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Abstract

Throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the province of Baghdad changed hands between the Aq Qoyunlu Turkmen tribal confederation, the Safavids and the Ottomans. From the last decade of the sixteenth to the first few years of the seventeenth centuries, there was a florescence of art production in Baghdad, at a time when the province was under Ottoman rule. This dissertation focuses on a period of rivalry and exchange between the Sunni Ottoman and the Shiʿite Safavid dynasties in the late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth centuries and elucidates the appearance and disappearance of a lively, yet short-lived, art market in the frontier province of Baghdad. A close study of the corpus of over thirty illustrated manuscripts, often described as exhibiting an “eclectic” style, and produced in Baghdad within a decade, shows that there was a broadening base of patronage as well as an open market for the purchase of art.

While scholarship on the art of the book in Baghdad considers the corpus of illustrated manuscripts solely from the perspective of an Ottoman “context,” this dissertation takes a broader, transregional perspective and studies the art market in Baghdad through the complex layers of Ottoman and Safavid relations. It questions notions of a “school” of painting and emphasizes movement and encounters instead. It also proposes that in the context of an early modern consolidation of imperial identity (represented purposefully distinctively through monumental architecture, painting, decoration, objects in the Ottoman, Safavid and Mughal empires), Baghdad as a frontier province between the Ottomans and the
Safavids challenges notions of cultural, ornamental and decorative idioms. Its hybridity is the very product of the “whirlwind” of affairs between the Ottomans and the Safavids.

The dissertation begins with a study of Ottoman-Safavid relations from the last quarter of the sixteenth to the first quarter of the seventeenth centuries. Making use of an unpublished history of Baghdad along with other published and unpublished chronicles, it presents an overview of the complex relations between the two rival empires as well as between the center, Istanbul and the province, Baghdad. This sets the background to the following chapters. Chapter 2 concentrates on a group of single-page paintings produced in Baghdad, which have heretofore escaped scholarly attention. These paintings bespeak a broadening base of patronage as well as an increasing interest in collecting art. The following chapter concerns illustrated popular religious literature, which constitutes the majority of manuscripts produced in Baghdad. It raises questions on the use of models, repetition of compositions and production of illustrated manuscripts for the speculative market. The fourth chapter takes a different turn and concentrates on the patronage of one of the eminent governors of Baghdad, Sokolluzade Hasan Paşa (d. 1602). Focusing on the ambitious project of an illustrated universal history, which was composed for this governor by a Baghdadi author, this chapter deals with the conception of history in the province. The final chapter brings attention to a group of illustrated genealogies most likely produced for the open market. These Ottoman-Turkish genealogies place the Ottoman dynasty as the pinnacle of history. However, one early-seventeenth-century manuscript in Persian turns the genre on its head and presents a pro-Safavid view through text and image within a largely Ottoman genre. Alterations done to its text to then suit a possible Ottoman owner highlight the in-betweenness of Baghdad.
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Note to the Reader

In transliterating from the Ottoman and Persian this dissertation follows the *International Journal of Middle East Studies*. Book titles and names of people have been transcribed according to the orthography of their respective systems, for example, Bākī for the Ottoman poet and Taqī Awḥādī for the Safavid author. In the footnotes and references, I have retained the manner of spelling and transliteration as provided in the titles of published primary and secondary sources. In the body of the text I have chosen to transliterate the name of the Ottoman bureaucrat at Mustafa Ṭālī to distinguish it from Ṭālī, and to transliterate the titles of books. The footnotes follow a full transliteration of names.
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</tr>
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<td>ÖNB</td>
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<td>NYPL</td>
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6. Conclusion


Figure 6.2 Portrait of Mehmed III. *Album*, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, H. 2164, fol. 61b.
The Persian poet and lexicographer Taqi al-Din Muhammed al-Husayni al-Awhadî (d. circa 1632–33) brings up a poetic banter between Mawlana Shani (d. before 1613–14) and Fazlî of Baghdad (d. late sixteenth century?) in his c. 1613–15 biographical dictionary (tadhkira) of Persian poets, ʿArafat al-ʿAshiqin wa ʿAraṣat al-ʿArifîn (The Places of Assembly for the Lovers and the Open Spaces for the Mystics). This repartee bespeaks poetic (and implicitly political) rivalries between an Ottoman and a Safavid residing in Baghdad. While Taqi Awhadî writes praising of Mawlana Shani, as he does of many of the poets included in his tadhkira, he also adds two issues of dispute surrounding this poet.

1 Mawlânâ Shâni Takkalu, whose name was Wâjîh al-Dîn Nasaf Aqa, was from the Takkalu tribe. In 1592–93 Mawlânâ Shâni was among the retinue of the young Safavid shah, ʿAbbâs I (r. 1588–1629) in Qazvin. Fâzîlî was the son of the Baghdadî poet, Fuṣûlî. Awhadî writes that Fâzîlî composed in three languages, like his father. Other than this, Awhadî does not provide much information on this poet but reiterates the dispute between him and Mawlânâ Shâni. Fâzîlî is not well known and he is not included in most Ottoman tadhkiras, except for the Baghdadî tadhkira writer ʿAhdî’s (d. 1593) Gûlsen-i Șu arâ (Rosegarden of Poets).

In addition, Baghdadî author Nazımzâde Murtaza’s (d. 1721–22?) Gûlsen-i Hulefâ (Rosegarden of Caliphs) refers to a chronogram composed by Fâzîlî for the mosque commissioned by Murâd Paşa, governor of Baghdad (between 1569–72). Baghdadî poet Rûhî (d. 1605) also notes Fazlî’s composition of chronograms in a letter-form qasîda (ode) sent from Damascus to Baghdad. Asking about each of his acquaintances he then asks: “Is Fâzîlî still composing only chronograms?” (Târîh midir dídiyekleri hep yine Fažîlî’nün?).

Muhammad Amîn Râyîhî in his study on Persian language and literature in the Ottoman lands also writes that Fazlî wrote in three languages and that he mainly composed mu ammas (enigmas) and chronograms. However, he does not cite his sources on this poet. Another unidentified source presented by Abdülkadir Karahan emphasizes Fazlî’s “impertinence” (also highlighted by Taqi Awhadî). Abdülkadir Karahan notes that the verses in Persian were provided by Süleyman Nazîfî, who saw these verses through Ali Emîrî, who also did not provide a reference. Abdülbaki Gölpmârî, who also provides brief information on Fazlî, reports that he does not know the origins of the verses.

The verses suggest that Fazlî and Fuṣûlî were resident in Hilla. They compare the father and son, by making a word play on their pen-names. The Persian verses note: “Dar Hilla do shâ ʾr-ʾand akhnîn / Fâzîlî pasar wa padar Fuṣûlî / ʾAks-ʾand jamʾ-1 kârʾiʾ almîm / Fâzîlî padar wa pasar Fuṣûlî” (In Hilla there are now two poets / Fazlî the son, Fuṣûlî the father / Everything is reversed in the world / The father is endowed with virtue, the son is impertinent).


One is that when the Safavid ruler Shah 'Abbas I (r. 1588–1629) greatly esteemed Mawlana Shani for a couplet he composed and gave him many gifts, other poets, who found his poetic capabilities, and in particular, this couplet subpar, were surprised by this choice. Shah ‘Abbas I’s librarian, the painter Sadiqi Beg (d. 1610) adds that no other poet had received such a rank since the famed poet Rudaki (d. 940/1).³ Shah ‘Abbas I responded to the complaints by commenting that he favored Mawlana Shani, firstly, because this poet was greatly respected by the military officer Farhad Khan Qaramanlu (d. 1598–99) and that the couplet was, in fact, just an excuse for his regard for the poet. ⁴ The second reason for this high esteem Mawlana Shani received was because of another dispute: this time between Mawlana Shani and the Ottoman poet Fazli, the son of Fuzuli of Baghdad (d. 1556).

According to the *tadhkira* writer, Mawlana Shani had gone to Baghdad during the reign of the Safavid ruler Shah Tahmasp I (r. 1524–1576).⁵ Taqi Awhadi writes that when the Ottoman ruler, Murad III (r. 1574–1595), ordered the Jews to put on red headgear, Fazli, the son of Fuzuli, composed an “impertinent” (fuẓūlī) *qiṭ’a on this occasion, making a verbal play on the red headgear of the Jews and the red headgear of the *Qizilbash* (red-heads).⁶


⁵ The *tadhkira* writer does not give a date, nor does he mention how long the poet stayed in Baghdad. It is unlikely, however, given the date of his death, that Mawlānā Shānī came to Baghdad right after 1530–31 when the Takkalus fell from grace and many were killed at the order of Shāh Ṭahmāsp I.

⁶ The term *Qizilbash* is generally used to “denote a wide variety of extremist Shi‘i sects, which flourished in Anatolia and Kurdistan,” and used in a more specific sense by the Ottomans to denote the supporters of the Safavid house.

Shani crassly responded to this with a verse immortalized in Taqi Awhadi’s *tadhkira.* The banter between the two poets, at a time when the Ottomans and the Safavids were in heated rivalry, shows the echoes of the poetic competition in the Safavid capital. This poetic cunning also became a source of pride, as Taqi Awhadi writes that Mawlana Shani had gained renown by his response to Fazli. This was the second reason why Shah ʿAbbas I had esteemed the poet.

The causes of rivalry do not simply lie among differences of confession or polity, but also between the imperial center and the province, as another case reveals. A seventeenth-century Baghdadí historian Mustafa b. Mulla Ridvan (d. after 1660) writes of Fazli’s response to a verse composed by an Ottoman bureaucrat, ʿĀli Efendi (possibly Mustafa

Regarding sumptuary laws, Ottoman bureaucrat Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī (d. 1600) writes in the *Kūnḥūʾ al-Abhār* (Essence of Histories) that the sultan’s *imam*, who is not named in the work, but whom another contemporary Ottoman historian, Muṣṭafā Selānīkī (d. 1600), identifies as Mevlānā ʿAbdūl Kerīm (d. 1593–94), was responsible for the sumptuary laws ordering non-Muslims and Jews to put on red caps instead of “sky colored” and saffron-yellow turbans. Cemal Kafadar adds that among the *imam*’s arguments for strict regulations on non-Muslims’ headgear was that they drove up the price of muslin. See Cemal Kafadar’s dissertation for an outline of the events leading up to the 1589 execution of governor-general of Rumeli, Doğunci Mehmed Paşa as well as the negative treatment of the Jewish population and the execution of the wealthy Jewish woman Esther Kira. Cemal Kafadar, “When Coins Turned into Drops of Dew and Bankers Became Robbers of Shadows: The Boundaries of Ottoman Economic Imagination at the End of the Sixteenth Century” (PhD diss., McGill University, 1986), 79, 107, 130; Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī, *Kūnḥūʾ al-Abhār, Dördüncü Rükn, 1599*. Facsimile edition (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2009), 519b–520a; and Muṣṭafā Selānīkī, *Tārīḫ-i Selānīkī*, cd. Mehmet İşpîrlî (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1999), 348.

On various sumptuary laws regarding non-Muslims in the sixteenth century see Ahmet Refik, *On Altınçe Asrarda İstanbul Hayatı (1553–1591)* (İstanbul: Devlet Basmevi, 1935), especially 47, 51–2. Refik includes an order dated 23 Rajab 988 (3 September 1580) denoting that Jews must wear red headgear. This date corresponds to what is most likely a date given in Tāqī Awhadī’s account.

Unfortunately, the verses by Fazlī and Shānī that Tāqī Awhadī includes in his *tadhkira* are in Ottoman Turkish and having gone through two editions (once by the seventeenth-century Safavid author and a second time by the present edition), there are slight differences in the verses provided in the entries for Fazlī and for Mawlānā Shānī. Given the importance of the placement of pointing diacritics that distinguish consonants, not all of the verses presently make sense.

In the entry for Fazlī, the poem provided is: Doh[u]ş buz [sic] u sekz u sekzun [sic] (This is possibly the date 988 (dokuz yüz seksen sekiz) in Turkish, which corresponds to the date in the above-mentioned order) / Ḥaḵḵ rāz nhāne eyleli fâş / Gıydi bâşna ḵızîl Yahûdî / Ya ni ki Yahûdî dir ḵızîlbaş (The truth revealed the secret / The Jew put on his head red [headgear] / Thus, the Qızîlbašt (redhead) is the Jew).

To this, Mawlānā Shānī responds crassly: “Çoḵ itme Fuzûlî oğli Fazlī / ′Alemdê Kızîlbaşt evini fâş / Ger gőtin gőge ceḵmîs / Bagdad be ṭr-i kîr zi ḵızîlbaş” (Do not reveal too much Fazlī, son of Fuzûlî / the house of the Qızîlbašt / When Baghdad has bent over / From the arrow of the penis of the Qızîlbašt).


Ibid., 1972.
Upon hearing the verses composed by ʿĀli, the author notes that Fazli went to his father’s grave and asked him, “How come, you, Fuzuli of Baghdad, have not pronounced such words that a sweet-tongued poet from the lands of Rum has found such meaning and expended this pearl and jewel?” (Neden gelesin Fuｚuli-yi Bağdâdi olasin / Bu elfâzi teleffûz itmediîn / Ki diyâr-i Rûm’dan bir sâ’i şir-i şirîn-zebân gele bu meşmûn bula ve bu dûr u cevâhiri harc eyliye?) The local poet Fazli thus identifies a difference between his famed Baghdadi father and the Ottoman bureaucrat appointed from the capital and finds such poetry regarding Baghdad to be worthy of a local Baghdadi, rather than someone from the lands of Rum. These two dynamics point to several instances at play at the end of the sixteenth century:

9 The verses composed by ʿĀli Efendi are:

GelʿIrâk-iʿArab’dadutnamakâm / Umma andandâşkîn hayâl-i bekâ / Bu cihânlî bir harâbemenzîldir / Kûndugöçdîhezârmîrîlivâ / Mâ’i cêrîdeihubûb gibi / Niçebîçetîkiîdnâ-peydâ / Hâkî Bağdâd’i zeyindenidenşeceri/ Nahî hurma şanur görûn ammâ / ʿUţîldarîrkiâldîmenzîlde / Çekilüb gîdîüşekerîhûleflâ (Come, do not stay in Arab’Iraq / Do not wish for perpetuity / This world is a ruinous station / A thousand governors have come and gone / Like the bubbles on flowing water / It made many a thousand tents vanish / The trees embellishing the Baghdad / May appear to be date trees, but / They are [in fact] standards left behind / The soldiers of the caliphs have all gone).

While Muşṭâfa b. Mulla Rûdvan el-Bağdâdî only refers to the finance director as ʿĀli, the fact that he was dismissed from his post as finance director, and that Fâzîl had heard of these verses, suggests that this person may be the Ottoman bureaucrat Muşṭâfa ʿĀli.

In the edition of Eviyâ’s text provided by Dağlı and Kahraman, the transliteration of the relevant section is provided as: “Hatta Hüseyin Ali Efendi Bağdâd defterdâri iken bu diyâr-i Irâk’în hurma dirahîlîrnîmdêhitmişird” (When Hüseynî Ali Efendi was the finance director of Baghdad, he praised the date trees of Iraq). However, upon comparing this with the facsimile edition of Eviyâ’s text, what the editors have read as “Hüseyin” is written slightly above the line and can rather be read as “ʿAyn.”

Whether or not either author is mistaken about the identity of the finance director does not take away from the construct presented in Muşṭâfa b. Mulla Rûdvan’s account that juxtaposes a local Baghdadi to not a finance director appointed from Rum.

charged relations between the Ottomans and the Safavids, engagements among confessions, and exchanges between center and periphery, and the projection of imperial image.

Art, architecture, and poetry all play an important role in the expression of political power. In the context of often-complicated relations between the Ottomans and the Safavids, distinct visual styles played a visible role in establishing imperial identity. When the founder of the Safavid dynasty, Shah Isma‘il I (r. 1501–1524), conquered Baghdad from the Aq Qoyunlu Turkmen confederation in 1508, he destroyed the Sunni holy sites, particularly the shrines of Abu Hanifa (d. 767) (founder of the Sunni Hanafi school of jurisprudence) and ‘Abd al-Qadir Gaylani (d. 1166) (Hanbali Sunni jurist and founder of the Qadiri Sufi order). Shah Isma‘il I then commissioned a new mausoleum over the tomb of Imam Musa al-Kazim (d. 799) (the seventh Shi‘i imam) and donated chandeliers and carpets to the shrines of ‘Ali b. Abi Talib, cousin and son-in-law of the Prophet Muhammad, and his son Imam Husayn, in Najaf and Karbala, respectively.10 The shrines of Abu Hanifa and of ‘Abd al-Qadir Gaylani were repaired and renewed when the Ottoman ruler Süleyman I (r. 1520–1566) conquered the province in 1534, thus establishing and emphasizing Sunni Ottoman authority.11 Their endowment deeds drawn during the Safavid rule of Baghdad, however, were voided and new endowments were created. The Ottoman ruler was recognized as the “possessor of the Arabian and Persian lands, the overseer of the regulations of the Two Mashhads (Najaf and Karbala), the pilgrim of the tomb of the Greatest Imam (Abu Hanifa)” following his campaign of the “two Iraqs,” that is Iraq-i ‘Arab and Iraq-i Ajam, corresponding to present-day Iraq and the lowlands of the Iranian plain, western Iran,


respectively. Süleyman I’s renovation and establishment of shrine complexes along the river Tigris is represented by a painting in the second volume of șehnâmece (shâhnâma writer) Seyyid Lokman’s (d. after 1601) Hûnernâme (Book of Talents), written during the reign of his grandson Murad III. When the Safavids regained the province in 1623, the shrine complex of Abu Hanîfa was once again demolished, and repaired in 1638 when the Ottoman ruler Murad IV (r. 1623–1640) conquered Baghdad.

Competition through objects and patronage was ripe, just before the Ottoman-Safavid wars of 1578–1590. Thus, in 1571, several years before the onset of the war, the governor of Baghdad was charged with the exchange of Persian style carpets with “Anatolian” style carpets in the shrines of Imams ʿAli and Husayn in Najaf and Karbala. However, two decades after the request for the exchange of carpets in the shrines, we find a group of illustrated manuscripts that are often described as “eclectic,” containing modes of representation and figure types that merge elements from Ottoman, Safavid and Mughal painting. In the words of Rachel Milstein, “the simultaneous depiction of Persian and Turkish attire in Baghdad miniatures is one of the reasons why this school resembles both Persian and Turkish painting.”

12 Ibid., 191.
13 The official court historian Seyyid Loḵmân writes that Süleymân had a fortified enclosure built around the complex of Abû Ḥanîfa, in order to protect it from the “worthless ruffians” (evbâş u kallâş). Seyyid Loḵmân, Hûnernâme, Vol. 2, TPML H. 1524, fols. 282b–283a (painting on folio 283a); Necipoḡlu, The Age of Sinan, 63.

In addition, for the inauguration of the Süleymaniye mosque in 1557, the Safavid ruler Shâh Tâhmâsp I offered to send carpets for the mosque, which was politely refused by the Süleymân I, as noted by Gülru Necipoḡlu. In this gift offer and the response by the Ottoman ruler, Necipoḡlu sees an iteration of artistic superiority. Necipoḡlu, The Age of Sinan, 67.
15 Rachel Milstein, Miniature Painting in Ottoman Baghdad (Costa Mesa: Mazda, 1990), 45.

In a 1969 article, G. M. Meredith-Owens also pointed to the blending of “entirely Persian colours” and “Turkic racial types” in the paintings of an illustrated copy of the sixth volume of the Rawżat al-Ṣâfâʾ (Garden of Purity) of Mirkhwand (d. 1498) at the British Library (Or. 5736).
subject of this dissertation. While I adopt the term “eclectic” in the dissertation, this material also allows us to raise the question of whether our definitions or descriptions of “Ottoman” or “Safavid” manuscripts too rigid.

The major early modern Islamic dynasties—Ottomans, Safavids, Mughals and Uzbeks—shared a common Turco-Iranian cultural background. As Gülru Necipoğlu points out, this shared “international Timurid-Turkmen” taste gave way, in the mid-sixteenth century, to distinct visual and cultural styles as each empire began to consolidate its own imperial ideology.¹⁶ Necipoğlu sees this “visible “distinction” as a deliberate project of early modern place-making and culture-making, constructed at the interface of multiple agencies.”¹⁷ In the context of an early modern consolidation of imperial identity (represented purposefully distinctly through monumental architecture, painting, decoration, and objects in the Ottoman, Safavid and Mughal empires), Baghdad as a frontier province between the Ottomans and the Safavids stands out in its hybridity. Thus, at a point when the rival Ottoman, Safavid and Mughal empires were consolidating their imperial identities, reflected through their decorative, architectural, cultural politics, Baghdad appears to be caught between an Ottoman and Safavid style, much like the characterization of the province by the


¹⁶ In a number of works Gülru Necipoğlu elaborates on the “classical idiom” as well as a move from an international Timurid identity, which the Ottomans, Safavids, Mughals and Uzbeks shared, to a distinctive imperial identity.


¹⁷ Necipoğlu, Early Modern Floral, 133.
seventeenth-century traveler Evliya Çelebi: “like a person caught in a whirlwind” between
the Ottomans and the Safavids (Bu kızm-i Bağdād bir girdāhda kaḥmīs kişi gibidir). 18 The
whirlwind simile captures the gist of the fluidity and rapidity of fluctuation and confusion—
the whirlwind moves, shuffles, uproots. The swirling aspect of the whirlwind suggests a
moment when everything is blown together, while at the same time its aftermath points to a
need for self-(re)definition. It is in this charged environment, right after the end of the
Ottoman-Safavid wars of 1578–1590, that there was a florescence in art production in
Baghdad.

This dissertation focuses on the production of illustrated manuscripts in Baghdad
over a brief period in the history of the province: from the last decade of the sixteenth and
the first quarter of the seventeenth centuries, a period right after the conclusion of the
Ottoman-Safavid wars of 1578–1590, with more favorable conditions obtained by the
Ottomans, through the rekindling of war between the two powers in the early seventeenth
century, and particularly important in the case of Baghdad, until the second conquest of the

18 Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi IV. Kitap, 243, 247. Another seventeenth-century Baghdadi author, Şeyhoğlu,
writes: “Baghdad is caught, desolate, between two tribes: one is the shâh of ’Ajam, the other the sultan of Rum
...When the shâh of ’Ajam invades it, he says “Oh, Abu Hanîfâ, the Sunnite,” and when the house of ’Osmân
takes it, he says “Oh, shâhsavân (lover of the shâh), Shi’i and heretic.”

According to the information given in his short history of the turmoil in the 1620s in Baghdad,
Şeyhoğlu was born in 1018 (1609–10). This author composed a work on the uprising of Bekir Subaşî (described
in more detail in Chapter 1) and the Ottomans’ loss of Baghdad in 1623. He ends his short account with a
qasîda on the description and state of Baghdad (kaşide-i ta râf’-i dâr’î selâm-i Bağdâd). This qasîda appears
almost verbatim in Evliyâ Çelebi’s travelogue. However, Evliyâ Çelebi ends the qasîda (which, in his account
titled, Şehrengiz-i dâr’-î hulefâ-yî Bağdâd ve ziyâretgâh-i ’Irâq-i behişt-âbâd): “Şükür kim ãldî Bağdâd’în bizê
haç seyriňi ıhsân / Fârâmûş etme ey seyyah oğu her demde Kur’an’î” (Thanks [to God] that He obliged us with
the beholding of Baghdad / Do not forget, oh traveler, read, every moment, the Qur’an). In Şeyhoğlu’s version
the final bayt is: “Şükür kim ãldî Bağdâd’i bize hem mesken hem medfen / Fârâmûş itme Şeyhoğlu oğlî her
demde Kur’an’î” (Thanks that [He] granted us Baghdad a dwelling and place of burial / Do not forget,
Şeyhoğlu, read, every moment, the Qur’an). It is unclear whether there is a third source from which the two
authors have based their qasîdâs or whether one appropriated it from the other. Either way, the two authors have
attached their own identities to the qasîda. Evliyâ’s version also has an added benediction to the Sufi saint
Ma’rûf Karkhî, which is missing in Şeyhoğlu’s history. Şeyhoğlu, Kitâb-i Türrîh-i Darâ’î selâm-i Bağdâd’în
Başına Gelen Ahvâlileri Beyân Ifer’dî Sene 1028 (1619), Codex Schultens 1278, Leiden University Library, fol.
20b, 24a. Henceforth Şeyhoğlu, Kitâb-i Türrîh. For an introduction, transcription and translation of Evliyâ’s
qasîda see Jessica Lutz, “Evliya Çelebi’s Qasida on Baghdad,” in De Turciciis Allasses Rebus Commentarii
Henry Hofman dedicati: Feestbundel voor professor emeritus H. F. Hofman ter gelegenheid van zijn
vijftenzeventigste verjaardag aangeboden door vrienden en studenten, ed. Hendrik Boeschoten (Utrecht: Institut
voor Oosterse Talen en Culturen, 1992), 59–79. Lutz does not mention Şeyhoğlu in her article.
province by the Safavids in 1623. It seeks to understand and contextualize the short-lived, yet prolific, art market in Baghdad. How do visually distinct styles play a role in the expression of political power, and under what circumstances do distinctions become blurred?

**Historiographical Background**

Evliya Çelebi’s description of Baghdad as resembling a person caught in a whirlwind befits scholarly studies about the province as well. While as the capital of the Abbasid caliphate Baghdad has received much interest throughout its history—from medieval writers and travelers to those of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries—scholarly interest in Baghdad has largely concentrated either on the medieval period or on the nineteenth century with an interest in its topography, urban history, and economy. In many studies, the period from

---

19 The turn of the twentieth century saw the publications by Guy le Strange and Clément Huart, the former on Baghdad during the Abbasid caliphate as well as on its topography, and the latter from the fall of Baghdad to the Mongols in 1258 until the early nineteenth century. Two decades later, Richard Coke published his Baghdad: The City of Peace. His book, casual in its citations, is geared towards a general readership but presents a broad history of Baghdad from the Abbasid period to the twentieth century. In addition to these histories from the early twentieth century, we can also add the turn-of-the-century study on the geography and topography of Baghdad, the work of Maximilian Streck.

In the mid-twentieth century, Muhammad Rashid al-Feel’s study provides insight into the period following the Mongol sack of Baghdad up to the Ottoman conquest in 1534, concentrating on the historical geography of Iraq. Jacob Lassner’s The Topography of Baghdad in the Early Middle Ages is a valuable source, which makes use of contemporary histories of medieval Baghdad, to provide a reconstruction of the city. Among Iraqi historians, Abbas al-Azzawi has written extensively on Baghdad and on Iraq, on various issues from the tribes of Iraq to literature. However, a history of its art has not been a major concern, especially a history of art under the Ottomans.

In addition to these twentieth-century studies, an overview of dissertations completed in Turkey, Iraq and the United States shows this divide as well, with the majority of works devoted to various issues from theology to economy during the Abbasid period, or on the nineteenth century, as well as recent studies on relations between the US and Iraq, and between Iraq and Iran. Recently, several plans, photographs, and maps from the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, kept in the Prime Ministry Archives has been published by Cevat Ekici, ed. Osmanlı Döneminde Irak: Plan, Fotograf ve Belgelerle (Iraq During the Ottoman Period: Plans, Photographs and Documents) (İstanbul: T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü, 2006). See Guy le Strange, Baghdad During the Abbasid Caliphate (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1900); also by the same author is the translation of the tenth century work by Ibn Serapion, Description of Mesopotamia and Baghdad (1985); Clément Huart, Histoire de Bagdad dans les Temps Modernes (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1901); Richard Coke, Baghdad, The City of Peace (London: Butterworth, 1927); Abbas al- Azzawi, Tarih al- Irāq bain Iḥtiłālīn, Vol. 4: al- ‘Ahd al- ‘Uthmānī al-Awwal (941-1048/1543-1638) wa Muḥāqīq fil Mustadrakāt wa-Ta’līqāt (Baghdad, 1949); Jacob Lassner, The Topography of Baghdad in the Early Middle Ages: Text and
the foundation of the city in 762 by Caliph al-Mansur (r. 754–775), through the next two centuries are considered to be the apogee of the Abbasid caliphate, and of the city of Baghdad. The subsequent centuries, however, particularly following the siege and sack of Baghdad in 1258 by the Mongols, are seen as a slow process of decline: “the city, with the country round it, can now do no more than mourn its great past, and adjust its point of view to a future which seems to become only narrower and narrower, ever more confined and less attractive.”


Baghdad was established as the seat of the Abbasid caliphate over a decade after the Abbasids replaced the Umayyads in 750. The capital was established by Caliph Jaʿfar al-Mansur. Rusafa, on the eastern bank of the Tigris, was established in 773. A civil war between the sons of caliph Harun al-Rashid (r. 786–809), al-Maʾmun (r. 813–833) and al-Amīn (r. 809–813), disrupted life in the city during the ninth century. While it is beyond the scope of my research, several scholarly works on “Arab painting” and cultural and artistic production in Iraq from the tenth to the twelfth century until the Ottoman conquest must be mentioned here, though with a caveat—the list of works provided here, which is not exhaustive, represents a corpus which deals with different issues and concerns with visual arts. Some tangentially point to Iraq or specifically to Baghdad as a center of production. Others deal with a broad and somewhat murky classification of “Arab painting.”

For a brief period in the early-ninth century (between 836–892) Samarra became the capital but Baghdad was still an important center of commerce. In 945, Buyid ruler Ṭḥālīm ibn Buya, known as Muʿizz al-Dawla (Glorifier of the State) (r. 945–967) conquered Iraq. Baghdad was made the capital. The Buyids (a Shiʿi dynasty ruling from Fars, Iraq and Rayy) were nominal governors under the Abbasids. Baghdad was conquered from the Buyids in 1055 by the Sunni dynasty of the Seljuqs. In 1258, Baghdad was sacked by the Mongols under Hulagū Khan (r. 1256–1265). Following the Mongols, Baghdad came in the possession of the Ilkhanids (until 1339–40). Timurids (1392–1401) Jalayirids (until 1410), the Qara Qoyunlu (until 1467) and Aq Qoyunlu (until 1507–8) Turkmen. In 1507–8, the Safavid ruler, Shāh Ismāʿīl I (r. 1501–1524) captured Baghdad without protest. In 1534, Ottoman ruler Süleyman I (r. 1520–1566) seized Baghdad, which remained in Ottoman hands until 1917, with the exception of a period between 1623–1638, when the province was conquered by the Safavids, and a part of the eighteenth-century when it was governed by Mamluks (Kūlêmen).


Richard Coke, Baghdad: The City of Peace, 177. Additionally, Stephen Hemsley Longrigg describes the nearly three centuries following the Mongol conquest of Baghdad as the “darkest age,” after the “dawn and morning” of the Abbasids, when “no period in its history was darker, more obscure, less happy.” He adds that there was no major cultural or material achievement.


While it is beyond the scope of my research, several scholarly works on “Arab painting” and cultural and artistic production in Iraq from the eleventh century until the Ottoman conquest must be mentioned here, though with a caveat—the list of works provided here, which is not exhaustive, represents a corpus which deals with different issues and concerns with visual arts. Some tangentially point to Iraq or specifically to Baghdad as a center of production. Others deal with a broad and somewhat murky classification of “Arab painting.”
Recently, Heghnar Watenpaugh and Khaled al-Rouayheb have taken a critical stance against a characterization of the Ottoman period as a hiatus until the “Arab awakening” in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. There has also been a growing interest in Arab cities under Ottoman rule. In these works, emphasis has mostly been on architecture.


23 Among cities and provinces, there have been studies devoted to Ottoman Aleppo, Cairo, Damascus, all, important regions for various economic and spiritual reasons. Other monographic works include studies on 'Aytanb, Jerusalem and Bursa, among others. See for example the edited volume: André Raymond, ed. Arab Cities in the Ottoman Period: Cairo, Syria and the Maghreb (Aldershot: Ashgate/Variorum, 2002). Also by André Raymond, La Ville Arabe, Alep, à
urban, and social history. Despite these studies on various former Ottoman provinces, early modern Baghdad has not received as much attention partly due to a primary interest in scholarship that conforms to a territory based on the nation-state. A dissertation completed in 1999 by Erdinç Gülçü is the sole study on Baghdad under the first Ottoman rule (1534–1623). This is a valuable study that makes use of available archival sources. However, in these works no attention has been paid to Baghdad as a center for art production, or on a cultural history of the city.\(^\text{24}\)

In addition to this dissertation, Halil Sahillioğlu’s study of the administrative division of Iraq under Ottoman rule sheds light on Baghdad and its administrative division into districts from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries.\(^\text{25}\) Özer Küpeli’s studies on


Ottoman-Safavid relations also emphasize the role of Arab Iraq (‘Irāk-ī ‘Arab) between the two rival dynasties.\(^\text{26}\) In addition, Colin Imber’s study, “The Persecution of the Ottoman Shi‘ites According to the Mühimme Defterleri, 1565–1585” also sheds some light on the role of Baghdad as a frontier region between the Ottomans and the Safavids.\(^\text{27}\) Especially during the Ottoman-Safavid wars of 1578–1590 and 1603–1618, and of course, the Safavids’ conquest of Baghdad in 1623, studies on Ottoman as well as Safavid history mention Baghdad. Chapter 1 will refer to these works in more detail. However, it must be noted here that these works emphasize the political history of the region and not the arts.

More recently, an international symposium centered on the issue of Baghdad in the context of Islamic civilization presented an array of topics, ranging from the formation of the Abbasid capital, to the socio-political dynamics in the medieval period, the Mongol invasions, non-Muslim populations in Baghdad and intellectual history.\(^\text{28}\) A few panels were also devoted to Baghdad under Ottoman rule, concentrating on the Ottoman administration of Baghdad, and on Ottoman-Safavid relations. The opening statements of the symposium by Raşit Küçük, Necla Pur and Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu emphasize, especially in the case of Küçük, the continuous role of Baghdad in Islamic civilization and its significance as a city that symbolizes Islamic civilization, and in the case of Pur and İhsanoğlu, the current state of affairs in Iraq in world politics and concerns with violence and sectarian fighting. It is apparent from the opening statements that one aim of the conference was to shed light on the cultural heritage of Baghdad at the critical moment of continuing violence. While the opening remarks do not provide a scholarly framework to the study of Baghdad over a vast


\(^{27}\) Colin H. Imber, *The Persecution of the Ottoman Shi’ites According to the Mühimme Defterleri, 1565–1585.*

\(^{28}\) İsmail Safa Üstün, ed. *İslam Medeniyetinde Bağdat (Medînetü’s Selâm) Uluslararası Sempozyum, 7-8-9 Kasım, 2008,* 2 Vols. (İstanbul: M.Ü. İlahiyat Fakültesi Vakfı Yayınları, 2011). Henceforth *İslam Medeniyetinde Bağdat.*
period of time—from the appearance of Islam until the mid-twentieth century—as per the somewhat murky title of the symposium, the symposium and its publication are a welcome addition to scholarship.

In terms of a historiography of art, Filiz Çağman’s 1973 article on a school of painting that arose in Mawlawi lodges at the end of the sixteenth century first brought scholarly attention to the production of illustrated manuscripts in Baghdad. While several earlier studies, such as Ivan Stchoukine’s *La Peinture Turque* and G. M. Meredith-Owens’ article on an illustrated manuscript of the *Rawżat al-Ṣafā’* (Garden of Purity) (British Library Or. 5736) of Mirkhwand (d. 1498) point to the different style (that is, different from the courtly style of Istanbul) of some illustrated manuscripts, such as the Ḥadīkatū’s-Sū‘edā (Garden of the Blessed) of Fuzuli and the *Maktel-i Āl-i Resūl* (Killing of the Prophet’s Family) of Lami’i Çelebi (d. 1533), it was Çağman’s article that first established the connection of these manuscripts to Baghdad. Çağman notes that several works produced at the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century are remarkably different in terms of style and subject matter from the illustrated manuscripts produced in the court atelier in Istanbul. She calls attention to stylistic influences from Shiraz, Qazvin and Isfahan in these paintings, without dwelling on this issue in depth. Çağman contends that governors of Baghdad during the reigns of Murad III and Mehmed III (r. 1595–1603), as well as members of the Mawlawi order (in Baghdad and Konya) must have been the patrons of illustrated works that are

29 Filiz Çağman, “XVI. Yüzyıl Sonlarında Mevlevi Dergahlarında Gelişen bir Minyatür Okulu,” in *I. Milletlerarası Türkoloji Kongresi* (İstanbul: Tercüman Gazetesi ve Türkiye Enstitüsü, 1979), 651–77. Also see the broader study by Filiz Çağman and Nurhan Atasoy, published a year later, which also discusses several of the manuscripts that were produced during the reigns of Murād III and Mehmed III but which point to “another school of painting” than the court atelier.
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different in style and theme from those of the court in Istanbul. Çağman’s early article has brought attention to Baghdad as a cultural center and allowed for the localization of several illustrated manuscripts that had been described as stylistically eclectic and loosely attributed to provincial schools.

In addition to this early work, Karin Rührdanz’s article on the illustrated copy of Fuzuli’s Beng u Bāde (Wine and Opium) (Landesbibliothek Dresden, Eb 362) provided an avenue for the consideration of other possible patrons, including Bektashis.31 The Beng u Bāde is dedicated to a governor of Baghdad, Sokolluzade Hasan Paşa (d. 1602). While this manuscript and the Cāmi ʿū’s-Siyer (Collection of Biographies) (discussed in Chapter 4) establish the importance of Hasan Paşa’s patronage in Baghdad, Rührdanz points out, rightly, that one cannot identify all the illustrated manuscripts with his patronage, some of which fall outside of his tenure in Baghdad. Basing her argument on one painting in the Beng u Bāde (on fol. 25a), which includes wandering dervishes, Rührdanz hypothesizes that other patrons, such as the Bektashis, may have been involved.

These early articles were followed by a monographic publication in 1990 by Milstein titled, Miniature Painting in Ottoman Baghdad.32 This work identified illustrated manuscripts attributed to Baghdad, either based on style or according to the information provided in the colophons. Milstein’s interest in Baghdad painting stems, in part from her early doctoral research on the illustrated Tercüme-i Șevāḵī-ı Menāḵīb (Translation of Stars of Legends) at the Pierpont Morgan Library (M. 466), which provides an overview of the two illustrated copies of this work by Derviș Mahmud Mesnevi of (d. 1602).33 Milstein’s


monograph on Baghdad painting identifies three groups of patrons for a body of manuscripts of mostly popular religious literature. These are: members of the Mawlawi order, Ottoman governors, and a somewhat loosely defined group of people interested in the portrayal of the Shi’i tragedy. Her book emphasizes the eclectic nature of the paintings and this is supported through a catalogue of architectural and sartorial details taken from paintings. Like Çağman and Rührdanz, Milstein also notes the influence of Shiraz and Qazvin painting on the eclectic nature of the illustrated works from Baghdad. However, despite the noted eclecticism of the paintings, the corpus is defined and accepted as an “art historical school” that arose in Baghdad for a brief period in time. Milstein’s book follows a linear progression of art historical development in its stylistic and iconographical analysis of the dated manuscripts. Based on dated manuscripts, Milstein provides a hypothetical chronological order for the thirty-one manuscripts included in her study.

My aim in this dissertation is not to supplant these studies but to introduce a broader, transregional perspective that examines the production of illustrated manuscripts in Baghdad through the complex layers of Ottoman and Safavid relations, and a more focused look at individual manuscripts on the micro level. Scholarship on painting in Baghdad in the late-sixteenth century, including but not limited to Milstein’s monograph, considered the corpus of illustrated manuscripts solely in the Ottoman context. While the appearance of this mostly stylistically coherent group (though not without variants) is an urban phenomenon associated with Ottoman governance in a frontier region of great importance to both the Ottomans and the Safavids, Baghdad needs to be studied in a wider and comparative context. Utilizing unpublished texts and highlighting previously overlooked “connected” art histories, my dissertation provides a more nuanced picture wherein governors, upstart rebels, local Arab chieftains all played crucial roles in leveraging their power between the Ottomans and the Safavids. By more closely situating the province in the context of Ottoman and
Safavid relations, I also challenge the notion of a “school” of painting, especially when movement was endemic to an artist’s career.

Among sources of inspiration for my research have been the notion of “connected histories” proposed by Sanjay Subrahmanyam, which focuses on the juncture between the local and the supra-local, as well as Barry Flood’s more recent study on the encounters and relations, amicable or not, between the Hindus and Muslims between the tenth and thirteenth centuries in the Indian subcontinent and the “translation,” or “transculturation,” of objects through such encounters, which highlights the need for more nuanced studies.34

A contextual approach that does not remain bound to territorial boundaries of modern nation-states, nor also to the sixteenth-century imperial boundaries of Safavid versus Ottoman empires (which at best were loose and often changing), is, I think useful for a study of Baghdad on several accounts. One is the very nature of Baghdad’s place as a frontier province between the Ottomans and the Safavids. Culturally and geographically Baghdad was at a crossroads between Ottomans, Safavids and local Arab tribes. Linking the Indian Ocean to the Mediterranean and located at the nexus of major trade routes, it was a vibrant hub. Through Basra, it opened into the Indian Ocean.35 Following the Ottoman conquest of Syria and Egypt in the early sixteenth century, the conquest of Baghdad in 1534–35 and of Basra in 1546 provided an outlet for the Ottomans into the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean. Through overland routes Baghdad also connected to eastern Anatolia and via Aleppo, to the Mediterranean. For the Ottomans, Baghdad and Basra were of great strategic importance. The city of Baghdad was also in close proximity to Najaf and Karbala, sites of the shrines of the Shi’i imams, ’Ali, and his son Husayn. While revered by the

Ottomans as well, these shrines were of primary spiritual importance for the Safavids, who claimed a fabricated descent from ʿAli, the son-in-law and cousin of the Prophet Muhammad. Housing major Shiʿi shrines, Baghdad was an important center for the Safavids and a strategic node for the Ottomans. It also housed the Sunni shrines of Abu Hanifa and ʿAbd al-Qadir Gaylani. The province of Baghdad drew many visitors, from those wishing to visit the shrines, to merchants, poets, and artists. Its geopolitical situation at a crossroads between two empires and on major trade routes made Baghdad a cosmopolitan provincial center.

The other reason for a study of the province through layers of Ottoman and Safavid encounters stems from the illustrated manuscripts themselves, which bespeak stylistic influences from Shiraz, Qazvin, Mashhad, as well as broader links with the Ottoman capital. In that respect, this dissertation also owes much to Lale Uluç’s study on Shiraz painting in the sixteenth century.36 Her book draws attention to the prolific production of luxury manuscripts in Shiraz, particularly from the mid-1570s through the 1580s, geared towards a Turkmen, Safavid, and Ottoman elite clientele. Uluç’s work shows, in contrast to the view that these works are provincial and “commercial,” and thus of inferior quality, that Shiraz painting in the sixteenth century, in fact emulated high-quality, luxury manuscripts. These were indeed commercial works, as Uluç demonstrates—the corpus of over eighty manuscripts does not include any names of patrons. Deluxe Shiraz manuscripts emulated royal manuscripts and were intended for courtly circles. She shows this through the material evidence of the manuscripts, many of which contain notes and seals of ownership. Uluç further links the waxing and waning of the production of deluxe manuscripts in Shiraz with the appointment of Muhammad Mirza, the future Safavid ruler, Muhammad Khudabanda (r.

---

1578–1587) to Shiraz as nominal governor in 1572, and the governorship of Fars by the Dhu’l-Qadirids between the early-sixteenth century and the early 1590s. Following the Ottoman-Safavid peace of 1590, Uluç notes that there was a decrease in the flow of Shiraz manuscripts. This also coincides, according to Uluç, with Shah ‘Abbas I’s structural reforms and the removal of the Turkmen Dhu’l-Qadirids from the governorship of Fars. The region was given in the early 1590s to Allahverdi Khan, a Georgian slave (ghulām). Henceforth, artistic and architectural endeavors were mostly concentrated in Isfahan.

That the production of illustrated manuscripts in Baghdad begins shortly after the removal of the Dhu’l-Qadirids from office and the waning of Shiraz production, as well as stylistic affinities, points to a possible exodus of artists from Shiraz to Baghdad. Uluç points to the evidence of an illustrated Mathnawi of Jalal al-Din Rumi (d. 1273) (New York Public Library, MS Per. 12) dated to 1011 (1603) as a possible link to the continued patronage of Dhu’l-Qadirids. The colophon of this manuscript includes the name of the patron, Imam Virdi Beg b. Alp Aslan Dhu’l Qadr. Both Uluç and Barbara Schmitz, who authored the catalogue of Islamic manuscripts in the New York Public Library, contend that this manuscript may be from Baghdad (though showing Shirazi or Qazvini influences) based on style as well as the inclusion of figures depicted with Ottoman headgear. This would provide a further link between Shiraz and Baghdad and may help explain the onset of painting in Baghdad in the 1590s. However, a close examination of this manuscript shows that the paintings as well as the colophon may be a slightly later addition. Further research on this manuscript may shed more light on possible links between Shiraz, Qazvin, and


38 Uluç, Selling to the Court, 91; Barbara Schmitz, Islamic Manuscripts in the New York Public Library (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 265–7, 265.

39 See my note in Chapter 3, footnote 315.
Baghdad. While, I think, the manuscript may not originally have been planned to be illustrated, this does not take away from the fact that a Dhu’l-Qadird official wished to have an illustrated, thus more expensive or lofty, manuscript for himself through the addition of paintings, as well as the inclusion of his name in the colophon. The stylistic eclecticism of the paintings of this manuscript also points to links between Shiraz, Qazvin and Baghdad, while at the same time raising the question of the validity of the notion of “schools” of painting.

In addition to this somewhat questionable manuscript, further illustrated examples also point in the direction of influences/movements between and among Shiraz, Qazvin, Mashhad, and Baghdad. Among these, one can name the Şecâ’atnâme (Book of Courage) of Asaﬁ Dal Mehmet Çelebi on the commander ‘Özdemiroğlu ‘Osman Paşa’s (d. 1585) eastern campaigns. Asaﬁ, who joined the campaign against the Safavids in 1577–78 as secretary, first to Lala Mustafa Paşa (d. 1580), then to ‘Özdemiroğlu ‘Osman Paşa, wrote of the war, as well as his years of captivity in Qazvin and Isfahan, and his final escape through Shiraz, Kazarun, Basra and Baghdad, eventually meeting the commander in Erzurum. Rahimizade İbrahim Çavuş’s (d. 1590) Kitâb-ı Gencîne-i Feth-i Gence (Treasure Trove of the Conquest of Ganja), detailing the campaign of Farhad Paşa (d. 1595) in Azerbaijan, also points to various Safavid stylistic influences. It also includes portraits of the Safavid ruler Shah ‘Abbas I and the child prince Haydar Mirza (d. 1595), who was sent to the Ottoman court as

40 Mehmêd Çelebi’s work deals with what transpired during the Ottoman-Safavid wars in the years between 1578 and 1585. This work is preserved in two copies: an unillustrated copy at the Topkapı Palace Museum Library (R. 1301) and an illustrated copy at the Istanbul University Rare Books and Manuscripts Library (T. 6043). Both are copied by ‘Ali b. Yûsuf. Güner Inal points out that R. 1301 shows signs that some illustrated pages have been taken out. Inal also notes the resemblance of some paintings pasted in a late-eighteenth-century manuscript of a translation of the Shâhnâma (Book of Kings) of Firdawsi, to paintings of the Şecâ’atnâme. She suggests that the Şecâ’atnâme shows strong influences of Qazvin painting. Güner Inal, “The Influence of the Kâzvin Style on Ottoman Miniature Painting,” in Fifth International Congress of Turkish Art, ed. Géza Fehér (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1978), 457–76, 459. On the Şecâ’atnâme also see Fetvacı, Picturing History at the Ottoman Court, 213–5.

41 Günay Karaağac and Adnan Eskikurt, eds. Rahimi-zâde İbrahim Çavuş, Kitâb-ı Gencîne-i Feth-i Gence [Osmanlı-İran Savaşları ve Gence’nin Fethi] (1583–1590) (İstanbul: Çamlıca, 2010), xxxix; Fetvacı, Picturing History at the Ottoman Court, 185–8, 209–12
a guarantor of peace in 1590. Gifts, including illustrated and illuminated books, were brought along with the prince.\textsuperscript{42} In addition, the author, Rahimizade İbrahim Çavuş, went to Baghdad in 1575 at the order of Murad III as a sergeant (çavuş-u dergâh-i ʿâli) and later took part in the Ottoman-Safavid war of 1578–1590.\textsuperscript{43} An illustrated version of his account was prepared in Istanbul. Çağman and Zeren Tanındı suggest that the Şecâ ʿatmâme and Kitâb-i Gencîne-i Feth-i Gence were the work of Safavid artists.\textsuperscript{44} Indeed, there is the further example of the Tabrizi painter Walijan, who worked at the Ottoman court atelier in the mid-1580s.\textsuperscript{45}

Additionally, a corpus of over twenty manuscripts of the Qiṣṣa al-Anbiyāʾ (Stories of the Prophets) and several Shâhnâmas (Book of Kings) whose texts have been slightly altered bear striking similarities in size, decoration, illustration and binding, which suggest that they were made in one center, much like the corpus of manuscripts produced in Baghdad.\textsuperscript{46} They bear stylistic resemblances to works produced in Qazvin and Tabriz under Safavid rule. In terms of subject matter, they also exhibit similarities to texts of universal history and popular religious


\textsuperscript{45} It must be highlighted here that Tabriz also changed hands between the Qara Qoyunlu Turkmen confederation, Safavids and Ottomans. Between 1585 and 1603, Tabriz was under Ottoman rule. While with the hindsight of history we know that Tabriz was regained by the Safavids, such changes of power must have affected the people living there, including adapting/reacting to a foreign rule, and change in tastes. Note, for example, the influences of Iznik ceramics in the kubachi wares of Tabriz. Esra Akm-Kivanç, Mustafa ʿAli’s Epic Deeds of Artists: A Critical Edition of the Earliest Ottoman Text about the Calligraphers and Painters of the Islamic World (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 134. Henceforth Mustafa ʿĀlī, Epic Deeds; Lisa Golombek, Persian Pottery in the First Global Age: The Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries (Leiden, Brill, 2013).

literature, prevalent in Baghdad. A collaborative work by Milstein, Rührdanz, and Schmitz on the Stories of the Prophets attribute these manuscripts to Ottoman Istanbul based on a conception of artists’ use of models in creating their compositions, which were available in Istanbul but not in Baghdad. An attribution to Istanbul, particularly on an assumption that artistic creation springs from the use and availability of models, is questionable. This material prompts wider questions of the use of models, artistic creativity, commercial production and book readership/ownership. However, I do not include this corpus in my study as further research needs to be done on the illustrated manuscripts of the Qiṣṣa al-Anbiyāʾ and the truncated Shāhnāmas. Instead, I have chosen to closely study manuscripts that have stronger connections to Baghdad, either through the information contained in their text, colophon or their close stylistic affinity to such manuscripts. That being said, the Qiṣṣa al-Anbiyāʾ and truncated Shāhnāma manuscripts, the prolific group of Shiraz deluxe manuscripts, as well as the corpus of Baghdad manuscripts attest to certain changes in the ownership of illustrated books, no longer just the prerogative of the ruling class but of a wider sub-royal group, as well as changing attitudes to art (as discussed further in Chapter 2). While falling beyond the confines of this dissertation, the above-mentioned examples point to the networks of artists, poets and manuscripts, especially during the years of close contact through war, and also illustrate an increasing interest in, and opportunity for, the ownership of illustrated manuscripts.

Movement of artists, objects and exchange of ideas, as well as relations between the Ottomans and the Safavids form the backbone of this dissertation, which aims to portray a more complicated picture than the identification of a particular “school” of painting. Where my dissertation diverges from Uluç’s work is the book’s linear approach in its chronological categorization of the illustrated manuscripts based on style, similar to that of Milstein’s. I do not attempt to construct a chronology in this dissertation, nor find it directly relevant for the questions raised in it. I am interested, rather, in the particular context in which there
appeared a group of illustrated manuscripts in and around Baghdad, which exemplifies a broadening base of patronage and certain social and urban transformations at the turn of the seventeenth century. In this respect, two additional studies must be mentioned: Tanındı’s essay on painting in the Ottoman provinces, which provides an overview of several illustrated works that were produced in Ottoman provinces at the end of the sixteenth century; and Emine Fetvacı’s recent book on Ottoman historical writing and image making in the late sixteenth century, which highlights the expansion of patronage and different agendas (not necessarily only of the ruler) in the commissioning of illustrated histories.47

The last decade of the sixteenth century marked a florescence in the production of illustrated manuscripts in Baghdad. While there is evidence of art production in other cities in this period, such as Aleppo and Cairo, Baghdad is unique for the breadth of its artistic production in this period. The earliest dated manuscript is from 1593 (Ḥadīkatū’s-Sū ēdā, Süleymaniye Library, Fatih 4321). The latest dated manuscript, which also stylistically belongs to this group of manuscripts dates to 1605 (Ḥadīkatū’s-Sū ēdā, Konya Mevlana Müzesi No. 101). The group of over thirty illustrated manuscripts prepared between the last decade of the sixteenth century and the first few years of the seventeenth century constitute the chronological limits of the dissertation. The beginning of the flourishing of art production in Baghdad likely has to do with the period of peace between the Ottomans and Safaivds, as well as a possible exodus of artists from Shiraz, then sustained by the particular interest and support of governors, such as Sokolluzade Hasan Paşa. This trend finally peters out with the rekindling of conflict with the Safavids in the early seventeenth century. While my dissertation concentrates on this brief period during which Baghdad was under Ottoman control, three examples from the late 1620s and 1630s and the turn of the eighteenth century

show that art production continued. These three examples comprise: an illustrated
\textit{Shāhnāma} dated 1627–1629 (Topkapı Palace Museum Library, H. 1496);\textsuperscript{48} a drawing by the
Safavid painter Muhammad Qasim of a likeness of a certain “Vali Tutunji” made in
Baghdad (Bibliothèque nationale de France, O.D. 41, fol. 33b); and a manuscript of the
\textit{ʿAjāʾib al-Makhlūqāt wa Gharāʾib al-Mawjūdāt} (Wonders of Creation and Oddities of
Existents) (Topkapı Palace Museum Library, H. 400) dated 1699. The two former examples
betray a Safavid style associated with Isfahan. The latter, later in date (1699), is also
stylistically different from the more coherent group of late-sixteenth-century Baghdad
manuscripts. These examples are associated with Baghdad based on the information in their
colophons and the inscription on the single-page painting (preserved in an album). Further
manuscript research may unearth more examples.

However, these fall outside the confines of this dissertation, as I am especially
interested in the particularities of a more or less coherent art market that flourished for a
brief period. These later works, particularly the two former examples that more clearly
betray a “Safavid” style, further highlights the particularity and coherence of the corpus of
some thirty manuscripts produced in the last decade of the sixteenth and the first few years
of the seventeenth centuries. There is, thus, a certain specificity to the group of manuscripts
under examination here. They are the product of a particular Ottoman socio-cultural context,
constituting an urban phenomenon that pertains to a broad and local, yet cosmopolitan,
audience. Once the particular conditions (such as sustained interest, social and political
stability, availability of artists and materials) favorable to such prolific production
disappeared, so did the coherence of manuscript production.

The majority of the manuscripts produced in Baghdad in this short period belong to
the genre of saintly biography and popular religious literature, not surprising for a city given

\textsuperscript{48} Zeren Tanındı briefly describes this manuscript in her article, “Bağdat Defterdarının Resimli Şahnamesi,” in
\textit{İslam Medeniyetinde Bağdat}, 329–43.
the appellation “bastion of saints” (burc-u evliyā). They recount stories of the prophets, the martyrdom of the caliphs, and the lives of famous mystics. Many of the texts that were illustrated are new texts, that is, texts written in the mid to the late-sixteenth century. There are multiple illustrated copies of the same title, like the illustrated genealogies, and Fuzuli’s Hadiṣatü’s Sū‘edā, or Lami’i Çelebi’s (d. 1533) Maḳtel-i Āl-i Resāl. Numerous illustrated copies of the same title suggest an increase in the popularity of such works, as well as a market for popular religious stories. There are works of literature, including a Shāhnāma, the Dīvān of Baki, and ‘Ali Çelebi’s (d. 1543) translation into Ottoman Turkish of the Anwar-i Suhaylī (Lights of Canopus) of Husayn Wa‘iz Kashifi, titled Hümāyünname (The Imperial Book) (the several illustrated copies of which are associated with the provincial centers of Baghdad and Cairo rather than the capital), and an early example of an illustrated travelogue-cum-campaign logbook detailing the travels of governor Çerkes Yusuf Paşa (d.after 1607). Moreover, as the second chapter shows, there are also single-page paintings that have hitherto escaped scholarly attention. These single-page paintings show that there was more variance in terms of subject matter than has previously been assumed. That it to say, it is not only works of popular religious literature that were produced in Baghdad, but also works of a secular nature. Furthermore, it must be added that the illustrated manuscripts produced in Baghdad are in Turkish or Persian, but not in Arabic.

While tadhkiras that provide information on Baghdadi poets often note their trilingualism,

49 Ernst Grube makes a note of the “mixed, provincial Safavid style” of two illustrated copies of the Hümāyünname (British Library Add. 15153 and Topkapı Palace Museum Library R. 843). While a location of production is not provided in these two examples, they are now commonly attributed to Baghdad based on style. See Şebnem Parladır’s dissertation for a discussion of these manuscripts.

Grube further notes that ‘Ali Çelebi’s translation is based on the Persian version of the Kalīla wa Dimna tale and that the few illustrated copies of this text are not associated with the courtly style of Istanbul. He points to one work that he suggests is in the Ottoman courtly style (British Library Or. 7354), which is not the translation by ‘Ali Çelebi but another, unidentified Turkish translation. Interestingly, several of Kāshif’s translations (such as the Anwar-i Suhaylī or the Rawżat al-Shuhadā’ (Garden of Martyrs)) are illustrated in Baghdad, in addition to the Rawżat al-Shuhadā’ itself and the Akhlāq-i Muḥṣin (Muḥsin’s Ethics)).

patrons interested in owning illustrated works appear to be Turkish and Persian speakers. Further research in a broader region that includes Tabriz, Qazvin, Shiraz, and eastern Anatolia may shed light on the readership of Persian texts, such as those produced in Baghdad, as well as the still elusive group of Qiṣṣa al-Anbiyāʾ manuscripts.

Rather than describing each manuscript, I have chosen to organize the dissertation around several key questions. What were the conditions that led to the efflorescence of art in Baghdad? How can we situate this efflorescence in the context of empire-wide social and urban transformations? What types of works were chosen for illustration, and for whom? What were the relations between the province and the center? What distinguishes Baghdad from other frontier provinces? In each chapter I employ an exemplary manuscript as a tool to explore these questions. However, I have examined all available copies in various manuscript libraries and a list of illustrated and unillustrated manuscripts that are connected to Baghdad, either through the information contained in their colophons or through stylistic affinity, is provided in the appendix. Here a note about sources is necessary. In terms of archival sources available, extant cadastral surveys and law codes in the Prime Ministry Ottoman Archives date to circa 1539–1545, soon after the conquest of the province under Süleyman I. There are also cadastral surveys from 1577–1578, right before the onset of the Ottoman-Safavid wars, marking the critical periods of post-conquest and pre-war. However, the period in between and after are lacking. There are also a number of mühimme registers (“registers of important affairs”) containing copies of orders sent to the provinces. While these provide a wealth of information, particularly regarding Ottoman-Safavid relations, they do not directly answer the kinds of questions posed in this dissertation. It must also be noted, however, that we currently lack concrete information regarding the specifics of the production of illustrated manuscripts in other centers, such as Shiraz, Qazvin or Tabriz as well.
Where archival sources are lacking, narrative sources are plenty. Both local histories and accounts of the re-conquest of the province by Murad IV in 1638, and broader histories provide information, particularly regarding relations between the imperial center and the province. Additionally, the tadhkira of the local poet ʿAhdi (d. 1593), and the Divān of Ruhi of Baghdad (d. 1605), as well as the tadhkira of the seventeenth-century Safavid author Mir Taqi al-Din Kashani, also provide important information regarding poets active in Baghdad.\(^{50}\)

Using unpublished histories of Baghdad written by two seventeenth-century Baghdadi authors, as well as Ottoman and Safavid chronicles from the late-sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries, the first chapter sets the political and historical background to Ottoman-Safavid relations and sheds light on relations between Istanbul and the province, the central administration’s ways of managing the provinces, as well as upstarts, who used the liminality of the province to leverage their authority. This chapter argues that multiple focal points are needed to understand the frontier zone of Baghdad. It also shows that governors as well as upstarts had the means—if not always legitimate—of increasing their wealth and rank. This is examined in the context of social and urban transformations taking place towards the end of the sixteenth century.

This sets the background to the following chapters, and particularly to Chapter 2, which concentrates on changing tastes in art, and especially an increasing interest in collecting single-page paintings and calligraphies. This chapter, through a study of


previously overlooked single-page paintings from Baghdad, shows that despite stylistic differences, these paintings shared in the changing tastes and new themes of entertainment current in the capital. These single-page paintings also point out that there was a more varied output of material than popular religious literature, as has been portrayed in scholarly literature.

This is followed in Chapter 3 by a case study of a manuscript of the Hadīkatū ’s- Sū’ ēdā (Brooklyn Museum of Art, 70.143) as an example of the multiple copies of this text on the Karbala tragedy by the Baghdadi author Fuzuli. Unillustrated copies of the Hadīkatū ’s-Sū’ ēdā are plenty, but somewhat like the thirteenth-century efflorescence of the illustrated copies of al-Hariri’s Maqāmāt, there appear several illustrated copies of the Hadīkatū ’s-Sū’ ēdā in Baghdad in the final decade of the sixteenth century. There are at least nine full, illustrated copies and several dispersed folios held in various libraries. I suggest that these works were read by and produced largely for a local Bektashi audience. The popularity of this work stems from the sacred topography of Baghdad and can be understood as analogous to pilgrimage certificates. Additionally, illustrated works on the Karbala tragedy coexist with illustrated stories on the lives of Sufi mystics and on the deeds of Mawlana Jalal al-Din Rumi. These works, produced in single copies for the most part, are likely produced for a Mawlawi audience, and possibly supported by local governors or officials in an attempt to counterbalance works on the Karbala tragedy. The coexistence of different types of texts highlights the multi-confessional nature of Baghdad.

Moving away from works that were likely produced for an open market, Chapter 4 concentrates on the patronage of Sokolluzade Hasan Paşa, taking the example of an ambitious universal history that was composed for this governor, who was the son of the influential grand vizier Sokollu Mehmed Paşa. This universal history, titled Cāmi ‘ū’s-Siyer, has a very local flavor, highlighting Baghdad in many occasions. While bearing local
aspects, through its universal scope this work also presents an image of the governor as the culmination of universal history, not unlike works of universal history produced in Istanbul.

The final chapter deals with the numerous copies of illustrated genealogies produced for a speculative market, concentrating in particular on one early seventeenth-century copy that appears to have been altered to suit multiple audiences. This illustrated genealogy composed in Persian takes a predominantly Ottoman genre and turns it on its head through its pro-Safavid text and iconography. The manuscript, possibly quite early in its lifetime, was altered through partial changes in its introduction and was addressed to the Ottoman ruler, Ahmed I (r. 1603–1617). While this particular manuscript points to the fluidity of texts, objects and identities, the group of illustrated genealogies is also remarkable for being an innovation in Baghdad, which then spread to the Ottoman court in Istanbul and became more popular in the seventeenth century. As such, these manuscripts challenge the assumption that “influence” always flowed from the capital to the provinces, by providing evidence for the other way around. I conclude the dissertation with several hypothetical questions on the production of illustrated manuscripts outside of the court. I also suggest that an approach, which considers a focused study of a region, particularly a frontier zone, along with a macro-level study of exchanges and encounters can be employed for other frontier zones. Furthermore, research into trade and politics among eastern Anatolian provinces down through Mosul, Baghdad and Basra as well as other Arab provinces, will shed light on the dynamics of relations and exchanges, as well as the reception and consumption of books and objects in this broader frontier region.
CHAPTER 1
UNCERTAIN LOYALTIES

A painting in an illustrated mecmu’a (compilation/miscellany) from the seventeenth century shows a youth dressed as a Bektashi dervish holding a book in one hand (fig. 1.1). The painting is accompanied by his tale. This youth was from the lands of Rum (diyâr-i Rûm) and was the son of a merchant who was trading in Baghdad and Basra. Offended, and estranged from the father, the youth traveled to the Safavid lands with his affluent lover; both of them disguised as Bektashi dervishes and went to the lands of ’Ajam (diyâr-i ’Ajem), travelled many lands and finally expired. The painting and the story portray the malleability of identity from being the son of a merchant, to a lover, to a dervish, and highlight fluidity or fluidities of identity, trade and travel from the lands of Rum to the lands of ’Ajam. This painting encapsulates what I wish to explore in this chapter, that is, different models of fluidity and negotiation in the frontier province of Baghdad. By this I mean several things: movement of people and objects between the Ottoman lands (Rum) and the lands of Iran-Iraq (’Ajam) through trade or war; mobility in terms of wealth and rank, albeit in not necessarily legitimate ways; and a coexistence, interaction, and negotiation of identities (between Ottoman and Safavid, or Sunni or Shiʿi). Religious identity is not necessarily always flexible but, in Baghdad with its major Shiʿi population under Sunni Ottoman rule, the two could coexist and interact, which is where the “flexibility” comes in. Religious affiliation could either be camouflaged through fear or caution (taqiyya) or negotiated. Coexistence of the Sunnis and Shiʿis in Baghdad also has implications on its


52 BnF, Turc 140, fol. 13a.
architecture, from the coexistence of Bektashi convents, Shi’i shrines and shrines of Sunni figures, and on its artistic production. I propose that one historical lens is insufficient to grasp the artistic production in Baghdad and that multiple perspectives are needed to reach a better understanding of this phenomenon.

Utilizing an unpublished history of the re-conquest of Baghdad by the Ottomans in 1638, this chapter presents a picture of late-sixteenth to early-seventeenth-century Baghdad, where different interest groups vied for power and leveraged the liminal position of Baghdad and the enmity between the Ottomans and the Safavids in order to gain the upper hand. I locate this picture in the larger context of social and urban transformations of its time, particularly the Celali uprisings, which will be described in more detail below. The present chapter provides several examples of upward mobility and alternative means of acquiring wealth. It is against this background of social and urban transformations that I will attempt to situate the short-lived art market in Baghdad and the patronage of illustrated manuscripts in subsequent chapters.

Contemporary narrative accounts evidence that alliances could be made and unmade with strategic acumen, and that difference could be both enhanced and undermined malleably. While the history of the Ottoman-Safavid wars\(^53\) is not my main concern in this

---

\(^53\) The period of intermittent war and peace between the Ottomans and the Safavids from the last quarter of the sixteenth century until the 1639 Treaty of Zuhab (Kasr-i Şirin) marks a lively period in which concerns of geopolitical and economic opportunism, factional and confessional rivalry, and identity formation played an important role. Statements of difference, particularly confessional difference, abound in chronicles, especially in accounts devoted to battles.

The military history of the Ottoman-Safavid wars of 1578–1590 has been studied in depth. Bekir Kütükoğlu’s important work on Ottoman-Safavid wars analyzes archival material regarding intermittent wars from 1578 to 1612. Another important source on the Ottoman-Safavid wars is Fahrettin Kırkıolu’s Osmanlılar’ın Kağkas-Ellerini Fethi (1451-1590). Özer Küpeli concentrates on wars between the Ottomans and the Safavids in the seventeenth century (between 1603–1612, 1615–1618 and 1623–1638). More recently, Rudi Matthee’s multi-perspective study on the causes and motives for war sheds light on the complexity of global contingencies and highlights the need for a comparative analysis of primary sources.

The Ottoman-Safavid wars of 1578–1590 brought about an outpour of histories devoted to the war and particularly to the personal valor of a single non-royal commander, such as the Nusratname (Book of Victory) of the Ottoman bureaucrat Muṣṭafa ʿAlī (d. 1600) devoted to Lâlâ Muṣṭafa Paşa’s (d. 1580) campaigns, the Şecâ atnâme (Book of Valor) of ʿAsafî Dal Mehmed Çelebi (d. 1597–98) and the anonymous Tarih-i ʿOsman Paşa (History of ʿOsman Paşa) detailing the deeds of ʿOsman Paşa (d. 1585), governor of Şirvân. The latter was
chapter, the volatility brought about by periods of war and peace, as well as the Ottomans’ policy of appeasement not only regarding the Ottoman-Safavid wars but also in the Ottoman state’s treatment of the Celali uprisings form the wider background to this dissertation. In fact, the issue of fluidity and flexibility runs through the dissertation, be it in the policy of appeasement on the part of both the Ottomans and the Safavids; in the broadening base of patronage of illustrated manuscripts and their movement, artists and poets (discussed in Chapter 2); or in alterations to manuscripts to suit different proclivities (discussed in Chapter 5).

Baghdad saw a rapid change of hands between the Ottomans and the Safavids well within a person’s lifetime, as was the case with the Baghdadi poet Fuzuli (d. 1556), for

---

published by Yunus Zeyrek. His edition is based on a manuscript held at the Austrian National Library (ÖNB Hist. Ott. 68).

In addition, Şeyh Vefâ’î Muhammed’s unpublished account, Tevârih-i Gazavât-i Sulûn Murad-î sâlîs (Histories of the Ghazas of Sultan Murad III) (ÖNB Hist. Ott. 66), and Taškîzâde’s Tebrîzîyye also provide important information regarding the war. Şeyh Vefâ’î Muhammed introduces the work as detailing the deeds of Özdemiroğlu ‘Osmân Paşa but the bulk of his work describes the battles of Cafer Paşa. Additionally, Giovanni Tommaso Minadói’s The History of the Vvarres Betvveene the Turkes and the Persians is an important source on the Ottoman-Safavid wars.

Another important and understudied work details the deeds of Elvendzâde ‘Ali Paşa (d. 1598), governor of Baghdad, in 1583 against the Safavids near Baghdad. This work titled Zâfername (Book of Victory) was composed by Nişanî and contains two maps. For a transcription of this manuscript source see Hamza Üzümçü, “Zafername-i Ali Paşa (Transcript ve Değerlendirme)” (MA Thesis, Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe Üniversitesi, 2008). This author notes that the unique copy of this work is preserved at Fatih Millet Kütüphanesi (Ali Emiri Tarih Nu. 396). On this work also see Mustafa Eravcı, “Niyazi’nin Zafername ve Bağdat Beylerbeyi Ali Paşa’nın Faaliyetleri,” in Islam Medeniyetinde Bağdat (Medenit’îs’s Selâm) Uluslararası Sempozyum, 7–8–9 Kasım, 2008, 2 Vols., ed. Ismail Safa Üstün (İstanbul: M.U. İlahiyat Fakültesi Vakfı Yayınları, 2011), 677–89.

example. Political allegiance is more easily fluid. Subjectivities defined publicly versus privately may also differ. That Shahverdi b. Muhammadi, a descendant of the nominal governors of Luristan, had escaped to Baghdad fearing the Safavid shah’s wrath, and “would wear the Qizilbash tāj or the large Ottoman turban ... as the occasion demanded,” gives an example of taqiyya and shows the art of negotiation of identities and allegiances.54

Gábor Ágoston points to the flexibility and pragmatism of the Ottoman state’s interaction with its frontier provinces as well as the complexity of relations between the central state and provinces. For example, various forms of governance could be observed in a single province, such as hereditary sancak (district) status as well as control by state appointed governors.55 Ágoston furthermore draws attention to differences among frontier

---

54 The tāj and the turban are potent symbols of identity. The Surname (Book of Festivities) of 1582 detailing the festivities associated with the Ottoman prince Mehmed’s (future Mehmed III) circumcision ceremony was composed at a time when the Ottomans and Safavids were at war and contains paintings that mock the Safavids, showing people throwing the Safavid tāj on the floor or wearing the Safavid tāj on their bottom. See Derin Terzioglu, “The Imperial Circumcision Festival of 1582: An Interpretation,” Muqarnas 12 (1995): 84–100, 86. In addition to the several paintings in the Surname as well as the Şehînêhnâne (Book of the King of Kings) showing mockery of the Safavids also note the depiction of Safavid captives at the Battle of Çıldır in the Nüsretnâme (TPML H. 1354, fols. 73b–74a).

The seventeenth-century Safavid author, Iskandar Munshi, writes that members of the Lur tribe in Luristan, a province in western Iran and south of Iraq, near Baghdad and Hamadan, were loyal to the Safavids from the time of Shah Ismâ’îl I (r. 1501–1524), under Shâh Rustam. Among his descendants, Amîr Jahangîr had caused some troubles and was killed by Shâh Tâhmâsp I (r. 1524–1576). His son Muhammaddî was his son also fled to Baghdad. Later on, he made his way back to the Safavid court and reestablished relations, only to rebel again later. Muhammaddî was imprisoned at Qâhqa. Circa 1587, his son, Shâhverdi, succeeded Muhammaddî as governor of Luristan. Around 1589, when the Ottomans and the Safavids were still at war, and when the Ottoman commander Cigalažâde Sinân Paşa (d. 1605) built a fort in Nehâvand and placed an Ottoman garrison there, many from the Qara Ulus tribe, moving from Hamadan to Luristan sought refuge with Shâhverdi, according to Iskandar Munshi. The author notes that Shâhverdi then submitted to the Ottomans and “became a vassal of the Ottoman governor of Baghdad.”

In 1591–92, Shâhverdi reestablished relations with the Safavid ruler, or in Munshi’s words, “was forced to declare his allegiance to the Safavid crown.” This coincides with the time when Shâh ‘Abâbî I (r. 1588–1629) was making fundamental reforms (he transferred the capital from Qazvin to Isfahan). He also diminished the power of the Qizilbash amirs and created a new corps in the army, of ghulâms, Muslim converts of Georgian, Circassian and Armenian origins). However, according to Iskandar Munshi, Shâhverdi had gotten used to being independent. When he killed Ughurli Sultan Bayâl, governor of Hamadan, who had come to levy taxes from Burûjîrî, in Luristan, Shâh ‘Abâbî I turned against Shâhverdi. Shâhverdi again escaped to Baghdad. Iskandar Munshi, History of Shah ‘Abbas the Great (Târîkh-i ’Alam-ârâ-yi ‘Abbâsi), tr. Roger Savory (Boulder: Westview Press, 1978–1986), Book 2, 642–6. Henceforth Iskandar Munshi, Târîkh-i ’Alam-ârâ-yi ‘Abbâsi.

55 A mid-seventeenth-century treatise on the timar system notes, for example, that Baghdad province consisted of twenty-five sancaks (districts), eight of which contained timars and ze’ amets, while some were defined as yurtluç-ocaklık. İhvan Şahîn, “Tîmar Süstemi Hakkında Bir Risale,” Tarih Dergisi 32 (1979): 905–935. Also see Halil Sahîlioglu, “Osmanlı Döneminde Irak’ın Idari Taksimleri,” Belleten 211 (1990): 1233–54.
provinces, even if their revenue management system could be the same. Here, we must also add a caveat that state pragmatism is different from the individual subjectivities of inhabitants in Baghdad.

What distinguishes Baghdad from other frontier provinces? While other provinces and cities such as Shirvan and Tabriz also changed hands between the Ottomans and the Safavids throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Baghdad was unique in its constant spiritual importance to the Ottomans and the Safavids since the province housed the shrines of Imam ʿAli in Najaf, Imam Husayn in Karbala, Imam Musa al-Kazim (the seventh Shiʿi imam), and Abu Hanifa (founder of the Sunni Hanafi school of jurisprudence) in Baghdad, as well as being a center for illustrated manuscript production. In this respect too, it stands in contrast to other Ottoman provincial centers such as Cairo or Damascus. In the imperial context of visual, architectural, and ceremonial distinction highlighted in the metropolitan works of art and architecture, illustrated manuscripts produced in Baghdad in the late-sixteenth century form a distinctive group that neither looks canonically Ottoman nor Safavid. This can also be argued for its architecture. Stylistically idiosyncratic and defined in art historical scholarship as a “school,” these manuscripts stand in contrast to those produced at the courts of Istanbul or Isfahan. Against the imperial context of difference also expressed visually, the fluidity of the frontier challenges notions of identity.

In this chapter, I will present an overview of the political history of Baghdad beginning with the Ottoman-Safavid wars of 1578–1590 and continuing until 1623, using an unpublished history of Baghdad composed by the seventeenth-century author Mustafa b.


