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Recent scholarship on the arts of the book from the Islamic world has been moving towards an examination of illustrated manuscripts as whole books, considering their aesthetic and intellectual components, as well as the contexts of their production and use.¹ Particular attention has also been paid to the workshops in which books and albums were produced and stored: the kitābkhana (book house) of the Persian-speaking world, or the nakkaşhane (designers’ house) of the Ottomans.² So far, archival documents, albums, treatises, and other workshop materials have been much more informative on the making of illustrated books than have the manuscripts themselves.³ Notable exceptions include the Haft Awrang of Jami prepared for the Safavid prince Sultan Ibrahim Mirza between 1556 and 1565; its multiple colophons and complicated production history have been incorporated into a detailed analysis of the manuscript as a whole.⁴ The Great Mongol Šahnāma is another exceptional manuscript that has been examined in terms of the relationship between image, text, and production.⁵ Most recently, fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Persian albums of calligraphy and painting and their prefaces have been masterfully studied, particularly with respect to the history of their production and the contexts in which they were used.⁶ While these studies have immensely expanded our field of knowledge, our understanding of how illustrated manuscripts were produced is still erratic. We now have a sense of the general process and contexts of creation, but we still have much to learn about the individual choices involved in the making of specific books. There is ample room and need for multi-layered studies that bring the production process to bear on a manuscript with its text, images, and illumination.

A rare survival from the late sixteenth-century Ottoman court provides an opportunity for just such a study, one that follows the production of a particular manuscript step by step and analyzes the evolution of its visual and verbal contents. It is particularly instructive to examine an Ottoman court history in this fashion because the illustrations of these books are often described in the scholarship as “realistic” or literal depictions of their verbal contents.⁷ The relationship between text and image is assumed to be a rather transparent one, where the visual simply reflects the verbal, which in turn is understood to be passively descriptive of its time and context. My examination of the production process, however, demonstrates clearly that the image-text relationship is a deliberate construction, in which the two work together to create meaning. Through the complicated dialogue between word and image, the manuscript works in its entirety to simultaneously subvert and strengthen different aspects of the Ottoman court’s social hierarchy by representing it in very particular ways.

The artwork in question, Şehnâme-i Selîm Ḥân (Book of Kings of [Sultan] Selim Khan), chronicles the events of the reign of the Ottoman sultan Selim II (r. 1566–74).⁸ In addition to the expansive preface detailing how the manuscript was produced, two preparatory drafts of the project provide invaluable material evidence of the creative process.⁹ One draft in the Topkapı Palace Museum Library contains the entire text, complete with corrections, additions, and edits.¹⁰ This volume also has instructions for the page layout of the final version, but no decorations of its own—that is, no ruling, illuminations, or illustrations. By contrast, a second draft currently in the British Library contains only the
introductory sections of the book, but is embellished with gold ruling, illuminated section headings, and nine paintings.\textsuperscript{11}

A pioneering study by Filiz Çağman introduced the manuscript and took note of the two earlier drafts. Çağman used the Topkapı draft to identify and complete those sections of the introductory narrative that are missing from the final version due to the loss of pages.\textsuperscript{12} She also published the two archival documents related to the project in order to identify the artists who worked on the paintings. Using Çağman’s article as a starting point, I will take my analysis of the Şehnâme-i Selîm Han in a different direction to examine the relationship between how the manuscript was produced and its intended meanings.

The three versions of the Şehnâme-i Selîm Han provide a treasure trove of information about the making of manuscripts in the Ottoman court and the sequence of steps taken by a collective group. We learn about the individuals involved in the project, their division of labor, and their methods of collaboration, and we see how word and image were deliberately brought together to create not only a luxurious account of the reign of Selim II but also a complex document containing multiple political messages targeted at its courtly audience. While this rich material can be taken in many directions to support a variety of studies and approaches, what I hope to show in the following pages is that a comprehensive account of the Şehnâme-i Selîm Han informed by the production process reveals layers of meaning in the manuscript that are otherwise not readily visible. When examined this way, we see that one of the primary goals of the Şehnâme-i Selîm Han was to record and thereby perpetuate the power structure of the Ottoman court, which was itself evolving.

THE FINAL VERSION: TOPKAPI PALACE MUSEUM LIBRARY, MS. A. 3595

The Şehnâme-i Selîm Han was composed in Persian verse by Seyyid Lokman, the official historian (şehnâmeci) from 1569 until 1595. Measuring 23.6 by 34.3 centimeters, the book currently has 158 folios and thirty-nine illustrations (figs. 1–41 [after the Appendix]).\textsuperscript{13} Some pages are missing from the manuscript, and on the basis of comparison with one of the drafts, it is clear that it originally had forty-six paintings, of which at least ten were double-page compositions.\textsuperscript{14} The date of completion provided in the colophon on folio 156a as January 12, 1581 (9 Dhu’l-Hijjah 988) places the Şehnâme-i Selîm Han squarely within the most prolific period of Ottoman illustrated manuscript production. The manuscript was a very long time in the making: it was begun before October 1571 during the reign of Selim II and finished under his son and successor Murad III (1574–95).\textsuperscript{15} As is evident from the manuscript’s large size, numerous illustrations, fine calligraphy, and careful illumination, the Şehnâme-i Selîm Han was deemed an important project.

