THE BEGINNINGS OF PRINTING IN THE OTTOMAN CAPITAL: BOOK PRODUCTION AND CIRCULATION IN EARLY MODERN ISTANBUL

Nil Pektas*

When Johannes Gutenberg began printing using the technology of movable type in Mainz around 1439, the Western world was to change rapidly and irreversibly. This shift from mainly handwritten production and the less popular xylographic printing (made from a single carved or sculpted block for each page) to typographic printing (made with movable type on a printing press in Gutenberg’s style) made it possible to produce more books by considerably reducing the time and cost of production. Renaissance and Reformation, the two movements that defined pre-modern Europe, would have been unthinkable without this technology.1 The conquest of Constantinople by the Ottomans in 1453, which coincided with the printing of Gutenberg’s Bible, forced a substantial number of scholars and scribes to migrate to the West, where they established workshops for the copying and printing of Greek liturgical, patristic and classical texts and grammars.2 Thus Greek printers and printers of Greek texts were active mainly in Italy, but also in Germany, France, England, the Netherlands and Spain.3 In The Printing Press as an Agent of Change, Elizabeth
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Eisenstein repeatedly refers to the link between the ‘fall of Constantinople’ and the transfer of classical Greek and Byzantine knowledge to the European shores. She argues that the ‘resurrection’ was only made possible by the printing’s powers of preservation and dissemination. She considers printing to be a ‘Western’ and ‘Christian’ development and —understandably— disregards the adoption of printing in the Ottoman Empire altogether. It is remarkable, though, that there is no mention of Turkey in any of the major histories of printing, apart from a few passing remarks on the threat of the Ottoman advances in Europe. In histories of the Ottoman Empire, on the other hand, printing only enters the picture with İbrahim Müteferrika, who became the first officially recognised Ottoman-Turkish printer when he set up his press in Istanbul in 1727. Without exception, he is primarily described as ‘a Christian convert’ or ‘a Hungarian renegade’. While Müteferrika’s non-Muslim origin has been brought to focus time and again to highlight the ‘Christian’ nature of printing, the various reasons behind the Ottoman reluctance to adopt this technology for the production and dissemination of Islamic texts are yet to be fully understood.

5 Ibid, 1: 179.
8 In his insightful examination of modes of reading, manuscript production and dissemination in the Ottoman Empire, Christoph Neumann dismisses the argument that Islam and printing are incompatible. He also finds Wahid Gdoura’s proposition that the economic threat to scribes hindered the adoption of
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**Printing of Islamic books in Europe**

The Islamic world cultivated a robust calligraphic tradition, and calligraphy persisted as a celebrated art with ever-evolving techniques and sophisticated abstract motifs even after the arrival of print. From a traditional point of view, the exquisiteness of the writing and the elegance of the letterforms were almost as important as the contents of Islamic books. In the sixteenth century, a number of European printers tried to open up to the Islamic book markets but struggled to produce books that would appeal to their intended readership, as they overlooked the strong relationship between refined penmanship and the holy word of Allah. The first book in Arabic type was printed in Fano in Italy in 1514 and it was a Book of Hours (Kitab Salat al-Sawa‘i), possibly intended for the Arabic-speaking Christians in the Levant. The first Quran was also printed with Arabic typeface in Fano in 1537 or 1538 by the Venetian printer Alessandro Paganino (fl. 1509–1538). The edition offers no scholia (marginal notes), translation or commentary in Latin or Greek, which suggests that it was intended for Islamic markets. Its financial failure is no surprise given the numerous errors the edition suffers from, such as misplaced diacritical marks, and confusion of letters (e.g. *dal* for *dhal* and *ayn* for *ghayn*, both of which are distinguished from the former with a dot (*nokta*) placed above the stem). Such disregard for textual preservation of their holy book and the crudeness of the letterforms that were the product of careless punch-cutting must have made pious Muslims even more sceptical of the merits of printing.

The most famous printing house for Arabic books was the *Typographia Medicea* in Rome, founded in 1584. The output of this prolific press was
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varied. The press primarily produced Catholic material in the languages of the Middle East (Arabic, Syriac, Coptic and Ethiopian) to strengthen the Christian mission in the Levant. Typographia Medicea also specialised in Arabic scientific texts. In 1593, it printed Avicenna’s (Ibn Sina, c. 980–1037) famous medical treatise al-Qanun. Another remarkable edition that came out the next year was the Kitab tahrir [al-]jusul li-Uqlidis, an Arabic redaction of Euclid’s Elements attributed to Nasiruddin Tusi (1201–1274).\(^\text{13}\) The typeface employed by Typographia Medicea was Robert Granjon’s (1513–c.1590) Arabic, a beautiful and fully ligatured set in three sizes, which certainly raised the bar for Arabic printing in Europe. The visual beauty of the books alone was not enough, however, to make printing of Arabic texts a profitable business for the press. The sales of both printed editions in Istanbul, for instance, were lower than expected, despite the significant demand for manuscript copies of the same texts.\(^\text{14}\) Antoine Galland (1646–1715), French Orientalist and visitor to between 1672 and 1673,\(^\text{15}\) came across a surviving copy of the Medici Avicenna in the sahaflar (bookshops) district of the city, which he frequently visited to buy second-hand and rare books. Galland was struck by the physical quality of this edition and its expert imitation of handwritten Arabic letterforms, which he claimed surpassed the beauty of all the other Arabic printed books he had seen to date. And yet, to his astonishment, Galland noted that the market for these editions was limited to the Christians of the Levant and the missionaries, because Muslim readers preferred manuscript copies, even when printed


editions were sold at a considerably cheaper price. Accumulating an impressive library with beautiful hand-copied books was an important status symbol for the Ottoman elite. Books were not merely vessels transmitting knowledge and information; they were also prized possessions to showcase one’s wealth and intellectual sophistication. This was even more so in the case of manuscript Qurans, which fetched higher sums in the market compared to other books, but were never really read. A well-educated Muslim book owner would already know his Quran by heart.

The fact that no Islamic books printed in this period have been discovered so far demonstrates that the Ottoman court was not interested in printing an official edition of the Quran, the hadiths or any of the celebrated tafsirs, and making them available to the masses. Even in the eighteenth century, the Müteferrika press was only allowed to print non-religious works. It is hard to understand the complex reasoning behind this since copying and disseminating the holy book of Islam and other necessary and useful texts were considered a sevap (good deed) among Muslims. Besides, scholars or wealthy individuals would commission the copying of core Islamic and scientific texts, which would then be bequeathed to the libraries of mosques and medreses, and movable type printing would have been the perfect method for cheap and fast, yet correct and efficient transmission of these texts. Perhaps, Ottoman readers found it hard to come to terms with the ‘cheap and fast’ aspect of the printing process. The press room of a printing house in the hand-press period was practically a sweatshop with several manual workers racing to ink the type, and to wash, press and dry the sheets up to twelve hours a day. This room would be a cramped place, with burning candles and boiling ink, and – most importantly – a deafening noise from the machinery. A long way from the tranquil setting in which a pious scribe would duly copy the holy word of God. Muslim Ottomans might have opined that the hubbub within the space where the printing activity took place and the scale of commercial gains created by the business would have besmirched the sanctity and taken away from the spiritual merits of transcribing religious texts. The scribe, in Ottoman culture, was bound by a

16 B. Herbelot de Molainville, Bibliothèque orientale, ou Dictionnaire universel contenant généralement tout ce qui regarde la connaissance des peuples de l’Orient [with a preface by Antoine Galland] (Paris: Compagnie des libraries, 1697), p. [ü].
moral duty to copy the holy text correctly and beautifully, and the process itself was considered a spiritually elevating experience. It is for this reason that when a müstensih (scribe) copied a Quran, he made a point of registering in the ferağ kaydı (colophon) how many copies of the holy book he produced up to that date.