57 It must be noted that Tabriz too was an important center of art production, particularly when the Safavid court was based there.
Mulla Rıdvan el-Baghdadi.\textsuperscript{58} This seventeenth-century Baghdadi author’s account provides a great amount of detail regarding Baghdad not found in other contemporary accounts. This particular source is remarkable for the amount of detail it provides on the loss of Baghdad in 1623. It also sheds light on frictions between the Ottomans and the Safavids, as well as governors, janissaries, segbâns (infantry units), levends (irregular militia), and the re ğyâ (tax-paying subjects), while also pointing to possible paths to increased wealth and upward mobility.\textsuperscript{59} This will set the background to subsequent chapters, which will concentrate more on the cultural milieu, being the producer and consumer of illustrated manuscripts.

\textsuperscript{58} Muştafa b. Mulla Rıdvan el-Bağdadî’s work is titled Tevârîh-i Fetihnâme-i Bağdâd be-dess-i Pâdisâh-i Dîn-\linebreak penâh Sultan Murâd Han Gâzî rahmetullahu ‘aleyh (Histories on the Conquest of Baghdad at the Hand of the Religion-protecting Sultan Murad Han Gazi (may God’s mercy be on him)). The author flourished after the second decade of the seventeenth century and was an eyewitness to Baghdad’s second conquest by the Ottomans. His work begins with Süleyman I’s conquest of Baghdad in 1534. The text is organized chronologically, with emphasis given to Ottoman-Safavid relations, events in and around Baghdad in the first half of the work. The second half (though not demarcated in the two manuscript copies) concerns the second conquest of Baghdad. The work ends with the enthronement of the Ottoman sultan İbrahim I in 1640 (d. 1648).

There are two manuscript copies of this work. One (Süleymaniye Library, Nuruosmaniye 3140/3) is part of a compilation, the first part of which comprises a translation of the Târîh-i Tabâri (History of Tabari). The second part is the Fetihnâme. It is comprised of 57 folios with 39 lines to a page. An illuminated unwan opens each volume of the History of Tabari as well as the Fetihnâme. The manuscript is copied by the calligrapher el-\linebreak Hacc Muharrem b. Abdurrahman. This work was copied at the request of the mid-seventeenth century commander of Aleppo, Murtaza Paşa. The colophon of the last work, which is the Fetihnâme, gives the date of 1656–57 (fol. 405a). Unfortunately, the manuscript shows signs of water damage at the top towards its middle section, and several folios in the middle are illegible.

The second manuscript copy is presently held at the Bodleian Library (Or. 276). This is the copy identified by Franz Babinger in his work, Osmanlı Tarih Yazarları. The author is of the opinion that this is most likely a unicum copy, but a comparison of the two manuscripts shows that they are the same text. The Bodleian copy is simpler in decoration with no illumination. Titles are written in red, as was the case in the Nuruosmaniye copy. The Bodleian copy consists of 297 folios with 21 lines to a page.

In addition to these two manuscript copies of Muştafa b. Mulla Rıdvan el-Bağdadî’s history of Baghdad, there is also a manuscript in the collection of the University of Leiden (Acad. 149), which was copied by this author, who is identified as el-\linebreak Hacc Muştafa b. Mulla Rıdvan el-Bağdadî, resident of Aleppo. It was copied on 13 Shawwal 1070 (22 June 1660). This manuscript contains a copy of the Persian Divan of Tâlib Âmulî (d. 1626–27). That the Nuruosmaniye copy of this author’s history of Baghdad was copied at the request of Murtaza Paşa, commander of Aleppo, strengthens the identity of the historian Muştafa b. Mulla Rıdvan el-\linebreak Bagdadî, who was originally from Baghdad but was a resident of Aleppo.

In addition to Muştafa b. Mulla Rıdvan el-Bağdadî’s work, the eighteenth-century Baghdadi author Nazmizâde Murtaza’s Gülşen-i Hulefâ (Rosary of Caliphs) is an important source. Nazmizâde’s work begins with Baghdad under the Abbasids, and ends with the early eighteenth century. The work is organized chronologically and divided according to the reigns and rules of caliphs, rulers, or governors. This work is more comprehensive in its account on late seventeenth and early eighteenth century. Mehmed Karataş, ed. Gülşen-i Hulefâ: Bağdat Tarihi 762-1717 (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2014). Henceforth Nazmizâde Murtaza, Gülşen-i Hulefâ; Jan Schmidt, Catalogue of Turkish Manuscripts in the Library of Leiden University and Other Collections in the Netherlands (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 193; Franz Babinger, Osmanlı Tarih Yazarları ve Eserleri (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1992), 199–200.

\textsuperscript{59} On social transformations of the early seventeenth century, janissary uprisings, and janissaries’ involvement in commercial life see Cemal Kafadar, “Janissaries and Other Riffraff of Ottoman Istanbul: Rebels without a
Prequel: The Ottoman-Safavid Wars of 1578–1590

In this section, I offer a brief overview of the events leading up to the Ottoman-Safavid wars of 1578–90 for two reasons. First, it will introduce some of the figures that we will encounter in subsequent chapters (particularly in Chapters 4 and 5). Second, and more importantly, it suggests the extent to which the context of war is ripe for assertions of difference and rivalry. For example, in 1571 in the shrines of Imams 'Ali and Husayn, Persian-style carpets with the names of the Twelve Imams woven on them to the exclusion of the first three Caliphs, were replaced with carpets from Anatolia.60 This was a subtle but charged decision in the several years leading up to the Ottoman-Safavid wars of 1578–1590. That the Safavid princess Pari Khan Khanum (d. 1578) sent silver candelabra and censers to the holy shrines in Baghdad in 1574 at a time when Baghdad was under Ottoman rule, points to the significant role of competitive art patronage in establishing identity and prestige.61 It was also in this charged environment that frontier governors were warned to be on guard, and a governor complained that, “there was no end to the heretics and misbelievers in the province.”62 Two decades after the replacement of carpets, and with the war over, we see a different picture in which illustrated manuscripts produced in Baghdad form an idiosyncratic group that looks neither canonically Ottoman nor Safavid. This material raises the broader question: are our definitions of Ottoman or Safavid manuscripts too rigid?

---


61 Prime Ministry Archives, Mühimme Defteri 22.125 and 22.234.

and historian Mustafa ʿĀli (d. 1600) writes that when the “deaf and blind Muhammad Khudabanda (r. 1578–1587) acceded to the throne, the age of consent and agreement between the Ottomans and the Safavids was broken, like the dissipation of the raucous crowd listening to the qīṣṣa-khwān (storyteller) at the approach of night. Now, care must be taken to subdue the land of the Persians.” Mustafa ʿĀli’s comparison of the breaching of this contract to the dispersing audience at the end of a story recitation captures the gist of an unraveling that precipitated the twelve-year war between the Ottomans and the Safavids. In the universal history ending in his own present of the late-sixteenth century, Mustafa ʿĀli continues this account of the broken compact with a description of a comet, which he notes is generally taken to be a sign of troublesome times.

The comet, which was observed in November 1577, appears in the same author’s Nusretnāme (Book of Victory). This work describes the first two years of the Ottoman-Safavid wars, from January 1578 until the death of the campaign leader Lala Mustafa Paşa


64 Ottoman historian Muṣṭafa Selânîkî Efendi and ʿAṣaṭ Dâl Mehmed Ǧelebi also note this event. Selânîkî gives the poet Sâiʾs chronogram in his history, while ʿAṣaṭ highlights the auspicious moment of the comet and the appointment of Lâlâ Muṣṭafa Paşa as campaign leader against the Safavids. ʿAṣaṭ’s illustrated history also includes a depiction of the comet (Ṣeṭʿatnāme, IUL, T. 6043, fol. 13b).

The Safavid historian Iskandar Munshi too writes about this comet and mentions that Shâh Ismâʾîl II was worried that the appearance of a comet such as this one presaged the downfall of a king. His astrologers were less worried and responded that since “the tail of the comet appeared in the west, the bulk of its effect would be felt in the Ottoman Empire and western lands.” However, as Iskandar Munshi points out, Shâh Ismâʾîl II had good reason to worry. The author writes that a comet that appears in the house of his descendant star surely was a sign of his downfall, and adds, that his astrologers had misled the Shâh. Soon thereafter, the Shâh died. The Ottoman astronomer Taḵiyuddîn too thought that the comet prophesied trouble in the east and the death of the Shâh. He was of the opinion that the comet was an auspicious sign.

On a poem in the Šehnâṣehnâme of Murâd III, which includes Taḵiyuddîn’s comments on the comet, the observatory and its demolition soon thereafter see Aydîn Sayîlî, “Aṭalûddîn Mansûr’un İstanbul Rasûthanesi Hakkindaki Şiirleri,” Belleten 20 (1956): 411–84. Also see by the same author, The Observatory in Islam (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1988); Iskandar Munshi, Târîkh-i ʿAlam-ārâ-yi ʿAbbâsî, Book 1, 325; Muṣṭafa ʿĀli, Nusretnāme, BL Add. 22011, fol. 5b. ʿAṣaṭ Dâl Mehmed Ǧelebi, Şēcā atnâme, IUL, T. 6043. For a facsimile edition of this work see Abdûlkâdir ʿOzcan, ed. ʿAṣaṭ Dâl Mehmed Ǧelebi, Şēcā atnâme: Özdemiroğlu Osman Paşa’nın Șaɾk Şeferleri (1578–1583) (Ankara: Çamlıca, 2006). For an introduction to this work and transcription of the text see Mustava Eravec, ed. ʿAṣaṭ Dâl Mehmed Ǧelebi ve Şēcā atnâme (Istanbul: MVT Yayıncılık, 2009).
in January 1580. The author participated in the eastern campaign as campaign secretary. Both works present a similar account of the comet, including observations by astrologers, and a chronogram composed by the poet/painter Saʿi. This poet, as well as general opinion, held the appearance of the comet to be a sign of some calamity, be it in the form of an earthquake, plague, or a drought; more particularly, it was held to be a sign of trouble with the Ottomans’ eastern neighbors. Popular opinion was that it signaled the inherent defeat of the Safavids. Saʿi’s chronogram for this occurrence cemented this view: “He composed the date: the ruler of Persia is to be annihilated” (Didi tārīhi: ‘Acem Şāhi ola nāgah māt). The Nuṣretnāme further references astrologers, who find the particularities of this comet to be a sign of trouble in the east and especially in the vicinity of Baghdad.

Following the Treaty of Amasya (1555) care was taken by both sides to abide by its clauses. However, as Colin Imber notes, “the Ottoman government wished to suppress Shiʿite-Safavid influence in Iraq, while remaining on good terms with Persia so long as hostilities continued in the west.” Governors were ordered to control the situation, but were warned not to transgress the pact. The border provinces of Baghdad, Basra, and Shahrizol, in particular, were areas that required extra caution. These had been former Safavid provinces and had a substantial Shiʿi populace, as evidenced by the governor of Baghdad’s claim in 1577, that “there was no end to the heretics and misbelievers in the province.” Imber further notes that the Ottoman government increased its surveillance of frontier regions and Qizilbash and Shiʿi elements in the year leading up to the war.

---

65 Nuṣretnāme, BL Add. 22011, fol. 5a; Künhūʾ’l Aḥbār, fol. 483b; Cornell Fleischer, Bureaucrat and Intellectual, 76.
66 Muṣṭafa ʿĀlī, Nuṣretnāme, BL Add. 22011, fol. 6a.
67 Colin Imber, Persecution of the Ottoman Shiʿites According to the Mühimme Defterleri, 1565–1585, 246.
68 According to the Gülşen-i Hulefā, the governor at this time is Elvendzāde ʿĀlī Paşa, who, according to Naḵīzāde Murtuza, was governor from 1574 to 1586. According to Selānīḵī, Elvendzāde ʿĀlī Paşa was appointed to Baghdad in 1593, and later in 1597. He adds that Elvendzāde had been appointed to Baghdad several times. He further notes that his appointment was switched to governorship of Basra when he was on his
On the Safavid side, in the aftermath of the death of Shah Tahmasp I (r. 1524–1576) there was an immediate power vacuum in the Safavid state as various Qizilbash tribal elements formed alliances and tried to increase their own power through the appointment of favored contenders to the throne. Iskandar Munshi (d. ca. 1632), court historian of Shah 'Abbas I (r. 1588–1629), considers the period between the death of Shah Tahmasp I and the accession of Isma'il II (r. 1576–1577) as an interregnum during which “the city [Qazvin] was in turmoil.” After Shah Isma'il II’s accession to the throne in August 1576, the new Shah had contenders to the throne, as well as supporters of the deceased Shah Tahmasp and his son Haydar Mirza, killed. Few were spared. Among them were the weak and half-blind Muhammad Khudabanda and the young 'Abbas Mirza, both of whom eventually succeeded Isma’il II. Shah Isma’il II, the ruler chosen by an alliance of the Rumlu, Afshar, Bayat and

way to Baghdad and had arrived in Aleppo. Selânikî writes that in 1598 Elvendzade 'Ali Paşa was appointed to Baghdad yet again, but before he could claim his office, he passed away. According to Selânikî, Elvendzade 'Ali Paşa was distinguished among his peers in terms of his possessions. Sources are not always very clear on dates of appointment of governors. Among governors appointed to Baghdad, Elvendzade 'Ali Paşa ruled for a comparatively longer time. Elvendzade 'Ali Paşa also rebuilt the dome of the shrine of Imam Husayn in Karbala.

It appears, from Muştafa b. Mulla Rûşân el-Bağdâdî’s account, that Elvendzade 'Ali Paşa’s son Arslan Beg remained in Baghdad and he was a böläkbaşi (commander of a janissary unit) in the household of Derviş Mehemmed, son of Mehemmed Kanber. Mehmmed Kanber will appear later in this chapter in more detail. He was charged with collecting tax and sending the yield every few years to the capital. The author writes that it had been five or six years that he had not sent this to Istanbul and that Derviş Mehemmed had seized this yield; it was through this that Arslan Beg had become affluent.


69 Ibid., 248.


71 Muḥammad Khudâbanda was spared on account of his physical condition. Both Muştafa b. Mulla Rûşân el-Bağdâdî and Iskandar Munshî mention Ismâ’il II’s shame in ordering his execution. On the other hand, 'Abbâs Mirzâ managed to survive his execution order thanks to Ismâ’il II’s early death. According to Iskandar Munshî, 'Ali Quli Khân Shamlu was charged with carrying out the execution of 'Abbâs Mirzâ. However, 'Ali Quli Khân, who had received patronage by Sultan Muḥammad, and whose mother had been the midwife at the young prince’s birth, was hesitant to carry out this order. He delayed the order as much as he could, and when in the end, Shâh Ismâ’il II died, 'Ali Quli Khân supported and protected the young prince. Iskandar Munshî, *Târîkh-i 'Alam-ârâ-yi 'Abbâsî*, Book 1, 362–3.

According to Kemâl bin Jalâl Munajîm, son of the astrologer to Shâh 'Abbâs I, and author of a summary universal history, Ḥusayn Mirzâ, son of Bahram Mirzâ was at the time in Qandahar and also was not
Varsaq tribes, the Kurds, Pari Khan Khanum, and her uncle, soon proved to be a failure. His short reign was marked by an increased influence of Qizilbash elements, many executions of the members of the ‘ulama’ and the Ustajlu clan, as well as discord raised by the shah’s pro-Sunni inclinations. Mustafa ‘Ali wrote: “When those heretics of bad conduct smelled his Sunnism, they wanted to get rid of him.”

Mustafa b. Mulla Rūdvan el-Bagdādī, Iskandar Munshi and Kemal bin Jalāl, son of the astrologer to Shah ‘Abbas I, provide a similar story of Ismā‘īl II’s death—one day he was found dead next to his boon companion, Halvajioğlu Hasan Beg. Iskandar Munshi writes of several theories that were brought up regarding killed. This author added that when news of Shāh Ẓahmāşp’s death reached Husayn Mirzā, he had coins minted and the khuṭba voiced in his name. This, however, raised some opposition and Husayn Mirzā was poisoned to death. Kemāl b. Jalāl, Tārīkh-i Kemāl, Sülêymanîyé Atif Efendi 1861, fols. 36a–36b.

Contrary to this author, Iskandar Munshi writes that Husayn Mirzā died of natural causes. However, Iskandar Munshi also voices his suspicions that the only reason Ibrāhīm Mirzā, Husayn Mirzā’s brother, was that he feared Husayn Mirzā might lead a revolt in Khurasan. In 984 (1577), Ibrāhīm Mirzā was strangled by Circassians at Ismā‘īl II’s orders. Iskandar Munshi writes that Ibrāhīm Mirzā was a skilled calligrapher and miniaturist and had a private library with manuscripts and china. He adds that most of his library was destroyed by his widow in order that the Shāh would not seize them. Ibrāhīm Mirzā is further known for his patronage of the Freer Haft Avarang: A Princeely Manuscript from Sixteenth Century Iran (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997).

Iskandar Munshi, Tārīkh-i ʿAlam-ārā-yi ᾕbāsī, Book 1, 309–11.

For a critical approach to primary sources and the works of Qāḍī Ahmad in particular, which presents information on Ibrāhīm Mirzā, see Massumeh Farhad and Marianna Shreve Simpson, “Sources for the Study of Safavid Painting and Patronage, or Méfiez-vous de Qazi Ahmad,” Muqarnas 10 (1993): 286–91.

72 Iskandar Munshi, as well as most Safavid historians, mention Shāh Ismā‘īl’s “weak attachment to Shi‘ism.”


Shohreh Gholsorkhi too finds Mirzā Makhdum Sharīfī, a politico-religious figure, to be highly influential in Ismā‘īl II’s pro-Sunni inclinations. Makhdum Sharīfī rose to prominence in the early part of Ismā‘īl II’s reign, only to be faced with the shah’s wrath and thrown in prison. After the death of Ismā‘īl II, Mirzā Makhdum Sharīfī managed to escape and found refuge in the Ottoman Empire. Iskandar Munshi writes that he first went to Baghdad.


73 Muṣṭafā ʿĀli, Niṣrētnāme, TPML H. 1365, fol. 9a. Muṣṭafā b. Mulla Rūdvan el-Bagdādī also uses almost the same words in his Tārīh-i Fatihname-yi Bagdād, Sülêymanîyé Kütüphanesi Nuruosmaniye 3140, fol. 11b.

Ismaʿil II’s death but in the end he hints at the oddity of the event when he wrote that “the common people were stupefied by such an unexpected and curious incident.”\(^75\)

Following the death of Shah Ismaʿil II there arose the question of succession. In the end, Shah Ismaʿil II’s brother Muhammad Khudabanda was preferred over Ismaʿil II’s eight-month-old son, Shah Shuja’, who would have been ruling under the guidance of Pari Khan Khanum.\(^76\) While during Ismaʿil II’s brief reign it was Pari Khan Khanum who was dominant in state affairs,\(^77\) during Muhammad Khudabanda’s reign it was his second wife Khayr al-Nisa Begum. She struggled to establish her son Hamza Mirza as heir apparent.\(^78\)

Cliques among the Qizilbash formed, some in favor of Hamza Mirza as the crown prince, some against. While Muhammad Khudabanda managed to remain in control of affairs of state until 1587, several Ottoman authors report challenges to his reign during the Ottoman-
Safavid war, with some advocating for Hamza Mirza, some for Tahmasp Mirza, and others for Ebu Talib Mirza.\(^79\) That news of such affairs reached Ottoman ears at the peak of war highlights the volatility of rule in the Safavid lands. In the end, it would be ‘Abbas Mirza, who replaced Muhammad Khudabanda in 1587, when Hamza Mirza mysteriously died in 1586.\(^80\)

The period of uncertainty brought about by Shah Tahmasp I’s death, followed by Isma’il II’s short and turbulent reign and the accession of the half-blind Muhammad Khudabanda, provided fertile ground for the Safavids’ neighbors to make an advance, a point raised by Iskandar Munshi, who noted the “grave weaknesses ... in the body politic.”\(^81\) Mustafa ‘Āli was also apt to take note of this period of uncertainty when he wrote that the pact between the two sides was broken, like the dissipation of the crowd listening to the \(qiṣṣa-khwān\) at the approach of night. This captures the tenor of the opportune moment that the Ottomans took advantage of in order to seize Azerbaijan and Shirvan at a time of disorder in the Safavid lands and relative quiet on the Ottomans’ western front.\(^82\)

---


\(^80\) Muştafa b. Mulla Riḍvan el-Bağdâdî writes that Hamza Mirzâ was murdered by a boon companion named Hûrî. The author notes that Hûrî had been fostered by an amir known as Ismîkhân. After killing Hamza Mirzâ with a dagger, Hûrî went to his patron, who brought Hûrî to Shâh Muḥammad Khudâbânda. Hûrî was immediately executed. \textit{Târîh-i Fetiḥnâme-i Bağdâd}, Bodleian Or. 276, fol. 48b.

\(^81\) Iskandar Munshî further notes in his discussion of the war with the Ottomans that: “Since God so willed, hardship and tribulation became the lot of the people of Azerbaijan and Shirvan after the murder of Shah Ismâ’îl II, and all peace and security departed from those regions.” Iskandar Munshî, \textit{Târîkh-i ‘Alum-ārâ-yi ‘Abbâsî}, Book 1, 341, 347.

\(^82\) It is slightly later in the same work, \textit{Kûnhû’il Aḥbâr}, that Muṣṭâfa ‘Ālî dwells on the particularities of this broken compact; that is, several herds of sheep had been looted in the vicinity of Canbaz Çuḵuri. Muṣṭâfa ‘Ālî’s voluminous universal history gives a more summary account on how the Ottomans justified a war against the Safavids. The same author’s \textit{Nusretnâme} is more comprehensive in explaining the motives for and justifying a war against the Safavids. Muṣṭâfa Eravcî, who studied the \textit{Nusretnâme} in connection with the Ottoman-Safavid wars notes that some parts of the \textit{Nusretnâme}, such as the section on the comet were taken almost fully and incorporated into the later work, \textit{Kûnhû’il Aḥbâr}. He further adds that the \textit{Kûnhû’il Aḥbâr} gives more detail regarding some events. In the explanation for the causes of war, however, \textit{Nusretnâme} provides more information. This may be because in composing this earlier work, Muṣṭâfa ‘Ālî was still hoping to win royal patronage, which is no longer the case with the \textit{Kûnhû’il Aḥbâr}. In the \textit{Nusretnâme} Muṣṭâfa ‘Ālî writes that the established protocol was for the Safavids to send envoys and congratulatory letters when a new ruler ascended to the throne in evidence of their submission. He writes that Ismâ’îl II, out of “foolishness and vanity was hesitant to send envoys; and a letter of congratulations is still wanting.” In addition, when “some nitwits among the Kurds from the vicinity of Shahrizol and Van passed into the shâh’s lands, he treated them warmly” (TPML
Given the uncertainty of loyalties after the death of Shah Tahmasp, the Ottoman government entertained the idea of an eastern campaign in order to seize Azerbaijan and Shirvan, whose mostly Sunni populace was under pressure by the Safavids. These were also important centers of silk trade, a point that often gets forgotten in studies of Ottoman-Safavid wars, which highlight religious difference as the most important catalyst for war. Bekir Kütükoğlu writes that once news of Shah Isma‘il II’s death reached the Ottomans, letters were sent to frontier governors ordering them to refresh their armaments but to adhere to the compact unless the Safavids acted against it; and to allow merchants to pass freely, unless borders were closed, in which case those merchants wishing to cross into Safavid

H. 1365, fol. 8b). Rivalry was not simply between Ottomans and Safavids but also between Qizilbash elements and Kurdish local notables, dating back to the early sixteenth century. Kurdish tribes in the bordering regions shifted their allegiance depending on the conjuncture. Akihiko Yamaguchi writes: “The Kurdish ruling families can be classified into three groups according to their attitudes towards the two empires: 1) those who abided by the Ottomans before or during the creation of the province of Diyarbakr in 1515, and who remained loyal to their Ottoman lord; 2) those who were continuously devoted to the Safavids; and 3) those who often switched loyalty between the Safavids and the Ottomans.”

The Safavid shah’s warm welcome to the Kurdish tribes must have been seen as a potential threat. Iskandar Munshi also notes the volatility of some of the Kurdish tribes in his discussion of the war between the Ottomans and the Safavids. He writes:

A number of seditious Kurds, notably Gażi Beg and other sons of Shahquli Bağlân and Gażî Qîrân, lived between Van and the Azerbaijan border. As is the custom of landowners in frontier areas, these men, as occasion demanded, from time to time attached themselves to the saddle straps of one of the rulers in the area and claimed to be his retainers, but their real motive was to stir up trouble and achieve their own ends in the ensuing confusion. On the accession of Şâh Ismâ‘îl II, they professed to enter his service and were received with favor. After his death, however, when they saw the weakness and disarray of the Safavid state and of the Qizilbash army, they went to Van and started to create trouble there. They incited Hüsrev Paşa, the governor of Van, to take advantage of the situation.


83 Carl Max Kortepeter’s work, Ottoman Imperialism During the Reformation: Europe and the Caucasus and Özer Küpeli’s Osmanlı-Safevi Münasebetleri are important works that take into account the wider geo-political and economic concerns in their studies. For a short study on silk trade during the Ottoman-Safavid wars of 1603–1618 also see András Riedlmayer, “Ottoman-Safavid Relations and the Anatolian Trade Routes: 1603–1618,” Turkish Studies Association Bulletin 5 (1981): 7–10. Carl Max Kortepeter, Ottoman Imperialism During the Reformation: Europe and the Caucasus (New York: New York University Press, 1972); Özer Küpeli, Osmanlı-Safevi Münasebetleri (Istanbul: Yeditepe, 2014).
lands should be detained for a while.\textsuperscript{84} The many mühimme registers in the years leading up to the war contain orders to governors of frontier regions to be vigilant.\textsuperscript{85} However, when an Ottoman caravan traveling from Gilan was sacked in Zanjan and several of the merchants killed or taken captive, and when cases of desertion\textsuperscript{86} and Shiʿi propaganda increased, the central government declared war against the Safavids.\textsuperscript{87} Thus, with the auspicious augury of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{84} Kütükoğlu, Osmanlı-Iran Siyasi Münasebetleri, 18. Muştafa Selânî too makes note of the numerous orders sent to frontier governors ordering them to strengthen the ramparts and to continue to notify the central government of local affairs. Muştafa Selânî Efendi, Tarih-i Selânî, Vol. 1, 116.
\item \textsuperscript{85} Bekir Kütükoğlu notes that it is possible to follow orders regarding the Shiʿis and Safavid sympathizers from mühimme registers from 966–68 (1558/9-1560/1) onwards. Ibid., 9.
\item \textsuperscript{86} An imperial order sent to the governor of Baghdad on 13 Shawwal 973 (3 May 1566) shows that desertion and threat of desertion is not necessarily a recent concern in hastening the war. The order regards someone named Şulţân ʿAli, who was arraigned for murder of some people from the ʿAbbas tribe. The suspect responded, “I will kill a few more of your lot and then go to the Qızılbash.” Prime Ministry Archives, Mühimme Defteri 5.1526.556.
\item \textsuperscript{87} Iskandar Munshi considers the Ottoman sultan Murād III’s actions to be against the peace treaty, which his grandfather had concluded with Shāh Tāhmasp I. Uzunçarşılı and Kütükoğlu consider the decision of the Ottoman government as self-defense. However, as Rudi Matthee points out, Persian scholarship views this as Ottoman opportunism. As Matthee’s multi-perspective study shows, it is important to study Ottoman-Safavid affairs in a broader context. In addition, factionalism within the Ottoman court also played a role in the onset of war. The grand vizier Sokollu Mehmed Paşa, for example, was not in favor of a war with the Safavids but his political rival Lâlâ Muştafa Paşa was adamant. Iskandar Munshi, Tâhir-i ʿAlâm-arâ-yi ʿAbbâsî, Book 2, 679–80. Özer Küpeli, Osmanlı-Safavi Münasebetleri, 41–2.
\end{itemize}

On factions and factionalism within the Ottoman court see Günhan Böreçki, “Factions and Favorites at the Courts of Sultan Ahmed I (r. 1603–17) and his Immediate Predecessors” (PhD diss., Ohio State University, 2010). Henceforth Böreçki, Factions and Favorites; Cornell Fleischer, Bureaucrat and Intellectual.

In the winter of 1578 Lâlâ Muştafa Paşa was appointed as commander. Governors of Erzurum, Diyarbakir, Sivas, Karaman, Maraş and Aleppo were to join him with their forces. In July/August 1578, the Ottoman army set up camp in Erzurum. The anonymous author of Tâhir-i ʿOsmâni Paşa writes: “That day ʿÖzdemir oğlu ʿOsmân Paşa adorned himself with arms and mounted that black Düldül, like ʿAlî. All the soldiers and their steeds were adorned with bejewelled arms and trappings. Before them six messengers stood, with golden helmets and golden belts, holding axes. And various governors, each to their abilities, adorned themselves and waited in line. And janissaries too put on grand jewels and hawk’s feathers. All the soldiers were bedecked with arms and armor and stood in rank and file, such that those who saw them would lose their minds. And the reason for such luster and bravado is that it is a frontier region and it is possible that the black-faced red-head has spies who would return to notify the heretics of the power and victory of the Râmîs so that each would be afraid and desolate.” (Fols. 5a–5b; Zeyrek, Tâhir-i ʿOsmâni Paşa, 18).

The author is aware of the conditions and circumstances of the frontier—he highlights difference within proximity through his pejorative description of the Safavid army. Furthermore, he highlights the importance of strategic use of might and pomp in a frontier zone prone to infiltration and espionage. Much like the extravagance and pomp displayed during the reception of envoys, the Ottoman army waiting at the frontier before any initial engagement with the enemy displayed its might through outward appearance. From Erzurum, the army marched towards Çıldır. There, a battle ensued between the Ottomans and the armies of Toqluq Khân, ruler of Revan (Saʿd Çukuru) and Nakhjivān, and İmâm Quli Khân, ruler of Ganja. The Ottomans were victorious, and in August 1578 Tbilisi fell. In September, the Ottomans were victorious in Koyun Geçidi (Kür). Shirvan and Daghestan too fell.
the comet solidifying the opportune moment of a new enthronement and civil discord in the
Safavid lands, the period of peace brought by the Treaty of Amasya and gingerly upheld
by the two sides for twenty-three years finally ended. Writing with hindsight of events,
Mustafa 'Ali adds that this auspicious augury in fact “betokened ten years of war,
bankruptcy, and ruination of both the Ottoman and Safavid lands.” Battles continued until
1590, when, under threat of an Uzbek incursion, the Safavid ruler Shah 'Abbas I sued for

At this point, contemporary accounts emphasize the role of Özdemiroğlu 'Osman Paşa, former
governor of Diyarbekir. Where other governors had declined the offer to remain in Shirvan and to govern the
province, Özdemiroğlu 'Osman Paşa accepted it. Aşaf Dal Mehemed Çelebi, Şecâ 'anâme (IUL T. 6043), fols.
25b–29a. Aşaf details how all the governors who were offered this post declined the offer. One, Muhammed
Paşâ, even resigned from his vizierate. This sets the background to Özdemiroğlu 'Osman Paşa’s singular
diligence and valor as described by Dal Mehemed Çelebi. Özdemiroğlu 'Osman Paşa was a critical figure in the
capture of Tabriz. İskandar Munshî writes that Hamza Mirzâ was inclined to come to an agreement with the
Ottoman commander Farhâd Paşa and even to send his son Haydar Mirzâ to the Ottoman capital. However,
Hamza Mirzâ was killed on the night of 22 Zu’l Hijja 994 (4 December 1586) by his barber, Khudâvârdî. The
munshî notes the oddity of this murder and brings up several theories and rumors that were circulating at the
time, including a jealousy over a possible beloved, envy or conspiracy among some of the Qizilbash. Muşafa
Selânîkî emphasizes the scarcity of food, famine, and the changes in the price of foodstuffs. See for example,
89 Contemporary accounts of the war also make sure to

88 Shâh Tâhmâsp I’s son by a Georgian wife, Haydar Mirzâ, was one of the contenders to the throne. İskandar Munshî also writes that Haydar Mirzâ was especially favored by Tâhmâsp I among his brothers. He also notes that while Ismâ’il too had been favored by Tâhmâsp, “he displayed ingratitude toward the Shah’s beneficence and committed certain acts displeasing to his father.” Later in his account, İskandar Munshî writes that Ismâ’il, on account of the rashness of youth, had associated “with certain crazy fools among the qezelbâsh.” Hasan Beg Rûmlû adds that Haydar Mirzâ brought a false paper, which he wrote himself, saying that Shâh Tâhmâsp had made him his heir. According to the Ottoman author, Muşafa b. Mulla Rûvûn el-Beğdâdi, who provides a
detailed account of the discord following Tâhmâsp’s death, Haydar Mirzâ’s half-sister, Pari Khân Khânîm, and
her Circassian uncle Shamkhal Sultan plotted to kill him. Husayn Qulî Khalîfa and Amir Arslan Khân along
with a group of Rumlû, Takkala, Turkmân, Afshar and Kûrds arrived in Qazvin. By night they attacked the
private quarters of Haydar Mirzâ. İskandar Munshî, who writes in great detail of the event, adds that that night the palace guards were supporters of Ismâ’il Mirzâ. Haydar Mirzâ first hid in the women’s quarters, then tried to
escape, wearing the garb of a woman. Soon he was noticed and caught. He was killed by Husayn Qulî Khalîfa and
Shamkhal Sultan. Muşafa b. Mulla Rûvûn el-Beğdâdi writes that when the Circassian and Shamkhal elements
saw that the defeated Georgian and Ustajlu elements were now favoring Ismâ’il Mirzâ, they switched
their allegiance. Ismâ’il Mirzâ, who was a half-brother to Haydar Mirzâ, had spent the past twenty years
imprisoned in the Fort of Qahqaha. Seeing that Ismâ’il Mirzâ was a serious contender now, the Shamkhal
announced to Ismâ’il Mirzâ that they killed Haydar Mirzâ for his sake.

Early Safavis: being the Aksamut Târîkh of Hasan-i Rumlû, ed. C. N. Seddon (Baroda: Oriental Institute,
1934), 202; Muşafa b. Mulla Rûvûn el-Beğdâdi, Târîh-i Feitiânâmê-yi Bağdâd, Süleymaniye Küütûphanesi
Nurusnumaniye 3140, fol. 11b.

89 Cornell Fleischer, Bureaucrat and Intellectual, 77. Contemporary accounts of the war also make sure to
emphasize the scarcity of food, famine, and the changes in the price of foodstuffs. See for example, Şeyh Muhammed Vefî’s Têvârîh-i Gazavât-i Sulîhân Murûd-a şêlim, ÖNB Hist. Ott. 66, fol. 74b–75a, 79a, 124a; Yunus Zeyrek, Târîh-i Osman Paşa, 24–5.
peace. Iskandar Munshi, who composed his history during the reign of ʿAbbas I, writes in the section on the beginning of the war with the Ottomans that it would be “the destiny of Shah ʿAbbas I to restore stability to the realm of Iran.”

It is almost immediately after the peace concluded between the Ottomans and the Safavids that we find the first illustrated manuscripts produced in Baghdad. Following the peace treaty concluded in 1590, a period of stability ensued in Baghdad until the middle of the first decade of the seventeenth century. From the 1590s until the first decade of the seventeenth century over thirty illustrated manuscripts were produced in Baghdad. Chapter 2 considers this corpus in the larger context of Ottoman and Safavid painting.

Precarious Alliances

Both Mustafa ʿĀli and the grand vizier Siyavuṣ Paṣa (d. 1602) understood that the Ottoman-Safavid wars took their toll on the treasury. The Ottoman-Habsburg wars of 1593–1606 would add to these expenses. In 1589, near the end of the Ottoman-Safavid war, janissaries in Istanbul revolted when their salaries were paid with debased coinage. Doğancı Mehmed Paṣa, governor-general of Rumeli, and a favorite of the Sultan Murad III, and Mahmud Efendi, the chief treasurer, were executed. Siyavuṣ Paṣa was dismissed from his post. The 1589 revolt was the harbinger of further janissary revolts and urban uprisings.

90 Iskandar Munshi, Tārīkh-i ʿAlam-ārā-yi ʿAbbāṣī, Book 1, 347.


92 Cemal Kafadar is careful to note the time lapse between the debasement and the uprising. Günhan Börekçi too revisits the execution of this governor-general and looks into palace cliques and factionalism within the court, which, in addition to the immediate reason of debasement, led to Doğancı Mehmed Paṣa’s death. Cemal Kafadar, “When Coins Turned into Drops of Dew and Bankers Became Robbers of Shadows: The Boundaries of Ottoman Economic Imagination at the End of the Sixteenth Century” (PhD diss., McGill University, 1986). Henceforth Kafadar, When Coins Turned into Drops of Dew; Börekçi, Factions and Favorites, 172–97.
The tax-paying reʿāyā was more immediately and adversely affected by the currency debasement. As taxes were fixed in terms of the devalued akçe, the reʿāyā found it more difficult to pay their taxes in cash. They were burdened by extraordinary taxes. In addition, provincial auxiliary mercenary troops using firearms were used at times of war. These segbāns and levends served provincial governors, who were tasked to mobilize mercenaries at times of war and to provide for their own entourage. Governor-generals were normally in charge of their own sancaks (district), known as the paşa sancağı (district of the governor-general). However, when taxes levied from their own districts were not enough to support their household, they could seek out further income through other districts of the province under the guise of general inspection. When governors were transferred or dismissed, their segbāns risked losing their source of income. Transformations in the military and timar systems, price inflation, debasement of the akçe, as well as possible effects of natural disasters such as several earthquakes in the Amasya region in the 1590s and a deteriorating climate paved the way to social unrest.

The final years of the sixteenth century and the first decade of the seventeenth century were marked by more localized student (sühte) uprisings and broader Celali uprisings. The structural changes and the Celali revolts that wreaked havoc mainly

---

93 In an article that revises Ömer Lütfi Barkan’s study on the price revolution of the sixteenth century, Şevket Pamuk incorporates farther archival data in his analysis. In addition to the possible effects of the price revolution in Ottoman fiscal difficulties, Pamuk points to the need for maintaining larger central armies and the protracted wars in the East and the West as contributing to the state’s fiscal difficulties. Pamuk reiterates the effects of changing technology of warfare. The timar-holding sipāhīs were no longer sufficient in facing Habsburg musketeers; hence there arose a need to increase the standing infantry corps. Şevket Pamuk, “The Price Revolution in the Ottoman Empire Reconsidered,” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 33 (2001): 69–89. Henceforth Pamuk, *The Price Revolution in the Ottoman Empire Reconsidered*.


throughout Anatolia came hand in hand with an economic downturn in the Ottoman Empire and broader global transformations in world trade. In the face of economic instability and job uncertainty, the tax-paying re ṭayā could seek employment as irregular soldiers; the paramilitary could seek continued work or increase in rank, and governors continued office or autonomy. These were several options of vertical mobility among others, as can be seen in the case of Canpuladoğlu 'Ali Paṣa, who planned to form a state of his own in northern Syria, or Kasım Paṣa, who was appointed as governor of Baghdad, but who failed to show up for duty, and instead levied taxes from the re ṭayā of Bursa together with his household of levends. Alliances among upstarts and local amirs were also possible, such as that between Canpuladoğlu 'Ali Paṣa and Muhammed, son of Tavil Ahmed, the upstart in Baghdad. If such alliances were not fruitful, the threat of an alliance with the Safavids, particularly in the border regions, was mostly effective. Writing in 1608, the Carmelite missionary Father Paul Simon noted the efficacy of threatening an alliance with the enemy. He writes that the pasha of Baghdad, whom he does not name, was “in rebellion against the Sultan of Turkey, in order to pay his soldiery ... and he leans on the Shah of Persia.”


98 In addition to works such as Celali İスタンları, The Great Anatolian Rebellion, and Karen Barkey’s Bandits and Bureaucrats: The Ottoman Route to State Centralization (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994), which deal with the larger context of Celali uprisings, banditry and the state’s various responses to individual cases, another work that is devoted to Canpuladoğlu 'Ali Paṣa is an unpublished master’s thesis: Süleyman Duman, “Celali İstanları Örneğinde Canbuladoğlu Ali Paṣa İstanı” (MA thesis, Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi, 2011).


100 Griswold, The Great Anatolian Rebellion, 121.

101 Ibid., 128.

is an apt observation by the Carmelite, who remained but a short time in Baghdad—it shows first of all, that the governor needed to pay his soldiery and did so through extortion, and secondly, that he used the liminal position of Baghdad as leverage in maintaining his rule.

From the early seventeenth century until the Ottomans’ loss of Baghdad in 1623 several of the possibilities mentioned above took place. The state also had various options to deal with upstart rebels. In most cases, a policy of appeasement was implemented. 'Abdülhalim, better known as Karayazıçı, was one example of mobility. When the district governor under whom Karayazıçı worked lost his office, Karayazıçı was left without a post. He thus gathered several men around him and became a Celali leader. The upstart Karayazıçı made further claims to authority and “legitimacy” through a fabricated genealogy. When he could not be subdued by force, he was incorporated into the state system by being granted the district of Amasya.

The economic downturn, currency fluctuation and shortage of treasury of the late-sixteenth century paved the way to widespread rebellion. But the structural changes that went along with it also allowed for alternative means of mobility, as well as an opportunity for local governors or leaders to try to increase their autonomy. This can perhaps be seen in the wider context of shifting Ottoman patronage from the last quarter of the sixteenth century onwards. In Baghdad too, the effects of economic and structural changes were felt particularly in the first quarter of the seventeenth century.

---

104 Börekçi, Factions and Favorites, 34.
105 Another example of uncertain alliances is when Hüseyin Bey, the governor of Karaman, who was sent to subdue Karayazıçı decided to join him instead. Later on, Karayazıçı would hand over Hüseyin Bey to the Porte in order to bargain for his freedom.
106 Fetvacı’s work informs us of the shift in patronage of illustrated manuscripts. Her work concentrates on the palace circle for the most part. What appears in the Ottoman capital manifests itself in the provinces as well to some extent, particularly in Baghdad, with the case of illustrated manuscripts and patronage of architecture. In addition to shifting bases of patronage, means of acquiring wealth and power are also important to note. While the financial downturn did indeed have its negative consequences, it was still possible to capitalize. The rise to
Following the appearance of the Celali rebel Karayazıcı and his brother Hüseyin in the early years of the seventeenth century, ʿAbdülkadir Efendi comments:

as Baghdad was a trading town (bender), merchants from the Safavid lands and India would come and customs tariff would be collected; the amount would be gathered as public treasury. Commanders of Basra and Lahsa would come to Baghdad by way of the Tigris; commodities would be sold. Travelers would come by way of the Tigris and Euphrates; travelers and merchants would come from Mosul, Diyarbekir and Jizra. The duplicity (alacalı) of the Shah of ʿAjam was certain, but not openly manifest.\(^\text{107}\)

The elusive, yet apposite, remark on the Safavid ruler’s “duplicity” at the end of this account (which the author does not continue—he instead turns to a discussion of the Székesfehérvár campaign), gives the gist of the context from the early sixteenth until the middle of the seventeenth century. Baghdad was a coveted province, being on the main Aleppo-Baghdad-Basra-Hormuz trade route as well as the pilgrimage route to Mecca and Medina.\(^\text{108}\) European travelers to Baghdad noted its importance as a trading port, especially by way of the Tigris and the Euphrates.\(^\text{109}\) A map (fig. 1.2) included in the Zafernâme (Book of

---


\(^\text{109}\) English merchant Anthony Sherley (1565–1636?) notes that upon arriving in Baghdad, the pasha seized their merchandise and returned to them half the price of their goods. Traveling some two decades before, in 1574, German botanist Rauwolff also hints at the extortion of governors, when the traveler realized the pasha wanted to “screw a present out of us.” These examples point to the integration of officials in commercial life and trade, and show other possible ways of gaining wealth. That so many governors became rich in Baghdad and that several of them were patrons of art and architecture may have something to do with Baghdad’s position as a trading port. The Carmelite missionary Father Paul Simon, writing in 1608, notes Baghdad’s former fame as a trading port “on account of the caravans arriving from India and passing to go to Aleppo.” He adds, however that “it is ruined because the pasha, who is in rebellion against the Sultan of Turkey, in order to pay his soldiery, has robbed and killed the richest merchants, the others have fled, and out of fear caravans no longer go to Baghdad.”

The importance and lucrativeness of this trade route is testified in Niyâzî’s account on Elvendzâde ʿAli Paşa’s 1583 campaign as well. Elvendzâde ʿAli Paşa was appointed as commander in Baghdad and Shahrizol...
Victory) of Elvendzade ʿAli Paṣa detailing his successes against the Safavids in the border of Baghdad in 1583, notes the distances from Baghdad to Bayat, Baghdad to Dizful, Dizful to Sushtar. It adds that the time of travel from Baghdad to Basra via the river is considerably shorter than the other way around. The arrangement of the text around the citadels, mountains and rivers gives a sense of direction as well as interconnectedness. More interestingly, the map points out the area ruled by Emir Seccad, the local Arab, who feigned submission to the Ottomans and made his living through pillaging merchants traveling between Baghdad and Basra.110 Also highlighted on the map in a larger handwriting is the “site of war between the Rum and Qizilbash and of the victory of the Rumiyan (Ottomans) and the defeat and rejection of those afflicted ruffians.”111 This map gives the gist of the precariousness, liminality, and interconnectedness of the border region.

Baghdad was in a strategic position to both the Ottomans, for whom it allowed an outlet to the Indian Ocean, and the Safavids in terms of access to the Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf. Given the moniker “bastion of saints” (burc-u evliyā), it was also important to both dynasties for its shrines, which were revered places of visitation. The city of Baghdad and its hinterland of Najaf, Karbala, Samarra, and Kazimiyya also housed Bektashi convents, which “functioned primarily as rest houses for those visiting the Shiʿi pilgrimage

against the Safavids during the Ottoman-Safavid wars. However, before continuing on this campaign near Shushtar, he first had to deal with Emir Seccād, who was ruling in Dizful and siding at times with Ottomans and at times with Safavids. Emir Seccād was called to join the campaign against the Safavids. However, Emir Seccād replied negatively to ʿAli Paṣa’s missive. One reason was that Emir Seccād, according to Niyāzi’s reflection of his letter, was making his livelihood by robbing merchants’ ships traveling between Basra and Baghdad.


sites in these locations.”

Chapter 3 will return to the issue of the ambiguity and pro-
Safavid sentiments in Bektashi convents and shrines of Imams 'Ali, Husayn and Musa al-
Kazim in Iraq. Strategically important, but relatively distant from both states for direct
control, it appears from contemporary accounts—particularly Mustafa b. Mulla Rıdvan el-
Bagdadi’s history—that there was room for upward mobility and claims for independence in
Baghdad.

Tārīh-i Fetihnaе-i Bağdād of Mustafa b. Mulla Rıdvan el-Bagdadi

In what follows, I want to concentrate on what transpired in Baghdad in the aftermath of the
Ottoman-Safavid wars until the Ottomans lost the city to the Safavids in 1624. Mustafa b.
Mulla Rıdvan el-Bagdadi’s Tārīh-i Fetihnaе-i Bağdād is an invaluable source about
Baghdad from its first conquest by Süleyman I (r. 1520–1566) to its second conquest by
Murad IV (r. 1623–1640). The bulk of the Baghdadi author’s work concentrates on Murad
IV’s campaign and ends with the coronation of Ibrahim I in 1640 (r. 1640–1648). While
composing his history in the style of a chronicle, the author highlights events of importance
to Baghdad. He writes that as Baghdad is his abode, he composed his account of events “as
they actually were” (ḥakka ne vakt ’ olduysa). He adds that his sources of information were
books of history and reports from acquaintances, who had seen and heard the events; he
hoped that his work would be read in gatherings and remembered.

112 Ayfer Karakaya-Stump, “Subjects of the Sultan, Disciples of the Shah: Formation and Transformation of the
Kızılbash/Alevi Communities in Ottoman Anatolia” (PhD diss., Harvard University, 2008), 130. Also see the
more recent publication by Ayfer Karakaya-Stump, Vefaillik, Bektashilik, Kızılbaşlık: Alevi Kaynaklarımı,
Tarihimi ve Tarih yazımıni Yeniden Düşünmek (Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2015); Ayfer

113 Muṣṭafa b. Mulla Rıdvan el-Bağdādī, Tārīh-i Fetihnaе-i Bağdād, Bodleian Or. 276, fol. 64a.
Following this, the author situates the “many seditions in Baghdad” (Bağdād-ı behişt-ābādda dahi niçe fitmeler olduğuunu beyân ider) in the larger context of the rekindled Ottoman-Safavid wars of 1603–1612, Celali uprisings, and the Ottoman-Habsburg wars. He writes that after 1000 (1591–92) governors such as Cigalazade Sinan Paşa and “Sinan Paşaoğlu Hasan Paşa” ruled in Baghdad and patronized many buildings that were still standing in his day.\(^{114}\) Hasan Paşa had patronized the mosque by the Tigris, known as Hasan Paşa Cami’i.\(^{115}\) We will encounter Hasan Paşa again in Chapter 4 in a discussion of his patronage of illustrated manuscripts. Cigalazade Sinan Paşa had built a khan and a

---

\(^{114}\) The author presents interesting information on Hasan Paşa. However, he seems to be confusing his pedigree. He writes that Hasan Paşa was the son of Sinān Paşa. Given the date, however, and the rest of the account presented by the author, the Hasan Paşa in question must be the son of the grand vizier Sokollu Mehmed Paşa. Muṣṭafā b. Mulla Ṭuğra el-Ṭāhrid writes that Ḥasan Paşa claimed to be a prince, because his father was granted a concubine by Sultan Murād III; and that Ḥasan Paşa was borne of this concubine. While Sinān Paşa would say that Ḥasan Paşa was his son, Hasan Paşa would proudly say that he was the son of Murād III. Giving this extra information about the pasha’s regal ambitions, Muṣṭafā b. Mulla Ṭuğra el-Ṭāhrid, continues his account and writes that Ḥasan Paşa gathered his men to battle ʿArayazici, the Celali leader. Moving from Mosul to Diyarbekir, Ḥasan Paşa surrounded ʿArayazici in Ruha (Urfa). When he failed to capture the Celali leader, Ḥasan Paşa then went to ʿOṭqat. ʿArayazici followed him there. ʿAbdūlūkādir Efendi notes that it was the former governor of Baghdad, Ḥasan Paşa, son of the old grand vizier, who was charged with subduing ʿArayazici when Muṣṭafā Paşa, governor of Sivas, and later Ḥūseyn Paşa, failed in the attempt. According to ʿAbdūlūkādir Efendi Ḥasan Paşa sought help from commanders of Aleppo, Tripoli, Damascus, Diyarbekir and Ruha. Gathering in Mosul, they then joined forces in Raqqqa, and met the army of ʿArayazici in Ruha. After a battle, ʿArayazici’s men dispersed. ʿArayazici, together with his son Deli Hasan, and others regrouped. In the meantime Ḥasan Paşa spent the month of July in Diyarbekir. News arrived that ʿArayazici had passed away and that Deli Hasan was now in charge. Hasan Paşa passed to ʿOṭqat for the winter. It was in the fortress in ʿOṭqat that Hasan Paşa was killed with a bullet. Chapter 4 deals with Hasan Paşa’s career in more detail. Muṣṭafā b. Mulla Ṭuğra el-Ṭāhrid, Tārīḫ-i Fetihname-i Bağdād, Bodleian Or. 276, fol. 64a; ʿAbdūlūkādir Efendi, Topcuṭar Kāṭibi ʿAbdūlūkādir (Kadrū) Efendi Tarhī, 321–5.

He also repaired the Zümrüt Hatun Mosque near the Mustansiriyva madrasa.  

However, after this date, the author notes, several uprisings took place. The first was by Karayazıçı. While Karayazıçı and his men gathered in Anatolia, it was the governor of Baghdad, the above-mentioned Hasan Paşa, who was charged with subduing him when previously appointed commanders, Mustafa Paşa and Hüseyin Paşa, had been unsuccessful. It was in this attempt that Hasan Paşa was killed. Then, the author writes, a Celali by the name of Uzun Ahmed appeared in Baghdad in the year 1004 (1595–96). Before moving on to describing the mischief of Uzun Ahmed’s son, Muhammed, the author dons his historian’s persona and writes:

The role of the governor is to guard and foster his reʿāyā, like sheep, so that he may feed off of their milk. Some governors, out of their own ignorance, devastate the reʿāyā. Some eat them themselves; some let the wolves snatch them. Subsequently, it is unquestionable that he himself will be devastated...

The aim of books of history is such that they give a lesson to those who read them and listen to them.

This will be a recurring trend in Mustafa b. Mulla Rıḍvan el-Bağdādi’s history, wherein governors or independent claimants to control oppress the reʿāyā. The author notes that Uzun Ahmed had two sons: Muhammed and Mustafa, who had gathered around them so many men that, “were the Shāh of ’Ajam to come, they would be able to face him.”

---

116 Naźmīzāde Murtaža adds a poem that was composed for the building of the coffeehouse. Naźmīzāde Murtaža, Gűlşen-i Hulefā, 191–3.

The seventeenth-century Safavid tadhkira writer, Tāqī Awhādī, writes that Mir ‘Abd al-Bāqī Nayrizī, poet and calligrapher, had spent some time in Shiraz, and later settled in Baghdad. He notes that he was well respected in Baghdad. In Baghdad, the poet was greatly in love with a coffee vendor. It is possible that Mir ‘Abd al-Bāqī Nayrizī was a frequenter of Cigalazade’s coffeehouse in Baghdad, where he encountered the youth. Tāqī Awhādī, ‘Arafāt al-’Ashiqīn wa ’Araṣat al-’Arīfīn (The Places of Assembly for the Lovers and the Open Spaces for the Mystics), Vol. 5 (Tehran: Mīrās-i Maktub: Bā Hamkārī-i Kūtábkhānah, Mūzīh va Markaz-i Asnād-i Majlis-i Şûrā-yi İslāmī), 2853.

117 Uluçam, Irak’taki Türk Mimari Eserleri, 55. Uluçam writes that this mosque was first built before the turn of the thirteenth century by Zümrüt Hatun, mother of caliph Nāṣir lidnillah.

118 Muṣṭafa b. Mulla Rūdvan el-Bağdādī, Tārīh-i Fetihname-i Bağdād, Bodleian Or. 276, fol. 65a.

119 Ibid., fol. 65a.
Similarly, though from a different point of view, Iskandar Munshi, situates the rekindling of the animosity between the Ottomans and the Safavids in 1603 in the context of the Celali uprisings, and disturbances in Nehavand, in the Hamadan province. Cigalazade Sinan Paşa had built a fort and installed a garrison in Nehavand in 1589 while the Ottoman-Safavid war continued. The garrison was supported financially from Baghdad. Iskandar Munshi voices the discontent of the Qizilbash, who were residing in Nehavand, as well as their appeals to have the fortress razed if the Ottomans wanted to maintain peace. The effects of the Celali uprisings were felt in Baghdad with Uzun Ahmed’s rise to power. However, this led to problems with the payments made from Baghdad to the garrison, which had settled at the Nehavand fort, causing some to desert and some to revert to rebellious behavior. When the officer appointed by the Ottoman court to look into the matter was not successful in quelling the rebellion, he sought assistance from Shah Ṭāhir, who then sent Hasan Khan, governor of Hamadan. On the shah’s orders, the fort was razed. It was obvious to Shah Ṭāhir, according to Iskandar Munshi, that this would soon lead to a renewal of hostilities. An important point the author makes here is that Shah Ṭāhir was biding his time and found the opportunity where “the Ottoman frontier pashas and governors had begun to behave like rebellious Jalalis.”

When, in 1017 (1608) Muhammed, son of Uzun (Tavil) Ahmed, who was a böyükbaş, claimed to be the sole authority in Baghdad and gathered around him segbāns and gönüllüs (volunteer), open hostilities had already broken out between the Ottomans and the

---

120 On the occasion of Cigalazade Sinan Paşa’s success in Nehavand, Baghdadi poet Rûhi composed a qasīda as well as a chronogram, which are included in his Dīvān. Coşkun Ak, Bağdatlı Rûhi Dīvānı, Tenkitli Metin, 2 Vols. (Bursa: Uludağ Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2001), Vol. 1, 96–9, 224.


122 Ibid., 827.
Safavids.\textsuperscript{123} Hadım Yusuf Paşa, former governor of Basra, was appointed as governor of Baghdad. However, Tavilzade Muhammed did not let this governor into the city. Nasuh Paşa, governor of Diyarbekir was sent against Tavilzade Muhammed, but due to the treachery of some men in his force, Nasuh Paşa was not successful, and Tavilzade Muhammed established himself in Baghdad.\textsuperscript{124} Tavilzade Muhammed’s authority was not permanent; after some time he was killed by his confidante, and chancery secretary, Muhammed established himself in Baghdad. This Muhammed Çelebi is noted to be the founder of the Mawlawi lodge in Baghdad and we will encounter him again in Chapter 3.\textsuperscript{125} Tavilzade Muhammed’s son, Mustafa, replaced him after his death.\textsuperscript{126} Thinking Baghdad was bequeathed to him, Mustafa acted as the \textit{de facto} ruler. Mustafa also fostered relations with the Safavid ruler; according to Mustafa b. Mulla Rıdvan el-Bağdadi, they also exchanged gifts.\textsuperscript{127} That Uzun


\textsuperscript{124} Historians Muştafa Şafi and Na’im present a more or less similar account of Naüş Paşa’s failure. Na’im writes that Naüş Paşa gathered together a force including Seyyid Hān, who was among the Kurdish begs, Sohran Beg, and Ebūrüşoğlu Emir Ahmed to fight Tavilzade Muhammed, who had faked a royal order and appointed himself governor of Baghdad. The historian points out that Ebūrüşoğlu reverted to duplicity and stalled the others while Naüş Paşa waited in Mosul for forty days. In the meantime, Seyyid Hān’s letter to Baghdad was intercepted. In the letter, Seyyid Hān was notifying Tavilzade Muhammed that they had stalled Naüş Paşa, and that he [Tavilzade] should try not to lose Baghdad. Realizing this, and realizing the difficulty of a successful campaign against Tavilzade with his remaining forces, Naüş Paşa still marched ahead towards Baghdad. Further seconds from Naüş Paşa’s force were bribed into joining Tavilzade Muhammed. In the ensuing battle, Vell Paşa, governor of Şehrizar, was killed and Naüş Paşa was injured, and he returned. Naüş Paşa’s failure is noted further in a letter from Constantinople dated June 22, 1606. A further report by Francis Zaneti refers to news in the February of 1607 that Baghdad had been taken by the Safavids. \textit{A Chronicle of the Carmelites}, 97; Mehmet İpşirli, ed. \textit{Tārīḫ-i Na’imā}, Vol. 1 (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2007), 323–4. Henceforth, Na’im, \textit{Tārīḥ-i Na’imā}; Ibrahim Hakkı Çuhadar, ed. \textit{Mustafa Şafi’ın Zübdetü’i-Tevārīh’i} (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2003), 50–1.

\textsuperscript{125} Naẓmizāde Murtaža, \textit{Gülsen-i Hulefâ}, 194.

\textsuperscript{126} This is according to Muştafa b. Mulla Rıdvan el-Bağdâddi. Na’im, however, notes that Muştafa is his brother. Na’im, \textit{Tārīḥ-i Na’imā}, Vol. 2, 337. Muştafa b. Mulla Rıdvan el-Bağdâddi, \textit{Tārīḥ-i Fetihnâme-i Bağdâd}, Bodleian Or. 276, fol. 68a.

\textsuperscript{127} Muştafa b. Mulla Rıdvan el-Bağdâddi, \textit{Tārīḥ-i Fetihnâme-i Bağdâd}, Bodleian Or. 276, fol. 68a. Correspondence with the Safavids is supported in the Safavid historian Jalâl al-Din Munajjim’s \textit{Tārīḫ-i ‘Abbâsî}, in which the author notes that Tavilzade Muhammed had sent a letter to the Safavids notifying them of Nasuh Paşa’s march towards Baghdad. Mullâ Jalâl recapitulates the letter, wherein the upstart writes to the
Ahmed, Tavilzade Muhammed and Mustafa would all claim sovereignty in Baghdad is critical in pointing to fundamental changes in governance in the frontier province of Baghdad, which more and more appeared to have become a hereditary rule.\textsuperscript{128} In addition, their correspondences with the Safavid shah and plans of allegiance with them suggest the tenuous, yet critical position of Baghdad between the two rival dynasties.\textsuperscript{129}

Cigalazade Mahmud Paşa, who was in the winter quarters of Ruha (Urfa) in 1608, and who was acquainted with various Kurdish and Arab tribes, was appointed as governor of Baghdad.\textsuperscript{130} When, according to Mustafa b. Mulla Rıdvan el-Bagdadi, the upstart Mustafa could not defeat Cigalazade Mahmud Paşa, he left Baghdad together with his levends and segbāns to the Safavid lands. Nazmizade Murtaza, however, provides a different story. He writes that, in the end, Mustafa was assuaged and given the sancak of Hilla, and Baghdad was “cleaned of the bandits.”\textsuperscript{131}

Nazmizade Murtaza notes that Cigalazade commissioned the bazaar known as Sarrachāne.\textsuperscript{132} Mustafa b. Mulla Rıdvan el-Bagdadi adds that Mahmud Paşa’s father had previously been in Baghdad and had many properties there, including shops and bazaars, and that he restored law and order to Baghdad.\textsuperscript{133} That many of the governors of the late-

\textsuperscript{128} This will be the case in the eighteenth century, when Baghdad was ruled by Mamluks (Kölemen).

\textsuperscript{129} Jalāl al-Dīn Munajjim makes note of both Muḥammed and Muṣṭafa’s letters to the Safavids, which propose to give Baghdad to the Safavids. These plans failed in the end when Cigalazāde Mahmud Paşa was sent against Muṣṭafa Paşa. Jalāl al-Dīn, Tārīkh-i Abbāsī, 312, 342.

\textsuperscript{130} Nazmizāde Murtaẓā, Gülşen-i Hulefā, 194.

\textsuperscript{131} Ibid., 194–5; Clément Huart, Histoire de Bagdad dans les Temps Modernes (Paris: E. Leroux, 1901), 46.

\textsuperscript{132} Nazmizāde Murtaẓā, Gülşen-i Hulefā, 195.

\textsuperscript{133} Muṣṭafa b. Mulla R̄dvan el-Bağdādī, Tārīh-i Fetih names-i Baġdād, Bodleian Or. 276, fols. 69b–70a. In the meantime, the author continues, Murād Paşa, later known as Kuyucu, was charged with subduing the Celalis. While not providing a detailed account of Murad Paşa’s skirmishes with the Celalis, the author writes that those who were not killed had escaped to ʿIraq-ı Ājam to seek refuge with the Safavids.
sixteenth and early-seventeenth centuries, including Elvendzade ‘Ali Paşa, Hasan Paşa, Cigalazade Sinan Paşa and Cigalazade Mahmud Paşa were patrons of architecture, testifies to the wealth they accrued during their tenure in office. The governor that succeeded Cigalazade Mahmud Paşa further betokens this. In addition to governors, the path to wealth was open to other officials, such as Bekir Şubaşı, which will be discussed later in this chapter.

Kadızade ‘Ali Paşa succeeded Cigalazade Mahmud Paşa. The two Baghdadi authors, Mustafa b. Mulla Rıdvan el-Bagdadi and Nazmizade Murtaza provide little to no information regarding ‘Ali Paşa. An interesting piece of insight comes from Louis Gédoyn, French consul in Aleppo between 1623–25. Facilitating Gédoyn’s journey from Constantinople to Aleppo was a man known as Süleyman Ağa, whom Gédoyn writes, was from Troyes, but who tried to keep his identity secret. It is from him, Gédoyn writes, that he learned about M. de Poitrincourt. According to Süleyman Ağa, the man known as M. de Poitrincourt was conscripted from Hungary and given to a judge (qadi) in Rumelia; he was named ‘Ali. Having no heirs of his own and liking the boy, the judge allowed him to be called Kadızade (son of the judge).

After the death of his adoptive father, Kadızade inherited some money and over time increased his fame and fortune. He was appointed as governor of Alaca Hisar, Niğbolu, Silistre, then Buda. At that time, Murad Paşa (later to be known as Kuyucu for burying


135 Gustav Bayerle, who notes the paucity of information about ‘Ali Paşa in Ottoman narrative accounts, writes (referencing the Sicill-i Osmanî) that his father, Habil Efendi, was born in Bursa. He had been chief judge in Temesvár, Buda and Belgrade.

defeated Celalis, dead and alive, in deep wells), was governor of Rumelia. At first disliking ʿAli Paşa on account of his fortune and sympathy towards Christians, Murad Paşa later came to favor him and even gave him his only daughter in marriage. Later, Murad Paşa was appointed as grand vizier, and was charged with subduing Canpuladoğlu ʿAli in Syria. Kadızade ʿAli joined him. On account of his successes, Kadızade ʿAli was granted the governorship of Baghdad.

Gédoyn continues the story, writing that during the four years that Kadızade ʿAli governed Baghdad, he acquired such wealth that he had more than three million filoris. When Murad Paşa died in 1611, Nasuh Paşa was named as grand vizier. Gédoyn describes Nasuh Paşa as a violent man who hated his predecessor; hence his antagonism towards Murad Paşa’s son-in-law, Kadızade ʿAli. The historian Naʿima also notes that Murad Paşa had warned Kadızade ʿAli Paşa not to engage with Nasuh Paşa, whose advice Kadızade did not heed. Seizing Baghdad from Kadızade ʿAli in addition to two million filoris, Nasuh Paşa antagonized him for two years; in the meantime, Kadızade ʿAli was appointed to Vize. While quiet about Kadızade ʿAli’s past, Mustafa b. Mulla Rûdvan el-Bagdadi confirms that after Murad Paşa’s death ʿAli Paşa was dismissed and again replaced by Cigalazade Mahmud Paşa. In the end, since, according to Gédoyn, Kadızade ʿAli was favored by Sultan Ahmed I (r. 1603–1617), Nasuh Paşa was executed (17 October 1614); Kadızade ʿAli Paşa was given the governorship of Buda a second time; he governed there for two and a half years and passed away in 1616.

138 Muṣṭâfa b. Mulla Rûdvan el-Bağdâdî, Târîh-i Fetihnames-i Bağdâd, Bodleian Or. 276, fol. 70b.
139 Gédoyn writes that he found out about Kadzâde ʿAli through Süleyman Ağa as well as Kadzâde’s son-in-law, and namesake. He continues that Kadzâde ʿAli, like Süleyman Ağa, did not want his identity to be known. However, after his death several papers and a letter from his mother were found. The letter from Madame de Poitrincourt was signed “A M. de Poitrincourt, mon fils, étant en Turquie.” Louis Gédoyn, Journal et Correspondance de Gédoyn “le Turc,” 136–40.
While not explicating it, Mustafa b. Mulla Rıdvan el-Bagdadi’s account also hints at Nasuh Paşa’s vexation with the inhabitants of Baghdad. He writes: “Nasuh Paşa was irritated by the inhabitants of Baghdad. He made haste to take revenge.”140 Before Nasuh Paşa’s execution in 1614, Dilaver Paşa was appointed as governor of Baghdad. Mustafa b. Mulla Rıdvan el-Bagdadi writes that Nasuh Paşa warned Dilaver Paşa about Baghdad, saying to him:

When you reach Baghdad, there are such people, who have commenced sedition and treachery that do not submit to the governors; they endeavor to be obstinate and defiant. It is necessary to not give any opportunity to this and to tackle these. Should they resist in their endeavor, I will mediate on your behalf when the court is notified of this matter. I will help you with whatever you might need in terms of soldiery and treasury. You must leave such a mark on that province that it be remembered till the Day of Judgment.141

Taking heed of Nasuh Paşa’s warnings, Dilaver Paşa ordered obedience to the sultan.

Mustafa b. Mulla Rıdvan el-Bagdadi comments that no other governor had accrued the amount of wealth and property that Dilaver Paşa had. How this much wealth came into his hands was mostly through fear and extortion, according to the author.142

In a way, Dilaver Paşa’s harsh and extortionist behavior partly paved the way for the rise of Bekir Subaşı, who was to be the cause for Baghdad’s loss. Mustafa b. Mulla Rıdvan el-Bagdadi takes the story back a few years, to the deeds of Tavilzade Muhammed, who had claimed sole authority in Baghdad in 1606–07. According to the Baghdadi author, Tavilzade Muhammed killed a man known as Hacı Burhan. Hacı Burhan had many sons, who escaped to Aleppo upon their father’s death.143 Among them was Bekir. When Tavilzade Muhammed was killed, the sons returned to Baghdad and reclaimed their father’s properties.

140 Muṣṭafa b. Mulla Rûdvan el-Beţändî, Tārîh-i Fetihname-i Baţdâd, Bodleian Or. 276, fol. 70b.

141 Ibid., fols. 70b-71a.

142 Muṣṭafa b. Mulla Rûdvan el-Beţändî, Tārîh-i Fetihname-i Baţdâd, Bodleian Or. 276, fol. 72a.

143 According to the Bodleian manuscript, Muḥammed had killed Ḥacı Burhan and his sons escaped to Aleppo after his death (Bodleian Or. 276, fol. 75a). The Nuruosmaniye manuscript, however, notes that it was when Muḥammed appeared in Baghdad, that Ḥacı Burhan’s sons escaped to Aleppo. (Nuruosmaniye 3140, fol. 24b).
Eventually they became servants of the state. Bekir, known as Bekir Subaşı on account of his position as **subaşı**, was a member of the janissary corps. When the inhabitants of Baghdad were hard-pressed by the governor Dilaver Paşa, they sought help from Bekir Subaşı, so that under his care and protection, they would not allow submission to governors ("Sen bizim serdar-i leşkerimiz olub bizi ḥüzû u ḥurâsetiñealdiðandan şoûra gelen beglerbegilere vûcûd virmiyelim"). Bekir Şubaşı agreed, however, he pointed out his misgivings about the light infantry troops (**āzekb**), whom the **subaşı** was of the opinion, would obey the governors instead.\(^{144}\) The leader of the **āzekb**, an émigré from Iran who had settled in Baghdad, Mehmed Kanber, however, agreed to follow Bekir Subaşı’s suit.\(^{145}\)

Bekir Subaşı’s rise to power from a member of the janissary corps to the *de facto* ruler of Baghdad, and a pawn between the Ottomans and the Safavids, within a period of around ten to fifteen years is one example of the possibilities of acquiring rank and wealth and balancing one’s power among various rivals. Mustafa b. Mullā Rûvân el-Bağdâdî’s detailed account summarizes the fragility, or perhaps the flexibility, of a balance of power between the janissary corps, **āzekb**, **segbân**, governors appointed by the state to the provinces, as well as local Arab tribes and rival Safavids that prevailed in the first quarter of seventeenth century.

The antagonism with Dilaver Paşa did not last too long. However, Dilaver Paşa was replaced with Mustafa Paşa, former governor of Diyarbekir.\(^{146}\) During the governorship of Mustafa Paşa, the governor had to deal with some Arab tribes who were pestering merchants traveling from Basra to Baghdad. After successfully subduing the Arabs, Mustafa Paşa

---

\(^{144}\) Muştafa b. Mullā Rûvân el-Bağdâdî, *Târîh-i Fetihnâme-i Bağdad*, Bodleian Or. 276, fol. 75b.

\(^{145}\) Ibid. The author’s reflection of Bekir Şubaşı’s initial misgivings about Meḥmed Kanber confirms Jane Hathaway’s point that the janissaries and **āzekb** were rivals in Baghdad. In this case, Meḥmed Kanber and Bekir Şubaşı initially form an alliance, only to be broken several years later, as will be discussed below. Jane Hathaway, *The Arab Lands Under Ottoman Rule, 1516-1800* (Harlow, England: Pearson Longman, 2008), 68.

\(^{146}\) Muştafa b. Mullā Rûvân el-Bağdâdî, *Târîh-i Fetihnâme-i Bağdad*, Bodleian Or. 276, fol. 76b.
remained in his post until his replacement by Hafız Ahmed Paşa, former governor of Damascus. In his stead, Mustafa Paşa was appointed governor of Damascus. The frequent change in appointed governors was a state strategy to stand in the way of individuals becoming too powerful.147

Mustafa b. Mulla Rıdvan el-Bağdadi writes that Hafız Ahmed Paşa was welcomed by a great procession that no other governor had received. However, writing in hindsight, the author comments, that “it was as if it was touched by the evil eye. What happened to the Baghdad folk has not befallen in any other province since the time of Adam. Such predicament had not happened even at the time of Hulagu or Timur.”148 By the time Hafız Ahmed Paşa arrived in Baghdad, Bekir Subaşı had already gained considerable influence.149 Of his four sons, he had appointed Derviş Mehmed as a janissary agha. The others, Derviş Mehmed and his immediate family “acquired great wealth, such that their

147 Between 1534 and 1623, governors appointed to Baghdad usually remained in office from several months to three or four years and were, like Ciğalazâde Sinân Paşa or Elvendzâde ‘Ali Paşa, appointed to Baghdad more than once. Most governors alternated between posts in neighboring or near provinces, such as Diyarbekir, Erzurum, Van, Şehrizol, Basra, Damascus, Aleppo, Revan, Najd, Lahsa.

In the tadhkira section of the Kûnhû’l Ahbâr, Muştafa ‘Ali mentions a certain Germî, who was the nephew of Elvendzâde ‘Ali Paşa, who was the governor of Baghdad and Basra and other provinces. Germî was appointed as district governor in various districts in Basra and Lahsa. Muştafa ‘Ali notes that when Germî’s request for a favor was not met favorably by Elvendzâde ‘Ali Paşa, Germî composed a satirical verse: “Rafîl be-sûyî-i Başra çu Lahsâ kharâb shod / Ba’d az kharâb-i Başra, kojâ mî-ravi, be-gu!” (When Lahsa was ruined, you went towards Basra / After Basra is ruined, where will you go, tell [me]!). That Elvendzâde ‘Ali Paşa’s son, Arslan Beg, remained in Baghdad (discussed above, see footnote 68) and that his nephew was appointed to various districts in the Basra and Lahsa region points to both movement among near provinces, as well as to some form of nepotism.

Among governor-generals of Baghdad, only a few moved between distant posts, such as Rumeli or Buda. Most governor-generals rotated between near or neighboring provinces. Governor-generals of Baghdad who had also been appointed to Buda or Rumeli are: Süleyman Paşa (governor of Baghdad in 1535–1536, and appointed to Buda in 1536, then to Damascus in 1537 and Aleppo in 1539–1540); Şofû Meşmed Paşa (d. 1557) was formerly governor of Rumelia, then becoming fourth vizier in 1539, second vizier later and then demoted to be the governor of Baghdad (1544–1547), and Bosnia before being promoted to governorship of Buda (1557); Hızır Paşa (governor of Baghdad in 1592, formerly appointed to Rumelia and Revan); Sinân Paşazâde Meşmed Paşa (among his posts are: Rumelia, Aleppo, Erzurum, Bosna, Erzurum again, Diyarbekir, Anatolia, Damascus and Anatolia again, Baghdad and Bosna); Kaşnazâde ‘Ali (former governor of Buda (1601), governor of Baghdad between 1610–1612, Silistre, Buda (1604), Cizre (1612), Buda (1614)); and Sokolluzâde Hasan Paşa (for his career path see Chapter 4).

148 Muştafa b. Mulla Rûdvan el-Bağdâdî, Tārîh-i Fetihname-i Bagdadî, Bodleian Or. 276, fol. 80a.

149 Ibid., fol. 79a.
possessions were like that of Korah (Karun), as well as an army that could rival the sultan’s. Whenever renowned men would come in ships from Najd and Basra, they would present gifts to Bekir Subaşi and his sons.”150 “Out of vainglory,” writes the Baghdadi author, Bekir Subaşi’s son Derviş Mehmed, “began to be contumacious to appointed governors.”151

The encounter between Bekir Subaşi and Hafız Ahmed Paşa upon his arrival is worth quoting in full:

When it was Bekir Şubaşı’s turn [to pay respects to the governor], he [the governor] admonished him, mixed with reproach, and said: “O wretched soup slurper, viziers come to Baghdad on the royal order of the world-protecting pâdîshâh. Most of them are not faced with gratitude and leave hurt and afflicted by your misdeeds. Do not think the successors will be like the predecessors. I would have cut off your head right here and now for the pâdîshâh. But I spare you now. Rid yourself of temptations of the devil. Don the belt of zeal and spirit and follow the right path. Do not be unfortunate; the sultan’s sword is long. All of a sudden you may face the wrath of the sultan. If you were to hide into the earth like a mouse, you still would not be safe from the dragon of his fury.”153

Hearing this from the governor, Bekir Subaşi escaped from the citadel, where Hafız Ahmed was in residence. When he returned to his entourage, he vowed never to return there.