The book opens with illuminated double pages announcing that this “opulent compendium and excellent copy, chosen from the treasury of the jewel-like holy events written on the bejeweled priceless tablet, is the introduction to the Book of Kings of the deceased Sultan Selim.”\textsuperscript{16} The introduction begins with an image of creation as the workshop of pure imagination—a familiar metaphor linking the making of the manuscript to the ultimate act of divine creation.\textsuperscript{17} After briefly praising God the creator, the Prophet Muhammad, and the first four caliphs, Lokman turns to the Ottomans, enumerating the qualities that in his eyes made the empire great. The dynasty is lauded for the beauty of its capital city, the strength of its army, the generous patronage its sultans extended to scholars and intellectuals, and the levy of Christian children through the devşirme system. The allusion to the institutions of the army, the scholarly class, and the devşirme implies that the greatness of the empire was closely tied to the ruling classes in general, a vision that incorporates a broad segment of the Ottoman court into the imperial image.

The discussion of the devşirme leads seamlessly into praise for the illustrious grand vizier Sokollu Mehmed Pasha, who also rose through the ranks of that system. Having attained the position of grand vizier towards the end of the life of Sultan Süleyman (r. 1520–66), Sokollu Mehmed Pasha served three successive sultans in this position until his assassination in 1579. He gained significant political and economic power as grand vizier, and his overarching control of the Ottoman state during the reign of Selim II inspired some of the historians of the day to refer to him as the “virtual sultan.”\textsuperscript{18} Such
power naturally inspired rivalry and jealousy, which, as will be discussed below, affected the editing process of the Şehnāme-i Selīm Ḥān.

After recounting the high points of Sokollu’s career, Lokman also praises the grand vizier’s confidant and secretary, Feridun Ahmed Beg. These two men happened to be Lokman’s main patrons, and mentioning them together allows the author to explain how he was appointed court historian with their help and the story of the writing of the present book.

The introduction sets the tone for the remainder of the manuscript: Lokman cites and praises the members of Selim II’s court almost as much as he does the sultan himself. This is partially due to the active involvement of these individuals in the production of the manuscript, which is discussed in detail in the introduction. Lokman also wished to ingratiate himself with those in the sultan’s entourage who were his patrons and sponsors. These motivations, however, are not enough to explain the unprecedented emphasis on the ruling elite in the Şehnāme-i Selīm Ḥān. A stronger reason seems to have been a desire on the part of the author to record the power structure of the Ottoman court. It is this structure that gives the Şehnāme-i Selīm Ḥān its final shape.

That this is so is clear from the beginning of the text, when Lokman praises God, the Prophet, and the four caliphs, who, he notes, worked “with the consultation of good viziers and country-adorning councilors.” The theme of helpers, i.e., viziers, is thus highlighted at the start of the manuscript. In addition to praising his patrons, Sokollu Mehmed Pasha and Feridun Ahmed Beg, Lokman also brings other viziers and courtiers into his text. The poem on fol. 10a, for example, begins as a eulogy to the sultan, but ends up praising his advisers as well. The emphasis on the court continues throughout the text of the manuscript, and is equally present in the images.

The Şehnāme proper begins with the ex libris of Selim II’s son, Sultan Murad III. The creation of the book is attributed here to Murad’s treasury, suggesting that work began on the final copy after his accession in 1574—at least three years after the project was initiated. The illuminated title Şehnāme-i Selim Ḥāniyye signals the start of the account. The customary praises of God, the Prophet Muhammad, and each of the four caliphs are followed by a eulogy of Sultan Selim. The encomium of the sultan also encompasses the greatness of his viziers, called the “shadows of the shadow of God on earth,” thereby drawing attention once again to the members of the court.

The narrative begins with a detailed account of Selim II’s accession to the throne. This is not merely a convenient starting point but also an opportunity to comment on the strained relationships between the new sultan’s entourage and the grand vizier. According to Lokman, the crown prince received a message from Sokollu Mehmed Pasha informing him of the death of his father Sultan Süleyman while on campaign in Hungary, and asking that he meet the army on its march back to the capital. This important matter was duly illustrated with a double-page spread, but one of the pages is missing, so that all we have is an image of the messenger arriving at Selim II’s camp (fig. 4). The new sultan, however, on the advice of his tutor and other companions, decided to stop first in Istanbul to accede to the throne, a move that can be interpreted as an assertion of independence from the grand vizier. Selim met the army after a brief stay in the capital. The second illustration comes at this point, and depicts Selim’s second accession in Belgrade, where he greeted the army. The enthronement is also marked with a celebratory poem eulogizing the sultan’s justice and enumerating his viziers. The sultan, his entourage, and the army then returned to Istanbul. Interwoven with the account of Selim II’s accession is a subtle detailing of the Ottoman structure of power. In the next few pages, Lokman continues to praise the sultan’s viziers, who are each depicted holding an audience. Among the important members of Selim II’s court praised by Lokman were the chief religious official of the empire, the şeyhülislam Ebussuud Efendi (d. 1574), the two army judges of Anatolia and Rumelia, and the leader of the sayyids. Other scholars and judges are not named but are mentioned in general terms. These early pages of the manuscript read almost like a record of the social and political hierarchies of the Ottoman court, a collective verbal portrait of the ruling elite during the decade of the book’s production.

