] Aşık Paşazade, *Osmanoğulları'nın Tarihi,* Eds. Kemal Yavuz, M.A. Yekta Saraç, K Kitaplığı, 2003, p 488.

[49] Ibid, p 488: "Hey devletlü sultânum! Atân deden bunca memleketler feth itdiler, hiç birinde mukata'a vaz' itmediler. Sultânuma lâyık degüldür."

[50] Ibid, p 488-489: "Pâdişâha bir vezir geldi kim ol bir kâfirün oglıydı, pâdişâha gâyette mukarreb oldı. Ve bu İstanbol'un eski kâfirleri bu vizîrün atası dosttlarıdı, yanına girdiler kim: "Hey ne'ylersin." didiler. "Bu Türkler girübu şehri ma'mûr itdiler." didiler. "Bu senün gayretün kanı! Atan deden yurdını ve bizüm atalarumuz dedelerümüz yurdlarını ve yurdlarımuzı bu Türkler aldılar, gözlerümüze karşu tasarruf iderler. İmdi sen hod pâdisâhun mukarrebisin." didiler. "Cehd eyle kim bu halka bir re'y ü tedbîr-ile kim bu halk bu şehrün 'imaretinden el çekeler ve girü evvelki gibi bu şehir bizüm elümüzde kala." didiler. Vezîr dahı eydür: "Buna şol mukata'a evvelde komışlardı, anı pâdişâha diyüp girü koduralum." didi…"

changes in the allocation of estates shared by the people and in the allocation of properties. I have heard that, poor people have settled in grand palaces and the rich that arrived later were left with the houses that were fit for the poor. My intention was to alter this situation.[51] Kemalpaşazade indicates the result was as the sultan anticipated. After the imposition of the taxes poor people who settled in grand houses had to move into more modest houses whose tax they could afford to pay, while rich people could move into bigger houses.[52]

What is explained as merely a detrimental regulation in Aşıkpaşazade had been legitimized in Kemalpaşazade. Indeed, both of these arguments make sense when we look into the event from the authors' perspective. It makes sense to think that the new settlers of İstanbul had a difficult time being driven away from their hometowns. They must have thought that at least they were granted private properties in this new city. However, once they settled into the city, the sultan changed his mind and asked for taxes for these properties. Aşıkpaşazade was among the people who owned properties in İstanbul. The new regulation affected him, as well. This is why even though there was a logic behind the imposition of the tax, it is understandable that he would not think the same way as Kemalpaşazade who had written about this event during the time of Bayezid II as a state official.

In comparing Kemalpaşazade with the "first Ottoman sources" such as Tursun Beg, Oruç Beg, Aşıkpaşazade, Neşri and İdris-i Bitlisi, Şerafettin Turan suggests that Kemalpaşazade's writing was superior to others.[53] In elaborating this suggestion, Turan compares different histories. As to Mehmed II's order for the killing of Çandarlı Halil Paşa (d.1453), Aşıkpaşazade states that Halil Paşa's affinity with the lord (*tekfur*) of Gallipoli has led to this incident. Turning back from Karaman, Mehmed II wanted to go into Rumelia through Gallipoli. The preparations made on that direction panicked the lord (*tekfur*) of Gallipoli and he sought the help of Halil Paşa whom he considered his friend. According to Aşıkpaşazade, the lord of Gallipoli said: "If there is a way of getting away from the Turk, it would be by our fellow Halil Paşa. From now on it is required to beg of him. Now it is better to send some fishes to

---

[51] İbn Kemal, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman,* p 98: "Murâdım, emvâl tahsîl eylemek değildi, belki ol halka üleşülen emlâki tahsîsde ve mellâk arasında tahsîste ta'dil etmekdi. İşitdüm ki, denî kimseler 'âlî saraylara girmişler, sonra gelen ganîler fakîrâne evlerde kalmışlar, maksûdum onları tebdîl etmekdi."

[52] Ibid, p 98.

[53] Şerafettin Turan, "Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman'ın Kıymeti", p LI.