Mustafa b. Mulla Rıdvan el-Bagdadi adds, however, that the governor was greatly sorry for his lenience, “biting his finger a thousand times, and thinking, “Why did I delay this important matter?’”154 Hafız Ahmed Paşa remained as the governor of Baghdad for three

150 Ibid., fol. 79a–b.
151 Ibid., 79b.
152 My translation here requires some explanation. Here, the governor addresses Bekir Subaşi as “çorbacı ḥâzretleri” and following the derogatory address, this can serve a double meaning in the sense of one who partakes of the sultan’s soup, which is distributed to the janissaries, at the same time referring to Bekir Subaşi’s position within the janissary corps. Elsewhere in the account Muşafa bin Mulla Rûvan el-Bağdâdî notes that in Baghdad they call a “çorbaci” “subaşi” and that this was the reason why Bekir was named “Bekir Subaşi.” Thus it could also be translated as “master sergeant.” Here, the governor-general is perhaps playing on the double meaning of the word and uses it in a derogatory manner. Ibid., fol. 75a.

On the position of “çorbaci” see Abdülkadir Özcan, “Çorbaci,” DIA Vol. 8, 369–70.
153 Muşafa b. Mulla Rûvan el-Bağdâdî, Târîh-i Fetihnâme-i Bagdâd, Bodleian Or. 276, fol. 80b.
154 Ibid.
years, after which he was replaced by Kemankeş 'Ali Paşa. Hafız Ahmed Paşa was appointed to Diyarbekir. Upon arriving in Baghdad, Kemankeş 'Ali Paşa sent a conciliatory letter to Bekir Subaşi, which the latter received with esteem and reciprocated with a feast and presentation of gifts. The Baghdadi author comments that during the governorship of Kemankeş 'Ali Paşa there was no sedition and the governor was at peace with the janissaries; he also visited shrines and went to Friday prayers, and attended gatherings in gardens. Kemankeş 'Ali Paşa also acquired great wealth, according to the author, and chose to send the best quality materials and horses to Sultan 'Osman II.  

At an unspecified date Kemankeş 'Ali Paşa was replaced, and Yusuf Paşa was appointed in his place. The years 1619–1620 mark a turning point for Baghdad, as Mustafa b. Mulla Rıdıvan el-Bagdadi notes: “when after some time, like the days of spring the hearts of the populace was joyful and at ease, all of a sudden wickedness and mischief awoke from sleep and caused ruin and anguish in the hearts of the people.” Here, moving from a chronological way of ordering his history, the author organizes the text according to each challenge that took place until the Ottomans’ loss of Baghdad in 1623–24.

The first challenge concerns Hasan Beg, the leader of the fortress of Zikiya (between Baghdad and Basra), Bekir Subaşi, and Afrasiyab Paşa, ruler of Basra, and local Arab tribes. Hasan Beg had established himself between Baghdad and Basra and would pester merchants traveling by ship from Basra to Baghdad. Hasan Beg and Bekir Subaşi had a somewhat neutral relationship, where Bekir Subaşi would overlook his actions and Hasan
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155 Ibid., fol. 87b.
156 Ibid., fol. 88a.
157 Rudi Matthee notes that the Ottoman governor of Basra, 'Ali Paşa sold the government to Afrasiyāb in 1596 and while the khatba was read in the name of the Ottoman sultan, Basra became a hereditary province under the descendants of Afrasiyāb until 1668. Later in Muṣṭaфа b. Mulla Rıdıvan el-Бağdādī’s account the author will have Bekir Subaşi give the example of Basra and claim similar independence. Rudi Matthee, “Between Arabs, Turks and Iranians: Basra, 1600–1700,” Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies 69 (2006): 53–78, 59.
Beg would at times send him gifts. Hasan Beg, however, was on bad terms with Afrasiyab. When merchants complained, Afrasiyab decided to march on Hasan Beg’s fortress, causing the latter to seek assistance from Bekir Subaşi. Hearing Bekir Subaşi’s approach, Afrasiyab’s men retreated; Hasan Beg showed his allegiance to Bekir Subaşi by presenting him and his family and household with horses.

The second calamity concerns Bekir Subaşi, his son Derviş Mehmed, Mehmed Kanber, leader of the 'azeb troops, and Yusuf Paşa, governor of Baghdad. In this instance, the Baghdadi author presents us with another case of rise to wealth in the person of Derviş Mehmed. The janissary agha is compared to Korah in wealth, Hatem-i Tayy in generosity, Harun al-Rashid and caliph al-Ma'mun in rank. His diversion and pleasure is compared with, and even exceeds that of, the Safavid shah. The author adds that Derviş Mehmed also gathered around him such strong men and showed them such benevolence that those who were in the household of appointed governors, would want to leave them and enter the service of Derviş Mehmed. The author writes:

When it comes to his pleasure and delight: he has a brilliant, precious, twenty-four oared ship, full of pictures and images, docked on the Tigris. On nights brimming with the full moon, he would sit with many a boon companion on his ornamented seat, the envy of the house of Mani. Around him would be rose-faced, cypress-statured, heart-stealing idols whose locks of hair were as if chains to lovers’ hearts. He would drink wine served by sâqîs, from jewel-encrusted flasks and crystal cups ... He had two singers: one was Zeynizade Hasan Çelebi, from Diyarbekir, and the other is Baghdadi Pirizade Ahmed Çelebi, each with a voice like that of David, a rarity of the age. After the Baghdad calamity, Zeynizade Hasan Çelebi became an intimate of Murad IV, and Baghdadi Pirizade Ahmed Çelebi became Shah 'Abbas’ favorite.

158 Muṣṭafa b. Mulla Raṉvan el-Baḡdādī, Tārīḥ-i Fetihnāme-i Baḡdād, Bodleian Or. 276, fol. 91b.

159 Taking the example of Cairo, Jane Hathaway presents a more flexible picture of the household, wherein the provincial governor and his household could face competition from local elites and their households. A similar case seems to arise in Baghdad as well. Jane Hathaway, “The Military Household in Ottoman Egypt,” International Journal of Middle East Studies 27 (1995): 39–52.

160 Muṣṭafa b. Mulla Raṉvan el-Baḡdādī, Tārīḥ-i Fetihnāme-i Baḡdād, Bodleian Or. 276, fol. 91b.
Mustafa b. Mulla Rıdvan el-Bagdadi’s lengthy description of Derviş Mehmed’s wealth and his pleasure-making proves the possibility of upward mobility from the ranks of a janissary agha to acquiring wealth and a household, to claiming rivalry to the de facto ruler of Baghdad, his own father. It also shows the possibility of mobility of members of the household, from the service of governors or local authorities, to Ottoman and Safavid rulers. This wealth and pomp drew much envy, especially at a time of famine and inflation as will be discussed later; it also led Derviş Mehmed to vainglory, according to Mustafa b. Mulla Rıdvan el-Bagdadi, for the son attempted to kill his father Bekir Subaşi. However much the son tried, he could not kill his father as Bekir Subaşi’s chief steward (kethūdā), ʿÖmer, became aware of Derviş Mehmed’s intentions and guarded him night and day.161

Bekir Şubaşi had four nephews: Bekir, Muhammed, ʿÖmer, and ʿOsman. Like Derviş Mehmed, these brothers were also part of the janissary corps. These four, fearing Derviş Mehmed, collaborated with the Arab tribe Khaza’el, and solidified their compact with a marriage alliance between Muhammed and the daughter of the Arab leader, Mahenna.162 When complaints against the Arab tribe and the four brothers came to Bekir Subaşi’s attention, he first sent them a letter to dissuade them from such action; when the reply was negative, Bekir Subaşi decided to march on them personally.163 Bekir Subaşi put together a squad comprised of his brother ʿÖmer, his kethūdā ʿÖmer, and several janissaries. He left his son Derviş Mehmed in Baghdad, under the guidance of Mehmed Kanber, who, on account of his corpulence (mülehim ve mücessim ādem idi), also remained in

161 Ibid., fol. 92a.

162 On the Khaza’el tribe see Max Freiherr von Oppenheim, Die Beduinen, Band III, Teil 2 (Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1952), 322–33.

163 Özer Küpeli also provides a summary of events, which led to the Safavids’ capture of Baghdad in his book on Ottoman-Safavid relations. His main source for these is also the Tarih-i Fetihnames-i Bagdad. Özer Küpeli, Osmanlı-Safevi Münasebetleri, 130–44.
Baghdad. The leader of the 'azeb force, Mehmed Kanber, and Bekir Subaşı had pledged allegiance to each other several years ago, when inhabitants of Baghdad had complained of the governor Dilaver Paşa’s actions. Mehmed Kanber had three sons: Ahmed Re’is, Mustafa Re’is, and ‘Abdullah Re’is. The latter was also sent along with Bekir Subaşı against the Arabs and the four nephews. Before going on campaign, Bekir Subaşı also visited the governor Yusuf Paşa to notify him of his plans. While the governor feigned amity, he was looking for an opportunity to rid Baghdad of Bekir Subaşı.

Mustafa b. Mulla Rıdvan el-Bağdadi notes that that year, when Bekir Subaşı had left to fight the Khaza’el, there was great famine in Baghdad. The eighteenth-century Baghdadí historian Nazmizade Murtaza, whose account of these events is not nearly as detailed as that of Mustafa b. Mulla Rıdvan el-Bağdadi, devotes a separate section to the extreme upsurge in prices in Baghdad (Der zikr-i ğalâ-yi ‘azîme der Bağdâd). Nazmizade Murtaza’s more flowery account presents a distinctly pejorative view of Bekir Subaşı, who is frequently identified as a malignant villain (şakîyy-i bed-fercâm) who sought to advance in rank. Nazmizade Murtaza directly correlates the upsurge in prices and famine with
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164 Muştafa b. Mulla Rıdvan el-Bağdadi, Târîh-i Fetihaâme-i Bağdâd, Bodleian Or. 276, fol. 93b.

165 Famine appears to be an important issue in these years as noted by contemporary authors. Another author, who identifies himself as Şeyhoğlu, and who composed a short history of Baghdad from 1619 until the conquest of the province by Murâd IV, writes of another famine that affected Baghdad soon after Bekir Subaşı executed Mehmed Kanber. He writes that when the flocks of the local Bedouins died, and all their means and sources of income were depleted, they proceeded to Baghdad to pillage the city and were the cause of the famine. Şeyhoğlu provides a very vivid description of the famine and writes that he himself was a witness of this when he came across some who wanted to cook a cat.

Şeyhoğlu adds: “no matter how much I tried, I could not rescue the cat from their hands. Before the yelping poor cat was fully cooked, they tore it to pieces and ate it, with all its blood and skin and seeing this, I was grateful for myself. But in the street, each day two hundred, three hundred men would die, crying, “I am hungry;” some would be buried, some would be thrown in the river.” (Ne deñli eyledim, ol kediyi ellerinden halâs idemedim. Âher, ol zavalli kedi çığra çığra cân vîrûb daha bişmeden bâre bâre bâre kanûyla ve derisiyle yiyyûb ol hâli görûb öz hâlîme âgyetle şük r eyledim. Âmûz zoka âlgârdanda ânle iki yüz üç yüz âdêm “cu an cu an” direk, ya ni “açım açım” dêyû mûrû-û cânı kafes-i bedenden pervûz idüb kimintî deñâ eleyûb ve kimintî şaatî buraçûrîlîr idî.) Şeyhoğlu, Kıtâb-ı Târîh-i Dürri’s selâm-i Bağdâd’în Başma Gelen Aḥvâllerî Beyân Íderî fi Sene 1028 (1619), Leiden University Cod. Schultens 1278, fols. 6b-7a. Henceforth Şeyhoğlu, Kıtâb-ı Târîh.

166 Nazmızâde Murtaza adds that there was such famine that inhabitants would cry out, “the starvation, the starvation” (el-cu ‘, el-cu’) in the markets and would eat putrid donkey meat that they could find in dumpsters. Gûlşen-i Hulefâ, 195, 201.
Bekir Subaşı’s mutiny against the sultan, and resulting in an interruption of trade and migration out of Baghdad.\footnote{Ibid., 201.} Mustafa b. Mulla Rûdvan el-Bagdâdi’s account is more neutral towards Bekir Subaşı. He finds that the reason for the famine is the great number of \textit{segbâns} and \textit{levends} that had gathered around Derviş Mehmed. The author voices the common opinion, which found these irregular soldiers to be a financial burden and to be useless, when the \textit{kul ta’ifesи} also strove zealously to fight enemies at war.\footnote{Muştafa b. Mulla Rûvan el-Bağdâdi, \textit{Târîh-i Fetihnâme-i Bagdâd}, Bodleian Or. 276, fol. 96a.}

Noting the disquietude “that passed like a cloud over the people and rained down corruption and sedition,” Mustafa b. Mulla Rûdvan el-Bagdâdi continues his relation of the events that transpired after Bekir Subaşı had left Baghdad.\footnote{Ibid.} He writes that on a Friday, when Mehmed Kanber had gone to pray at the Hasan Paşa Cami’i (built by the former governor Sokolluzade Hasan Paşa mentioned above), there was a great commotion outside the mosque. They complained, rather menacingly:

\begin{quote}
You are traitors to the \textit{pâdishâh}! You hold the sultan’s land and possessions (\textit{mülk}) and hand over the collected revenues to the \textit{levend} and \textit{segbân}, take the victuals and use them for yourselves and your horses while the \textit{re’âyâ} is trodden under the feet of the \textit{levend} and \textit{segbân}. There is no food to be found in the marketplaces. And our women are unable to go to the baths; our children are unable to go to markets. This is clearly an atrocity. Will you help rid this innovation (\textit{bid’at}) or shall we unite together (\textit{yek dîl ve yek cihet olub}) and notify the sultan’s fair vizier [Yusuf Paşa] of our plaint, and show everyone his place?\footnote{Ibid., fol. 96b.}
\end{quote}

The author repeats, here, that since Mehmed Kanber was corpulent, he was afraid of the mob and barely managed to disperse them by promising to send the \textit{sebgân} away. The crowd, however, thinking Bekir Subaşı would want to take revenge, also sought to kill Derviş Mehmed, ban Bekir Subaşı from the city, and make Mehmed Kanber their leader in his
The mob wanted Mehmed Kanber to go to the governor. In the meantime, ʿÖmer kethūdā became aware of this. Mehmed Kanber managed to still the crowd’s anger and keep them from killing ʿÖmer kethūdā, relating to the latter the reʿāyā’s vexation with the segbāns and scarcity of food. ʿÖmer kethūdā, in turn, convinced Derviṣ Mehmed to send the segbāns away; they made way to the land of Rūm (merzbūm-u Rūm). Mustafa b. Mulla Rûvan el-Bagdadi, adds, however that, “their disturbed hearts were not calmed by the migration of the segbān. Taking Mehmed Kanber, almost by force with them, the mob made its way to the pasha, “who was searching for the key to such sedition, and found it in the hands of the city-dwellers (şehrlî),” for he too wanted to get rid of Bekir Subaşi.

In the meantime Mehmed Kanber broke his pact with Bekir Subaşi and tried to have him killed. 172 When news reached Bekir Subaşi, he captured Mehmed Kanber’s son ʿAbdullah Reʾis and two other amirs, decapitated them, sent the heads to Mehmed Kanber, and made his way to Baghdad. 173 In order to avenge his son’s death, Mehmed Kanber prepared to attack Bekir Subaşi as he entered Baghdad. In the skirmish, Yusuf Paşa was struck by a bullet and died. 174 Mehmed Kanber was also killed and his body and those of his sons were placed in a boat, released to the Tigris and set on fire. 175 The events up to now, as reflected in near contemporary accounts, show the precarious balance of power and its disruption between the state appointed governors, janissary aghas, ʿazebs, irregular soldiers, and local Arabs.
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171 Ibid., fols. 96b–97a.

172 Naʾīmā, Tārīh-i Naʾīmā, 517.


174 Naʾīmā adds that Bekir Şubaşi killed some five hundred ʿazebs as well. Ibid., fol. 103b; Naʾīmā, Tārīh-i Naʾīmā, 517.

175 Ibid., fol. 104b; Naʾīmā, Tārīh-i Naʾīmā, 518.
The first time that Bekir Subaşı openly voices his sole authority, as put in his mouth by the Baghdadi author, is right after these events. The author writes:

Bekir Şubaşı said: “As of now, we do not need a governor. They should give Baghdad to me, for those governors that come, lust after our property and attempt against our lives. [See how] in Basra Afrasiyab is the ruler; governors are not appointed there. Let them give Baghdad to us and we would yearly send treasury and gifts/tribute (pişkeş) to the sultan.”176

After these words by Bekir Subaşı, the author continues his chronicle with events that took place in the capital, including plans for the Battle of Khotyn (1621), the janissary uprisings in Istanbul, Sultan ‘Osman II’s murder, the enthronement of Sultan Mustafa I (r. 1617–8; 1622–3)—who was soon to be replaced by Sultan Murad IV (r. 1623–1640)—and the uprising of Abaza Mehmed Paşa in Erzurum.177 Intermixed with the account of Abaza Mehmed Paşa’s uprising, the author relates how Baghdad was lost to the Safavids. European travelers and consuls present at the time were aware of the disorder in the Ottoman lands. Louis Gédoyn, now writing from Sofia, Bulgaria, in the February of 1624, notes the “confusion and astonishment” that was prevalent: it was certain that Baghdad was lost; Abaza’s (Mehmed) forces were growing by the day.178 Italian traveler Pietro della Valle writing from Goa in November 1624, and having heard in May that Shah ‘Abbas had taken Baghdad, was not surprised that Baghdad was lost. He notes how the death of the sultan (wrongly identified as Suleiman), the janissary uprisings, the brief restoration of Mustafa I, and the deeds of “the tyrant Bechir Subasci” had served Shah ‘Abbas I the opportunity to make “himself master of Baghdad.”179 It is in the context of disturbances at court and in
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176 Muşafa b. Mulla Râvan el-Bağdâdî, Târîh-i Fetihname-i Bağdâd, Bodleian Or. 276, fol. 104b.

177 Ibid., fols. 104b–114b.


179 Pietro della Valle, The Travels of Sig. Pietro della Valle, a Noble Roman, into East-India and Arabia Deserta: in which, the Several Countries, Together with the Customs, Manners, Traffique, and Rites both Religious and Civil, of those Oriental Princes and Nations, are Faithfully Described, in Familiar Letters to his Friend Signior Mario Schipano: whereunto is Added a Relation of Sir Thomas Roe’s Voyage into the East Indies (London: J. Macock, 1665), 211–3.
Baghdad, as well as the Portuguese’ and Safavids’ attempts to seize control of Basra that one can see the fall of Baghdad, and its added importance to the Safavids.180

Mustafa b. Mulla Rıdvan el-Bagdadi summarizes the situation and foreshadows what was to happen, as put into the mouth of the former governor Kemaneş 'Ali Paşa, who was consulted regarding the matter and who says: “[Baghdad] is a frontier province. It is 'Arabistan. They did not kill Yusuf Paşa on purpose; his end being near, he passed away during the battle. The Qizilbash of the abject-sect is close. It is possible that there will be regret. Appoint another governor who would rule with ease.”181 Following Kemaneş 'Ali Paşa’s advice Süleyman Paşa was appointed as governor. When the new appointee was not allowed into Baghdad, he returned to Diyarbekir to seek assistance from Hafız Ahmed Paşa.182 Süleyman Paşa, who was already suffering from a case of carbuncle, passed away before a combined force of governors and commanders from the provinces of Diyarbekir, Mosul and Kurdistan could march against Bekir “Paşa,” as he is now described in the text.183

Because of their former antagonism, Bekir Paşa adamantly refused Hafız Ahmed Paşa when he heard that his army was approaching Baghdad, claiming: “if it were any other governor, I would allow him. It is the pâdishâh’s domain (memleket). He can give it to whomever he may wish. But since Hafız is coming, I would not give a stone from Baghdad;

---

180 Pietro della Valle points to the critical geopolitical position of Baghdad in the Safavids’ plans to capture Baghdad. He comments: “...And this is a clear case, that if he [Shâh ʿAbbâs] hath Baghdad, he intends also to have the port of Bassora, which is of great importance.”

Ibid., 211.

181 Muṣṭafa b. Mulla Râûvan el-Bâgdâdî, Târîh-i Fetihname-i Bağdâd, Bodleian Or. 276, fol. 115b.

Similarly, İbrahim Peçevî, who was the keeper of the treasury register of Diyarbekir, notes in his history that he would often (futilely) warn Hâfiz Ahmed Paşa that Baghdad was a frontier province and that its people were sympathetic to the Safavids. One of Peçevî’s concerns is that Baghdad had, for some time, been dominated by the influence of the local or yerli regiments of salaried volunteer soldiers established in the province. Peçevî, Târîh-i Peçevî (Istanbul: Matbaa-i Amire, 1865–7), 391–4.

182 Ibid., fols. 116a–116b; Naʾîmâ, Târîh-i Naʾîmâ, 519.

183 In Süleyman Paşa’s stead, Bostan Paşa was appointed to Baghdad on Hâfiz Ahmed’s suggestion.
I will strive as long as life remains in my body.”184 The seventeenth-century Baghdadi writer Şeyhoğlu, who composed a short history of Baghdad after 1619, also testifies to the antagonism between the two, when he comments that Hafız Ahmed Paşa had formerly been governor of Baghdad and had left in grief and heartache (meger sâbıken Hâfiz Ahmed Paşa Bağdâd’a beglerbegi olmuş idi ve bunların ilinden cigeri kebâb ve bağı hûn olub gîmiş idi).185 However, when Hafız Ahmed Paşa dealt him a blow, Bekir Paşa devised a plan to send a letter to Qasim Khan, ruler of Luristan, hoping that Hafız Ahmed Paşa would back off, seeing what he would think to be the approaching Safavids. Bekir Paşa’s plan was, according to the author, to send off Qasim Khan’s men with “gifts and tribute” (hedâyâ ve pişkeş).186

In a further plot twist, the messenger, 'Abbas Ağa, who was supposed to give the letter to Qasim Khan, instead delivered it to Shah 'Abbas I.187 The shah, who had “night and day moaned, ‘âh Bağdâd, vâh Bağdâd,,’’ sent an army led by Safi Quli Khan to capture Baghdad.188 Upon this, Hafız Ahmed Paşa gave in and sent a letter to Bekir Paşa granting him the governorship of Baghdad, lest he give the province to “the heretics.”189 Bekir Paşa, still partly oblivious to 'Abbas Ağa’s treachery, received Safi Quli Khan, who ordered him
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184 Muştafa b. Mulla Rûdvan el-Bağdâdî, Târîh-i Fetiînâmê-i Bağdâd, Bodleian Or. 276, fol. 119a.

185 Şeyhoğlu, Kitâb-i Târîh, Leiden University, Or. 1278, fol. 8a.

186 Muştafa b. Mulla Rûdvan el-Bağdâdî, Târîh-i Fetiînâmê-i Bağdâd, Bodleian Or. 276, fol. 122a.

187 Ibid., fols. 122a–123a.

188 Ibid., fol. 123a.

189 Ibid., fol. 124b. In fact, even when Hâfiz Ahmed Paşa had heard of the approach of the Safavids, he had sent an envoy, Seyyid Hân, to Bekir Paşa to convince him to give Baghdad over to Bostân Paşa. Bekir Paşa replied in the negative, saying Bostân Paşa had been an agha of Dilâver Paşa and had done some injury to Baghdad. When, however, the battle continued, Hâfiz Ahmed Paşa was worried that Baghdad might fall to the Safavids.
to hand over Baghdad to Shāh Ṭubbās and to pledge fealty to the Safavids, rhetorically asking (in the author’s words): “He [Bekir] does not give Baghdad to the Ottomans, he does not give it to the deviated shah; does he think to claim the caliphate for himself, thinking this land will remain his? Does he think to claim sovereignty (pādişāhlık) among two padishāhs?" According to Mustafa b. Mulla Rıdvan el-Bağdadi, it is then that Bekir Paşa realized what had happened and regretted his actions, “for he was a Sunni Muslim of the Hanafi sect.” It is only at this point when religious confessions become an issue it seems, where before, Bekir Subaşı had not seen any concern in leveraging the position of Baghdad between the Ottomans and the Safavids to gain the province for himself. While political negotiation is common, there comes a time when it is no longer feasible, and there are limits to translatability of identities.

Unable to defend Baghdad and rejecting the shah’s offer to spare his life in exchange for Baghdad, Bekir Paşa continued to fight. However, his son, Derviş Mehmed, handed over the keys to the fortress, hoping his life and possessions would be spared. Bekir Paşa was killed before his son’s eyes. His body was taken by the one remaining son of Mehmed Kanber and burned in revenge for their father and brother’s death; Bekir Paşa’s sons Derviş
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190 Ibid., fol. 125b.
191 Ibid.
193 Muṣṭafa b. Mulla Rıdvan el-Bağdādī, Tārīḫ-i Fetihname-i Bağdād, Bodleian Or. 276, fol. 140b. The author includes an interesting story on Bekir Paşa’s death. Bekir Paşa and his wife were both captured and after many tortures, when Derviş Mehmed arrived to see their imminent execution, Bekir Paşa exclaimed, “I have not seen such an unfaithful son who has no mercy for his father and mother. He’s not like our other children.” To this, the wife replies, “That is correct. According to “Külüş şeyin yerci ilä aşlıhi” (All things revert to their original source), this son is not from your loin.” The author relates what had happened to Bekir Paşa’s wife. Apparently, she and her family lived in a village named Mandali, which was near the frontier with the Safavids. The two sides would at times take prisoners from the other. If the prisoner had relatives, they could free them by paying some money. This woman had once been taken captive by a Qizilbash. Her father freed her, but in the meantime she had become pregnant, and Derviş Mehmed was apparently from this man, according to the author.
Mustafa, Derviş Hasan and Derviş 'Ali were exiled to the Safavid lands. Safi Quli Khan was appointed as governor of Baghdad. The province was to remain in Safavid hands for a decade and a half until Murad IV’s conquest in 1639, after which it continued to be an Ottoman possession well into the end of the dynasty (until 1917).

The period from the conclusion of the peace treaty between the Ottomans and the Safavids in 1590 until Baghdad’s conquest by Shah 'Abbas I in 1623 marks the near boundaries of this dissertation. The majority of the illustrated manuscripts were produced in the period of relative peace after 1590 until the appearance of Tavilzade Muhammed in Baghdad. However, a few examples from the late 1620s and 1630s point to the continuation of sporadic artistic production in Baghdad.

Contemporary accounts, particularly Mustafa b. Mulla Rıdvan el-Bagdadi’s history, present a complex picture of Baghdad, in which socio-religious, political and economic transformations of the late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth centuries allowed for different means of mobility and in which there was a balance of power, or at times, lack thereof, between local Arab tribes, janissaries, irregular soldiers, governors on a local level, and between the Ottomans and the Safavids on the international level. These accounts show that there were possible, though not necessarily legitimate, paths to wealth and power, suggesting a broadening base of patronage that is not restricted to the Ottoman capital. While the majority of illustrated manuscripts and paintings from Baghdad do not bear the names of patrons, it is worth considering that some of the figures mentioned in this chapter may be possible patrons or buyers of artworks. The next chapter will deal with

194 Ibid., fol. 141a; Right after writing about Mehmed Kanber and his son’s death, Na’imā notes that Bekir Şubaşı faced a very similar fate soon thereafter and he was “set on fire with naphtha and roasted, on the water.” However, in Na’imā’s account, it is not Mehmed Kanber’s son but the Safavid shah and Derviş Mehmed who executed Bekir Şubaşı in this manner. Na’imā, Tarih-i Naʿimā, 518, 532.

transformations of the art market in the late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth centuries, and on several single-page paintings produced in Baghdad in the context of art collecting.
CHAPTER 2
SINGLE-PAGE PAINTINGS

This chapter analyzes single-page paintings produced in Baghdad as an expression of a larger trend entailing a broadening of the base of patronage and changes in the conception of art. It deals with the role of the newly arising themes of entertainment and social companionship in the early modern period. In the last decade of the sixteenth century there arose a short-lived but lively art market in Baghdad, a phenomenon itself related to these trends. However, the types of texts that were illustrated in Baghdad only tangentially resonate with currents in the capital, Istanbul, where official histories or texts on the deeds of campaign leaders were, for the most part, preponderant in this period. Broadly speaking, the kinds of illustrated works that are produced in Baghdad are those of popular religious literature, illustrated genealogies (an innovation that has its roots in the capital but take on a different, regional, guise in Baghdad, only to return to the capital decades later) and several works of literature (such as the Shāhnāma of Firdawsī or the Hūmāyunīnname, the Ottoman translation by Vasiʿ Ali Çelebi [d. 1543] of the Kalīla wa Dimna). On the other hand, the single-page paintings produced in Baghdad closely reflect the new themes and aspects of an entertainment culture and a different engagement with painting.

First, an overview of some of these new themes as well as ways of interacting with paintings as seen in Istanbul and Isfahan will be instrumental in understanding the broader picture and contextualizing one aspect of the art market in Baghdad as evidenced by single-page paintings. Then, moving from a broad view of the early modern art market, in which one can also consider Istanbul, Shiraz, Qazvin, Mashhad and Isfahan (and the still elusive corpus of truncated Shāhnāmas and manuscripts of the Qiṣaṣ al-Anbiyāʾ (Stories of the Prophets) and ʿAjāʿīb al-Makhlūqāt (Wonders of Creation)), to a microscopic view of a
specific place, at a specific time period, a short one indeed, this chapter examines single-page paintings. In doing so, it seeks to understand the art market in Baghdad and its interconnectedness to the city’s social and cultural geography.

These works, preserved in several albums in the Topkapi Palace Museum Library, have escaped scholarly attention, while emphasis has mostly been placed on manuscripts of popular religious literature. These single-page paintings and calligraphies (some of which contain notes that they were executed in Baghdad and Karbala) support the idea that shrines were also centers of art production and that there was a merging of the religious and the secular in early modern practices of representation.\(^{196}\) I argue that while significant differences exist between the aesthetics of the capital and the province (in terms of style, taste and choice of texts), single-page paintings force us to reconsider the nature and extent of those differences. This, I hope, will raise larger debates on questions of center and periphery (or their relevance), artistic centers, physical mobility and diffusion, and the use of models in the creation of compositions.

\(^{196}\) Such a merging of the worldly and the religious is attested partly in their immediate contexts within albums and in the multivalency of their readings. It also ties in with a discussion of the illustrated works of popular religious literature, such as the Ḥadīkatū’s-Sī‘edā (Garden of the Blessed), Mākṭel-i Âl-i Resāl (Killing of the Prophet’s Family) and biographies of Sufi saints such as the Nafahāt al-Uns (Breaths of Intimacy) of Jāmī (d. 1492), or the Manāqīb al-‘Arīfīn (The Virtues of the Gnostics) of Aflākī (d. 1360), where elements of the worldly permeate the compositions. This can also be aligned with similar early modern and particularly post-Tridentine concerns with the secular and the religious in European art and literature. The recent collection of essays edited by David Loewenstein and Michael Witmore on various aspects of Shakespeare’s engagement with religion sheds light on the multifaceted and often complicated relations with regards to Catholic and Protestant ideals and their own engagement with art. David Loewenstein and Michael Witmore, eds. *Shakespeare and Early Modern Religion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015). Also see Marcia Hall and Tracy E. Cooper, eds. *The Sensuous in the Counter-Reformation Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013) and Pamela M. Jones, *Federico Borromeo and the Ambrosiana: Art Patronage and Reform in Seventeenth Century Milan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993). For a broader perspective on the visual secular see Suzanne Smith, “Religious Law and the Visual Secular,” *Harvard Divinity Bulletin* 43 (2015).
New Tastes, Themes, and Audiences

In his *Menāḵib-i Hünerverān* (Epic Deeds of Artists), the bureaucrat Mustafa ‘Āli (d. 1600) writes:

Among penmen [there are] some depraved [persons], whose corrupt natures came out into the open, the sons of so and so, who are utterly deprived of talent having to do with bookkeeping or writing, devoid, like a blank page, of the blackness [i.e., ink] of the science of accounting (*ʿilm-i hesāb*), and ready, like court artisans (*ehl-i hīref*), to avoid the embarrassment of reading a [single] word. They obtained [their] certificates of literacy through reports that were jotted down thanks to the titles of their fathers. As for their revenues in their account books, [these] shrank day by day due to the craze for [purchasing] calligraphic works. So much so that, every new enthusiast painter sold the sketch that he drew in the pitch-black of the night to the aforesaid [men] saying it was a pencil drawing by Mani. In addition to buying [calligraphic pieces] from scribes with no name or fame, who forged on their works the signature of Mir ‘Ali, some of [these ignorant men] spent a considerable amount of *aspers* on the gilding and illumination [of these pieces], squandered many thousand *dinars* in a year, and bought anything they found. And there are painters and dealers who, having sold [everything in their hands] to the ignorant among the aforementioned group, do not have left in their wallet even a rough sketch, and who wasted away forty or fifty *filorins* for a single album… [Furthermore there are] those who, as expected of [ones with] their distorted nature, produced books of fragmentary poems (*cönk*), ruining the corner of every page with incorrect couplets [that are scribbled] in the form of marginal notes (*hāsiye*) [executed] by breaking up each *qitʿa* into four parts, by separating each of its hemistiches from the one to which it was connected, and by arbitrarily patching them.197

This lengthy diatribe, preceded by Mustafa ‘Āli’s hyperbolic “cries, a hundred thousand cries” (*feryād, ṣad hezār feryād*) for such dolts and rich men enamored with calligraphy, points to several issues: the interest in collecting calligraphy, paintings, and drawings; the increasing demand for albums in the latter decades of the sixteenth century when the author wrote his text; the production of works to match a non-courtly, albeit at times uninformed demand; and the making, re-making, or un-making of meaning(s) where quatrains are taken apart and randomly put together in albums. Elsewhere, Mustafa ‘Āli complained about the

---

expenses wasted on court artisans as well as the high prices artisans charged for his own manuscript commission.\textsuperscript{198}

Financially astute and himself a part of this art market, Mustafa ʿĀli was well aware of the flourishing of the arts during the reign of the Ottoman sultan Murad III (r. 1574–1595) and the interest in collecting calligraphic works. Elsewhere in this account of notable artists and calligraphers Mustafa ʿĀli writes, for example, that Mir ʿAli’s two quatrains were sold for a hundred filoris in those days after much haggling.\textsuperscript{199} Recognizing the demand for calligraphies and albums, Mustafa ʿĀli judges that:

It would be prudent to adequately investigate and examine the identities of [these] scribes of good penmanship, cutters, illuminators, decorative-painters, and portraitists, their origins, the masters under whom they excelled and the pādishāhs by whose favor they attained those [exalted] ranks, if the qitʿas, calligraphic works, paintings and illuminations acquired [by these aficionadors] are to be appreciated.\textsuperscript{200}

His book thus provides a guideline for those interested in buying and collecting art through an outline of master-disciple lineages and patronage of rulers. Not a practitioner of art himself but a self-proclaimed connoisseur and struggling patron, Mustafa ʿĀli nevertheless finds the courage to compose this work at the insistence of his acquaintances and those who scattered their money on albums, since he has “many ideas that developed into various world-renowned texts.”\textsuperscript{201} His slightly younger contemporary, also not a practitioner of art but a physician and art collector, Guilio Mancini (d. 1630), shows a similar sensibility in his intention to “offer and consider some advice by which a man, who enjoys such studies might readily judge paintings set before him and know how to buy, acquire and hang them in their places according to the time when they were done, the subject represented and the skill of

\textsuperscript{198} Ibid., 100–2.
\textsuperscript{199} Ibid., 165.
\textsuperscript{200} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{201} Ibid.
the artisan who made them.” While indeed Mustafaʿ Āli does not directly deal with the display of art and calligraphy, his concern about the breaking up and arbitrary placement of quatrains (presumably in the context of an album) suggests a certain order and categorization of art. His organization of the Menāḵtib-ī Hünerverān hints at this as well. Much like sixteenth-century treatises on art in the form of album prefaces, emphasis is placed on the word, on calligraphy; here, treated in separate chapters according to style, followed by other forms of the art of the book including decoupage, painting, illumination and binding. Mustafaʿ Āli’s comments on prices and forgeries show concerns with the issue of copies and originals, and judging quality, even in a tradition where emulation and repetition was key to learning.

Mustafaʿ Āli is also part of various interconnected circles of artists, patrons and connoisseurs of varying qualities. He may have met the Tabrizi painter Walijan during his posts as finance officer in Aleppo, Baghdad, or in Istanbul. Always in search of patrons,

---


204 On Walijan, Muṣṭafaʿ Āli writes: “Among the pupils of Siyāvūsh [there was] a person named Master Walijan, one of the new enthusiasts and young [faces] among [the artists] of Tabriz origin. At the time this treatise was being penned, he too came to Rum and became one of the [regularly] paid painters in the Exalted Capital City, [Istanbul]. Truly, his work is marked by finesse, just as his wonder-working reed pen, like the reed pens of the masters of the past, is marked by precision and grace. However, his youthfulness and the praises of the fools who inhabit the house of stupidity, as well as [the praises of people who proclaim] his oeuvre as absolute confirmation [of the saying]. "This is a marvel! have devastated the black core of his heart with the darkness of vanity. And it is known to the young and old that [manipulated in this way], his pride became a great obstacle for him in the learning [of his] art. May God whose lauds I recite and who should be extolled bless him with a long life, make him perfect, and substitute the merits of proficiency and modesty for his vanity and pride." Muṣṭafaʿ Āli, Epic Deeds, 271–2.

Additionally, Şebnem Parladır points to the possibility of Walijan as one of the painters of an illustrated Hünernāme (British Library Add. 15153). She notes the inscription “Walī” and the date 990 (1582) in a painting depicting the story of a mischievous bird (fol. 176a). She asks whether this Walī could be the Tabrizi Walijan, who was known to be in Aleppo at the time. She adds that archival records show him to be in Istanbul, working on the Zübdetüʾt-Tevârîh (Cream of Histories) and the second volume of the Hünernāme.
the ever disgruntled Mustafa ‘Āli had, or at times, attempted to have several of his works illustrated for presentation. Thus, in addition to claiming to be a connoisseur of the arts in the *Menāḳīb-ī Hūnerverān*, Mustafa ‘Āli was also a patron, whose *Nuṣretnāme* (Book of Victory) detailing Lala Mustafa Paşa’s (d. 1580) Shirvan campaign was illustrated. A presentation copy of his *Cāmiʿūl Buhūr der Mecālīs-i Sūr* (Gathering of the Seas on the Scenes of the Celebration) was prepared in Baghdad, and was meant to have paintings with nine blank pages left for illustration. Like the *Cāmiʿūl Buhūr der Mecālīs-i Sūr*, the composition of the *Menāḳīb-ī Hūnerverān* was also begun during the author’s time in Baghdad when he was appointed as finance director of the province. It was also in Baghdad that the bureaucrat made the acquaintance of several poets and painters. His 1581 *Nuṣḥatūs Selāṭīn* (Counsel for Sultans) too was illustrated, but left incomplete. This work was copied in Aleppo, where Mustafa ‘Āli was an administrator of provincial fiefs.

---

205 There are two illustrated copies of this work. One is at the British Library (Add. 22011) and has six paintings, paid by Muṣṭafa ‘Āli himself, according to Esra Akın-Kıvanç. The second copy, at the Topkapı Palace Museum Library (H. 1365), is the presentation copy and has forty-six paintings. On illustrated copies of the *Nuṣretnāme* see Emine Fetvacı, *Picturing History at the Ottoman Court* (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2013), esp. 193–209. Henceforth Fetvacı, *Picturing History at the Ottoman Court; Epic Deeds*, 23.

206 The presentation copy of this manuscript bears an illuminated dedicatory medallion in the name of Sultan Murād III and belongs to the Topkapı Palace Museum Library (B. 203). The text was written in 991 (1583).

207 Muṣṭafa ‘Āli was appointed as finance director in 1585 but before reaching his post he was dismissed. However, he stayed in Baghdad until 1586.


209 On Muṣṭafa ‘Ālī’s life and career see Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual*. In this work, Fleischer suggests that this book may have been prepared while Muṣṭafa ‘Āli was in Baghdad but the colophon of the manuscript (TPML R. 406) notes Aleppo as its place of production. In my opinion, the style of the paintings does not appear to be Baghdadi. However, this manuscript is interesting as it shows that Aleppo too was a place of art production, as also testified by the painted decoration of the Aleppo Room, now in the Pergamon Museum (I.2862).

In addition to the commission of these manuscripts, the author also endowed a fountain in Karbala where he spent some time in contemplation.  

Mustafa ʿĀli’s commissions of illustrated copies of his texts, albeit mostly incomplete, as well as his financial acumen and comments on the fledgling calligraphers and artists sketching in the dark of the night and copying works of famed calligraphers, suggest the wider participation of actors in the open art market. This is already at a point when “various members of the bureaucratic-military class and imperial household servants participated in the patronage and production of ... books.” While Mustafa ʿĀli’s comments in his *Menâkıb-i Hünerverân* quoted at the beginning of this chapter most likely refer to those artists, calligraphers and buyers in Istanbul, the Aleppine copies of the *Nuṣḥatî’s Selâṭîn* and *Nuṣretnâme* and the unfinished *Câmi‘ü’l Buhûr der Mecâlîs-i Sûr* also point to cities outside the capital, where artists could find work or patrons could find artists. Concurrently, illustrated and illuminated manuscripts from Shiraz found favor at the Ottoman court (as well as among Safavid and Turkmen governors), pointing to a broader art market that crossed boundaries between empires.

Mustafa ʿĀli’s comments as a connoisseur are grounded in the social and urban transformations of the late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth centuries, appearance of new places of gathering (such as the coffeehouse), interregional trade and exchange, and changing patterns of patronage. The subject of sub-royal patronage as well as new themes in painting and entertainment culture in the capital has been of recent interest to scholars of art and literature. The reason why this scholarship has concentrated on the capital is partly

---

211 Fetvacı, *Picturing History at the Ottoman Court*, 5.
212 On Shiraz painting see Lale Uluç, *Turkman Governors, Shiraz Artists and Ottoman Collectors: Sixteenth Century Shiraz Manuscript* (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası, 2006).
213 Major among these are the above-mentioned work by Fetvacı, *Picturing History at the Ottoman Court*; also by the same author “Love in the Album of Ahmed I,” *Journal of Turkish Studies* 34 (2010): 37–51; and
due to the wealth of manuscript and archival material in various manuscript libraries in
Istanbul and elsewhere.

The transformations of social and urban life and the increasing prevalence of
entertainment culture and new themes and tastes in art and literature inform a new kind of
painting, particularly in the form of single-page painting. The polysemy of single-page
paintings, whether on their own, in the immediate context of juxtaposition with a text, or in
the slightly wider context of the album or an “implied context,” allows multiple readings
of the whole, at times also combining the worldly and the religious.

Late-sixteenth-century social and urban transformation, described to some extent in
the previous chapter, paved the way to alternative means of acquiring wealth and prestige,
which in turn allowed for a broader base of patronage. Along with new audiences, new
subject matters and alternative ways of engaging with painting appeared in this period.

The Fālnāmeh (Book of Omens) of Ahmed I (r. 1603–1614), a book on divination, is a good
equation to book production and consumption. Fetvaci notes the

“Enriched Narrative and Empowered Images in Seventeenth Century Ottoman Manuscripts,” Art Orientalis 40
Görselin “Okunması:” İmgenin Ardındaki Hikayeler (Şehir Oğlanları ve İstanbul’un Meşhur Kadınılar) (Visual
Reading or Reading with Images? Visibility and Orality in Ottoman Manuscript Culture (City Boys and
Değirmenci, Osmanlı Tasvir Sanatında Görselin Okunması; Walter Andrews and Mehmet Kalpakli, The Age of
Beloveds: Love and the Beloved in Early Modern Ottoman and European Culture and Society (Durham: Duke
University Press, 2005).

214 I borrow this term from the work of Massumeh Farhad, “Safavid Single-page Painting, 1629–1666” (PhD

215 Fetvaci, Enriched Narratives.

216 The Fālnāmeh and an album named the Album of Ahmed I (TPML B. 408), also compiled by ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Muḥammad Bāṣa–
–that portrays single figure images and scenes from daily life and entertainment—can be seen in the context of a
rapid proliferation of coffeehouses that were introduced around 1550, where stories could be recited with
images and where puppet plays could be viewed, an image of which is given in the album. ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Muḥammad Bāṣa was a
close acquaintance of el-Ḥācc Muṣṭṭafa Ağa, the chief black eunuch, who had recommended him to the sultan
for the post of building supervisor for his mosque complex that was to be built. ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Muḥammad Bāṣa appears to be a
polymath almost. His various careers as margin-setter, treasurer, building supervisor and album compiler show
the fluidity between professions, as well as their inter-relation. As the building supervisor, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Muḥammad Bāṣa must
have been in close contact with the architect Muḥammad Ağa, one of Sinān’s pupils, and whose vita was composed
by the writer, Câfer Efendi. The autobiography of the architect Sinān, penned by his friend Şâ’il, who was also
a painter, further attests to the close relationship between painters, architects and writers.
increasing fluidity between courtly and popular art in the early seventeenth century, as well as a “merging of the hitherto separated spheres of creators and enjoyers of artworks.” The Fālnāmeh presented to Ahmed I is one such work that blends popular soothsaying and fortune-telling practices in courtly production. Its large scale suggests a different means of consumption, one that is immersed in the growing entertainment culture that also used large-scale images in the recitation of stories. The manuscript is structured in such a way as to have images on the right hand side, and the text corresponding to it on the left. The book would be opened randomly and the image and text interpreted accordingly. The Fālnāmeh and albums of painting and calligraphy as well as single-page paintings force us to rethink questions of text-image relations. The image, particularly the album image or the single-folio image, was no longer an “illustration” of a text anchored to a narrative. It acquired a life of its own, in response to and in tandem with an “implied context” that is shared by the cultural milieu that produced and consumed it or with popular stories that were current at the time.

While the Fālnāmeh of Ahmed I is a courtly example, the practice of using images for divination or storytelling was not confined to the court. Evliya Çelebi, in his mid-seventeenth-century travelogue mentions a certain Mehmed Çelebi, who had a shop in Mahmudpaşa, where he would hang large-scale images on the walls and read his clients’

---

217 Fetvacı, Enriched Narratives, 247.

fortunes through images and texts, not unlike the Fālnāmehs of Shah Tahmasp I (r. 1524–1576) and Ahmed I. Similar practices of divination took place in Isfahan in the Maydan-i Shah, as observed by Adam Olearius and Jean Chardin between the middle and late 1600s. The 1597 circumcision festival of the sons of the Ottoman vizier Mehmed Paşa provides another instance of the use of images in entertainment and storytelling. For the celebration, many court officials were gathered, and various unusual images of skillful masters were gazed upon, amid the activities of drinking and eating to musical accompaniment, followed by a fireworks display. More increasingly, in the late sixteenth century, we read of the use of paintings in entertainment and story recitation. More and more, paintings emerged from the more private sphere of royal gatherings (majālis) into the recently emerging alternative and more public sphere of the coffeehouse.

In addition to an entertainment culture, where paintings seem to have shared a common ground with poetry, shahrangīz (city-thriller) or shahrāshūb (city-disturber) literature in both Ottoman Turkish and Persian points also to the coffeehouse as a locale for

---


Fortune-telling shops also appear to be locales for gathering, in addition to baths and coffeehouses. For example, the sixteenth-century Ottoman poet Zātī kept a fortune-telling shop, which moonlighted as a literary salon where poets, such as Bākī would gather.


love affairs and social companionship.\textsuperscript{223} In the biographical entry for a poet named Sani, Mustafa Ṣāli writes that when Süleyman I forbade wine drinking, the poet was greatly saddened, to the extent that he composed a poem, mourning that he was now imprisoned in coffeehouses.\textsuperscript{224} Around the turn of the seventeenth century, however, the coffeehouse increased in popularity: a change marked, for example by an album painting depicting the interior of a coffeehouse (fig. 2.1).\textsuperscript{225} The bustling coffeehouse depicted in this album painting is frequented by youths wearing turbans with flowers tucked into the folds. There are thin daggers hanging from their belts, a social marker associated with the somewhat ambiguous çelebi status.\textsuperscript{226} Groups of youths play backgammon; some hold fans or books of poetry in their hands. One, wearing a dervish cap, is in the midst of composition, perhaps extemporizing poetry. The newly emerging and fast spreading coffeehouse provided an

\textsuperscript{223} On the newly arising themes of entertainment and transformations in poetry see Walter Andrews and Mehmet Kalpaklı, 	extit{The Age of Beloveds}.

\textsuperscript{224} Mustafa İşen, 	extit{Künhü-i Ahbar'ın Tezkire Kısımı} (Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Yayınları, 1994), 296–97. The Ottoman ruler Süleyman I’s ban on wine drinking and selling is represented in a painting in the 	extit{Tetimme-i Ahvâl-i Sülûtân Süleymân Hân} (CBL T. 413, fol. 9a). His ban, as well as a more austere religious fervor late in life can be compared with his contemporary Shah Tahmasp’s Edicts of Sincere Repentance, turning away from the arts, poetry and music, as well as closing down taverns and brothels.

This same poet Sani was also known for his invectives. When he was angered by a certain Haydarzade, he composed a raging invective about him: “Oh Sani, this is the satire [found] in Galata: / Haydar Reis’s son is a fool to the world / The sailors are always fucking him, back and forth / They say, that faggot’s ass is a landing ship" (\textit{Bu hicv-i şa'ırdâne Galatada Sâni'ye / Haydar re'ısı'n oğlu şu şi' anlık cihaneder / Her dem siker ‘azabâls bir varma gelmedür / Gıyâ ki götit ol kêkizûn tershâneder}). (I would like to thank Sooyong Kim for his help with this translation.)

This Haydarzade is the son of Haydar Re’is. According to the 	extit{tadhkira} (biographical dictionary) writer Beyâni, Haydar Re’is was a 	extit{muşâkhib} (boon companion) of the Ottoman ruler Selim II (r. 1566–1574). Beyâni writes that Haydar Re is, also known as Nigârî, would not leave the 	extit{majâlîs} (gatherings) of Selim II, just like wine would also not leave the 	extit{majâlîs}. ‘Aşık Çelebi, his contemporary, wrote that Nigârî lived in the Galata region of Istanbul and used to hold meetings and parties in his house with poets and learned men, and most often with a fair amount of wine and opiates involved. Haydar Re is was also a painter and a sailor, hence the pun on shipyards in the invective above.

Beyâni, 	extit{Tezkiretü’s Şû' arâ,} 299–300; ‘Aşık Çelebi, 	extit{Meşârü’i̇ ş-Şû' arâ,} 995–8.


alternative public sphere in addition to mosques and public baths. Cemal Kafadar points to the emergence of a new urban society and new forms of art and entertainment.\textsuperscript{227} The rise and popularity of the coffeehouse is integrated into these social and urban transformations.

An early-seventeenth-century story in prose, \textit{Dāstān-i Kiṣṣa-i Şâd ile ġâm} (The Story of Exulting and Sorrow) gives a sense of the vibrant city life in Istanbul.\textsuperscript{228} A sub-story embedded in this account tells of a coffeehouse in Egypt, where musicians played, coffee was served, and a storyteller told various stories. This storyteller was so good that he could be compared with the renowned storytellers of Bursa, or with a certain Şekerci Salih, who was still telling stories in coffeehouses in Istanbul.\textsuperscript{229} An early-seventeenth-century illustrated copy of the translation of Abdurrahman Bistami’s (d. 1453) \textit{Miṣfāḥ al-Jafr al-Jāmi’} (Key to the Comprehensive Prognosticon) on divination through characters, and signs of Doomsday, depicts a view of the Nile (fig. 2.2).\textsuperscript{230} Two boats pass full of men (and a woman) drinking coffee. On the banks of the Nile, a group of men have gathered in two structures lined by palm trees and on the shore, also drinking coffee. The painting represents a view of Cairo and the Nile as described by the author (\textit{mü’ellif bu mahalde Kāhire’ni niğ ve Nil’ini şüretleri niş ve tâşvîr itmişdir}), as well as illustrating a metaphor reported by `Ali


\textsuperscript{228} This tale tells the story of Mehmed Bey, who arrives in Istanbul from Ereğli and falls in love with Ferruhdil. The two lovers are captured by European corsairs, and taken to different households (Ferruhdil to a court in “Françe,” and Mehmed Bey to a monastery in “İspaniye”). The lovers are later reunited with the help of Algerian corsairs. In Istanbul, however, Mehmed Bey meets an acquaintance, ‘Ali Efendi, who takes him around Istanbul. They go from Cincimeydanı where they watch men playing \textit{cirid}, to Cundimeyda mı where they watch some sort of a hunting game between two parties named the Okras (\textit{bamyali}) and the Cabbages (\textit{lahanalı}). They frequent the bazaars, go to Eyüb, Unkapanı, and visit all the must-see sights. Şükrü Elçin, “Dastan-i Kiṣṣa-i Şad ile ġâm-Ferruhdil ile Mehmed Bey’in Hikayesi,” \textit{Türk Araştırmaları}, XV/1-2, (1976): 167–207.

\textsuperscript{229} Ibid., 190–1.

b. Abi Talib likening humankind to passengers on a ship. That an aspect of daily life, one that must have been recently in vogue, is included in this painting representing Cairo and the Nile, where it is not called for in the text, suggests both the popularity of coffee-drinking and socializing (particularly with an aspect of seeing and being seen by the riverside) and a possible warning of such activities of leisure given the increasing concerns over Doomsday.

Another painting in this manuscript and one in a slightly earlier copy of the same text show men and women seated on a rug outside, under the shade of trees, drinking and playing musical instruments (figs. 2.3–4). In this instance, the two paintings (appearing in the same place within the text) are allegories for the sufferings of the impious, who will be left on earth to face the Apocalypse after a wind will deliver the souls of the true believers to safety. Paintings of outdoor entertainment in a similar style appear in two contemporary albums (figs. 2.5–6). One (in an album prepared for Ahmed I) (fig. 2.5) depicts five women in nature, reading and drinking. This is juxtaposed to a painting of a female dancer and a couple embracing on the lower half of the page, and a Persian quatrain copied by Muhammad Amin al-Katib al-Haravi in Mecca above. The other (fig. 2.6) is found in an album at the Chester Beatty Library, which also includes the coffeehouse scene mentioned above (fig. 2.1). This page juxtaposes a painting of several men seated, arms linked, listening to music in nature with Arabic verses attributed to ʿAli b. Abi Talib surrounding the painting, and two paintings of Europeans on the lower half of the page.

231 *Tercüme-i Miştāh-i Cifrūʾl Câmiʾ*, TPML B. 373, fols. 243a–244b, IUL T. 6624, fol. 100b.


233 The first bayt appears in Qâdî ʿAlâm’s *Khulāṣat al-Tawârîkh* (Abstract of History) in a poem that appears in the account of Süleymân I’s victory at Szigetvár (1566) and the capture of booty and captives. I have not been able to identify the second bayt. Perhaps it is an example of Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī’s complaint of random placement of qīlʾ as.

In terms of the calligrapher of this work, Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī mentions a Mollâ Hajî Mirak of Bukhara, known as Muḥammad Amin as among the pupils of Mir ʿAlî Haravî. Whether this calligrapher is the one mentioned by Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī is not clear. Another calligrapher named Muḥammad Amin is a pupil of Mawlânâ Muḥammad Baqir (son of Mir ʿAlî Haravî).

That the impious, who will face the pains of the Apocalypse are associated with men and women drinking and listening to music in nature and enjoying themselves suggests possible alternative readings to the album paintings as well. Tülay Artan raises a similar point in her discussion of entertainment scenes in an illustrated hunting treatise prepared for Ahmed I, where such scenes of self-indulgence may also be viewed with a certain sense of warning.234 Paintings of entertainment, wine and coffee drinking, can thus reflect both the changing social and urban culture and act as a warning against worldly temptations. A similar juxtaposition of the worldly (and particularly of financial activity) and the religious, can also be observed in sixteenth-century Antwerp, where “everyday subjects ... were often produced in combination with a sacred subject.”235 We can note the preoccupation with the precarious state of the coffeehouse not only in painting but in text as well. Mustafa ʿĀli writes, for example, that Cairo is notable for the multitude of its coffeehouses. He finds the invigorating aspect of coffee useful for religious worship, particularly in the morning. Thus, “early rising worshippers and pious men get up and go [there], drink a cup of coffee adding life to their life. They feel, in a way, that its slight exhilaration strengthens them for their religious observance and worship.”236 However, he also voices concern over the assembly of the ignorant and parasites and opium-eaters in coffeehouses.237

Concern over worldly temptations aside, these paintings also reflect and are informed by current urban transformations. Thus, a mid-seventeenth-century poet writes:

“the heart fancies neither coffee, nor coffeehouse / the heart fancies companionship, coffee

---


237 Ibid.
is an excuse.”

The coffeehouse, then, despite (or perhaps in addition to) Mustafa ‘Āli’s somewhat puritanical judgments, also becomes a place of companionship, and of poetic and artistic discourse. An oft-quoted anecdote about Sadiqi Beg (d. 1610), painter and librarian to the Safavid shah Abbas I (r. 1587–1629) points to the mobility of works, the persona of the artist, as well as the financial conditions/effects of the art market:

I wrote a qasīda in praise of Sadiqi and went to recite it in the coffeehouse. The qasīda had not yet come to an end, when [Sadiqi] seized it from me and said, “I don’t have patience to listen to more than this!” Getting up after a moment, he tossed down five tomans bound in a cloth, along with pieces of paper on which he had executed black-line drawings. He gave them to me and said: “Merchants buy each page of my work for three tomans. They take them to Hindustan. Don’t sell them any cheaper!” Then he excused himself several times and went out.

Here, the coffeehouse also becomes a locus of artistic and poetic exchange. Sadiqi Beg, who also composed a biographical dictionary, Majma’ al-Khawāṣṣ (The Concourse of the Elites) and a treatise on painting Qānūn al-Ṣuwar (Canons of Painting) begins the latter by noting how, from a military background, he found his “true vocation in art.” More and more, like the example of Sadiqi Beg, we can observe (particularly in the Safavid case) the identity and persona of the artist through signed single-page paintings and drawings. Like Mustafa ‘Āli, Sadiqi Beg—a decade after the Menākb-i Hünerverān—also writes that he composed this treatise at the instigation of a friend who was also deeply drawn to art. The enterprising sensitivity that Sadiqi Beg shows in the quote above is akin to Mustafa ‘Āli’s perspective in the Menākb-i Hünerverān, in which he considers himself to be a knowledgeable

---


connoisseur of the arts, and provides insight into art appraisal. Additionally, Sadiqi Beg is a practicing artist, who had found his calling in art. To these two works one can also add the biographical dictionary of painters and calligraphers, *Gulistân-i Hunar* (Rosegarden of Talent), by the Safavid author and historian, Qadi Ahmad.\(^{241}\)

When read together with the narrative sources of the period, as well as the biographical dictionaries of artists and calligraphers and Sadiqi Beg’s treatise on painting and the call for his “true vocation in art,” one sees the increased mobility of works and artists, and the emergence of a market, where the images also form part of an entertainment culture and social gatherings, now more so in coffeehouses than in royal gatherings (though not necessarily excluding the latter). Cemal Kafadar points out that:

> By the end of the sixteenth century, … [g]uilds, with their monopolistic practices, established their umbrella over the artisanal world. Migrations to the city had created a second tier of producers and laborers who remained outside the guild framework as petty tradesmen or daily wage laborers; the majority of these *lumpenesnaf* seem to have remained also outside the framework of family (and *mahalle ?*) life, residing in the bachelors’ inns (*bekar odalari*). Many of them established links with the Janissary corps while it was increasingly expected (and eventually also accepted) that a growing number of Janissaries would be engaged in some trade, within or outside the guild system. The urban society flourished with new forms of sociability and entertainment, as exemplified by the coffeehouses and Karagöz.\(^{242}\)

Given the migrant populations that the city attracted (also reflected by Ferruh Bey in the above-mentioned story *Dastân-i Kişsa-i Şâd ile Ğâm*) and the laborers that remained outside the guild structure and decreased courtly patronage of illustrated manuscripts, one wonders whether the transformations in art and the changes in visual taste have to do with a loosening of the bureaucratization of art production at the court.\(^{243}\) Kafadar also points to


\(^{242}\) Kafadar, *Riffraff*, 119.

\(^{243}\) In response to Sultan Süleyman I’s wishes to renew the Byzantine water conduits, the grand vizier Semiz ʿAli Paşa responds that should more water be brought to all areas of Istanbul more people would rush to the city, and it would be difficult to provide for the people. Villagers would leave their lands and move to Istanbul, leaving the lands fallow. He notes that this would cause further problems in the future. After reporting the grand
the coincidence of new forms of urbanization, the spread of coffeehouses, the use of the nighttime and new forms of entertainment.\textsuperscript{244} Likewise, alternative voices to the official şehnāmeci were also vocalized in this period, as marked by the plethora of illustrated manuscripts dedicated to the deeds of campaign leaders or high court officials, a point raised by Fetvacı.\textsuperscript{245} The changing subject matter from illustrated histories and genealogies to scenes of daily life or entertainment and to compilations of stories speak to a changing taste and a changing market. They also reflect and form the particularities of transformations taking place in the early seventeenth century. Similar shifts in the conception of the image, a looser and perhaps more complicated relationship between text and image, a more humorous and witty approach to painting and an emphasis on originality in the “new style” (şīve-i tāze or tāzehgū твор) of poetry can be observed in both Ottoman and Safavid settings.\textsuperscript{246} These transformations can be aligned not simply to the specific contexts of the two empires but viewed in relation to early modern sensibilities that are shared but executed differently.

Massumeh Farhad notes that:

… No longer strictly bound by royal taste and aesthetic preferences, the genre shifted its focus from the idealized world of princes and legendary heroes of literary texts to that of stylized yet recognizable and sophisticated figures derived from Safavid contemporary society. The handsome youth typifying those encountered in coffeehouses, the beautiful Georgian woman, the seductive courtesan and even the roguish but learned middle-aged man belonged to a world that non-royal patrons knew best.\textsuperscript{247}

\textsuperscript{244} Kafadar, \textit{How Dark is the History of the Night}.

\textsuperscript{245} See Fetvaci, \textit{Picturing History at the Ottoman Court}, and by the same author \textit{Enriched Narratives}.


\textsuperscript{247} Farhad, \textit{Safavid Single-page Painting}, 256.
While depicted differently, and more so through the medium of drawings, this shift in genre is similar to a shift in subject matter observed in Ottoman paintings in this same period. Both seem to be engrained in an entertainment culture (or its implicit dangers), in the companionship and discourse of coffeehouses, in artistic and poetic competition on a commercial level. The changing subject matters of the early-seventeenth-century drawings, as well as their humor and originality and play on earlier models all find parallels in the new style of contemporary poetry. The innovative subject matters and the self-awareness of painters and poets speak to an enhanced sense of originality and can be matched to the tāze-gūʿī (fresh speech) of poetry.

From the late-sixteenth to the early-seventeenth centuries, in both the Ottoman and Safavid empires, we see a broadening base of patronage, a change in subject matter and format from the codex to the single-page, as well as an awareness of the identity of the artist and the value of the art work. The loosening relationship of the nakkāṣ and ṣehnāmeṣi, the loosening of the artistic and physical ties of artists to a kitābkhāneḥ, as well as the idea of originality in poetry, fluidity between courtly and popular art, and the proliferation of entertainment culture, trade and interactions with other cultures hint at the changes in visuality in the Ottoman and Safavid empires. Added to this, the movement of artists, paintings and manuscripts makes for a more fluid and complicated image of what is considered to be “typical” Ottoman or Safavid art.

---

248 While itinerancy was endemic to the artists’ and calligraphers’ careers and a feature of their lives alternated by periods of settled and continuous patronage, the richer sources of the 1500s and 1600s record these effects more clearly. For example, ʿAbdullah Shirāzī, a well-known mudhahbih (illuminator) and rawgānī (lacquerer), and close friend of the Safavid prince Ibrāhīm Mirzā (d. 1577), worked briefly for Shāh Ismāʿīl II after the death of Ibrāhīm Mirzā; he then served as farrāsh (carpet spreader) at the shrine of Imām Rīza in Mashhad, and moved to Khurasan to continue his profession. In the 1550s, at a time when artists were in less demand, with Shāh Ṭahmāsp I’s (r. 1524-1576) withdrawal from the arts, Sādiq Beg, for example, traveled to Baghdad and Aleppo, dressed as a dervish, and in Aleppo, he met the Ottoman poet Bākī. A good number of Persian artists and calligraphers also traveled to the Ottoman court in search of employment. Muṣliḥuddin Lārī (d. 1572), whose accounts of Shāh Ismāʿīl and Shāh Ṭahmāsp have been reproduced in the Ankara Silsilenāmeḥ discussed in Chapter 5, is another example of an itinerant scholar. He left the Safavid court for India. After the death of the Mughal emperor Humāyun, Muṣliḥuddin Lārī traveled to Aleppo, Istanbul, Baghdad, and finally settled in Diyarbekir. In the Ahsan al-Tawārikh (Most Beautiful of Histories), the author Ḥasan Beg Rūmlū points out that
The disparate images/texts set within a frame from a page in the *Album of Ahmed I* (fig. 2.7), raise the issue of artistic interaction between the Ottomans and Safavids. On the top left is what appears to be a cartoon for a Turcoman looking image, possibly with color annotations (fig. 2.8). To its right, at the top, is a Safavid looking, unfinished, drawing (fig. 2.9). Below this is another drawing, probably based on a Timurid design but with Safavid-type horses (fig. 2.10). On the bottom is another Safavid drawing, again with color notations (fig. 2.11). To the bottom left sits a youth while a man offers him pomegranates; the youth, again slightly Safavid looking, particularly in the details of the eyes, hair and headgear, but the image as a whole appears to be an Ottoman study, or perhaps a Safavid provincial copy (fig. 2.12). To the right, a calligraphic sample and a partial textblock, both in Persian, line these images, while at the top and bottom is a text in Ottoman chancellery hand.

The album, from which this page is taken, was made for Ahmed I, some time before 1616, when its compiler Kalender Paşa died. Several sources from the early-seventeenth century note that Kalender Paşa was of the çavuş (sergeant) rank; that he had been the mütevelli (director of the foundation) of sultanic waqfs; and that he was the second treasurer, and building supervisor of the Sultan Ahmed mosque. Kalender Paşa was also renowned for his skills in setting margins. He writes in the preface to the *Album of Ahmed I* that he had

---

Muşlihuddin Lārī was a pupil of Amir Ghiyāšuddin Maşûr. Another pupil of Amir Ghiyāšuddin Maşûr was Mawlānā Qūṭbuddin Baghdādī. David Roxburgh and Esra Akın-Kıvanç note that this Mawlānā Qūṭbuddin Baghdādī is not the same person mentioned in Muṣṭafa ʿAllī’s *Menākbī-i Hünerverān*, Mawlānā Qūṭbuddin Yazdī, whom the author met in Baghdad.

Moreover, that Derviş Mehmed’s musician Pīrzāde Ahmed Çelebi, discussed in Chapter 1, found patronage at the court of Shāh ʿAbbās I when the latter conquered Baghdad, shows the broad possibility of employment of artists and scholars.


---

Ḳalender Paşa was also responsible for another album, a calligraphy album (TPML H. 2171), and the Fānlāmeh, also made for Ahmed I. On the career of Kalender Paşa see Serpl Bağcı, *Presenting Vassal Kalender’s Works*, and Fetvaci, *Enriched Narratives*, 245–7.
compiled and set the images in multi-color frames.\textsuperscript{250} The images and samples of calligraphy in the album were brought to the sultan as gifts, or as samples of artists asking for the sultan’s favor.\textsuperscript{251} Kalender Paşa’s preface to the \textit{Album of Ahmed I} also emphasizes the changing role (and power) of images, a point raised by Fetvaci.\textsuperscript{252}

One of the many interesting things about the \textit{Album of Ahmed I} is the relative cohesiveness of the album as a totality. That is to say, while the individual images seem to be from different sources, ranging from Timurid to Safavid to purely Ottoman, the majority of the paintings appear to be have been copied from originals. The album contains calligraphic samples, illuminations, and pages from a manuscript that seems to be contemporary with the album. The album also includes portraits of sultans, who are identified by name; single figures that are reminiscent of images from costume albums (fig. 2.13); images of Safavids and Europeans, albeit mostly rendered in an Ottoman hand; and newly introduced themes of popular entertainment and humor (fig. 2.14).

A painting of a white bearded flute player seated on a Savonarola chair attests to the movement and copying of paintings (figs. 2.15–16), where the figure is reversed and details of his garment slightly altered. In addition, an inscription on a drawing belonging to the Harvard Art Museums identifies a seated, contemplative figure holding a book in one hand as Hafiz of Shiraz (fig. 2.17). A similar, painted figure appears in the \textit{Album of Ahmed I} (fig. 2.18). Here, the figure in the painting is reversed and situated in a mountainous landscape. Likewise, a tinted drawing also appears in an album in the Bibliothèque nationale de France (O.D. 41, fol. 24) (fig. 2.19). That the Harvard folio identifies the figure as Hafiz suggests that the figures, which appear in the \textit{Album of Ahmed I} and the Paris Album may have also been known among album’s contemporary viewers. This inference is supported by the

\textsuperscript{250} TPML B. 408, fols. 3a–b.

\textsuperscript{251} See Fetvaci, \textit{Enriched Narratives}, 246 and by the same author, \textit{The Album of Ahmed I}.

\textsuperscript{252} Fetvaci, \textit{The Album of Ahmed I}, esp. 128–9.
appearance of inscriptions found in an album belonging to the British Library (Or. 2709), where figures are identified by name, some of which are tied to well-known contemporary stories.

For example, two warriors in single combat are identified by their names, Bediʿ and Kasım (fig. 2.20). Bediʿ and Kasım are characters in a popular story. The eighteenth-century work by Ismaʿil Beliğ, Güldeste-i Riyāż-ı Īrfān (Bouquet of Meadows of Knowing), immortalizes a feud that took place during the recitation of the story of Bediʿ and Kasım in the year 1025 (1616). In this year, in Bursa, a storyteller was reciting the story and the listeners sided with either Bediʿ or Kasım. The poet Hayli Çelebi, who was partially blind, was among those excitedly rooting for Kasım. The storyteller Saçakçızade retorted to Hayli Çelebi’s cheering for Kasım, by saying “With what eye did you see him [win]?” Greatly angered by the storyteller Saçakçızade’s jesting, Hayli Çelebi pierced Saçakçızade’s belly with a dagger and killed him then and there.253 That the combatant figures in the British Library Album are identified as the two warriors in the popular story suggests that other paintings and drawings preserved in albums may also be tied to popular stories. This points to alternative ways of engaging with the paintings, where they become objects of discussion and entertainment themselves, as well as feeding from that same culture. The Album of Ahmed I in particular embodies the newly arising entertainment culture (and as with the examples of entertainment scenes in the Tercüme-i Miftāḥ-ı Cifrū‘l Cāmi‘, possible worries about it) and alternative ways of engaging with images and with non-narrative text and with stories. In this album, Ottoman renditions of Persian paintings and drawings as well as an

interest in various figure types, from Europeans to Safavids, exemplify the interconnectedness of geographies where artists, paintings and objects moved.

**From the Capital to the Province**

Mustafa ʿĀli’s biases and personal grudges aside (for elsewhere, the author greatly disparages the court artists and artisans), the latter years of the sixteenth century and the first quarter of the seventeenth century are marked by a change in patronage relations, in the taste, consumption and reception of art, the conception of the image, and a shift from the manuscript to the album and the single-folio. In this period a different kind of rivalry took place between artists and poets, with paintings vying with poems on a more immediate, and perhaps also commercial, level. More and more works were signed (whether authentic or not), works of well-known artists were copied, and a greater number of drawings and single-folio images were produced speculatively.

Mustafa ʿĀli’s comments on the newly emerging artists hurriedly sketching in the dark of the night and trying to sell their sketches, and the newly rich trying to get their hands on calligraphies, paintings and drawings embody urban and social transformations and point to a market for art production and consumption. Chapter 1 remarked further on social and economic transformations in the late sixteenth century, from currency devaluation to Celali uprisings and alternative means of acquiring wealth and power. Social and economic transformations allowed for upward mobility and increase in wealth (for some). The lessening of royal patronage in the Ottoman and Safavid contexts too allowed for sub-royal patrons as well as provincial governors and local elites to act as patrons of art and architecture.

The social and economic transformations observed in the capital in the late-sixteenth century were also felt in Baghdad as well. The art market in Baghdad, which emerged in the
late-sixteenth century, can be seen as a reflection of these broader changes. As contemporary
and slightly later authors such as Mustafa b. Mulla Rıdvan, Nazmizade Murtaza and Louis
Gedoyn show, several governors as well as upstarts in Baghdad acquired great amounts of
wealth. Elvendzade ’Ali Paşa’s (d. 1598) son Arslan Beg (d. 1625–26) remained in Baghdad
after his father’s death and was among the household of Derviş Mehmed, son of Mehmed
Kanber, leader of the ’azeb.254 By “failing” to send tax yields to the capital, Derviş
Mehmed, and through him, Arslan Beg, had become affluent.255 The botanist and physician
Leonhard Rauwolff and the French consul Louis Gedoyyn also point to the wealth of
governors. The former notes the “covetousness” of the governor and of customs officials.256
Control of transit trade and collecting tax and its abuse provided possible opportunities for
increasing one’s wealth. The latter notes the wealth of governor Kadızade ’Ali Paşa, which,
according to Gedoyyn, the governor acquired during his office in Baghdad.257

Additionally, governors Sokolluzade Hasan Paşa and Hadım Yusuf Paşa were known
to be patrons of illustrated manuscripts. In particular, Sokolluzade Hasan Paşa’s grandiose
personality and interest in illustrated manuscripts (discussed further in Chapter 4), seems to

---

254 Abdul-Rahim Abu Husayn in his study on provincial leadership in Syria points to the complex links between
provincial leaders. He writes that following the death of Yûsuf Sayfî in 1625, Muṣṭaفا Paşa b. Iskender, who
was appointed as governor of Tripoli, collaborated with Fâkhr al-Dîn Ma‘n against the Sayfas, who, under
Yûsuf Sayfî had been the power-holders in Tripoli for almost a century. Yûsuf Sayfî’s nephew, Sulaymân
Sayfî, was killed by the bedouin chief Mudlîj al-Hayari, with whom he had sought refuge in Salamiyya. The
bedouin chief had been an ally of Hâfîz Ahmed Paşa in his attempts to regain Baghdad from the Safavids.

In the meantime, Arslan Paşa (at the time, district governor of Ma‘arra, and formerly district governor
of Hîlla, and importantly, son of the above-mentioned Elvendzade ’Ali Paşa) was also in Salamiyya and was
suspected of acting against the Ottomans, and of siding with the governor-turned-rebel Abaza Mehmed Paşa.
The bedouin chief was ordered by Hâfîz Ahmed Paşa to execute Arslan Beg and Sulaymân Sayfî in 1625–26.

Abdul-Rahim Abû–Huşayn, Provincial Leadership in Syria, 1575–1650 (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University
Press, 1985), 55–6; MuṣṭaFa b. Mulla Raﬂvan el-Bağdâdi, Târîh-i Fitihname-yi Bagdad, Bodleian Or. 276, fols.
98b–100a.