Lokman finally begins his account of the significant events of Selim II’s reign on folio 38a. Here, too, the main protagonists are Selim’s generals and viziers. This
is perfectly in line with the way Lokman presents his duties a few pages earlier: to praise the House of Osman and its warriors. The remainder of the manuscript concentrates on their military deeds: Iskender Pasha’s suppression of rebels in Basra; Osman Pasha’s victories in the Yemen aided by Behram Pasha; the Tunisia and Cyprus campaigns featuring the governor of Algeria, Ali Pasha, as well as Koca Sinan Pasha, Piyale Pasha, and Lala Mustafa Pasha; the battles on the Dalmatian coast fought by Pertev Pasha and Ahmed Pasha; and Siyavuş Pasha’s dealings in Bogdan. A number of other naval engagements led by Selim’s commanders are also recounted. The overall tone is rather victorious, celebratory, and energetic. The defeat at Lepanto is glossed over on folios 127b–130a, almost as if it had been a minor skirmish dwarfed in importance by the Ottomans’ numerous naval victories. All these victories are connected to the sultan via the series of letters sent to Istanbul to keep him informed of what was happening at the various fronts. Lokman also inserts short descriptions of the commanders taking leave of the sultan before going on campaign, thus implying that all of these victories were effected by his grace and permission. Also bringing the focus back to Istanbul are the gifts that arrived at the capital, either from Selim’s commanders or from foreign envoys. The receipt of news from the front allows for a transition in the narrative, and the discussion moves once again to Selim’s commanders. Thus, while the historian has chosen to focus the majority of the text on events away from the capital, thereby having the viziers as the main protagonists, a balance is provided by the rhetorical return of the authorial gaze to Istanbul to discuss audiences, the arrival of gifts, and other goings-on connected to the sultan in the capital. The sultan who did not go to war is thus cast into the center of the text as the one who makes possible all the action that is the main focus of the Şehnâme-i Selim Hân.

Other themes addressed in the book include the Ottomans’ protection of pilgrimage routes and Selim II’s architectural patronage, as demonstrated by his renovations at the Ka’ba, and the construction of the Selimiye Mosque and of a bridge in Büyükçekmece. These topics allow the author to portray the sultan as charitable and pious, and as a model follower of the Prophet Muhammad. Thus, the two faces of sovereignty underlined by the text of the Şehnâme-i Selim Hân feature the sultan as the center of an empire effectively protected and administered by his lieutenants, and as the shadow of God on earth, who guarantees pilgrimage routes and shows his generosity and piety through his architectural projects. The sultan’s funeral is one of the last topics treated by Lokman. The main body of the manuscript begins with the events leading to Selim’s accession in 1566, and ends with his death in 1574. The scope of the book, determined by major turning points in Selim II’s life, also underscores the importance of the sultan to the work as a whole, even if the focus of the action lies with his courtiers.

The sultan appears in only six of the illustrations in the Şehnâme-i Selim Hân: the first two relate to the making of the book (figs. 2 and 3); the third, which is missing, shows him receiving the news of his father’s death (see fig. 4 for the right half); the fourth portrays his accession (fig. 5); the fifth depicts him receiving the Safavid shah’s gifts (fig. 16); and the last is of his funeral (see fig. 40 for the left half). By contrast, twenty-six paintings feature Selim’s commanders and viziers. The distribution of images tilts the focus of the manuscript further towards the court than the text appears to, allowing for a slightly different reading than one would get from the words alone. The juxtaposition of the visual and verbal narratives of the Şehnâme-i Selim Hân produces a court history that is as much an account of the Ottoman ruling elite surrounding the sultan as it is of the sultan’s reign.

The Şehnâme-i Selim Hân thus presents a map of the social hierarchies of the Ottoman court, with the sultan appearing at the apex of a solid pyramid made up of bureaucrats, companions, and scholars. His power is supported by these deputies: he rules through his viziers and judges and conquers through his commanders. This understanding of the Ottoman court finds its reflection in the manuscript’s detailed record of the individuals who produced it, as if to emphasize the close relationship between the creation of the manuscript and its intended meanings.

THE STORY OF THE ŞEHNâME-İ SELİM Hân

Many illustrated manuscripts from the Islamic world, especially within the Ottoman context, contain the
stories of their creation. The story is often given in an introductory section named “Reason for Writing” (sebeb-i te’līf), revealing, however, not so much how the book was written but why, that is, who the patron was, who commissioned the book, or why the author deemed it worth writing. Often this story relates to the composition of a text, with no discussion of the illumination or illustrations contained therein. The colophon, if there is one, will reveal, at most, when, where, and by whom the book in hand was penned, as well as how long it took to complete. The preface of the Şehnâme-i Selim Hân, by contrast, is extremely detailed about the story of its own making. Not only do we learn how the book was commissioned, but also how the production team was chosen, the names of those involved in the project, and the steps that had to be followed to attain approval of the illustrated copy. This highly detailed preface helps to contextualize the editorial choices that can be traced through the various drafts. Analyzing the preface with all its nuances is therefore crucial to an understanding of the production of the Şehnâme-i Selim Hân.

In the preface, Lokman recounts how he came to compose the Şehnâme-i Selim Hân and how the final copy was prepared. He begins by explaining how he was sent by the şeyhülislam Ebussuud Efendi to seek the opinion of the renowned scholar Şemseddin Ahmed Karabaği (d. 1600) regarding the first imperial commission he had completed, the Zaferâname (Book of Victory). We are not told exactly when this meeting took place, but it must have been sometime between the completion of the Zaferâname in 1579 and the start of this project in October 1581. Praising Lokman’s work, Karabaği encouraged him to write an account of the reign of Selim II. He then gave Lokman his notes on the period and invited painters and scribes to discuss the project.