Halil Paşa." Aşıkpaşazade further explains that they filled the stomach of the fishes with golden coins (*florin*) and sent them to Halil Paşa. Halil Paşa had placed the coins in a box. Accepting the words of the infidels [sic], arrived to the presence of the sultan.[54]

The event that was depicted as a case of bribery in Aşıkpaşazade was explained differently in Kemalpaşazade. Contrary to the belief that Çandarlı Halil Paşa was killed due to bribery, Kemal Paşazade indicates that the emperors of Byzantium and Çandarlı family have always maintained their good relations.[55] Kemalpaşazade says that Halil Paşa played a prominent role in the process leading to the withdrawal of Mehmed II from the throne in 1446. According to him, the consequence of operating in roughness and stiffness in between the father and the son, for the lasting of the sultanate and the recovering of the country, had been capital punishment (*mucib-i siyaset*).[56] Mehmed II's hidden anger against Halil Paşa became apparent after the conquest of İstanbul. In the aftermath of the conquest, proving his strength, he ordered for the killing of Halil Paşa.[57]

Even though Kemalpaşazade tries to provide a clear picture of events, this would not mean that he had written very objectively just to reveal the true face of events. For instance when writing on the birth of Cem Sultan, even though this is a rumour, Kemalpaşazade narrates that the sultan was not happy with the birth of a third *şehzade*, and kicked the cradle of Cem Sultan.[58] On the subject of to whom Mehmed II had given his support as the future sultan in between Cem and Bayezid, Kemalpaşazade says that conforming to the tradition, Mehmed II was willing that the eldest son, i.e. Bayezid II, should take over the throne.[59] Kemalpaşazade was openly writing in support of the sultanate of his patron.

---

[54] Aşık Paşazade, *Osmanoğulları'nın Tarihi*, p 486: "Tekfur eyidür: "Eger bu Türkden bize kurtılmaga çâre olursa dostumuz Halîl Paşa'dan olur. Girü ana yalvarmak gerekdür." didiler. "İmdi girü Halîl Paşa'ya balıcaklar göndermek gerekdür." didiler. Balıgın karnın florinle toldurdılar... Balıgı Halîl'e getürdiler. Halîl Paşa balıgun karnını sanduga koydu. Kâfirlerün sözini kabûl idüp turdı, hünkâra geldi..."

[55] Şerafettin Turan, "Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman'ın Kıymeti", p LXIX.

[56] İbn Kemal, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman,* p 90: "…ibkâ-yı saltanat, ihyâ-yı vilâyet ecli içün ata ve oğul beyninde huşunet ve kesâfet eylemeğin 'âkıbeti mûcib-i siyâset oldı."

[57] Şerafettin Turan, "Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman'ın Kıymeti", p LXIX: "…serîr-i saltanat vücûd-ı şerîfleri ile zîb ü ziynet bulub İstanbul feth olunmayınca vezir-i mezbûra hışmkin oldukların bir ferde duyurmadı."

[58] Ibid, p XLIX.

[59] Ibid, XC.

4.3-Legitimizing the State Authority

With respect to the reign of Selim I (r. 1512-1520), it is known that Kemalpaşazade was quite close to Yavuz Sultan Selim. When Selim I headed towards a campaign of Egypt he demanded Kemalpaşazade to accompany him and appointed him as the *kazasker* of Anatolia.[60] It was mainly after Kemalpaşazade issued a fatwa in support of a campaign against the Safavids that he had earned the respect of the sultan.

Selim I's first concern was to defeat the internal enemies. During the late periods of Bayezid II's reign the *şehzade*s initiated into a struggle for power.[61] After defeating his brothers, Selim I directed his focus on how to get rid of Şah İsmail (1487-1524; founder of Safavids). However, it was not easy to convince people to wage a war against a Muslim country. Among the Ottoman statesmen there were some who were against a war with Şah İsmail.[62] The sultan was in need of an excuse. Kemalpaşazade was one of the scholars who assisted the sultan in justifying the idea of a campaign. He issued a fatwa on the subject arguing that the Shia, i.e. followers of Şah İsmail in this case, should be regarded as apostates.[63] In his fatwa Kemalpaşazade argued that the Safavids deny the caliphate of the three imams (Ebu Bekir, Ömer, Osman) and swear against these three imams. They took into granted whatever Şah İsmail regarded as *helal* (lawful) or *haram* (unlawful or ill-gotten). They even consumed alcohol since Şah İsmail stated that it is *helal*. According to Kemalpaşazade, even their marriages were invalid.[64] These are some reasons listed by Kemalpaşazade to convince people that a war against Safavids would be counted as *gaza* (holy war).