255 Ibid.

256 Leonhard Rauwolff, A Collection of Curious Travels and Voyages. In Two Tomes. The First Containing Dr.
L. Rauwolff’s Itinerary into the Eastern Countries, as Syria, Palestine, etc., 179; Justin Marozzi, “Of Turks and

have provided a boost to the local art market in Baghdad, also drawing artists and artisans from elsewhere (possibly including Shiraz and Qazvin) seeking employment. In addition to the patronage of Ottoman governors and an otherwise unidentified Turkmen official, Imam Virdi Beg b. Alparslan Beg Dhu’l Qadr, there are numerous illustrated manuscripts that do not contain notes of attribution. Close to a dozen illustrated genealogies were produced in the span of a few years and several of them contain notes of well wishes on the reader.\textsuperscript{258} Multiple copies of illustrated manuscripts of the \textit{Hadikatü’s-Sü’edā} (Garden of the Blessed) of Fuzuli (d. 1556) and the \textit{Maḳtel-i Âl-i Resūl} (Killing of the Prophet’s Family) of Lami’i Çelebi (d. 1533), with similar size, binding and paintings also point to the interest in such works of popular religious stories, which were most likely prepared for a speculative market. This material is the subject of the next chapter.

It is in the wider background of social and urban transformation, entertainment culture, and broadening base of patronage and alternative ways of engaging with painting that I will now analyze several albums belonging to the Topkapı Palace Museum Library, which contain paintings and calligraphic samples made in Baghdad. These paintings have so far escaped scholarly attention. While studies on painting in Baghdad, such as the seminal \textit{Miniature Painting in Ottoman Baghdad}, and Çağman and Tanındı’s work on painting in Mawlawi shrines emphasize the popular religious nature of the majority of illustrated manuscripts produced in Baghdad at the end of the sixteenth century, these album paintings point to the coexistence of the spiritual and the worldly, and reflect the changing subject matters in painting in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.\textsuperscript{259} These single

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{259} Rachel Milstein, \textit{Miniature Painting in Ottoman Baghdad}; Filiz Çağman, “XVI. Yüzyıl Sonlarında Mevlevi Dergahlarında Gelişen bir Minyatür Okulu” in \textit{I. Milletlerarası Türkoloji Kongresi} (İstanbul: Tercüman Gazetesi ve Türkiye Enstitüsü, 1979), 651–77.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}

Single-page Paintings from Baghdad

As H. 2149 has not been studied previously, I will briefly describe its contents and then concentrate on material from Baghdad in connection with another Topkapı album, H. 2133-4. H. 2149 has a simple, marbled-paper-lined board binding, which possibly dates to the eighteenth century. There is as yet no information as to when, or by whom, this album was compiled. There are no notes of ownership except for a seal on a calligraphic sample on folio 42a, which belongs to a certain el-Fakir Ahmed bin Halil, whose identity I have not been able to determine.

The album presently opens with the left side of an illuminated carpet page taken from a manuscript of the Shāh u Dervīsh (The Shah and the Dervish) of Hilali Chaghatayi (d. 1529–30). This is the left hand side of a double-folio composition, the right hand side of which is not present in the album. Surrounding the central compositions in this album (be they of calligraphy or painting) is a border of rectangular cartouches cut and pasted, mainly containing verses from the Shāh u Dervīsh, as well as the Makhzan al-Asrār (The Treasury of Secrets) of Nizami (for example on folio 6a). In addition to the persistent use of the text of the Shāh u Dervīsh throughout, there is a certain coherence in this album with a dominance of compositions of school or majlis scenes as well as scenes from the story of Yūsuf u Zulaykhā (fols. 15a, 15b, 20a, 20b, figs. 2.26–28). The album also includes samples of calligraphy and Safavid paintings and drawings from mid-sixteenth to the early-

seventeenth centuries. In addition, H. 2149 contains several paintings that can be attributed to Baghdad. I will concentrate on these paintings found in this album and in several other Topkapı albums.

Following the opening lines of the Shāh u Dervīšh, the next page includes several lines of text from the sayings by the eleventh-century Khorasani Sufi master ‘Abdullah Ansari (d. 1088). Facing this page is a sample of calligraphy by ’Ali al-Katib (the text of which can be found in H. 2145 as well, which was copied by Husayn al-Tabrizi) (fols. 1b-2a). Next, a painting depicting a school scene appears on folio 2b (fig. 2.21). This painting of students encircling a teacher is juxtaposed with the text of the Shāh u Dervīšh of Hilali. On the left margin we see the exterior of the mosque, where the scene is taking place.

A mu‘azzin is voicing the call to prayer on the balcony, while a youth looks out from a parted door below. This is juxtaposed, on the facing page, to a text describing a battle in the center, and verses from the Shāh u Dervīšh surrounding the central composition.

In this album there is another composition portraying a scene of conversation and learning on folio 7a (fig. 2.22). In this painting, a white-bearded man and a middle-aged man sit on a rug inside. They have books, an inkwell and a pen-case before them. A pair sits to

261 Calligraphic samples in this album feature verses from the works of eleventh-century Khurasani Sufi shaykh and exegete ‘Abdullah Ansārī, mid-tenth/early-eleventh century Persian Sufi poet Abū Sa‘id Fazlullah bin Abū l-Khayr Aḥmad, twelfth-century poet Nizāmī and sixteenth-century Safavid author Mīr Qārī Gilānī and other unidentified works. In terms of the choice for texts and calligraphers whose works are included, there is a certain overlap between H. 2145 and H. 2149. For example, verses by Abū Sa‘id Abū l’Khayr are also included in H. 2145. This poet was also among the sources of Muḥammad Tāhir’s Cūmī i’s-Siyer (Collection of Biographies), discussed in Chapter 4. In terms of paintings in H. 2149, there seems to be an emphasis on school scenes or scenes of preaching and conversation. This is something we encounter quite often in Baghdad painting from the late-sixteenth century, particularly in illustrated works of popular religious literature, which will be discussed in the next chapter. H. 2149 includes samples of calligraphy by calligraphers such as ’Alī al-Kātib, Sultān ’Alī al-Mashhādī, Muḥammad Aḥmad b. Ibrāhīm al-Mudhahhīb, Aḥmad al-Ḥusaynī, Fakhr ’Alī and Mu izz al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Ḥusaynī. There are several examples from the work of Mu‘izz al-Dīn al-Ḥusaynī, which also appear in H. 2145 (fols. 5a, 5b, 10a, 38b, 41b). For another work by this calligrapher see Sīfat al-ʿAshīqīn, dated 978 (1570–71) (Walters Art Museum W. 656). More research needs to be done on albums and on the choice of calligraphies, whether we can discern a particular choice as to content, calligrapher, style of writing, but it is worth noting that H. 2145 also contains an excerpt from the text of the Sīfat al-ʿAshīqīn of Hilālī-yi Chagātāyī, the author of the Shāh u Dervīšh featured in H. 2149.

262 For a comparison see the Shāh u Dervīšh dated ca. 1530, presently at the Konya Mevlana Müzesi (İhtisas Kütüphanesi 2547, fol. 14a). For a reproduction of this painting see Serpil Bağcı, Konya Mevlana Müzesi Resimli Elyazmaları (İstanbul: MAS Matbaacılık, 2003), 57.
their left while another group has books laid before them or held in their hands. There seems to be some commotion at the lower left, where a man dressed in yellow stands between two others, about to step inside with one foot on the cartouche below containing a verse from the Shāh u Dervīsh, the text of which surrounds the painting. Note the figure dressed in red and green, portrayed partly from the back and in profile. Figures portrayed in profile, from the back, or looking directly at the viewer, and in lively interaction with others abound in paintings from Baghdad.

Another painting from H. 2149 (fig. 2.23) can be linked to the Topkapı Palace album, H. 2133-4 (fig. 2.52), both in terms of style and in terms of the surrounding text from the Shāh u Dervīsh. In the former, a cross-legged, seated ruler appears to be in conversation with a bearded man dressed in green. A youth wearing a long-sleeved red and yellow garment stands on the right, while an attendant brings a bare-footed dervish-like captive on the lower left. Two vases with flowers stand on either side of a pool. In several audience scenes in the Baghdad style, there appear vases and bouquets of flowers, such as in fig. 2.52. On the top and bottom of the composition are verses from the Shāh u Dervīsh. These paintings as well as those on folios 8b, 10b, 11a, 19a, 27a and 58b in H. 2149 can be attributed to Baghdad based on style. They feature animated figures wearing wide turbans; some of the figures have almond shaped eyes and thin, arched eyebrows like the figures, which will be mentioned below (figs. 2.48–51 and 55). Several of the young figures in Baghdad painting are depicted with slanting but somewhat stocky bodies (for example the youth on fol. 33a or the dark-skinned man on fol. 54b (figs. 4.13–14) in the Cāmiʿü’s-Sīyer (Collection of Biographies)). In addition, the color palette appears to be darker with deep hues.

Most of the Baghdadi paintings in H. 2149 portray scenes of conversation, mostly with books, either in a garden (fig. 2.24) or inside as in folios 10b–11a (fig. 2.25). Note in
the painting on folio 8b (fig. 2.24) the dark green hue of the grassy hill dotted with flowers and the golden background, a color scheme often encountered in single-folio paintings from Baghdad. Scenes of gatherings in an interior or a mosque are also common compositions in illustrated works from Baghdad. We will encounter these in many of the compositions in works of popular literature, which will be discussed in the next chapter.

In addition to these there are several paintings from the story of Yūsuf u Zulaykhā (figs. 2.26–28), albeit removed from their text; a painting depicting Solomon enthroned among divs and beasts, together with Asaf and Belqis (fig. 2.29); and a painting showing Rustam, the hero from the Shāhnāma, lifting Bizhan from the pit (fig. 2.30), in a style comparable to a late-sixteenth-century Shāhnāma brought to the Topkapı treasury from the collection of the son of the grand vizier Sinan Paşa, or the Eckstein Shāhnāma (particularly note the handling of the cloud formations). In addition to these narrative scenes, there are also paintings and drawings of youths that are not linked to a particular narrative, but which in the present location of the album may provoke various readings, such as a male and a female placed on facing pages and making burn marks on their bared forearms (fig. 2.32), or two drawings of hunters (fig. 2.33). The text around both of these compositions is from various sections of the Shāh u Dervīsh.

Another Topkapı album, H. 2145, bears certain similarities to H. 2149 in terms of the choices of texts, calligraphers and drawings and paintings—mostly drawings and paintings of youths in the manner of Walijan, Riza ‘Abbasi (fig. 2.34) and Muhammad Qasim (fig. 2.35)—and of course, the inclusion of paintings that can be stylistically attributed to

---

263 This manuscript (TPML H. 1487) can also be seen in line with a group of Qiṣṣa al-Anbiyā’ manuscripts from the last quarter of the sixteenth century. One can note the dark purple outline of pinkish hills in some paintings in these manuscripts, or the cloud formations seen in the album painting and a painting showing Rustam Killing Sohrab in H. 1487 (fig. 2.31).


264 Massumeh Farhad attributes this drawing to Muhammad Qāsim. This composition resembles another drawing by this painter, which portrays a standing youth carrying a tray of cups (Bibliothèque nationale de
Baghdad. I will discuss the material from Baghdad contained in this album in line with H. 2133-4 as well as two illustrated manuscripts copied in Karbala.

As with H. 2149, we do not know when or by whom this album was compiled. There are presently no signs of ownership except for an illegible seal on folio 10a. H. 2145 has a brown leather binding that is partly covered with a fine brocaded, orange and red cloth with a leaf design, with the edges of the leather binding decorated with a chain design in painted gold. The marbled-paper doublure is matched with a marbled endpaper. The album opens with a double-folio painting of an outdoor encampment scene in Safavid style that can be attributed to the last quarter of the sixteenth century. The album mainly consists of calligraphic pieces and several paintings, one of which can be attributed to Baghdad based on style (fig. 2.48).

Most of the calligraphic examples in H. 2145 are signed. Calligraphers whose works are included are: Ahmad al-Ḥusaynī, Sultan ʿAlī, Ḥajji Muḥammad, Muʿizz al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Ḥusaynī Qāsim, Muḥammad Qāsim, Muḥammad al-Kātib, Yārī, Ḥasan ʿAlī al-Mashhādī, Shāh Muḥammad Nishābūrī, Muḥammad Rīza ʿAlī, Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Ṭabrizī, Muṣṭafā al-Rīzvī, Baba Shāh al-ʿIraq, Muḥammad al-Sānī al-Kirmānī, Muḥammad al-Haravī. Muṣṭafā ʿAlī mentions several of these calligraphers in his treatise. One, Muḥammad Qāsim, son of Shādīshāh, was a pupil of ʿAlī of Mashhād. Muṣṭafā ʿAlī further adds that Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim’s pupils were Mawlānā ʿAyshī, Mawlānā Muḥyī, Mawlānā Ḥusayn of Bākharz and Sultan Muḥammad of Turbat. The other calligrapher by the name of Qāsim, whose works are included in H. 2145, was a near contemporary of Muṣṭafā ʿAlī. Among the calligraphers, Ḥasan ʿAlī Mashhādī is most likely the pupil of Mīr Ṣayyād ʿAbd al-Mashhādī. The famed calligrapher Shāh Muḥammad Nishābūrī was a pupil of Sultan ʿAlī Mashhādī. Muṣṭafā ʿAlī also mentions Muʿizz al-Dīn Muḥammad as the pupil of Mīr Hībatullāh of Kāshān, and the master of Ḥiḍāyatullāh of ʿĪṣāfān. Works by Amir Khusraw Dihlawī, Jami, Khwaju Kirmanī, Hafiz, Hilālī-yi Chaghatayī, Saʿdi, Vaḥshī, Ubayd Zākānī, Awḥāfī-yi Maragḥī, Niẓāmī, Rūmī, Musib Khan, Ḥasan Dihlawī, ʿAlī Shir Nawāʾī, ʿArīf, Hīkānī and Shaykh Muḥammad Shabistarī are featured in this album as well as the Nādī ʿAlī (Call Ali the Manifestor of Wonders) prayer, calling Imam ʿAlī for help (fol. 5a), and lines from the Arabic Qasīdat-yi Majdīyya of Imam ʿAlī (fol. 9a). While works of poets such as Saʿdi, Hāfiz, Niẓāmī and Jāmī are frequent in albums, the inclusion of sections from the Farhād u Shihrūn of the late-sixteenth-century poet Vaḥshī is interesting. On Vaḥshī see Paul Losensky, “Vaḥshī Bahkī (or Yazdī),” Encyclopedia of Islam, Second Edition, ed. P. Bearman et al. Brill Online. 2015. Reference. Harvard University. 10 December 2015. http://referenceworks.brillonline.com.ezp-prod1hul.harvard.edu/entries/encyclopaedia-of-islam-2/wahshi-bafki-or-yazdi-SIM_7828

France, O.D. 41, fol. 33b) (fig. 2.36). The Paris drawing contains an inscription by the painter as well as a note that the drawing is a likeness of a certain Valī Tutunjī executed in Baghdad (read by Farhad possibly as Tunjī(?)). Farhad, Safavid single-page painting, 373.
Baghdad in the year 985 (1577–58) (fig. 2.37). Mustafa ʿĀli references Qutb al-Din Yazdi’s treatise on calligraphers, Risāle-yi Qutbiyya, and remarks that Qutb al-Din had kept him company in Baghdad in his Menākb-ī Hünervan. The Baghdadi tadhkira writer ʿAḥdi (d. 1593) also notes Qutb al-Din Yazdi’s abilities in calligraphy, and compares him to Mir ʿAli in the copying of qit‘a, and to Mir Muzaffer in riqa style. ʿAḥdi adds that Qutb al-Din also composed poetry. Another dated sample of Qutb al-Din Yazdi’s calligraphy can be found in an album in the Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris (Supp. persan 1171, fol. 22a). ʿAḥdi, Sadiqi, Muṣṭafa ʿĀli and Qutb al-Din Yazdi were contemporaries and acquaintances in Baghdad. The fact that a calligraphic sample by the latter is included in H. 2145 makes a further connection to Baghdad in this album (in addition to the painting that can be attributed to Baghdad, discussed below). These also point to Baghdad as a place of art production. Moreover, this album presents evidence that Karbala was also a center of art production.

This is supported by the example of another calligraphic sample presenting a qit‘a by Abu Saʿid Abu’l Khayr (d. 1049) in H. 2145. This was written by calligrapher Hasan ʿĀli in Karbala (fig. 2.38). This calligrapher copied two other illustrated manuscripts in Karbala (TPML R. 1046, H. 281, discussed below). Mustafa ʿĀli mentions Monla Hasan ʿĀli, who was a pupil of Mir Sayyid Ahmad Mashhadi (d. 1578–79). He praises Monla Hasan ʿĀli for his competence in calligraphy and for “his attachment to his master’s calligraphic style.”


268 Sādiqī Beg writes that he and ʿAḥdi (d. 1593) had corresponded for years. Sādiqī Beg, Majmaʿ al-Khawāṣṣ, 281.

269 Muṣṭafa ʿĀli, Epic Deeds, 244.
Çağman and Tanındı add that Hasan ʿAli, who hailed from Khurasan, lived in Herat until the death of his patron, ʿAli Quli Khan Shamlu (d. 1589), the governor of Herat. The authors also point to a portrait of ʿAli Quli Khan Shamlu executed by the painter Muhammadi, in an album held at the Topkapı Palace Museum Library (H. 2155, fol. 20b), which further points to the broadening base of patronage in the late-sixteenth century, which can be observed not only in the Ottoman context but also in the Safavid context. Hasan ʿAli is one among many who traveled from the Safavid lands to the Ottoman lands in search of patronage. Following the death of his patron ʿAli Quli Khan Shamlu, Hasan ʿAli went to Baghdad and then to the Hijaz where he died in 1592–93. This presents one example of the movement of artists among courts in search of patronage. Hasan ʿAli thus traveled to Baghdad after the death of his patron, possibly in search of patronage or in order to reach Mecca and Medina via Baghdad for pilgrimage, as was the common pilgrimage route from the Safavid lands.

The two Topkapı manuscripts copied by Hasan ʿAli in Karbala are selections from the Munājāt (Invocations) of the Sufi master and exegete, ʿAbdullah Ansari. One of them (R. 1046) is a composite work, beginning with the Gūy u Chāwgān (Polo and Polo Stick) of ʿArif, copied in 1549 by Shah Mahmud Nishapuri. The Gūy u Chāwgān contains three paintings. Following the end of this text, the Munājāt opens with a double-folio painting set against a light blue border with gold animal and vegetal decoration consisting of chilins, deers, birds, flowers and Chinese clouds (fig. 2.39). The double-folio painting depicts a continuous hunting scene set against high, tan-colored hills edged with light purple rocks. Water flows from some of the rocks, some of which have turned into faces in a visual conceit. The sky, like the hills, is tan colored, with dashes of red, white, and blue.

On the right, we see a youth wearing a gold-sashed turban enclosing a fur cap with a carnation set among the folds. The youth rides a dappled gray horse with rich trappings and  

---

270 Çağman and Tanındı, Remarks on Some Manuscripts from the Topkapı Palace Treasury in the Context of Ottoman-Safavid Relations.
raises one gloved hand as he unleashes his falcon. His piebald hunting dog runs beside him while foxes run in the foreground and deer in the background. Two hunters take cover behind the light purple hills. One, on the left, has released an arrow, that has pierced a leopard, while the other one, on the right, is readying his musket. On the left side of the double-folio composition, three other young hunters have caught their prey.

The next folio (fol. 19b) opens with a painting set against a similar background, in the place of an ʿunwan (fig. 2.40). The painting portrays a bearded man seated on a rug with raised hands in conversation with a youth facing him, seated kneeling and holding a book in his hand. The text is written in a large nastāʿliq of seven lines to a page and it is placed within borders of blue paper, nicely decorated with gold (fig. 2.41). The manuscript ends with a double-folio finispiece (fig. 2.42). Again we find the same tan and light purple hilly landscape and tan skies with red, white and blue streaks. The double-folio composition shows an angel seated on a low throne while a white div is digging, on the right; and an angel flying in, holding a gazelle, while two other angels peer from behind the hills, one holding a golden jug, on the left. The second part of the manuscript ends with a colophon noting that the work was copied in the shrine of the sultan of Karbala, that is, of Imam Husayn.

The other manuscript (H. 281) copied by Hasan ʿAli in Karbala follows a similar organization with seven lines of large nastāʿliq to a page and the text pages bordered with turquoise paper with animal and tree decorations in gold. The manuscript opens with a double-folio painting (fig. 2.43) showing a hunting scene, composed in a similar color palette as R. 1046. This is followed by a smaller composition in place of an ʿunwan (fig. 2.44) showing a bearded man seated on a rug while a youth facing him holds a book. On the same page, towards the bottom light purple, blue and brown rocks arise from the edges of
the ruling, in between the lines of text. The manuscript ends with a double-folio finispiece depicting a hunting scene (fig. 2.45).

A painting in the Album of Ahmed I can also be stylistically located to Karbala (fig. 2.46). A youth riding a black horse and an attendant halberdier on foot are portrayed in a mountainous setting, where the tops of the rocks are painted in orange, green, light purple and blue, and the sky and the grounds left tan, similar to the paintings in the two manuscripts described above. In addition to these paintings and samples of calligraphy, two folios of calligraphic samples appended to a Silsinenâme (Karlsruhe, Rastatt 201) produced in Baghdad, include an example copied by al-ʿAbd Kalîm al-Hâdîm al-Hayrâtî “in the shrine of sultan of Karbala,” referring to the shrine of Imam Husayn in Karbala.271

Çağman and Tanındı suggest that H. 281 and R. 1046 were originally bound together and at some point were separated.272 While there is as yet no clue as to possible patron(s) of these manuscripts, that the Munâjât of ʿAbdullah Ansârî is chosen for a small, yet, luxury production is not surprising. Selections from ʿAbdullah Ansârî’s works appear in H. 2149 and H. 2145 as well. In addition, the sixteenth-century scholar Muḥammad Tâhir devotes considerable attention to this Sûfî and exegete in his universal history, Câmiʿüʾs-Sîyer, discussed in Chapter 4. The Baghdadi author’s universal history includes a section on shaykhs and ulema who lived during the Abasid caliphate and among them, several are given distinguished placement, including ʿAbdullah Ansârî (H. 1230, fols. 106a–106b).

These works show that Karbala, and in particular the shrine of Imam Husayn, also appears as a location where manuscripts may be produced. Çağman and Tanındı point to the

271 The sample by al-ʿAbd Kalîm al-Hâdîm al-Hayrâtî shares the page with another calligraphic sample by Muḥammad Sharîf al-Haravî (fol. 17a). Two other samples are signed by Muḥammad Ḥusayn and Muḥammad Zamân al-Ṭabrizî.

In addition to these, there is a Divân of Anwarî (d. 1189) copied by Muḥammad b. Naṣr ʿAlî in the shrine of Imâm Ḥusayn in 1026 (1617) (IUL F. 358).

272 Çağman and Tanındı, Remarks on Some Manuscripts from the Topkapî Palace Treasury in the Context of Ottoman-Safavid Relations, 142.
convents of Abu Ishaq Ibrahim, founder of the Kazaruni order, which also functioned as scriptoria for the production of illuminated manuscripts. The Ottomans did not share the Safavids’ treatment of shrines as centers for book production, collection or sale, as for example in the case of the shrine of Shaykh Safi in Ardabil, to which Shah `Abbas I donated his collection of manuscripts and china. However, in the case of the shrine of Imam Husayn, we see that it was also a place of production of manuscripts and paintings at a time when it was under Ottoman control. While the Munâjāt of `Abdullah Ansari and the qiṭ’a copied by Hasan `Ali (H. 2145, fol. 23a, fig. 2.38) bear Sufi overtones, the painting in the Album of Ahmed I depicts a rider and an attendant, not tied to a particular text. While more research needs to be done on Karbala, this album painting, as well as several others described below, shows that the spiritual could go hand in hand with the worldly.

To return to H. 2145, in addition to samples of calligraphy this album also contains drawings and paintings that are reminiscent of figures of youths by the painter Walijan, and the style of Riza `Abbasi; a drawing of leaves and flowers in the saz style juxtaposed

---

273 Further research into manuscript production in shrines will shed light into how, where and for whom manuscripts were made. Baghdad, Karbala and Najaf house important Sunni and Shi’i shrines. As an important center of Islamic learning and a locus for Hanafi, Shafi’i, and Hanbal schools, as well as having a considerable Shi’i population, Baghdad was a multi-confessional province. As Ayfer Karakaya-Stump shows, there were close relations between the Qizilbash/Alevi communities of Anatolia and Bektashi convents in Iraq, particularly around the convent in Karbala. She points to archival records, which show suspicion on the part of Ottomans, that these shrines were retreats of pro-Safavid groups and may have acted as bridges between the Safavids and Qizilbash/Alevi followers in Anatolia. I will return to this issue in the next chapter. Filiz Çağman and Zeren Tanındı, “Manuscript Production at the Kazaruni Orders in Safavid Shiraz,” in Safavid Art and Architecture, ed. Sheila Canby (London: British Museum Press, 2002) and “Illustration and the Art of the Book in the Sufi Orders in the Ottoman Empire,” in Sufism and Sufis in Ottoman Society, ed. Ahmet Yaşar Ocağ (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2006), 501–27. Henceforth Filiz Çağman and Zeren Tanındı, Illustration and the Art of the Book in the Sufi Orders in the Ottoman Empire; Ayfer Karakaya-Stump, “The Forgotten Dervishes: The Bektashi Convents in Iraq and the Kızılbaş Clients,” International Journal of Turkish Studies 16, Nos. 1&2 (2010): 1–24.


with a painted drawing of a barren tree trunk and two large insects (fig. 2.47). Additionally, one painting can be attributed to Baghdad based on style (fig. 2.48). This is a painting of two youths. Surrounding the composition on four sides are examples of large nastāʿlīq calligraphy in black ink on a gold background decorated with blue and red flowers. The calligraphic sample in a larger nastāʿlīq above and below is an excerpt from a ghazal of Amir Khusraw Dihlavi (d. 1325), while the verses on the four corners in smaller nastāʿlīq are from the rubāʿiyāt of Omar Khayyam (d. 1131). The seated youth on the right is dressed in a red brocaded garment with a swan pattern of gold, over which is a fur-lined, black, gold brocaded outer garment with long, dangling sleeves. In his right hand he holds a gold brocaded white handkerchief, while he is reaching out to a small blue and white cup that the standing youth is offering him. The standing youth facing him is dressed more simply in a light blue, brocaded garment, with a short-sleeved light purple, brocaded outer garment. He too holds a white handkerchief with its sash brocaded with gold. The figures are outside on a dark green grass spotted with flowers. The background is gold and a light purple carnation awkwardly floats above. Note the almond shaped eyes of the youths. These figures with almond shaped eyes with a slight cast and arcing eyebrows that meet in the middle, characteristic of Baghdad painting, can be likened to two paintings added to the end of a late-sixteenth-century Silsilenāme (Karlsruhe, Rastatt 201) produced in Baghdad.  

276 While lacking a colophon, this illustrated genealogy can be attributed to Baghdad and to the reign of the Ottoman ruler Mehmed III, during whose reign there was a proliferation of illustrated genealogies, and who is depicted as the last, reigning ruler, and whose full portrait is appended to the end of the manuscript. The manuscript opens with a fine illuminated ʿunwan of blue, gold and orange, with the title Zâhdeṭū l-Tevârīh written in white. The text, written in nastāʿlīq, is in Turkish. As will be shown in Chapter 5, it is a translation from one of the two versions of Persian texts composed in the mid-sixteenth century. There are forty-six painted medallions of prophets and kings and it ends with the portrait medallion of Mehmed III with a wish that his rule last until the end of time, suggesting that the manuscript must have been completed during the reign of this sultan. Where normally the corpus of illustrated genealogies produced in Baghdad would end with the reigning sultan, or would have later additions, this manuscript contains two paintings and three pages of calligraphic samples appended to the end. This manuscript was acquired in 1774 by the Swedish orientalist and collector, Jakob Jonas Björnstähl, as seen in a note in Latin at the beginning of the manuscript. For a brief description of this manuscript see Hans Georg Majer, “Das Buch Quintessenz der Historien,” in Die Karlsruher Türkendeuten: Die “Türkische Kammer” des Markgrafen Ludwig Wilhelm von Baden-Baden, Die “Türkischen Curiositäten” der Markgrafen von Baden-Durlach, ed. Ernst Petrasch (Munich: Hirmer Verlag, 1991), 369–78.
painting that follows the diagrammatic genealogy shows the Ottoman ruler Mehmed III (r. 1595–1603) enthroned (fig. 2.49). He sits on a golden throne encrusted with turquoise. Like the seated youth in album H. 2145, he wears a dark orange, swan-patterned garment, with a fur-lined, brocaded white garment. He wears a tall turban with two bejeweled aigrettes. The enthroned sultan is depicted beneath a red arch and against a light blue background of geometric ornament. Above the border of the painting, there are two cartouches that closely resemble the compositions of sultan’s portraits in illustrated manuscripts of the 1579 Şemāʾ ilnāme (Book of Physiognomy), where hemistiches about the sultan would be written in the cartouches.

Following this is a page of various samples of calligraphy written in different sizes of nastāʿīlīq. The second painting comes after this. It depicts a youth holding a bird in one hand, while a falcon is perched on his gloved wrist (fig. 2.50). Quite like the portrait of Mehmed III in this manuscript, the falconer too wears a red garment with a fur-lined, wide-patterned, brocaded white garment, here with long, draping sleeves. Like the previous painting, here too there are two cartouches outlined with gold and left empty. These two paintings in the Karlsruhe Silsilenāme are similar to the painting of youths in the Topkapı albums, H. 2145 and H. 2133-4.

The painting of two youths facing each other in H. 2145 (fig. 2.48) can be compared to a painting found in another album from the Topkapı Palace Museum Library, H. 2133-4. This painting (fig. 2.51) depicts three youths standing in a dark green landscape with a gold background while an attendant pours a drink into porcelain cups. Two of the standing youths hold small, blue and white porcelain cups. The figure on the left is dressed in a purple garment and a sleeveless black outer garment. The end of his dagger juts out from the slit in his garment. He extends a porcelain cup to the youth standing next to him, who has reached

277 One of these is signed by Muḥammad Sharīf al-Haravī. There is another sample of calligraphy by Muḥammad Sharīf al-Haravī on fol.17a in the Karlsruhe Silsilenāme, as well as several other examples in H. 2145 and H. 2149.
out to him to hold his hand. This figure, in the middle, wears a sky blue garment and a white, brocaded outer garment. The figure on the right, a slightly portly youth, wears a red and yellow garment and is drinking from the porcelain cup. A youth on the lower left is pouring a drink into cups placed on a gold tray. Like the Karlsruhe paintings and the H. 2145 painting, the figures in H. 2133-4 wear rich, brocaded garments. The figures are somewhat stocky, but with a slight sway to their body. The color scheme in these paintings is also similar to the previously mentioned composition. Like the painting in H. 2145, the grass is dark green and dotted with flowers. Surrounding the painting are verses written in white ink on a gold ground. The verses above and below the composition possibly belong to Baba Fighani (d. 1519), while the verses written vertically on the sides are unidentified.

The page as a whole with the verses surrounding the painting allows alternative readings of the composition. The verses above and below may reference the lavishly dressed youths standing side by side, leisurely drinking from their cups while the poet/beloved/viewer is distraught by their sight: “There are a thousand diamond daggers in my heart / From these wearing silk robes side by side” (Hazār hancar-i almās dar dīl-ast ma-rā / Az īn harīr qabayān ki dūsh bar dūshand). The verses on the right and left comment further on the nature of love, suggesting that: “Love is not through means and materials but through moaning lamentation; whoever does not wail in lamentation is abhorred; in this path a good name is cause for reputation, leave aside your reputation, for time is short, man needs humility not riches” (ʿAshq be-zūr u zar nīst, be-zārīst / Har ki bī-zārīst, dar hvor-i bīzārīst / Dar īn rāh nām-i nikā mawjīb-i nang ast / Nāmūs ba-yak ūrāf nih ki waqt tang ast / Mard-rā chahra-i zard bāyad, ne ān ki badra-i zar). Together with these verses on the sides, the painting may also act as a warning lest one falls for the superficiality of material, heightened

278 The verses attributed to Fighānī are: “Hazār sūzān-i fulād bar dīl-i ma-rā/ Az īn harīr qabayān ki dūsh bar dūshand” whereas in the album it is “Hazār hancar-i almās bar dīl-i ma-rā / Az īn harīr qabayān ki dūsh bar dūshand.” Aḥmad Suhaylī Khvansarī, ed. Dīvān-i Ashʿār-i Bābā Fighānī (Tehran: Iqbal, 1983), 243.
in fact, through the lavish use of gold in the background and borders, the brocaded garments of the youths and blue and white porcelain cups from which they drink.

In addition to this painting of three youths drinking from porcelain cups, H. 2133-4 has two other paintings that can be attributed to Baghdad stylistically. One, on folio 19b (fig. 2.52), shows an interior scene, where a ruler sits on a throne/chair. Several men sit kneeling before him in a circle. One of them, sitting closest to him, and wearing a red and yellow garment, holds an open book in his hand. Two vases with flowers decorate the carpeted and tiled interior. A young attendant stands on the right while an old man leaning on a long stick stands on the left at the door. On the top and bottom are verses from the Shāh u Dervīsh of Hilali Chaghatayi, as was the case in the composition in H. 2149 (fig. 2.23).

On folio 20a, there is another painting that can be attributed to Baghdad. This painting (fig. 2.53) portrays a scene most likely from the Shāh u Dervīsh (or possibly Gūy u Chawgān), where a brown-skinned beggar wearing a short blue garment and brown shawl and white cap extends a ball to the youthful prince on horseback. It is interesting that these three paintings are grouped together in H. 2133-4. As mentioned above, the paintings on folios 19b-20a can also be linked to H. 2149.

Further evidence of the production of single-page paintings in Baghdad can be found in a detached page depicting a hunting party (fig. 2.54) and in a painting preserved in the Topkapı album, H. 2165 (fig. 2.55). This painting portrays a youth dressed in yellow, blue and red riding a brown horse at the center of the composition, with hunters carrying the prey, and a mounted falconer behind the hills. Like the majority of paintings from these albums (figs. 2.24, 2.25, 2.48, 2.51, 2.53), this composition is also set on a gold background. Also note the almond shaped eyes of the figures and the dark green hue of the grass.

The surrounding text, written on a gold background in black ink, further makes a connection to Baghdad. The verses surrounding this painting complain about an unnamed
governor of Baghdad. The verses highlight Baghdad’s peculiar place as hosting important shrines, including those of Imams ‘Ali and Husayn, the seventh Shi’i Imam Musa al-Kazim (d. 799), founder of the Hanafi legal school of thought, Abu Hanifa (d. 772), Junayd of Baghdad (d. 911) and his disciple Shibli (d. 945), founder of the Sunni Qadiriyya order ‘Abd al-Qadir al-Geylani (d. 1166), and the tenth and eleventh Shi’i Imams, ‘Ali al-Hadi (d. 868) and Hasan al-’Askari (d. 874). The unidentified author of these verses writes: “In such holy ground, o ruler / Its condition is tyranny, oppression and injustice / He has no regard for learning and the learned / He has quite the hostility for the virtuous / He degraded both rich and poor / He disparaged the poor.” While the author and the governor in question are unknown, the fact that a painting attributable to Baghdad and this text regarding Baghdad and its unjust governor are juxtaposed is surely no coincidence. This identification of the sacred topography of Baghdad will be relevant for the next chapter as well, which raises the issue of the textual ramifications of a multicultural/religious landscape.

This chapter introduced previously unexamined paintings preserved in the Topkapı Palace albums as evidence for the production of single-page painting and calligraphy in Baghdad and Karbala. These works as well as the two manuscripts of the Munajāt of ‘Abdullah Ansari confirm that the shrine of Imam Husayn in Karbala was a center for


280 The album (H. 2165) in which this painting is found contains several other important documents, from letters from the grand vizier Sinan Paşa to imperial orders (one of particular importance is to governor Ḥasan Paşa, son of the grand vizier Sokollu Meḥmed Paşa, on account of his deeds in the construction of the Kars fortress, which will be discussed in Chapter 4), an ode to Meḥmed III on the occasion of his accession to the throne and texts on this sultan’s Eger campaign.

For a detailed study of this album see Banu Mahir, “XVI. Yüzyıl Osmanlı Nakkaşhanesinde Murakka Yapımçılığı,” Uluslararası Sanat Tarihi Sempozyumu. Prof. Dr. Gönül Öney’e Armağan (İzmir: Ege Üniversitesi, 2002), 401–17.
copying manuscripts.\footnote{Stylistically the manuscripts from Karbala are different from the corpus of manuscripts and single-page paintings from Baghdad proper. However, a closer look at paintings from Baghdad suggests that there are variants within painting in Baghdad as well.} They also demonstrate that, in addition to the corpus of manuscripts known to be from Baghdad (most of which are also different from the types of works produced and consumed in Istanbul in terms of subject matter), single-page paintings meant for albums were produced in these two cities. Some of these paintings partake of the new themes current in the capital, Istanbul. Similar to the changing means and markets in the capital at the end of the late sixteenth century, and in line with the newly rich trying to acquire single-page paintings, these album paintings show that there was a similar demand in Baghdad for such small-scale works.
CHAPTER 3
THE GARDEN OF THE BLESSED

The propitious moment of a balanced supply of and demand for art in the sacred topography of Baghdad engendered multiple copies of illustrated works of a religious nature. While intersecting with the interest in the lives of prophets (note the corpus of illustrated manuscripts of the *Qiṣṣa al-Anbiyāʾ* (Stories of Prophets) and particularly of the Prophet Muhammad (e.g. *Siyer-i Nebī* (The Biography of the Prophet) produced at court), it was the Karbala tragedy that motored the production of multiple illustrated texts in Baghdad. In addition to works on the Karbala tragedy, there were also several copies of illustrated works on the lives of Sufi mystics and particularly on the life and deeds of Mawlana Jalal al-Din Rumi (d. 1273) produced in late-sixteenth-century Baghdad. With regard to the coexistence of illustrated texts on the Karbala tragedy and texts on the lives of Sufi mystics, and the life and deeds of Rumi, Baghdad is unique. This uniqueness reflects, and is reflected by, the multi-cultural, multi-confessional nature of early modern Baghdad—the members of the Shiʿi Bektashi convents and the Sunni Mawlawi lodge in Baghdad being two possible instigators or consumers of these works. The central lodges of both Sufi orders were based in the Ottoman mainland in central Anatolia (Kırşehir and Konya respectively), with sub-branches proliferating in various Ottoman urban centers in this period.

Taking an early-seventeenth-century manuscript of the *Hadiḳatūʾs-Sūʾ edā* of Fuzuli of Baghdad (d. 1556) (Brooklyn Museum of Art 70.143) as a case study, this chapter proposes, first, that the popularity of works on the Karbala tragedy, likely read by the local Bektashi circles and others, stems from the very geography of Baghdad as a shrine center and that these works may have acted as visual reminders of the Karbala tragedy. Second, it

---

considers how these works coexisted with works on the lives of Sufi mystics and of Mawlana Jalal al-Din Rumi, with the latter probably having been commissioned by state appointed governors, who had connections with the Mawlawi order. The proliferation of Mawlawi convents in this period in such cities as Cairo, Aleppo and Baghdad was part of a process of Ottomanizing the Arab provinces of the empire, which had only recently been conquered in the early century. I will first provide an overview of the types of texts that the sacred topography of Baghdad brought about. Then I will concentrate on the Hadîkatü’s-Sü’edâ in terms of its text and paintings, taking the Brooklyn Museum of Art manuscript as a basis.

The province of Baghdad was important not only for its location at a crossroads between the Indian Ocean through the Persian Gulf, the Mediterranean and mainland trade routes, but also for being a center of shrine visitation of importance to both the Ottomans and the Safavids. The Topkapi Palace Museum Library album page (fig. 2.55) depicting a young hunter on horseback juxtaposes the painting to a poem complaining of the injustice of an unnamed governor of Baghdad. The poem highlights the sacred topography of Baghdad, which necessitates a certain type of behavior. The poet thus finds the unjust and tyrannical behavior of the governor unworthy of a province that housed the holy shrines of such eminent figures. These shrines dominate the land on either side of the Tigris with their bulbous domes on raised drums, conical sugar-loaf domes, and tapering minarets on an undated and unpublished map of Baghdad (fig. 3.1), which identifies the main structures of the city and its environs.283 The map shows the fortified enclosure—built after the Ottomans

283 The undated map is painted on cotton and identifies the major shrines in and around Baghdad as well as the citadel of Baghdad. It also denotes fortresses, districts, and villages in the hinterland of Baghdad, noting which ones are under the governance of the province, which ones are ze’amet, and which belong to the state, whether it is in the mountainous area (in the east of Baghdad, which itself is denoted), as well as distances to the city of Baghdad. For details on the administrative structure of the province see Halil Sahilioğlu, “Osmanlı Döneminde Irak’ın İdari Taksimati,” Belleten 211 (1990): 1233–54.
conquered Baghdad in 1534\(^{284}\)—around the shrine of Abu Hanifa, the shrines of Musa al-Kazim and Muhammad al-Jawad (d. 835), shrines of Hasan al-ʿAskari and ʿAli al-Hadi, Salman Farisi (d. 656) and of the Sufi saint Maʿruf al-Karkhi (d. circa 815–20). Within the citadel, the shrines of Shaykh Shihab al-Din al-Suhrawardi (d. 1234) and ʿAbd al-Qadir al-Gaylani (d. 1166) are also identified. The depiction of these shrines juxtaposed to citadels in various districts of Baghdad and Kirkuk, all linked to the citadel of Baghdad, emphasizes the importance of the city and its identity, both as a major provincial center, and as a site marked for its conglomeration of shrines, known, as mentioned previously, as the *burc-u evliyā* (bastion of saints). Baghdad’s places of visitation (*ziyāretgāh*) are also highlighted in Nazmizade Murtaza’s (d. 1723) *Tekkire-i Evliyā-yi Bağdād* (Biographical Dictionary of the Saints of Baghdad), a work dedicated to the accounts of various saints and shaykhs buried in Baghdad, as well as Evliya Çelebi’s travelogue, which includes a list of shrines in and around Baghdad and places of burial and visitation, particularly of the seventy-two martyrs of Karbala.\(^{285}\) Shrines in the province of Baghdad were, not surprisingly, also highlighted in the illustrated account of Matrakçı Nasuh’s (d. 1564) *Beyān-i Menāzil-i Sefer-i ʿIrakeyn* (Description of the Stages of the Campaign in the Two Iraqs), which focused on the stops on


\(^{285}\) This biographical dictionary of the saints of Baghdad was composed by Nazımzade Murtaza in 1666 at the instigation of Uzun İbrahim Paşa, governor of Baghdad, and expanded in 1681 at İbrahim Paşa’s order, another governor of Baghdad by the same name. This work provides a brief account on the lives and deeds of various saints who were buried in Baghdad and at the end of each account, the author mentions the *maqām* or shrine of the saint, giving a rough distance and direction from Baghdad. There are various manuscript copies of this work but a critical edition has not been published. The copy that I have consulted is the Süleymaniye Library copy (Halet Efendi 241). Tahsin Özcan, “Nazımzade Murtaza Efendi,” *DIA* 32 (Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2006), 461–3; Yücel Dağlı and S. Kahraman, eds. *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi IV. Kitap Topkapı Sarayı Bağdat 305 Numaralı Yazmanın Transkripsiyonu - Dizini* (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2000), 247–65. Henceforth *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi IV. Kitap.*
route to Baghdad during Ottoman ruler Süleyman I’s (r. 1520–1566) eastern campaign in 1534–36.286

Patronage of shrines, particularly in Najaf and Karbala, was important to the Safavids, as well as to the Ottomans. In 1574, the Safavid princess Pari Khan Khanum (d. 1578) sent several carpets and censers to the shrines in Baghdad, as stated before.287 These shrines drew many Safavid visitors, who wanted to pay respect to saints, contemplate, as well as to bury their dead, which at times became an issue.288 Evliya Çelebi adds that every year people came from the lands of ‘Ajam to bury their dead in the shrine of Imam Musa al-Kazim, the Shi‘i imam to whom the Safavid dynasty traced its lineage.289

Shrines as places of visitation and contemplation were important both locally and interregionally. However, in the frontier context especially, they could also raise suspicion. A number of mühimme registers from the 1560s onward testify to the precarious position of shrines in Baghdad. These shrines were viewed by the Ottoman central administration with

286 The surviving copy of this illustrated work is in the Istanbul University Library (T. 5964) and a facsimile edition is also available.

The great emphasis in this work on the shrines in Baghdad, Kufa, Hilla, Najaf results partly from the importance of the shrines themselves as places of visitation, and partly from the strategic importance of Süleyman I’s campaign to the two ‘Iraqs. Contemporary and later histories also emphasize Süleyman I’s patronage of architecture and renovation of the shrine centers, particularly of the shrines of ‘Abd al-Qadir Gaylānī and Abū Ḥanīfa as an act of establishing Sunni orthodoxy and authority in the newly conquered Baghdad, a point raised by Gülru Necipoğlu. See Necipoğlu, The Age of Sinan, 63–4; Hüseyin G. Yurdaydın, Naṣūḥū’s Silāḥī (Matekçī), Beyān-ı Menāzīl-i Sefer-i ‘Trâkey-i Sultân Süleymân Hân (Ankara: Universite Basimevi, 1976).

287 Prime Ministry Archives, Mühimme Defteri 22.234.88.

288 An order sent from the Ottoman capital to the governor of Baghdad in 972 (1564–65) notes that pilgrims should instead use the Damascus and Egypt routes and that those wishing to visit the shrines in Baghdad must return after they have completed their spiritual duties; that burying their dead in the shrines was still prohibited and that it would only be allowed for the relatives of the shah (Prime Ministry Archives, Mühimme Defteri 6.39.17). Another order from the same date asks that it be inquired whether the mother of Prince Ismā‘īl Mirza who fell ill during her visit to the shrines, has recovered and returned or was putting it off (Prime Ministry Archives, Mühimme Defteri 6.665.313). An order sent almost a decade later, in 981 (1573–74) reiterates that it was not allowed for the corpses to be buried in the shrines and that care must be taken not to act contrary to this. This suggests that despite the ban, such a practice continued (Prime Ministry Archives, Mühimme Defteri 22.288.144).

289 Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi IV. Kitap, 242.
suspicion as being hubs of pro-Safavid activity in the frontier province. Karakaya-Stump shows that Bektashi convents in the courtyards of the shrines of Shi’i imams or those, which were independent in Baghdad, Kazimiyya, Karbala, Najaf and Samarra “functioned primarily as rest houses for those visiting the Shi’i pilgrimage sites in these locations.”

Drawing on a number of sources (not all of which come from the period in question in this dissertation, but which make use of later oral reports as well) Karakaya-Stump hypothesizes that some dervishes in Bektashi convents in Iraq may have acted as “mediators between the Safavid shahs and their followers in Anatolia.” In addition, Karakaya-Stump has published a letter from a certain Sayyid Baqi, a Sufi from the line of Hacı Bektaş, and resident at the Bektashi convent in Karbala, to Sayyid Yusuf in Malatya. In the letter, Sayyid Baqi congratulates Shah ’Abbas I’s conquest of Baghdad. This letter further shows the pro-Safavid sentiments among some members of the convent.

Regardless of possible pro-Shi’i activities within Shi’i shrines and Bektashi convents in Baghdad and its environs, these centers drew many visitors. Some, like the poet Hamdi of Bursa, were inspired to compose elegies upon visiting the shrine of Imam Husayn; and some, like the sixteenth-century poet La’li of Kayseri visited Baghdad and its shrines during

---


291 Ayfer Karakaya-Stump, “Subjects of the Sultan, Disciples of the Shah: Formation and Transformation of the Kızılbaş/Alevi Communities in Ottoman Anatolia” (PhD diss., Harvard University, 2008), 130. Henceforth, Karakaya-Stump, Subjects of the Sultan, Disciples of the Shah. Also see the more recent publication by Ayfer Karakaya-Stump, Vefailik, Bektaşılik, Kızılbaşlık: Alevi Kaynaklarını, Tarihini ve Tarihyazımını Yeniden Düşünmek (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2015).

292 Karakaya-Stump, Subjects of the Sultan, Disciples of the Shah, 168.

his wider travels in Egypt, Damascus, and Aleppo. Baghdad was a way station on the pilgrimage route; many visited Baghdad and its shrines on the way to or from the Hijaz.

Also a vibrant cultural center, Baghdad drew many artists and poets in search of patronage. Hasan ʿAli Mashhadi, mentioned in the previous chapter, was one patronage. Hasan ʿAli Mashhadi is particularly interesting, for, as mentioned in the previous chapter, a sample of his calligraphy is preserved in a Topkapı Album (fig. 2.38) and two manuscripts of the Munājāt of ʿAbdullah Ansari (figs. 2.39–45), were copied by him in the shrine of Imam Husayn in Karbala, showing that shrines could also function as places for artistic activity. The tadkhira writer ʿAhdī (d. 1593) of Baghdad mentions that the poet Kelami (d. 1595–96), who has a Dīvān and a prose work titled ʿKiṣṣa-i Ebū ʿAlī Sīnā (Story of Abu ʿAli Sina) was connected to a certain Hüseyin Dede of the convent of the Abdals of Rum in the shrine of Imam Husayn in Karbala. Kelami is also named as the mütevellī (administrator of the

294 ʿAhdī writes that Ḥamdī Brusevī first went to Egypt and followed the path of ʿĪbrāhīm Gülṣenī. Then he went to Baghdad, and there he made the acquaintance of the tadkhira writer himself. Gülṣen-i ʿȘ ārā, 78b–79a, 173a.

295 Particularly during the Ottoman-Safavid wars of 1578–90 and 1603–18 the issue of pilgrimage routes through Baghdad was a major concern. Pilgrims were rerouted through Aleppo and Damascus, as Baghdad and Basra were deemed unsafe. In addition to safety concerns, possible suspicions of pro-Safavid activity within Shi‘ī shrines and convents as well as the major Shi‘ī population in Baghdad may have been reasons for such control over pilgrimage routes via Baghdad and Basra. However, this had to be balanced with the need to protect pilgrims’ right to pilgrimage. See Willem Floor and E. Herzig, Iran and the World in the Safavid Age (London and New York, I.B. Tauris, 2012), 84–5; Suraiya Faroqhi, Pilgrims and Sultans: The Hajj under the Ottomans (London and New York: I.B. Tauris, 1994), 137–8.

296 Cihan Okuyucu notes that Kelāmī Dede has a Dīvān (Yapı Kredi Bankası Sermet Çiifter Kütüphanesi No. 611). He also attributes one prose work on the story of Avicenna to this author: ʿKiṣṣa-i Ebū ʿAlī Sīnā (The Story of Abū ʿAlī Sina) (IUL, T. 690).

pious endowment) of Mustafa ‘Āli’s foundation of a fountain in Karbala.297 Contemporary accounts, such as Mustafa ‘Āli’s Kūnhū’l Ahbār, as well as biographical dictionaries elucidate the networks of poets in Baghdad.

Shrines, convents, and Mawlawi lodges were also centers of production of art and literature—for example, the adaptation/translation of the Thawāqib al-Manāqib (Stars of the Merits) was completed by Derviş Mahmud (d. 1602) in 1590 in the Mawlawi lodge of Konya, as mentioned by the author in the introduction to his text.298 The Baghdadi poet Fuzuli, receiving wages from the Ottoman waqf administration, worked as candle-lighter (çerāğci) at the Bektashi convent in the shrine of Imam Husayn in Karbala, and after his death he was buried on the grounds of the convent.299 In the early-seventeenth century, the calligraphers Nusayra Dede and ‘Abd al-Baqi al-Mawlawi worked at the Mawlawi lodge in Baghdad.300 The dedicatory panels of the lodge, which was built in 1599, were by the

---


299 According to oral reports, Ayfer Karakaya-Stump notes that the “shaykhs of the Karbala convent had historically functioned as the çerāğcīs for the shrine of Imam Husayn.” This is noted by ‘Alī Su’ā’d in his travels, who found out about this function from the shaykh of the convent, ‘Abdülhüseyin Dede. The convent, according to Karakaya-Stump, was in the courtyard of the tomb complex of Imam Ḥusayn. ‘Abdülhüseyin Dede also notes that the convent was established five hundred years ago (reported in the early twentieth century). However, the connection between Fuzuli and the Bektashi convent is questioned by Bülent Yorulmaz and by Abdülباقي Gölpinarlı. Additionally, Halîl İnalcık, referring to a Persian qasida of Fuzuli, opines that he worked in the shrine of Imām ‘Alī in Najaf. To date, there have been many studies regarding Fuzuli, some of which provide contradictory views based on the limited nature of documents regarding the poet.


300 5aḫb Dede’s Sefine-i Neşîfe-i Mevleviyân and ‘Alî Enver’s (d. 1920) Semâhâne-i Edeb provide further information on Nüşayra Dede (d. 1640) than that mentioned by secondary sources cited below. It is noted, that
latter.\textsuperscript{301} It is likely that these centers also housed painters who produced illustrated copies of popular religious texts, and that members or supporters of the Mawlawi order in Baghdad were also patrons of these works. Filiz Çağman was among the first to suggest that illustrated manuscripts of popular religious literature, and particularly, of manuscripts of saintly biography, may have been made for a Mawlawi audience in Baghdad and Konya.

Later studies, such as Milstein’s seminal study on Baghdad painting as well as others, including Justin Marozzi and Tülay Artan, concur.\textsuperscript{302} Circumstantial evidence does point to

Nuşayra Dede was trained by Cününi Dede (who lived in Baghdad in the early-seventeenth century and who then founded the Mawlawi lodge in Bursa), and that he belonged to the line of ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Hamadānī, who had composed the \textit{Manāqīb al-Thawāqīb}. Having learned that his uncle belonged to the Mawlawi order in Damascus, Nuşayra Dede traveled from Iran to Damascus. He traveled with the Baghdadi poet, and Mawlawi, Rāhī-i Bağdādī and another Mawlawi by the name Şamtī. ‘Ali Enver adds that Nuşayra Dede was in Baghdad as shaykh of the Mawlawi order when Shāh ‘Abbās I took Baghdad in 1623. He notes that the shah did not harm him or the Mawlawi lodge.


\textsuperscript{301} Nazımzade Murtaza mentions that Ṭāvīlzāde Mehmed, who had revolted in Baghdad in 1608, was killed by his scribe and confidant, Muḥammad Çelbe, who was the founder of the Mawlawi lodge. Most likely based on this source, Abbas Azizawi, Clément Huart and Richard Coke also mention this otherwise unknown Muḥammad Çelbe as the founder of the lodge. Additionally, Erden Gürçü notes that from 1611 onwards the Mustanṣiriyya madrasa was also used as the Mawlawi lodge. However, he does not comment on the reasons for it, or on the former location of the lodge. Evliyâ Çelebi also mentions a Mawlawi lodge in Baghdad, as well as a Bektashi lodge. In writing about the bridge that spans the Tigris, near the citadel, Evliyâ writes, “All the heart-captivating beauties of Baghdad dip into the river from this bridge. A pleasure outing of Baghdad is the foot of this bridge. It is a sight to behold, this bridge, adorned with coffeehouses and Mawlawi lodges. (Ve cem'i dîlber-i Bağdâd kendiyle bu cîsr üzre Şâş'ta ilka ederler. Bağdad’ı’n bir mesîregâhi dahi bu cîsr başlarıdır. Kahvehâneler ve mevlevihâneler ile ârâste ve memerr-i nûs ile pirâste olmuş bir cîsr-i ’ebret-nûmâdûr.)”

Abdülbaki Gölpinarlı also mentions a Mawlawi zaviyə in Baghdad, noting that the zaviyəs were smaller than asînās and that their shaykhs were also of a lesser status. Further research on Ottoman Mawlawi lodges outside of the present boundaries of Turkey will shed more light on these institutions.


the importance of the Mawlawi order in Baghdad in the supply and demand of these
illustrated manuscripts, a Sunni order that counterbalanced the predominantly Shi‘i
landscape of Baghdad in the Ottoman period. Unfortunately, there is little information on the
activities of the Mawlawi order in Baghdad. However, it appears that governors appointed
from the capital had connections to the Mawlawi order and they may have been agents in the
production of illustrated Mawlawi texts.

That governor Hasan Paşa (d. 1602), son of the grand vizier Sokollu Mehmed Paşa
(d. 1579), and patron of architecture and illustrated manuscripts in Baghdad (discussed in
the next chapter), gifted a silver door for the prayer room of the Mawlawi lodge in Konya,

further supports a connection between the patronage of the supporters of the Mawlawi order
and the illustrated copies of popular religious texts, particularly on the life of Mawlama Jalal
al-Din Rumi. Hasan Paşa’s Cami ’u’s-Siyer bears further evidence of a Mawlawi
connection in its inclusion of two paintings, one depicting the final sermon of Mawlama Jalal
al-Din Rumi’s father, Baha al-Din Walad (d. 1231) in Balkh (fig. 4.18), the other depicting
Mawlama meeting Shams-i Tabrizi (d. 1248) (fig. 4.21). Çağman and Tanındı point out the
uniqueness of the inclusion of these figures in illustrated books of history produced in
Istanbul. In addition, the illustrated campaign logbook of governor Hadım Yusuf Paşa
(governor of Baghdad in 1605–06) also includes paintings representing the governor among
whirling dervishes in Konya, and paying his respect at the shrine of Mawlama Jalal al-Din

303 On the door is the inscription: “Ṣadr-ı ‘azam Meḥmed’iñ halefi vüzerä serveri Ḥasan Paşa āstâne-yi bâb-ı
Monâ’nîñ itî elf [ve] şemanede ihdâ.” (The successor of the grand vizier Meḥmed, Ḥasan Paşa, chief of
viziers, gifted [it] to the threshold of the Mulla; 1008 (1599–1600)).

304 Filiz Çağman and Zeren Tanındı, The Book in the Sufi Orders in the Ottoman Empire, 519.
Rumi and at the tombs of Seljuq rulers (figs. 3.2–3). Visiting the Mawlawi shrine in Konya regardless of one’s religious affiliation, was popular, as encountered in the case of commander Lala Mustafa Paşa and Mustafa ’Āli, who paid their respects, and had prognostication based on the Mathnawī of Rumi, on the way to the campaign against the Safavids. This visitation was given heightened emphasis in Mustafa ’Āli’s account of the campaign, the Nuṣretnāme (Book of Victory), by the inclusion of a painting. Yusuf Paşa’s interest in shrine visitation and the visitation of holy places is marked by the paintings as well as the account of his travels from Istanbul to Basra, where he and his retinue stopped in several places, including the shrine of Daniel in Tarsus (fig. 3.4), the pond of Abraham in Ruha (fig. 3.5), and shrines in Baghdad and the Taq-i Kisra in Ctesiphon.


306 Necipoğlu, *The Age of Sinan*, 64.

307 For a reproduction of this painting see ibid., 66.

308 This illustrated campaign logbook records Yusuf Paşa’s travels from Istanbul to Basra in the early-seventeenth century. While incomplete, and no longer extant, Cihan Okuyucu’s article on this work is important in bringing attention to this little-studied work. He provides a transcription of a part of the text until folio 21b. The manuscript, which I have studied in microfilm format, consists of 39 folios and 7 paintings, yet it is incomplete and as the text implies, it was meant to include a section on Yusuf Paşa’s post in Baghdad as well as poems by Basran and Baghdadi poets. The manuscript measures 23.5 x 13.5 cm.

This manuscript sheds light on the dynamics of power play between the Ottomans, Safavids and local Arab tribes. The particular Arab chieftain in question made his living through looting trade caravans and consolidated his power by allying himself with the Ottomans and the Safavids as the occasion demanded. This unpublished and little-known work raises larger questions of identity, diplomatic and trade relations in the Baghdad and Basra region.

The atmosphere of tumult and the vizier’s courage and generosity set the background for the work that chronicles Yusuf Paşa’s journey from Istanbul to Basra, and thence to Baghdad. The vizier travels via Pendik, Gebze, Hereke to Izmit. These and further stage posts are succinctly described in the text, sometimes embellished with a distich on their qualities, or brief stories regarding the posts. For example, Muḥlisī writes that according to some old histories, Izmit was a large city, perhaps older than “İslambil;” and that “the famed poet Halil[1] once fell in love with a youth here and composed a splendid shahrangız” (şu aradan meşhûr-u âfûk olan merhûm Halîl bunda bir civâna ‘âşık olub hakkında ‘îla sehrengız söylemişlerdir) (Sefernâme, Turc 127, fol. 5b). The next stage post in the journey is Yenişehir, whose “waters are healing for those afflicted with thirst/ [and whose] green herbage is sufficient for all animals.” Here, the author notes, the deceased vizier Sinan Paşa had built a khan and hospice. From Yenişehir, they travel to Pazarcık, then Bozüyük. On the way to Bozüyük, there is a grand caravan and opposite it, according to the author, are the shrines of two saints, Pozbıyuh and Akbıyuh.
The importance of the province of Baghdad as a spiritual center that drew many
visitors of various backgrounds and religious inclinations is relevant for understanding the
popularity of illustrated manuscripts of religious literature. The coexistence in Baghdad of
the more aristocratic Mawlawi branch of Sufi orders, shrine centers of importance for
Sunnis and Shi‘a is alike, and Bektashi convents, with possibly pro-Safavid inclinations, is
one aspect of the convergence of multiple identities. As suggested by the banter between the
poet Fazlı and Mawlana Shani (see the Introduction) in Baghdad, coexistence at times came
with dispute. However, the dispute also points to the multifaceted cultural life in Baghdad,
particularly in the period after the peace settlement between the Ottomans and Safavids, and

From Bozüyük, Yusuf Paşa and his retinue travel to Akşehir. Muḥlisī writes that before they reached
Akşehir, a brigand named Mehmed wreaked havoc in the region. The villagers, having heard of the arrival of
Yusuf Paşa, complained about Mehmed. Close to thirty bandits were killed. Muḥlisī’s travelogue is dotted with
similar instances that both highlight Yusuf Paşa’s valor and the instability and turmoil caused by the Celali
uprisings throughout Anatolia.

While Muḥlisī’s text must be read in the context of the Celali uprisings, the author is as much
interested in giving an account of their travels and the sites they see, in particular the shrines they visit, for
example the shrine of the mid-thirteenth century Mawlawi, Sayyīd Mähmed Ḥayran in Akşehir. In this same
city, in the direction of the gībla and adjacent to the city walls on one side is a cemetery, which includes the
tomb of Nasrudden Hoca. Shrine visitation is an important part of Yusuf Paşa’s journey to Basra and an
important aspect of travel, for various purposes, as can be seen in the case of Lala Muṣṭafā Paşa’s visitation of
the tomb of Mawlana Jaʿlāl al-Dīn Rūmī in Konya on his way to the eastern campaign, as noted by Muṣṭafā ‘Alī
(Kūnwī ‘l Abhār, fol. 484a).

The first part of Muḥlisī’s account deals more prominently with the sights and places of visitation
along the road from Istanbul to Basra and shows an interest in visiting ancient or holy sights, with a sense of
both paying respect and seeing and enjoying. So, for example, in his account on Tarsus, he writes: “The
following day the above-mentioned amīr took the vizier to see the sights and places of visitation in Tarsus, first
teferruçgâhlarî ziyâret u tefferrûc vevelâ meghâr-u aţâfik olan Ceyhûn [zimmîn] üzerinde enbîyâ-yî
‘izâmdan hâzâret-i Dûnîyalī ‘leyhi’s selâm ziyâret olundı).”

Following an account of Yusuf Paşa’s battles with the local Arabs, the author Muḥlisī, writes that he
taveled to Baghdad to visit the shrine of Imâm ʿAlī as well as other shrines. A list of the shrines visited by
Yusuf Paşa was supposed to appear in the manuscript as per the text. Space is left for the list as well as some
dates elsewhere in the text. Seeşnâmē, BnF Turc 127, fols. 11a and 31b. Cihan Okuyucu, “Muḥlisī’nin Çerkes
115–35.

309 The role of shrines in the formation imperial ideology and orthodoxy in a wide perspective has been dealt
with by Kishwar Rizvi in her study of the Safavid dynastic shrine in Ardabil. Rizvi follows the changing roles
of the dynastic shrine from its inception in the thirteenth century through Safavid rule. In addition, Zeynep
Yüreklî’s study of shrines of Seyyid Gazi and Haci Bektash in Anatolia and her reading of hagiographies through
time highlights questions of patronage, orthodoxy, resistance to state centralization.

Kishwar Rizvi, The Safavid Dynastic Shrine: Architecture, Religion and Power in Early Modern Iran (London:
I.B. Tauris, 2011); Zeynep Yüreklî, Architecture and Hagiography in the Ottoman Empire: The Politics of
Bektashi Shrines in the Classical Age (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2012). Also see May Farhat, “Islamic Piety and
Dynastic Legitimacy: The Case of the Shrine of Ali al-Rida in Mashhad (10th–17th Century)” (PhD diss.,
Harvard University, 2002).
at the auspicious conglomeration of enough wealth and interest in illustrated manuscripts and their supply.

Especially in the case of illustrated manuscripts of religious literature, the different genres of texts and their multiple copies suggest a broad clientele. Multiple illustrated copies of works on the Karbala tragedy in a region that housed the shrines of Imams ‘Ali and Husayn and the site of the martyrdom of the seventy-two members of Husayn’s family and following appear together with texts dealing with the lives of Sufi mystics and of Mawlana Jalal al-Din Rumi. It is not only in texts relating the life and deeds of Rumi and of Sufi mystics that figures associated with the Mawlawi order appear, but in other paintings from Baghdad as well, where the text does not necessarily call for their inclusion.\(^{310}\) The Mawlawi order had close ties with the Ottoman state. It appears that among the governors of Baghdad, Hasan Paşà and Yusuf Paşà also had connections to the order, at least as evidenced through their patronage. The fewer, yet more copiously illustrated texts on the lives of Sufi mystics and on Mawlana Jalal al-Din Rumi, may have been commissioned either by governors or by eminent members or supporters of the Mawlawi order perhaps in an effort to counterbalance the popularity of illustrated texts on the Karbala tragedy. The

---

\(^{310}\) A similar tendency can also be observed in the *Album of Ahmed I* (TPML B. 408). For example, an album page (fol. 9a) juxtaposes a painting of a Mawlawi dervish holding a book and a fan, to paintings of a possibly Wallachian youth, two youths with turbans on their heads and thin daggers hanging from their belts, and two women, one holding a flower, the other nude but for a transparent cloth held around her waist. Another painting portrays two Mawlavis seated outside drinking from porcelain cups (fol. 17a). In the foreground there is a youth partially reclining on a pillow as a page serves him a drink. Another youth stands on the right while two sit opposite. This painting from the same album in particular, and the above-mentioned album page, are interesting for the inclusion of Mawlawi figures in seemingly unlikely contexts and suggest, first, that there are the inklings of a proliferation of Mawlawi culture in the visual arts (emphasized more so closer to the end of the first quarter of the sixteenth century) not only in Baghdad but also in Istanbul as well, and that here too we can observe a merging of the religious and the secular (as discussed in Chapter 2). The latter point can also be illustrated in another painting from this album, which shows Hasan and Husayn on the shoulders of the Prophet Muḥammad (fol. 15a). This painting is juxtaposed to other paintings depicting single figures—several women, a warrior and an angel. Additionally, around the time when copying of the *Mathnawi* became more widespread in Istanbul (described in detail by Çağman and Tamnd, and related in this chapter below), we come across multiple paintings of Mawlawi figures in the circa 1620 costume album, *The Habits of the Grand Signor’s Court* (British Museum 1928.0323.0.46.1-122).
appearance and coexistence of these different types of texts point to the multiplicity of confessions in Baghdad.

The majority of the illustrated manuscripts produced in Baghdad are works of popular religious literature. Works of saintly biography and those on the Karbala tragedy composed in Turkish and Persian abound. Among these are the Nafahat al-Uns (Breezes/Breaths of Humanity) of Jami (d. 1492), Manâqib al-'Ārifîn (Merits of the Mystics) of Aflaki (d. 1360), and Tercüme-i Șevâkibü'l-Menâkîb (Translation of the Stars of the Merits) of Derviș Mahmud Mesnevihvan. These are works of saintly biography. In addition, the Rawzat al-Shuhadâ’ (Garden of Martyrs) of Husayn Va’iz Kashîfî (d. 1504–05), 311 Հադիկատուի Սուի էդա of Fuzuli, and Maḳṭel Āl-i Resūl (Killing of the Prophet’s Family) of Lami’i Çelebi (d. 1533) are devoted to the Karbala tragedy.312

Some of the illustrated works from Baghdad are relatively new works, several of them dating from the mid- to late-sixteenth century in their time of composition/translatation. In addition to their newness as texts, the majority of the compositions are also remarkable

__________________________
311 Husayn Wâ’iz Kâshîfî’s Rawzat al-Shuhadâ’ was composed for a grandson of the Timurid ruler of Herat, Husayn Bayqara (d. 1506). Kâshîfî’s prose text, interspersed with verses in Persian and Arabic, consists of ten chapters. The first chapter concerns the sufferings of prophets. The second chapter is on the sufferings of Prophet Muhammad and the martyrdom of Ja’far ibn Abî Ṭâlib (d. 629), also known as Ja’far al-Tayyâr, and brother of Imâm ’Ali. The third chapter is on the death of Prophet Muhammad. The fourth chapter is on the life and death of the daughter of Prophet Muhammad, and wife of ’Ali, Fatima. The fifth chapter concerns the life and death of ’Ali. The sixth chapter is on the virtues and life of Imâm Ĥusayn. The next chapter concerns stories on his birth and an account of his life after the death of his brother, Ḥasan. The eighth chapter is on the martyrdom of Muslim b. Ṭâlikî and his sons. The following two chapters are on the battle of Karbala and the aftermath of the battle. The work ends with a genealogy of the twelve imams.


for their originality, marking the liveliness of Baghdad as a place of artistic creation. Several included compositional innovations that stemmed from their subject matter. While these works also speak to a wider pre-occupation with stories of the lives of prophets, in particular of the Prophet Muhammad, as well as concerns with the expected arrival of the Apocalypse, the popularity of illustrated copies of works on both the Karbala tragedy and lives of Sufi mystics is unique to Baghdad.

While the majority of the extant manuscripts do not include patrons’ names, we may speculate that given the possibilities of rise in wealth and rank in this period (discussed in Chapter 1), wealthy individuals, officials and governors may have commissioned or purchased these works. Indeed, that governors were patrons of art and architecture is testified through the patronage of Maktul (Executed) Ayas Paşa (governor of Baghdad between 1545–1547), Murad Paşa (governor of Baghdad between 1569–1572), Elvendzade ʿAli Paşa (governor of Baghdad between 1574–1576, 1582–1583, 1597–1598), Cigalazade Yusuf Sinan Paşa (governor of Baghdad between 1586–1589, 1592), Sokolluzade Hasan Paşa (governor of Baghdad between 1598–1602) and Hadım Yusuf Paşa (governor of Baghdad in 1605–1606).313 A certain Hasan Çavuş, among the chief sergeants of governor Cigalazade Yusuf Sinan Paşa, also owned an unillustrated copy of the Hümâyûnname (The Imperial Book), the Ottoman translation of the Anwar-i Suhaylî (Lights of Canopus) by ʿAli Çelebi, dated to 1582. This suggests that beyond illustrated manuscripts there was further interest in the ownership of books by lesser officials as well, and that these found the conditions ripe for commissioning calligraphers to copy manuscripts for them or purchase works from them.314

313 On the architectural patronage of Ayas Paşa and Murad Paşa see Necipoğlu, The Age of Sinan, 470–1.

314 Şebnum Parladır’s extensive research on illustrated and non-illustrated copies of ʿAlî Çelebi’s Hümâyûnname show that in addition to the illustrated copy of this work produced in Baghdad, there were several unillustrated copies, the colophons of which show Baghdad as the place of copying. These are: a 1573 manuscript copied by Ādem b. Sinân (Sadberk Hanım Müzesi No. 419), a 1582 manuscript copied by
In addition to Elvendzade ‘Ali Paşa, Sokolluzade Hasan Paşa and Hadım Yusuf Paşa, whose names were included in the illustrated manuscripts they commissioned, the rare, illustrated copy of the *Mathnawī* of Mawlana Jalal al-Din Rumi, presents us with further evidence of a named patron. The colophon of the manuscript provides the date (16 Ramaḍān 1011/ 28 February 1603) and the name of the patron Imam Verdi Beg b. Alp Arslan Dhu’l Qadr, whose identity remains unknown.\(^{315}\) In addition to this illustrated *Mathnawī*, a

---

\(^{315}\) Barbara Schmitz, in her catalogue entry on this manuscript notes that stylistically, the paintings appear closer to Shiraz paintings from the last two decades of the sixteenth century. She adds that the inclusion of Ottoman headgear, including the headgear of janissaries, also points to Baghdad. Additionally, Lale Uluç shows that the production of illustrated manuscripts in Shiraz was supported to a great extent by the Dhu’l-Qadirids, who were the nominal rulers of Fars. She connects the dwindling of production in Shiraz in the 1590s with the removal of the Dhu’l-Qadirids from Fars. The 1603 NYPL manuscript, which names a Dhu’l-Qadrid officer as its patron, provides a connection between Shiraz and Baghdad. While not disregarding a possible Shirazi exodus (which is supported through stylistic similarities in other illustrated examples as well), a close inspection of the manuscript shows that the colophon is likely a later addition and that the paintings appear where there was continuous text. In several places, parts of letters appear under some paintings (e.g. fol. 41b, 85a, 113a, 155a).

For example, on folio 113a, there is a painting in which two armies on either bank of a river are depicted. The painting appears in the story of the Sabaeans and their ingratitude. In the manuscript, there are twenty-four to twenty-five lines arranged in four columns to a page. Here, the painting takes up around eighteen lines. Presently, the text that follows below the painting in fact skips a whole section on “the arrival of prophets to admonish the Sabaeans” (āmādan paygāmbarān-i haqq be-naṣīḥat-i ahl-i Sabā) and starts half way through a bayt belonging to the next section, “the tribe asks for a miracle from the prophets” (mi jīza khwastan qawm az paygāmbarān). The missing section amounts to forty-three bays. Organized in four columns, this missing section amounts to around twenty lines, nearly the amount of space occupied by the painting.
genealogy at the Museum of Ethnography in Ankara (discussed in the final chapter) also shows that it was not only Ottomans who were patrons of art in Baghdad. Like the vogue for luxury Shiraz manuscripts among Ottoman, Turkmen and Safavid elites, the Mathnawi and the Ankara genealogy suggest a broader clientele for manuscripts produced in Baghdad. However, unlike Shiraz manuscripts, the smaller corpus of Baghdad manuscripts appears to have been geared to, and sustained by, the local market.

In comparison to the single illustrated copy of the Mathnawi, Fuzuli’s translation/adaptation of the Rawżat al-Shuhadā’ was quite popular; illustrated manuscripts of the Ḥadīkatū’s-Sū’edā were copied more widely than any of the other above-mentioned works. It appears to be the most popular among the illustrated works of religious stories

---

316 Manuscripts of the Ḥadīkatū’s-Sū’edā that can be attributed to Baghdad are:
1. Fatih 4321, Sîleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul (date: Shawwal 1002-June/July 1594)
2. Talat 81 Ṭarīkh Turkī, Dar al-Kutub, Cairo
7. Türk İslam Eserleri Müzesi, T. 1967
8. Brooklyn Museum of Art, 70.143, Brooklyn, NY (date: Jumada II 1011-November/December 1602, copied in Baghdad)
9. Mevlana Müzesi Hemden Çelebi 101, Konya (date: Ramaḍān 1013-January/February 1605)

While the earliest dated illustrated copy that can be attributed to Baghdad is the Sîleymaniye copy, there is an undated illustrated copy of the Ḥadīkatū’s Sū’edā at the Harvard Art Museums (1985.213). This manuscript is not dated and it is stylistically different from the Baghdadi manuscripts of the late-sixteenth century. However, the paintings in this manuscript are similar in style to a 1575 manuscript of Muṣṭafā b. Celâ’î’s Tabakâtî’l Memâlîk ve Derecâtî’l Mesâlîk (Levels of the Dominions and Grades of the Professions) presently at the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna (Hist. Ott. 41). This manuscript was copied by İbrahim b. ʿAlī in Szolnok, Hungary in 6 Sha’ban 983 (10 November 1575). As the following will suggest, it is
and saintly biographies. Together with the illustrated genealogies, the *Ḥadīkatū’s-Sūʿedā* copies constitute the majority of the illustrated manuscripts in Baghdad in the late sixteenth century. We can consider the *Ḥadīkatū’s-Sūʿedā* in conjunction with the illustrated genealogies (discussed in the final chapter) or single-page paintings (discussed in the previous chapter), also likely to be produced for the speculative market.