The illustrious Ebussuud Efendi had been appointed şeyhülislam by Sultan Süleyman in 1548, and retained his influential position as the highest religious and judicial official of the empire until his death in August 1574. As head of the ulema, he was aligned with Sokollu in constructing the policies of the state. The two men remained staunch allies despite the shifting dynamics of the post-Süleymanic Ottoman court. Given Ebussuud’s involvement in Lokman’s appointment to the position of court historian, it comes as no surprise that he would be the one to encourage the author to commence work on a new composition.

Despite his less familiar name, Şemseddin Ahmed Karabaği was an influential scholar during the last quarter of the sixteenth century. Among his prestigious teaching appointments was one at the madrasa of Sokollu Mehmed Pasha in Lüleburgaz. Between June–July 1572 and January 1574, he served in the Istanbul-Kadırga madrasa of the grand vizier and his wife İsmihan Sultan, the daughter of Selim II. Karabaği also taught at the madrasa founded by İsmihan Sultan in Eyüp on the Golden Horn. He was clearly backed by the royal couple as he rose through the ranks of the ulema hierarchy to hold various teaching positions and judgships, his successful career culminating in multiple terms as chief military judge of Anatolia. It is likely that he was acting in his patron Sokollu’s name and interest when he encouraged Lokman to write a narrative of the reign of Selim II.

It is tempting to suggest that the audience Karabaği had with Lokman took place in Kadırga, as many of Sokollu’s protégés and employees had settled around the palace of the grand vizier and his royal wife in that neighborhood. Such a location would also explain the scholar’s ability to summon an artist and a scribe. It was highly unlikely that he would have had artists in his personal employ, but he may have had access to those affiliated with the chancery and workshops of the grand vizier’s palace. He did not teach at the grand vizier’s Lüleburgaz madrasa after August 1571, which increases the likelihood that he was present in the capital during the autumn of that year, prior to his appointment at the madrasa in Kadırga.

The first illustration in Topkapı Palace Museum Library (hereafter TSK) A. 3595 depicts this meeting (majlis) between the author Lokman and the scholar Şemseddin Ahmed Karabaği. Lokman and his host are portrayed conversing with a painter, an illuminator, and a scribe, who are shown holding examples of their work (see detail of fig. 1 on following page). There are also two attendants in the background bringing in books, attesting to Ahmed Karabaği’s scholarly qualities. The image presents Lokman in the midst of this learned atmosphere, claiming a scholarly status for
That the first painting should concern the creation of the manuscript points to the significance of the production process as a key to understanding the contents of the book. While manuscripts and albums from elsewhere in the Islamic world do at times proclaim in their texts and inscriptions the collaborative effort that led to their production, or bear traces of such joint efforts, the Şehnâme-i Selim Hân is unique in the extent to which its multiple creators are allowed to be visible to its audience. Even more than the text of the preface, this painting marks the detailed account of the creation of the manuscript as an unusual feature of the work; it can be thought of as a multiple author portrait, giving credit to those who were involved in the making of the book.33

In the pages following this first painting, Lokman describes how he showed Sokollu Mehmed Pasha some of his text.34 Sokollu, in turn, brought in Osman, who was unequalled among Ottoman (‘ Osman) painters (thus making a pun on the artist’s name) and Sinan, a calligrapher with a spear-like pen (sinâni qalam), to write and illustrate the work. Osman painted an image of the sultan shooting an arrow from the Tower of Justice (in the second courtyard of the Topkapı Palace, adjacent to the Imperial Council Chamber) at a gilded openwork spherical target (qabāq) hanging from the dome of the Imperial Council Chamber. Sinan wrote out one of Lokman’s couplets. The first examples of painting and calligraphy were received positively by Sokollu, who then sent the painting to the sultan for his approval.35

Osman’s depiction of Selim’s symbolic feat of archery (fig. 2) was included in the introduction, but is no longer in the manuscript. The sultan is seated in the upper left, under the conical dome of the Tower of Justice, accompanied by two attendants. He gazes down at a meeting of the Imperial Council, depicted in the lower part of the image. The openwork sphere hanging from the dome of the Council Chamber has an arrow, just shot by the sultan, planted in it.

If the first painting is a collective author portrait, this second one can be interpreted as a visual schematization of the Ottoman power structure. Lokman’s verbal description of the painting demonstrates that he himself understood it in such metaphorical terms. Writing that the scene was painted to show both the sultan’s skill in archery and his justice as a ruler, Lokman refers
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The target hanging from the vault of the Imperial Council Chamber is likened to the sphere of the earth, at the center of which is the seal of the vizier (or deputy) of the sultan, the grand vizier. The rest of the text elaborates on the justice of Selim’s rule and how he controls the lands and the seas with the help of his grand vizier.36

Lokman’s description of the Tower of Justice and the Imperial Council Chamber accords with contemporary interpretations—including his Hünernâme, where he is even more explicit in his verbal description. The arrow represents the imperial decrees guaranteeing justice, the gilded openwork sphere the world under the sultan’s dominion, and the window a means for the sultan to oversee and protect both state and religion. The grand vizier is his representative in the dispensing of justice, albeit under the sultan’s ultimate authority.37