Ottoman attitudes to printing

A substantial number of scholarly works argue that it was forbidden by law to print or disseminate printed books in the Ottoman Empire until Müteferrika established his printing house. A commonly quoted example is a decree supposedly issued by Beyazid II (r. 1481–1512) in 1483 banning printing in Ottoman territory. His successor Selim I (r. 1512–1520) allegedly renewed this ban in 1515. I have not been able to locate these documents nor have I seen any direct reference to them in any scholarly work on Turkish printing.

Early modern Western sources are rife with references to an Ottoman ban on printing and the fatal consequences of its violation. Robert Midgley wrote:

As for Printing, [Turks] would never endure it amongst them. A Grand Vizir’s judgment of it was remarkable, which shews rather their Prudence than any effect of their Ignorance. A famous Printer of Holland, by Religion a Jew, came to Constantinople, bringing Presses with him, with Characters of all Sorts of Idioms, particularly Arabick, Turk, Greek, and Persian Letters, with design to introduce the use of Printing into that great City. As soon as the Vizir was informed of it, he caused the Jew to be Hanged, and broke all his Engins and Millions of Characters which he had brought; declaring, it would be a great Cruelty, that One Man should, to enrich himself, take the Bread out of the Mouths of Eleven Thousand Scribes, who gained their Livings at Constantinople by their Pens.

The story is fabricated, but Midgley has a point. Sir Thomas Roe (c. 1581–1644), the English ambassador who spent the first decade of the seventeenth century in Istanbul, was also aware of the perils of printing in the
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capital and the arbitrariness of the law concerning printed book production. He wrote:

Yet knowing the jealouslye of this nation, and that, notwithstanding the licence [for the Greek press], it might be in the power of every judge to quarrel against the noveltye, especially at the printing of books, which might be wrested by consequence prejudiciall to their law; we agreed to proceed warily, de modo of putting it in use.25

An Ottoman kadi would have no direct power over the affairs of non-Muslim subjects of the Sultan, but he was still responsible for ensuring the public order for all within the district under his jurisdiction.26 Therefore, Roe’s concerns that a kadi might throw a spanner in the works upon a complaint from a local resident were not wholly unwarranted because the conservative members of the ilmiye class27 who had strong ties to the scribal community took a dim view of the printing technology.

Ottoman bureaucracy and the manuscript tradition

Ottoman scribes and copyists were a privileged community with strong ties to the seraglio. While many early modern Western travellers to the Empire cited ‘an abhorrence of learning’ as a factor, the Ottoman reluctance to print had more to do with the possible economic threat that the technology of printing posed to the business of müstensihs (copyists), hattats (calligraphers) and müzehhhips (illuminators). This argument was also voiced by Luigi Fernando Marsigli (1658–1730), a visitor to the Empire in the late seventeenth century who estimated that a staggering 80,000 workers were involved in the manuscript production in Istanbul alone.28 In comparison, those who would have profited from the increased trade in printed books were small in numbers:

25 The negotiations of Sir Thomas Roe, in his Embassy to the Ottoman Porte, from the Year 1621 to 1628 inclusive (London: Printed by Samuel Richardson, 1740), p. 761.
27 Some members of the ulama were close to or actively supported the Kadızadeli movement, known for their staunch opposition to innovation (bi’dat). On the Kadızadeli movement, see M. Zilfi, ‘The Kadızadelis: Discordant Revivalism in Seventeenth-Century Constantinople’, Journal of Near Eastern Studies 45 (1986), 251-269.
Evliya Çelebi estimated that there were only 60 bookshops and 300 people working in the book trade in Istanbul in 1630.  

The Ottoman Empire had developed an established system of writing that satisfied the needs of the bureaucracy, and introducing a new medium into this system pre-dating the moveable type was a tricky business. The output of the palace scribes was enormous, but there was little need for mass production of documents since each Ottoman ferma was issued in response to an individual request for permission. Printing would not have facilitated faster production as these were all unique and not multiple copies of the same document. Furthermore, Ottoman scribal practices encoded written texts in particular ways. Specialised techniques, characters and methods of writing and formal variations determined the communicative, cultural and political status of documents, and ensured their authenticity.

Yet, the Turkish indifference to printing cannot be solely explained by the economic threat to local scribes or the existence of an established and efficient system of document production. Printing in Western Europe flourished within the historical contexts of the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation, which saw opposing groups utilise printing technology for the immediate dissemination of propaganda material such as religious tracts, political treatises and periodicals. There was no such grand-scale religious debate at an institutional level in the Muslim world in this period, hence no basis for widespread circulation of polemical texts. The Ottoman Empire was no exception in that the antagonisms between the dominant religious movements of the period, such as the controversy between Kadızadelis and the Halvetis, did not translate into a rigorous production of polemical texts that reached a wide readership.

The importation of printed books

Textbook histories of the Ottoman Empire reiterate the mainstream misconception that no printing activity was present in the empire until the eighteenth century. Contrary to the common misbelief, however, the history of printing in Ottoman lands began almost as early as its European counterparts and printed material in various languages of the Empire circulated within the Empire’s vast territory and beyond. The invention and the proliferation of the
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30 By contrast, in the archives of Western European countries are preserved thousands of printed proclamations issued by kings and queens dating back to the fifteenth century.
printing technology in Europe were by no means unknown to Ottomans. Mehmed the Conqueror (r.1451–1481), whose reign saw the invention and proliferation of the moveable type in Europe, was an avid reader with a particular interest in geography, and a collector of maps and incunabula. Historian Peçevi İbrahim Efendi (1572–1650) mentions the widespread use of printed material in the West, while the geographer and bibliophile Kâtip Çelebi (1609–1657) mourns the lack of printing technology in his immediate proximity and complains that he could not include as many maps as he wished to in his Cihannüma, fearing that they would be copied incorrectly.