**Fuzuli’s *Ḥadīkatū’s-Sūʿedā***

The *Ḥadīkatū’s-Sūʿedā* was composed by Fuzuli as a translation/adaptation of Husayn Va’iz Kashifi’s *Rawżat al-Shuhadāʾ*. The date of the composition of this work is not known. However, Fuzuli notes that this work was composed for Mehmed Paşa, one of the officials of Süleyman I.¹³⁷ Husayn Va’iz Kashifi’s *Rawżat al-Shuhadāʾ* and *Ḥadīkatū’s-Sūʿedā* both likely that the production of illustrated manuscripts of the *Ḥadīkatū’s-Sūʿedā* were connected to the Bektashi order. Balázs Sudár, who has written on Bektashi convents in Hungary, suggests that a convent in Szolnok possibly had Bektashi affiliations. This early, and rather rare case of an illustrated *Ḥadīkatū’s-Sūʿedā* manuscript may further corroborate the connection of the text and Bektashi convents.

There is another illustrated manuscript of the *Ḥadīkatū’s-Sūʿedā* at the Konya Mevlana Müzesi (No. 93). This is dated 994 (1585–86) and is also stylistically different from what is considered the typical Baghdad “school” of the late sixteenth century. In terms of the compositions and choices for which scenes are illustrated, these two early examples are also different from the corpus of *Ḥadīkatū’s-Sūʿedā* manuscripts from late-sixteenth-century Baghdad.

In addition to these illustrated manuscripts, there are several dispersed leaves at various museums and libraries:

1. Wereldmuseum, 60948, Rotterdam (Ali Murdered by Ibn Muljam)
2. British Museum, 1949,1210,0.8, London (Death of ’Alī)
3. British Museum, 1949, 1210,0.9, London (Death of Hasan)
5. Los Angeles County Museum, M.85.237.35, LA (Abraham Catapulted into Flames)
6. Topkapı Palace Museum Library, H. 1564 (Painting depicting the Expulsion from Paradise pasted at the beginning of a manuscript of the *Kıyâfet-i ʾınsâniyye fi ʾılmāʾ ilîʾı ʾı ʿOsmâniyye*)
7. Kraus Collection (E. J. Grube, Islamic Paintings from the 11th to the 18th Century in the Collection of Hans P. Kraus (New York: H.P. Kraus, 1972), 208–9, no. 179.


¹³⁷ According to Şeyma Güngör, who has published a critical edition of the *Ḥadīkatū’s-Sūʿedā*, this Meḥmed Paşa may be Sofu Mehmed Paşa (d. 1551), who was in Baghdad between 1545–47. Her hypothesis is based on
deal with the sufferings of Prophet Muhammad and his family, and particularly the Karbala tragedy, and can be considered in the wider context of works composed in Arabic and Persian on the Karbala tragedy.\textsuperscript{318} Fuzuli’s \textit{Hadikatü’s-Sü‘edā} follows the structure and organization of the \textit{Rawżat al-Shuhadā’}; both are works in prose interspersed with verse.\textsuperscript{319} Fuzuli’s \textit{Hadikatü’s-Sü‘edā}, which makes use of early examples of \textit{maqtaš} literature and histories (such as that of Tabari) in Arabic as well as the \textit{Rawżat al-Shuhadā’}, consists of ten chapters and ends with a conclusion.\textsuperscript{320} The first chapter of the \textit{Hadikatü’s-Sü‘edā} concerns the toils of prophets beginning with Adam and ending with Yahya (John) and Zekeriyya (Zechariah). The second chapter is on the sufferings Prophet Muhammad faced from the people of Quraysh. The following four chapters regard the deaths of the Prophet, his

---

318 Abū Mihnāf Liṭ. b. Yahya’s (d. 774) \textit{Kitābu Maḳteši’l Husayn} (Book of the Killing of Husayn) is among the first works in Arabic on the Karbala tragedy and is one of the sources for Fuzuli’s work as well. Abū’l Faraj al-İsfahānī (d. 967) and Abū Ishaq İsfarayini (d. 1027) have also composed works on the Karbala tragedy in Arabic. Husayn Wa’ iz Kāshīfi’s \textit{Rawżat al-Shuhadā’} is the most well-known Persian work on the Karbala tragedy. Several works of \textit{maqtaš} literature have also been composed in Ottoman Turkish (from at least the mid-fourteenth century onwards), one of the most popular being Lāmî’i Celebi’s \textit{Maḳteš-i Āl-i Resûl}. Before the composition of Lāmî’i Celebi’s \textit{maqtaš}, we can also note the \textit{Makteš-i Hûseyin} of the fourteenth-century author, Şâfi from Kastamonu.


319 Cem Dilçin points out that several of the Turkish verses included in the \textit{Hadikatü’s-Sü‘edā} are also included in his Turkish \textit{Divan}.


320 While Fuzuli refers to other works, such as the \textit{maqtaš} of Abū Mihnāf, the \textit{Shawâḥid-i Nuḥuwwat} (The Witnesses of Prophecy) of Ǧâmi the \textit{Kanz al-Gharâ’i} (Treasure of Wonders), Abid Nazar Mahdum shows that these references are also found in the \textit{Rawżat al-Shuhadā’} in the same instances. Abid Nazar Mahdum, “Ravzati’s Şûheda ile Hadikatü’s-Süeda Mukayyesesinin Işığında Eski Türk Edebiyatında Tercüme Anlayışı” (PhD diss., İstanbul Üniversitesi, 2001), 135–6. Henceforth Abid Nazar Mahdum, \textit{Ravzati’ş Şûheda ile Hadikatü’s-Süeda Mukayyesesinin Işığında Eski Türk Edebiyatında Tercüme Anlayışı}.
daughter Fatima, cousin and son-in-law ʿAli, and of Hasan, the elder son of Imam ʿAli. The seventh chapter is on Husayn’s move from Madina to Mecca. The eighth chapter is on the martyrdom of Muslim b. ʿʿAqil, a cousin of Husayn b. ʿAli. The following chapter is on Imam Husayn’s move from Mecca to Karbala and the final chapter is on the martyrdom of Imam Husayn. The concluding section of Fuzuli’s Ḥadīkatūʾs-Sūʾ edā differs from that of the Rawżat al-Shuhadāʾ. Fuzuli’s work adds a section on the story of the surviving women and children from Husayn’s family being taken to Damascus; and ends with an elegy on Imam Husayn. Husayn Va’iz Kashifi’s concluding section, however, concerns the story of the Twelve Imams, which Fuzuli also provides in his work in summary form. In his biographical dictionary, tadhkira writer Kınalızade Hasan Çelebi (d. 1604) notes the difference of Fuzuli’s work when he suggests that it is no mere translation, but that “verily he had planted such saplings of eloquence in that delicate garden that Husayn Va’iz Kashifi has not seen [such] fruit.”

In addition to slight differences in the text and conclusion, the two authors’ reasons for composition also differ. While Husayn Va’iz Kashifi’s reason for composition is to create a comprehensive and detailed account of the lives of prophets and martyrs, which he finds lacking, Fuzuli’s aim for composition is to provide the story of the martyrs of Karbala in the Turkish language. Fuzuli’s aim to provide this work in the Turkish language is telling of the interest in the story and remembrance of the Karbala tragedy in Baghdad. Fuzuli’s Ḥadīkatūʾs-Sūʾ edā reiterates the importance of remembrance and grievance for the martyrdom of the Prophet’s family and particularly for the Karbala tragedy. He notes that every year, in the month of muḥarram people go to Karbala to renew the observances of mourning (her māh-i muḥarrem tecdīd-i merāsim-i mātem idūb eṭrāf u cevānibden

---

müteveccih-i deşt-i Kerbelâ olurlar). He adds, however, that “whereas Arab and Persian nobles were able to benefit from listening to the tales of battles in Karbala, venerable Turks, who were a considerable part of the congregation, would be deprived of understanding the truth of the matter; they would be left out of the ranks of the majlis like needless lines on book pages” (Ammâ cemî-i müddetde mecâlis u mehâfilde takrîr olinan ve käïyi-i Kerbelâ ve keyfiyyet-i ahvâl-i şühedâ Farsî ve Tâzî ’ibâretinde beyân olmağın esrâf-i ’Arab ve ekâbir-i ’Acem temettu’ bulub e’izze-i Etrâk, ki cûz-i a’zam-i terkib-i ’alem ve şînf-i ekser-i nev-i benî Ādem’dür, saat-rı zâyid-i şahâif-i kütüb gibi şûfûf-u mecâlisden hâric kalub istifâ-yi idrâk-i hakâyik-i ahvâlden mahrûm kaårurlardı). Thus, the author was incited to compose a work in the “renewed style” (tarz-i mücedded) so that eloquent men speaking Turkish would also benefit from hearing it. While there are conflicting accounts regarding Fuzuli’s birthplace (Baghdad, Karbala, Hilla or Najaf), it appears from the extent of his writings as well as tadhkiras, that he did not leave ‘Iraq-i ‘Arab. Fuzuli’s particular choice of the Rawzat al-Shuhadâ (which had for the most part supplanted earlier examples of maqtal literature) for translation into Turkish in Baghdad and his reasons for the translation/adaptation point to the interest in the remembrance of the Karbala tragedy in the very topography in which it took place. It is not surprising that this text, composed by an author who lived and died in the very lands in which the tragedy took place, also became especially popular in Baghdad.

The Baghdadi author’s reason for composition suggests a multi-ethnic and possibly multi-confessional gathering, which listened to the performance of the story of the Karbala tragedy. Fuzuli’s text, while immortalized in writing also suggests an oral and performative

---

322 Güngör, Ḥadîkatü’s-Šû’ edâ, 16.
323 Ibid.
324 Ibid.
aspect in its language. While manuscript copies of the text were numerous (pointing to the
popularity of the work in its circulation), the division of the work into ten chapters (like the
Rawżat al-Safā) also points to the possible performance of this work through the
reading/listening of a chapter each day over ten days of muḥarram.325 Some four decades
after the composition of this work, the text took on a new appearance and renewed
popularity through the addition of paintings. The animated compositions and scenes of
preaching, most often with expressive and affectated audiences, in illustrated copies of this
work also hint at the performative aspect of the Ḥadīkatū’s-Sūʿedā. Almost a century after
the death of Fuzuli, the traveler Evliya Çelebi noted the performance of Fuzuli’s
“unfavorable” (nā-pesendīde) work in Dergezin in the month of muḥarram. Evliya Çelebi
wrote of his observations of the muḥarram commemoration, when people gathered in and
around tents outside the town of Dergezin:

All the Shiʿi’s, heretics, revilers, cursers, tüüngišs, dervishes, Qalandaris, kharjītes sat side by side in the tent enclosure to listen to the Makteliʿl Hūsayn (Killing of Husayn). Then a four-footed mother-of-pearl bench and a five-stepped pulpit were brought. Then when a turbaned, large donkey-eared, camel-lipped, disgusting “shaykh” with puttees on his legs and eyes blackened with kohl and all his facial hair shaved appeared from behind the tent enclosure, all stood up to greet him. Receiving their greetings, the shaykh ascended the pulpit and began with a Fatihayha and blessings on the malicious shāh; when he reached the section on the martyrs of Karbala from the preposterous words from the unfavorable work Fuzuli of Baghdad’s Makteliʿl Hūseyin, what life remained in those listening! Such shrieking and wailing came from that group of ʿAjam soldiers that one would think it to be Judgment Day...When the khan said: “Oh Evliya Agha, rise and look!”

lowly one stood and readied myself for the show (temāşā). When the shaykh reached the part where Husayn was martyred, the curtain behind the pulpit parted and a man brought out a model (?) of Imam Husayn, blood trickling down his neck; his noble head severed, blood spurting forth. When the image of Husayn and his offspring and martyrs of Karbala were portrayed, all the lovers of the house of the ahl-i bayt cried out “Ah Husayn, Shah Husayn!” and held their arms out to the barbers, who, like butchers, would nick their arms with razors and cut their chests in pieces and let their blood flow for the love of Husayn.326

In his description of the commemoration Evliya Çelebi is careful to emphasize that the population of Dergezin was Shiʿite (ammā cümlesi Șiʿi megheblerdir); his view on Fuzuli’s work is outright negative, particularly in his vivid description of the rawzā-khwān (reciter of the Garden [of the Martyrs]). While implicit, Evliya’s portrayal of the shaykh as a man with a shaved head and face brings to mind the exonymous dervishes that sixteenth-century Bursa preacher Monla ṬArab associated with the readers of the Maḳtel-i Hüseyin (discussed below). However, Evliya Çelebi’s description of the gathering and performance also points to the continued interest in Fuzuli’s work and its theatrical performance in the border region of Dergezin.327

While found unfavorable by Evliya Çelebi, Fuzuli’s Ḥadīḳatū’s-Süʿedā was quite popular. Mid-sixteenth-century Baghdadi tadhkira writer ṬAhdi noted that the work was currently well known.328 Güngör has identified 229 manuscript copies of the work, not including possible copies in private collections.329 While the Ḥadīḳatū’s-Süʿedā was widely read and copied, it was in Baghdad that this work took on a new appearance in the late-
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326 According to Robert Dankoff, tūlūngī is a term for Safavid followers or an assumed name for Safavid spies and cevelłakī is used for Safavid dervishes. Robert Dankoff, Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi Okuma Sözlüğü (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2008), 82, 230; Yücel Dağlı and S. Kahraman, eds. Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi IV: Kitap, 200.

327 Theatrical performance of the taʿziyeh commemorations became more established during the Safavid rule. Especially during the reign of Shāh ʿAbbās I, it became an important public event attended by the shah himself. Rahimi provides an overview of the development of the muḥarram rituals from the seventh to the seventeenth centuries, from a rather esoteric practice into a state sponsored public spectacle. Babak Rahimi, Theater State and the Formation of Early Modern Public Sphere in Iran, 199–234.

328 ṬAhdi, Gülşen-i Şuʿarā, fol. 156a.

329 Güngör, Ḥadīḳatū’s-Süʿedā, LV.
sixteenth century with the addition of paintings. Below, I will describe the paintings of the Ḥadīkatūʾs-Sūʾ edā manuscript in the Brooklyn Museum of Art (70.143) with the aim, first, to point out the repetition of compositions in these manuscripts, and second, to point to certain innovations in these compositions where previous models were available. The repetition of compositions in the multiple copies of this work produced within a decade likely suggests an open market for these works.

**Brooklyn Museum of Art Ḥadīkatūʾs-Sūʾ edā**

The reason for my particular emphasis on the Brooklyn manuscript is on account of the fact that the colophon of the Ḥadīkatūʾs-Sūʾ edā denotes that the manuscript was copied in Baghdad. This is the only manuscript of the Ḥadīkatūʾs-Sūʾ edā that contains a colophon stating its place of production. The manuscript measures 14 x 24.8 cm and has 580 folios. Its binding is a typical brown leather one with a central almond-shaped medallion and corner pieces with a floral design in dark red leather filigree against a partly faded gold background. The manuscript opens with an illuminated ‘unwan. The text is written in nastāʾīq and was copied by ʿAzizullah al-Husayni al-Kashani in Jumada II 1011 (1602) in Baghdad. It has nine paintings. As most copies of the Ḥadīkatūʾs-Sūʾ edā produced in Baghdad in this period are similar in format, decoration and choice of paintings, I will briefly describe the paintings in the Brooklyn Museum of Art manuscript to give a sense of the painting scheme in Ḥadīkatūʾs-Sūʾ edā manuscripts. Using this manuscript as a basis
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330 Manuscript copies of the Ḥadīkatūʾs-Sūʾ edā appear in commodity lists and probate inventory lists of eminent officials. Among them we can point out the late-eighteenth-century governor of Baghdad, Ḥāfiz Muṣṭafa Paşa (d. 1778) as an example. This governor’s commodity list includes a large number of books. Notable among them is a copy of the Ḥadīkatūʾs-Sūʾ edā, Menākbhīʾl Evlīyā, as well as an Akhlāq-ı Muhsini (Virtues of the Benefactor). Other books included are mostly works of history. The inclusion of the Aḥlāk-ı Muhsini of Husayn Waʿiz Kashifi is particularly interesting. The list does not note whether the manuscripts are illustrated or not. However, there is an illustrated copy of this work in the Topkapı Palace Museum Library (R. 392). I was not able to examine this manuscript due to its poor condition.

TPMA D. 6460 “Bağdad valisi Hafiz Mustafa Paşa’nn Eşya Listesi.”
from which to consider the corpus of illustrated copies of this text as well as comparable
texts, this chapter, on the one hand, calls into question the use of models and conditions
under which illustrated books are made, and suggests, on the other, that these manuscripts
were made on speculation.

The first painting that appears in the Brooklyn manuscript depicts the *Expulsion from
Paradise* (fig. 3.6). Almost all of the Ḥadīkatūʾs-Sūʾ ādā manuscripts begin with a painting
depicting the expulsion of Adam and Eve from Paradise, situated at the moment Adam and
Eve are shamefully expelled. In the Brooklyn Museum of Art manuscript, Adam and Eve
are depicted half naked, with wide leaves covering their loins. Adam holds Eve’s hand as
they face the Archangel Gabriel, who is standing at the gate of a double-storey structure.
Three other angels peer from the upper storey and balcony while two angels stand outside in
the paradise garden. On the lower left, the dark skinned Iblis/Satan wearing a red cap
appears along with a peacock and a snake.

Fuzuli writes that Adam and Eve had been allowed to reside in paradise and could
eat everything except for the fruit from the forbidden tree (*mīve-i șecere-i menhiyye*). When
Iblis learned of this, he became envious and entered paradise with the help of a snake and
peacock and tempted Adam. Fuzuli’s narrative account is interspersed with verses and the
painting in the Brooklyn Museum of Art comes at the end of the verse: “To Lord God my
bad deed / Made me vile and abject when I was honored / This is the penalty to the one who
goes against You / who gives into worldly temptation” (*Büzürgvar hudâya isâ-et-i ʾamelium
/ Beni mükerrrem iken hâr u häksâr itdi / Budur cezâsi anuň kim saña muhâlîf olub / Hevâ-yî
nefs mûraʾatüñ ihtiyâr itdi*). Adam’s recognition of his sin, composed in verse in the first
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331 Paintings of the *Expulsion from Paradise* can also be found in the British Library Or. 7301 and Or. 12009,
fol. 7b, Sûleymaniye Kütüphanesi Fatih 4321, fol. 9a, BnF Supp. Turc 1088, fol. 9b, and Talaat 81 Tarikh
Turkı, Dar al-Kutub Cairo, fol. 7a.

332 Ḥadīkatūʾs-Sūʾ ādā, Brooklyn Museum, 70.143, fols. 13b–14a.
person, acts at the same time, as a warning to the reader/listener. Adam and Eve then cover themselves with fig leaves, portrayed as well in this painting, and exit Paradise.

While Fuzuli gives a brief overview on the reasons for Adam and Eve’s expulsion and Adam’s repentance, this section, and subsequently the first chapter, establishes a typology whereby the sufferings of Adam and Old Testament prophets and Zechariah, John the Baptist and Jesus Christ are consistently compared to the toils of Imam Husayn. Additionally, in the case of Adam, Fuzuli emphasizes the predestination of Muhammad as Prophet. Fuzuli notes that the reasons for the acceptance of Adam’s penitence were threefold: his penitence, lamentation, and prayer; Adam’s prayers and conversation with God prefigured the prophethood and distinction of Muhammad. This is a recurrent theme in the text, whereby Prophet Muhammad and his family, and particularly Imam Husayn, are distinguished among all.

Breaking his narrative on the murder of Abel, son of Adam, and God’s order that Cain would remain forever in pain and punishment, Fuzuli warns: “Oh noble ones, as such punishment has befallen one who has forgone respect for Adam and murdered his son, it should be obvious what pains one deserves, who does not respect and revere Muhammad, who is loftier and greater than Adam, and murders his offspring.” Fuzuli ends this section with the comments that the sufferings and troubles of Husayn are greater than that of Adam. This comparison continues in the subsequent sections as well. Throughout the text, the Karbala tragedy is foreshadowed and prefigured through anecdotes.

The second painting (fig. 3.7) represents the Sacrifice of Ishmael. This scene is illustrated in several other manuscripts of the Ḩadī̄katü’s-Sūʿ ēdā. The painting shows Abraham dressed in a brown garment and turban wrapped around a green cap, pinning his

333 Ḩadī̄katü’s-Sūʿ ēdā, 29.

334 Etnografya Müzesi Besim Atalay Env. 7294, fol. 36a; British Library Or. 12009, fol. 19b, Türk İslam Eserleri Müzesi, T. 1967, fol. 19b, Talaat 81 Tarih Turki, Dar al-Kutub Cairo, fol. 20b.
son down as he strikes him with a knife. The son, Ishmael, bare headed—his turban and brocaded blue garment rest on top of the light purple rocks—and dressed in a white garment, has his hands and feet tied. One of Ishmael’s last requests was for his father to tie his hands and feet firmly lest he resist and give his father trouble when his weak body involuntarily moves in anguish from the pain of the sword (زمان-ی یکل ای ژایی یسمو مهکم باگلایسن کی یکیزی-یی ایلم ای تیگ ایرسیککدی یسم-ی یا یییی ییی-یییی ییییی ییییی یییییی یییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییییі
example of the Sacrifice of Ishmael. In terms of the composition, the seven manuscript copies that include this scene are almost the same. It is most likely that these works, which were produced over a short span of time, from circa 1595 to 1605, repeated models.

Let us briefly compare these compositions with several slightly earlier examples of the Sacrifice of Ishmael found in manuscripts of the Qiṣaṣ al-Anbiyāʾ (figs. 3.14–17). These compositions provide the essential figures of Abraham and Ishmael, both with flaming haloes, a darker-skinned Iblis observing, and the angel bringing the ram in Ishmael’s stead, with an occasional spectator (fig. 3.14). Similarly, the large-scale illustrated courtly copies of the Zübdetü’r-Tevārīh (Quintessence of Histories) of Seyyid Lokman reflect the interest in the stories of the prophets (and especially a particular view of history that associates Ottoman rulers with prophets). 337 The large paintings (sometimes juxtaposing two or three stories on one page) present the bare essentials of the story in a legible manner. For example, the paintings of Abraham and Ishmael are placed together, with a frontal depiction of Abraham engulfed in flames on the bottom register (Nimrod and the catapult can be seen on the right), and an older, white-bearded Abraham, seated kneeling, behind Ishmael and Gabriel with a white ram at the top (fig. 3.18).

While the iconography of the story of the Sacrifice of Ishmael had its precedents, from the early texts of Tabari’s (d. 923) Tārīkh al-Rusūl wa’l Mulūk (History of the Prophets and Kings), its Persian translation by Bal’ami, the Jāmiʿ al-Tawārīkh of Rashid al-Din Fadl Allah Hamadani (d. 1318), and particularly, the numerous illustrated copies of the Qiṣaṣ al-Anbiyāʾ manuscripts produced in the last quarter of the sixteenth century, the late-sixteenth-century Baghdad copies add a new element, as noted by Milstein. This is the inclusion of

337 Emine Fetvacı highlights the importance of genealogical succession in text and image, which led to the Ottoman rulers. Fetvacı, Picturing History at the Ottoman Court, 160–75.
several angels carrying bowls of fire around Abraham and Ishmael. Milstein sees in this detail a reflection both of Fuzuli’s text, which mentions the intercession of angels to stop the sacrifice, and of Sufi ideas of nearing the presence of God. She compares these paintings with scenes of the Mi’raj of the Prophet. Indeed, Fuzuli emphasizes the steadfastness of both Abraham and Ishmael in their readiness for the sacrifice. As with Adam’s repentance and communication with God, here too, at the critical moment of the acceptance of the ram as sacrifice, Fuzuli notes the communication between Abraham and God. God asks whether he loves himself or Prophet Muhammad more, and whether he loves his own child or Muhammad’s. Abraham’s response to both is that he loves Muhammad and his family more, upon which God proclaims that Muhammad’s family will be martyred in Karbala, and that the recompense for his lamentation for the martyrs of Karbala is greater than that for his own son. This again strengthens the ties with the stories of prophets as both exempla and as scales by which to judge the Karbala tragedy. Fuzuli’s text highlights this connection throughout.

Milstein’s emphasis on the innovation of the “Baghdad school” hinges on her understanding of the text as bearing Sufi overtones. However, one must be careful not to read all details with the same understanding, especially in the works of a poet who is not associated with any particular Sufi path. A note of caution can be extended to the

338 Ibid., 14.
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340 Ḥadikatū’s-Sü’edā, 42.
341 There is controversy regarding Fużūlī’s ethnic origin, place of birth and his religious affiliation. Some of these controversies are fed by nationalist concerns regarding appropriation of Fużūlī. While Fuad Köprülü, Haluk İpekten and İbrahim Aşkı suggest that Fuţūlī was a Shi’ite, Süleyman Nazif suggests that Fuţūlī was a Sunni. On the otherhand, summarizing several controversies regarding this issue, Abdülkadir Karahan is of the opinion that Fuţūlī followed a mild form of Twelver Shi’ism. Halil İnalcık is also of the opinion that Fuţūlī followed Twelver Shi’ism. Additionally, Haluk İpekten argues that while mysticism is an important part of Fuţūlī’s works, it was, for him, not the end but a means to an end.
See Fuad Köprülü, Fuţūlī, Hayati ve Eseri (İstanbul: Yeni Şark Kütüphanesi, 1924); İbrahim Aşkı, Fuţūlī Hakkında Bir İki Söz (İstanbul: Ali Şükrü Matbaası, 1919); Abdülkadir Karahan, Fuţūlī, Muhitti, Hayatt ve
paintings as well. Whatever the cause (a Sufi interpretation of Fuzuli’s text in paintings produced in Baghdad according to Milstein, or a difference in taste and artistic choice over time or space among others), the inclusion of the angels carrying trays in this composition is an innovation that appears in Baghdad in the late sixteenth century. This can also be aligned with other types of paintings produced in Baghdad in this period, which in general are more crowded in comparison to the more legible Istanbul paintings—compare for example the unfinished painting showing an audience scene in the Câmi ü’s-Siyer (Collection of Biographies), likely added later at the court (fig. 4.6), and a scene depicting the reception of an envoy (fig. 4.9) in this same manuscript (described in further detail in the next chapter). Note in fig. 4.9 both the larger group of people before Alexander, as well as the crowded group waiting and watching at the doorway on the right. Such groups of people waiting and peering from the doorway often appear in Baghdad manuscripts, as in the case of figures 3.31–35.

As with Adam and Abraham’s lamentation over the loss or readiness to lose a child, Fuzuli’s text builds this typology in the story of Jacob and Joseph as well. Jacob’s constant lamentation is compared with the constant lamentation of Imam Zayn al-ʿAbidin following the battle in Karbala. When, according to a report, Zayn al-ʿAbidin, son of Husayn, was constantly crying and was asked to bear with patience, he replied: “Jacob had become separated from his son / The rush of tears had blinded his eyes / Is it a wonder that I should cry / Having been separated from many a Joseph-like innocent?” Further comparisons between prophets and the martyrs of Karbala are made, in the case of the brothers of Joseph denying him water, much like the martyrs of Karbala being denied water. These
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typologies emphasize the predestination of the Karbala tragedy. If we consider the Ḥadiḳatū’s-Sū‘edā in the context of an interest in the stories of the prophets, universal histories and their synopses in the form of genealogies that begin with Creation and the stories of Old Testament prophets, and certainly, as well, with the popularization of illustrated copies of the Qiṣṣa al-Anbiyāʾ in the 1570s and 1580s, then these works seen together with Fuzuli’s text, take on another meaning, where the manuscripts dedicated to the stories of the prophets prefigure what was to befall Husayn and his family in Karbala. These seemingly different genres share much in common. Moreover, the illustrated Ḥadiḳatū’s-Sū‘edā copies also appear at a moment when illustrated copies of the Qiṣṣa al-Anbiyāʾ were widespread, providing a wealth of possible models.

While the Brooklyn manuscript does not have a painting representing the story of Jacob and Joseph, several manuscripts of the Ḥadiḳatū’s-Sū‘edā as well as the Rawżat al-Shuhadāʾ and Rawżat al-Ṣafāʾ include scenes from their tale. Fuzuli’s relatively longer account of the sufferings of the father and son likely feeds from the interest in the story of Joseph and Zulaykha and illustrated copies of this story and the inclusion of their tales in other works, such as Saʿdi’s Bustān (Rosegarden). In several manuscripts of the Ḥadiḳatū’s-Sū‘edā we encounter paintings from the story of Joseph, such as the appearance of Archangel Gabriel in the guise of Jacob to console Joseph (fig. 3.19), Joseph found by the merchants (figs. 3.20–22) and Joseph sold in the slave market (figs. 3.23–24).

As with the previous sections, Fuzuli ends the story on the toils of Jacob and Joseph with a quatrain highlighting the incomparable toils of Husayn.344 The sufferings of Moses, Christ and Job are given only brief mention, and emphasis in these accounts is again on direct comparison to the toils of the martyrs of Karbala. In the illustrated manuscripts of the Ḥadiḳatū’s-Sū‘edā the scenes that are illustrated the most in the section on prophets are that

344 Ibid., 69.
of the *Expulsion from Paradise*, *Sacrifice of Ishmael*, and the *Martyrdom of Zechariah*. In the Brooklyn manuscript, we encounter all three.

The third painting of the Brooklyn manuscript depicts the *Martyrdom of Zechariah* (fig. 3.25). The painting appears in the last section of the second chapter of Fuzuli’s *Ḥādiḳatū’s-Sū’edā*, which deals with the calamities faced by Zechariah and his son Yahya. According to Fuzuli’s account, when Yahya did not give consent to the marriage of the ruler (Herod Antipas) to his stepdaughter (Salome), the ruler’s wife sent her daughter (from another marriage) to him, who, one night drunk, gave in to his stepdaughter’s wish to have Yahya beheaded. When the executioners were loth to kill Yahya because of the eminence of his father, it was decided that both would be killed. Yahya was caught while Zechariah hid inside the trunk of a tree. However, Iblis pulled the hem of Zechariah’s garment out and exposed him to the executioners. They sawed the tree in half along with Zechariah.

The painting in the Brooklyn Museum of Art manuscript is dominated by the centrally placed tree, which is being sawn by two men, depicted here as Europeans wearing black hats. On the lower right, Iblis, dressed in a long brown garment, and his face rubbed off, pulls Zechariah’s hem. Those watching the execution are also portrayed as Europeans. On the left, Yahya is depicted, dressed in a light green and blue garment, with a flaming halo around his head. His hands are tied and he is led by a man wearing a conical cap, who points to the tree, in which his father was hidden. The inclusion of Yahya, a “double martyrdom” in the words of Milstein, is also a new element, which stems from Fuzuli’s text. Yahya is included in almost all copies of the *Ḥādiḳatū’s-Sū’edā* manuscripts, which portray the *Martyrdom of Zechariah* (figs. 3.25–27). The only exception to this is the Konya manuscript (fig. 3.28), which, however, like the other versions of this subject, also portrays
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345 In Fuzūlî’s account the ruler or his stepdaughter are not named.

the executioners and onlookers as Europeans. It is worth noting here that the faces of the executioners have been rubbed off, as was the case in the Brooklyn and Ankara copies. The appearance of European figures in paintings that can be attributed to Baghdad can also be found in a painting of the *Fire Ordeal of Abraham* (fig. 3.29) where those throwing Abraham from the catapult as well as onlookers are portrayed as Europeans.

The predominance of Europeans in not only negative light as in these above-mentioned examples, but also in other contexts as signifying Jews (fig. 4.14), discussed further in the next chapter, is frequent in Baghdad paintings. It is not only Europeans that appear in Baghdad paintings but a wide variety of figure types, from Indians to figures depicted with Shirazi headgear to Ottoman headgear, Bedouins, beggars, etc. Perhaps here too we can find a double entendre in the portrayal of Europeans, in the case of the executioners in an openly negative light, and in other contexts as an eclectic incorporation of a somewhat anachronistic representation of an “other” such as in figure 4.14.

The martyrdom of Yahya and Zechariah ends the first chapter. The following chapter deals with the sufferings of Prophet Muhammad, and Fuzuli provides a conceptual link by suggesting that prophets among all humankind are those that face affliction and trouble and can bear it with patience, and that among them, Prophet Muhammad is distinguished in the amount of his suffering and patience. Among his sufferings, according to Fuzuli, were: becoming an orphan, opposition to his call to faith, and the death of his son, Ibrahim.

Quoting the *Shawāhīd-i Nubuwwat* (The Witnesses of Prophecy) of Jami, Fuzuli writes that when faced with the choice of either his son Ibrahim’s or his grandson Husayn’s death, Muhammad chose to bear the pain himself by giving his consent for the death of his son, for “if Ibrahim dies, most of the pain will be mine, whereas if Husayn dies, I and ‘Ali and Zahra
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will be in pain.” In the Brooklyn manuscript there are no paintings in the second chapter. However, a 1594 copy of the Ḥadīkatūʾs-Sūʾ edā includes a rare instance of the illustration of the martyrdom of Jaʿfar ibn Abi Talib in Muʾtah (fig. 3.30), a story also included in this chapter.

The following painting in the Brooklyn manuscript belongs to the third chapter of the work and depicts the Prophet Muhammad preaching before his death (fig. 3.31). The Prophet Muhammad dressed in brown and green and wearing a green turban, is portrayed with a veil covering his face and a flaming halo surrounding him. He sits on the pulpit, while the Archangel Gabriel faces him. The congregation, including his son-in-law ʿAli, and grandsons Hasan and Husayn, seated on the right, also adorned by a flaming halo, listens to the Prophet’s final sermon. At the entrance, three men dressed in brown and blue and wearing wooden clogs, stand. One gazes straight at the viewer, as is typical of many paintings found in manuscripts from Baghdad.

Two other copies of the Ḥadīkatūʾs-Sūʾ edā include representations of the Prophet’s Final Sermon. These appear in the Paris (fig. 3.32) and the Ankara copies (fig. 3.33). Compositionally these three paintings are quite similar with the Prophet preaching from the pulpit on the right as a wide variety of people, including beggars (fig. 3.33) and Bedouins, listen, seated in a circle while ʿAli and his sons sit next to the pulpit. However, all three paintings depict different moments in the story according to their placement within the text.

The Ankara painting (fig. 3.33) uses the composition of the page, with the text and painting to suggest the interior of the mosque and its exterior on the margins, especially with the green colored dome on the upper margin. Here, the Prophet is giving his final sermon and will to the congregation and tells them that, as no prophet is immortal, he too is not
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immortal, and asks them not to forget him.\textsuperscript{349} Next, he asks that whomever he has wronged
to claim his due in retribution. A man named ʿUkkaše rises and says that during the battle in
Tabuk (in 630), the Prophet Muhammad had struck his camel with a lash, but had missed
and struck him instead.

In the Paris manuscript (fig. 3.32), we see ʿUkkaše standing before the Prophet, with
a whip in his hand. Not giving into the crowd’s pleas to take on the retribution themselves,
ʿUkkaše further demands that the Prophet Muhammad strip, as he himself had been bare
when he was struck. When the Prophet Muhammad complies and takes his garment off,
ʿUkkaše sees the seal of prophethood on his shoulder and bowing before him, drops the lash,
saying his reason for this excess was twofold: to show the congregation the Prophet’s justice
and to bow before and touch his blessed body to save himself from hellfire.\textsuperscript{350}

The Brooklyn manuscript juxtaposes the scene of the Prophet Muhammad’s final
sermon with the story of the moment of his death. Fuzuli writes that the Angel of Death
appeared at the door disguised as a Bedouin and asked for his permission to take his life.
The Prophet asked him to wait until the arrival of Gabriel, who is portrayed as kneeling
before the Prophet (fig. 3.31). In the majority of the paintings in this and other copies of the
\textit{Ḥadiḳatū’s-Sūʿ ʿedā} we can note a close relationship between Fuzuli’s text and the
compositions, some of which show certain innovations when compared to possible models.
Some of the examples mentioned above, such as the \textit{Expulsion from Paradise} or \textit{Sacrifice of
Ishmael} were repeated in several copies and multiple copies of the text were prepared within
a short period of time. Some of the models encountered in the \textit{Ḥadiḳatū’s-Sūʿ ʿedā} also

\textsuperscript{349} \textit{Ḥadiḳatū’s-Sūʿ ʿedā}, Ankara Etnografya Müzesi, Besim Atalay, Env. 7294, fol. 68a.

\textsuperscript{350} \textit{Ḥadiḳatū’s-Sūʿ ʿedā}, BnF, Supp. turc 1088, fols. 64b–65a.
appear in another text dealing with the Karbala tragedy, the *Maḳtel-i Āl-i Resūl*. Here, however, the composition depicting the Prophet preaching before his death in the Ḥadīḳatū’s-'Sū’ edā takes on a different meaning in the *Maḳtel-i Āl-i Resūl* of Lami’i Çelebi and emphasizes the role of the Prophet Muhammad as the foundation of the faith.

Composed in verse in the first quarter of the sixteenth century in Bursa, this work differs from Fuzuli’s in its approach to the tragedy. Lami’i Çelebi’s *Maḳtel-i Āl-i Resūl* was, according to ‘Aşık Çelebi and Hasan Çelebi’s (d. 1604) mid- and late-sixteenth-century *tadhkiras*, accepted by the ulema of Bursa, at a time when the reading and the possible performance of *maḳtal* literature in gatherings was frowned upon. In his *Maḳtel-i Āl-i

---


352 Kınaalızade Hasan Çelebi notes that the preacher Mulla ‘Arab (d. 1531) was of the opinion that reading of the *maḳtal* of Husayn in gatherings was misbelief (kufr). ‘Aşık Çelebi’s *Meṣâʿ ʿirāʼ-i Ṣu’-ārā* also sheds light into the initial doubts about this work. According to Filiz Kılıç’s critical edition of this text (which makes use of five manuscript copies), Mulla ‘Arab found the reading of *maḳtal* literature appropriate to the exonymous folk (“*şıklara mahoṣṣ*”). This phrase is missing in the one illustrated copy of the text (Fatih Millet Kütüphanesi 772, fol. 154b). In this version, the copyist has omitted Mulla ‘Arab’s signification of the *maḳtaḥs* as (only) worthy of those who remain outside of the orthodox society or central state. Instead, it is written: “Ve Maḳtel-i Ḥüşeyin va ‘iz Mulla ‘Arab Burusa’da ‘kaž-ı-yi vaḳṭ Aṣçızāde Hasan Çelebi ve Mulla ‘Arab’-i va ‘sâ-ı rı ‘ulemāyi cem’-ı dîdb maḳṭelin okudub ‘ulemā kaqūl îmîsrîldîr.” (And he has gathered Mulla ‘Arab, the judge of the time Aṣçızāde Hasan Çelebi and other members of the ulema in the mosque of Bursa and had them read the *Maḳtel-i Ḥüşeyin* and accept it). What is also missing in this illustrated version is the note that Lâmi’i Çelebi based his work on historical facts and presented it to the ulema, who then accepted it. Thus, in Kılıç’s critical edition it is added: “Ve Maḳtel-i Ḥüşeyin va ‘iz Mulla ‘Arab Burusa’da şıklara maḥṣūs Maḳtel-i Ḥüşeyin okunmâq men’-ı dîdbîe merhîm Lâmi’î Çelebi tevârîh-ı şahîhîdan cem’-ı tertîbî dîdb Burusa’da ‘kaž-ı-yi vaḳṭ Aṣçızāde Hasan Çelebi’T-i ve Mulla ‘Arab’-ı va ‘ızî ve ‘sâ-ı rı ‘ulemâyi cem’-ı dîdb maḳṭelin okudub ‘ulemâ kaqûl îmîsrîldîr.” (And the deceased Lâmi’i Çelebi, collected and composed his *Maḳtel-i Ḥüşeyin* based on approved historical accounts when the preacher Mulla ‘Arab had deemed the *Maḳtel-i Ḥüşeyin* to be intended for exonyms and thus prohibited its reading [and] he gathered the judge of the time Aṣçızāde Hasan Çelebi, preacher Mulla ‘Arab and other members of the ulema in the mosque of Bursa and had them read the *Maḳtel-i Ḥüşeyin*, [which] they accepted).

Mulla ‘Arab’s opposition to *maḳtal* literature and his identification of its readers as “*şıḳ*” needs to be considered in the context of the early-sixteenth-century power dynamics between the Ottomans and the Safavids (particularly during the reign of Selim I) as well as Shi‘i sensitivities in Anatolia in this period. Helga Anetshofer considers the “*şıḳ*” to suggest exonymous persons, that is to say those that stand in opposition to central authority and are found inappropriate by the central authorities. Anetshofer analyzes the use of this term through time, first encountered in the *divan* of Yunus Emre, used in a derogatory way to denote a begging wandering dervish; later used also in a derogatory manner to suggest wandering dervishes of various propensities of faith. Anetshofer notes that the term “*şıḳ*” is used by ‘Aşık Çelebi himself on two occasions and in reports from others on three occasions. She notes that while not explicit, there is a connection to the Abdals in ‘Aşık Çelebi’s usage. In the above-mentioned example, ‘Aşık Çelebi refrains from voicing his judgment. Lâmi’i Çelebi’s *Maḳtel-i Āl-i Resūl* is dedicated to Sinan Bey, finance director of Süleyman I (r. 1520–1566). It appears that even in the context of dispute regarding the reading of *maḳtal* literature, Lâmi’i Çelebi was able to gain the support of the court. Various other works of his are dedicated to Ottoman rulers. Among
Resûl, Lami’i Çelebi emphasizes the work’s close adherence to historic facts, a possible factor for its acceptance. However, compared to Fuzuli’s Hadîkatû’s-Sü’ edâ, Lami’i’s Maktel-i Âl-i Resûl was not as popular, at least as it appears from the extant manuscript copies.

Lami’i Çelebi’s text emphasizes the Prophet and his family and defines them all as Sunnis in opposition to their enemies, identified as kharîjîtes. There is greater emphasis in Lami’i Çelebi’s text on the rightly guided caliphs, whereas Fuzuli’s text highlights Husayn’s sufferings above all. In his Maktel-i Âl-i Resûl Lami’i Çelebi shies away from cursing Yazid. Quoting Hızır b. Celal (d. 1459), the first judge of Istanbul, he advises the reader to be quiet and not curse, as Yazid is not worse than the devil (Çünkî şeytândan Yezîd artuk degül / Aduñ li ‘îna daḵma sâkit ol). However, Lami’i Çelebi also attests to the horror of the tragedy when he writes that the altercation has drained any efforts to cease cursing (terk-

them are several translations from Persian, including Fattâhî Nishabûrî’s (d. 1448) Husnu u Dil (Beauty and Heart) and ‘Ali Shîr Nuvâ’î’s Farhâd u Shîrîn, both presented to Selim I (r. 1512–1520) and Vâmiq u ’Azrâ (Vamiq and Azra) and Viş u Râmîn (Vis and Ramin) presented to Süleyman I.

Both ‘Âşık Çelebi and Hasan Çelebi provide a comprehensive list of Lâmi’i Çelebi’s works in their tadkhîras. ‘Âşık Çelebi and Hasan Çelebi also note him as the Jâmi of Rum (Câmi-i Rûm) on account of the fact that he has translated several of Jâmi’s works. Mustafa ‘Ali counters this likening, however, deeming them incomparable. In addition to his translation of Jâmi’s works, Lâmi’i Çelebi also followed the Naqshbandî Sufi order.


353 İşit imdi böyledir kavîl-i şâhid / Kim tevârîh ehli yazmışdır sarîh (Listen now to such sound words / Which historians have composed evidently)
Kîtâb-i Maktel-i Âl-i Resûl, 78.

354 Gûnay Kut provides a list of manuscript copies of this work. Among the nine extant copies, three of them (mentioned above) are illustrated. Recently, a dispersed folio from a Maktel-i Âl-i Resûl, containing a painting, was sold at Sotheby’s in London (20 April 2016, Lot 42). See note 358 below.

Like Fuzuli, Lami‘i Çelebi also wants to incite the readers to lamentation (ağlasunlar işidüb bu mâtemi / dem âkitsunlar añub ol bir demi).

Not as popular as the Baghdadi author’s version of the Karbala tragedy, there were fewer illustrated copies of Lami‘i Çelebi’s Maktel. Two copies, a manuscript in London (fig. 3.34) and a dispersed leaf in New York (fig. 3.35) portray the Prophet preaching inside a mosque. As in the Hadıkatü’s-Sü’edā examples, here too, ‘Ali and his sons are depicted seated on the right among a crowd of people listening. Figures appear at the doorway also listening. However, in this instance, it is not the Prophet’s final sermon that is depicted, but Lami‘i Çelebi’s laudatory remarks on the Prophet in the introduction to his work. The placement of the painting in the London copy further supports the Sunni bent of Lami‘i Çelebi’s text. Here, the author writes: “In order to make the palace of religion solid / [You] made the rightly guided caliphs the pillars [to its throne].” While Lami‘i Çelebi’s text

---

356 Kitāb-i Maktel-i Âl-i Resūl, 75.
357 Ibid.
359 Lâmî‘i’s verse may play on the idea of the angels bearing the throne of God, ḥ amaletü’l ‘arş, when he writes: “Kaşr-i dīni kilmagîçin üstüvâr / Çâryârîn ‘arşâ itdûh rûk-n-i câr.” Here I translated ‘arş as throne but as the metaphor of the palace is used for religion, the likening of the four rightly guided caliphs could be to the pillars of the palace as well. Maktel-i Âl-i Resûl, Or. 7238, fol. 3a, British Library, London.
differs from Fuzuli’s, the paintings, including sermon scenes and battle scenes are quite similar and include paintings of the Swearing of Allegiance of ʿAli (fig. 3.36), and several combat scenes from the Battle of Karbala—the two texts, while different in approach tell the story of the same event and repeat compositions for ease of preparation of the illustrated copies.

Returning to the Brooklyn Museum of Art manuscript, the painting that follows the Prophet Muhammad’s final sermon illustrates a scene from the life of ʿAli b. Abi Talib. The painting (fig. 3.37) portrays ʿAli enthroned before a tent. He is dressed in a green and brown garment and dark green turban. A flaming halo surrounds his shoulders and head. His attendant stands holding his double-edged sword while his army, and his donkey can be seen on either side of the tent. The particular scene takes place after the Battle of Nahrawan, when ʿAli asked who would send news of victory to Kufa. ʿAbd al-Rahman b. Muljam-i Muradi stepped up to the task. Here, Ibn Muljam, portrayed as a dark-skinned man, depicted in profile, foreshadows the murder of ʿAli b. Abi Talib at his hands. Fuzuli’s account, which does not follow a chronological sequence but a thematic one within each chapter, connects this event with the story of Ibn Muljam, who hailed from Egypt along with the tribe that came to murder ʿOsman and remained in Kufa. Fuzuli mentions Ibn Muljam’s gifting a sword to ʿAli at another point in time, and the latter’s refusal of it, as well as ʿAli’s prescience of his death at the hands of Ibn Muljam.\(^{360}\) The majority of the manuscripts of Ḥadīḳatū’s-Sūʿaṣāṣ portray the climactic moment of ʿAli b. Abi Talib’s death and the capture of Ibn Muljam (figs. 3.38–39). However, like the Brooklyn Museum of Art manuscript, the Paris copy also chooses a different moment in the story of ʿAli b. Abi Talib. Here (fig. 3.40), as in the Brooklyn copy, a moment of victory is chosen for representation—ʿAli and his army victorious over the kharījites at the Battle of Nahrawan.

\(^{360}\) Hadīḳatū’s-Sūʿaṣāṣ, 200–1.
In addition to illustrating the story and particularly the death of ’Ali b. Abi Talib, Ḥadīkātū’s-Sūʿedā manuscripts often illustrate battle scenes between ’Alid forces and the Umayyad forces, such as a battle between Muslim b. ’Aqil and the Umayyad forces of ’Ubaydallah b. Ziyad (figs. 3.41–42), or between Ezrak and his sons and Qasim, son of Hasan (figs. 3.43–44). Often, members of the Umayyad army are portrayed with slightly darker skin and grotesque features, visually enhancing the opposition between the forces.

Among the episodes that are often highlighted with the inclusion of a painting are the Death of Hasan (figs. 3.45–51) and Zayn al-ʿAbidin Preaching (figs. 3.52–57). Most of the paintings depicting the Death of Hasan are compositionally similar. Hasan, surrounded by a flaming halo, lies down, accompanied by Husayn, also surrounded by a flaming halo. The London manuscript (fig. 3.46) portrays him in the attendance of Husayn and several women. Women also appear, though not so prominently, in other paintings depicting the Death of Hasan, as observers. In one case, in the Rawžat al-Shuhadāʾ, two women appear (fig. 3.50). This time, they are not observers. The painting juxtaposes several moments in the story of the death of Imam Hasan. On the right, we see Jaʿda bint al-Ashʿath, also known as Asma, wife of Imam Hasan, taking the poison—diamond powder—from a woman. The main composition depicts Hasan dying. Among the attendants are his brother Husayn, and his son Qasim, as noted by an inscription on his turban.361

The Death of Hasan is also included in Lamiʿi Çelebi’s Maḳtel-i Āl-i Resūl, in a composition similar to the above-mentioned examples. Citing Muhammad Parsa’s (d. 1420) Faṣl al-Khiṭāb li Waṣl al-Albāb (The Conclusive Judgment in Uniting the Hearts) Lamiʿi Çelebi writes: “Six times they gave him pure poison / As his body was from top to bottom a theriac / His heart was fearless of any poison” (Böyle yazmış şāhib-i Faṣlūʾl Hīṭāb / Altı kez

---

361 As the following chapter will point out, women also appear in another manuscript, the Câmi ʿûs Siyer, in which they are represented among the audience in a painting depicting Baha al-Din Walad, preaching in Balkh (fig. 4.18).
The painting in the Museum of Turkish and Islamic Art (fig. 3.51) appears at this climactic moment, when the sixth time, the poison finally does its job.

Almost all of the Ḥadīkatū’s-Sū’edā manuscripts and the single illustrated copy of the Rawżat al-Shuhadāʾ include a painting depicting Zayn al-ʿAbidin, the son of Husayn, preaching in the mosque. The painting in the Rawżat al-Shuhadāʾ identifies the location specifically as Damascus, whereas several of the compositions depict the scene in an otherwise generic mosque interior, and several also include the exterior of the mosque, dome on a high drum and tapering minarets on the upper margin that appear in Baghdad (figs. 3.52–53 and 56). Most of the paintings appear at the moment when Imam Zayn al-ʿAbidin had obtained permission from Yazid to voice the sermon (figs. 3.53–54, 56–57). Wary of the crowd’s reaction to Zayn al-ʿAbidin’s sermon, however, Yazid wanted to have the muʾazzīn interject the sermon. Figures 3.52 and 3.55 portray this moment when the muʾazzīn, instead of interjecting, voices the pronouncement of faith. This is highlighted in the Istanbul manuscript, where a man dressed in red, possibly the muʾazzīn, stood up and voiced the takbir, as noted by Fuzuli. Both moments highlight Zayn al-ʿAbidin’s open challenge to Yazid, who, in Fuzuli’s account, proclaims he had not consented to Husayn’s murder (“Ben Ḥüseyn’iñ katline rāzī degüldim, la’net ’Ubeydullāh’a ki bu emr-i kabīhe ıkdām idüb beni ’Iraq u Şām’da bed-nām itdi’”). Fuzuli’s narrative ends with Yazid’s curse upon ’Ubaydallah b. Ziyad, the governor of Kufa.

---

362 Muḥammad Parsā, an eminent member of the Naqshbandiyā order, is among Lamīʿī’s references in his work, which emphasizes the veracity of historic facts as evidenced by his examples of such authors, and as through his reiterations, that “this is how historians have noted the events” (Böyledir tarih ehlinden haber). Fuzûlī too references Muḥammad Parsā in his Ḥadīkatū’Sū’edā. Mâketel-i Al-i Resūl, TIEM T. 1958, fôl. 10b.

363 A dispersed leaf from a manuscript of the Ḥadīkatū’Sū’edā, presently in the Museum of Ethnology in Rotterdam also depicts this moment. For a reproduction of this painting, see Mahnaz Shayeste Far, “The Impact of Religion on the Painting and Inscriptions,” Central Asiatic Journal 47 (2003): 250–93, 281.

364 Ḥadīkatū’Sū’edā, 468.
Fuzuli ends his work with various reported and written accounts of the remaining female companions, their lamentation, a short story and poem comparing the pains and sufferings of prophets to that of the martyrs of Karbala (hence linking the end of his account with the beginning), as well as with an account of the worldly pains and sufferings of those who perpetrated the murders, before facing their eternal judgment (el-ḳiṣṣa ḳutelā-yi Hüseyn ākūbāt-i 'uhrevīden muḳaddem ākūbāt-i dünyāya giriftār olmadan dünyādan gitmediler). To this, he appends an elegy on Imam Husayn (missing in Kashifi’s version), as well as a brief overview of the twelve Shi’i imams, as per Husayn Va’iz Kashifi’s Rawżat al-Shuhadā’.

While Fuzuli’s Ḥadīkatū’ı’s-Sū’edā follows a linear chronology in its organization, beginning with Adam and Old Testament prophets and ending with an elegy on Husayn, within each chapter there are chronological warps through reported stories about the lives of Prophet Muhammad and his family that highlight themes of suffering, lamentation, predestination, and patience.

Paintings in many of the illustrated copies include episodes on the stories of the prophets, scenes of preaching, and of battles or single combats. In this regard, they are not unlike the Rawżat al-Shuhadā’ or the Maḳtel-i Āl-i Resūl copies. While there are stylistic variations among all, compositionally the multiple copies of these works on the Karbala tragedy bare striking similarities among each other, as well as showing innovations that appear to be unique to Baghdad. That there are multiple copies of the Ḥadīkatū’ı’s-Sū’edā, all with more or less the same episodes illustrated, and less so of the Maḳtel-i Āl-i Resūl or the single illustrated copy of the Rawżat al-Shuhadā’ raises questions about ownership, audience, and readership. The similar compositions and subject matter in the Maḳtel-i Āl-i

365 Ibid., 479.
366 Fuţūlī writes that while a genealogy of the sayyids is not part of the account of what befell the martyrs in Karbala and the story of the sufferings of prophets, he includes a summary version of this information in line with his following or imitation (tutabbu’) of the Rawżat al-Shuhadā’. Ibid., 483.
Resûl, Ḥadîkatî ’s-Sü’edâ as well as the Rawżat al-Shuhadâ’ also raise questions on the use of models in the preparation of illustrated manuscripts and the conditions under which manuscripts were prepared outside of the court. Given the multiple copies of illustrated genealogies, some of which contain notes of well wishes on the reader (discussed in chapter 5), the multiple copies of the Ḥadîkatî ’s-Sü’edâ suggest that these may have been produced for a speculative audience, or possibly for those wishing to have a visual reminder of the very sites of the Karbala tragedy and the shrines and burial grounds of the martyrs of Karbala. The inclusion of a painting depicting Prophet Muhammad praying for the souls of those interred at the cemetery of Baqi’ before his death (a scene depicted in only one manuscript copy) (fig. 3.58), and the importance of this site for Shi’i is make a further connection between the illustrated copies of the Ḥadîkatî ’s-Sü’edâ (or at least one copy) and the Shi’i population of Baghdad. The London manuscript, which includes this painting, is, however, the only example among the Ḥadîkatî ’s-Sü’edâ manuscripts to


368 The cemetery of Baqi’ in Medina contains the graves of many of the Prophet’s companions and relatives, including his infant son İbrâhîm, his uncle ʿAbbâs, Imams Hasan b. ʿAlî, Zayn al-ʿAbidin, Muḥammad al-ʿAqrî, Ja’far al-Sâdiq. Ulrich Marzolph has published on an illustrated nineteenth-century Shi’i pilgrimage scroll in a private collection in Hawai. This scroll, commissioned by a Muḥammad Ja’far Kasî’î, a cloth-merchant from Karbala, includes the main sites in Mecca and Medina, as well as the cemetery of Baqi’ and Fadak (which according to Marzolph is rarely, if ever, found in Sunni pilgrimage certificates), and sites in Kufa, Najâf, Karbala and Mashhad. An earlier example of the depiction of the cemetery of Baqi’ can be found in the example written by Seyyid ʿAlî, mentioned below. Interestingly, the cemetery of Baqi’ is also included in the pilgrimage certificate drawn for prince Meḥmed (d. 1543), son of Süleymân I.

It is worth noting that the Câmi’ü ’s-Siyer (described in further detail in the next chapter) was meant to include a painting to accompany a very brief account of Fadak. It appears in the story of what happened during the time of the Umâyяд caliph ʿOmar b. Abd al-ʿAzîz (r. 717–720). The author writes: “And also in this year the village named Fadak, which the Prophet had [...] it had been given to the possession of the treasury, it was given back to ʿAṭṭâ’s family so that it would be divided among the descendants of the Prophet.” (Ve hem bu yılda Fedek nâm kârîye ki hâzret-i şâllallahu ʿalehy ve sellem tîmişî beynî’l mâla zaḥî olunmuşdu girî benî ʿAṭṭâ ya teslim idîb sâdat mâbeyininde kismet olmak için bir ’âmîl ta’în eyledî). Here, the author does not refer to any of the former dispute between the daughter of Muḥammad and caliph Abû Bakr regarding the rights to the possession of Fadak. Instead, the brief statement shows that Fadak was returned to the descendants of ʿAṭṭa.

include a depiction of the cemetery of Baqi.’ In addition, the use of similar compositions, possible use of models in the preparation of the illustrated manuscripts, and illustrating three different texts on the Karbala tragedy, the Persian Rawżat al-Shuhadā’, and the Turkish Ḥadiḵatū’s-Sū‘ edā and Maktel-i Āl-i Resūl, pose questions on the possible owners of these manuscripts. I suggest that these were geared for a local, speculative audience. Bektashi circles in Baghdad appear to be a likely audience, especially for the Ḥadiḵatū’s-Sū‘ edā. A more Sunni-bent group, much smaller based on the extant manuscripts, may be the audience for the Maktel-i Āl-i Resūl. Whoever the particular audience/owner/reader may be, these illustrated works likely fed from the sacred topography of Baghdad and possibly functioned as visual mementos of the very land, which was the site of the martyrdom of the family of the Prophet.

Sayyid ‘Ali al-Husayni, a sixteenth-century author, who made the pilgrimage in 967 (1559), noted down his journey and illustrated the account, “so that [his] dear friend, when he looks upon these images, will be filled with a longing to see them, and will make every effort to set out on the road.”

Pilgrimage scrolls and guides to the holy sites of Mecca, Medina and Jerusalem act as visual reminders and certificates of piety; additionally, texts on the essentials of the pilgrimage, such as the Futūḥ al-Haramayn (Description of the Two Holy Sanctuaries) of Muhyi al-Din Lari (d. 1526–27) or the Dalā‘il al-Khayrāt (Ways of Edification) of Muhammad ibn Sulayman al-Jazuli (d. 1465) act as guides to the rituals of the pilgrimage. Ibn Tawus (d. 1266), jurist and theologian from Hilla, and composer of a

---

369 Milstein introduces this work titled Shawqnāma (The Book of Longing), which is at the National Maritime Museum in Haifa (Inv. no. 4576). She notes that the otherwise unidentified author was the scribe of another illustrated manuscript copied in Mecca in 957 (1550–51). The preparation of the illustrated account of the hajj pilgrimage can also be seen in the context of bringing back souvenirs from Mecca. See for example, Suraiya Faroqhi’s chapter, “Keepsakes and Trade Goods from Mecca,” in Travel and Artisans in the Ottoman Empire: Employment and Mobility in the Early Modern Era (London, New York: I. B. Tauris, 2014), 89–98; Rachel Milstein, Kitāb Shawq-nāma.

370 Composed in the mid-fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries, illustrated versions of these texts appeared throughout the sixteenth century and became more popular in the succeeding centuries. Rachel Milstein identifies fourteen dated, illustrated manuscripts of the Futūḥ al-Haramayn, dating to the sixteenth century.
work on the Karbala tragedy, writes that he composed his work as a companion to the
visitors of the shrines. Is it possible to consider the illustrated copies of the Ḥadīkatū’s-
Sū’ edā as visual mementos of a pilgrimage to the burial sites and shrines of the martyrs of
Karbala, or as reminders of the lamentation that is emphasized throughout the text? Metin
And and Haluk İpekten point to the popularity and readership of the Ḥadīkatū’s-Sū’ edā of
Fuzuli among Bektashi circles. M. Enver Beşe also notes the popularity of the
Ḥadīkatū’s-Sū’ edā among Bektashis and its use in muḥarram ceremonies. Unfortunately
this is based on observation of such practices in Anatolian villages and I have not come
across evidence from late-sixteenth-century Baghdad that supports this. While literary
references to the presence of Bektashis in Iraq date to the early seventeenth century, the
popularity of the Ḥadīkatū’s-Sū’ edā in Baghdad may be seen in a wider context of
verification of identity and genealogy (through the visitation of Alevi dedes to have their
genealogies renewed), popular piety and shrine visitation that was geographically
immediately central to Baghdad. In her discussion of ‘Alid shrines in medieval Syria,
Stephennie Mulder points to the connection of place and sacred history through the interplay
of visitation, ritual acts, and texts. A similar interconnection between the sacred

There are also undated copies, which are datable to the sixteenth century based on style. For a list of these
manuscripts see Rachel Milstein, “Illustrations of the Hajj Route,” in Mamluks and Ottomans, Studies in
Honour of Michael Winter, ed. David J. Wasserstein and Ami Ayalon (London and New York: Routledge,

371 Fuţûlî’s Ḥadīkatū’s-Sū’ edā also refers to this work in several occasions.
Güngör, Maktel-i Hüseyin, 456.

372 İpekten, Fuzuli, 55; Metin And, Ritüelden Drama, 94.


374 Karakaya-Stump’s research on Bektashi convents in Iraq suggests that the convent in Karbala was visited by
Alevi dedes, who had their genealogies renewed. Ayfer Karakaya-Stump, “The Forgotten Dervishes: The Bektashi Convents in Iraq and their Kızılbash Clients,”

375 Stephennie Mulder, The Shrines of the ‘Alids in Medieval Syria: Sunnis, Shi’is and the Architecture of
topography of Baghdad, from the Karbala tragedy of the seventh century to shrine visitation and the associated rituals through time, the reading/performance of the Karbala tragedy in that very land, and the production of illustrated accounts of the tragedy by the local author Fuzuli, can be seen in the popularization of the Ḥadīkatū’s-Sū’ edā in Baghdad. The expressive figures in the compositions and scenes of preaching included in the illustrated copies of this text may also refer to the performative aspect of the text. In addition, the Baghdadi origins of Fuzuli may have enhanced the work’s popularity in the province. İpekten adds that the sixteenth-century translation of the Rawżat al-Shuhadā’, prepared by a poet named Ahmed, known by the penname Cami, was soon forgotten following the composition of Fuzuli’s Ḥadīkatū’s-Sū’ edā. Among other contemporary works on the Karbala tragedy, Fuzuli’s version, was the most widely read (at least as evidenced by the surviving manuscript copies).

David J. Roxburgh suggests that “the effect of images of Mecca, Medina and other holy sites is to transform geography into religious topography, to present pilgrimage spaces through their symbolic structures, and, in effect, to authenticate a set of religious practices and beliefs.” While the Ḥadīkatū’s-Sū’ edā cannot be considered in this same genre of pilgrimage texts and images of holy sites, its very essence arises from the site of the martyrdom of Husayn and his followers. The dynamics of certification of lineage and that of acts of piety and pilgrimage inform the context in which one can view the proliferation of

---

376 Haluk İpekten, Fuzuli, 56. İpekten does not provide a reference but his point may be based on the tadhkira section of Muṣṭafa ʿAlī’s Künhü’l Ahbār, in which the Ottoman bureaucrat writes, regarding Cāmī, that following the excellent works of Kāshīfī in Persian and of Fuzūlī in Turkish, composing such a work and having it approved or liked by the talented ones, is hardly possible. Mustafa İsen, ed. Künhü’l Ahbār’ın Tezkire Kısmı (Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Yayını, 1994), 202.

the illustrated copies of the Ḥadīkatū ’s-Sū ’edā, particularly in the province of Baghdad denoted as the burc-u evliyā. This aspect of Baghdad as a site of holy shrines of importance to both the Ottomans and the Safavids, also informs another group of illustrated manuscripts, which have been more closely studied elsewhere. While these works on the lives and miracles of Sufi mystics is beyond the scope of this chapter, they too take part in a wider interest in popular religious stories, such as the interest in illustrated copies of the Majālis al-’Ushshāq (Assemblies of Lovers) produced in Shiraz. In a study outlining the patronage of books in Sufi orders in the Ottoman Empire, Çağman and Tanındı point out that it was only in the early seventeenth century that Ottoman patrons became interested in owning illuminated copies of the Mathnawī. Cevri Ibrahim, a calligrapher and Mawlawi poet, copied twenty-two copies of the Mathnawī during his retirement after his office as secretary to the Imperial Chancery. Moreover, other illustrated manuscripts, such as the Turkish translation of the Shāhnāma (Book of Kings) copied in the early seventeenth century by calligraphers associated with the Mawlawi order, and one of which was likely to have been produced for

378 Haral, Osmanlı Minyatüründe Mevlana’nın Yaşam Öyküsü.


380 The authors first provide an overview of the patronage and production of illuminated and rare instances of illustrated copies of the Mathnawī from the late-thirteenth century through the early-sixteenth century in Anatolia under the Seljuqs, as well as in art centers such as Shiraz, Baghdad, Herat, and Samarqand under Timurid and Turkmen rulers. They remark that while the Mathnawī continued to be copied in the fifteenth century under Timurid and Turkmen patronage, it was rather the text as a work of poetry that the Mathnawī was viewed in this period. The authors provide examples of a mid-fifteenth-century illustrated copy of the Mathnawī, indeed a rare example of the work being illustrated, as well as an unillustrated copy prepared for the Qara Qoyunlu prince Pir Budaq (d. 1466), several late-fifteenth and early-sixteenth-century examples copied in the maqām of the Kazaruni order in Shiraz and several illuminated copies of the Mathnawī prepared for Timurid rulers. The illustrated Mathnawī dated circa 1455 is presently in the Topkapı Palace Museum Library (R. 432) while the unillustrated copy prepared for Pir Budaq is in the Bodleian Library in Oxford (Elliot 251). On the patronage of Pir Budaq see David J. Roxburgh, “ ’Many a Wish Has Turned to Dust:’ Pir Budaq and the Formation of Turkmen Arts of the Book,” in Envisioning Islamic Art and Architecture, ed. David J. Roxburgh (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 175–223. In addition, for the production of manuscripts at the Kazeruni orders see the article by Filiz Çağman and Zeren Tanındı, “Manuscript Production at the Kāzerūnī Orders in Safavid Shiraz,” in Safavid Art and Architecture, ed. Sheila Canby (London: 2002): 43–8; Filiz Çağman and Zeren Tanındı, The Book in the Sufi Orders in the Ottoman Empire, 509–11.
Hafız Ahmed Paşa (d. 1632), who was close to Mawlawi circles, show the increasing interest in illuminated and illustrated works among Ottomans, who were in or close to the Mawlawi order.381 While various shrine centers such as that of Abu Ishaq Ibrahim in Kazarun, Imam ’Ali al-Rida in Mashhad, or Shaykh Safi in Ardabil also accommodated artists and precious books, Çağman and Tanındı note that the Ottomans did not treat shrines in the same manner as the Safavids, where books could be produced or sold. In addition, the Ottomans did not show the same interest as the Safavids in the production of illustrated and illuminated copies of the works of mystics such as ’Abdullah Ansari, ’Attar, Rumi, or Jami.382 Rather, it was illustrated books of history that were mostly produced in the court atelier in the late sixteenth century. In this respect, illustrated works on the lives of Sufi mystics prepared in Baghdad (as well as the Ḥadīḳatū’s-Sü’edā) present a divergence from courtly interests in Istanbul.

Additionally, as mentioned in the previous chapter, calligraphers were active in the shrine of Imam Husayn in Karbala. Illustrated works on the lives of Sufi mystics and on the Karbala tragedy prepared in Baghdad, are remarkable for their compositional innovation. While the story of the life of Prophet Muhammad was also illustrated in the capital and there was an interest in the stories of prophets, Baghdad is unique with respect to the coexistence of multiple illustrated copies of texts on the Karbala tragedy (possibly geared at a Bektashi audience) as well as texts on lives of Mawlana Jalal al-Din Rumi and Sufi mystics.383 It is also likely that the illustrated manuscripts on the lives of Sufi mystics and on the life of Jalal

381 Çağman and Tanındı, The Book in the Sufi Orders in the Ottoman Empire, 511–3.

382 Ibid., 516–7.

al-Din Rumi were made on commission, possibly to counter the popularity of the illustrated Ḥadiḵatü’s-Śü‘edā manuscripts.
CHAPTER 4
THE GOVERNOR HASAN PAŞA AND HIS ILLUSTRATED UNIVERSAL HISTORY

It is reported that when he was governor in Baghdad, he would go to the Friday prayers in sultanic habit and manner. His father asked for his removal from the post, in case, God forbid, news of this [behavior] would incur the sultan’s wrath. He had an incomparable, comely appearance; he was a gallant çelebi (bir şehbaz ve şehlevend çelebi idi). But he was haughty and self-absorbed. He would appoint a page as his treasurer and dress him in like garments; the page would ride a horse, like his, by his side; set up tent by his side. Other attendants would also dress like him, wearing atlas and brocade from head to toe. I have seen him several times, in Eger, dressed in red atlas and with a golden belt with sheets decorated with images of simurghs. This too was particular to him. But stranger than these, when he was governor of Baghdad, he had built a silver throne worth forty-fifty thousand ghurush. Named “paradise throne,” it was decorated with silver branches and leaves and fruits; the mind would be in wonder. When Hasan Paşa was besieged in Tokat, the Celali rebel Deli Hasan had his harem and treasury brought from Baghdad. Deli Hasan would wind [the throne] and his bandits would watch.

Thus writes historian Ibrahim Peçevi on Hasan Paşa, governor of Baghdad from 1598 until his death in 1602. Hasan Paşa was one of the sons of the grand vizier Sokollu Mehmed Paşa (d. 1579). From the early 1570s until his death, Hasan Paşa served as district governor and governor-general in several provinces, as well as commander in several battles, including the 1596 Eger campaign. While late-sixteenth- and seventeenth-century chronicles sporadically mention the governor, especially with regard to his deeds in various battles, it is during his post as governor-general of Baghdad that Hasan Paşa appears as an idiosyncratic man almost fashioning himself as a ruler. This chapter considers the patronage of Hasan Paşa in the context of the art market in Baghdad. Through a detailed study of an ambitious unpublished universal history composed and prepared for him, this chapter addresses two

384 Here a note is necessary regarding the historical inaccuracies in Peçevî’s account, possibly due to his temporal distance from the events. As will be shown below, Hasan Paşa was appointed to Baghdad after the death of his father. That being said, it does not take away from the impression of grandiosity that Hasan Paşa gave.
questions: Why did the ostentatious governor commission a new universal history? How was this history imagined? Commissioning a universal history is a paradigmatic way of heightening political legitimacy. Through his patrilineal links with the eminent grand vizier Sokollu Mehmed Paşa as well as possibly matrilineal links through this stepmother, İsmihan, daughter of the Ottoman ruler, Selim II (r. 1566–1574), the governor-general sought to create an almost sultanic image for himself through his art patronage, and particularly through his commission of a universal history. This work titled Cāmiʿūʾs-Siyer (Collection of Biographies), which was written most likely by a local author, for this governor-general, presents a particular view of history that is tinged with a local flavor. As a universal history its scope is general. However, this work is also grounded in local realities, which is also reflected in local elements in the paintings.

The quality, size/scope and ambition of the projects created for Hasan Paşa affirm his regal aspirations. Contemporary accounts concur on the governor’s grandiose manners and appearance. Mustafa bin Mulla Rıdvan el-Bağdadi presents interesting, yet somewhat mistaken information on Hasan Paşa. This seventeenth-century author writes, mistakenly, that Hasan Paşa was the son of a certain Sinan Paşa. He adds that Hasan Paşa claimed to be a prince because he was borne of a concubine granted to his father by Sultan Murad III (r. 1574–1595). While “Sinan Paşa” would say that Hasan Paşa was his son, Hasan Paşa would proudly claim that he was the son of the Ottoman sultan Murad III. Giving this extra information about the pasha’s regal ambitions, Mustafa bin Mulla Rıdvan continues his account and writes that Hasan Paşa gathered his men to battle Karayazıcı, the Celali leader discussed in Chapter 1.385 Given the date and the account of Hasan Paşa’s battle with the rebellious Karayazıcı presented by the author, the pasha in question must be the son of the grand vizier Sokollu Mehmed Paşa. Regardless of whether Hasan Paşa’s claims to be the

385 Muṣṭafa b. Mulla Rıdvan el-Bağdādī, Tārīh-i Fetihnāme-yi Bağdād, Bodleian Or. 276, fol. 64b.
son of the sultan as noted by the Baghdadi author are true or not, the author’s inclusion of this detail corroborates opinions regarding Hasan Paşa’s over-the-top behavior.  

The eighteenth-century author Nazmizade Murtaza also notes Hasan Paşa’s self-absorbedness and çelebi character. This author also mentions Hasan Paşa’s ornamented silver throne, which, from Peçevi’s account quoted above, would appear to be an automaton. In addition to this ornamented, silver throne, the same governor also gifted a silver door for the prayer room of the Mawlawi shrine in Konya. Nazmizade Murtaza further identifies Hasan Paşa as the patron of the portico of the mosque known as Hasan Paşa Cami’i in Baghdad. Pedro Teixeira, who traveled from Basra to Baghdad in the early seventeenth century, attributes a new ditch, market, khan, and coffeehouse to Hasan Paşa. He writes: “This ditch is a new work, made in 1601, by Açen Baxa Wazir, who also built thereby the market, khan, and coffeehouse, yet known by his name—very fine building.”

386 While Muştafa b. Mulla Ridvan el-Bağdadi is mistaken about Hasan Paşa’s father, possible rumors about his princely claims may have to do with the fact that Sokollu Mehmed Paşa later married princess İsmihan Sultan. While Hasan Paşa was not İsmihan Sultan’s son, Sokollu’s sons remained with him even after his marriage to the princess. Sokollu and İsmihan’s only surviving son, İbrâhîm Hân (a title bestowed on him by Selim II) and his descendants, the İbrâhîm Hânzâdes controlled their own pious endowments. See Gülru Necipoğlu’s chapter, “İsmihan Sultan and the Grand Vizier Sokollu Mehmed Paşa,” in The Age of Sinan: Architectural Culture in the Ottoman Empire (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2005): 331–45.

387 With unclear origins, the title “çelebi” was used in the Ottoman context as a “title or epithet of persons of princely rank, high ecclesiastical officials (particularly those who were at the heads of Derwish orders), famous authors, etc.” In the seventeenth century the term seems to have taken a different meaning to also signify the learned urbanite folk. In the case of Hasan Paşa, Nazmizade Murtaza or Peçevi’s attributions would more likely be referring to his princely behavior. On the title see Barthold, W. “Çelebi.” Encyclopaedia of Islam, First Edition (1913–1936), eds., M.Th. Houtsma, T.W. Arnold, R. Basset, R. Hartmann. Brill Online, 2015. Reference. Harvard University. 13 November 2015 <http://referenceworks.brillonline.com.ezp-prod1.hul.harvard.edu/entries/encyclopaedia-of-islam-1/celebi-SIM_1969>; First appeared online: 2012; First Print Edition: isbn: 9789004082656, 1913-1936.


389 Nazmîzâde Murtâzâ, Gülşen-i Hulefâ, 193.

390 Pedro Teixeira notes that the gateways of the khan and a new mosque were the only stone structures. Teixeira also introduces coffee and the coffeehouse. He writes that it was a place, where men gathered for
While other governors of Baghdad, such as Murad Paşa, Elvendzade ʿAli Paşa and Cigalazade Sinan Paşa, were also patrons of architecture, Hasan Paşa is especially notable for his patronage of illustrated manuscripts. In fact, the burst of artistic activity in Baghdad in the last decade of the sixteenth century nearly coincides with the governorship of Hasan Paşa. The question is whether it was his regal aspirations that found fertile ground in Baghdad in the form of artistic patronage, or whether Hasan Paşa himself was the catalyst for the short-lived art market.