The composition of the image begs an allegorical reading. That the separate parts of the painting stand for more than themselves is obvious from Lokman’s descriptions. The triangular formation of the figures, with the sultan at the apex, whose power is both supported and represented by the members of the Imperial Council spreading out to either side below him, graphically depicts Lokman’s verbal description. At the bottom of this pyramid are the functionaries, such as the scribes, while in the next level are the viziers, the representatives of the sultan. Selim’s gaze falls directly on his grand vizier, Sokollu Mehmed Pasha, seated at the head of the viziers and facing the two army judges of Anatolia and Rumelia, who represent the central territories of the empire. This verbal and visual description of the sultan overseeing the Imperial Council is also a depiction of the Ottoman world order. The seating arrangement at the Council was determined in the fifteenth century, and has already been interpreted as a “clear diagram of the centralized state structure.”38 That schema was carefully replicated in Osman’s painting of the Council, and on some level informs the entire conception of the Şehnâme-i Selîm Hân.

The process involved in getting the manuscript approved is also recounted in terms that demonstrate the court’s constitution. Upon examining the painting, the sultan determined that the rest of the account should be written, and a section of the introduction along with some of the poetry was then presented to him.39 Lokman mentions that since some in the sultan’s
entourage did not like this excerpt, the sultan wanted “the lofty ones who scrutinize things” (mumayyizan-i sâmi) to examine it. The companions of the sultan who read and approved the “introduction and some of the text” were the sultan’s tutor Hoca Ataullah Efendi, the şeyhülislam Ebussuud Efendi, and Mevlana Ebulfazl Mehmed, the son of the renowned historian Idris-i Bitlisi (d. 1520). Hoca Ataullah was one of Selim II’s most trusted advisers and a leader of the anti-Sokollu faction in Selim II’s court; Ebussuud Efendi, on the other hand, was an ally of the grand vizier. We will turn to the content of their editorial interventions in the next section, but suffice it to say here that the nature of the changes they made suggests that their respective political allegiances came into play.

Their eventual approval of the work was communicated to the grand vizier, and Lokman was summoned to court for a second time. This time, the artist Osman and the scribe Sinan, whose work had been examined earlier, were also present, and were assigned the task of copying and illustrating the book. By Sokollu’s order, a “clean” copy of the approved part of the text was produced, and presented to the sultan. Lokman then moves into a description of how he was first appointed to the task of composing a royal history, namely, the Zafernâme, thus coming full circle to the beginning of the story of how the Şehnâme-i Selim Han was produced, since it was while seeking opinions on his Zafernâme that he had been sent to the scholar Şemseddin Ahmed Karabaği in the first place.

The third illustration of the finished manuscript (fig. 3) relates to the commissioning of the Zafernâme, and depicts Lokman and Sokollu Mehmed Pasha in the sultan’s audience. However, the grand vizier is not explicitly mentioned in the text immediately surrounding the image. Instead, Lokman writes in the passive voice: “My situation was presented to the Sultan.” Indeed, the text does not even describe an audience such as the one illustrated here. Hence, the painting visually clarifies what the text omits: that it was the grand vizier who made it possible for Lokman to get his first imperial commission. Sokollu’s role as intermediary is underscored by his position: slightly in front of Lokman, and closer to the sultan.

The introduction thus highlights a point of utmost importance, namely, that the creators of the manuscript were fully aware of and interested in maintaining a close relationship between text and image in such a way as to enhance the multivalency of both media. This conclusion is further strengthened as other examples of deliberate image-text dialogue are revealed through an examination of the multiple drafts. The complexity and variety of these verbal-visual connections challenge conventional understandings of the image-text relationship in Ottoman manuscripts, as it becomes clear that the illustrations are not merely visual restatements of the narrative, but rather add new layers of meaning, enhancing and/or inflecting the textual contents of the book.

The making of the manuscript and its meanings are nowhere more closely linked than in these introductory pages describing how the Şehnâme-i Selim Han was produced. The environment in which Ottoman historical manuscripts were created was here closely aligned with the content of the histories themselves. There was a community of scholars close to the court who were the intellectual supervisors of the project, and since they were older and more experienced, they guided Lokman in his work. In fact, the şehnâmeci was under constant supervision, perhaps because he was at an early stage of his career. After all, prior to this project he had only produced the Zafernâme, and that was admittedly a verification of a pre-approved text, the Nüzhetül-Ahbâr der Sefer-i Sîgetvâr (Joyful Chronicle of the Szigetvár Campaign), composed by his supporter Feridun Ahmed Beg for their common patron, Sokollu Mehmed Pasha. By contrast, those who supervised Lokman (namely, Karabaği, Ebussuud, Ataullah, and Ebulfazl) were among the most esteemed minds of the Ottoman court and intelligentsia. Lokman’s recounting of the involvement and approval of these powerful intellectual and political figures can almost be interpreted as boasting of being in their company.

The introduction makes it abundantly clear that Sokollu Mehmed Pasha was the intermediary between the sultan and this intellectual community. The grand vizier is portrayed as the linchpin in the equation: he supervised not only the writing but also the embellishment of the work, and was of course instrumental in attaining Selim II’s approval of the project. Additionally, he was the patron of the scholar who instigated the project. It is clear from the numerous approvals
The production of the Şehnâme-i Selîm Hân was not an automatic one. Indeed, it appears to have been closely dependent on the personal involvement of Sokollu Mehmed Pasha. Thus, the survival of the two drafts might be a direct result of the control mechanisms the grand vizier had established.