There was no printing press in Istanbul catering to a Turkish-speaking readership until İbrahim Müteferrika completed the printing of his first book in 1729. Nevertheless, books in Arabic script (in Turkish, Arabic and Persian) including copies of the Quran began to be imported for the use of the learned much earlier. The merchant brothers Brantoni and Orazio Bandini came to the Ottoman Empire to sell books in Turkish, Arabic and Persian. One of those books was Kitab tahrir [al-]usul li-Uqldis, the Arabic redaction of Euclid’s Elements published by Typographia Medicea. The two Italians attached a copy of Sultan Murad III’s emirname allowing the circulation and trade of books in


Furthermore, there were a number of printing presses established by the non-Muslim millets of the Empire.

Plate 1 – Sultan Murad III’s emirname of 1588 printed in Euclid’s Elements (Rome, 1594) (Copy from the British Library, shelfmark G.7840)
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Hebrew printing in Constantinople

The first printing press in Istanbul was established by the brothers David and Samuel Nahmias, who fled from the Iberian Peninsula to Constantinople after the expulsion of Jews in 1492 by the Catholic Monarchs Queen Isabella I of Castile and King Ferdinand II of Aragon. It is widely known that Sephardic Jews were received well in the Ottoman Empire, and that the printers secured a ferman from Sultan Beyazid II sanctioning their printing activities. This printing house’s first publication was Rabbi Jacob ben Asher’s fourteenth-century work Arba’ah Turim (Four Orders of the Code of Law), which came out in 1493. This was a large volume consisting of over 800 folio pages, and its immediate appearance in a city where printing was hitherto unknown is rather curious. Codicological evidence helps us identify the origin of the Nahmias brothers from their possible connection with a press in Hijar, the second most prominent Hebrew printing centre in Spain, and to reconstruct their journey to Constantinople via Naples, where they added further printing material to their inventory. There is a remarkable gap of twelve years between the first and the second output of the Hebrew press in Constantinople. The second book produced, a Pentateuch with commentaries, came out in 1505


38 Nuhoğlu, ‘Müteferrika matbaası’, p. 221. This is possibly the same decree mentioned above. Beyazid II might have allowed the establishment of a printing house on condition that the publishers would not attempt to print Islamic books. Indeed, Müteferrika’s licence included a similar provision.


and the Nahmias family were actively involved in printing until 1518. After this date, a number of presses were established by Joseph ben Ajid al-Kabizi, Yom-Tob Sichri ben Raphael and Moses ben Samuel Facilino. This early period of Hebrew printing in Constantinople was relatively prolific and more than 100 books of mainly religious content were published until 1530, a number exceeding the entire production of Müteferrika in the eighteenth century.

The beginnings of printing in the Ottoman capital…

In 1530, Gershom Soncino set up a Hebrew press in Istanbul, after his peregrinations in Venice, Fano, Pesaro, Rimini and Thessaloniki. Upon Gershom’s death in 1533, his son Eliezer took over the family business. Between 1530 and 1547, the father and son printed over 30 volumes including David Kimhi’s Miklol, a monumental work comprising an exposition of Hebrew grammar and a dictionary of the Bible; a polyglot Pentateuch in Hebrew, Aramaic, Arabic, Persian; and another in Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek and Spanish all set in Hebrew type. In 1547, the Soncino press, types and ornaments were transferred to physician-turned-printer Moses ben Eliezer, who published five books including Solomon ibn Melekh’s biblical commentary Miklol Yofi. The book came out in 1549 after a year of financial hardship, which ended when a local patron offered a helping hand. During the same period, we find Halicz brothers from Krakow printing in Istanbul. Another addition to the printing scene was Solomon Jabez, who printed previously in Thessaloniki and Adrianople, before settling in Istanbul in 1556. Solomon was joined by his brother Joseph in 1572 and they produced more than 40 titles altogether. Motivated by the burning of the Talmud in Rome, Venice, Florence and other Italian cities in the year 1553, the Jabez brothers took on the colossal task of printing a new issue of the Talmud between 1583 and 1593, a project that they never got to complete.

Patronage of influential Jews helped Constantinopolitan Hebrew printing flourish. One such figure was Esther Kira, the wife of Elijah Handali, who had close ties to the Seraglio. She reportedly spent all the money she made through her luxury goods trade on charity. Esther not only supported many scholars, but also paid for the expenses for the printing of the astronomer and mathematician Abraham Zacuto’s genealogical chronicle Sefer ha-Yuhasin published by Samuel Shalom and printed at the Jabez press in 1566. Another female patron was Reyna, Joseph Nasi’s widow, who set up a press in Belvedere, her palace in Ortaköy, which became an important centre of Jewish learning in Istanbul. The press was operated by Joseph ben Yitzhak Ashkeloni,

42 A list of books published by Gershom and Elieser Soncino can be found in A. Freimann, ‘Die Soncinaten-Drucke in Salonichi und Constantinopel (1526–1547)’ Zeitschrift für hebraische Bibliographie 9 (1905), 21-25.
45 Rozen, A History of the Jewish Community of Constantinople, pp. 207 and 262.
46 For a description of this volume, see Heller, The Sixteenth Century Hebrew Book, pp. 584-585.
who produced seven titles between 1593 and 1597. The printing house was then moved to Kuruçeşme, where another eight titles were issued. The press ceased activity after Reyna’s death in 1599, which left the Jewish community without a means to print until 1639, when Shlomo ben David Franco founded a new printing house.47

Evidently, the Jews, among the non-Muslim millets of Istanbul, established the most successful early printing businesses. The dedicated patronage and charity of Jewish notables played a crucial role in the relative success of the Hebrew presses, but a printing business could not thrive without economic gain. We see that the Jewish printers succeeded—to some extent—in reaching out to the Constantinopolitan book market and occasionally to a readership outside the close-knit Jewish community. The products of local Hebrew presses found a place in the market, alongside with printed books imported from Europe. Galland recorded in his diary that he purchased a rare book printed by Karaite Jews of Istanbul for 10 kuruş during one of his frequent visits to the bookshops in the Bedesten.48

**Abgar Dpir: the first Armenian printer**

The first Armenian printing press in Istanbul was established by Abgar Dpir Tokhatetsi of Sivas in 1567 in the Surp Nigogos Church (known today as Kefeli Mescid) in Edirnekapi. Abgar Dpir learned the art of printing in Venice, where he stayed for five years following his unsuccessful mission to Pope Pius IV in 1562. There he printed a broadsheet calendar titled *Kharnapntiur tomarı (Confusion of the Calendar)* and a Psalter.49 In 1567, Abgar Dpir transferred his press to Istanbul and published the *Pòqr qerakanütyun (Brief Armenian Grammar)* in collaboration with a monk named Hotor. His enterprise ended when his work was interrupted by Ottoman officials in 1569, by which time he had printed five books including a liturgy, a prayer book and a Church calendar.50
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47 For more on Hebrew printing in Constantinople and elsewhere in the Ottoman Empire see, Y. Ben-Naeh, ‘Hebrew printing houses in the Ottoman Empire’, 35-82.
Having spent several years in Rome and Venice to master the art of printing, the priest Johannes Têrznc'i founded a printing house in Istanbul in 1587. Johannes Ankiwrac'i, another Armenian cleric-turned-printer who was trained in Venice, set up his press in 1644. The Ottoman-Armenian intellectual Eremya Çelebi Komürçiyan also printed two pamphlets between 1677 and 1678 under the patronage of the merchant Abro Çelebi. Only a handful of Armenian books were printed in Istanbul until the end of the seventeenth century indicating that the conditions for Armenian printing to flourish had not been achieved before the eighteenth century.\(^{51}\)

**The first Greek press**

The establishment of the first Greek printing press in Constantinople is an interesting chapter in the history of the Ottoman capital and the best documented of the earlier printing houses in the city.\(^{52}\) Nikodemos Metaxas, a Venetian subject and an Orthodox monk of Greek origin, hailing from the Ionian island of Kefalonia printed the first Greek book in Istanbul in 1627.