It must have been due to the support of Kemalpaşazade for the campaign that the sultan appointed him as the *kadı* of Edirne in his return from the Battle of *Çaldıran* in 1514.[65] As above stated Selim I was later on to appoint him as the *kazasker* of Anatolia. All these findings demonstrate that Kemalpaşazade was very much attached to the ideology of state authority.

---

[60] Ahmet Uğur, *Kemal Paşa-zade İbn-Kemal,* p 16.
[61] Ibid, p 14.
[62] Ibid, p 15.
[63] M.A. Yekta Saraç, *Şeyhülislam Kemal Paşazade…,* p 90.
[64] Ibid, p 89.
[65] Ahmet Uğur, *Kemal Paşa-zade İbn-Kemal,* p 16.

Apart from the Safavid threat creating the religious opposition of the Shia, at the second half of the sixteenth century, a new sect different from the sect of Fahreddin Razi (the main sect followed by the *ulema*) emerged. This sect was led by Birgivi Mehmed Efendi (1522-1573). According to Ahmet Yaşar Ocak this sect can be considered as the first sect that opposed the orthodox Islamic understanding in the Ottoman Empire.[66] The Sufi orders in Anatolia had yet constituted another group that were critical of the Islamic orthodoxy. At this point we need to keep in mind that the *Celali* revolts led mainly by irregular troops and some cavalrymen reflecting the dissatisfaction of the population with economic crises and the policies of the state[67] also emerged during the time. From all these it can be anticipated that during the time Kemalpaşazade had served the state, i.e. second half of the fifteenth and first part of the sixteenth century, there emerged different voices in the Ottoman state criticizing the policies of the central authority. However, as one of the religious authorities, Kemalpaşazade had strived to bring about solutions that would consolidate the authority of the sultan.

In dealing with different religious sects, Kemalpaşazade depended on a hadith (prophet Muhammed's sayings and deeds) which states 'the ones who make an innovation in religion are in error, and those people in error will go to hell.'[68] According to Kemalpaşazade these different sects were trying to make innovation in religion which was unacceptable.[69] Another hadith he used states 'what happened to the Israelites will also happen to my ummah [the whole community of Muslims]. Israelites disintegrated into seventy two different factions. My ummah will split into seventy three factions and all of these different factions but one will go into hell.'[70] Kemalpaşazade divided different groups of Islamic thought into six. He said that under each fraction there are twelve different factions. This gives us seventy two different factions in the end. These groups were classified by him as *hariciyye*, *rafiziyye*,

---

66 Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, "İbn-i Kemal'in yaşadığı XV. Ve XVI. Asırlar Türkiyesi'nde İlim ve Fikir Hayatı", p 34.

67 Oktay Özel, "Population Changes in Ottoman Anatolia during the 16th and 17th Centuries: The Demographic Crisis Reconsidered", *Journal of Middle East Studies,* Volume 36, United States of America 2004, pp 183-205, p 184.

68 Sabri Hizmetli, "Mezhepler Tarihi Yönünden Kemal Paşazâde'nin Görüşleri", *Şeyhülislam İbn Kemal Sempozyumu*, Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1986, pp 123-141, p 125.

69 Ibid, p 125.

70 Sayın Dalkıran, *İbn-i Kemal ve Düşünce Tarihimiz*, p 69.

kaderiyye, *cebriyye, cehmiyye*, *mürcie.*[71] There is also the Sunni Islam supported by the state which makes a total of seventy three groups.