**BRITISH LIBRARY MS. OR. 7043: EVIDENCE FOR A SHIFT IN EMPHASIS**

The British Library draft consists of thirty-one folios (as opposed to the 158 and 131 of the others), and is illustrated with nine paintings. The book contains the introduction and the first few pages of the main narrative in verse. The partial manuscript is much larger in size than the other two copies, which was probably useful for seeing the details of the paintings and the calligraphy, and provided ample space for editorial markings. A comparison of the verbal and visual contents of this draft with the two later versions (i.e., the Topkapı draft and the final manuscript) reveals that a significant shift in emphasis occurred during the editing process. This raises two possibilities: either the British Library manuscript was intended as a draft, or it was begun as the final copy, but was abandoned once its contents were deemed unsuitable.

In either case, the most important fact is that the British Library manuscript provides solid evidence that at a certain point the collaborators in this project decided to take the Şehnâme-i Selîm Hân in a different direction. Probably as a result of this shift, it was treated as a working draft. Lines of text are crossed out and replaced by others, there are empty but ruled pages at the end, and large portions of text are cancelled by vertical lines drawn over them. The nine paintings demonstrate not only the style and skill of the artists but also the types of relationships between text and image that would be established in the final copy.

The introduction in its entire and final format is not present in this draft. The last section of the prefatory text in the final version, where Lokman relates his dream and the şeyhülislam’s interpretation, and the mystically oriented excursus on composing poetry, are not found here. There are also discrepancies in the sections of the text that are present in both; these reveal exactly where the British Library draft fits into the production process. Of particular interest is the middle section of the story of the making of the Şehnâme-i Selîm Hân. The earlier stages—through the discussion of the painter Osman and the scribe Sinan’s submission of examples of their work—are described with the same words in all three copies. However, the British Library manuscript is missing some crucial lines before the first painting on folio 7b (fig. 42). The sending of an excerpt to the sultan, the mixed reviews it received, and its eventual submission to the scrutiny of grand scholars are not described here. Instead, this version of the account simply states that as soon as the scribe and the painter were approved, they exited the grand vizier’s audience and started recopying. In the meantime, they benefited greatly from Sokollu Mehmed Pasha’s generosity. The British Library draft and the final manuscript converge again with the remark that after some sections were made into a clean copy according to the grand vizier’s instructions, they were presented to the sultan. The story of the making of the Şehnâme-i Selîm Hân ends at this point in the British Library draft.

The omission of both the mixed reviews given the excerpt and the subsequent consultation with the sultan’s companions suggests that the British Library manuscript might have been the very excerpt submitted to the sultan’s advisers. “The introduction and some of the poetry” are precisely what Lokman presented to Selim II after the painter Osman and the scribe Sinan were appointed to the project. Could it be that he was referring to British Library (hereafter BL) Or. 7043? The details of its contents, the markings on the text, and the discrepancies between this draft and the other two would certainly direct us toward such a conclusion. The statement following this—that a clean copy was made of some sections upon the grand vizier’s orders—is the same in both drafts, and is non-specific enough to refer to either draft. The author did not deem it necessary to modify these lines in the final version, but instead inserted the description of the mixed reviews and the consultation of the scholars in such a way as not to disrupt the flow of his text. Of the three manuscripts considered here, in other words, the British Library one
came first—even though it is illustrated and Topkapı Palace Museum Library (TSK) R. 1537 is not. Consequently, the changes introduced into the Topkapı draft can be understood as being the result of the mixed reviews given the British Library draft.

What were the changes deemed necessary? The first alteration was in the illustration depicting how the manuscript came to be produced, the first painting in the British Library manuscript (fig. 42). The lower half of this two-part image appears to be the first incarnation of the gathering of the author Lokman, the scholar Karabagi, and the artists and scribe of the manuscript, the final version of which I discussed above (fig. 1). The upper part of the page depicts Selim II after he has shot the target hanging from the dome of the Imperial Council Chamber, a scene that also appears in the final manuscript (fig. 2). For the final copy, the makers of the manuscript separated the two halves of the painting so that the image of the scholarly gathering would come first. While the British Library image is a fascinating example of an image within an image, emphasizing the artists’ creativity, the final manuscript privileges Karabagi’s central role in the production process by isolating his audience scene and including it as the first painting in the manuscript.

What remained constant between the British Library draft and the final manuscript was the allegorical nature of the image of Selim II in the Tower of Justice. The associated section of the text was already present with the same words in the British Library manuscript. In BL Or. 7043, however, the pyramidal scheme of the Ottoman polity expands to include the lowest register of the painting. Those above both supervise—the sultan overseeing his viziers, the grand vizier the production of the manuscript—and are represented by—whether literally or figuratively— the scribes, scholars, and artists below them. Understood in this way, the British Library painting explains why the Şehnâme-i Selim Han was commissioned in the first place. An appropriately rendered history helps to shape the image of its protagonists in very particular ways, potentially supporting the careers of the Şehnâmeci’s patrons.