Nikodemos began his printing venture in London in the beginning of 1620s and published his first book in 1625. During his sojourn in England, Nikodemos published three volumes forming an exquisite collection of theological and rhetorical works by select Greek scholars and Orthodox clergymen. In 1627, he brought to Istanbul a printing press and Greek types, thereby furnishing the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople with a powerful tool for publishing and disseminating Orthodox tracts in a language accessible to the local Greek community and beyond.

Cyril Loukaris (1572–1638), who occupied the patriarchal throne loosely from 1620 until his tragic death, was the head of the Orthodox subjects (Rum milleti) of the Ottoman sultan.\(^{53}\) Cyril, allegedly of Calvinist sympathies,\(^{54}\) rose

---


\(^{53}\) Cyril Loukaris, a native of Candia, Crete, was an eminent Greek prelate and theologian. He served as the Greek Patriarch of Alexandria (1601–1620) and Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople loosely between
to prominence as a figure who had extremely close relations with the Anglican and Protestant theologians with whom he kept a regular correspondence. Cyril had long been friends with Cornelius Haga, the envoy of the Dutch Republic in Istanbul, and Sir Thomas Roe, the English Ambassador to the Porte, who were ready to help the publication of his works and other Orthodox tracts in European presses in exchange for sought-after ancient Greek manuscripts. In response to Cyril’s wish to establish a publishing house in Constantinople under the auspices of the Patriarchate, Nikodemos purchased a printing press at his own expense and transported it to Istanbul.

Nikodemos arrived in Istanbul in June 1627, bringing with him a printing press, typefaces, paper and crates of printed books, on board the Royal Defence, a vessel that belonged to the Levant Company. Nikodemos unloaded his cargo


A French Catholic tract concerning the opinions of the patriarch dating from 1620s implies that Cyril has ceased to honour the Holy Sacrament under the influence of his ‘heretical’ friends: Paris, BnF, MS fr., 16160, ff. 157r-v, 158r, 160v, quoted in D. Harai, ‘Une chaire aux enchaères: Ambassadeurs catholiques et protestants à la conquête du patriarchat grec de Constantinople (1620-1638)’, Revue d’histoire moderne et contemporaine 58.2 (2011), 49-71 (p. 51).


in a few weeks’ time at the port of Karaköy under Roe’s privileges.\textsuperscript{57} His freight included a hand-press printing device, which weighed around 350 kilograms.\textsuperscript{58} Metaxas transferred two sets of Greek type: Pierre Haultin’s 96 mm \textit{saint-augustin} (english) set on a 114 mm \textit{gros roman} (great primer) body for the main text and his 76 mm \textit{philosophie} (small pica) for marginal notes. It is evident from the surviving impressions that Metaxas purchased a full set of his main font, complete with capital letters, small capitals, lower case letters, accented letters, ligatures, punctuation marks, numbers and special symbols. In addition, he stocked capitals, small letters and numbers for his smaller type, as well as spaces of various sizes, not to mention ornaments and woodcuts such as printers’ flowers and block letter initials. Metaxas also needed three pairs of cases to hold the type for composition, in addition to composing sticks, page galleys, chases (with wedges or quoins to lock the forme) and, finally, a peel (a T-shaped pole used for hanging up freshly printed sheets of paper to dry).\textsuperscript{59} To conclude, we can estimate that Metaxas was carrying at least 1,000 kilograms of typographical hardware. The unloading of such a massive bulk of exotic materials at the customs must have been a spectacle to behold.

Cyril, whose long awaited wish of maintaining a printing press at the service of his Orthodox flock was finally to be fulfilled, was so delighted that he came to the port, escorted by Gerasimos Spartaliotes, Patriarch of Alexandria, and Daniel, Metropolitan of Corinth, to receive Nikodemos.\textsuperscript{60} As far as we know, this is the first time the Patriarch and the printer met in person.

**The Jesuit propaganda**

Nikodemos intended to employ his press to nourish the Orthodox flock intellectually by printing and disseminating Byzantine and post-Byzantine theological texts in response to the intense Catholic propaganda run by the
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\textsuperscript{57} Roe, \textit{Negotiations}, p. 760.

\textsuperscript{58} Sheila Lambert documented that the two presses installed at Cambridge in 1697 weighed about 350 kilograms each, and that was without their stones, see her ‘Journeymen and master printers in the early seventeenth century’, \textit{Journal of the Printing Historical Society} 21 (1992), 13-27 (pp. 21-22). For a survey of all surviving hand-press devices in England and their technical data, see P. Gaskell, ‘A Census of wooden presses’ \textit{Journal of the Printing Historical Society} 6 (1970), 1-32.

\textsuperscript{59} For a brief glossary of early printing terms, see ‘First impressions’, University of Manchester Library, available online at: http://www.library.manchester.ac.uk/firstimpressions/The-Collection/Glossary/ (accessed on 15 July 2013).

\textsuperscript{60} Roe, \textit{Negotiations}, p. 761.
Catholic missionaries residing in Constantinople. The Jesuits, who were to play a crucial part in the plot to end Nikodemos’s printing activities, arrived in Istanbul as early as 1583.61 They were based in the Church of St Benedict in Karaköy where the Lycée St Benoit stands today. Their first attempt to settle failed due to a plague epidemic that swept through Istanbul that year. Another group of Jesuits arrived in late 1609 and they took up residence in the same building. Their services—conducted in Italian in the morning and French in the evening—began to attract large congregations.62 During Nikodemos’s stay, the Jesuit mission was headed by the abbot Franciscus Canigliao. Other notable fathers included Dionysius Guiller, François Aurillac and Domenicus Mauritius.63 The Jesuit establishment was protected by the French Ambassador Philippe de Harlay (1620–1631).