Kemalpaşazade was strictly against these different fractions. This has something to do with his political and social concerns, Yekta Saraç indicates. In preparing the grounds for a campaign against Şah İsmail or in ensuring the death of people such as Molla Kabız, who were accused of dividing the society into different religious groups by spreading their marginal beliefs and by disturbing the social solidarity,[72] he was concerned about eliminating the factors threatening the social order. Other than that even though Kemalpaşazade was critical of some practices of the Sufi orders such as *raks* (dance), *sema* (listening to mystical incantation), and *devran* (whirling),[73] he displayed a milder attitude toward them. This is because the Sufi orders were both very widespread in the Ottoman Empire and some of them had good connections with the political authorities. For example, while the *Mevlevi*s had been close to the Ottoman sultans, the *Bektaşi*s had a huge impact on the establishment of the Janissaries.[74]

While it is difficult to understand Kemalpaşazade's mild attitude towards Sufi orders as an individual, it is possible to understand his approach as the *Şeyhülislam*. Keeping in mind that Kemalpaşazade served as *kadı*, *kazasker*, and eventually as the *Şeyhülislam*, he might have opposed to seventy two sects not because all of them were deadly wrong, but maybe because they posed a potential threat to the Ottoman state. As possible threats to the state they were to be suppressed before their ideals were spread among the population. On the other hand, the Sufi orders were already widespread and some of the Sufi orders had close relations with the sultans. This is why any direct attack on these orders could have created a disorder in the social and political order. Kemalpaşazade's opposition to twenty two sects and his mild attitude towards Sufi orders can both be explained by his status as a state official having concerns with regard to the consolidation of the social order.

In analysing the effects of Kemalpaşazade's status on his works, it can be stated that he had generally written in order to support the policies of the Ottoman state and the sultanate. This does not mean that he was pursuing his

---

[71] Ibid, p 70.
[72] M.A. Yekta Saraç, *Şeyhülislam Kemal Paşazade…,* p 31.
[73] Ibid, p 35.
[74] Sayın Dalkıran, *İbn-i Kemal ve Düşünce Tarihimiz*, p 19.

self-interests. As Ahmet Uğur indicates, Kemalpaşazade's main policy can be summarized as supporting the policies of the sultan and the unity of the Ottoman state. The people deemed capable of supporting this ultimate goal were supported by Kemalpaşazade. He again is at the same rate critical of the ones opposing the policies of these sultans. Especially Kemalpaşazade had been against the people or groups who had the potential of threatening the well-being of the Ottoman socio-political system.[75]

5-Conclusion

In the Ottoman Empire, the religious scholarly organization was an inseparable part of the Ottoman administrative system especially during the sixteenth century when the Ottoman state had yet to establish a well-designed bureaucratic system. Kemalpaşazade as both a well-known scholar and a prominent statesman is selected in this study in order to understand the ways relations between the state and the scholarly organization affected an Ottoman intellectual's scholarly disposition. Kemalpaşazade's scholarly disposition with respect to both the histories of the sultans and the socio-political events taking place in the sixteenth century –such as war against Safavids and emergence of different religious factions- was highly influenced by his position as a statesman. Still, it should be remembered that during the sixteenth century there was hardly an equivalent to the modern understanding of producing scientific works or to the modern understanding of intellectuality. Even though he had written the *Tevarih-i Ali Osman* by the order of the sultan, in doing that he accompanied the political authority both in transferring religious and cultural values from one generation to another and in consolidating the social order by legitimizing the doings of the sultans. In his fatwas, as well, it seems clear that his aim was to eliminate the negative effects of the religious fractions on the Ottoman social order. In that sense as one of the most prominent scholars of the sixteenth century, Kemalpaşazade reflects the characteristic features of an early modern intellectual, i.e. *literati*.

[75] Ahmet Uğur, "İbni Kemal'in Siyasi Görüşleri", *Şeyhülislam İbn Kemal Sempozyumu*, Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1986, pp 71-87, p 82.