As Emine Fetvacı has shown, the base of patronage broadened in the late-sixteenth century in the Ottoman realm to include high-ranking court officials or figures such as the

conversation and entertainment; and pretty boys would attract customers, serve coffee and take payments. He adds that it was by the river and had two galleries with plenty of windows. Teixeira arrived in Baghdad in October 1604 and remained there for two months. The Açen Pasha Wazir mentioned by Teixeira is most probably Hasan Paşa. He attributes the market, khan and coffeehouse to this governor. However, later in his description of Baghdad he notes that the current pasha was Yûsuf Paşa, the Circassian eunuch, who had come from Basra. This must be the Yûsuf Paşa whose travels from Istanbul to Basra are described by Muḥlişi (BnF Turc 127).

Another traveler who notes the coffeehouse (among other sights, including the bridge, mosque and citadel) is Sir Thomas Herbert (d. 1682). He writes: “Coho-houses are houses of good fellowship, where towards evening most commonly many Mussulmen ordinarily assemble to sip coffee, a Stygian liquor, black, thick and bitter, brewed out of bunchie or bunnin berries, more reputed of, if they hold on to the old custom that is recorded by Herodotus, how that not a woman here but once in her lifetime sat in Venus’ temple, but most esteemed from a tradition they have that Mohammad sipped no other broth than this, which was invented by Gabriel. In the coho-house they also inebriate themselves with arak and tobacco.” Pedro Teixeira, *The Travels of Pedro Teixeira: with his “Kings of Harmuz,” and Extracts From his “Kings of Persia,”* tr. William F. Sinclair (London: Hakluyt Society, 1902), 61–2. Henceforth Teixeira, *The Travels of Pedro Teixeira; Sir Thomas Herbert, Some Years Travels into Africa and Asia the Great, Especially Describing the Famous Empires of Persia and Hindustan, as Also Divers Other Kingdoms in the Oriental Indies, 1627–30*, ed. John A. Butler (Arizona: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2012), 513. Henceforth Sir Thomas Herbert, *Some Years Travels into Africa and Asia the Great.*

391 Naẓımzâde Murtaża writes that Cığalazâde Sinân Paşa built a coffeehouse and adds a poem that was composed for the building of the coffeehouse. Abdüsselam Uluçam also notes that this governor built a khan (1590) and repaired the Zümruṭ Hatun Mosque near the Mustansiriyya madrasa. Uluçam writes that this mosque was first built before the turn of the thirteenth century by Zümruṭ Hatun, mother of the Abbasid caliph, al-Nâṣîr li-Dînillah (r. 1180–1225).

Citing the Ottoman traveler and geographer, Mehmed ʿAşık, Necipoğlu notes that the mosque of Murâd Paşa had a single dome in the Ottoman manner but that “its minaret is in the style of minarets in the Arab lands.” The mosque was commissioned from the architect Sinân. Naẓımzâde Murtaža also adds that Fâżîl of Baghdad composed a chronogram for this building.

As the mosque commissioned by Hasan Paşa has undergone extensive repair and renovation in 1957 and has not retained its original plan or decoration, it is difficult to comment on his patronage of architecture in comparison to that of other governors of Baghdad. The mosque is located by the Tigris near a bridge connecting the two banks.

bureaucrat Mustafa ʿĀli, detailed in Chapter 2. In addition to and in line with the broadening base of patronage, the deeds of non-royal figures came to be illustrated. Works like the 1582 *Nuṣretnāme* (Book of Victory), presented to Murad III by the chief white eunuch Gazanfer Ağa (d. 1603), the *Şecaʿatnāme* (Book of Courage) of Asafi Dal Mehmed Çelebi on ʿÖzdemiroğlu ʿOsman Paşa’s (d. 1585) eastern campaigns, and the 1594 *Tārīh-i Feth-i Yemen* (History of the Conquest of Yemen) portraying the deeds of the grand vizier Sinan Paşa (d. 1596) “embody the emergence of divergent histories of the Ottoman empire—alternative voices to that of the şehnāmeci (shahnameh writer).”

High-ranking court officials acted as intermediaries, as for example the above-mentioned case of Gazanfer Ağa, or as patrons of the arts as well, as in the case of the grand vizier Sinan Paşa. In addition to being the subject of the *Tārīh-i Feth-i Yemen*, this grand vizier was also a collector. He possessed eight illustrated manuscripts of Safavid production, five of which can be attributed to Shiraz, along with a treasure of richly decorated objects, trappings, and garments. A richly illustrated *Shāhnāma* (Istanbul, Topkapı Palace

---


393 Less elaborate but still illustrated (with one or two paintings) works highlight the personal valor of individual campaign leaders, such as ʿTālḵīzāde’s *Tārīh-i ʿOsman Paşa* (TPML R. 1300) or Niyāzī’s *Zafernāme-i ʿAlī Paşa* (Millet Ktp. Ali Emiri Tarih Nu. 396). The latter contains two maps: one of Dizful and its surroundings (fols. 41b–42a), the other of Sushtar and its surroundings (fols. 69b–70a). The 1603 *Vakʿa ʿynāme-i ʿAlī Paşa*, while reminiscent of the *Nuṣretnāme* and the *Tārīh-i Feth-i Yemen* in terms of portraying the deeds of a single non-royal actor, still differs from the latter two because of its lack of battle scenes and emphasis on the grand vizier ʿAlī Pasha’s justice. For the latter work see Soner Demirsoy, ed. *Vekâyi-i Ali Paşa (Yavuz Ali Paşa’nın Mısır Vâliği 1601–1603)* (İstanbul: Çamlıca, 2012). On this work also see Fetvacı, *Enriched Narratives*, especially 247–52. Fetvacı considers this manuscript, along with the *Divân of Nādirī* (TPML H. 889) as works that reflect a transformation in the understanding of illustrated history and the conceptualization of the book. She adds that the *Vakʿa ʿynāme-i ʿAlī Paşa* highlights the governor’s administration of justice and his generosity, rather than military battles. Ibid., 303

394 Gülru Necipoğlu points to this grand vizier’s immense wealth and patronage of pious foundations. See Necipoğlu, *The Age of Sinan*, 506.

Museum Library, R. 1544) was presented by this grand vizier to Mehmed III (r. 1595–1603) in the year 999 (1590–91).  

The popularity of illustrated Shāhnāmas, and to a lesser extent, Silsilenāmes (discussed in the next chapter), is reflected in Ottoman archival registers as well. Book ownership and collecting reflected status and social prestige. For example, the personal library of Doğancı Mehmed Paşa (d. 1589), Murad III’s favorite and the governor-general of Rumelia briefly introduced in Chapter 1, contained several important manuscripts. The probate inventory (tereke) for this executed governor-general shows that he possessed an album of paintings and calligraphy, illustrated copies of the Shāhnāma, a Khamsa (Quintet) of Nizami, a Ḥadīkatū’s-Sū’edā (Garden of the Blessed) of Fuzuli, a Majālis al-’Ushshāq (Assembly of Lovers) and two manuscripts of the Külliyāt (Collected/Complete Works) of Sa’di. Chapter 1 also presented the example of the janissary-turned-governor Bekir Subaşı’s son Derviş Mehmed: While not a patron of illustrated manuscripts, he owned a decorated ship, and two musicians, who attended to his feasts. Chapter 1 showed that governors in the frontier province of Baghdad as well as upstarts had the means to increase their wealth, and that they were also patrons of art and architecture. As noted above, the present chapter concentrates on Hasan Paşa during his post as governor of Baghdad, who also partakes of a broadening base of patronage in the late sixteenth century, showing that the patronage of high-ranking officials was not exclusive to the capital but took place in provincial centers as well. Among this broadening base of sub-royal patronage, Hasan Paşa’s patronage of the Cāmī’ü’s-Siyer is further remarkable for being a new text, which

396 Ibid., 245.


398 Günhan Börekçi, “Factions and Favorites at the Courts of Sultan Ahmed I (r. 1603–17) and his Immediate Predecessors” (PhD diss., The Ohio State University, 2010), 187. Henceforth Börekçi, Factions and Favorites.
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was prepared for this governor during his post as governor of Baghdad. Given the scope of Hasan Paşa’s personal authority, lavish display and performance of that means as manifested in the broad range of his patronage, it comes as no surprise that he commissioned a universal history. The Câmi ‘ü’s-Siyer emphasizes the position and role of the vizier-cum-governor Hasan Paşa as the culmination of universal history, an ambition with almost sultanic claims. Such a structure very much parallels the contents of imperial universal histories, like the Zübdetü’t Tevârîh, which show the reigning Ottoman sultan as the culmination of universal history.

**Hasan Paşa’s Career**

Before he became governor-general of Baghdad, Hasan Paşa was assigned several posts, mostly as district governor in the early years of his long career, and later as governor-general in various provinces. His first post was in Bosnia, followed by the governor-generalship of Aleppo in 1572, Diyarbekir in 1573, and Damascus in 1577; the latter three being closely connected to the region of Baghdad. Almost a month before the commander Lala Mustafa set out on the eastern campaign against the Safavids in March 1578, a petition from the people and grandees of Erzurum to the governor-general Hasan Paşa asked that the Porte be notified of their plans to expand the ramparts and fortifications at their own expense. While Erhan Afyoncu suggests that it is not clear whether Hasan Paşa was governor of Erzurum at this point, according to Selaniki’s chronicle, it is through Hasan Paşa that the petition was presented. In addition, the historian Mustafa ʿĀli’s raging invective

---


against Ömer Beg, the district governor of Trebizond, makes note of “the apple of [Sokollu Mehmed Paşa’s] eye,” Hasan Paşa’s appointment as governor of Erzurum.403

Almost a year after the above-mentioned petition, when the Ottoman army gathered in Erzurum in the beginning of July 1579, Hasan Paşa was acknowledged as the governor-general of Damascus.404 He too was summoned to Erzurum along with governors of Karaman, Zulkadiye, Aleppo, Diyarbekir, Rumelia and Anatolia; thence the governors were to go to Kars, in order to prepare for the fortification of the castle.405 The importance given to the construction of the Kars castle was highlighted by an eyewitness account and a painting in each of the two illustrated copies of the Nuşretnâme (figs. 4.1–2). Moreover, an imperial warrant written to Hasan Paşa, governor of Damascus, after the conquest of Kars, and preserved in an album (TPML H. 2165) further emphasizes the importance of this achievement (fig. 4.3). That multiple mosques were built (and illustrated in the two paintings representing the construction of the Kars castle) distinguished the city and “announced the inauguration of Sunni orthodoxy.”406

Following the construction of the Kars castle, Hasan Paşa was then sent to Tbilisi (Tiflis) to provide war supplies to its commander-governor Mehmed Paşa, son of Solak

403 While Ömer Beg was a protégé of Sokollu Mehmed Paşa, Muştafa ‘Alī writes disparagingly of Ömer Beg, whom he met in Trabzon. In the Counsel for Sultans, Muştafa ‘Alī denounces Ömer Beg, with whom both Hasan Paşa and the author himself had lodged, and in each case, Ömer Beg had slandered their servants, accusing them of having stolen furnishings. Muştafa ‘Alī also adds that whenever Ömer Beg was traveling from town to town to take land registers, he would “lay hands on a virgin under the cloak of marriage.” Andreas Tietze, Mustafa ‘Ali’s Counsel for Sultans of 1581: Edition, Translation, Notes (Vienna: Verl. d. Österr. Akad. d. Wiss, 1979–82), 22–5 (trans.), 137–41 (text); Fleischer, Bureaucrat and Intellectual, 87.

404 A mühimme register from October 22, 1578 notes Hasan Paşa to be the governor of Damascus. An order sent to the former governor of Temesvár, Çâfer Paşa, states that as Hasan Paşa, governor of Damascus, was appointed for the defense of Erzurum, Çâfer Paşa is to march to Damascus for the region’s defense (Prime Ministry Archives, Mühimme Defteri 32.243.451). This register also includes orders to the governors of Adana, Anatolia and Egypt to mobilize their men to Damascus (Prime Ministry Archives, Mühimme Defteri 32.242.448 and 32.245.454), as well as to the governor of Damascus to mobilize his forces (Prime Ministry Archives, Mühimme Defteri 32.244.453). Mühimme register 34 also contains orders regarding Hasan Paşa (Prime Ministry Archives, Mühimme Defteri 34.708). Kütükoğlu, Osmanlı-İran Siyasî Münasebeteri, 72.


406 Necipoğlu, The Age of Sinan, 76.
Ferhad Paşa. According to Uruch Beg, who was one of the secretaries to the Safavid ambassador, and who was also known as Don Juan of Persia upon his conversion to Catholicism, the Safavid commander ‘Ali Quli Khan and the Georgian Simon ambushed the Ottoman supply forces. While Hasan Paşa lost some men, he was able to capture ‘Ali Quli Khan, and bring relief forces into Tbilisi. In the meantime, governorship of Tbilisi was given to Hacı Beyzade Ahmed Paşa in Mehmed Paşa’s stead. According to Don Juan of Persia, Hasan Paşa was honored with a shield for his deeds in Tbilisi.

Under the command of Koca Sinan Paşa and later Ferhad Paşa, Hasan Paşa took part in the eastern campaigns. Until 1583 his posts alternated between governorship of Damascus and Diyarbekir, in addition to taking part in campaigns against the Safavids. In May 1582, Hasan Paşa, still the governor of Damascus, was included among the invited guests in the circumcision festivities of prince Mehmed (son of Murad III) in Istanbul. His duties in the Ottoman-Safavid wars continued, with posts in campaigns in Georgia and in the repair of the Revan fortress. In early 1584, he was appointed as governor-general of Aleppo, replacing Üveys Paşa; a year later he was appointed as governor-general of Erzurum. By the end of the Ottoman-Safavid wars in 1590, Hasan Paşa assumed the post of governor-general of

---


409 Don Juan of Persia, 158. Sir Thomas Herbert notes that it was on account of his father (and for capturing the Safavid general) that Hasan Paşa was granted “a silver battleaxe double-gilded and set with precious stones sent unto him with a shield of pure gold embellished with pearl and a vest of cloth-of-gold.” Sir Thomas Herbert, Some Years Travels into Africa and Asia the Great, 639.


Damascus again, then of Anatolia in Kütahya. In the latter office, Hasan Paşa received the Safavid embassy bringing the hostage prince Haydar Mirza (d. 1595) as guarantor of the peace treaty signed between the Ottoman sultan Murad III and the Safavid ruler Shah Abbas in 1590.

The entry of the Safavid prince into Istanbul captured the interest of poets, painters and historians and it must have made an impression on the poet Baki as well, for he refers to the event in his ode to Murad III. A detached folio from an illustrated Divan of Baki, which is stylistically attributable to Baghdad, features the Safavid prince, his retinue and Sokolluzade Hasan Paşa on horseback as they enter Istanbul (fig. 4.4). Hasan Paşa, placed centrally in the composition and mounted on a black horse, looks directly at the viewer and almost towers above the young prince on horseback, who is flanked by two attendants. While the folio is detached from its manuscript, the manuscript is likely to have been commissioned by Hasan Paşa. Zeren Tanındı suggests that the lines “As [one] reads/hears [the story] of your eulogy, [he] comes from a corner to listen to it / The life of Salman /[and] the pure soul of his excellency Hassan comes” (Okuduğa na’tını bir şişeden şiş itmege/ Câns-i Salmân ruh-u pâk-i hażret-i Hassan gelişi) may refer to both Sokolluzade Hasan Paşa and Hasan, the son of caliph ’Ali b. Ebi Talib. These verses are written on the obverse of

---

412 İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, Bizans ve Selçukluographs Germeyan ve Osman Oğulları Zamanında Kütahya Şehri (Istanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1932).

413 The surrender of the Safavid prince as part of the peace negotiations between the Ottomans and the Safavids made an impression, not only on the poet Baki, but also on the historian Selânikî Muṣṭafâ Efendi, who provided a detailed account of the entry of the prince in Istanbul. The interactions with the child prince are also illustrated several times in the Kitâb-i Gencine-i Feth-i Gence. In addition to the two illustrated Divân of Bâkî and the Kitâb-i Gencine-i Feth-i Gence (Book of Treasury of the Conquest of Ganja), Sinem Arcak also mentions another representation of the procession of the prince preserved in an album prepared for Rudolf II (ÖNB, Codex Vindobonensis 8626, fols. 123r–28r). For a study on the role of the child prince in Ottoman-Safavid negotiations see Sinem Arcak, “A Peace for a Prince: The Reception of a Safavid Child Hostage Prince at the Ottoman Court,” in Gifts in Motion: Ottoman-Safavid Cultural Exchange, 1501-1618 (PhD diss. University of Minnesota, 2012), 135–87.

414 Tanındı identifies the subject matter of this painting, which had mostly been thought to represent the Ottoman army entering the capital. A close reading of the text reveals that the folio comes from a Divân of Bâkî. Two other detached folios appear to have come from the same manuscript, which is no longer extant. These are: a painting depicting the Ottoman shaykh al-islam Ebussu’ud (d. 1574) (Metropolitan Museum of Art, 25.83.9)
the detached folio and are written in diagonal lines to arrange the number of verses on the page to accommodate the painting.

Although the text refers to the entry of the prince into Istanbul, the Baghdadi painter has depicted the city with local features more typical of Baghdad than Istanbul: note the bulbous green dome and the gatehouse with an upper gate pavilion, and the city castle with gun holes mounted with cannon. The “pencil minarets” are typical features of Baghdad painters, who use this motif to mark the “Ottomanness” of various sites. Compare this composition with another painting depicting the entry of the Safavid prince. While Tanındı notes that the Metropolitan Museum of Art painting is the only known visual depiction of the arrival of Haydar Mirza in a Divan of Baki, an unpublished Divan at the Harvard Art Museums (1985.273) also has a painting depicting this event. This painting (fig. 4.5) portrays the young prince on horseback together with his retinue, who are marked by their distinctive headgear. Behind the light green hills, Ottomans (also distinguished by their turbans) watch as they proceed. Set in a nondescript background, the composition in the Harvard Divan allows us to note the particularity of the Metropolitan Museum of Art page, where a specific moment in the event is depicted. This further connects the manuscript to the patronage of Hasan Paşa, who welcomed the prince and his retinue in Üsküdar, and joined them as they crossed the Bosphorus and entered the city.

Following the dismissal of Apostol Hasan Paşa in May 1591, Sokolluzade Hasan Paşa took up his position as governor of Rumelia. He was later appointed as governor of

---

illustrating the winter ode, which was addressed to the eminent shaykh al-islam; and a painting depicting Süleyman I on horseback surrounded by his army (RISD Museum, 17.459) illustrating the qasida addressed to the sultan. While Tanındı notes that the Metropolitan painting is the only known visual depiction of the arrival of Haydar Mirza, an unpublished Divan of Baki at the Harvard Art Museums (1985.273) also has a painting depicting this event. The leaf with this painting is currently loose and placed out of context in the Harvard Divan. I discuss this Divan further in a forthcoming article.


Buda at the start of the Ottoman-Habsburg wars (1593-1606), in which he joined several campaigns.\footnote{Writing in February 28, 1595 Selâniği notes that Ḥasan Paşa was sent as commander to Wallachia. Selâniği Muşṭaфа Efendi, \textit{Târîh-i Selâniği}, Vol. 2, 451.} In the meantime, his office was transferred again to Rumelia in 1595.\footnote{Afyoncu, “Sokulluzade Hasan Paşa,” \textit{DIA} 37, 367; Selâniği MuşṭaFa Efendi, \textit{Târîh-i Selâniği}, Vol. 2, 457, 494.} In 1596 he took part in the Eger and Mezökeresztes campaigns in Hungary, when he must have made the acquaintance of the historian Peçevi.\footnote{Peçevi, \textit{Peçevî Târîhi}, 30; Selâniği MuşṭaFa Efendi, \textit{Târîh-i Selâniği}, Vol. 2, 662, 669, 672.} Peçevi, who was a relative of the grand vizier Sokollu Mehmêd Paşa (his mother belonged to the Sokollu (Sokolović) family), notes that the posts of the governor-general of Buda (Budin) and Rumelia (based in Sofia) alternated between the sons of two famous grand viziers: Sokolluzade (lit. son of Sokollu) Hasan Paşa and Sinan Paşaçâde (lit. son of [Koca] Sinan) Mehmêd Paşa. He adds that while the latter often imitated the former in behavior, Hasan Paşa was renowned for his valor, whereas Mehmêd Paşa was known as a coward.\footnote{In 1599 Sinân Paşazâde Mehmêd Paşa was sent to Ruha (Urfa) to fight the rebel Karayazıcı and Hüseyin Paşa, who had joined him in the rebellion. After a period of two months of fighting, Karayazıcı and Sinân Paşazâde Mehmêd Paşa reached an agreement. However, Günhan Börekçi shows that Karayazıcı corresponded with the mufti of Istanbul, Şûn ullah Efendi, who acted as an intermediary. In his letters, Karayazıcı notes the broken agreement between himself and Sinân Paşazâde Mehmêd Paşa, who “sent the sultan his own fallen soldiers’ heads, pretending that they were those of Karayazıcı’s commanders, so that he could capitalize on his fake victory.” While Karayazıcı’s intentions are not necessarily innocent, his correspondence with the mufti of Istanbul and his complaint about Sinân Paşazâde Mehmêd Paşa show the level of intrigue at court as well as the hope of appeasement or promotion through leverage. Börekçi further notes that Karayazıcı was pardoned (for the time being) and that Sinân Paşazâde Mehmêd Paşa was replaced by Haci Ibrâhîm Paşa (who was a client of Şûn ullah Efendi). Börekçi adds that in 1605 Ahmed I (r. 1603–1617) wanted to execute Sinân Paşazâde Mehmêd Paşa, who was governor-general of Aleppo at the time. Saved (briefly) by the intercession of the queen mother, he was recalled to the capital and then executed. It appears that while Sinân Paşazâde Mehmêd Paşa did have connections at court, he was not nearly on firm footing as was Ḥasan Paşa. Günhan Börekçi, \textit{Factions and Favorites}, 40–1, 120–1. Peçevi, \textit{Peçevî Târîhi}, 31. On Sinân Paşazâde Mehmêd’s career in Buda and Rumelia also see Selâniği MuşṭaFa Efendi, \textit{Târîh-i Selâniği}, Vol. 1, 263, 314–5, 331, 336–7, 369, 381, 390, 394–5, 397. Şolakzâde also suggests Sinân Paşa’s ambitions in promoting his son over Ḥasan Paşa, particularly wanting the governorship of Rumelia to be given to his son Mehmêd Paşa rather than Ḥasan Paşa. Solakzâde, \textit{Şolakzâde Târîhi}, Vol. 2 (Istanbul: Mahmut Bey Matbaası, 1298 [1880/1]), 359.} Even before Peçevi’s comments on Sokolluzade Hasan Paşa in Eger and especially during his governorship in Baghdad, the historian Selaniki makes note of Hasan Paşa’s poise and flair, when in a \textit{divan} (council) meeting in Istanbul in June 1593 he stood out by his aura...
of power in the gathering. Selaniki writes praisingly of him elsewhere, noting his diligence in preserving order in the capital. While distinguishing himself among his peers and also successful in the Ottoman-Habsburg wars, Hasan Paşa seems to have fallen out of favor after the Eger campaign. He was demoted from the governorship of Belgrade, initially to Malkara, presumably to exile, but was able to remain in Istanbul. In early 1598, he was appointed as governor of Baghdad, following Elvendzade ʿAli Paşa’s death. While Selaniki does not elaborate on the reasons for Hasan Paşa’s fall from grace, it appears that the appointment to Baghdad was a means to keep him distant from the capital. Hasan Paşa remained in office as governor of Baghdad until his death in 1602. He was killed in Tokat during his battle against the Celali upstart Deli Hasan.

It is during his governorship of Baghdad that Hasan Paşa emerges as a patron of the arts. This was a time of relative calm in Baghdad with the Ottoman-Safavid wars over in 1590. During this time Hasan Paşa was somewhat more settled rather than on campaign, with the exception of his charge against the Celali rebels, Karayazı and Deli Hasan. Hasan Paşa remained in Baghdad for four years, longer than most governors, whose posts would

420 Selānikī mentions that Ḥasan Paşa’s father had endless power and possessions. Whether he makes a direct connection to this with regards to Ḥasan Paşa’s distinction is not too clear, but it is possible that Ḥasan Paşa built his aura around his father’s status. In his brief discussion on the gathering, Selānikī also mentions Nişancı Feridun, who was the first one to don tiger-skin kaftans. Selānikī Muṣṭafa Efendi, Tārīḥ-i Selānikī, Vol. 1, 315.


422 Ibid., 707.

423 The octogenarian Elvendzāde ʿAlī Paşa, who resided in Aleppo and who possessed a household and property there (ṣahīḥ-i tecemmūl ve emlak), was appointed yet again to Baghdad. However, soon after his appointment, he passed away. Ḥasan Paşa had first been ordered as commander but he wanted vizierate, according to Selānikī Muṣṭafa Efendi. Displeased by this, the grand vizier Ḥadīm Ḥasan Paşa appointed him to Baghdad. Selānikī notes that Ḥasan Paşa was loath to go to Baghdad. The grand vizier threatened to have him jailed if he refused the sultan’s orders to go to Baghdad, which Ḥasan Paşa had to accept. Selānikī Muṣṭafa Efendi, Tārīḥ-i Selānikī, Vol. 2, 722; Afyoncu, “Sokulluzade Hasan Paşa,” DL湛江 37.

rotate almost every year. Before Hasan Paşa’s appointment as governor of Baghdad in 1598, we find several dated and illustrated manuscripts copied in Baghdad, suggesting that there was already fertile ground for his patronage. Hasan Paşa is known to be the patron of at least two illustrated manuscripts: One is the short Beng u Bāde (Opium and Wine) of the Baghdadi poet Fuzuli (d. 1556) dated 1599–1600. The other is the more ambitious yet incomplete Cāmi ’ü’s-Siyer of Muhammed Tahir el-Sīddiki el-Necibi el-Suhreverdi. From internal evidence we know that the author of this work followed the Sufi Suhreverdi path (a Sunni order founded by Ziya al-Din Abū’l-Najīb as-Suhrawardi (1097–1168) whose luxurious khanqah in Baghdad was built for him by the Abbāsid Caliph al-Nasir) and that he was a servant of Hasan Paşa, for whom he composed this universal history. The latter text was composed for and dedicated to Hasan Paşa. It is possible that Hasan Paşa was the patron of another large-scale illustrated manuscript, a Rawżat al-Ṣafā’ (The Garden of Purity) (BL Or. 5736). Among the corpus of illustrated manuscripts produced in Baghdad in the late sixteenth century, the Cāmi ’ü’s-Siyer is unique for being a new text composed for the governor. This work is also remarkable in its painting program and while incomplete, the manuscript’s size and planned paintings rival those of the large-scale Shāhnāma (TPML H. 1486) and Rawżat al-Ṣafā’ manuscripts in ambition. The painting program of H. 1230 in


426 These are: Hadīkatū’s-Sī‘ edā (Süleymaniye Ktb. Fatiḥ 4321) dated 1002 (1593/4); Nafahāt al-Uns (Chester Beatty Library T. 474) dated 1003 (1594/1595); three Silsilenāmēs (two are at the Topkapı Palace Museum Library, H. 1521 and H. 1324, and one at the Chester Beatty Library, T. 423) all dated 1006 (1597/8).

427 Dresden Eb. 362. This manuscript was copied by Muṣṭafa bin Muḥammad el-Rūžavī el-Ḥüseynī in 1008 (1599/1600).

428 I have not encountered this author in other biographical works.

429 More research needs to be done on this manuscript and on other possible patrons, perhaps not only resident in Baghdad but in the wider region. The calligrapher of the Rawżat al-Ṣafā’ also copied an illustrated manuscript of the Hadīkatū’s-Sī‘ edā (Besim Atalay Env. 7294, Etnografya Müzesi, Ankara). On the Rawżat al-Ṣafā’ see G. M. Meredith-Owens, “A Copy of the Rawżat al-Ṣafa with Turkish Miniatures,” in Paintings from Islamic Lands, ed. R. Pinder-Wilson (Oxford: Bruno Cassirer, 1969), 110–24. Henceforth Meredith-Owens, A Copy of the Rawżat al-Ṣafa with Turkish Miniatures.
particular highlights the role of viziers rather than rulers, perhaps making a connection to the role Hasan Paşa wished to carve for himself.

*Câmi‘ü’s-Siyer (TPML H. 1369, TPML H. 1230)*

As the *Câmi‘ü’s-Siyer* has not been studied previously, I offer a brief description of the two extant manuscripts here. Both of them (H. 1369, H. 1230) are held at the Topkapı Palace Museum Library and are the only extant copies. Each manuscript measures 34.5 x 20 cm and lacks a colophon. H. 1369 contains 578 folios with sixteen lines to a page, and H. 1230 has 219 folios with twenty-five lines to a page. While H. 1369 contains the beginning of Muhammed Tahir’s text, from the creation of the universe until the early Abbasid caliphate, H. 1230 contains the second part of the author’s work, which is from the Abbasid caliphate until the early fourteenth century.

The *Câmi‘ü’s-Siyer* is composed of an introduction, reason for composition (discussed in further detail below), and consists of six chapters or books (*daftars*). An index is provided in H. 1369. The first chapter concerns the celestial spheres, elements and natural phenomena. The second book is on the stories of prophets and pre-Islamic philosophers and dynasties, ending with Prophet Muhammad. The following chapter is on the story of the Prophet, his companions and the martyrdom of Imams Hasan and Husayn. The next two chapters are on the Umayyad dynasty and its fall. The sixth chapter is on the Abbasid dynasty and other contemporary dynasties as well as on the Mongols and Ilkhanids following the fall of the Abbasids. H. 1369 contains all five chapters and the beginning of the sixth chapter. H. 1230 begins from the sixth chapter, but like H. 1369, it too is incomplete. According to the index provided in H. 1369, there was meant to be a concluding
section on Hasan Paşa’s governorship. Let us now turn to the contents of the two manuscripts.

H. 1369 begins with the creation of the universe and continues until the beginning of the Abbasid caliph Harun al-Rashid’s (r. 786–809) reign. The manuscript ends mid-sentence. The catchword written on the lower left suggests that the manuscript initially continued further. However, its final seven folios are in a different handwriting than the rest, suggesting that this section might be a later addition. Several folios have been damaged and the manuscript has been rebound, with a section of it placed out of order. There are also several folios missing. H. 1369 is unfinished with space left for an illuminated heading on folio 1b as well as thirty-seven paintings planned but not executed. Some pages remain unruled and spaces were allocated for several chapter headings. There are six complete paintings. On the front flyleaf there is a note of ownership with the date 1742–43 and the name of a certain Küçük el-Hace Mehmed ibn Küçük Hacı ʿAli Ağâ from the Bazarbeyli district of Dimetoka.

The front flyleaf of H. 1230 contains two inscriptions, which note that the manuscript has nine paintings and identify the work as the “Cāmiʿū’s Siyer-i bī-nazīr” (The Nonpareil Compilation of Biographies). There is an effaced, round seal on the front flyleaf. There is also an oval seal on folio 3a, which has been blackened. The manuscript opens with an illuminated ʿunwan. The title “Cild-i sânī-yi kitāb-i Cāmiʿū’s-Siyer min kelām-i Muḥammad el-Ṭahir” (Second Volume of the Compilation of Biographies of Muhammed Tahir) is written in white ink inside a gold cartouche. This manuscript has also been rebound but it is preserved in better condition than H. 1369, which bears signs of repair in some

430 There is a page missing between folio 265b and folio 266a in the section on pre-Islamic Arab tribes. There are remnants of paint on the folio and it is possible that it once contained a painting.

431 I have not been able to find further information on this owner. The connection between this owner from Thrace and the Baghdadi manuscript is interesting. Perhaps he acquired the manuscript in Baghdad on his way to Mecca for pilgrimage duty.
parts. There are nine finished paintings as mentioned on the flyleaf. However, on folio 210a of H. 1230 there is another space left for a painting.

H. 1230 begins with a brief introductory praise of God, the Prophet Muhammad and the Ottoman sultan, Mehmed III, and then names the author as Muhammed Tahir. It notes that with the first volume completed, hereby the second volume begins. A sub-heading copied in red ink marks: “The sixth book tells the accounts of the Abbasid caliphs and neighboring rulers.” This subheading as well as its content matches the index provided in the introduction to H. 1369. After this sub-heading, the text of H. 1230 overlaps almost verbatim with the last forty-four folios of H. 1369, which covers the history of the first four Abbasid caliphs.

Thus, H. 1230 covers the Abbasid dynasty from its inception to end, as well as including stories on contemporary shaykhs and ulema, and other contemporary dynasties until an account of Muhammad Khan (d. 1338), who was a claimant to the Ilkhanid throne. While the manuscript ends here and the section appears to be complete according to the internal index provided in H. 1369, there was also meant to be a conclusion following the six chapters. The conclusion was to be on the career and battles of Hasan Paşa. As noted above, such a conception of universal history would place Hasan Paşa as the culmination of history.

Both copies name Muhammed Tahir el-Siddiki el-Necibi el-Suhreverdi as the author. H. 1369 is copied in nastaʿ(liq while H. 1230 is in copied in naskh. While it is not unlikely to have different calligraphers working on a single manuscript, as in the case of the Freer Gallery of Art Haft Awrang (Seven Thrones), and while a calligrapher could copy in both scripts, it is highly unusual to have two different scripts in what seems to be a continuous
text prepared in two volumes. In previous scholarship H. 1369 and H. 1230 were thought to be two volumes of one unique, possibly autograph, copy. However, the different calligraphy and the overlap of a portion of the text raise the question of whether there were two separate copies of this text in multiple volumes. Thus, considering the case that the author actually completed the work, then, the two copies that are extant would each be incomplete and would have further volumes that are no longer extant. This would raise the further question of whether multiple patrons or owners were involved. The use of nastaʿliq and naskh also suggests different readerships. The other hypothesis, though less likely, is that H. 1369 and H. 1230 were meant to be part of one large voluminous project but were copied by different calligraphers. As H. 1369 is in worse condition, it is possible that the second volume began not from where H. 1369 presently ends but from the beginning of a new chapter, which is on the Abbasid dynasty.

While both manuscripts lack colophons, the calligraphy of H. 1230 closely matches another contemporary illustrated manuscript, which may have been prepared for Hasan Paşa. This manuscript (BL Or. 5736) is the sixth volume of the Rawżat al-Ṣafāʾ of Mirkhwand (d. 1498). Dated 1008 (1599–1600), the British Library Rawżat al-Ṣafāʾ manuscript was copied by ʿAli bin Muhammed el-Tustari. He is the calligrapher of another manuscript produced in Baghdad: a Ḥadīkatüʾs-Sūʿedā dated Zi’l hijja 1008 (June/July 1600) at the Museum of Ethnography in Ankara (Besim Atalay Env. 7294). I will first examine the H. 1369 and H.

---


433 Serpil Bağcı, et al. Ottoman Painting (Ankara: Republic of Turkey, Ministry of Culture and Tourism Publications, 2010), 255. Additionally, Rachel Milstein writes that this work consists of six volumes, and that only two illustrated manuscripts (TPML H. 1369 and TPML H. 1230) are known. These, she notes, are the first two volumes. However, the six daftars that the author writes of in the introduction do cover the content of TPML H. 1369 and TPML H. 1230. The daftars thus must be seen not as separate volumes, but six broad chapters. Milstein, Miniature Painting in Ottoman Baghdad, 110.

1230 copies separately as I wish to study the text of the Čemiʿū’s-Siyer chronologically. I will then analyze the two copies together and comment on a select number of their paintings.

Muhammed Tahir’s Conception of Universal History

The Čemiʿū’s-Siyer is a new text. It begins, as is customary, with praise of God and Creation. In keeping with the mysticism of light (illuminationism) associated with the Suhrawardiyya order to which the author belonged, all of creation is categorized in the text dualistically. In it, each being is “dressed accordingly in robes of felicity or in sack-cloths of wretchedness; the light of belief illumines the forehead of the felicitous and misery springs forth from the timid forehead of the wretched.” Among all of Creation, humankind is distinguished by virtue of speech; and prophets are further distinguished from other human beings. Prophet Muhammad is praised, in particular for his abrogation of “the deviated ones in the path of rebellion and obliteration of the darkness of blasphemy with the torches of lights of guidance in the right path.”

After the introductory praise of God and Prophet Muhammad, the text quickly turns to the praiseworthy qualities of the grand vizier Sokollu Mehmed Paşa, in particular his tact and acuity in disguising the death of Süleyman I (r. 1520–1566) during the Szigetvár campaign in Hungary in 1566. A portrayal of the meeting of Süleyman I and the grand vizier is the first painting of the manuscript (fig. 4.6). The unfinished painting (most likely added

---

435 TPML H. 1369, fol. 2a.

436 Here and elsewhere in the text, terms such as bağy and ‘inad (rebellion, obstinacy) are prevalent. While a comprehensive textual analysis across time and among more works is needed, I have encountered these words quite often in texts of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, particularly in the context of Celali uprisings. While in this particular context it is a broader distinction between the followers of the right path, that is the path of the Prophet, and between followers of the wrong, the prevalence of such terms elsewhere in this text may have different connotations, especially given the wider context in which this text was composed. Ibid., fol. 2b.
later and in a different hand from the others) depicts Süleyman I seated on a throne in a tent and Sokollu Mehmed Paşa standing before him with his hands clasped. Two pages wait in attendance on the right and two other officials wait on the left. Immediately outside the tent enclosure there are three janissaries. The unpainted faces suggest that these would have been added by a different painter, who specialized in portraiture. Similarly, the details of the tent and tent enclosure are unfinished.

This painting comes at a critical point in the text, where Süleyman I asked the grand vizier about the state of Szigetvár and the grand vizier replied that it would soon be conquered. Immediately below the painting, the author notes that when the battle gained intensity, the ruler fell ill and his condition worsened day by day.\textsuperscript{437} The author then highlights the grand vizier’s acute judgment in concealing the ruler’s condition until the fortress was captured and prince Selim, soon to be Selim II (r. 1566–1574), notified. Using the common reference of the good judgment of Asaf, the vizier of Solomon, the author exalts Sokollu Mehmed Paşa as the grand vizier of Süleyman I. The importance of the Szigetvár campaign is further attested in the illustrated histories commissioned by Sokollu.\textsuperscript{438} The inclusion of this particular detail enhances Hasan Paşa’s role as the patron of this illustrated history as the son of the eminent grand vizier, who was also an important patron of art.

In the introductory lines about Murad III’s accession, Muhammad Tahir writes that “as previously, [the sultan] handed the keys of the treasury and rule to the cautious hands of that grand vizier with great respect.”\textsuperscript{439} The grand vizier, in turn, gave his all in “meeting all

\textsuperscript{437} Ibid., fols. 6a–b.

\textsuperscript{438} On Sokollu’s patronage of illustrated histories and the particular importance of the Szigetvár campaign, see Fetvacı, \textit{Picturing History at the Ottoman Court}, especially Chapter 3.

\textsuperscript{439} Ibid., fol. 8b.
commands, replenishing the treasury and the army and mending the state. According to the author, the ruler then, without sparing too many words on the ruler, turns to the grand vizier’s assassination, which he likens to what befell the companions of Prophet Muhammad, and comparing Sokollu’s assassin to Ibn Muljam, the assassin of caliph ʿAli. This is a potent metaphor.

Following an elegy of Sokollu Mehmed Paşa, the author then introduces his son, Hasan Paşa, the patron of the history. Mirroring Selim II and Murad III’s entrustment of governance to Sokollu Mehmed Paşa, the newly enthroned Mehmed III appoints Hasan Paşa as commander on the western front. The author notes Hasan Paşa’s closeness to the sultan during the Eger campaign as well as his spirit and valor. Following an ornate account of the Ottomans’ success, the author next turns to Hasan Paşa’s victory in subduing the rebellious Bedouins in the Lahsa and Basra region. Muhammed Tahir writes that, “some bandits appeared in the vicinity of Baghdad and caused disorder in the cities and blockaded the paths of the people and looted the possessions of merchants and caravans.” One of these bandits was Sayyid Mubarak (d. 1616–17), chieftain of the Shiʿi Mushaʿshaʿ tribe. The author adds that this bandit caused such fear that travelers and merchants from India and Iran were not able to travel. The historian Selaniki Mustafa Efendi also notes Sayyid

440 Ibid.

441 Here the author uses similar wording and writes: “As previously, the sapling of the garden of vizierate and head-exalting cypress of flower of premiership were deposited in [his] cautious hands.” Mehmed III, the current ruler during his reign the Câmiʿî ʿs-Siyer was composed, is esteemed as “the asylum of the world, shadow of God on earth, resplendent like the sun, scattering justice, protector and defender of religion, one who strengthens the world and religion, succour of Islam, asylum of east and west, protector of Mecca and Medina, master of ʿArab and ʿAjam, ruler of the rulers of the world.” Ibid., fols. 10b–11a.

442 Ibid., fol. 13a.


444 The frequent use of terms like baği, inād and tuğyān are worth noting here as they appear elsewhere in this text, which are not necessarily directly in reference to current events, such as the actions of Sayyid Mubarak but, for example, in referring to the rebelliousness of the Devil refusing to worship Adam. The particular example of
Mubarak’s acts of pillaging in the areas of Basra, Lahsa and Baghdad, where he and his bandits looted the goods of travelers and merchants.\textsuperscript{445} News of Mubarak also reached Faizi (d. 1595), third poet-laureate at the court of the Mughal emperor Akbar (r. 1556–1605), traveling in Ahmadnagar in the first years of the 1590s.\textsuperscript{446} Sayyid Mubarak appears to have caught the attention of European travelers as well. Pedro Teixeira, who was traveling to Basra in 1604, writes that “Mombarek, son of Motelob” held the northern plains of the Shatt al-'Arab;\textsuperscript{447} Pietro della Valle, writing in 1616, notes Mubarak’s antagonism with the governors of Baghdad and Basra.\textsuperscript{448}

In the \textit{Cāmi ʿiṣ-Ṣiyer}, it is at the point of the governor’s charge against the Arab chieftain that an underdrawing for a painting appears (fig. 4.7). This underdrawing shows the sultan Mehmed III seated on a throne in a privileged audience given in his private

---

\textsuperscript{445} Selânikî notes that when Hasan Paşa was appointed to defend Baghdad against Sayyid Mubârak, the Safavid ruler Shâh ʿAbbâs I sent a letter in 1599 warning him that Sayyid Mubârak was, of old, belonging to the Safavid dynasty and that he did not approve of an Ottoman attack on him, adding that, should Sayyid Mubârak act in insolence and disrespect in the Ottoman lands, he would be put in his place by the Safavids. Sayyid Mubârak’s allegiance with the Safavids is corroborated in a letter (dated December 1616) by Pietro della Valle, who notes that even though Sayyid Mubârak was an independent ruler, he recognized the authority of the Safavid shah. Pietro della Valle also passingly mentions that Sayyid Mubârak was in quarrel with the governor of Baghdad. Unfortunately, della Valle does not name this governor. The traveller acknowledges rumors of attacks in Basra and Baghdad and notes that he chose not to go to “Babel.” Selânikî Muṣṭafa Efendi, \textit{Tārīkh-i Selânikî}, Vol. 2, 745, 822, 828; Pietro della Valle, \textit{Viaggi di Pietro Della Valle Il Pellegrino con Minuto Ragguaglio di Tutte le Cose Notabili Osservate in Essi: Discritti da Lui Medesimo in 54 Lettere Familiari} (Rome, Appresso Vitale Mascalidi, 1650), 705–6. Henceforth Pietro della Valle, \textit{Viaggi di Pietro Della Valle}.

\textsuperscript{446} Faizi writes of news from various merchants and travelers from the Ottoman and Safavid lands. He adds that trading ships bringing ‘Iraqi horses from Humrūz to Goa arrived and that some Safavids also came to India “on account of the turbulence in ‘Iraq and Fars;” he writes about news from the Safavid lands, particularly on the executions of Bektash Khân, governor of Kirman and Yazid, and Ya qub Khân Dhu’l Qadr, governor of Fars. Faizi also mentions Mubârak, who fought against the Ottomans and who often allied with the Safavids. See Muzaffar Alam and Sanjay Subrahmanyan, “A Place in the Sun: Travels with Faizî in the Deccan, 1591–1593,” in \textit{Les Sources et le Temps (Sources and Time): A Colloquium, Pondicherry 11–13 January 1997}, ed. François Grimal (Pondicherry: Institut Français de Pondichéry, 2001), 265–307. Also see by the same authors, “The Deccan Frontier and Mughal Expansion, Circa 1600,” in \textit{Writing Mughal World: Studies on Culture and Politics} (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), 165–203.

\textsuperscript{447} The Travels of Pedro Teixeira, 26.

\textsuperscript{448} Pietro della Valle, \textit{Viaggi di Pietro Della Valle}, 705.
residential quarters, rather than the ordinary hall of private audience. Facing him, on the right is presumably Hasan Paşa. Two other officials stand on the right and three Privy Chamber pages stand on the left. Stylistically the first unfinished painting and this underdrawing do not appear to be made in Baghdad. At least their style differs from the idiosyncratic Baghdad style paintings. Note, for example, the taller, thinner turbans and elongated personages. While any intermediary provenance is not known until the late eighteenth century inscription, these underdrawings appear not to have been executed much later than the rest of the paintings. We can at least infer that these moments were important enough to be planned to include paintings.

Like the first painting, this underdrawing (fig. 4.7) appears at a crucial moment in the text in which Hasan Paşa is chosen by the sultan “after much serious thought and consideration” as the only official who could reclaim the region. He is thus sent to Baghdad, and “like the sun of felicity, the lustrous rays of [his] magnificence destroyed the darkness of tyranny and the flashing light of his sanguinary sword broke the necks of the enemy and the blackness of sedition routed from the great city; he brought the province from disorder to calm.” While Hasan Paşa’s successes at the Eger campaign are also highlighted in the text, it is this particular achievement in Baghdad, which gets illustrated, for it was on that occasion, according to the text, that Hasan Paşa was sent to Baghdad. The potency of this painting is further enhanced through textual and visual parallels with the first painting of the manuscript.

449 TPML H.1369, fol. 14a.
450 Ibid.
451 Contemporary histories do not mention Hasan Paşa specifically with regards to his success against Sayyid Mubarak. They are also not very verbose on his role at Eger. However, one can infer from Selânikî’s comments (see the section on Hasan Paşa’s career) that his appointment to Baghdad following the Eger campaign was a demotion.
Both paintings depict privileged private meetings between the ruler and his vizier and appear at moments of investiture, in which the grand vizier Sokollu Mehmed Paşa and his son governor Hasan Paşa show their courage and valor against the enemy on either front of the empire. The paintings and the similar wording used to describe the grand vizier and the governor establish links between father and son. They are not just distinguished among their peers but also show efficacy in dealing with the enemies.

After this lengthy account about Sokollu Mehmed’s acuity and the governor Hasan Paşa’s valor in subduing the Musha’sha’ chieftain, the author turns to the purpose of composition. The author, Muhammed Tahir, writes that he was among the servants of the governor of Baghdad, who wished to know the histories of the first four caliphs and the deeds of rulers in the Turkish language.\(^{452}\) The author is careful to note that while the governor was learned in Arabic and Persian, those conversing with him would be deprived of conversation if the work were composed in Arabic or Persian. This implies that the text was meant to be read and discussed among the companions/attendants of Sokollu Hasan Paşa. The resulting work, which is a compilation and translation of various Persian and Arabic sources, is titled *Cāmi‘u’s-Siyer*.

Before the first chapter begins, a proem gives an account of the creation of the firmament and the earth in six days. Here, the author, somewhat advisingly points to the necessity of deliberation and contemplation in one’s affairs lest rushing lead to regret (\(芊u\)n\(a\) tenbi\(h\)dir \(k\)i \(u\)m\(ü\)rlar\(ı\)nda \(i\)sti\(ç\)\(l\) ğl \(i\)t\(m\)ey\(üb\) te\(’\)\(n\)ni ve te\(f\)ek\(k\)ür ve te\(d\)\(b\)ir üzre \(o\)lub \(b\)\(î\)le\(r\) ki \(h\)er \(e\)mr\(r\)de \(k\)i \(ı\)vmek ve \(ı\)c\(a\)le \(o\)la \(a\)n\(ı\)n\(ı\) pi\(ş\)manlık ve nedâmet olur ve te\(’\)emmül \(i\)le \(o\)lan \(u\)m\(ü\)ru\(n\) şo\(n\)ı ma\(h\)mûd ve \(h\)u\(ş\)ü-\(ü\) ma\(k\)şûda \(b\)a ‘\(i\)s\(ı\)\).\(^{453}\) Following this warning, the author describes the creation of the *jinn* out of fire before the creation of mankind. In this

\(^{452}\) TPML H.1369, fol., 15b.

\(^{453}\) Ibid., fol. 18a.
section too we find the dualism the author had proposed in his introduction, that is to say, the *jinn* are classified as those that are obedient to God, and those that give in to desire and rebelliousness and sedition and are thus rewarded or punished accordingly.\(^{454}\) When the *jinn* “step into the valley of vileness and loosen the reins of rebelliousness and went on the path of disobedience,” several of them perished and several remained on the right path.\(^{455}\) The author notes the messengers that were sent to the *jinn* and how the *jinn* had killed each one. This sets a parallel between God’s order and path imposed on the *jinn* and angels as his creation, and the second chapter of the book, which is on prophets and their call as messengers. The prophets and messengers call the folk to the path of God and are often denied and reviled. In both cases there is an insistence on the call to the path of God. This theme can also be found in illustrated genealogies, which are described in the next chapter. The link between the *jinn* and angels and mankind, and the wider order of the universe is further enhanced through the example of Iblis (Satan), or ‘Azazil, and his rebelliousness to Adam.

Iblis, who was distinguished from the *jinn* and taken among the level of angels, was sent to subdue the *jinn*. The author notes, however, that Iblis soon gave in to haughtiness. Iblis showed further rebelliousness in claiming to be created out of a higher element than man and refused to bow in obeisance before Adam. Iblis’s refusal to bow before Adam or his temptation of Adam and Eve to eat of the forbidden fruit, and their expulsion from Paradise are depicted frequently in works such as the *Majālis al-ʿUshshāq* or the *Ḥadīkatū’s-Sū’ edā*, described in more detail in the previous chapter.\(^{456}\) Interestingly, in this

\(^{454}\) Ibid., fol. 18b.

\(^{455}\) Ibid.

\(^{456}\) In the following section on the *ulu‘l azm* prophets, the author further details the temptation of Adam and Eve and provides various accounts of it. Some, he writes, argue that what is meant by “tree” is in fact wheat. He adds that others have also suggested that is grape or fig. TPML H. 1369, fol. 32a.
manuscript, these oft-illustrated scenes are not chosen for representation. Instead, there was meant to be a painting in the first chapter following this proem. A painting was planned to end the section on the celestial spheres, stations of the moon, the four elements and their effects on natural phenomena. While we do not know what the painting would have looked like, given its placement at the end of a section on the creation of the universe, we may imagine it to be a schematic depiction of the celestial spheres, like that found in the *Tomar-i Hümâyūn* (Imperial Scroll) (TPML A. 3599) or the *Zübdetü‘t-Tevārīh*.

The first part of the cosmological first chapter is quite detailed and informative. It walks the reader through the celestial globes, planets and stars, to the terrestrial globe. In explaining the motions and behavior of elements, the author provides examples that a non-specialist could understand. For example, to explain the condensation of water vapor, Muhammed Tahir refers to how vapor rises towards the dome of a public bath and then falls down in droplets, or how snow falls like fluffed cotton. The author also provides the Arabic, Persian, and Turkish terms for snow, rain, hail, and frost. The examples and the trilingual terminology make the author’s otherwise quite detailed description of the inclination and nature of elements accessible. At the end of this section on the elements, space is left (on folio 27a) for a painting, which corresponds to the adjacent text on desert winds and the nature of water, fog and smoke. Following this the author turns to a brief description of the nature of plants and animals and thus ends the first chapter.

The second chapter concerns Old Testament prophets and *ulu‘l-azm* prophets, those who were endowed with patience and determination. The author introduces prophets, messengers and *ulu‘l-azm* prophets by referring to a conversation between the Prophet Muhammad and one of his companions, Abu Zarr al-Gifari (d. 652), in which the latter asks the Prophet about the number of prophets, the number of messengers, and the first among

457 Ibid., fol. 22b.
the messengers, and whether any books had been sent. Interspersed with reports from the companions of the Prophet Muhammad, the Traditions of the Prophet and other sources and references such as the Haft Awrang of Jami and the Fütûhât-i Mekkiye (The Meccan Openings) of Ibn al-ʿArabi (d. 1240), the author provides a lengthy account, first on the creation of Adam, and then on the prophets, who followed the first man. Some like Adam, Moses, and Joseph are dealt with in greater detail, whereas others like Job or Shuʿayb are succinctly described. The second chapter was planned to include thirteen paintings illustrating the stories of the prophets as well as another painting to portray the story of the death of Socrates. While these were not executed, several of the scenes that were meant to have paintings can also be encountered in the Zübdetü ’t-Tevârîh copies and some in manuscripts of the Qiṣṣa al-Anbiyāʾ.

458 Ibid., fols. 29a–29b.

459 A painting was planned to depict the story of Noah and his ark. Following an account of the tribe refusing to heed to Noah’s message and mocking him, the author highlights Noah’s resilience in building the ark. When the ark is finally prepared, Noah tells those, who believe, to embark the ship, voicing the name of God as it was God’s wish that would make the ship move or halt (fol. 36a). This is where a painting was planned. Noah then urges his son Kenʾan to embrace the right path and embark on the ship. Kenʾan refuses, thinking he would be safe from the waters on top of a mountain. Muḥammed Ṭāhir writes that through his “air of pride and rebelliousness” (ḥavā-yi ṣurūr ve ʿiyān) Kenʾan drowned (fol. 37a). While the account of Noah’s trials, his ark and the flood follow the plot drawn out from the Quranic chapter Hud, the author also adds information on the sons of Noah and their progeny based on various historians, whom he does not name in this particular case. In other instances, the author provides his references.

In addition to the painting planned to accompany the story of Noah and his ark, there was meant to be an illustration of the story of Saleh and the camel (fol. 40a), and Gabriel in the pit with Joseph (fol. 51b). Followed by another planned painting, most likely to depict Joseph imprisoned (fol. 56b). The story of Joseph is dealt with in more detail than most of the prophets described in this section. Following this longer account on Joseph, the author turns to the prophets Khidr and Moses, where an illustration was meant to appear in the story of Khidr taking the life of a young boy whose parents were believers (fol. 72b). The story of Khidr and Moses also follow the plot provided in the Quran, in chapter Kehf. The story of Noah and his ark and that of Saleh and the camel can also be found in the illustrated Zübdetü ’t-Tevârîh manuscripts (TPML H. 1321 and TIEM T. 1973). It is more difficult to comment on the compositions meant for the story of Joseph and Jacob given the possible different moments that could be chosen for illustration. Assuming a close text-image relationship in TPML H. 1369, the paintings that would be included in this manuscript would be different from those that are in the Zübdetü ’t-Tevârîh manuscripts, which depict different moments in the story.

Following shorter accounts on Job and Shuʿayb, the author then turns to a longer account on the life and deeds of Moses. The story of Moses, like that of Joseph, is dealt with in great detail and was meant to include two paintings. These were to appear when Moses helped the two women water their flocks (fol. 80b) and his challenge before the magicians in which his rod turned into a dragon (fol. 85b). Shorter accounts on prophets Yusha, Ilyas, Elyesa, and Ishmuil follow. After these, there was space left for a painting in the story of Saul (Talut) and Goliath (Calut), in which Saul orders his army to not drink from the water of a river (fol. 97a). Interestingly, this particular scene was chosen for illustration rather than the more common scene of David fighting Goliath. The following paintings were to appear in the story of Solomon and Bilqis. The first would most likely represent Solomon enthroned (fol. 103a) appearing at a moment of the description of his throne. The
The account on the lives and toils of prophets mainly follows the genre of popular stories of the prophets as well as verses from the Qur’an. Muhammed Tahir’s universal history shares much with the texts of the Qiṣṣa al-Anbiyā’, Majālis al-ʿUshshāq, and Ḥadīḵatūʾs-Sūʾ, all of which saw a burst of popularity in the 1570s and 1580s, much like the outpour of the Maqāmat of Hariri in the thirteenth century. The Cāmiʿ ūʾs-Siyer also partakes in the Ottoman metropolitan interest in universal dynastic histories from the mid-sixteenth century onwards, beginning with the ambitious Tevārīḥ-i Āl-i ʿOsmān and Imperial Scroll, and marked in particular by the Żübdetūʾt-Tevārīḥ (Quintessence of Histories) projects of the 1580s and 1590s. Thus, the Cāmiʿ ūʾs-Siyer is as much a product of the widespread interest in stories of the prophets as marked by the corpus of Qiṣṣa al-Anbiyāʾ manuscripts, the corpus of illustrated Majālis al-ʿUshshāq manuscripts produced in Shiraz, and the illustrated Ḥadīḵatūʾs-Sūʾ manuscripts produced in Baghdad and

next painting would mostly likely represent Bilqis (Queen of Sheba) lifting the hem of her skirt to walk across the transparent glass floor in the courtyard of Solomon’s palace (fol. 109b). This transparent glass was prepared as a trick so that Bilqis would think it was water and she would lift her skirt up to walk across the water and Solomon would thus see her legs in order to make sure that she was not a female devil with donkey hooves instead of legs.

The next painting was to appear at a moment where, either it was decided that Jonah (Yunus) was to be thrown into the sea, or when he was swallowed by a whale (fol. 118a). Following this are accounts on Ezekiel, Zachariah, John and finally Jesus Christ. There were to be two paintings accompanying the story of Christ. While many of the planned paintings in the section on prophets in the Cāmiʿ ūʾs-Siyer are commonly found in other illustrated manuscripts that deal with the stories of prophets, the paintings that were to accompany the story of Christ are less often found. Most Qiṣṣa al-Anbiyāʾ manuscripts, for example, depict Christ’s crucifixion (which is depicted as hanging rather than crucifixion). Instead, in the Cāmiʿ ūʾs-Siyer, it is scenes from the birth of Christ (fol. 126a) and Christ speaking from the cradle (fol. 127a) that were chosen for illustration. The first painting planned in the section on Christ was to appear when Mary was instructed to eat dates from a tree to regain her strength during the first pangs of childbirth. While rare, one manuscript of the Qiṣṣa al-Anbiyāʾ from circa 1570–80 (Chester Beatty Library Per 231.227) does represent this story. For a reproduction of this painting see E. Wright, Islam: Faith, Art, Culture: Manuscripts of the Chester Beatty Library (London: Scala Publishers, 2009), 213.


461 On history writing in the Ottoman Empire in this period see Fettvacı, Picturing History at the Ottoman Court; Erdem Çıpa and E. Fettvacı, eds. Writing History at the Ottoman Court: Editing the Past, Fashioning the Future (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013); Fatma Sinem Eryılmaz Aresnas-Vives, “The Shehnamecsis of Sultan Süleyman: ‘Arif and Eflatun and their Dynamic Project” (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2010).
illustrated Rawżat al-Ṣafā’ manuscripts, as it is of illustrated universal histories and siyar texts produced in Istanbul.

These universal histories and the Cāmiʿū’s-Siyer also share much with the outpouring of illustrated genealogies produced in Baghdad in this period. Chapter 5 deals with these genealogies in more detail but it should suffice to say here that these works present compact and immediately graspable summary versions of universal history told through a genealogical succession. For example, following the story of Noah, the Cāmiʿū’s-Siyer turns to an overview of the sons of Noah and the nations springing from their lineage. This has close parallels with the information provided in genealogies, wherein all nations are categorized under the three sons of Noah. In his account of various rulers, particularly pre-Islamic kings, Muhammed Tahir notes their given names as well as their patronym, and their meaning in various languages. This is encountered not only in illustrated universal genealogies but also in those of various Sufi orders. A shared approach to universal history and a rekindling in the popularity of illustrated stories of the prophets in the last quarter of the sixteenth century permeates the illustrated genealogies, Qīṣṣa al-Anbiyā’, Majālis al-ʿUshshaq and Hadīḳatū’s-Sūʿedā manuscripts and the unique Cāmiʿū’s-Siyer.

In addition to this shared perception of universal history, the author of the Cāmiʿū’s-Siyer also includes information relevant to his own period. For example, in his account of Abraham, Muhammed Tahir adds that the infant Abraham was hidden in a grotto in a village

462 For example, he explains that Alexander’s name in Greek is “Ahşidreş,” which Muḥammed Tāhir notes, means philosopher. He adds that while some historians name Alexander “Ṣikender-i Aşgar” to differentiate him from “Ṣikender-i Ekber,” who built the wall against Gog and Magog, some historians consider “Ṣikender-i Aşgar” to be the one who built the same wall. Muḥammed Tāhir also points to variances in the identity of Alexander. TPML H. 1369, fol. 160b–161a.

in Kufa, where, in the author’s present there was a convent (khanqah) that people were still visiting. Along with historical sources and exegeses, the author also cites verses from Persian poets such as Sa’di, Kashifī, and Jami. In fact, the section on Prophet Joseph is dotted with verses from the Haft Awrang of Jami. Blending different sources such as Qur’anic verses, ḥadīth and tafsīr together with poetry, historical texts, reports and current references, Muhammed Tahir’s universal history provides a comprehensive view of the world geared towards a learned lay reader. The Cāmi’ī’s-Siyer is both vertical in its organization of time from the prelude of existence in the creation of the universe, and horizontally in its organization of the separate chapters in which contemporary dynasties are presented. For example, following his account on Abrahamic prophets, Muhammed Tahir devotes a section, first to philosophers such as Pythagoras, Socrates (whose account was meant to include a painting on folio 134a), Diogenes, Plato, and Ptolemy. Then, a section on pre-Islamic Persian kingdoms follows. In this section, in the story of Minuchihr, for example, the author notes that his reign coincided with that of Shu‘ayb, Moses, Harun and Joshua, giving a sense of the horizontal nature of time.

---

464 TPML H. 1369, fol. 41a.


466 TPML H. 1369, fol. 145b.
whole work chronologically, but within each chapter there is an effort to give a sense of synchronicity.

With the exception of the painting depicting the meeting of Sokollu Mehmed Paşa and Süleyman I and the underdrawing representing the meeting of Hasan Paşa and Mehmed III, all of the finished paintings in this manuscript belong to the section about pre-Islamic Persian kingdoms, in other words, the heroes of the Shāhnāma. The first of these shows a battle scene between Afrasiyab, the ruler of Turan, and Zav, the grandson of Minuchihr, the ruler of Iran (fig. 4.8). While slightly damaged, and at one point, most likely early in its lifetime, folded into four and then pasted on the page, this painting differs in style from the first painting of this manuscript. This crowded battle scene is typical of paintings produced in Baghdad in this period. The rest of the paintings in the manuscript follow a similar style of somewhat crowded scenes, squat figures, and a similar palette with dark greens and dullish blues. The other four finished paintings in this manuscript also belong to the section on pre-Islamic dynasties. They illustrate Alexander receiving the ruler of China (fig. 4.9), Bahram Gur hunting in India (fig. 4.10), the death of Nushzad at the hands of Ram Barzin (fig. 4.11), and Farrukh Hurmuzd killed on the orders of Azarmidukht (fig. 4.12).

These paintings appear in the section on Pishdadians and Sassanids. The author begins the section on the Pishdadians by noting that he will present a summary version of their history. Referencing a number of sources such as the Jāmiʿ al-Tawārīkh of Rashid al-Din Hamadani, the Shāhnāma of Firdawsi and the Jāwīdān-i Khirad of Ibn Miskawayh,

467 The story on Khusraw I and Nushzad begins on folio 184a. Muḥammed Tāhir’s main source in this section is the Rawżat al-Ṣafā’. After folio 184b a section of text has been mis-bound and instead of the continuation of the account of Nushzad’s rebelliousness against his father, there is a section on caliph ʿOmar. The story on Nushzad continues on folio 252a. In a scene partly reminiscent of the death of Sohrab, the painting that appears on this folio depicts Nushzad as a fallen soldier, who was killed by Ram Barzin. The section that is mis-bound was meant to include two paintings on the Battle of Qadisiyya (fols. 215a, 235a).

468 Some of the faces of the main figures in these paintings seem to have been intentionally erased or damaged, particularly in the painting depicting the death of Nushzad and the death of Farrukh Hurmuzd, where the faces of those who were responsible for their execution have been erased.
Muhammed Tahir presents an overview of the reigns of Pishdadian rulers from Gayumars until Garshasp. The painting (fig. 4.8) of the battle between Afrasiyab and Zav, son of Tahmasp, grandson of Minuchihr, appears at the moment when Afrasiyab’s army is defeated by the Iranian army of Zav.

Following a very brief account on the final Pishdadian ruler Garshasp, Muhammed Tahir turns to the Kayanian dynasty, beginning with Kay Qubad. His account of the Kayanian dynasty, and in particular of the king-maker Rustam, as well as the story of Siyavush, son of Kay Khusraw, and Sudabeh, his stepmother, is quite detailed whereas other figures of the Kayanian dynasty are given cursory treatment. Also described in detail is the story of Alexander the Great. Following his defeat of the Kayanian ruler Dara, Muhammed Tahir writes that Alexander also attacked Zoroastrians, then campaigned to India. Following his control of India, Alexander turned towards China. It is here, at the moment when the ruler of China pledges obedience to Alexander that there is a painting (fig. 4.9).

Following the story of the death of Alexander, the Cāmiʿī’s-Siyer turns to an account of the Arsacid and Sassanid dynasties. Among the Sassanid rulers, Bahram V (r. 420–438), also known as Bahram Gur, son of Yazdagird I (r. 399–420), is distinguished by the inclusion of a painting. While the story of Bahram Gur is popular in Persian literature, particularly in Nizami’s Haft Paykar (The Seven Princesses), Firdawsi’s Shāhnāma, and Amir Khusraw Dihlavi’s Hasht Bihisht (Eight Paradises), the majority of paintings related to the legends surrounding Bahram Gur depict him in the seven pavilions each with a different princess (in the Haft Paykar), hunting onagers, hunting with Fitnah, Azadeh or Dilaram, and

---

469 For this section, Muḥammed Tāhir’s sources as he cites them are: Mafāṭih aʿl ʿUlūm of Abū ʿAbdullah al-Kāṭīb al-Khwārazmī, Rawzat al-Ṣafāʾ of Mirkhwand, and the History of Tabari. He also includes verses from the Persian Sufi poet Abū Saʿīd Abūʾl Khayr (d. 1049) and Ḥāfīz (d. 1389–90).

battling lions to claim his crown. In the Cāmiʿū’s-Sīyer, a different scene was chosen for the inclusion of a painting. Here, the story of Bahram Gur in India is portrayed.

There was, in India, a massive rogue elephant that would run out of the forest onto the pathways and trample people. In the painting, which is dominated by the deep green hue of the hills, the elephant has trampled two men (fig. 4.10). Bahram Gur, dressed in a red garment, is about to shoot an arrow at the elephant. Rabbits and does run around; a monkey is climbing a tree on which several birds have perched. Two other donkeys look from atop banana trees, while the ruler of India and his retinue, all depicted with dark skin, gaze in surprise from behind the hills. Below the painting, the text continues by relaying that the ruler of India had gathered a group of strong-armed men, all of whom the elephant either killed or routed. Bahram Gur then charged at the elephant, first piercing the side of the animal with an arrow, then grasping its trunk, brought the elephant to its knees before killing it. Bahram Gur, who had concealed his identity from the ruler of India, further aided the Indian ruler against an attacking army, after which the Indian ruler granted Bahram Gur his daughter in marriage.\textsuperscript{471}

The final two completed paintings also illustrate episodes from Sassanid history. Like the particular choice of the episode of Bahram Gur killing the elephant, these two paintings also depict relatively less illustrated scenes: that of the death of Nushzad, son of Khusraw I (r. 531–579) and the death of Farrukh Hurmuzd. Nushzad was borne of a Christian mother and Sassanid ruler, Khusraw I. Nushzad followed his mother’s faith instead of Zoroastrianism, which displeased Khusraw I, who wanted to have Nushzad imprisoned. Nushzad then drew an army against his father. The painting shows the moment of Nushzad’s death after his rebellion (fig. 4.11). While several manuscript copies of the

\textsuperscript{471} TPML H. 1369, fols. 178b–179a.
Shāhnāma include paintings of the episode of Nushzad’s death,\textsuperscript{472} the episode of the death of Farrukh Hurmuzd at the orders of Azarmidukht is rare. Azarmidukht was the daughter of the Sassanid ruler Khusraw II (r. 590–591; 591–628). The particular scene illustrated in H. 1369 (fig. 4.12) depicts the moment of Farrukh Hurmuzd’s execution. Farrukh Hurmuzd had wanted to marry Azarmidukht in order to usurp the Sassanid throne. Unable to refuse him, Azarmidukht, instead, had him killed.\textsuperscript{473} In the gated garden of Azarmidukht’s palace, Farrukh Hurmuzd is pinned down by Siyavash (grandson of Bahram Chubin, [d. 591]), as the latter slit his throat. Azarmidukht appears from behind the blue curtain of the gate of her palace.\textsuperscript{474} Following the history of the Sassanid dynasty, the author Muhammed Tahir turns to the history of pre-Islamic Arabia.\textsuperscript{475}

\textsuperscript{472} The database of the Shahnama Project at Cambridge University identifies thirty-four illustrations of this scene. Several of these are undated but appear to be later examples. Several manuscripts included in the database that include a painting of this scene are from the early to mid-sixteenth century. These are TIEM T. 1955, The National Library of Iran Ms. 10982 F, BnF Supp. persan 489, and the St. Petersburg Institute of Oriental Manuscripts MS. C. 50. A 1586 copy at the British Library (MS Add. 27302) also includes this scene, where Nushzad’s death is mourned, in a composition somewhat similar to the Cāmiʿūs-Siyer, in which Nushzad lies dead on the lap of a soldier. Other late sixteenth century Shāhnāma copies show the moment of his death as he is struck by Ram Barzin (TIEM T. 1983; Tehran Majlis Library 622). http://shahnama.caret.cam.ac.uk/new/jnama/workbook/W5549988?view=gallery&order=natural&index=0

\textsuperscript{473} Following the death of Khusraw II in 628 his son Shiroe (Kavad II) became ruler. Farrukh Hurmuzd, who was an army chief, had aided in Kavad II’s accession. However, Kavad II died within a year, after having made peace with the Byzantines. The Sassanid Empire lost some territory to the Byzantines, and the northern part of the empire was divided. Farrukh Hurmuzd then ruled the independent Parthian faction. Ardashir III succeeded his father, Kavad II. As the new ruler was still an infant, the general Sharhbaraz seized the throne in 629. However, he was murdered. Sassanid rule then passed to several of Khusraw II’s daughters and Azarmidukht was one among them. Wanting to join the divided factions and to seize power, Farrukh Hurmuzd had asked to marry Azarmidukht.


\textsuperscript{474} Note the wide ogival patterns on her brocaded garment, similar examples of which appear in the paintings appended to the end of the Karlsruhe Sīsīlenāme described in Chapter 2, as well as on the figure entering the court of Harun al-Rashid in TPML H. 1230, fol. 33a (fig. 4.13) and in a painting depicting the camel driver who witnessed the events at Karbala in the Mašṭeš-i Al-i Resūl of Lāmī’i Çelebi (TIEM T. 1958, fol. 40a). For a reproduction of this painting see Milstein, Miniature Painting in Ottoman Baghdad, fig. 28.

\textsuperscript{475} On the Ghassanids and Lakhmids and particularly their political relations with the Byzantine empire see Irfan Shahid, Byzantium and the Arabs in the Sixth Century, Vol. 1: Political and Military History (Washington, D. C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1995).
In addition to the four paintings assigned to depict pre-Islamic dynasties, two others were planned to illustrate the Battle of Qadisiyya between the Muslim Arab and the Sassanid Persian armies (fols. 215a, 235a). Another painting was planned to appear in the story of Mürsed ibn-i Külal and the girl who interpreted his dream (fol. 273b). The story of the encounter between Fatima bint Mürr el-Has‘ amiyye and ‘Abdullah bin ‘Abdü‘l Muttalib, father of Prophet Muhammad also has a space left for a painting at a moment when the woman noticed light radiating from ‘Abdullah’s face and realizing it to be a divine radiance, approached ‘Abdullah to express her wish to carry his offspring (fol. 286b). Again these are rarely portrayed scenes. Further planned but unexecuted paintings were to be about the battles between Imam ‘Ali and Mu‘awiya (fols. 395b, 404b, 413b, 420a, 428b, 451a), the execution of Abu Salama (fol. 549a), and the meeting between Abu Muslim, the general who had been influential in toppling the Umayyad dynasty and Malik b. al-Haytham (fol. 556b). The latter painting was to appear in the section on the death of Abu Muslim, in

---

476 Muhammed Tahir adds that some suggest that the woman in question is not Fatima Has‘ amiyye but the sister of Varaka ibn Navfal. ‘Abdullah bin ‘Abdü‘l Muttalib refuses this woman. A section heading in red denotes that the account was to continue with the story of the birth of the Prophet, however the next section is again misbound, and instead concerns the story of Jazima al-Abrash, ruler of Hira. This section continues until folio 289b. From folio 290a the text continues with the story of caliph ‘Oğmân. TPML H. 1369 fol. 287a.

477 Abū Salama, known as wazir al-Muhammad, was an Abbasid propagandist in Kufa, following Bukayr b. Mahan. While he was influential in the Abbasid revolution, his wish to appoint an Alid caliph and his network in Kufa were threats to both the first Abbasid caliph, al-Saffah, and to Abū Muslim. The latter was also influential in the Abbasid revolution and was powerful in Khurasan. In the end, Abū Muslim’s power also posed a threat and he too was killed. Muhammed Tahir’s account of the death of Abū Salama proposes Abū Salama’s stalling the acceptance of al-Saffah as caliph and his wish to place someone from the family of ’Ali as caliph as the reasons for his execution. The author adds that al-Saffah needed Abū Muslim’s help in this. He thus sent his brother Abū Ja‘far to Marw to meet with Abū Muslim. Having assured Khurasani support, Abū Ja‘far suggested to Abū Muslim that Abū Salama had objected to some caliphal orders. The author adds that Abū Salama’s execution was ascribed to the Kharjites (TPML H. 1360, fol. 549b; TPML H. 1230, fol. 10a–b). The author then moves directly from this to relaying Abū Ja‘far’s opinion that Abū Muslim was a threat to the caliphate (“her ne deñlü ki Ebu Müslim arsa-yı alemde mevcid ola, emr-i hilafetde revâc ve revnâk olmaz”). Muhammad Tahir writes that al-Saffah did not pay heed to this idea. His account points to growing animosity between Abū Ja‘far and Abū Muslim when he notes that Abū Muslim was offended that al-Saffah had appointed Abū Ja‘far as his heir without consulting Abū Muslim. (TPML H. 1369, fol. 550b; TPML H. 1230, fol. 10b). Next, Muhammed Tahir turns to Abū Muslim’s wish to make the pilgrimage and to the increasing animosity between Abū Muslim and Abū Ja‘far. Abū Muslim’s wish to bring an escort of eight thousand people on the pilgrimage was seen as excessive. Al-Saffah refused this, saying with so many men there would be water shortage on the route. Al-Saffah further appointed Abū Ja‘far to lead the pilgrims instead of Abū Muslim. During the pilgrimage, news came that al-Saffah had passed away. Though Abū Ja‘far had been heir apparent, his uncle ‘Abdullah bin ‘Ali showed opposition. Abū Ja‘far sent Abū Muslim to subdue ‘Abdullah (TPML H.
which Malik b. al-Haytham warned Abu Muslim not to go to Abu Jaʿfar’s court lest he be killed. Abu Muslim, who played an important role in the success of the Abbasid revolution, was summarily executed upon admission to Abu Jaʿfar’s court, as there had been growing enmity between the general and the caliph, according to Muhammed Tahir.

Muhammed Tahir writes of two uprisings that took place following Abu Muslim’s death. One was by a Magian (mecūsī) named Sunbadh, who wanted to avenge Abu Muslim’s death. The second was by the extreme Messianic group Rawandiyya, who believed in reincarnation (tenāsuḥ) and held Jaʿfar al-Mansur to be their god. Muhammed Tahir writes that when the caliph heard of this, he imprisoned one hundred members of the Rawandiyya and ordered the group not to congregate. Upon this, the Rawandiyya sought to kill Jaʿfar al-Mansur and to find another god, according to Muhammed Tahir. While the author does not cite his source, Muhammed Tahir’s history here more or less follows Tabari’s account, which is among Muhammad Tahir’s main sources in his history.478

When the group started walking around the caliphal palace, Jaʿfar al-Mansur exited the palace and was accosted by Maʾn b. Zaʿide, a former Umayyad officer, who begged him to return to safety. It is at this point that there was meant to be a painting in H. 1369 (fol.