The Jesuits had established a school in Galata, the cosmopolitan quarter of Istanbul, where foreign diplomatic agents, clergymen, Genoese, Greek, Armenian and Jewish subjects and merchants, and European tradesmen settled.64 The Jesuit fathers provided free education in their schools, where the languages of instruction were Italian and Greek and the curriculum spanned grammar, liberal arts and languages.65 In addition to the regular classes, the Jesuits organised extra-curricular activities such as theatrical performances of mystery plays. These were popular among both the Catholics of Galata and the Orthodox population settled in the Fener district, where the Greek Patriarchate was located. Plays re-enacting the lives of early Christian martyrs or tragedies often portraying ‘a sinner converted to Catholicism’ were staged in vernacular Greek, and these dramatic genres thrived thanks to Jesuit efforts in the early seventeenth-century Levant. The themes and language of the plays make it clear that the Jesuit theatrical performances were aimed at the Greek-speaking population. A good example is the reported staging of a play about the childhood of St John Chrysostom in Constantinople on 13 November 1624, the

62 Frazee, Catholics and the Sultans, p. 82.
very day the Orthodox celebrate the feast of the venerated saint.66 This particular play is tied intricately to the antagonism between Loukaris and Harlay. Harlay’s eight-year-old son played the leading role. Reportedly, the boy’s acting was so admirable that Loukaris requested to be invited to the performance to see him reciting the long and complex soliloquies in Greek.67 This seems extraordinary, given that the Patriarch had strongly rebuked the Jesuit theatrical performances just a few years earlier by denouncing them as unsuitable for a Greek audience and warning parents against such ‘traps’ designed to lure Orthodox children to Jesuit schools.68 Loukaris’s disapproval of the theatrical medium is not surprising in the light of the early Church’s negative stance against theatrical performances as theatre was continuously and rigorously excoriated by the clergy throughout the Byzantine and post-Byzantine period.69 What is striking in this case is Loukaris’s willingness to offer an olive branch to the Jesuits and de Harlay. Loukaris’s diplomatic move to reinstate peaceful relations with the French, however, was not reciprocated. The representatives of the Dutch Republic, Holy Roman Empire and Venice were among the guests of honour, yet Harlay refused to invite Loukaris and Roe.70 Very rarely in the history of drama did such an intimate and quotidian performance become the centre point of a diplomatic game between the great powers of Europe.

The Jesuit educational activities proved extremely popular among the locals.71 Many Greeks, including monks, bishops and deacons, were attending lectures at the Jesuit College, where the language of instruction was in Greek but the Orthodox students were taught the principles of the Latin rite. When it was brought to his attention that the Greeks indeed outnumbered the Catholic pupils at the Jesuit College, Cyril was induced to produce an encyclical advising his flock to remove their children from Jesuit schools in order to protect their impressionable minds from potential ‘heresy’.72 This inevitably led to a conflict between the Greek clergy, who were disappointed with the diminishing

68 Ibid.
69 Perhaps the most famous piece of animadversion against performances was put forward by Chrysostom. See his homily Against those who have abandoned the church and deserted it for hippodromes and theatres (contra ludos et theatre), Patrologia Graeca, vol. 56, cols. 261-270.
72 Papadopoulos, Κόμιλλος Λούκαρης, p. 37.
numbers of their students at the Patriarchal school and their declining influence on the Greek millet. The Jesuit school was hailed as an answer to the lack of education among the Constantinopolitan youth. Cyril was aware that there was a potential danger of exposure to ‘false doctrine’ by none other than the proponents of the Latin rite. His vigilance was not unfounded: on several occasions the Jesuits were accused of trying to convert Greek children, while the fathers of the Church of St Benedict reportedly forced pupils to kneel during the services in contradiction to the Greek tradition. According to Logothete Chrysosculos, however, proselytising mostly occurred in subtler forms and only wise men such as Cyril and his circle who were ‘a cut above the rest’ recognized ‘the serpent hidden in the grass’.

**Nikodemos’s printing house and the books printed there**

Nikodemos set up his press in a large building in Pera in close proximity to the English Embassy and not far from the French Embassy. A typical printing house of the period would also be the dwelling place of the printer, where various rooms served as the ‘correction room’, the ‘press room’ and the ‘warehouse’. Roe notes that Nikodemos and his servants worked and lived in this house before the printer received death threats from the Jesuits and decided to take up residence in the English ambassador’s house. According to a seventeenth-century printing manual, it was desirable that the building in which the press would be operated would have a firm foundation and structure to accommodate the constant pulling of the pressmen. The press room needed to be luminous enough to allow high visibility, but away from direct sunlight to avoid overheating, as heat was not only detrimental to the hard manual work of the pressmen, but also caused the wetted paper to dry prematurely. The house Metaxas rented in Pera offered the perfect setting: it was away from the dampness of the seafront, built on structurally safe ground and on top of a hill to take in generous daylight. The early modern printing establishment also

---

The beginnings of printing in the Ottoman capital…

functioned as a cultural hub or a meeting place, where learned men (authors, correctors, editors etc.) and businessmen (publishers, printers, booksellers, binders etc.) came together. Nikodemos’s house seems to have fulfilled this function, too: it is documented that Michael Kavakis, a Constantinopolitan nobleman was visiting the printing house when the Janissaries broke in and confiscated the equipment.

Plate 3 – First page of Cyril Loukaris’s Σύντομος πραγματεία κατὰ Τουθαίον ἐν ἀπλῇ διαλέκτῳ printed by Nikodemos Metaxas in Constantinople in 1627. (Copy from Harvard University Houghton Library, shelfmark STC 16854.3).
Nikodemos began operating the press sometime after 4 September 1627.\(^{78}\) The first volume he began to work on contains a dedicatory letter addressed to a Constantinopolitan clergyman by the name of Skarlatos Vlasios,\(^{79}\) dated 1 November 1627, Cyril Loukaris’s Κατὰ Ἰουδαίων (Against the Jews) and a collection of Maximos Margounios’s Homilies, comprising six sermons on the six Sundays of Lent and a seventh sermon on the Good Friday. According to reports, Cyril’s tract had been printed by 4 September\(^{80}\) and Margounios’s tract was still a work-in-progress on 13 November.\(^{81}\) The expenses for this publication were paid by Nikodemos himself and this is the one and only complete work that came out of the first Greek press of Istanbul.

The Greek scholar Maximos Margounios (1549–1602) was known for his stance against papal supremacy and the printing of this tract in Constantinople no doubt angered the Jesuits. As soon as Nikodemos completed working on this tract, the Jesuits tried to dissuade him from his purpose with threats and coercion. Nikodemos received numerous threats, and on a daily basis he expected to be murdered in the street or in his bed.\(^{82}\) His fear grew so much that at night he sought shelter at the English Embassy, and throughout the day he had a companion for protection. The news of the malicious attack of the Jesuits travelled fast and Logothete Chrysosculos wrote a letter to David le Leu de Willem\(^{83}\) detailing the troubles the Jesuits inflicted on Cyril.\(^{84}\)

Metaxas’s second project was to print Cyril Loukaris’s Ἐκθέσεις Ὀρθοδόξου Πίστεως (Exposition of the Orthodox Faith), but this volume never reached completion. Scholars have often confused this work with the later and

\(^{78}\) Venier’s report dated 4 September 1627, Venice, ASV, Dispacci, Constantinoli, 105/47, ff. 67r–71r.