The two scenes are not merely separated in the final Topkapi manuscript, however—they are also changed in other ways. The scholarly gathering in the Topkapi manuscript (fig. 1) is the mirror image of the original composition, with the figures on the left now on the right and vice versa. Furthermore, the background becomes more streamlined between the first and the second versions: the tree to the right of the Bursa arch in the British Library image (fig. 42) disappears, implying that the scene is now indoors; the cushion behind the central figure and the textile he is sitting on have been discarded; and the background no longer has a
brick dado. The seated figures have been moved into a tighter triangular formation with the scholar at the center, as a result of which the stack of books on the right side of the first image has been placed rather awkwardly between the heads of the two figures seated on the left side of the illustration in the Topkapı scene. These two men are clearly more senior, a status evident from their placement in the image and their larger turbans; the faces have also become more elongated. In addition, the clothing worn by the two attendants bringing the books has been simplified in the second painting, their animal print and fur-trimmed caps replaced with plain white turbans and the gold frogging on their outfits removed.

The image of Selim II overseeing the Imperial Council has also been altered in a similar fashion. Here, too, the later image contains less detail than the earlier one, even though it has been enlarged to fill the entire page. The column on the right supporting the arch of the Council ceiling, for example, is no longer there, and the arch of the dome no longer extends to the edge, appearing to float in the air. The sparser image may have been deemed more appropriate as an embodiment of the abstract idea of just rule, and it also presents the Imperial Council as a unified body as opposed to distinct individuals. The spatial relationship between the Council Chamber and the sultan’s viewing room has been significantly altered as well. By moving the roof line above the sultan and the council in the first image to the center of the second one in such a way that it separates the sultan from his Council, the distance between the ruler and his subjects is exaggerated.

Why were these changes made? What was gained by them? One answer is suggested by the British Library image’s location in the text. We know from the surrounding text that the majlis image in the Topkapı manuscript depicts Lokman’s audience with the scholar Şemseddin Ahmed Karabaği. The British Library painting, however, is inserted after Lokman’s description of how the grand vizier, upon examining his verse, summoned the painter Osman and the scribe Sinan. The inscription on the paper scroll in front of the seated scribe at the far left also links the painting with its surrounding text. The verse inscribed there translates: “The arrow from his bow pierced his enemy like his rule on the face of the earth.”55 This is the exact same line that Lokman reports as having been penned by the scribe Sinan to demonstrate his calligraphic skills. It refers, undoubtedly, to Selim II’s shooting his arrow from the Tower of Justice, and incorporates the symbolic aspect of the sultan’s arrow as his rule (hukm) penetrating the openwork globe, which stands for the world (rū-ye zamīn) under his dominion. The arrow, then, as the vehicle of the sultan’s rule, can be understood as an imperial decree that delivers justice. Furthermore, the piece of paper held by the man seated next to Sinan contains the sketch of a vertical pavilion with a conical roof. This is probably a summary sketch of the Tower of Justice (depicted in the image in the upper register of Selim shooting his arrow), referring to the scene painted by the artist Osman upon the grand vizier’s request.

In other words, its relationship with the text around it suggests that this painting represents not the audience of the esteemed scholar Şemseddin Ahmed Karabaği with Lokman, but that of Sokollu Mehmed Pasha with Lokman, accompanied by the artists and scribe whom the grand vizier invited to work on the project. The framing text allows us to comprehend the nature of the relationship between the two images positioned one atop the other. We know from Lokman’s account that the image of the sultan with his arrow planted in the hanging target was the only sample painting submitted by the artist Osman. The image above is the larger and more detailed version alluded to by the sketch in the hands of the artist in the lower register.

If this was indeed the case, we can interpret the visual changes found in the final manuscript as an attempt to adapt the preexisting composition depicting a scene from either the grand vizier’s palace or the scribes’ chamber just outside of the Imperial Council Hall, to the place where Karabaği taught—either his madrasa or house. What challenges such a reading of the British Library image, however, is that the elongated face and larger turban are what mainly distinguish the two central figures, a difference not large enough to correspond to the vast disparities between the social status of a scholar and that of the powerful grand vizier. Indeed, the portrait of the grand vizier in the upper part of the British Library image depicts him with clothing and headgear more luxurious than that worn by the central figure in the lower register, suggesting that the latter
individual was not Sokollu, but Karabaği. The humble way in which the central figure sits on the ground along with the scribes also makes it rather difficult for him to be the grand vizier.

In this instance, the relationship between the text and the image leads to one kind of interpretation, but the visual specifics of the painting itself suggest another explanation. This potential for rather divergent readings can be regarded as a manifestation of the multivalency of the manuscript. Alternatively, a more mischievous reader might view this as an inconsistency or unresolved point brought about by the ten-year-long production process, or by the involvement of multiple individuals in the project. While such an imperfection might not have been deliberate, the changes outlined above do also point to the conscious development of a recognizable visual idiom for the work produced by the office of the court historian. This represents a significant development for the history of the arts of the Ottoman court. The detailed and embellished visuals of the British Library manuscript do not accord with the official style of the final version, which is more in keeping with other Ottoman şehnâmes, privileging compositional order and legibility over detail and complexity. The second version of the painting is a simpler and clearer representation of the hierarchies of the Ottoman court, and presents its members as a collective whole rather than as distinct individuals. Though the grand vizier is identifiable in both paintings, his depiction is less divergent from that of his colleagues in the final image.