---

The rest of the account is summarized briefly in the *Cāmiʿū’s-Siyer*, wherein the Rawandiyya are routed and Maʿn b. Zaʿide is given governorship of Yemen.\(^{479}\) Next, Muhammed Tahir turns to discussing the choice and building of Baghdad as the caliphal center. Muhammed Tahir’s sources in his account of the early Abbasid caliphate are works by Dinawari (d. 896), Masʿudi (d. 956), Ibn al-Jawzi (d. 1201), Hafiz Abbru (d. 1430), Hamdullah Mustawfi (d. 1349), ʿAbdullah ibn Asad Yafiʿi (d. 1367), Mirkhwand (d. 1498), and ʿAli b. Yaqtin (d. 798). While there is an emphasis on the story of Abu Muslim, Muhammed Tahir presents a relatively neutral view of early Abbasid history.\(^ {480}\) He also devotes great attention to the history of Baghdad, various versions on the meaning of the name of the city and the caliph al-Mansur’s foundation of Baghdad as his capital.\(^ {481}\) Following the story of the foundation of Baghdad, Muhammed Tahir writes about the death of the caliph al-Mansur and in this section, the author also provides various stories from al-Mansur’s life that give an idea about his character. One such story is taken from Masʿudi’s *Murūj al-Dhahāb* (Meadows of Gold). It tells of an arrow, which landed near al-Mansur and had verses inscribed on it. The verses read that an innocent man had been imprisoned in Hamadan. Al-Mansur called for the old man, heard his story and freed him, granting him governorship of Hamadan.\(^ {482}\) After this point, that is, beginning with folio 570a, until the end of the manuscript on folio 577b, the text is written in a different hand. H. 1369 ends after an account of the death of the caliph al-Hadi (r. 785–786) and the beginning of the account of the caliph Harun al-Rashid (r. 786–809).

\(^ {479}\) TPML H. 1369, fols. 564a–b; TPML H. 1230, fol. 18a.

\(^ {480}\) In fact, it is not only in the section devoted to Abū Muslim that the author discusses the revolutionary figure but elsewhere too he provides stories regarding him. For example, in his account on caliph Mahdi, he writes about Hashim, also known as al-Muqanna, who claimed to be an incarnation of God. According to Muḥammed Ṭāhir, al-Muqanna claimed that the incarnation of God passed through Noah and various other prophets and philosophers, and then through Abū Muslim. TPML H. 1230, fol. 22a.

\(^ {481}\) TPML H. 1369, fols. 564b–567a; TPML H.1230, fols. 18a–19b.

\(^ {482}\) TPML H. 1369, fol. 569b; TPML H. 1230, fol. 21a.
The second volume of the Čami'ü's-Siyer, as it is titled on the illuminated heading, begins with a short praise of God, His judgment in advancing or denouncing sovereignty, and on the Prophet Muhammad. Following the encomium, it continues:

It will not be hidden to the discerning and far-sighted minds, who have ever illuminating lantern-like hearts, that Muhammed Tahir el-Necibi, the composer of these fragrant writings—may God Almighty grant him success in his endeavor—began writing the second volume after the first volume of the histories on the august fortuned prophets and caliphs and lofty sultans [had been] completed, which has been adorned and extended with the name of Sultan Mehmed Khan—may the Merciful support him—who is the center of the celestial spheres, shadow of the creator on earth, crown of the sultans, the fairest of the [existing] rulers, king of kings of the world, possessor of the throne of Jam, heir to Solomon, protector of mankind.

Written in red ink, a rubric marks the following section as “the sixth book on the Abbasid caliphs and neighboring rulers.” This section until the middle of folio 30a overlaps with the final forty-four folios of H. 1369. This overlapping section begins with the Abbasid revolution and the reign of the first Abbasid caliph, Abu'l-'Abbas as-Saffah (r. 750–754) and continues until the beginning of the caliphate of Harun al-Rashid.

483 Here the author quotes the Qur’anic chapter Ali Imran, verse 26: “Say, “O Allah, Owner of Sovereignty, You give sovereignty to whom You will, and take sovereignty away from whom You will. You honor whom You will and You humble who you will. In Your hand is [all] good. Indeed, You are over all things competent.”

484 The terms “müzeyyen and müzeyyel” give the sense of ornamenting, extending, supplementing, adding on to, or more literally in the case of “müzeyyel” adding length to the hem of a dress. As TPML H. 1369 is incomplete, it is not possible to judge whether this introductory section was meant to be included. Folios 533b–534a are left blank in TPML H. 1369 and the text, beginning with “It is reported that there were thirty seven caliphs who acceded to the throne of the Abbasid caliphate” starts from the middle of the page on folio 534b. Elsewhere in TPML H. 1369 there are spaces left for rubrics, which were to be added in red, blue or gold ink. So, it is possible that TPML H. 1369 would also include this introductory paragraph, which begins TPML H. 1230. However, it is also possible that this space in TPML H. 1369 was reserved for an illuminated ʿunwan.

Thus, this introductory paragraph may be unique to TPML H. 1230. After this introductory section and the rubric in red, which notes “the sixth book on the Abbasid caliphs and neighboring rulers,” TPML H. 1230 continues with the sentence, “It is reported that there were thirty seven caliphs who acceded to the throne of the Abbasid caliphate.” The rest of the text up to folio 30a is almost the same as the last forty-four folios of TPML H. 1369.

485 TPML H. 1230, fol. 1b.

486 Ibid.

487 With the exception of a few words the two texts are exactly the same. However, TPML H. 1369 is missing some of the chapter headings and there is space left for them to be filled later.
While this overlapping section was intended to have three paintings in H. 1369, there are no corresponding paintings in H. 1230. The first painting in H. 1230 thus appears in the account about the Abbasid caliph Harun al-Rashid (fig. 4.13) and his meeting with the influential vizier Yahya b. Khalid (d. 806), of the Barmakid family. This painting is superior in quality and execution compared to the ones we have encountered thus far. Even though towards the end of Harun al-Rashid’s reign the Barmakid family of viziers fell into disgrace, in the Câmi ü’s-Siyer, the meeting of the caliph and the vizier appears at the moment when the latter is at the peak of his powers, having been “given the reigns of governance, and his sons given high rank and distinguished among [their] peers.” The painting depicts the caliph Harun al-Rashid, dressed in black with a historical sensitivity to the typical color of Abbasid caliphal attire. He sits cross-legged on a cushion and faces the vizier, who sits kneeling on the rug before the caliph. A youth, dressed in yellow and red, stands to the right, hands clasped before him. Others, including a dark-skinned, white-bearded man, sit around the caliph and the vizier, on either side of a water fountain. A youth wearing a wide ogival-patterned brocaded white garment, a design typical of Ottoman silk brocade textiles at that time and often encountered in Baghdad painting, stands right outside the enclosure as a dark-skinned attendant peaks out from behind the curtains. A portly, mustachioed man, wearing a turban with a peacock feather aigrette, stands outside the enclosure, in the garden. Note the dark greens, the many flowers in the garden and the figures with almond-shaped eyes, squat figures with large turbans, all typical of contemporary Baghdad paintings.

The second painting (fig. 4.14) in this manuscript, again of high quality, portrays the Abbasid caliph al-Mutawakkil (r. 847–861) in discussion with a stocky, bearded man. Two attendants stand on the left; one of them holding the caliph’s sword. Four men stare out from the gateway; two of them, on either side of a portly dark-skinned man, look directly at the

488 TPML H. 1230, fols. 33a–33b.
viewer, another feature often encountered in contemporary paintings from Baghdad. Right outside the caliph’s palace are several Jews and Christians, here depicted as contemporary Europeans. A turbanned attendant dressed in red holds one by the wrist and points towards him. This painting appears at the moment when al-Mutawakkil had imposed sumptuary laws on the Jews and Christians in 850. That this particular scene is chosen for illustration may resonate with the relatively recent imposition of sumptuary laws on Jews and Christians by the Ottoman ruler Murad III, wherein Jews were ordered to wear red headgear instead of saffron-colored headgear. Before his discussion of al-Mutawakkil’s sumptuary laws for the non-Muslims, Muhammed Tahir also notes that this caliph had destroyed the shrine of Imam Husayn at Karbala and that ‘Alawites had been “greatly disturbed and [were] in a ruined state” (be-gāyet mużтарıb ve perişän ḥāl idiler). Following these comments on al-Mutawakkil towards the ‘Alawites and Christians and Jews, the author turns to the account of al-Mutawakkil’s murder.

While the first painting in this manuscript highlighted the vizier of the caliph Harun al-Rashid, and the second painting presented a somewhat murky view of the later caliph al-Mutawakkil, the following two paintings that appear in H. 1230 represent moments of defeat for the Abbasid caliphs. One of these (fig. 4.15) depicts the severed head of the caliph al-Muqtadir (r. 908–932) brought before his vizier Munis al-Muzaffar (d. 933), who bites his finger in astonishment. Munis had been commander-in-chief during the reign of al-Mu’tadid (r. 892–902) and later of al-Muqtadir; he had been influential in quelling a palace coup against the latter in 908. Two decades later, it was Munis, who would lead a coup against

---

489 Muṣṭafa ‘Ālī writes in the Künhū’l Aḥbār that the sultan’s imam, who is not named in the Künhū’l Aḥbār, but whom Selânîkî identifies as Mevîlā’l Kerîm (d. 1599–94), was responsible for the sumptuary laws ordering non-Muslims and Jews to put on red caps instead of “sky colored” and saffron-yellow turbans. Muṣṭafa ‘Ālī, Künhū’l Aḥbār, 519b–520a and Selânîkî Muṣṭafâ Efendi, Tarih-i Selânîkî, 348.

490 Ibid., fol. 54a.

491 Kennedy, The Prophet and the Age of the Caliphates, 191.
Muhammed Tahir does not dwell on the reasons for the coup, except to write that in 929
“Munis, Ibn Hamdan, Abu Hayja and others stepped on the position of obstinacy and
rebellion (temerrūd ve 'isyān).” They then deposed al-Muqtadir and placed his brother
Muhammad al-Qahir on the throne.

Muhammed Tahir seems to be merging the accounts of the two palace coups into
one, for he writes that Ibn Hamdan was murdered, whereas the Hamdanid leader had been
killed in 908 in the first palace coup against al-Muqtadir. In the end, the 908 and 929
coups are not successful and al-Muqtadir returns to his caliphal seat. Muhammed Tahir
notes that al-Qahir was first pardoned, and when al-Muqtadir regained his power, he had
him imprisoned. The author adds: “Some say that Munis did not consent to the caliph’s
deposition.” Thus, Munis was “granted much honor and his rank was increased. For quite
some time there was understanding and consent between them until the year 320 (932),
when [they] reported to Munis that, through the opinions of Husayn b. Qasim, [the caliph]
intended to imprison him.” Muhammed Tahir adds that Munis, who had gone to Mosul
without the caliph’s approval, sent a messenger to the caliph. Husayn b. Qasim, the vizier of
the caliph, asked the messenger for the letter. The messenger refused, saying he would only
tell the content of the letter to the caliph. The vizier then imprisoned the messenger and
asked that Munis’ palace be looted. Husayn b. Qasim further sought the support of the

---

492 Ibid.
493 TPML H. 1230, fol. 68b.
494 Hugh Kennedy, The Prophet and the Age of the Caliphates, 191.
495 TPML H. 1230, fol. 69a.
496 There had been enmity between Husayn b. Qāsim and Munis and the latter had twice prevented al-Muqtadir
from appointing Husayn b. Qāsim as vizier. Ibid., fol. 69b.
   On the role and influence of Munis in Abbasid administration see Ihsan Arslan, “Abbasi Devleti’ndeki
Komutanların Siyasi ve İdari Sahalarda Etkileri, Munisü’l Muazaffer Örneği” (The Influence of the Commanders
in the Abbasid State on the Political and Administrative Fields, the Example of Munisü’l Muazaffer), The
Hamdanids in battling Munis. The author writes that staying another six months in Mosul first and gathering his army, Munis then marched towards Baghdad. During this battle between Munis and the caliph, the latter was defeated and beheaded. His head was brought before Munis, who reprimanded the killer for having killed the caliph without his permission, which explains his expression of surprise (fig. 4.15). While there is an emphasis on the story of the commander, the author is careful not to cast him in an overly negative manner.

The following painting (fig. 4.16) depicts yet another defeat, this time of the last Abbasid caliph, al-Muṣṭaṣim Billah (r. 1242–1258). In a relatively short account, the author writes that this caliph had great wealth, property, splendid fabrics, gold and silver coins, and that his name was voiced in the ḥutba in the east and west. After this brief introduction, the author turns to a year-by-year account of his reign, in which there was an outbreak of the plague, flooding of the Tigris, and finally the sack of Baghdad by the Mongols in 1258. The author writes that Hulagu Khan (r. 1256–1265) first seized Alamut castle from Rukn al-Dīn Khurshah (d. 1256), then with the counsel of Nasir al-Dīn Tusi (d. 1274), went on to besiege Baghdad. The caliph and his sons were killed by the Mongols. Thus ended the Abbasid caliphate.

The painting (fig. 4.16) shows the Mongol ruler, Hulagu Khan, seated on a throne in a tent. The Mongols are portrayed with a sensitivity to their headgear and Mongolian facial features. Hulagu Khan is conversing with another Mongol official, while on the left, the Mongol army stands in waiting, swords in hand. On the lower left, two officers of the Mongol army are beheading prisoners, whose severed heads and decapitated corpses lie on

---

497 The author adds that among the Hamdanids, Ibn Davud did not want to fight Munis, for the Hamdanids and Munis had an understanding between them. However, his brothers proposed to fight. Ibn Davud had prophesied that he would be killed in this battle, and he was. TPML H. 1230, fol. 69b.

498 Ibid., fol. 70a.
the ground. On the right, the caliph and his sons stand, hands clasped before them. They are dressed in ceremonial black garments as they await their death. Muhammed Tahir ends his account on the Abbasid caliphate with a brief overview of al-Mustaʿsim’s length of life and rule and a Persian poem regarding the names of the Abbasid caliphs. Interestingly, in several cases, it is the role of the vizier rather than the Abbasid caliphs, who are, at times, depicted in moments of defeat. This may be a subtle commentary on the role Hasan Paşa wished to claim for himself through his patrilineal link.

Following a history of the Abbasid caliphate, the author then gives an account of the imams of the four schools of Sunni jurisprudence. Of these, the Baghdadi Abu Hanifa is given distinction through a more detailed narrative. Next, the author presents the story of various shaykhs, some of them buried in Baghdad. Among these ʿAbd al-Qadir al-Gilani (d. 1166), Ziya al-Din Abu’l-Najib al-Suhrawardi (d. 1168), Shihab al-Din Suhrwardi (d. 1191), Baha’ al-Din Walad (d. 1231), Shams-i Tabrizi (d. 1248), and Farid al-Din ʿAttar (d. 1220) are highlighted with more detailed accounts. Among these, ʿAbd al-Qadir al-Gilani, Baha’ al-Din Walad and Shams-i Tabrizi are further emphasized by the inclusion of a painting.

Originally from the province of Gilan, ʿAbd al-Qadir went to Baghdad at a young age to acquire religious learning. When his father had passed away he had bequeathed eighty dinars, which were divided between ʿAbd al-Qadir and his brother. Their mother, Fatima, had sewn ʿAbd al-Qadir’s share of his inheritance in his quilt and sent him off to Baghdad, admonishing him to always be truthful. When the convoy he joined passed from Hamadan, they were accosted by a group of bandits. The bandits looted the merchandise of the convoy and then asked ʿAbd al-Qadir al-Gilani if he had any possessions, to which he replied saying

---

he had forty dinars sewn in his quilt. Not believing him, the bandits took ʿAbd al-Qadir to their leader. He repeated the same reply, and his money was found. This took the bandits by surprise and when they remarked that he could have kept this a secret, the young ʿAbd al-Qadir told them that his mother had warned him to always speak the truth. It is at this point when the bandits repent that there is a painting (fig. 4.17). It portrays a dark green hill and a grayish-blue rock formation on the right, around which various animals graze and perch. Dominating the composition, on the left, is the merchandise of the convoy, around which the bandits have gathered. On top, ʿAbd al-Qadir al-Gilani, dressed in a simple blue and brown dervish garment, sits kneeling, while the bandit chief has knelt before him and kisses his hand in obeisance. ʿAbd al-Qadir al-Gilani, the founder of the Qadiriyya order in Baghdad, was certainly an influential figure in the Abbasid capital, where he was eventually buried near his shrine, restored soon after the Ottoman sultan Süleyman I conquered Baghdad from the Safavids in 1534.500 Throughout Muhammed Tahir’s account, there is a notable emphasis on the history of Baghdad and figures from or based in Baghdad, as well as references to sources from Baghdadi authors. Thus it comes as no surprise that ʿAbd al-Qadir is highlighted with both a more detailed story and a painting.

Similarly, it is no surprise that Ziya al-Din Abu’l-Najib al-Suhrawardi and Shihab al-Din Suhrawardi, in whose Suhrawardiyya Sufi order the author belonged, play a prominent role in the Cāmiʿū’s-Siyer. However, the particular episode of the bandits’ repentance may also have to do with the context in which Muhammed Tahir composed his universal history. The introduction to his Cāmiʿū’s-Siyer situated his patron’s appointment to Baghdad in the context of the Celali uprisings. The late sixteenth- and early seventeenth centuries saw the havoc wrought by such bandits throughout Anatolia and beyond. Baghdad was also affected by uprisings, which in the end led to Hasan Paşa’s death. Resonances with Ottoman

500 Necipoğlu, The Age of Sinan, 470.
Baghdad and its environs are further accentuated by the contemporary local costumes and distinctive turbans worn by individuals, along with other anachronistic details.

The next painting (fig. 4.18) portrays Baha’ al-Din Walad, the father of Mawlama Rumi, who is preaching just before leaving Balkh. Here, Baha’ al-Din Walad dressed in green and blue, is preaching from the minbar while the congregation listens affectedly. While paintings depicting preachers and preaching are frequent in Baghdad paintings, particularly in manuscripts of the Hadīkatū’s-Sū’ edā (discussed in the previous chapter), this painting is remarkable for the inclusion of women listening from the upper gallery of the mosque. This is not a feature encountered in Ottoman paintings produced in Istanbul. However, female participation in such settings appears in Safavid paintings. Note for example the inclusion of similarly veiled women in a 1582 manuscript of the Tadhkira (Biographical Account) of Shaykh Safi, eponymous founder of the Safaviyya order, in a scene showing Shaykh Safi dancing in the khanqah (fig. 4.19), a painting depicting pilgrims at the Ka’ba in a 1573 Shirazi manuscript of Ahmad ibn Muhammad Ghaffari’s Nigaristān (fig. 4.20) or a circa 1575 Haft Awrang (Seven Thrones) of Jāmi. While I have not been able to find concrete evidence of a Shirazi connection to Baghdad, there is circumstantial evidence connecting these centers, particularly after Shah Abbas I’s extrication of Fars from the Qizilbash. In addition to possible Shirazi or Qazwini connections, what is interesting about this painting is the depiction of a local, Baghdadi, mosque interior.

---

501 Also note the inclusion of women in the 1594 Hadikatū’s Sū’ edā (Süleymaniye Library, Fatih 4321) in the painting portraying Zayn al-‘Abidin preaching (fol. 253a) (fig. 3.54).

502 A color reproduction of a painting depicting men and women listening to a sermon in a mosque from the Haft Awrang of Jāmī (TPML H. 751, fol. 21b) can be found in Uluç, “Majālis al-‘Ushshāq,” 589.

503 Lale Uluç presents the evidence of a 1603 Mathnavī of Jalāl al-Din Rūmī at the New York Public Library (Pers 12), which was copied, possibly in Baghdad, for a certain Dhu’l-Qadirid patron named Imam Virdi Beg b. Alp Arslan Beg Dhu’l Qadr. She connects the wealth of luxury illustrated manuscripts produced in Shiraz and its waning in the 1590s to the rule and then fall of Dhu’l-Qadirid power in Shiraz. An exodus of artists from Shiraz from 1590 onwards, when Ya’qub Khan Dhu’l Dadr was executed by the orders of Shāh ‘Abbās I, makes for a plausible scenario in which artists, and possibly Dhu’l-Qadirid notables, went to Baghdad or other centers.
The next painting (fig. 4.21) portrays Baha al-Din Walad’s son Mawlana Jalal al-Din Rumi meeting Shams-i Tabrizi in Konya. Both paintings partake of the interest in deeds of Mawlana Rumi and of Sufi mystics: the Mawlawi order of dervishes with its headquarters based in central Anatolia, at Konya, was in fact represented by a network of interdependent Mawlawi convents built in the capitals of the Arab provinces of the Ottoman empire, including Damascus, Aleppo, and Cairo. As the previous chapter showed, there was also a Mawlawi convent in Baghdad. The deeds of Rumi were popularized in Baghdad in the late sixteenth century, with illustrated copies of Aflaki’s Manāqib al-ʿĀrifīn (Merits of the Mystics), Derviṣ Mahmud Mesnevihan’s Tercüme-i Șevâkib-i Menâkib (Translation of Stars of Legends),504 Jami’s Nafahāt al-ʻUns (Breezes/Breaths of Humanity), as well as Mawlana’s Mathnawī-yi Maʾnawī (Moral Poetry) produced in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.

Following an account of the Abbasid caliphate and contemporary shaykhs and ulema, the author then turns back in time and writes of the Tahirid dynasty that governed from Khurasan, which was founded by Tahir ibn Husayn (r. 821–22), and lasted from 821 to 873.505 This is followed by an account of the Samanid dynasty (819–999), the Buyids (934–1062), Ziyarids (930–1090), Ghaznavids (977–1186), Fatimids (909–1171), Ismaʿili rulers of Alamut (1090–1256), the Seljuqs, the dynasty of Khwarazm Shahs (1077–1231/1256),


the Zangids (1127–1250), Eldiguzids (c. 1135–1225), Salghurids (1148–1282), Hazaraspids (1154–1424), the Mongols and ending finally with the Ilkhanids.

The section on the Abbasids’ contemporaries contains two paintings, as well as a space left for a painting on the Mongol invasions (fol. 210a). One painting portrays a prisoner being paraded with a golden tray and ewer balanced on his head, as was the custom in eleventh-century Gujarat (fig. 4.22). This painting appears in the story of Mahmud of Ghazni’s (r. 1002–1030) conquest of Somnath temple in 1026. After having conquered the wealthy temple, Mahmud of Ghazni entertained the idea of transferring his capital there. However, upon his ministers’ advice, he finally ordered that a local chief be appointed there as his deputy. A member from the noble Dabshalim family was appointed. This “Dabshalim” had taken on the habit of a Brahman. However, some opposed this decision, contending that this “Dabshalim” was not of a good disposition and had taken the habit of an ascetic out of necessity. They proposed another “Dabshalim,” who was a local ruler. The former was chosen, however, and he agreed to send Mahmud of Ghazni tribute but asked the

506 In Miniature Painting in Ottoman Baghdad, Rachel Milstein points to the frequent portrayal of Indians and Europeans in Baghdad paintings. In addition to Indian figure types included in a number of manuscripts from Baghdad, TPML H. 1369 and TPML H. 1230 are also interesting in terms of their inclusion of paintings set in India, such as this particular painting, or Bahram Gur Hunting in India. Ottoman-Safavid-Portuguese relations and the important role of Basra and Baghdad in the Indian Ocean trade may have to do with the prevalence of paintings set in India. In another work, Milstein briefly points out similarities between the Hümâyûnname (The Imperial Book) and Mughal copies of the Anwar-i Suhaylî (Lights of Canopus). With regards to possible links to India, Milstein also presents the example of an illustrated Yüsuf u Zulaykhâ, possibly made in Golconda (Salar Jung Museum in Hyderabad) that is stylistically similar to Baghdad manuscripts. Additionally she notes that among the group of Majâlîs al-‘Ushshâq (Assemblies of Lovers) manuscripts generally attributed to Shiraz, several were found in India. Milstein points to the need for further study with regards to connections between Shiraz, Qazvin, India and Iraq. I have not been able to find direct connections yet, except for several comments by the Mughal poet Faizi and Father Paul Simon (see above). Baghdad’s position as an outlet to the Indian Ocean as well as a point of transit trade makes these broad connections likely. Further research will shed more light on relations among Ottomans, Safavids and Mughals. For now, my reading of the text of the Çâmi ‘û’s-Siyer at least allows for a more accurate identification of the painting than has been put forth in previous scholarship, and makes a direct connection with Gujarat.


507 “Dabshalim” appears to be a title here. The term is also encountered in the Kalila wa Dimna (Kalila and Dimna) and its Persian translation, Anwar-i Suhayli as the Hindu ruler.
ruler’s support in protecting the domains against the other Dabshalim (fülan dâbeslim benümle ‘adâvet makâmındâr her gâh ki pâdişâh gâziniñ saʾadet ile mûracaʾâtn istîmaʾ itdikden şoñra şebihsz bu cânibe leşker çeker). Mahmud of Ghazni then took this Dabshalim as prisoner and brought him to the Brahman Dabshalim. However, this deputy Dabshalim stated that it was against their custom to kill another ruler. Instead, he would be imprisoned in a dark pit underneath the victor’s throne until either one died. The deputy also added that it would be preferable if Mahmud of Ghazni were to take this man back to Ghazni with him and return him when the deputy had established his power and order in Gujarat. After having sent tribute, the deputy asked for the return of the prisoner. Mahmud of Ghazni sent the prisoner back to Somnath. Having heard of the prisoner’s arrival, the deputy readied the prison. Muhammed Tahir adds that it was their custom that the ruler would receive the prisoner, on whose head a tray and ewer would be placed and who would walk by the side of the mounted ruler. The painting illustrates this moment in the story, where the prisoner, hands tied behind his back, is walking alongside Dabshalim with a tray and ewer on his head.

The final painting (fig. 4.23) shows the audience of the young Anatolian (Rum) Seljuq ruler Kay Khusraw III (r. 1265–1284) and his vizier Muʾin al-Din Parvaneh (d. 1277). After giving a brief account of the reigns of the rulers of the Seljuqs of Rum, and the Mongol invasion of Anatolia, Muhammed Tahir writes that as Kay Khusraw III was a child at the time of his succession, Muʾin al-Din Pervaneh was given charge of carrying out the affairs of state. Muʾin al-Din Pervaneh was an influential statesman, who orchestrated the murder of Sultan Kilij Arslan IV (r. 1248–1265). Muʾin al-Din Pervaneh’s father

508 TPML H. 1230, fol. 163a.
509 Ibid. On possible sources for this story see Edward C. Bayley, The History of India as Told by its own Historians, The Local Muhammadan Dynasties: Gujarat (New Delhi: S. Chand & Co., 1970), 34.
510 TPML H. 1230, fol. 194a.
Muhadhdhab al-Din 'Ali al-Daylami too was a vizier, who had served the Seljuq sultan Kay Khusraw II (r. 1237–1246).\textsuperscript{511} Given the influence of Muhadhdhab al-Din 'Ali al-Daylami and Mu'in al-Din Pervaneh in state affairs (as well as the father-son relationship between the two viziers), this painting emphasizes the role of the vizierial figure, in effect heightening the role of governor Hasan Paşa cast in this universal history.

\section*{A Local, Universal History}

Whether part of one multi-volume project or conceived as two separate, and presently incomplete copies, H. 1369 and H. 1230 present a unique view of history, which despite its comprehensiveness as a universal history still retains a local flavor. The modes of representation enhance this regional consciousness. The figure types are squat, some even portly, and most of them have almond-shaped eyes. They wear oversized turbans that are typical of Baghdad. The figure types, their costumes, and the details of architecture reflect the eclecticism of Baghdad paintings from the late sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{512} There is often interaction among figures that are not central to the main composition. Some are portrayed directly facing the viewer (figs. 4.24–25) or from the back (fig. 4.26). These features are all typical of Baghdad paintings from the late sixteenth century. In addition, details such as the inclusion of women in the upper gallery of the mosque, in which Baha al-Din Walad was preaching (fig. 4.18), or the minarets in the Divan of Baki (fig. 4.4) also present a regional sensibility.


\textsuperscript{512} This has been dealt with in great detail by Rachel Milstein, who provides drawings of tent and architecture types, headgear, plants and articles of use found in the corpus of Baghdad style manuscripts. She is among the first to note the eclecticism of Baghdad paintings. See Milstein, \textit{Miniature Painting in Ottoman Baghdad}.
At the same time, while many of the sources Muhammed Tahir has employed are well-known works, such as the histories of Tabari, Masʿudi, Rashid al-Din and Mirkhwand, the author also references authors of the Suhrawardī path, to which he belonged. In addition, there is an emphasis on the history of Baghdad. As mentioned above, the author highlights figures from Baghdad, such as ʿAbd al-Qadir Gilani and Shihab al-Din Suhrawardī. This is especially prevalent in H. 1230, which begins with the history of the Abbasid caliphate and includes an account of the establishment of Baghdad as the Abbasid capital. For example, his very brief note on the thirteenth-century shaykh Makarim remarks that he lived during the reign of caliph al-Nasir (r. 1180–1225) and that when he passed away, he was buried in a location four parasangs (league) from Baghdad, an area “which is currently known under the shaykh’s name.” The paintings, which are included in these two manuscripts, are also noteworthy for representing scenes that are rare—for example, the execution of Farrukh Hurmuzd (fig. 4.12), the looting of ʿAbd al-Qadir Gilani’s convoy (fig. 4.17), or the return of a prisoner to Gujarat (fig. 4.22).

In addition to the new subject matters, there is an emphasis on paintings that highlight the role of viziers. Among the most remarkable is the first painting of H. 1230, which represents an audience scene between caliph Harun al-Rashid and Yahya b. Khalid Barmaki, of the Barmakid family of viziers. This is particularly potent as the Barmakids were an influential family, which would resonate with the familial links of Sokollu Mehmed Paşa and his son Hasan Paşa. While the Barmakid family later fell from favor, the moment depicted in this painting (fig. 4.13) represents the vizier Yahya b. Khalid Barmaki

---

513 Both Tabari and Masʿudi are also personally connected to Baghdad, as is Ibn al-Jawzi, whose Zad al-Masir was among the author’s sources. Muḥammad Ṭāhir references both Abū’l Najib al-Suhrawardī and Shihāb al-Dīn Suhrawardī and Shams al-Dīn Shahrazuri’s history. It is interesting to note that Shahrazuri had also composed a commentary on Suhrawardī. On Shams al-Dīn Shahrazuri see P. Lory, “Shahrazuri,” in The Encyclopedia of Islam, 2nd Edition, eds. H.A.R. Gibbs et al. 11 Vols., Vol. 9 (Leiden: Brill, 1960-2002), 219.

514 TPML H. 1230, fol. 109b.

515 Necipoğlu, The Age of Sinan, 345.
at the height of his power. This painting can be seen along with the first two paintings of H. 1369 (figs. 4.5–6), which represented Sokollu Mehmed Paşa and his son Hasan Paşa in the private audience of the sultan, highlighting their privileged position. In addition, the rather murky scene of the severed head of the caliph al-Muqtadir brought before the caliph’s commander, Munis, (fig. 4.15), and the latter’s indignation at the caliph’s murder, as well as the audience of Kay Khusraw III and Mu’ in al-Din Parvaneh (fig. 4.23) further emphasize the role of the vizier. Together with the text, which focuses on Baghdadi figures, the choice of illustrations, their subject matter, and mode of representation also present a localized view of universal history, which highlight the position of the governor Hasan Paşa.

Necipoğlu points to the fact that Sokollu Mehmed Paşa was accused of nepotism by the historian Peçevi, who was a relative of the grand vizier. That Sokollu’s sons, Hasan Paşa and Kurd Kasım Beg (d. 1571), were able to rise to important provincial positions even after the grand vizier’s marriage to the princess Ismihan Sultan, further shows the grand vizier’s influence in using his position to leverage the posts of his family and clique. 516 Additionally, Börekçi’s study on court factions shows the complicated and competitive relations among high-ranking officials. 517 In the case of Hasan Paşa, his immediate connection to Sokollu Mehmed Paşa is highlighted not only in the Câmi ’ü’s-Siyer (in text and painting) but also in the colophon of Fuzuli’s Beng u Bāde (Wine and Opium), which remarks that the manuscript was copied for Hasan Paşa, son of Sokollu Mehmed. The small but richly illuminated manuscript with three paintings ends with the note that it was commissioned on

516 On Sokollu Mehmed Paşa’s relation and patronage with the princess İsmihan Sultan see Necipoğlu, The Age of Sinan, 330–45.

517 Günhan Börekçi, “Factions and Favorites at the Courts of Sultan Ahmed I (r. 1603–17) and his Immediate Predecessors” (PhD diss., The Ohio State University, 2010).
the order of the “great commander and governor of Baghdad Hasan Paşa, son of the deceased grand vizier Mehmed Paşa.”

The Câmi ü’s-Siyer and Beng u Bâde are works that are directly connected to Hasan Paşa’s patronage. His patronage of art and architecture can be seen along the lines of the broadening base of patronage in the late sixteenth century, as well as the increasing interest in collecting artworks that Mustafa ῖ Ali had pointed out (see Chapter 2). The next chapter will show that there were around a dozen illustrated genealogies produced in Baghdad in the last decade of the sixteenth century. That several of them contain notes of well wishes on the reader suggest that there was an open market for such small-scale but illustrated works.

There are also multiple copies of the Ḥadīkatü’s-Sū’edā and Maḳtel-i Āl-i Resūl (Killing of the Prophet’s Family), which further suggest a speculative market in Baghdad. In addition, there are large-scale manuscripts with many paintings, such as the Shāhnāma (Istanbul, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, H. 1486), Rawżat al-Ṣafāʾ (London, British Library, Or. 5736), and Hūmayunnāme (Istanbul, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, R. 843), which suggest that there may be other patrons of art in Baghdad and its hinterland. Among these, the Câmi ü’s-Siyer of Hasan Paşa stands out, not only in terms of its size and ambition, but also in terms of its very direct connection to Hasan Paşa, from its introduction, to its paintings that highlight vizierial roles.

---

518 Fużûlî, Beng u Bâde, Dresden Eb. 362, fol. 28b.

519 To these, one can also add the dispersed Divân of Bâkî and possibly the British Library Rawżat al-Ṣafāʾ mentioned above. However, I will not be discussing these manuscripts in detail in this dissertation.

CHAPTER 5

ILLUSTRATING THE GENEALOGY

Literally meaning a “chain” in Arabic, the term *silsila* denotes a line of descent or lineage. Be it a certification of training, affiliation to a particular master and Sufi order, or a confirmation of consanguinity, the genealogy in the form of a tabulated list, diagrammatic tree or narrative text serves the purpose of constructing an identity and tradition, as well as providing a synopsis of history. The compilation of genealogies relates in its approach to the idea of certification, to the practice of authentication through a chain of transmission, or *isnad*, a common method used in the study of hadith, the traditions of Prophet Muhammad. The establishment of the chain of transmission as a methodological tool in providing authenticity underlines its use in genealogical registers, be they of Sufi orders, of dynasties, or various other genres of texts such as biographical dictionaries.

Related to the practice of *isnad* in terms of its approach, and employed for a variety of purposes, from linking disciple to master, to showing dynastic or universal history, the genealogical register presents a succinct and palpable representation of legitimacy and distinction by virtue of being included and linked. 521 Universal and dynastic histories that

---

521 Early examples, such as the ninth-century historian Hishām b. Muḥammad al-Ḵalībī’s *Jamharat al-nasab* (Genealogical Collection), which provides a comprehensive lineage of the Arab tribes, point to the interest in compiling genealogies. It is also in the ninth century that the earliest references to the office of the “marshal of the nobility” (*naqīb al-ashrāf*) are found. The *naqīb*, himself a descendant of the family of the Prophet, was responsible for the practical role of keeping a register of the descendants of the family of the Prophet, as well as the moral role of maintaining the purity of the lineage and acting as guardians of the members of this noble line. Descent from the Prophet’s family accorded one legitimacy and offered social and economic privileges that differentiated the *ṣaḥif* from others. The genealogical register marking such descent was thus a concrete embodiment of legitimacy and privilege. In the context of Sufi orders, the genealogy provided certification and authenticity to the disciple’s affiliation with a certain master and order, and thence to the Prophet in succession. Here, too, a link to Prophet Muhammad through his companions afforded distinction through the denotation of the *silsilat al-dhahāb*, or the golden chain. While the compilation of lists of *sayyids* and *ṣaḥifs* and their guardianship by the *naqīb al-ashrāf* can be thought of as a separate genre of its own, it is related to universal or dynastic histories in the format of genealogy in terms of its approach and methodology. Hugh Kennedy, “From Oral Tradition to Written Record in Arabic Genealogy,” *Arabica* T. 44, Fasc. 4 (1997): 531–44. For early examples of the genre of genealogy also see Zoltán Szombathy, *The Roots of Arabic Genealogy: A Study in Historical Anthropology* (Piliscsaba: The Avicenna Institute of Middle Eastern Studies, 2003). On the post of the *naqīb al-ashrāf*, A. Havemann, “Nakīb al-As̲hrāf̲.” *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second*
begin with Adam and a succession of Old Testament prophets, pre-Islamic and Islamic rulers play into the practice of creating a chain of transmission that accords authenticity. This shows the malleability of genres of universal history and genealogy, which are sometimes combined in a single text. Indeed, universal histories in prose share much in terms of content with schematic genealogies.

This chapter focuses on an early-seventeenth-century Silsilenâme (Museum of Ethnography, Ankara, No. 8457), which is stylistically attributable to Baghdad, and which is iconographically and textually pro-Safavid at a point when Baghdad was under Ottoman rule. Taking the format of the illustrated genealogy, the first examples of which appear in the post-Mongol Persianate world, and which then became widespread in the Ottoman realm in the mid-sixteenth century, the Ankara Silsilenâme adapts the Ottoman genealogical tree tradition to give it a particularly Safavid tenor. I argue that with its immediate visual graspability and use of the genealogy as a methodological tool to claim legitimacy, this manuscript represents contested identities in the liminal region of Baghdad. In the late sixteenth century, Baghdad became a center of production of illustrated silsilenâmes, a phenomenon related to late-sixteenth-century court dynastic histories and books of physiognomy. It is in this context of Baghdad as a center of production of illustrated genealogy that I will examine the Ankara manuscript.

While the genealogical register has a long history in the Islamic context with several examples of illustrated genealogies from the early fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, along with one unillustrated Persian (fig. 5.1) and two Latin ones from the reign of the Ottoman

---


The emergence of the diagrammatical genealogical tree can be dated to the early thirteenth century. İlker Evrim Binbaş considers the Mongol invasions as a point of rupture in the understanding of a universal design defined by the caliphate, and hence an interest in defining lineages in the form of genealogical registers. İlker Evrim Binbaş, “Structure and Function of the Genealogical Tree,” in Horizons of the World: Festschrift for Isenbike Togan (Hududu’l Alem: Isenbike Togan’a Armağan), ed. İlker Evrim Binbaş et al. (İstanbul: Ithaki, 2011), 482.
ruler Bayezid II (r. 1481–1512), it is only in the mid-sixteenth century that an Ottoman
Turkish genealogy was composed, and only in the late sixteenth century that illustrated
Ottoman dynastic genealogies began to be produced. In the late sixteenth century,
particularly in the context of imperial projects of dynastic histories that sought to portray the
Ottomans as the embodiment and expression of a culmination of universal history, the
dynastic genealogy tradition in the Ottoman realm was revived. Viewed against the
backdrop of illustrated universal histories and books of physiognomy that present the

522 In the Ottoman realm, the earliest royal silsilenâme can be dated to the reign of Bayezid II. Originally in
scroll format, this genealogy has been transformed into a codex and is presently at the Topkapı Palace Museum
Library (H. 1590). It begins with Adam and his sons and contains brief stories concerning a prophet or ruler’s
age, duration of reign, and major events, written in ta’lîq next to the medallions of important figures. Longer
texts are devoted to major dynasties beginning with the Samanids and ending with the Ottomans. The genealogy
ends with a wish of a lengthy life for Bayezid II so long as the world revolves. In addition, a later note in
Persian has been added to the beginning of the manuscript above the medallion of Adam regarding the visit of
Iblis to the pregnant Eve and tricking her into naming the born to be child ‘Abd al-Hârîq (TPML H. 1590, fol.
1b). The note refers to the sura of A’raf, saying “in A’raf it is told that when Eve was pregnant, Iblis appeared to
Eve in an unknown likeness and said, “What is that thing in your belly?” Eve replied, ‘I do not know.’ Iblis
said, “Perhaps it is a beast.” He asked, “Where will it come out of?” Eve said, “It is not known to me.” Iblis
said, “From the mouth, or from the ear, or from the nostril? Or will it tear your belly?” Eve was afraid. […]’

The relevant verses (189–191) in the sura of A’raf do refer to a pregnancy and a “good child” without
naming Adam and Eve, adding that “But when He gives them a good [child], they ascribe partners to Him
concerning which He has given them. Exalted is Allah above what they associate with Him.” (7:191).
In most of the later illustrated genealogies ‘Abd al-Hârîq is depicted as well, with no line continuing from him.

The composition of this unillustrated Persian silsilenâme coincides with the re-institution of the office
of the naqīb al-ashrâf during the reign of Bayezid II after a brief interim rescission during the reign of Mehmed
II. The office of the naqīb al-ashrâf in the Ottoman realm was instituted during the reign of Bayezid I when
Sâyyîd Nattâdî was appointed for the office. Sâyyîd Nattâdî had come to Anatolia from Baghdad together with
Emir Sûlûn Buhârî, who later married a daughter of Bayezid I.

Interestingly, it is also during the reign of Bayezid II that an illustrated genealogy of the Ottoman
dynasty is prepared. This genealogical scroll, Genealogia Turcorum Imperatorum, Lex Imperii Domi militaeque
habita, dedicate Principi Voladislavio Hungarie Bohemicio C. Regi, was prepared by the advisor of Matthias
Corvinus (r. 1458–1490) and his successor Vladislav II, Felix Petancius, who undertook diplomatic missions to
the Ottoman empire and who dedicated the illustrated scroll to King Wladislaus II of Hungary (r. 1490–1516).

Two illustrated copies of the Genealogia Turcorum Imperatorum are extant: one in the Orszagos
Szécheny Könyvtár, Budapest (Cod. Lat. 378), and another in the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid (Vitr. 4–12).
The Genealogia Turcorum Imperatorum presents the first eight sultans, beginning with ‘Osman I and ending
with Bayezid II, who is distinguished from the other portraits by being represented in a slightly larger roundel
and seated underneath a curtained canopy, holding a scepter in one hand and a bow in the other, with two
attendants in the background. They are identified by their names written on the right and the four sons of
Bayezid II are denoted in four cartouches. Further down, the daughters of Bayezid II are included but their
names are not given. They are, rather, identified as the wives of various Ottoman officials to whom they have
been wedded. Below these, various important posts of the Ottoman bureaucracy are indicated, such as the
governor, vizier, treasurer, chancellor, mufti, sipâhî oglam, janissary, etc. as well as various other officers such
as the groom and taster. Their total numbers are given in list form. A final section deals with the laws and
customs of the Ottomans.

Selmin Kangal (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası, 2000), 64–96. 92. On the post of the naqīb al-ashrâf see Rüya
Kılıç, “The Reflection of Islamic Tradition on Ottoman Social Structure: The Sayyids and Sharifs,” in Sayyids
Ottoman rulers in succession, the Ottoman Turkish *silsilenâme* tradition appears in the last decade of the sixteenth century in Baghdad, where close to a dozen illustrated copies were produced.\(^{523}\)

Taking its inspiration from an interest in royal portraiture in the last two decades of the sixteenth century, as well as in the composition of universal histories, the genealogy takes on a new appearance in Baghdad. Much smaller in size and with less grandeur than the official illustrated histories produced at court, the *silsilenâme* manuscripts provide a summary of universal history, with short stories of important figures regarding their life and length of rule. Between eighteen to thirty folios in length and of smaller size, with simpler brown leather binding, these manuscripts are less costly productions that, I suggest, were produced for the speculative market in Baghdad. Of the dozen late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth-century *silsilenâme* manuscripts that are attributed to Baghdad based on style, three bear colophons with the date 1006 (1597–98) and with the names of scribes who were

---

\(^{523}\) These are:

1. *Cem-i Tarih* (Collection of History), Museum of Ethnography, Ankara (No. 8457)
2. *Zâḥdettî 'l-Târîh* (The Quintessence of History), Topkapı Palace Museum Library (H.1324), dated 1597
3. *Zâḥdettî 'l-Târîh* (The Quintessence of History), Topkapı Palace Museum Library (H.1591), dated 1597
4. *Zâḥdettî 'l-Târîh* (The Quintessence of History), Topkapı Palace Museum Library (A. 3110)
5. *Zâḥdettî 'l-Târîh* (The Quintessence of History), Topkapı Palace Museum Library (H.1624)
6. *Zâḥdettî 'l-Târîh* (The Quintessence of History), Chester Beatty Library (T. 423), dated 1598
7. *Zâḥdettî 'l-Târîh* (The Quintessence of History), Los Angeles County Museum of Art (M.85.237.26)
8. *Silsilenâme*, Kuwait National Museum (LNS 66 MS) (single leaf, fol. 44b)
10. *Silsilenâme*, Badische Landesmuseum, Karlsruhe (Hs. Rastatt 201)
11. *Zâḥdettî 'l-Tevârîh* (The Quintessence of History), Bibliothèque nationale de France (Supp. turc 126), dated 1604–1605

In addition to these late-sixteenth and early seventeenth-century examples, there are several more, late seventeenth century examples. These are:

1. *Silsilenâme*, Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü (No. 1872), dated 1682
2. *Subḥâhât-i-Akkâbâr* (The Rosary of World History), Österreichische Nationalbibliothek (A.F. 50), dated 1683
3. *Silsilenâme*, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek (A. F. 17), dated 12 September 1692
4. *Zâhe-i Târîh*, Istanbul University Rare Books and Manuscripts Library, T. 6092 (This manuscript was compiled in the late eighteenth century but includes some pages from an earlier genealogy, which can be attributed to Baghdad.)
all residents of Baghdad.\textsuperscript{524} Like the illustrated Ḥadïkatü’s-Sü’edā (The Garden of the Blessed) manuscripts, illustrated silsilenâmes were an idiosyncracy of the Baghdad school.

That several illustrated genealogies were produced in the span of a few months, or a few years of each other, and that some of these end with notes of well wishes on the reader, suggest that there was a market in Baghdad for such brief and relatively less expensive but illustrated universal histories told through genealogical succession.\textsuperscript{525} Ottoman archival book registers also point to the popularity of silsilenâmes.\textsuperscript{526} Most likely produced on speculation, the illustrated silsilenâmes can be likened to a similar popularization of the illustrated Majâlis al-’Ushshâq (The Assemblies of the Lovers) that occured ten years earlier in Shiraz.\textsuperscript{527} While questions of readership and popularity of certain genres at a particular time or place require further study, the number of illustrated manuscripts of the silsilenâme, as well as the Ḥadïkatü’s-Sü’edâ, indicate that these became popular in Baghdad at the turn of the seventeenth century.

Scholarship commonly, and in quite a confused manner, attributes several authors to the Persian, Turkish and Arabic versions of the dynastic silsilenâme, variously known under the titles Subhâtu’l-Akhbâr (The Rosary of World History), Subhâtu’l-Akhyâr (The Rosary of the Good), Subhâtu’l-Akhbâr ve ûTuhaft al-Akhyâr (The Rosary of World History and the Gift of the Good) and Zübdetü’t-Tevärîh (The Quintessence of Histories). It is assumed that the “original” was a Persian text composed by either Derviš Muhammad bin Ramazan or by

\textsuperscript{524} These are TPML H. 1591, TPML H. 1324 and CBL T. 423. In addition to these, which Bağcı mentions, the BnF Silsilenâme was also copied in Baghdad. This Silsilenâme is slightly different from the others, however, in that instead of paintings within roundels, there are drawings that are likely to have been added later.


\textsuperscript{525} Ibid., 198.


\textsuperscript{527} For a detailed study on the production of illustrated manuscripts, and in particular, on the Majâlis al-’Ushshâq, see Uluç, Turkman Governors.
Abdüllatif Şerif Īşmed's medallions are in Turkish. He notes that the titles of the Persian text is Īṣīī, both of whom lived during the reign of Süleyman I. The name of Derviş Mehmed bin Şeyh Ramaçan is also given in the Kesfī‘ z Zūnān of Kātib Čelebi (d. 1657), as an author who has composed a genealogical scroll up to the time of Süleyman I, with the title Subḥāt al-Akhbār ve Tuhfāt al-Akhyār.

Flügel, in the catalogue entry to Österreichische Nationalbibliothek’s Cod. Mixt. 437, is uncertain with regards to authorial attributions. He notes that the manuscript in question titled Subḥāt al-Akhbār was a translation from the Persian. The author of the Persian text is noted as Īṣīī. Flügel voices concern regarding to authorial attributions. He notes that the manuscript in question titled Subḥāt al-Akhbār and Subḥāt al-Akhyār are often confused. He further refers to the St. Petersburg copy. Subḥāt al-Akhyār, whose author is noted to be Yūsuf bin ‘Abdullātīf (Catalogue des Manuscrits et Xylographes Orientaux de la Bibliothèque Imperiale Publique de St. Pétersburg, DXXII, pg.468, 1852). I have not been able to see this manuscript but the catalogue entry gives the beginning of this manuscript as: ‘Hamd-i bī-hadd u şenā-yi bi’-add’, and notes that the text ends with the chronogram ‘Kuverteüş kiş’ (952/1545). This text is different from the text contained in ÖNB Cod. Mixt. 437, which begins: ‘Zübde-yi silsile-yi hâkînî and hulaş-yi dûdmân-i Ḍūmâni, Sultân Sûleymân Hân bin Sultân Selîm Hân.’

An unillustrated sîsilênumâ, titled Subḥātû’l Akhbâr, and kept at the Sûlemaniye Library (Ayasofya 3259) also begins with the words ‘Hamd-i bī-hadd u şenā-yi bi’-add’. This manuscript (formerly a codex) gives the name of the translator as Yūsuf bin Ābd al-Latîf (folio 2a). The manuscript ends with an overview of the reign of Sultân Sûleymân, with his conquests written as well as listed in a diagram organized according to seven climes. Medallions for Sûleymân’s sons and for the succeeding sultan have been added but left blank. After a blank double page, there is a short section in verse composed additionally by the translator. This section asks for the favor of the “shah full of divine radiance,” and wishes for the continuance of his reign and his dynasty with “sun-faced, beautiful princes” (folio 65b). The author notes that the manuscript was completed during a severe winter with an abundance of snow and ends with a chronogram denoting the year 952 (1545).

A close reading of illustrated and unillustrated genealogies shows, however, that there are slightly varying versions in both Persian and Turkish.

The following copies have more or less the same Turkish introduction: Badische Landesbibliothek Rastatt 301, TPML A. 3110, TPML H. 1624, TPML H. 1591, TPML H. 1620, CBL T. 423, ÖNB A. F. 50, BnF Supp. turc 126, LACMA M.85.237.38, Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü 1872. To these, one can add the early-seventeenth-century illustrated copy held at the Museum of Ethnography in Ankara (No. 8457), which is composed in Persian. This manuscript is studied in detail in the second part of this chapter. The above-mentioned Turkish texts are very close translations of this Persian text, with only the verbs changed from Persian to Turkish.

Another version, which is similar in content but different in its wording can be found in these manuscripts: St. Petersburg 522, TPML B. 193, National Library of Tunisia Nr. 1459 (This is the first part of a compilation), Sakip Sabanci Museum 190-0520.

A different, Turkish, version can be found at ÖNB A. F. 17, which begins: “ʻÇun haţret-i mebdâ’-i bedi’i garibetü’l âşâr ve’l-mahluûkât şânı’i-şânı’-i acibetü’l-etvâr ve’l mesnu â’t izz şâne ve berr ɨhsâne vûfûr kûdret-i kâmîle…”

In addition, there are several manuscripts that begin with an additional Arabic section, followed by the Turkish introduction. These are: CBL T. 423, TPML H. 1591 and TPML H. 1324. It is worth noting that these three manuscripts are copied in the naskh script rather than the nastâ‘i şiq, and follow a similar organization with the introductory Arabic section beginning with a double folio illumination surrounding the text and ending with a stepped chart. These three manuscripts also bear the name of the calligrapher and the place of copying. TPML H. 1324 and TPML H. 1591 are copied by Yūsuf bin Muḥammad al-Dizîfül, “sâkin-i Bağdâd” (resident of Baghdad). CBL T. 423 is copied by Abū Tâlib Ṣafihânti, “sâkin-i Bağdâd.” While CBL T. 423 has not retained its original binding, it is worth noting that TPML H. 1324 has a lacquered binding depicting a lion, tiger, chîlîn and gazelle amidst trees and flowers. Among all the sîsilênumâs, this is the only copy that has a lacquered binding. The others, those still retaining their original bindings, are mostly leather bindings with a central shamsa and cornerpieces in gold. It is likely that TPML H. 1324 and also TPML H. 1591 and CBL T. 423 were prepared for governors or other high-ranking officers.

---

528 Franz Babinger notes Şerif Şâfi‘i as the author of the Persian text, as well as translations by Derviş Mehmed bin Şeyh Ramazan, and Yūsuf bin ‘Abdullâtîf, both of whom lived during the reign of Süleyman I. The name of Derviş Mehmed bin Şeyh Ramaçan is also given in the Kesfî‘ z Zūnān of Kātib Čelebi (d. 1657), as an author who has composed a genealogical scroll up to the time of Süleyman I, with the title Subḥāt al-Akhbār ve Tuhfāt al-Akhyār.
by Katip Çelebi in his bibliographical dictionary, Kesfui’z Zunun, in which he notes a
genealogical scroll composed by Derviş Muhammad bin Ramazan.\(^{529}\) This is repeated by
Franz Babinger who writes that Derviş Muhammad bin Ramazan’s universal history was
translated into Ottoman Turkish by Yusuf bin ‘Abdüllatif in 1545. The name of the latter as
the translator is given in a mid-eighteenth-century unillustrated genealogy.\(^{530}\)

A close reading of illustrated and unillustrated genealogical manuscripts and scrolls
shows that there are two Persian versions, from which stem two Turkish versions. While it is
not the aim of this chapter to provide a critical edition of these texts, it is important to note
differences, as will be discussed later. In particular, what is left out or added, both in text
and in painting, can be hints at how the same format of the genealogical tree can be
manipulated to highlight a particular dynasty or lineage. Inasmuch as authentication through
a silsilah was an end, the act of creating the genealogical register was a way to establish
authentication, which did not preclude fabrication to suit one’s purpose, which shows the
potency of these registers.\(^{531}\)

---

529 G. M. Meredith-Owens also notes, without providing the source that a continuation of the Turkish genealogy
was made by Derwis Mehemed ibn Shaykh Ramažân, with the title Subhāt al-akhbār va tuḥfat al-ābrār.
G.M. Meredith-Owens, “A Genealogical Roll in the Metropolitan Museum,” in Islamic Art in the Metropolitan
Meredith-Owens, A Genealogical Roll.

530 Serpil Bağcı writes that the name of Yusuf bin ‘Abdüllatif is given in a mid-eighteenth-century silsilênâme
preserved at the Topkapı Palace Museum Library (B.193), the introduction of which notes Yusuf bin ‘Abdüllatif
as the translator of the Persian work.
Bağcı, From Adam to Mehmed III, 188.

531 The case of the late-sixteenth-century Celali rebel ‘Abdülhalîm Karayazıci, who reportedly claimed a
genealogy that went back to unidentified ancient rulers is one example in which claiming a certain lineage
becomes a means to seeking legitimacy. That the rebel was also issuing orders with an imperial seal after his
capture of the town of Ruha (present day Urfa), and his appointment of the Ottoman governor-turned-rebel
Hüseyin Paşa as his grand vizier, shows the importance of genealogies, fabricated or not, along with other
visible marks of power and legitimacy.
Günhan Börekçi, “Factions and Favorites at the Courts of Sultan Ahmed I (r.1603–1617) and his Immediate
Predecessors” (PhD diss., The Ohio State University, 2010), 34; Baki Tezcan, “Searching for Osman: A
Reassessment of the Deposition of the Ottoman Sultan Osman II (1618–1622)” (PhD diss., Princeton
I have come across only one work, a scroll, which names the author as Shafi‘i al-Sharif. This is an unillustrated scroll composed in Persian, with annotations around medallions in Turkish, most likely added at a later date. As this scroll held at the Metropolitan Museum is the only work that contains the name of the author in its introductory section, I begin with this Persian text and compare this with the two other Persian language silsilenâmes and the Turkish silsilenâmes. Of the two Persian language genealogies, one is an unillustrated scroll at the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek in Vienna (Cod. Mixt. 487). The other is the illustrated manuscript preserved at the Museum of Ethnography in Ankara (No. 8457), which will be discussed in further detail in the following section.

The preface to the Metropolitan Museum of Art scroll begins with praise to God, who “with the hand of providence and compass of design/will ... created Adam from clay over forty mornings.” The preface continues by noting the select nature of mankind, and that of Muhammad. The author writes that he had wished to compose a work of history, but since many others had composed histories before him, he wanted to compose a genealogical roll. After noting the difficulties of such an endeavor and the criticism of [enemies], a praise of Sultan Süleyman follows. While all the other silsilenâmes, with the exception of the Ankara copy, praise this Ottoman sultan, the wording is quite different in the Metropolitan scroll compared to the other copies. Here the sultan is praised as the “padishah of caliphal

\[532\] This scroll is at the Metropolitan Museum of Art (67.272) and has escaped the attention of most scholars, with the exception of G. M. Meredith-Owens who provides a brief introduction to this work. Meredith-Owens, A Genealogical Roll.

\[533\] While many of the same hadiths, such as the one mentioned above (hammadtu tiynete Ademe erbaine sabahen) and Qur'anic quotations are included in all of the silsilenâme manuscripts, the Metropolitan scroll is slightly different in that the beginning of the preface is a summary version of the other silsilenâme texts, and the rest of the preface of this scroll diverges from the others.
essence, king of kings of clement disposition, Iskandar of Aristotle-mind, sun of the heavens, guardian of the world, the purest substance of the house of Osman.”534 This is followed by an overview of the organization of the scroll and the diagrammatic genealogy (two red circles for prophets, one circle for others, connected by lines; prophets lined in the middle of the page, while the sons of Gayumars, the Kayanians, and others at the top, all the way to the Ottomans at the bottom of the page, or scroll), and the length of time from Adam to major prophets before and after the Deluge. It then lists dynasties before and after the rise of Islam and provides a table of the twelve dynasties that come after the advent of Islam, ending with the Ottomans.

A comparison of this text with the Vienna copy shows that while the Vienna copy starts directly with the praise of Sultan Süleyman, which only begins with the words “the purest substance of the house of Osman,” the rest of the preface is the same and provides information on the organization of the layout of the scroll, length of rule of prophets and kings, as well as a table of dynasties after the advent of Islam.535 In both scrolls, the text written next to and around the medallions is in Turkish and in a different hand. It is possible that these were added later.

Two other unillustrated works are Turkish translations of this version. One is currently at the Sakıp Sabancı Museum (190-0592). The preface of this work, in Turkish, gives the name of the author as Şerif el-Şafi’i. The Sabancı Museum scroll highlights Süleyman I, whose name is written within a large medallion, one half of which contains a text regarding his reign, the other half of which is subdivided into the seven climes and the


535 Note also that in both scrolls the Genghisids are not provided with the same information (number of rulers, length of rule), but their dynasty is left blank. The likelihood that the Vienna scroll is missing a portion at the beginning should also be noted. Presently, the scroll is capped with an ogival shaped paper, whose somewhat rudimentary illumination follows its shape. On the right and left margins the ruling lining the scroll on both sides can be seen to continue towards the top of the scroll.
lands he possesses. The scroll presently ends with an empty medallion, reserved for the Ottoman ruler Mehmed III (r. 1595–1603).

The other translation is an unillustrated genealogy of the mid-eighteenth century, composed in Turkish, and originally organized in scroll format but presently in the form of a codex. This work is a translation of this version of the Persian text. This manuscript (TPML B.193) provides us with yet another name, that of the translator of this work into Turkish: Yusuf bin ʿAbdüllatif. Both the Metropolitan scroll and the Topkapı manuscript name the work as *Subḥāt al-Akhbār*.

While similar in content and making reference to the same Qur’anic quotations, the other Persian language preface, which can be found in the Ankara manuscript, is quite different in wording and is likely to be the work of another author. Whether this is the Derviş Muhammad bin Ramazan mentioned by Katip Çelebi is not substantiated. However, it is this version, rather than the Metropolitan and Vienna texts, that forms the basis of the majority of late-sixteenth-century illustrated Ottoman Turkish versions. The contents of this preface will be explained in detail in my discussion of the Ankara manuscript. Suffice it to say that the Ottoman Turkish versions are an almost verbatim translation of this text, with only the verbs changed from the Persian to the Turkish. These texts praise Sultan Süleyman, who is distinguished as the “glory of the House of Osman.” They also include a short section on the five things that cannot be known to mankind, and end with the various benefits of the composition and reading of genealogies.

Following the preface, the diagrammatic genealogical tree begins with Adam, who is often depicted seated kneeling, while the Archangel Gabriel presents him a book. Figures are often depicted seated, either kneeling or cross-legged. Prophets have flaming haloes

---

536 Serpil Bağcı too notes that the name of the translator of the genealogy can be found in this manuscript but she has not made the connection between this manuscript and the Metropolitan scroll, which forms the basis of this Turkish translation by Yusuf bin ʿAbdüllatif. Bağcı, *From Adam to Mehmed III*, 188.
around their heads, and at times depicted together with Gabriel, as is the case with Idris, for example. Some hold books or prayer beads in their hands. Like the prophets, rulers are also depicted seated, sometimes holding a cup in hand. With few exceptions such as the prophet Saleh (Salih) with his camel, Moses (Musa) with his rod turned into a dragon (fig. 5.2), or Cain (Kabil) striking Abel (Habil) with a rock, most of the paintings portray the prophets and kings in an iconic manner. Figures are placed on a pricked gold background. Stylistically these illustrated genealogies can be attributed to Baghdad. Furthermore, three illustrated manuscripts have colophons giving the name of the scribe, who was a “resident of Baghdad.” Another illustrated manuscript (BnF Supp. turc 126), whose drawn illustrations may have been added later, gives the date 1604–5, as well as the place of execution as Baghdad (figs. 5.3–4).

Another illustrated copy, while lacking a colophon, contains further evidence of a connection to Baghdad, in addition to the stylistic affinity of the painted medallions to Baghdad paintings. This genealogy ends with the reign of Mehmed III. Appended to the end of the genealogy is a painting depicting Mehmed III enthroned (fig. 2.49). Seated under a baldachin, the sultan wears a tall, plumed turban, and a white, brocaded garment. Above, there are two cartouches left blank. In terms of its composition, this can be likened to portraits of sultans found in the Kitâfetü’l İnsâniyye fî Şemâ’ilî’l ‘Osmâniyye (Human Physiognomy Concerning the Personal Dispositions of the Ottomans), where two cartouches placed above contain a hemistiche in each, invoking the reader/viewer to look at the attributes of the sultan portrayed, or providing the gist of the ruler’s qualities.

This painting, stylistically attributable to Baghdad, is followed by calligraphic compositions, several of which are signed by Muhammad Şerif el-Haravi. Next, there is another painting depicting a young falconer (fig. 2.50). This falconer, with almond-shaped
eyes and eyebrows that meet at the top of his nose, holds a pigeon in one hand while a falcon is perched on his wrist. Like the seated sultan, the falconer too wears a brocaded, white, fur-lined garment. This is a pattern found commonly in Baghdad painting, perhaps referencing local sartorial fashions. Above the painting, cartouches have been added in gold, also left blank. This painting, in particular, can be compared with another found in an unexamined album at the Topkapı Palace (fig. 2.48), where two youths with similar facial features and turbans, face each other in a landscape, the standing one handing the other a porcelain cup. This type of a wider turban with the end of the cloth drooping from one fold as seen in these two figures is often encountered in paintings that are attributed to Baghdad, as mentioned previously in Chapter 2.

The repetitive and iconic nature of the paintings in illustrated genealogies, as well as the structure and format of the manuscripts, produced within several years hint at the use of models, and the popularity of these short, universal histories. These also highlight how the Ankara manuscript, while stylistically similar, is iconographically more elaborate and is pro-Safavid in text and image.

The Ankara Silsilenāme

The Ankara Silsilenāme is a relatively small manuscript, measuring 250 x 145 mm. It has 18 folios. The manuscript has not retained its original binding, presently having a black, checkered, board binding. In the re-binding process some folios have been misplaced. The folios have been damaged and trimmed at the edges of the ruling and have not been re-margined. A typed note pasted on the doublure shows that the manuscript was gifted to the

539 Günsel Renda provides a reconstruction of the manuscript in her article on this manuscript. Günsel Renda, “Ankara Etnografiya Müzesi’ndeki 8457 No.lu Silsilaname Üzerine Bazı Düşünceler,” in Kemal Çiğ’a Armağan (İstanbul: Bozok Matbaası, 1984), 175–202, 181. Henceforth Renda, Ankara Etnografiya Müzesi’ndeki 8457 No.lu Silsilaname Üzerine Bazı Düşünceler.
museum on 28 May 1934 by the architect/engineer J. Aggiman. In addition to the rebinding process, there have been some early modifications to the text, which will be discussed later.

The manuscript opens with an illuminated ʿunwan, which is predominantly gold and blue with maroon, stylized lotus flowers on the upper section. The central gold, lobed cartouche, which lacks the title of the work, is outlined with orange, a color often found in ʿunwans of illuminated manuscripts from Baghdad. The text is composed in Persian and written in nastaʿliq. Qurʾanic quotations and Arabic phrases are written in thuluth in blue ink. The opening two folios of text have interlineal illumination in gold (fig. 5.5). The double-folio of the illustrated genealogical tree beginning with Adam and Eve is decorated above with a floral design in gold, and animal design below (fig. 5.6). The rest of the folios are decorated with small floral design in gold, except for several sheets that are decorated with animal or tree designs. There are 146 painted medallions depicting Old Testament prophets, Prophet Muhammad, ʿAli ibn Abi Talib and the twelve imams, and the Abbasid caliphs and various rulers through time, ending with a larger painted medallion of the Safavid prince Hamza Mirza (d. 1586), the son of the Safavid shah Muhammad Khudabanda (r. 1578–1587), and the elder brother of the future Safavid Shah ʿAbbas I (r. 1588–1629).

The text consists of two parts: a short introduction in prose and the illustrated genealogical tree, which includes short biographical information written around the medallions. The prose introduction begins by praising God as the creator of the universe and attributes all existence and existents to God. Among all, Adam is distinguished as the chosen one on account of his purity. After voicing gratitude to the creator, the author writes that the universe and all existents are a drop from the sea of God’s generosity.540 Interspersed with quotations from the Qurʾan that emphasize creation and the elect nature of mankind, the introduction likens creation to the act of writing. After noting Adam’s prime nature, the

---

540 AEM No. 8457, fol. 1b.
author then moves on to praise the prophets and saints, who are honorable and special on account of their divine blessing (kerāmet). Here too, appropriate Qur’anic verses and hadiths are chosen to highlight the nature of prophets. Among the prophets, Muhammad is given the distinction of being the lord of the prophets. The author quotes a Qur’anic verse which points out the role of Prophet Muhammad as a messenger among other messengers (3:144); immediately following this, an excerpted and somewhat contested hadith highlights Muhammad’s elect nature by saying, “Were it not for you, I would not have created the universe.” The florid encomium ends with blessings on the prophet and on ‘Ali ibn Abi Talib, his deputy.

The next section of the introduction that follows this “divine encomium, and [having established] the fundamentals of the guidance of prophecy” shows evidence of modification to the text. Two lines in the middle of folio 2a have been replaced (fig. 5.7). The different calligraphic hand as well as the different paper can be observed upon an examination of the manuscript. The revised line sounds praise on Shah Ahmad, “the ruler of the auspicious conjunction of the time, the outcome of the world, possessor of good fortune, undaunted against the enemy with the sword of the prophet, lover of the four caliphs” (sultān-ı bar-ḥaqq u burhān-ı muṭlāq ḥaṣıl-ı kawn u makān ṣāḥib-qirān-ı zamān, sar-āndāz-ı dushman be-tīgh-ı Muḥammad, muḥibb-ı cahāryār-ı khālīš, Shah Ahmed). The altered text continues with an invocation of wishes of victory against the Qizilbash:

---

541 AEM No. 8457, fol. 2a.


543 Part of the line, beginning with “sar-āndāz-ı dushman ba-tīgh” is original. The next few words have been altered: “Muḥammad, muḥibb-ı cahāryār-ı khālīs, Shah Ahmed.” The next line is also original, but the line below this has also been altered: “chatr-ı asmānī mu’assas o mostahkam bād wa shamshere-ı an soļtān az sar-ı sorkhsarān bar naṣṣāna wa bar ān doshmanān hamīṣha [nāṣr u manṣūr bād].” The line below this continues according to the original text. It is clear from the change in calligraphy as well as the paper that the name of Shah Aḥmād has been added later, as well as his identification as a lover of the four caliphs. AEM No. 8457, fol. 2a.
May the tent ropes of felicity and happiness, the curtains founded on the firmament, and the heavenly tent of that magnanimous sultan forever be strong. And may his sword never be lacking from the necks of the redheads (sorkhsarān) and may he be forever victorious against that enemy. May the pillars of his reign and the days of his fortune be ever present on his realms and the sun of his benevolence forever shine on his subjects, all the way from the fish to the moon, until the day of Judgment.  

The rest of the encomiastic section of the introduction is original; it ends with the author naming the work as Jamʿ-ī Tārīkh (Collection of History).

A timeline from Adam to Prophet Muhammad and a discussion of variances in dating, as well as the number of years from each major prophet to Muhammad follows. History and rulers are categorized into two: those who come before the advent of Islam (the jāhilīyya), and those who come after (the Islāmīyya). These are then further described according to dynasty, by giving the dynasty name, the number of rulers and the number of years the dynasty was in power. Emphasis is placed on the Safavid dynasty in this text. After naming the post-Mongol dynasties, the text briefly mentions “and the other: the Ottomans—they are fourteen [rulers]—who ruled to this day, the year 1015 (1606–07), for 315 years.” This corresponds to the reign of Ahmed I (r. 1603–1617), the fourteenth Ottoman sultan, the ruler whose name has been added to the introduction. The prose preface ends on folio 3a with blessings on the Safavid dynasty: “By mentioning the kings of the Safavid dynasty, the emblem of the guardianship of the imamate and of supreme guidance—may

---

544 “Hamīsha ʿan sultān-i ʿālī-jaṅāb-rā ṭnāb-ī surādeqāt-i ʿizzat u kāmrānī wa sarāpārda-yi faḷak-asas-i ṣāhib-qirānī ... chatt-i āsmānī muʿaassas wa mustahkam bād ve shamsīr-i ʿan sultān az sar-i sorkhsarān bar-nayāmad wa bar ʿan dushmanānī hamīsha nāṣīr u maṃṣūr bād wa qawāʿīd-i saṭṭanat wa ayyām-i dawlātahu bar bāṣīr-i mamlakat wa aflāb-i ināyātahu az faq-r-i māh tā ba-māhī bar sar-i sarwarān-i nā-mutanāhī tābān u rakhshān wa ila yawm al-mīʿād”  
Ibid.

545 The pre-Islamic dynasties are in four groups or tabaqaš: Pishdadians, Kayanians, Seleucids and Parthians, and Sassanids. Those dynasties that came after the advent of Islam are the Umayyads, Abbasids, Tahirids and Saffārīds, Samanids, Ghaznavids, Buyids, Daylamids, Khwarazmshah, the Great Seljuqs of Iran, Seljuqs of Rum, Genghisids and those that came after the Genghisids. These include the Chupanids, Ilkhanids, İnjus, Muzaffārīds, the Kartid dynasty, Sarbadars, Timurids, the Aqqoyunlu and Qara Qoyunlu, Uzbeks, Ottomans, and Safavids. This manuscript is interesting also in its breadth of inclusion of post-Mongol dynasties, which is not the case for the majority of other illustrated genealogies.

546 AEM No. 8457, fol. 3a.
God protect them with sublime holy lights and eternal rule!—the purpose of this description is also [to provide] a sample of their divine characteristics and their glorious feats” (dar zikr-
i pādishāhān-i khāndān-i wīlāyat-nīshān-i imāmat wa hidāyat-i ‘āliya-i ṣafawīya
ḥafazzuhumallah bā anwār al-jalīla al-qudsiyya wa ’l dawlatahu sar madiya ki maqṣūd az īn
ta’rif shamnay nīz az manāqib-i ilahiyya wa ma’āthir-i ‘aliyya-i ʾishān-ast wa Allahu al-
musta’an wa alayhi al-takalan tammat).

The diagrammatic genealogical tree begins on folio 3b starting with Adam and his offspring. Either the portraits or names of prophets and rulers are given in variously sized medallions. Cursory stories related to major prophets and rulers are added around the painted medallions. Individuals are organized into dynastic lines indicated by vertical lines. Contemporary rulers or prophets are shown next to each other on the same page. This format allows for both a synchronic and diachronic synopsis of universal history.

The sons of Adam are provided in succession below the larger, painted medallion that portrays the Archangel Gabriel presenting Adam with a tablet. Eve and her two sons, presumably Cain and Abel are on her lap on the right. Abel’s name is written in a medallion that branches to the right and a depiction of his murder by Cain is provided in a larger medallion below. From the succession of the other sons of Adam, beginning with Seth (Shith), Enosh (Anush), Qinan (Kan’an), Mahalaleel (Mahla’il) and Jared (Bared), a line branches to the left, where the line of the ancient Persian kings begins, with the first king, Gayumars, whose line descends from Qinan. Gayumars’s line runs on the left side of the folio, followed by Siyamak, Hushang, Tahmuras, Faridun and his sons.

At this point, the sons of Noah (Nuh) appear, where Japheth (Yafes) is portrayed on the left-hand side, Shem (Sam) in the middle and Ham on the right. The descendants of the sons of Noah are represented in red ink within a blue medallion for the offspring of Japheth

---
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and Shem, and in blue ink within a red medallion for those of Ham, who was unfavored. The color coding of blue ink for the names and red ink for the medallions is followed for some of the pre-Islamic Iranian kings as well. The names of many of the Old Testament prophets are written in red ink in blue medallions. For example, Abraham (Ibrahim) and Aaron (Harun) are identified in this manner, whereas Nimrod (Nimrud), who had cast Abraham into fire, is identified with a red medallion, linked by a red line to Ham. Nimrod is further distinguished with a painting—he is portrayed as a seated ruler dressed in yellow, arms akimbo and hands resting at his thighs, while a page dressed in red and blue strikes him on the head with a mace. This particular scene illustrates the story of the mosquito that had entered Nimrod’s brain. Here, the page strikes him to get rid of the buzzing of the mosquito (fig. 5.8). Among rulers, and particularly the post-Timurid dynasts, the Safavids are given a distinctive place by being placed centrally and their dynasty denoted by a continuous line, whereas contemporary neighboring rulers are placed on either side, almost floating on the page.

Thus, the color coding, the placement on the folio, the size of the medallion and whether or not a painting has been included determine relative importance and provide a legible summary of universal and dynastic history, as well as a quickly graspable show of legitimacy. These provide a synopsis of who is considered important or legitimate. The manuscript currently ends with a larger portrait medallion of prince Hamza Mirza on folio 18a (fig. 5.9). The text regarding Hamza Mirza begins by relating how valiantly he fought the ranks of the Ottomans, and that among the Ottomans he was known as “Koç Kapan”

---

548 The Ankara Silsilenâme does not develop the story of the sons of Noah and only notes the partition of lands among the three sons and the peoples that descended from them. A contemporary work, the Câmi‘ü’s-Siyer (Collection of Biographies) (see the previous Chapter) discusses the story of Noah and his sons in more depth (TPML H. 1369, fol. 37b).