\(^{79}\) We do not possess any information about Vlasios other than that he was a fervent supporter of Korydaleus at the Patriarchal Academy. See M.I. Gedeon, Χρονικά τῆς Πατριαρχικῆς Ἀκαδημίας (Constantinople: Ἐκ τοῦ Πατριαρχικοῦ Τυπογράφου, 1883), p. 80.

\(^{80}\) The Venetian bailo Sebastian Venier sent books printed by Metaxas including A short treatise against the Jews to Venice for inspection, along with his report dated 4 September, Venice, ASV, Dispacci, Constantinoli, 105/47, ff. 67r–71r.

\(^{81}\) Venier reveals that Metaxas was working on a treatise by Margounios in his report dated 13 November, Venice, ASV, Dispacci, Constantinoli, 105/63, f. 316r.

\(^{82}\) Roe, Negotiations, p. 761.

\(^{83}\) David le Leu de Willem (1588–1658) was a scholar of oriental languages and law in Leiden. From 1617 to 1629 he worked as a merchant in Syria and Egypt, where he probably met Loukaris while the latter occupied the Patriarchal throne of Alexandria. See E. Jorink, ‘Noah’s Ark restored (and wrecked): Dutch collectors, natural history and the problem of biblical exegesis’, in Silent Messengers: The Circulation of Material Objects of Knowledge in the Early Modern Low Countries, eds S. Dupré and C.H. Läthly (Münster: LIT Verlag, 2011), p. 166. Loukaris wrote a number of letters to de Willem, fourteen of which, penned in the years 1618-1619, survive. The originals, now preserved in the Library of the University of Leiden, Shelfmark BPL 26 B, ff. 5-36, were published by Aymon, Monuments authentiques, pp. 172-200.

\(^{84}\) Letter dated 9 November 1628, quoted in Aymon, Monuments authentiques, pp. 201, 217-219.
notoriously ‘Calvinistic’ *Confessio Fidei* printed in Latin in Geneva in 1629.\(^85\) According to the colophon, the *Confessio* was composed in Istanbul in March 1629.\(^86\) It was translated into Greek (incip.: Πιστεύομεν ἐνα Θεόν ἠληθῇ, παντοκράτορα καὶ ἄριστον, τρισυπόστατον, Πατέρα, Υἱόν καὶ Ἄγιον Πνεῦμα) only in January 1631.\(^87\) Clearly this cannot have been the book Nikodemos began printing in Istanbul in 1628, so there must be another text that was made available to our printer. Hering noted that Cyril wrote a catechism in vernacular Greek in 1618 but he was unable to get it printed and that the manuscript does not survive.\(^88\) It appears Hering was unaware that Chrysostomos Papadopoulos had found, in Constantinople, the text of an earlier and allegedly more ‘Orthodox’ confession by Cyril (incip.: Πιστεύομεν καὶ ὀμολογοῦμεν τὴν τρισυπόστατον θεότητα ὁμοούσιον καὶ συνάναρχον εἶναι), together with his homilies.\(^89\) The manuscript in question is the “Constantinople, *Metochiou Panagiou Taphou 411*”, now housed in the National Library of Greece. The text of this earlier confession, as reported by Papadopoulos, is contained in an insert of three folios attached to the beginning of the codex. The insert is copied in a different hand from that in the rest of the volume and bears no date, signature or colophon.\(^90\) The date of the manuscript is revealed in a report by Roe informing us that Cyril had written a piece that was ‘only a
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\(^86\) ‘Confessio fidei reverendissimi domini Cyrilli Patriarchae Constantinopolitani nomine et consensu Patriarcharum Alexandrini et Hierosolymitani, aliarumque Ecclesiarum Orientalium Antistitum, scripta Constantinopoli mense Martio anni 1629.’

The confession was also published in English in London, and in French in Paris and Sedan in 1629. The Geneva confession was the source of great controversy in the Orthodox world and brought the destruction of Loukaris. See G.P. Michaelides, ‘The Greek Orthodox Position on the Confession of Cyril Lucaris’, *Church History* 12.2 (1943), 118-129. The authenticity of the confession has long been challenged, and suspicions apparently arose as soon as the first edition came out, as this title from 1629 suggests: E. Martin (ed.), *L'imposture de la pretendue confession de foy de Cyrille, patriarche de Constantinople* (A Poictiers: chez la veuve d’Antoine Mesnier, 1629). In contrast, the earlier confession, as discovered by Papadopoulos, has been overlooked by generations of scholars and theologians.

\(^87\) Printed with a facing French translation in Aymon, *Lettres anecdotes de Cyrille Lucaris*, pp. 237-254. The text employed ‘an autograph MS’ of which Aymon had confirmed the authenticity prior to printing. The colophon reads: ‘Ἐδόθη ἐν κωνσταντινουπόλει μηπὶ Ἴανουαρίῳ, αἰχα [1631]. Κύριλλος πατριάρχης κωνσταντινουπόλεως, οἰκεία χώρα ἄγραφα.’ In the French translation the date is erroneously given as 1621, which must have contributed to the confusion. The Greek translation was reprinted in E.J. Kimmel, *Monumenta Fidei Ecclesiae Orientalis*, Part I (Genève: Apud F. Mauke, 1850), pp. 24-44.

\(^88\) Hering, *Ökumenisches Patriarchat*, p. 183.

\(^89\) The text of this earlier confession is published with a foreword by Ch. Papadopoulos, ‘Κυρίλλου Λουκάρεως Πίναξ Ομιλίων καὶ Ἐκθέσεως Ὀρθοδόξου Πίστεως’, *Εκκλησιαστικὸς Φύρος* 10 (1912), 483-497.

\(^90\) Ch. Papadopoulos, *Απολογία Κυρίλλου τοῦ Λουκάρεως* (Jerusalem: Ἐκ τοῦ Τυπογραφείου τοῦ Ἐκκλησιαστικῶν, 1905), p. 485.
declaration of the faith and tenets of the Greeke church [i.e., the Exposition of the Orthodox Faith] ... which he had resolued to dedicate to his late majestie of blessed memorye [King James I of England]. If the Exposition of the Orthodox faith was dedicated to James I, the text must have been in existence before the king’s death in 1625. Roe further remarks that Cyril’s original plan was to send the manuscript to England and have it printed there; ‘but now, hauing the opportunitye to doe it here [in Constantinople], he only changed the epistle from the father to the sonne.’ So, the dedication must have been emended during the reign of Charles I (1625–1649), successor to James I. Two other reports confirm the existence of the earlier confession: Cornelis Haga reported to his superiors in November 1627 that Cyril had ‘begun to prepare his catechism for print’, and Venier wrote in January 1628 that the Patriarch’s work was ‘now ready for publication’.