Primary Sources

Aşık Paşazade, *Osmanloğulları'nın Tarihi*, Eds. Kemal Yavuz, M.A. Yekta Saraç, K Kitaplığı, 2003.

İbn Kemal, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman*, Ed. Şerafettin Turan, Volume 7, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, Ankara 1991.

References

Afyoncu, E., "Osmanlı Siyasî Tarihinin Ana Kaynakları: Kronikler", *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi,* Volume 1(2), 2003, p. 101-172.

Aksoy, H., "Müeyyedzâde Abdurrahman Efendi", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi,* Volume 31, Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, İstanbul 2006, p. 485-486.

Al-Tikriti, N., "Ibn-i Kemal's Confessionalism and the Construction of an Ottoman Islam*", Living in the Ottoman Realm: Empire and Identity, 13th to 20th Centuries,* Eds. Christine Isom-Verhaaren, Kent F. Schull,. Indiana University Press, 2016, p. 95-107.

Bein, A., *Osmanlı Uleması ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti: Değişimin Failleri ve Geleneğin Muhafızları,* Trans. Bülent Üçpunar, Kitap Yayınevi, İstanbul 2012.

Dalkıran, S., *İbn-i Kemal ve Düşünce Tarihimiz*, Osmanlı Araştırmaları Vakfı Yayınları, İstanbul 1997.

Fayda, M., "İbni Kemal'in Hayatı ve Eserleri", *Şeyhülislam İbn Kemal Sempozyumu*, Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1986, 53-63.

Hizmetli, S., "Mezhepler Tarihi Yönünden Kemal Paşazâdenin Görüşleri", *Şeyhülislam İbn Kemal Sempozyumu,* Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1986, 123-141.

Imber, C., "Ideals and Legitimation in Early Ottoman Historiography", *Süleyman the Magnificient and His Age. The Ottoman Empire in the Early Modern World,* Eds. Metin Kunt, Christine Woodhead), Longman, London and New York 1995, p. 138-153.

Ocak, A. Y., "İbn Kemal'in Yaşadığı XV. ve XVI. Asırlar Türkiyesi'nde İlim ve Fikir Hayatı", *Şeyhülislam İbn Kemal Sempozyumu,* Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1986, 31-41.

Öçal, Ş., *Kışladan Medreseye: Osmanlı Bilgini Kemalpaşazade'nin Düşünce Dünyası,* İz Yayıncılık, İstanbul 2013.

Özcan, A., "Osmanlı Tarihiçiliğine ve Tarih Kaynaklarına Genel Bir Bakış", *FSM İlmi Araştırmalar İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Dergisi*, Volume 1, Spring 2013, p. 271-293.

Özel, O., "Population Changes in Ottoman Anatolia during the 16th and 17th Centuries: The Demographic Crisis Reconsidered", *Journal of Middle East Studies,* Volume 36, United States of America 2004, p. 183-205.

Öztürk, N. & Yıldız M., *İmparatorluk Tarihinin Kalemli Muhafızları: Osmanlı Tarihçileri. Ahmedî'den Ahmed Refik'e,* Bilge Kültür Sanat, İstanbul 2013.

Saraç, Y. M. A., *Şeyhülislam Kemal Paşazade: Hayatı, Şahsiyeti, Eserleri ve Bazı Şiirleri*, Risaye Yayıncılık, İstanbul 1995.

Mardin, Ş., "Aydınlar Konusunda Ülgener ve Bir İzah Denemesi", *Türkiye'de Din ve Siyaset,* Eds. M. Türköne, T. Önder, İletişim, 2011.

Mardin, Ş., "The Just and the Unjust", *Daedalus*, Volume 120(3), Summer 1991, 113-129.

Turan, Ş., "Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman'ın Kıymeti", *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman,* Volume 7, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, Ankara: 1991.

Uğur, A., "İbni Kemal'in Siyasi Görüşleri", *Şeyhülislam İbn Kemal Sempozyumu,* Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1986, p. 71-87.

Uğur, A., *Kemal Paşa-zade İbn-Kemal*, Milli Eğitim Basımevi, Ankara 1996.