On the construction of identity in the early modern period, and the question of the “Other” which sees the re-use of the story of the sons of Noah see Benjamin Braude, “The Sons of Noah and the Construction of Ethnic and Geographical Identities in the Medieval and Early Modern Periods,” The William and Mary Quarterly 54 (1997): 103–42.
Hamza Mirza is often mentioned in sixteenth-century Ottoman chronicles on account of his role during the Ottoman-Safavid wars of 1578–1590, as described further in Chapter 1. Hamza Mirza is further highlighted in Ottoman sources, especially in the Şecāʿatnāme (Book of Courage) of Asafi Dal Mehmed Çelebi (d. 1597–98), who includes several portraits of the young prince in his illustrated account of the war. Hamza Mirza had been named heir apparent in 1579 as his mother, Muhammad Khudabanda’s second wife, Khayr al-Nisa, attempted to secure his position as successor. Khayr al-Nisa was, however, assassinated in Jumada 987/July 1579, having incurred the wrath of some of the Qizilbash elements. Hamza Mirza was declared crown prince by a Takkalu-Mawsillu-Turkmen alliance. However, a Shamlu-Ustajlu alliance declared ‘Abbas Mirza as the heir apparent. Muhammad Khudabanda’s younger son ‘Abbas Mirza was eight years old at the time. Qizilbash factionalism and the ineffective rule of Muhammad Khudabanda saw the curious murder of Hamza Mirza on 6 December 1586. Two years later, Hamza Mirza’s younger brother, ‘Abbas was to become shah.

The text in the Ankara manuscript regarding Hamza Mirza ends with the verse:

“Undaunted against the enemy with a sword like diamond/ Slave of ‘Ali-yi Vali, Shah
‘Abbas (Sar-andāz-i dushman be-tīgh chu almās / Ghulām-i ‘Ali-yi valī, Shāh ‘Abbās).”

The cursory remark about Shah ‘Abbas, right where the manuscript presently ends, suggests

549 Ḥamza Mirzā, denoted as “Ṣāḥ oğlu” (son of the shāh) appears on several occasions in the illustrated manuscript (T. 6043): on folios 76a (depicting a captured Ḍālīrāy Khān during battle in Shamakhi brought before the mounted Ḥamza Mirzā), 139a (the captive Gāzi Girāy Khān ordered to dismount from his horse before Ḥamza Mirzā, refuses), 153a (Āṣafī brought before Muḥammad Khudābanda and Ḥamza Mirzā, responds to them), 243a (Gāzi Girāy before Ḥamza Mirzā intercedes on behalf of Āṣafī Pașa), 246a (Āṣafī Pașa, Gāzi Girāy Khān, ‘ʿAlī Qulī Khān before Ḥamza Mirzā) and 247b (ʿʿAlī Qulī Khān, Gāzi Girāy Khān and Āṣafī Pașa before Ḥamza Mirzā). This and the Ankara genealogy are rare examples, which portray Ḥamza Mirzā and Muḥammad Khudābanda, who are not as visible in Safavid counterparts.

For a facsimile edition of this work see Abdülkadir Özcan, ed. Āṣafī Dal Mehmed Çelebi, Şecāʿatnāme: Özdemiroğlu Osman Paşa’nın Şarık Seferleri (1578–1585) (Ankara: Çamlıca, 2006). For an introduction to this work and transcription of the text see Mustafa Eravcı, ed. Āṣafī Dal Mehmed Çelebi ve Şecāʿatnāme (İstanbul: MVT Yayıncılık, 2009).
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that the genealogy may have continued with an account on Shah `Abbas I (r. 1588–1629).

This would correspond with the date 1606–1607 given in the preface, as also mentioned by Renda.\(^{552}\) It is likely that the manuscript is unfinished, or more likely, is currently lacking several folios at its end. In all likelihood, the manuscript did not make it to its intended owner, thus going back on the speculative market.

In addition to the emphasis given to the Safavid rulers in both the preface and the paintings, the texts surrounding the portrait medallions also present a pro-Safavid stance. Cursory accounts of the reigns of Shah Tahmasp and Shah Muhammad Khudabanda voice praise on the former’s support of Twelver Shi‘ism and wish the latter’s success against the Ottomans. The texts for Shah Isma’il I and Shah Tahmasp I are taken from the *Mir’āt al-Adwār wa Mirqāt al-Akhbār* (Mirror of Periods and Staircase of Accounts) of Muslih al-Din Lari (d. 1572), who composed a universal world history in Persian, among other works.\(^{553}\) It is noted in the account on Shah Tahmasp I, for example, that he gave currency to the twelve imams and Twelver Shi‘ism, and that he destroyed the works of the “ahl-i sunna” in that land.\(^{554}\) For Shah Muhammad Khudabanda, the author wishes that, “God willing, with the help of God, the rest [of the Ottomans] will be captured.”\(^{555}\)

---


553 A comparison of the Ankara manuscript and one of the manuscript copies of this work (Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi Ayasofya 3085, fols. 388a–388b) shows that the text regarding Ismā‘īl I and Tahmāsp I are taken from Muslih al-Din Lārī’s work. Other copies of this work can be found in the Istanbul University Library, F. 725 and F. 1505; British Library Add.7650; Astan-i Quds-i Rizavi, Mashhad 4155.

This work by Muslih al-Din Lārī was translated in the late sixteenth century into Turkish by Hoca Sa‘dedin, who named the work, *Tācī‘ ʾt Tevārīḥ* (Crown of Histories). According to Ḥasan Beg Rumlū, Muslih al-Din Lārī was a pupil of Amir Ghiyāṣuddin Maṣūr of Shiraz. It is interesting to note that Mawlāna Quṭbuddin Baghdādī (d. 1562–63), mentioned in Chapter 2, was also a pupil of the same Amir Ghiyāṣuddin Maṣūr.

Muslih al-Din Lārī went to India and became emperor Humāyun’s (r. 1530–1540, 1555–1556) chief minister. After the emperor’s death, the author set sail for Mecca and Medina, but was shipwrecked, where he lost nearly four hundred of his books. He then went to Constantinople and was well received at the court of Selim II. He traveled to Diyarbekir, and thence to Baghdad together with Iskandar Pāshā around 1566–67. He finally went to Diyarbekir, where he died in 980 (1572–73).


554 “Wa tarvī‘-i madhab-i ḥaqq aimma-i ma’ṣumīn ve shi‘a-i iṣna‘ ashara’ alayhassalam az ibtidā-yi saltanat tā ḡayat jidd u ijtīhād mar‘i mi-dasht. Āsār-i ahī-i sunna dar ān bīlād ba-gožasht.”
It appears, thus, that whoever altered the preface did not do a thorough job in going through the whole text, and thus, left conflicting accounts, between hopes of success against the Safavids on the one hand in the introduction, and hopes of success against the Ottomans on the other hand, in the brief narratives surrounding the portrait medallion of Shah Muhammad Khudabanda. A quick change to the introduction was perhaps aimed to suit the proclivities of a possible Ottoman audience. With its curious provenance and confused text, the Ankara manuscript exemplifies the liminarity and tensions of artistic and cultural output in Baghdad between the Ottomans and the Safavids.

A comparison of the text of the Ankara manuscript with the illustrated Ottoman Turkish genealogies shows that the latter is a close translation of this version of the Persian sîlsîlenâme. As mentioned above, the introductory prose section as well as the brief biographies of Old Testament prophets written around the portrait medallions are taken almost verbatim, with only the verbs changed from the Persian into the Turkish. The introduction in the Ottoman Turkish texts, however, lacks the mention of Imam ʿAli as the deputy of the prophet. In the Ankara Sîlsîlenâme, ʿAli is given further distinction by being placed together with Prophet Muhammad and Archangel Gabriel (fig. 5.10). Furthermore, the portraits of the four orthodox caliphs are missing, whereas in the illustrated Ottoman Turkish genealogies, Prophet Muhammad is often portrayed together with the four caliphs.

More interestingly, none of the Ottoman Turkish sîlsîlenâmes include the invocation of success against and military weight over the Qizilbash that is present in the Ankara manuscript. In the Ottoman Turkish copies, the same encomiastic ascription of “the ruler of the auspicious conjunction of the time, the product of the world, undaunted against the enemy of the sword of the prophet” (sultân-î ber ḥâk ve bûrhân-î muṭlâk ḥâṣîl-î kevn ü

AEM No. 8457, fol. 17b.

555 "Ānjā Rûmîyân dar châhâr deh sâl fatḥ kardand wa seh bâr lashkar-î Rûm be-koshtand wa qarîb-i do bâre šâd hazâr Rûmî koshta shudand wa insh allâh taʾâla bâqî-ye digar be-tawfiq-i Allâh girifta shud. Wallâhu ʾâlam.” AEM No. 8457, fol. 18a.
mekân-ı şâhib-kirân-ı zamân, fahr-i āl-i ´Ozmân sulţân ibn el-sulţân ibn el-sulţân Süleymân Hân) is reserved for Süleyman I, the “glory of the house of Osman” (fahr-i āl-i ´Ozmân), during whose reign the Turkish translation was made. The appeal that the ruler be victorious over the Qizilbash (sorkhsarân) is missing in all of the Turkish translations and the text simply continues to wish that the “basis of the ruler’s reign and the days of his rule remain forever over the scope of his realm, and that the light of his generosity shine all the way from the moon to the fish in the sea.”556 The addition of the name of Shah Ahmad, his description as the “friend of the four caliphs” (muhîbb-i chahâr yâr), as well as the invocation of victory against the Qizilbash, is a potent modification in an otherwise pro-Safavid manuscript. It is most likely that this alteration was made early in the life of the manuscript, during the reign of the Ottoman ruler, Ahmed I.

A similar appeal for success against the Qizilbash appears in contemporary Ottoman texts, reflecting the (re)current tensions between the two rival neighbors in the early seventeenth century. One example can be found in the Bahâriyye (Spring Ode) of Cafer Efendi, the biographer of the architect Mehmed Ağa. The qasîda praising the Mosque of Sultan Ahmed is embedded in the text of Cafer Efendi’s Risâle-i Mi‘âriyye (Treatise on Architecture), an early-seventeenth-century treatise on architecture-cum-architect’s biography. The treatise was written in 1614–15, when the dome of the Mosque of Sultan Ahmed was completed. Dotted with metaphors of flowers and trees in the spring, the qasîda then turns to an ekphrastic description of the mosque, likening parts of the mosque to flowers and vegetation. Finally, the qasîda praises “the victorious shah and sovereign sultan,

556 The ruler of the auspicious conjunction of the time, the outcome of the world, the pride of the line of the Ottomans, the sultan son of a sultan son of a sultan, Sultan Süleyman Han, son of Sultan Selim Han, that ruler of the universe, may the ropes of the tent of felicity and excellence and his celestial tent be forever strong. May the foundations of his reign and the days of his rule be forever on his domains, and may the rays of his grace ceaselessly shine on the lords, [all the way] from the fish to the moon till the Day of Judgment.

TPML H. 1591, fol. 16b; TPML H. 1624, fol. 2b; TPML A. 3110, fol. 2a; CBL T. 423, fol. 15b; LACMA M85.237.38, fol. 2a, BnF Supp.turc 126, fol. 2a, ÖNB A. F. 50, fol. 2a.
Ahmed Khan, and ends with an invocation of success against the “Shah of the Heretics,” saying:

O God, bless him with long life like the Prophet Hızr!
Make the all-knowing saint the companion of that Sultan!
Overwhelm his enemies with torment and subjugation!
O Irresistible One, give not importance to his enemies!
Let the Shāh of the Heretics be perpetually powerless before him!
Let the infidels groan under the blows of his [Ahmed Khan’s] sword!
Let him be triumphant and victorious, and a vanquisher and a taker of spoils.  

Similar wording is used in Mustafa Sa’i’s rendering of the chief architect Sinan’s (d. 1588) autobiography. In his praise of the reigning sultan Murad III, Mustafa Sa’i concentrates mainly on the sultan’s eastern conquests and his victories against the Safavids; he writes:

[He] imprisoned him in his square and checkmated him.
One of his army columns conquered the domains of Shirvan.
The lion cut Van off from the enemy.
[The shāh] suffered the blow of the Rūmī.
He deemed it the claw of an iron dog.
Think not that he lost [but] Kars and Yerevan!
He lost his goods. He lost his life.
While [the shāh] was sovereign of the world, alas,
They [the Ottomans] made his crown too tight for his head.
Those who blaspheme the Friends are hypocrite.
[They] deserve whatever suffering is inflicted on them.
Long live the sultan, refuge of the world!
May the celestial sphere be to him an imperial tent.

These wishes for success against the Safavid shah in seemingly unlikely sources hint at the prevalent mood, where slightly over a decade after the peace of 1590, hostilities between the two states were rekindled, especially between 1603 and 1607, and again after 1612. The date of 1606–07 corresponds to the aftermath of uncertainty and precariousness when the Celali rebels occupied Baghdad, and the insurgence of Uzun Ahmed, as mentioned in Chapter 1.

---


558 Ibid., 75–6.

In addition to its curious provenance, the Ankara manuscript is also remarkable in terms of its composition and iconography. Where most silsilenâmes provide portrait images of the prophet or ruler in question, the compositions in the Ankara Silsilenâme interact with the text more closely, as well as relating to other illustrated works such as the Qiṣaṣ al-Anbîyâ or the Shâhnâma. The genealogy begins with Adam, who is usually depicted with the archangel Gabriel. In the Ankara Silsilenâme, in addition to Gabriel, he is depicted together with Eve, who has two infants on her lap (fig. 5.11). On the lower right, Cain is depicted killing Abel (fig. 5.12). Cain, dressed in an animal-skin garment lifts a piece of rock, while Abel has already fallen. In the distance, behind the green hills two goats watch. The reason for Abel’s murder is implied as jealousy in the rather laconic account given in the text. It is written: “Fire took Abel’s sacrifice and Cain struck Abel in the head with a rock.” The text continues: “Eve parted herself from Cain. Abel had many sons. They resided in Yemen and Aden and built fire-houses/temples. And Idris (Enoch), fought with them. The offspring of Cain reached forty-thousand.”

The summary nature of the text, and references in some of the accounts, that the story of a particular personage is widely known assume a familiarity with the stories of the Old Testament prophets. Similarly, the more narrative nature of the images hints at visual links between this Silsilenâme and illustrated works such as the Qiṣaṣ al-Anbîyâ, Hadîkatü’s Sû‘edâ or the Shâhnâma. Sharing the same page as Adam and his sons, there is a painting of Gayumars, the legendary first king of Iran, and the first worldly ruler. Gayumars is frequently portrayed in illustrated Shâhnâmas. He is usually depicted dressed in animal skin. Here too, he is dressed in animal skin, but rather than an almost iconic image as found in the

560 Renda, Ankara Etnografya Müzesi’ndeki 8457 No.lu Silsilenâme Üzerine Bazı Düşünceler, 185, 187.
561 The murder of Abel, though not named as such but as the son of Adam, is noted in the Qur’an (Sura al-Ma’ida, 27–32). AEM No. 8457, fol. 3a.
562 Ibid.
other illustrated genealogies, the Ankara Sîlsîlêname portrays Gayumars together with his flock and people, who are, likewise, dressed in animal skin (fig. 5.13).

The narrative nature of the images can be seen in the example of Iraj, one of the sons of the Iranian mythical king Faridun, who is murdered by his brothers, Salm and Tur (fig. 5.14). In the painted medallion, Tur can be seen grasping Iraj by the hair and slitting his throat, while Salm seems to be pinning him down. Sharing the same page with Iraj, there is a painting depicting the prophet Saleh and the camel that he made appear from the rocks (fig. 5.15). While several illustrated genealogies also show Saleh with his camel, here, the camel is grazing while her calf is suckling. Lower down the same page, the story of the prophet Eber (Hud) is related and the painted medallion shows the prophet standing on the right, with hands clasped before him, while the tribe of ʿAd has been stricken with a thunderous storm. Bahram Gur, the Sassanid king, whose fame is immortalized in the Haft Paykar (Seven Beauties) of Nizami (d. 1209) and in the Shāhnāma of Firdawsi, is shown seated on a throne flanked by two lions (fig. 5.16). One of the stories in the Shāhnāma concerns how Bahram Gur slayed two lions to gain his crown. The Ankara Sîlsîlêname does not depict this moment of battle, but shows an awareness of the story in its inclusion of the two lions on either side of the throne.

In addition to visual references from the Shāhnāma or the Qīṣaṣ al-Anbīyā, such as Cain killing Abel, the sacrifice of Ishmael, Noah and his ark, or the prophet Saleh and the camel, some of the paintings show a closer relation to the text itself. For example, while it is common to depict the Infant Christ on the lap of Mary, the Ankara Sîlsîlêname includes a bearded man, kneeling next to the Virgin Mary and the Infant Christ (fig. 5.17). Renda
suggests that this represents the man who was crucified instead of Jesus.\textsuperscript{563} Around the painting it is written that:

some of the Jews rejected him and tried to kill him. God placed his likeness (\textit{ṣurat}) on a Jew, and they crucified him. At the age of thirty-three, by the order of God, Jesus ascended to the fourth heaven. And at the end of time, he will return to earth, kill the Deccal, and pray with Imam Muhammad al-Mahdi.\textsuperscript{564}

Given the close relationship between text and image, the kneeling man may indeed be the man who was crucified instead of Jesus, but iconographically it is reminiscent of the paintings of the Holy Family. It is also likely that the bearded, kneeling man, with his European-style hat in his hands, is Joseph.

Another painting that shows the close relationship between text and image is that of Ishmael (Ismaʿil) praying in front of the Kaʿba (fig. 5.18). His father’s grave is marked as well. The text notes that Ishmael went to Mecca after the death of his father, Abraham, and visited his grave. The painting shows this moment. It is added that Ishmael was given prophethood and invited people, who were idolaters, to Islam, and that some converted. The conjoined twins, Hashim and Ṭabd Shams are also depicted, attached to each other as newborns, as their father, Ṭabd Menaf, separates them with a sword (fig. 5.19). While misplaced in the manuscript during the rebinding process, the near contemporary Abraha

\textsuperscript{563} Renda also points out that a depiction of a man who was crucified instead of Jesus Christ appeared in the \textit{Zübdetü‘Tevarîh} copies (CBL T. 414, fol. 102b, Museum of Turkish and Islamic Arts T. 1973, fol. 40a, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, H. 1321, fol. 46a). She adds that such a composition does not appear in other illustrated genealogies.


\textsuperscript{564} The reference to Jesus Christ praying with the Imam Muhammad al-Mahdi, the twelfth Imam, believed to be in Occultation, also suggests the Shi’i nature of the text. However, as Subrahmanyam remarks, it is not only Shi’i who believe in the Mahdi. He gives the example of mid-sixteenth-century Morocco “where the ruler Muhammad al-Shaikh, second of the Sa’di dynasty of Sayyids from the southern Atlas, took to titling himself “al-Mahdi.”"

(Ebrehe) is portrayed on a white elephant, with a shield and sword in his raised hands. He is identified as the ruler of Yemen, and the story relates how he built cathedrals in Sanaʿa to rival the Kaʿba at Mecca. 565

In addition to the Old Testament prophets and possible visual links to other genres of texts, the way some of the rulers are depicted is worth noting as well. The Abbasid caliphs and the post-Mongol dynasties are first introduced by a text above, followed by portrait medallions with individual texts regarding the rulers surrounding the medallions. Rather than single portraits within medallions, however, some rulers are depicted in the company of their retinue or in audience. For example, the Muzaffarid ruler Shah Mansur (d. 1393) is depicted on a dappled grey horse, looking back at a woman who is addressing him. His contemporary, Khwaja ʿAli al-Muʿayyad (d. 1386), the last ruler of the Sarbadars, who ruled in Khurasan in the mid-fourteenth century, is depicted seated outside, while an attendant holds his horse. Qutluq Khan Abu Bakr ibn Saʿd ibn Zangi (r. 1226–1259), the Salghurid atabeg, is portrayed as a young ruler seated on a throne, while a bearded man, who is identified as Saʿdi, kneels before him, presenting him a book (fig. 5.20). It is noted that Qutluq Khan was a just ruler and that his fairness was known all around the world; that he supported shaykhs and men of knowledge of Shiraz, and greatly cultivated and built Shiraz;

565 Another interesting portrayal of the battle between Abraha and ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib, who was guarding the Kaʿba, can be seen in an almost contemporary ʿAjāʾ ib al-Makhnūq bās Gharāʾ ib al-Mawṣūdī (Marvels of Creatures and Wondrous Existent) manuscript (Walters Art Museum W.593, fol. 78b), where the battle and the attack of the ababil birds to aid the Meccans, is portrayed on the margins, while the central composition shows a bird’s-eye view of Mecca. This manuscript is quite interesting in its innovative portrayal of this scene as well as another composition depicting the Prophet’s tomb in Medina in the center, and a fight at the mosque to protect the tomb in the margins (fol. 80a). Also note the black and white striped garment of one of the figures in the previous painting. While I have not been able to find anything on this kind of garment, it is more commonly found in Baghdad manuscripts than courtly manuscripts. I have also observed this in many of the Qīṣṣa al-Anbiyāʾ and ʿAjāʾ ib al-Makhkūqī manuscripts that are, I believe, wrongly attributed to Istanbul. That being said, I do not suggest that these are immediately related. Stilistically, they do not look like the typical Baghdad manuscripts of the end of the sixteenth century. However, these works require further study.

The Walters manuscript can also be linked to this body of Qīṣṣa and ʿAjāʾ ib manuscripts of the last quarter of the sixteenth century that are still a question mark in the field. The Walters manuscript presents many similar compositions depicting the stories of prophets, such as the hanging of a man believed to be Christ (fol. 82b), or the Seven Sleepers (fol. 195b).

On illustrated manuscripts of the Qīṣṣa al-Anbiyāʾ see Rachel Milstein, Karin Rührdanz and Barbara Schmitz, Stories of the Prophets: Illustrated Manuscripts of Qīṣṣa al-Anbiyāʾ (Costa Mesa: Mazda, 1999).
that Sa’di of Shiraz dedicated the *Gulistān* (Rosegarden) to him.\footnote{AEM No. 8457, fol. 10b.} As per the text, the atabeg is depicted together with Sa’di. The Ottoman ruler, identified as “‘Oşmâniyân’dan Sultân Meḥmed Fâtiḥ,” is depicted together with a white bearded man, most likely a member of the ulema, holding a book (fig. 5.21).\footnote{Ibid., fol. 9b.} In addition to the Old Testament prophets and kings, this manuscript also includes representations of Plato (fig. 5.22), Pythagoras and Nasir al-Din Tusi (d. 1274), whose portraits are otherwise rarely included in other illustrated genealogies.

Among all the rulers depicted, the Safavids are given prime importance. The members of the Safavid dynasty are all placed centrally on the page, whereas contemporary Ottoman, Uzbek and Mughal rulers appear to float on the left and right sides of the pages, not following a consistent line, as would have been expected. Somewhat less disorganized than the contemporary Ottoman Turkish *silsilenâmes*, the Ankara manuscript first introduces the Safavid dynasty with a section taken from the *Mir’at al-Adwâr wa Mirqat al-Akhbâr*, detailing the founder, Shah Isma’il I’s (r. 1501–1524), battle with the Aq Qoyunlu ruler Alvand (r. 1497–1501), the conquest of Tabriz, the defeat of Murad b. Ya’qub Aq Qoyunlu (d. 1514), Isma’il I’s possession of ’Iraq and Fars, his defeat of Muhammad Khan Shaybani (d. 1510) and possession of Khorasan, ending with Isma’il I’s defeat at Chaldiran (1514).

The text emphasizes Shah Isma’il I’s victories in the first decade of his rule, passing over his defeat at Chaldiran only briefly to then outline the date of his birth and length of rule. The attention paid to Isma’il I’s victories against the Aq Qoyunlu and the Shaybanids in Tabriz and Khurasan is matched in the manuscript with the inclusion of Aq Qoyunlu, Qara Qoyunlu and Shaybanid rulers in portrait medallions, as well as in the introductory text. These dynasties do not appear in any of the Ottoman Turkish *silsilenâmes*.
Below the text, in a rectangular frame, the founder of the Safavid dynasty is portrayed seated on a baldachined throne surrounded by attendants (fig. 5.23). He wears a plumed, Safavid turban. His retinue too can be distinguished by their red turbans wrapped around a baton, as noted in the text above. The founder of the dynasty is distinguished by this larger painting devoted to him in a rectangular format, rather than the portrait medallions. Above, on the upper left of the page, there is a portrait medallion depicting a seated ruler with a youth facing him (fig. 5.24). The youth is identified as Sultan ʿAli Safavi, brother of Shah Ismaʿil. A cryptic inscription below the medallion notes: “brother of Shah Ismaʿil was Haydar-i Husayni was martyred in Shirvan” (barādar-i hażrat-i Shāh Iṣmāʿīl Ḥaydar-i Ḥusaynī būd wa dar Shirwan shāhīd shod). It is possible that the figure on the left, facing the youth, portrays Shaykh Haydar, the father of Ismaʿil I, who was killed in Shirvan in 1488. Below this curious double portrait, is the portrait medallion of the Ottoman ruler Süleyman I, portrayed in Ottoman attire, and reminiscent of Ottoman portrait traditions of depicting the ruler seated cross-legged against a pillow, and holding a handkerchief in one hand. An inscription in red denotes him as “Sulṭān Süleymān-ī Rūmī,” indicating that the manuscript is not addressed to an Ottoman reader. The text regarding Süleyman I begins with his conquest of Belgrade, Baghdad, and Esztergom in a speedy overview of his conquests. It continues with a brief account of the rebel prince Alqas Mirza (d. 1550), with whom Süleyman marched towards Tabriz, seizing Van. Süleyman I’s peace treaty (in 1555) with Shah Tahmasp I, the shāh-i ālam (ruler of the world), is mentioned next. Following this, the text turns to an account of Prince Bayezid, who rebelled against his father and sought refuge at the Safavid court. Later, he was handed over along with five of his sons.
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568 AEM No. 8457, fol. 17a.

569 Ibid.
The text ends with a brief account of Süleyman I’s death during campaign at Szigetvár (1566).

The next double-folio presents the three Safavid rulers, Tahmasp I, Isma‘il II (on folio 17b) and Muhammad Khudabanda as well as the prince Hamza Mirza (on folio 18a), all centrally placed on the page, within large circular medallions and linked by a blue line (figs. 5.25–26). The pages are decorated with a gold floral decoration surrounding the medallions. Their Uzbek, Ottoman and Mughal contemporaries are placed on the left and right, in smaller portrait medallions. The manuscript ends with a painting of Hamza Mirza hunting (fig. 5.9). His near contemporaries, Sultan Mehmed III (r. 1595–1603) and the Mughal ruler Akbar (r. 1556–1605), are portrayed on either side, in smaller portrait medallions. It is noteworthy that Akbar is portrayed seated on a throne on a white elephant. Here again, as in the Cāmī‘ū’s-Siyer, we find a more pronounced portrayal of a Mughal figure. Further research on Ottoman and Mughal relations may shed light on the salient depiction of figures associated with India or the Mughal dynasty. Additionally, Hamza Mirza too is distinguished, though not as an enthroned ruler figure, but as a prince hunting with falcons.

The page with the painting of Shah Tahmasp and Shah Isma‘il II is cut in the middle and the figure of Shah Tahmasp is rubbed off (fig. 5.25). Interestingly, Murad III’s face too is rubbed off. The page is mended later with tape. What remains of the portrait of Shah Tahmasp shows an enthroned ruler, with an attendant on the right wearing a fur cap, holding his arrows. Three men stand on the left, wearing Safavid turbans and waiting in obeisance, while a fourth, dressed in orange, kneels before the ruler, presenting him a petition. The text surrounding this portrait medallion begins with Shah Tahmasp’s accession to the throne and his giving currency to the infallible imams and Twelver Shi‘ism and his destruction of the monuments of the “ahl-i sunna (tarvīj-i madhhab-i haqq aimma-yi ma’ṣumīn wa shi‘a-yi
The second part of the text is devoted to his campaigns, first with the Uzbeks in Jam (in the summer of 1528); next with the “pādishāh-i Rūm, Sulṭān Śuleyman.” The text does not mention Shah Tahmasp’s defeat by the Ottomans; instead, turning the events around, it is the Ottomans, who “went back to Rum out of fear of the army in whose footsteps victory follows; and peace was made afterwards” (az khavf-i lashkar-i zafar-āsār bāz be-Rūm raftand wa baʿd az ān sulh shod).571

His successor Shah Ismaʿil II is portrayed enthroned in an outdoor setting, with an attendant on the right holding his arrows, and a similarly attired attendant wearing a blue, fur cap wrapped in its middle with a cloth offers him a cup while another holds a tray of fruits. The text surrounding his portrait medallion reflects the somewhat turbulent years of the short reign of Shah Ismaʿil II, noting that “many amirs were killed and sedition increased and all the princes perished in that tumult except for the exalted padishah Sultan Muhammad and Sultan Hamza Mirza in Fars.”572

Muhammad Khudabanda, Shah Ismaʿil’s brother, not viable for candidacy for the throne on account of his near blindness, was spared, as well as Muhammad Khudabanda’s sons Hamza Mirza and ʿAbbas Mirza, the details of which were given in Chapter 1. The surviving members of the dynasty are represented on the facing page, on folio 18a (fig. 5.26). Above, Sultan Muhammad Khudabanda is represented seated on a rug outside, wearing a gold turban. Seated next to him is a young prince, also wearing a gold, aigretted turban and looking at Muhammad Khudabanda, who is identified not by his given name but
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570 Ibid., 17b.
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with the title “ashraf-i ‘alī shāh” (the most exalted shāh).\textsuperscript{573} Given that a larger portrait medallion is devoted to Hamza Mirza, the youth seated with Muhammad Khudabanda is most likely this prince. While Muhammad Khudabanda is given a lofty title, the text surrounding the medallion is somewhat critical of his reign, during which “viziers and amirs plundered the treasury and exerted taxation on the populace; and great damage was done. From the west the \textit{Rūmiyān} sallied forth. The Qizilbash lost Tabriz and Shirvan; Turkmen and Takkalu [tribes] rebelled and were defeated.\textsuperscript{574} Afterwards, the army of the Ottomans was defeated three times; a hundred thousand Ottomans (\textit{Rūmiyān}) were killed and hopefully, with the help of God, the rest will be captured.”\textsuperscript{575} The beginning of Shah Muhammad Khudabanda’s reign saw the resumption of war with the Ottomans, which was to last until 1590. The spurious reference to the defeat of the Ottomans in the account regarding Muhammad Khudabanda is apt at a time when the two rivals were at war yet again. Hopes for further success against the Ottomans in this text and hopes for success against the Safavids added to the preface exemplify the volatility of the status quo between the two rival empires as experienced in the frontiers.

Slightly later than the corpus of illustrated genealogies produced in Baghdad, the Ankara manuscript maintains the same format and main text (although here the text around the medallions is in Persian also, rather than Turkish), as well as stylistic features. However, unlike the more iconic portraits of prophets and kings who are depicted seated against bolsters in a plain gold, almost timeless background, the figures in this manuscript are provided a narrative that is closely related to the surrounding text, as well as other popular

\textsuperscript{573} It is most likely that the inscriptions in red are not written by the calligrapher of the manuscript but by an owner/reader, who is also most likely not an Ottoman reader. The text surrounding this painting clearly refers to Shāh Muḥammad Khudābanda.

\textsuperscript{574} AEM No. 8457, fol. 18a.

\textsuperscript{575} Ibid.
stories. The only other genealogical manuscript attributable to Baghdad that distinguishes a particular figure with a narrative context is the fragmentary genealogy presently at the Linden-Museum Stuttgart. The work in question is in fragment form, and ends with a larger portrait medallion depicting Ahmed I hunting. In a centrally placed medallion at the bottom of the page, the young sultan Ahmed I is portrayed on horseback, with janissary guards on either side (fig. 5.27). While the portrayal of a sultan hunting is exceptional in this manuscript, that this figure is Ahmed I is also noteworthy. Ahmed I was particularly fond of hunting. It was during the reign of Mehmed III that the illustrated genealogies were produced and became popular. The Ankara and Stuttgart manuscripts show that the interest in shorter illustrated universal histories in the format of a diagrammatic genealogy continued in the early seventeenth century during the reigns of Ahmed I and Shah ʿAbbas I, a period when conflicts between the Ottomans and the Safavids were rekindled. Given the parallel transformations in the artistic and cultural realms, as well as Shah ʿAbbas I’s diminishing of the influence of the Qizilbash and instead empowering ghulāms—which can be likened to the Ottoman system of conscripted slaves—the silsilenāme too forms a familiar, yet subtly potent, medium for legitimacy and supremacy. This is further heightened where, in the Ankara manuscript, the name of Ahmed I is inserted into the text along with a wish for his victory against the Safavids, which finds a similar reflection in contemporary Ottoman texts.

Gülru Necipoğlu points out the role of the medallioned genealogies in “legitimizing Sunni Ottoman rule in the then recently conquered eastern frontiers of the empire, where the


578 Bağcı, From Adam to Mehmed III, 188.
memory of pre-Ottoman Islamic dynasties enumerated in these manuscripts was particularly strong.**579** The Ottoman Turkish illustrated genealogies highlight the Sunni Abbasid heritage, as well as emphasizing links between the early Ottomans and the Seljuqs. The story related to the foundation of the Ottoman dynasty in these manuscripts points to the idea of continuity, as per the gist of the genealogy, where Sultan 'Osman I received the drum and standard from the Seljuq ruler 'Ala al-Din Kayqubad I (r. 1220–1237), a point made by Necipoğlu.**580** The Ottoman Turkish silsilenâmes highlight the relation between 'Ala al-Din Kayqubad I and Ertuğrul, father of 'Osman I. According to these, Ertuğrul aided the Seljuq ruler in his battle with the Mongols, and was given land and acknowledged as a brother ('Ala 'addin dahi Ertuğrul'a ḏarındaşın didi).**581** The text claims that this brotherly relation is continued by Sultan 'Ala al-Din and 'Osman I.

In these Turkish-language genealogies, the Ottoman dynasty is at the forefront, to the total absence of other contemporary dynasties. The portrait medallions follow the line of succession of Ottoman rulers in an unbroken line, while the texts surrounding these emphasize their accession, length of rule and conquests. In this context, the Ankara manuscript stands out with its emphasis on not only the Safavid dynasty, but also with its inclusion of other post-Mongol and post-Timurid dynasties, such as the Injus, Muzaffarids, Aq Qoyunlu, Qara Qoyunlu and the Uzbeks, which are not included in other illustrated genealogies.

The Ankara manuscript, and the corpus of Turkish-language genealogies raise several issues: visual portrayals of legitimacy and competition that utilize the methodology used for certification and authentication; the popularity of summary universal histories as well as popular religious stories and the relationship between the two; the
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**579** Necipoğlu, *Serial Portraits*, 45.

**580** Ibid., 46.

**581** For example, TPML A. 3110, fol. 12b.
audience/readership/ownership, or the market, for these short but heavily illustrated manuscripts; and relations between the court and the provinces. The intended audience of the Ankara Silsilenâme is still an unanswered question. Necipoğlu points out that it is unlikely to be a royal Safavid commission, as the manuscript contains a medallion depicting Abu Muslim (d. 755) (folio 8a). During the reign of Shah 'Abbas I, the ritual cursing of Abu Muslim was sanctioned, thus this manuscript is unlikely to be a royal commission. It is clear, however, that it is not an Ottoman commission either. While the question is still open, the manuscript’s curious provenance does point out that there was a broader market in Baghdad than just the Ottoman governors of Baghdad. This is further strengthened by the dedication of the 1603 illustrated Mathnawî to Imam Virdi Beg bin Alp Aslan Beg Dhu’l Qadr (NYPL Spencer Coll. Pers 12). In addition, that the name of the calligrapher Yusuf bin Muhammad al-Dizfuli, “resident of Baghdad (sâkîn-i Bağdâd) appears in two genealogies copied in the same year, along with another calligrapher of a genealogy, Abu Talib Isfahani, “sâkin-i Bağdâd,” and that there are a dozen illustrated genealogies that can be attributed to Baghdad based on style, show the popularity of these works. Necipoğlu provides a point of comparison with Mughal India, where the “emperor Jahangir had ordered multiple copies of the Jahangîrnâma (Book of Jahangir), illustrated with a frontispiece miniature depicting his accession to be prepared for distribution to dignitaries and administrators.”

In terms of content, the illustrated silsilenâme surely takes part in the interest in universal dynastic histories produced at court, especially the Zübdetû’r-Tevârîh, which also contains lines running through the pages. However, their originality in terms
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582 On this manuscript see note 315 in Chapter 3.

583 Necipoğlu, Serial Portraits, 45.

584 That several of the genealogies also share the title Zübdetû’r-Tevârîh with Loğmân’s work of the same title shows the congruence between these illustrated genealogies and universal histories produced at court, a point made by Gülru Necipoğlu. In addition, I have come across a manuscript sold at auction (Sotheby’s London, Thursday 15 October 1998, Lot 47), which combines Loğmân’s Zübdetû’r-Tevârîh and an illustrated diagrammatical genealogical tree in a single volume. The manuscript was formerly in the collection of Selim al-
of their organization of painted medallions, is undeniable. Illustrated genealogies produced at the court in Istanbul will appear later, in the mid-seventeenth century. At a certain point in their lifetime, illustrated genealogies from Baghdad found their way to the Topkapi Palace Library. It is possible that these works influenced later courtly examples.

In the liminal geography of Baghdad, where identity is at best murky, and perhaps not unlike the appearance of diagrammatic genealogies after the Mongol conquest, the outburst of illustrated genealogies makes a claim to Sunni Ottoman identity. In this context, the Ankara manuscript clearly stands apart, and turns the genre on its head, by placing the Safavids as the culmination of universal history.

Awranuwsī, governor of Bosnia, 1239 (1823). According to the sales catalogue, this manuscript is a composite work containing the incomplete text of Loḵmān’s Ziḥbedüʾiʾ T-evārīh and the incomplete illustrated genealogical tree, which stylistically can be located to Baghdad. In addition, there is a single full-page painting showing Solomon and Belqis enthroned, surrounded by men and angels. This is the right half of a possible double-folio opening illustration. The inclusion of such illustrated frontispieces in many Shirazi manuscripts of the late sixteenth century as well as many of the Qiṣāṣ al-Anbiyāʾ manuscripts, the place of production of which is still a matter of debate, points to the relevance and congruity of portrayals of prophethood and the kinds of texts that are contained within a codex headed by such paintings.

CONCLUSION

The Ankara Sılsilenâme perhaps best highlights what the seventeenth-century authors Şeyhoğlu and Evliya Çelebi wrote regarding Baghdad: “[It] is caught, destitute, between two tribes: one is the shâh of ’Ajam; the other, the sultan of Rum ... When the ’Ajam comes to Baghdad, he says “heretic and Sunni;” when the Rum comes, he says “heretic, infidel and Christian” (İki ḵavm arasında ῃn neden āvāre kalmışlar / Biri ya’ni ’Acem şâh, biri hem Rūm sulṭān ... ’Acem geldikde Baḵdād’a dir kim mülḥid u sūnī / Urum geldikde sōyler râfüzî bī-dīn u naṣrānī). This reciprocal denigration gives a prima facie impression of difference between the two rival dynasties based on confession. It also hints at the complexity of interaction between the Rum and the ’Ajam inhabitants of the city. The Ankara Sılsilenâme also hints at recurrent tensions, be they of pronounced sectarian differences or political rivalries. However, it also indicates an ease and flexibility in what seems to be an insurmountable difference. By means of slight alterations to its text, the genealogy could (hope to) find a new home with an Ottoman owner, because it was an adaptation of an Ottoman genre in the first place.

This translatability finds body in a different way for the rest of the corpus of illustrated manuscripts from turn-of-the-century Baghdad. It is through style, often described as “eclectic,” that the in-betweeness of Baghdad is reflected. The characterization of Baghdad as a “person” caught in a whirlwind between the Ottomans and the Safavids underlines this eclecticism. At the moment when the Ottomans and the Safavids were actively and dialogically creating a distinct visual, ceremonial and architectural idiom, the

585 This is phrased slightly differently by Evliya Çelebi, who writes: ...When the shâh of ’Ajam invades Baghdad, he says “Oh, Abu Hanîfa, the Sunnite,” and when the house of ’Osmân takes it, he says “Oh, shahsavâv (lover of the shâh), Shi’i and heretic” (Bu ɣehr-i Baḵdâd’a ’Acem şâhî istilā ɛse ehl-i Baḵdâd’a “Ey Nu mân-i A ḡam-i Sûnî!” ve dâ-l-i ’Osmân mutaṣarraf ɔlsa bu ehl-i Baḵdâd’a, “Ey şâhseven şî’i wî râfüzî wî hârîcî!” derler. Bu hâl üzre ehl-i Baḵdâd arada kalmışlar.) Şeyhoğlu, Kitâb-i Tûrîh-i Dârî’s selâm-i Baḵdâd’in Bâṣna Gênî Ḥâvîlîeri Beyân İder fi Sene 1028 (1619), Codex Schultens 1278, Leiden University Library, fols. 20b–21a; Yücel Dağlı and S. Kahraman, eds. Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi IV. Kitap Topkapı Sarayı Bağdat 303 Numaralı Yazmanın Transkripsiyonu - Dizini (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayımları, 2000), 243.
illustrated manuscripts from Baghdad appeared to be a mix between the two styles. This stylistic eclecticism that sprung forth from a conglomeration of different sartorial and architectural elements, contrasts with the creation of a marked difference in imperial identity in the capitals. Where the province does not fit the model of “distinction” in the second half of the sixteenth century, this in-betweenness and eclecticism of style, matched to a certain extent by the textual sources, points to a fluidity of identity owing to the liminal position of Baghdad as a frontier. The “eclecticism” of the frontier thus stands out particularly in contradiction to the imperial image of the capitals. It also urges us to question our definitions of what is considered “Ottoman” or “Safavid.”

Thus, the Turkmen Sadiqi Beg, painter and librarian to Shah ʿAbbas I, traveled to the Ottoman lands dressed as a dervish, somewhat like the story of the youth dressed as a Bektashi dervish with which I began the dissertation. There he met the Ottoman poet Baki in Aleppo. The Khorasani calligrapher Hasan ʿAli found continued patronage in Karbala, following the death of his former patron; and Fuzuli, who did not move out of Arab Iraq, composed for its Aq Qoyunlu, Safavid, and Ottoman overlords. This indicates the porosity of boundaries between what we take to be monolithic and hermeneutically sealed entities, the Ottoman and Safavid empires. Through a close reading of sources we can construct the networks of poets (such as Mustafa ʿAli, ʿAhdi, Kelami and Tarzi in Baghdad), governors and their sons and relatives in various neighboring districts and provinces, and upstarts trying to be or becoming integrated into the state system. Moreover, artists and poets traveled for patronage, for shrine visitation, for trade among other reasons; merchants and pilgrims traveled and with them brought goods or took souvenirs. In the case of upstarts, the very liminality of Baghdad offered advantages and avenues for leverage. For example, in the case of Bekir Subaşı, using the liminal position of Baghdad against the Ottomans in order to become the governor of the province did not initially seem to be a major concern. It is only
after the realization of failure that Bekir Subaşı is claimed to have regretted his actions, “for he was a Sunni Muslim of the Hanafi sect,” as construed in a chronicle. Forging direct connections among different individuals is not necessarily the aim in this dissertation. However, these networks of relations between various individuals in districts in and around Iraq as well as the Arab lands, eastern Anatolia, and the metropolitan centers, paint a more closely connected, albeit complicated, image. Certainly, networks and broad connections both within the Ottoman Empire and with its neighbors always existed in different ways. However, the specific case of Baghdad as a frontier zone with its outpouring of illustrated manuscripts in the late sixteenth century is unique. While on the imperial level, distinction expressed dialogically though monumental architecture, ornament, ceremony, official histories and painting, presents claims of difference, Baghdad reveals a more variegated picture. A study of its art production, the present dissertation proposed, needs to consider both the micro-level and the macro-level from a transregional perspective that takes into account multiple levels of interaction, influence, and opposition, including degrees of translatability and the limits of translation.

The foregoing has been an attempt to contextualize the appearance of a short-lived, yet lively art market in the frontier province of Baghdad. This florescence of the interest in art appears at a moment of empire-wide social, cultural, political and urban transformations, including the appearance of new modes of sociability and new places of socialization such as the coffeehouse, the emergence of the newly rich interested in buying art, and Celali uprisings. It coincides with the broadening of the base of patronage within the capital, where there was an increasing interest in collecting and owning illustrated manuscripts, paintings and calligraphies. The corpus of illustrated manuscripts produced in and around Baghdad appears at the auspicious conjunction of a period of peace, with the Ottoman and Safavid

586 Muṣṭafa b. Mulla Ṭoḏvan el-Bağdādī, ʿTārīḫ-i Fetiḥnâme-i Bağdād, Bodleian Or. 276, fol. 125b.
wars having recently ended in 1590, with more favorable conditions obtained by the former, a possible exodus of artists from Shiraz, and a wider group of sufficiently wealthy buyers to sustain a market, including but not restricted to governors. To works produced in the metropolitan centers of Istanbul and Isfahan in the late sixteenth century, one can also add the prolific production of Shiraz painting as well as the still elusive group of *Qiṣṣa al-Anbiyāʾ* (Stories of the Prophets) and truncated *Shāhnāmas* (Book of Kings). These further point to an increasing desire to own illustrated works, and the production of such works outside metropolitan centers. While the illustrated manuscripts produced in Baghdad can be loosely connected to current trends in the Ottoman and Safavid metropolitan centers, the types of works that were chosen for illustration in Baghdad as well as their compositions differ considerably.

The more or less coherent group of manuscripts produced in Baghdad in this period appears under a predominantly Ottoman, yet cosmopolitan, social context, though this should not be taken to mean that it was only an Ottoman audience that consumed these works. The very example of the Ankara *Silsilenāme* shows that there was a broader market that included not only Ottoman but Turkmen and Safavid patrons as well. After the first few years of the seventeenth century, the production of illustrated manuscripts in Baghdad waned. This coincides with the rekindling of warfare with the Safavids in 1603, turmoils in Baghdad caused by the uprising of Tavilzade Muhammed in 1608, and with Shah ʿAbbas I gaining an upperhand after having stabilized the eastern frontiers of his dominions bordering the Uzbeks, allowing him to initiate reforms and turn his attention to recapturing lands occupied by the Ottomans.

The corpus of over thirty manuscripts attributed to Baghdad has often been defined or accepted as a “school” of painting, without questioning the notion of a school of painting or the conditions under which illustrated manuscripts were produced. Archival research has
not yet shed light on the particularities of the production of illustrated manuscripts, such as
the acquisition of materials, payment of artists, and organization of the preparation of
manuscripts in Baghdad (nor in other centers, like Shiraz, Mashhad, Tabriz and Qazvin).
However, even the “eclecticism” associated with Baghdad points in the direction of a more
complicated picture wherein the movement of patrons, artists, and objects played a crucial
part. While the questions of how, where, by whom, and for whom the manuscripts were
prepared in Baghdad, cannot be answered fully given the limited nature of available
documents, a consideration of the corpus as a whole (in terms of size, format, overall
appearance, calligraphy, illustration and illumination) suggests a multilayered view of the
production and consumption processes. We need perhaps to think of different models or
conditions of production. For example, the Cāmīʿī’s-Siyer (Collection of Biographies) of
the governor Hasan Paşa (d. 1602) or the large-scale Shāhnāma (Topkapı Palace Museum
Library, H. 1486) with fifty-five paintings, and the large-sized and luxury manuscript of the
Rawżat al-Safāʾ (Garden of Purity) (British Library, Or. 5736) may require a different form
of organization of pigments, materials, artists and calligraphers, than the much smaller
illustrated genealogies, not to mention the differing status of their patrons/buyers.

While not every manuscript studied in the present dissertation has retained its
original binding, there are certain similarities as well as differences. As a whole, the group
of manuscripts attributed to Baghdad, do not share the striking similarity of bindings
characterizing Shiraz manuscripts and the group of Qiṣaṣ al-Anbiyāʾ (Stories of the
Prophets), or truncated Shāhnāmas. While the bindings of most of the Baghdad manuscripts
are brown leather with a centrally placed, gilded shamsa, and corner pieces, they are not
identical across the corpus. The same observation can be extended to the calligraphy.
However, as pointed out in Chapter 4, the calligrapher of the Ankara Ḥadīkatū’s-Sü‘ edā
(Besim Atalay 7294) also copied the Rawżat al-Šafā’ (Or. 5736) and likely the second volume of the Cāmiʿī’s-Siyer (TPML H. 1230) as well.

Here, we can also look to another example, this time not from Baghdad but from Damascus. From the late-1580s through the first decade of the seventeenth century, we find a calligrapher named Derviṣ Muhammed Ahlaki, who copied seven manuscripts of the Hūmāyūnname (The Imperial Book), which is the translation of the Anwar-i Suhaylī (Lights of Canopus) of Kashīfi.\(^{587}\) In addition, a calligrapher named ʿAbdūlhalik b. Derviṣ Muhammed (perhaps Derviṣ Muhammed Ahlaki’s son?) also copied a Hūmāyūnname manuscript (Süleymanie Library, Ayasofya 4349) in 1610.\(^{588}\) Derviṣ Muhammed, according to Parładır, may have traveled from Damascus to Baghdad, and worked on the illustrated Hūmāyūnname (TPML R. 843) there. This observation is based on affinity of style in calligraphy. The manuscript, unfortunately, does not contain information about its place of production. However, its paintings are stylistically akin to those of Baghdad manuscripts. Assuming it was copied by Derviṣ Mehmed Ahlaki in Baghdad, then one can ask: did the calligrapher move from Damascus to Baghdad in search of patronage? What do the multiple copies of Hūmāyūnname (localized to Damascus, Cairo, Baghdad) in the late sixteenth century suggest about the popularity of this text? (A similar question was raised in this dissertation about the Ḥadīkatū’s-Sü’edā and the illustrated genealogies). If we consider that certain works achieved popularity in certain places, then could/would artists/calligraphers move in order to find continued patronage? What about a particular specialization of an individual calligrapher in copying a certain text? In the late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth centuries we can note Derviṣ Muhammed Ahlaki’s occupation as

\(^{587}\) For a list of these works copied by this calligrapher see Şebnem Parładır, “Resimli Nasihatnameler: Ali Çelebi’nin Hūmāyūnname’si” (PhD. diss, Ege Üniversitesi, 2011), 12.

\(^{588}\) Ibid.
calligrapher of Hūmāyūnīm. In the 1620s, we also saw the case of Ibrahim Cevri, who copied multiple manuscripts of the Mathnawī following his retirement (Chapter 3).

Turning the initial assumption around, can we also consider the scenario in which Derviş Muhammed remains in Damascus and copies the Topkapı Hūmāyūnīme, which could then be illustrated in Baghdad or even Damascus? These questions are certainly hypothetical, but stem from the crucial example of the illustrated Freer Haft Awrang (46.12) of Jami (d. 1492) produced for the Safavid prince Ibrahim Mirza (d. 1577). The case of the Freer Haft Awrang, which is extraordinary for the amount of documentation it contains with regards to the process of production, shows that different parts of the manuscript were copied over a period of nine years (between 1556–1565), by different calligraphers in different locations (Mashhad, Qazvin, Herat). Marianne Shreve-Simpson observes that the Safavid kitābkhāna was not part of the official bureaucracy but a private institution convened by a patron, rather than an artist (unlike the Italian examples of workshops). Calligraphers and painters who were involved in the production may or may not be salaried members of the workshop. Here the examples from the Ottoman realm of Kalender and Nakkaş Hasan Paşa also point to alternative career paths. Moreover, artists and calligraphers could also move with the Safavid court, as was the case with one of the calligraphers of the Freer Haft Awrang, Malik al-Daylami, who completed parts of the work in Mashhad and Qazvin. While we are still a long way from a concrete understanding of the functionings of the kitābkhāna or the process of production of manuscripts, the example of the Haft Awrang paints a more versatile picture. While we know that the Ottoman court

---


atelier in Istanbul had a much more centralized organization as revealed in payment registers (ehl-i hıref defterleri), this was not the case with artists employed in provincial capitals like Aleppo or Baghdad.\(^591\)

With the more complicated picture provided by Shreve-Simpson in mind, and currently with a lack of archival evidence, we can at least raise hypothetical questions about the conditions under which illustrated manuscripts were made in Baghdad. Could Hasan Paşa or other governors have had their own kitābkhanās, just as some of their colleagues did in Istanbul? How would other patrons, such as Mustafa Āli, access/approach painters and calligraphers? Where did artists work? In the case of the illustrated manuscripts of the Munājāt (Invocations) of `Abdullah Ansari and several calligraphic samples, we saw that the Shi`i shrine of Imam Husayn also acted as a place where artistic production took place. We also know, for instance, that illustrated pilgrimage scrolls and manuscripts were produced in or near the Masjid-al Haram in Mecca for both Sunni and Shi`i pilgrims. Additionally, the above-mentioned anecdote about the painter Sadiqi Beg showed that the coffeehouse could be a place of exchange/sale of art. Can we also consider the coffeehouse, or the Sunni Mawlawi lodge, or Shi`i Bektashi convents in Baghdad as places where artworks could be created or purchased? If so, sectarian and Sufi affiliation could have exercised an impact on intended customers. Furthermore, given the similarity of compositions in the Ḥadīkatū’s-Sū’ edā, Rawżat al-Shuhadā’ and the Maḵtel-i Āl-i Resūl or the illustrated genealogies, how can we imagine the creative process of artists? These questions remain unanswered but I hope that this dissertation opens avenues for further exploration into the production of manuscripts outside of the royal court.

A further implication of this work focused on Baghdad is the importance of studying the frontier zone through a micro- and macro-level reading. Baghdad was unique among other Ottoman provinces with regards to its art market due to its specific condition and location and the apparent availability of materials, artists and patrons to support that market. However, other frontier provinces could present different aspects of a cultural admixture in different ways. Focused studies on the Buda province in the Ottoman empire’s western frontier, for example, would paint a different picture of relations between the Ottomans and the Habsburgs. Likewise, Mecca as a pilgrimage site and trade center would be another point of interest. Outside the boundaries of the Ottoman Empire, we can also consider the Deccan, particularly art production in various sultanates in the sixteenth and mid-seventeenth centuries, for example. Contacts (artistic or otherwise) with India were hinted at in the present dissertation. Indeed, in addition to the unusual predominance of figures from Indian history, such as the painting of the nominal ruler of Somnath included in the Câmi ‘ü’s-Siyer (fig. 4.22), stylistic similarities between Baghdad, Shiraz, and Deccani painting can also be observed, a point first raised by Milstein.592

Questions on the movement of artists and objects have been elaborated to some extent throughout the present dissertation. Further research on relations between the Ottomans, Mughals and Deccani rulers will shed more light on the specifics of contacts. The implications of a focused micro-level study on a frontier zone that also takes into account the macro-level history, interactions, and encounters, I propose, may be a fruitful approach for other frontier zones as well, such as the Deccan, regardless of its possible contacts with Baghdad. The frontier, in the case of Baghdad, was a zone or place of cultural and religious coalescence, as it was a vibrant center of trade at the confluence of the Mediterranean and Indian Ocean traffic as well as a pilgrimage center. As such, it comes close to Mecca, more

than any other Ottoman city, and to a lesser degree, Konya. This amalgamation becomes more concrete in Baghdad, when seen against the opposite sides of that very frontier.

Within the (loose and changing) boundaries of empire, the present dissertation also poses further questions on relations between center and province, relations among provinces, and different projection(s) of an imperial image on its provinces. In the case of Baghdad, the Ottoman bureaucrat Mustafa ʿĀli was one point of contact between Istanbul and Baghdad, in addition to other officials appointed to that province. His important treatise on calligraphers and painters was begun in Baghdad; there, he also connected with a network of poets and calligraphers. In addition to the case of Mustafa ʿĀli, the present dissertation also emphasized possible influences and interactions between Istanbul and Baghdad particularly through the examples of single-page paintings and illustrated genealogies. Can we also consider the seventeenth-century painter Nakşi as another individual contributing to a possible connection between Baghdad and the Ottoman capital? This idiosyncratic painter, whose name is mentioned in the epilogue to the 1621 illustrated Tercüme-i Şakâ ik-i Nuʿmaniye (Translation of the Crimson Peonies), has produced a number of paintings in several illustrated manuscripts and single-page paintings created at the court in Istanbul. In his paintings, Nakşi merges elements from European and Persianate works, and synthesizes them within an Ottoman visual idiom, yet maintaining his personal style. His figures have large heads with characteristic faces. He plays with the sizes of figures and includes elements that are not directly related to the text but either show his personal eyewitness experience, or are represented as witty quotations.

Together with his inclusion of humorous details (that also frequently appear in Baghdad paintings), the most striking element in Nakşi’s paintings, perhaps his signature, is the use of an intuitive and experimental perspective in archways and windows, yet one with no shadows that confines it in a world of abstraction. Sometimes rendered in black ink in distinction to the rest of the painted composition, Nakşi’s representations of architecture stand out as his signature. Like the characterization of Baghdad paintings, this painter has also often been described as having an “eclectic” style. Moreover, details of architectural elements included in Nakşi’s paintings, especially his depiction of minarets very closely resembles the representation of minarets in Baghdad painting. Note, for example the tapering minaret in the painting depicting the early-sixteenth-century shaykh al-islam Zenbilli ʿAli Efendi (d. 1526) delivering answers to legal questions by means of a basket (zenbil) in his residence in Istanbul (fig. 6.1). This painting is one among many that shows Nakşi’s witticism. The door and windows of Zenbilli ʿAli Efendi’s abode show the artist’s attempts at perspective, while the statement of the legal question (“bu mes’ele beyânında”) as it is written on the paper is legible, and the rocks in the background have transformed into human faces. The inclusion of a single-page painting by Nakşi, depicting the Ottoman sultan Mehmed III (fig. 6.2) in the Topkapı Palace Museum album, H. 2165, which also contained a painting from Baghdad (fig. 2.55), shows the accord found between these paintings by the compiler of the album. While I do not suggest direct connections between Baghdad and Nakşi, on whose life we know little, it is worth questioning whether further connections pointing to a two-way traffic between the capital and the province of Baghdad can be teased out in future research. As I have suggested in Chapter 5, it is likely that the illustrated genealogies show an influence moving from the capital to the province, and then back to the capital. Perhaps further research into these connections, not only in painting but other aspects of art and architecture, among provinces and between provinces and the capital will
shed more light into dynamics of exchange. Indeed, further research may show that these dynamics were not unidirectional from the capital to the provinces, but that the provinces also influenced the capital in turn.

Finally, while the present dissertation concentrated particularly on Baghdad as a center of art production and consumption, relations among provinces in the Arab lands and eastern Anatolia must also be considered in addition to relations between Baghdad and the Ottoman capital. Baghdad’s specific location at major sea and overland trade routes rendered it of crucial strategic importance for both the Ottomans and the Safavids. Baghdad was especially remarkable for being a center of art production. Extending the current research to a broader region that encompasses other Arab provinces of the Ottoman Empire as well as eastern Anatolia may highlight dynamic relations among provinces and between the provinces and their metropolitan centers and the Ottoman capital. In terms of “connected histories,” Baghdad is closely tied to Aleppo, Mosul, Diyarbekir, as well as eastern Anatolian provinces. Many of the governors of Baghdad hailed from Van, Erzurum, Diyarbekir, Mosul, Damascus, Aleppo, Shahrizol, Najd, and Lahsa. Governors and their households often rotated among these provinces, creating further networks of relations, as revealed in architectural projects during the sixteenth century and beyond.\(^{594}\) For example, Elvendzade ʿAli Paşa remained in the Baghdad-Basra-Najd-Lahsa region, eventually retiring to Aleppo. He was known to have acquired great property there. His nephew, Germi, was appointed as district governor in the provinces of Basra and Lahsa; his son, Arslan, remained for some time in Baghdad, and was in the household of the son of the leader of the ʿazeb forces, Mehmed Kanber, discussed in detail in Chapter 1. Arslan was also appointed as district governor in Hilla and Maʿarra, Syria. Furthermore, he was known to have fostered relations with the upstart Abaza Mehmed Paşa (d. 1634) and was thus executed in 1625–26.

The case of Elvendzade ʿAli Paşa and his family is one example of the interconnected relations in these regions. Asafi Dal Mehmed Çelebi is another example of connections between Istanbul, Erzurum, Qazvin, Isfahan, Shiraz, Basra, and Baghdad. Further research into rapidly circulating governors, commanders, their households, and scribes associated with their divans may shed light into the dynamics within the larger region that not only includes Baghdad and its immediate hinterland but also Aleppo, Diyarbekir, Erzurum, Van, etc. Trade relations and the movement of objects, including books, will also add to this picture, already demonstrated in the case of architectural patronage. Thus, moving from the specifics of Baghdad as a frontier zone between the Ottomans and the Safavids, we must also consider the region of eastern Anatolia down through Aleppo, Mosul, Baghdad, and Basra. This broader region was constantly being reclassified, through changes in governance between the Aq Qoyunlu and Qara Qoyunlu Turkmen confederations, Safavids and Ottomans and through changes in administrative divisions of the provinces.

The present research concentrated on the period following the peace treaty between the Ottomans and the Safavids in 1590 and the rekindling of war between the two empires in the early seventeenth century. Extending the geography to the wider frontier zone, and the chronology, may illuminate the geopolitical and cultural effects of reclassifications of loose and changing borders, connections and networks in and around the frontiers, and imperial projects of incorporating newly acquired lands.

595 For the concept of an Ottomanized frontier zone in eastern Anatolia and Syria as distinct from Iraq, Cairo and North Africa, which were also not integrated into the timar system and hence less Ottomanized, see Necipoğlu, The Age of Sinan, 455–75.
APPENDIX

Illustrated Manuscripts Attributed to Baghdad

*Hadîkatü’s-Sü’ edâ, Fuţüllî*
Süleymaniye Library Fatih 4321, Istanbul
Date: Shawwal 1002 (June/July 1594)

*Hadîkatü’s-Sü’ edâ, Fuţüllî*
Etnografya Müzesi, Besim Atalay Env. 7294, Ankara
Date: Zi’l hijja 1008 (June/July 1600)
Calligrapher: ’Ali b. Muĥammed el-Tustarî

*Hadîkatü’s-Sü’ edâ, Fuţüllî*
Brooklyn Museum of Art 70.143
Date: Jumada II 1011 (November/December 1602)
Calligrapher: ’Azizullah al-Husayni al-Kashani

*Hadîkatü’s-Sü’ edâ, Fuţüllî*
British Library, Or. 12009, London

*Hadîkatü’s-Sü’ edâ, Fuţüllî*
British Library, Or. 7301, London

*Hadîkatü’s-Sü’ edâ, Fuţüllî*
Bibliothèque nationale de France, Supp. turc 1088

*Hadîkatü’s-Sü’ edâ, Fuţüllî*
Mevlana Museum 101, Konya
Date: 20 Ramaån 1013 (9 February 1604)

*Hadîkatü’s-Sü’ edâ, Fuţüllî*
Museum of Turkish and Islamic Art, T. 1967, Istanbul

*Hadîkatü’s-Sü’ edâ, Fuţüllî*
Dar al-Kutub, Talaat 81 Tarikh Turki, Cairo

*Rawżat al-Shuhadâ’, Ḥusayn Wâ’iz Kâshîfî*
Berlin Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Ms. Diez A Fol. 5, Berlin

*Maktel-i Āl-i Resûl, Lâmî’î Çelebi*
Museum of Turkish and Islamic Art, T. 1968, Istanbul

*Maktel-i Āl-i Resûl, Lâmî’î Çelebi*
British Library, London Or. 7238

*Maktel-i Āl-i Resûl, Lâmî’î Çelebi*
Czartoryski Library, Nr. 2327 III, Krakow, Poland
Nafaḥāt al-Uns, Jāmī
Chester Beatty Library T. 474, Dublin
Date: 1003 (1594–5)

Manāqib al-ʿĀrifīn, Aflākī
Uppsala University Library, MS O Nova 94, Sweden
Calligrapher: Kemāl el-Kātib

Tercüme-i ʿevākıb-ı Menākıb, Maḥmud Dede
Pierpont Morgan Library, M. 466, New York

Tercüme-i ʿevākıb-ı Menākıb, Maḥmud Dede
Topkapi Palace Museum Library, R. 1479, İstanbul
Date: Ziʾl ḳaʾde 1007 (May/June 1599)

Hümāyūnname, ʿAlī Çelebi
Topkapi Palace Museum Library, H. 357, İstanbul
Date: Jumada 1013 (September 1604)
Calligrapher: Derviṣ Muḥammad Ahlākī

Hümāyūnname, ʿAlī Çelebi
Topkapi Palace Museum Library, R. 843, İstanbul

Hümāyūnname, ʿAlī Çelebi
British Library Add. 15153, London

Silsilene
Topkapi Palace Museum Library, A. 3110

Silsilene
Topkapi Palace Museum Library, H. 1324
Date: 1006 (1597)
Calligrapher: Yusuf b. Muḥammad al-Dizfulī

Silsilene
Topkapi Palace Museum Library, H. 1591
Date: 1006 (1597)
Calligrapher: Yusuf b. Muḥammad al-Dizfulī

Silsilene
Topkapi Palace Museum Library, H. 1624

Silsilene
Badische Landesmuseum, Rastatt 201, Karlsruhe

Silsilene
Bibliothèque nationale de France, Supp. turc 126, Paris
Date: 1013 (1604–5)
Copied in Baghdad
Silsilenāme
Dar al-Kutub, 30 Tarikh Turki Khalil Agha, Cairo

Silsilenāme
Los Angeles County Museum of Art M.85.237.38, Los Angeles

Silsilenāme
Chester Beatty Library, T. 423, Dublin
Date: 1006 (1597–8)
Calligrapher: Abū Ṭālib Iṣfahānī (sākin-i Bağdād)

Silsilenāme
Museum of Ethnography, 8457, Ankara

Silsilenāme
The Nasser D. Khalili Collection of Islamic Art, MS. 581

Silsilenāme
Kuwait National Museum, LNS 66 MS

Silsilenāme
Istanbul University Rare Books and Manuscripts Library, T. 6092

Cāmiʿ iʾs-Siyer, Muḥammed Ṭāhir
Topkapi Palace Museum Library, H. 1230, Istanbul

Cāmiʿ iʾs-Siyer, Muḥammed Ṭāhir
Topkapi Palace Museum Library, H. 1369, Istanbul

Beng u Bāde, Fużūlī
Sächsichen Landesbibliothek Dresden Eb. 362
Date: 1008 (1599–1600)
Calligrapher: Muḥṣafā b. Muḥammed el-Rużāvī el-Ḥuseynī
Copied for Sokolluzāde Ḥasan Paşa (d. 1602)

Rawżat al-Ṣafāʾ, Mirkhwand
British Library Or. 5736, London
Date: 1008 (1599–1600)
Calligrapher: 'Alī b. Muḥammad Tustarī

Shāhnāma, Firdawsi
Topkapi Palace Museum Library, H. 1486, İstanbul

Akhlāq-i Muḥsinī, Ḥusayn Waʿiz Kāshifi
Topkapi Palace Museum Library, R. 392, İstanbul

Laylī u Majnūn, Fużūlī
Bibliotheque nationale de France, Turc 316

Mathnawī, Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī
New York Public Library, Spencer Collection Pers. MS 12
Date: Ramażān 1011 (February/March 1603)

Sefernāme, Muḥlisī
Bibliothèque nationale de France, Turc 127, Paris

Munājid, ʿAbdullah Ansārī
Topkapi Palace Museum Library, H. 281 and R. 1046, İstanbul
Copied by: Ḥasan ʿAlī in Karbala

Shāhnāma, Firdawsī
Topkapi Palace Museum Library, H. 1496
Date: Muḥarrem 1037 (October/November 1627) and 22 Jumada II 1038 (16 February 1629)
Copied by: Walī Bayat (in Baghdad)

Ajāʾīb al-Makhlūqāt wa Gharāʾīb al-Mawjūdāt
Topkapi Palace Museum Library, H. 400
Date: 1110 (1699)

Single-page Paintings and Dispersed Leaves Attributed to Baghdad

Hunting scene
Los Angeles County Museum of Art, M85.237.25, Los Angeles


Youth on Horseback with Attendants, Album, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, Istanbul, H. 2165, fol. 44b.

The Beggar Bringing the Polo Ball to the King, Album, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, Istanbul, fol. 20a.


*Mīraj of the Prophet*. (Dispersed Leaf)
Los Angeles County Museum of Art, M. 85.237.44, Los Angeles

*Ḥadiḳatü’s-Sū’edā*, Fużūlī (Dispersed Leaf) (Abraham Catapulted into Flames)
Los Angeles County Museum of Art, M.85.237.35, Los Angeles

*Ḥadiḳatü’s-Sū’edā*, Fużūlī (Dispersed Leaf) (ʿAlī Murdered by Ibn Muljam)
Wereldmuseum, 60948, Rotterdam

*Ḥadiḳatü’s-Sū’edā*, Fużūlī (Dispersed Leaf) (Death of Ḥasan)
British Museum, 1949, 1210,0.8, London

*Ḥadiḳatü’s-Sū’edā*, Fużūlī (Dispersed Leaf) (Death of Ḥasan)
Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1979.211, New York

*Ḥadiḳatü’s-Sū’edā*, Fużūlī (Dispersed Leaf) (Expulsion from Paradise)
Topkapi Palace Museum Library, H. 1564 (Painting pasted to the beginning of a manuscript of the *Ḳiyāfetü’s Insāniyye fī Şemāʿ ilī’l ‘Osmāniyye*)

*Ḥadiḳatü’s-Sū’edā*, Fużūlī (Dispersed Leaf)
Kraus Collection (E. J. Grube, *Islamic Paintings from the 11th to the 18th Century in the Collection of Hans P. Kraus*) (New York: H.P. Kraus, 1972), 208–9, no. 179.

*Ḥadiḳatü’s-Sū’edā*, Fużūlī (Dispersed Leaf) (Ḥusayn Addressing the Umayyad Army in Karbala)
Harvard Art Museums, 1985.227, Cambridge, MA

*Maktel-i Āl-i Resūl* (Dispersed Leaf) (ʿAlī Swearing Allegiance)
Harvard Art Museums, 1985.229, Cambridge, MA

*Maktel-i Āl-i Resūl* (Dispersed Leaf) (Prophet Muhammad Preaching)
Metropolitan Museum of Art, 55.121.40, New York

*Maktel-i Āl-i Resūl* (Dispersed Leaf) (Death of Ṭūl)
Princeton University Library, No. 1958.111, New Jersey

*Maktel-i Āl-i Resūl* (Dispersed Leaf) (Ubaydullah b. Ziyad Going from Basra to Kufa to Have Muslim b. ʿAqil Killed)
Arts of the Islamic World, 20 April 2016, Sotheby’s, Lot 42

*Rawẓat al-Ṣafāʾ* (Dispersed Leaf) (Jonah and the Whale)
Israel Museum, Dawud Collection, 903.69, Jerusalem

*Rawẓat al-Ṣafāʾ* (Dispersed Leaf) (Joseph Among the Ishmaelites)
Israel Museum, Dawud Collection, 622.29, Jerusalem

Rawżat al-Ṣafāʾ (Dispersed Leaf) (King Nimrod Ascending to Heaven)
Israel Museum, Dawud Collection, 539.69, Jerusalem

Tercüme-i Sevākib-i Menākib, Mahmud Dede (Mawlānā Distributing Sweetmeats)
Museum of Fine Arts, 07.692, Boston (Dispersed Leaf)

The Prophet at the Ka‘ba, Walters Art Gallery, No. 10.679 a-b, Baltimore

Mi‘raj, Los Angeles County Museum of Art, M. 85.237.44

Tercüme-i Sevākib-i Menākib, Mahmud Dede (Mawlānā Dancing)
L. M. Mayer Memorial Institute, MS 58-69, Jerusalem

Dīvān, Bākī (Dispersed Leaf) (Süleymān I’s Procession on Horseback/ Depicting a qasīda for Süleymān I)
RISD Museum, 17.459, Providence, RI

Dīvān, Bākī (Dispersed Leaf) (Entry of the Safavid Prince Ḥaydar Mirzā)
Metropolitan Museum of Art, 45.174.5, New York

Dīvān, Bākī (Dispersed Leaf) (Ebussu‘ud Efendi/Depicting Bākī’s Winter Ode dedicated to the shaykh al-islam)
Metropolitan Museum of Art, 25.83.9, New York

Mehmed III Enthroned, Folio from an Unidentified Manuscript
Harvard Art Museums, 1985.226

Ahvāl-i Kiyāmet (Dispersed Leaf) (Day of Judgment)
Free Library Rare Book Department, Lewis Ms. O.-T4, Philadelphia

Ahvāl-i Kiyāmet (Dispersed Leaf) (Scene from Purgatory)
Free Library Rare Book Department, Lewis Ms. O.-T5, Philadelphia

Ahvāl-i Kiyāmet (Dispersed Leaf) (Hellfire)
Free Library Rare Book Department, Lewis Ms. O.-T6, Philadelphia

Ahvāl-i Kiyāmet (Dispersed Leaf) (Believers in Paradise)
Free Library Rare Book Department, Lewis Ms. O.-T7, Philadelphia

Portrait of Vali Tutunji
Bibliothèque nationale de France, O.D. 41, fol. 33b
Drawing attributed to Muhammad Qasim
1630s

Unillustrated Manuscripts Copied in Baghdad

Hümāyūnāme, 'Alī Çelebi
Sadberk Hanım Müzesi, No. 419, İstanbul
Date: 6 Sha’ban 981 (1 December 1573)
Calligrapher: Ādem b. Sinān

Hūmāyūnnāme, ’Alī Çelebi
Arkeoloji Müzesi, No. 196, İstanbul
Date: Muḥarram 990 (January-February 1582)
Calligrapher: Kuṭbuddin

Hūmāyūnnāme, ’Alī Çelebi
Arkeoloji Müzesi, No. 198, İstanbul
Date: Jumada II 997 (April-May 1589)
Calligrapher: Muḥammad İṣḥāḳ Bağdādī, resident of Najaf

Dīvān, Fuẓūlī
Āstān-i Quds-i Ražavī, Mashhad
Date: 991 (1583)
Calligrapher: Rūḥī b. Ḥayrī Bağdādī

Ḥadīkatū’s-Sū’ ʿedā, Fuẓūlī
Medrese-i Ali-i Şehid Mutahhari Kütüphanesi, Nr. 446
Date: 992 (1584–5)
Calligrapher: ’Abdullah b. Necibullah (copied in Baghdad)

Tācūʾ ‘Tevārīḥ, Hoca Sa’ deddin
Topkapı Palace Museum Library, R. 1106
Date: 1002 (1593–4)
Calligrapher: ’Abdī el-Bağdādī

Tācūʾ ‘Tevarīḥ, Hoca Sa’ deddin
Bibliothèque nationale de France, Supp. turc 150, Paris
Date: 999 (1590)

Mir’at-i Kāināt, Nişancızāde Meḥmed Kudsī (d. 1622)
Topkapı Palace Museum Library, E.H. 1389, İstanbul
Date: 1022 (1613)
Copied by: Muşṭafa b. Şemseddin b. Kemāleddin Bağdādī

Dīvān, Anvarī
İstanbul University Rare Books and Manuscripts Library, F. 358, İstanbul
Date: 1026 (1617)
Calligrapher: Muḥammad b. Naṣr ’Alī (copied in the shrine of Imām Ḥusayn)

Du’anāme, Ebu’s su’ud Efendi
Ayatullah Marashi Najafi Library, Nr. 2851, Qum
Date: Zi’l ḥicce 1062 (November/December 1652)
Calligrapher: Muḥammed Rīżā (copied in Baghdad)

Ravzat el-Ebrār, Karaçelezāde ’Abdūl’azīz
Topkapı Palace Museum Library, E. H. 1376, İstanbul
Date: 1089 (1678–9)
Calligrapher: Derviş b. 'Osmān Şerif (copied in Baghdad)

*Düstūrū ’l İnşā, Reʾisūʾl kuttāb ’Abdullah Efendi*
Topkapı Palace Museum Library, K. 1940, İstanbul
Date: 1089 (1678–9)
Copied by: Ḥacī ʿAlī el-Bağdādī
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FIGURES

1. Uncertain Loyalties

Figure 1.1 Youth disguised as a dervish. Mecmû’a, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, Turc 140, fol. 13a.
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