The Jesuit plot

During the printing of the Exposition of the Orthodox Faith, the Jesuits commissioned Ibrahim Aga, the former governor of Galata, to report Nikodemos’s ‘state-threatening’ activities to the Kaymakam Recep. The accusations were abundant and varied from Nikodemos being an English agent to a war-like criminal. The Jesuits also spread rumours that he intended to start a rebellion among Cossacks and other Orthodox people at a critical time, when Sultan Murad IV (r. 1623–1640) was embarking on an Asian expedition. The

91 Roe, Negotiations, p. 761. The catechism is also mentioned in Smith, Collectanea de Cyrillo Lucario, p. 102.
92 Roe, Negotiations, p. 761
93 Quoted in Hering, Ökumenisches Patriarchat, p. 183.
94 ASV, Dispacci, Constantinopoli, 105/79, f. 556”, also quoted in Augliera, Libri, politica, religione, p. 74.
95 Harlay’s letter to Bethune, dated 27 April 1628, quoted in Hering, Ökumenisches Patriarchat, p. 167.
96 The Jesuits were well aware of the perils such an accusation could bring to any non-Muslim resident of Galata. Not long before, in August of 1616, six Jesuit fathers residing at the Church of St Benedict were apprehended by the kadi and subaşı of Galata under the pretext that they were plotting against the Sultan with the Cossacks and the Habsburgs. Their quarters were raided, materials confiscated and the prisoners were taken in for interrogation. The Jesuit fathers were found guilty of spying and subsequently imprisoned. Despite the efforts of Achille de Harlay de Sancy, the French ambassador to the Porte (1610–1619) for a reconciliation, the Jesuits were kept behind bars for two months, then ordered to leave Istanbul for good. Therefore, it was no coincidence that the Jesuits chose to accuse Nikodemos of particular offences that precisely tapped into the Ottoman fear of a minority uprising. On the imprisonment and deportation of Jesuits see, T. Krstić, ‘Contesting subjecthood and sovereignty in Ottoman Galata in the age of confessionalization: The Carazo affair, 1613-1617’, Oriente Moderno 93 (2013), 422-453 (pp. 438-439).
Jesuits also claimed to have found a passage denigrating Prophet Muhammad in Cyril’s treatise *Against the Jews*.

According to Roe, upon hearing these accusations, the Grand Vizier Damat Halil Pasha (1626–1628) ‘was thrown into fury’ and gave orders that 150 Janissaries break into Nikodemos’s workshop to catch the printer in action on Friday, 14 January.\(^7\) Being a political opponent of the English ambassador, Philippe de Harlay suggested a twist to the original plan to bring harm to Thomas Roe, as well. Roe had organised a banquet to be held on Sunday, 16 January, marking the Feast of Epiphany on Twelfth Night, to which Venier and Cyril were invited. Harlay vindictively suggested that the attack should be deferred until that Sunday to ‘make sauce to [Roe’s] feast’.\(^8\) On the day of the feast at noon, the Janissaries raided Nikodemos’s printing house, confiscated his books, press, printing equipment and paper, and arrested the workmen.\(^9\) In the meantime, Nikodemos was returning from Galata with the secretary to the English Embassy, Domenico Timone, a man of letters who befriended many learned men from England including Edward Pococke, the celebrated orientalist.\(^10\) Apparently Nikodemos was wearing a hat at that moment, which helped him pass through the guarded passages incognito, and the pair was able to slip into the English ambassador’s residence.\(^11\) Roe decided not to interrupt the entertainment, but insisted that Nikodemos stay in his residence until the dust settled. Cyril, as we learn from the first in a series of hastily written notes to Roe, was unable to attend the feast at the English Embassy, because of the disruption at the printing house.\(^12\)

**Nikodemos’s trial**

The next day the books were examined by the Sadaret Kaymakami (deputy vizier) Recep Pasha and the Kazasker (military judge) Hasan Efendi with the help of a Greek renegade, who translated the allegedly anti-Islamic passage in the printed book. According to Roe, ‘ther was nothing found of
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\(^7\) Roe, *Negotiations*, p. 762.

\(^8\) Ibid.

\(^9\) It has been claimed time and again that Metaxas’s press was thrown into the sea or destroyed at this point: Dositheos, *Ieropia*, 2: 1174; Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity*, pp. 272-273; S. Faroqhi, *Subjects of the Sultan: Culture and Daily Life in the Ottoman Empire* (New York, NY: I.B. Tauris Publishers, 2000), p. 70. This assumption is erroneous and contradicts with archival evidence, as the printer was later returned to Nikodemos and transferred to Kefalonia.


\(^12\) Loukaris to Roe, dated 16 January 1628, NA, SP 97/14, f. 1; Roberts, ‘The Greek Press’, p. 34.
consequence.’\textsuperscript{103} Kaymakam Recep, also known as \textit{Topal} (lame) Recep Pasha, was of an avaricious and spiteful character,\textsuperscript{104} and he would not let it go. He ordered another converted çavuş (Janissary captain) to inspect the book once again; but to no avail, nothing offensive could be found,\textsuperscript{105} since Nikodemos had expunged the openly anti-Islamic remarks from the printed edition of Cyriel’s text.\textsuperscript{106} The Šeyh-ül-Islam further remarked that:

Dogmas contrary to the precepts of Mahomet are not, on that account, necessarily blasphemous or criminal; since Christians are permitted by the Sultan to profess their doctrines, there can be no harm in writing than in preaching in their defence: it is not simple belief, but an overt act, which renders men amenable to laws’.\textsuperscript{107}

It is highly likely that these words were uttered by the Šeyh-ül-Islam of the period, Zekeriyaşâde Yahya Efendi, an eminent scholar often praised for his wisdom and integrity.\textsuperscript{108} In the Kadızadeli-Sûfi debate he sided with the Halvetis, a popular dervish order of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and stood against the fundamentalist Kadızadeli ideology.\textsuperscript{109}

The absurdity of the accusations against Nikodemos became apparent as soon as his books were investigated and the testimony of the English ambassador was heard. His workmen and servants were released immediately, but the subsequent return of the goods to their rightful owner took an excruciatingly long time. Having held onto the press for much longer than necessary, Kaymakam Recep finally ordered the release of it on 17 March 1628.\textsuperscript{110} In the meantime Cyril was trying to find suitable premises for printing,

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{105} Hering, \textit{Ökumenisches Patriarchat}, p. 168.
\bibitem{107} Neale, \textit{A History of the Holy Eastern Church}, 2: 430, gives no reference for his quotation, but he evidently translated it from Smith, \textit{Collectanea de Cyrillo Lucario}, p. 106.
\bibitem{110} Loukaris to Roe dated 17 March 1628, NA, SP 97/14, f. 72; Auglieria, \textit{Libri, politica, religione}, pp. 75-76.
\end{thebibliography}
before Yakup Çelebi, the Turkish officer who was supposed to transfer the press, brought it back to the Patriarchate.\textsuperscript{111} Having suffered, however, such abuse and financial loss (amounting to 4,000 thalers according to the reports),\textsuperscript{112} Nikodemos decided not to print in Istanbul again. Possibly as compensation, he was eventually ordained the Archbishop of Zakynthos, Ithaca and Kefalonia. He ascended the archiepiscopal throne on 8 July 1628.\textsuperscript{113} Upon the closure of the printing house and his new appointment, Nikodemos transported the press to Kefalonia, to the village of Frangata (later renamed Metaxata after the noble family).\textsuperscript{114} No Greek printing materials were left in Istanbul after Nikodemos’s departure. The second printing press acquired by the Patriarchate of Constantinople produced its first output almost 130 years later, in 1756.\textsuperscript{115} The origins of the second Greek printing press and its typefaces remain unknown.

**Conclusion**

This article offers a glimpse into the Ottoman capital’s answer to Europe’s printing revolution by examining the first printed books produced in Istanbul and the printers behind their publication. Printing was introduced to the Ottoman Empire very early, yet it did not find the favourable environment for it to flourish as a commercial activity. Almost all early presses established in Istanbul either published sporadically or ceased production prematurely and in an abrupt manner due to disruptions. It remains unknown to us whether there were any interactions between the printers of different non-Muslim communities in Istanbul during the period. While Nikodemos was active in 1627–1628, both the Jewish and Armenian communities of the capital city were without presses. A probe into the interactions and possible collaborations among the printers in the capital remains a desideratum.

The reasons that arrested the development of printing included a limited readership for books, cultural bias and a working and efficient system of manuscript document production for the bureaucratic class. As I have tried to demonstrate, the printing trade was not always sustainable and the book trade was not satisfactorily active to keep the printers in business, let alone be lucrative. The Nahmias brothers, Abgar Dpir and Nikodemos Metaxas all
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\textsuperscript{111} Loukaris to Roe dated 18 March 1628, NA, SP 97/14, f. 86; Augliera, *Libri, politica, religione*, p. 75.


\textsuperscript{113} Sathas, *Νικολάου Φιλολογία*, p. 180.


\textsuperscript{115} The books published that year were two tracts by Eustratios Argenti: Εγχειρίδιον περί βεβαίωμας καλούμενον χειραγωγία πλανομένου... [\textit{Manual on Baptism}, entitled \textit{Guide of those in error}...] (Constantinople, 1756) and Βιβλίον καλούμενον Ῥαντισμοῦ Στηλίσεως [\textit{Book entitled Refutation of Sprinkling}] (Constantinople, 1756). See, Bokos, *Τὰ Πρώτα Ελληνικά Τυπογραφεῖα*, pp. 44-55.
invested great sums into their charitable printing ventures never to see a palpable financial return.\textsuperscript{116} They all learned printing outside the borders of the Empire and brought their presses and printing materials from Europe. The lack of type-foundries, punch cutters, woodcut makers and engravers might have been tolerated to some extent, but the provision of perishables (especially paper) would always pose a problem. Although some sources point to the existence of a paper-mill in Kağthane district,\textsuperscript{117} the output of this manufacturer was clearly inadequate to supply printing grade paper to the trade. The first Jewish book produced in Istanbul was printed on Northern Italian paper that the Nahmias brothers brought with them from Naples, while the 1505 Pentateuch features French paper.\textsuperscript{118} Nikodemos brought his paper stock with him from London, but it was actually crown paper manufactured in Normandy.

Printing thrived in Europe partly in response to the need to disseminate religious propaganda material as a result of Reformation and counter-Reformation movements. The confessional tensions and religious polemics between the disparate entities of Christianity fuelled the proliferation of cheap prints and popular reads. These polemical tracts and religious treatises would have circulated in the manuscript form prior to the spread of printing. The printing technology made their production easier, faster and cheaper, thus propaganda material soared and became widely available. Conversely, Nikodemos’s press in Istanbul was established in response to the Catholic propaganda targeting the Greek population. The main focus of the output of his press was polemical works of anti-Latin and anti-Jewish nature which sought to keep the Greeks in the Orthodox fold. In this respect, the interaction between the non-Muslim millets of the Empire and the religious antagonisms among the different ethnic groups call for more attention. On the other hand, we do not see the emergence of a comparable body of propaganda literature among the Muslim populations of the Ottoman Empire, which may have well stunted the adoption of printing technology among the Turkish-speaking Muslim population of Istanbul.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{116} This also applies to Müteferrika’s printing house. \\
\end{flushright}
Yet printing technology was not banned in early modern Ottoman Istanbul and presses did exist in the city in this period and their output was impressive in quality, if not in quantity, thanks to the individual efforts of the printers who brought their expertise with them from foreign lands. The printing houses of Istanbul and their production had repercussions that made a significant impact on the social and cultural lives of the non-Muslim inhabitants of the city.

The beginnings of printing in the Ottoman capital: Book production and circulation in early modern Istanbul

Printing and circulation of printed texts in the Eastern Mediterranean have become central to the study of the history of the book in recent years. Despite the substantial research on Ottoman printing in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and in different locales, the beginnings of printing in Istanbul and the Ottoman practices concerning the circulation of printed books in the early modern period is an area that remains largely unexplored. This paper examines the appearance of the printed book in the city after the fall of the Byzantine Constantinople to the Ottomans in 1453, which coincided with the establishment of Gutenberg’s press, and before the founding of the first ‘official’ Ottoman press in 1727. The paper investigates incunabula printing, book production and the first non-Muslim presses run by Jewish, Armenian and Greek publishers in Istanbul with a particular emphasis on the Orthodox monk Nikodemos Metaxas’s printing activities.

**Key words:** Printing in early modern Ottoman Empire; Hebrew, Armenian and Greek printing in Istanbul; Nikodemos Metaxas; history of the book and print culture

Osmanlı’da matbaacılığın başlangıcı:
Erken modern İstanbul’da basma eserlerin üretimi ve yayımı

Son yıllarda Doğu Akdeniz bölgesinde basma eserlerin üretimi ve yayımı, matbaa ve yayınıcılık tarihi araştırmalarının önemli bir konusu haline geldi. On sekizinci ve on dokuzuncu yüzyıllarda Osmanlı topraklarında kurulan basımların hakkında kapsamlı araştırmalar yapılmış olmasına rağmen, İstanbul’dan kurulan ilk matbaalar ve basılan ilk eserler hakkında yeterli çalışma bulunmamaktadır. Bu makale, Konstantinopolis’in 1453 yılında Osmanlılar tarafından fethinden sonra - ki bu tarih ‘Gutenberg İncili’inin basımıyla aynı zamanda denk gelmektedir - ve 1727 yılında İbrahim Mütferrika tarafından kurulan ilk resmi Osmanlı matbaasının faaliyete geçişinden önceki dönemde İstanbul’dan basma eserlerin üretimi incelemektedir. Yahudi, Ermeni ve Rum matbaacılığının İstanbul’daki ilk örneklerinin ele alındığı bu çalışmada,
Nikodemos Metaksas adlı Ortodoks rahibin İngiltere’den getirdiği matbaa ve Yunan harfleri ile bastığı risaleler de incelenmektedir.

**Anahtar sözcükler:** Osmanlı Devleti’nde matbaa; İstanbul; İbranice, Ermenice ve Rumca basma eserler; Nikodemos Metaksas, yayıncılık tarihi.