A closely related editorial decision was to change the beginning of the main narrative. In the British Library draft, the account of Selim’s reign begins with the Szigetvár campaign preceding his accession. This was clearly found to be inappropriate: the whole page following the “Beginning of the Story” (āghāz-i dāstān) section has vertical lines going over each column, indicating that the text should be deleted. It was obviously determined at some point in the production process that Şehnâme-i Selîm Han should begin not with the start of the campaign but with the accession of Selim II, which took place at its conclusion.

The Szigetvár expedition was one of the highlights of Sokollu Mehmed Pasha’s career. The conquest of the fortress of Szigetvár under his guidance, and his subsequent success in hiding Sultan Süleyman’s death from the army until Selim II was on his way to the front, were significant achievements. Additionally, Sokollu’s precautions guaranteed the smooth transition of rule from father to son. The removal of the account of the campaign indicates that those who gave the manuscript mixed reviews wanted to tone down the positive image of the grand vizier in the work. The presence of the sultan’s tutor among those who examined the British Library excerpt renders this scenario highly likely, since we know from historical accounts that Selim’s princely entourage resented the grand vizier’s power and influence. Their disapproval of a work that exalts him at the expense of the sultan would not be surprising. Thus, the trio of the royal tutor, the şeyhülislam, and the historian Ebulfazl Efendi must have suggested some compromises (such as changing where the story would begin) to make the manuscript more acceptable to a wider group of courtiers, including those on the grand vizier’s side. The recommended changes also had practical implications. The Szigetvár campaign had already been recorded in detail—in prose, verse, and image—by the Nüzhetül-Ahbâr der Sefer-i Sîgetvâr and the Zafername. It did not need to be repeated. Moreover, the highly detailed discussion of Sokollu’s contributions in the preface already included the Szigetvár campaign.

The decision to remove the Szigetvár account explains the different portraits of the sultan in the London and Istanbul manuscripts. While in the British Library copy Selim is depicted enthroned in the Topkapı Palace in Istanbul (fig. 43), in the final version his enthronement in Belgrade was chosen (fig. 5). This was because the final manuscript only includes the story of Selim II’s accession in Belgrade rather than a narrative of the entire Szigetvár campaign. Just as with the additions Lokman made to his account of how the Şehname-i Selim Han was created, the discussion of Selim’s accession to the throne was inserted into the existing text, and the ensuing sections were left the same.

The inclusion of the sultan’s meeting with the army in Belgrade highlights the delicacy of the power struggles at court, and can be understood as an attempt to gloss over tensions. As I have already explained, Selim’s decision to accede to the throne in Istanbul prior to meeting with the army was an assertion of his independence and power, a mini-revolt on the part of the new sultan against the status quo, which favored the grand
much more powerful statement of the sultan’s acceptance by his subjects.

The pages lauding Selim II’s viziers have also been altered for the final manuscript, with the addition of individual section titles giving the name of each vizier. The encomium of Sokollu is given its own title in both cases, but the British Library version contains only one group title for the discussion of the other viziers: “Mention of the Laudable Qualities of the Great Viziers.” Those who oversaw the manuscript evidently decided that more emphasis needed to be placed on Sokollu’s junior colleagues by stating their names in individual headings. This change also allowed a slightly different picture of the social and political hierarchies in court to be inscribed into the manuscript—one that partially levels the differences between the grand vizier and the other members of the Imperial Council.

In comparing the British Library draft with the finished version (TSK A. 3595), we find that a significant shift in emphasis resulted from the mixed reviews that the draft had received. Once this draft was viewed, then, and the sultan’s entourage had weighed in on what changes needed to be made, Lokman and his colleagues went back to work. The paintings were modified to present the members of the Ottoman court as a collective whole, unified and orderly; the discussion of the Szigetvár campaign was edited out, and greater emphasis was placed on other members of the Imperial Council. The focus was moved away from Sokollu Mehmed Pasha as the sultan’s deputy. The next surviving piece of the production puzzle—the non-illustrated draft currently in the Topkapı Library—is instructive as to what the new focus would be.

TSK MS. R. 1537: PAGE LAYOUT AND FINAL EDIT

The Topkapı draft (TSK R. 1537) is the last surviving step in the production process before the final manuscript. At 131 folios, measuring 33.3 by 22.5 centimeters, it contains the full text of the Şehnâme-i Selîm Hân. This draft is nearly the same size as the final copy, the fewer number of pages reflecting the greater amount of text contained on each one (seventeen lines as opposed to fifteen in the final manuscript), the lack of images, and
the addition of text in its margins. Just like the British Library draft, this was also a working copy, as can be gathered by the numerous corrections and edits inserted into its margins. The annotations are not only textual changes: the margins are peppered with instructions and shorthand notations relating to spacing of text on a page and the location and size of paintings. This draft was an internal document, used in the workshop to make corrections and plan for the next version. TSK R. 1537 thus provides us with invaluable information about the mechanics of manuscript production. After first interpreting the annotations that determined the appearance of the final copy, I will then turn to those that shaped its contents. Since it is impossible to give an account of all the markings on the 131 folios in a study of this scope, I will present selected examples to give a sense of how this draft was used.

The most basic function of the Topkapı draft was to determine the pagination and organization of lines in the final copy. Many of the page breaks are indicated by the words salahfe (page) or varak (sheet), written in the margins in red ink. These notations do not correspond to page breaks in the draft, but rather to the pagination of the final manuscript. At times, the number of lines to be included on a given page is also marked in the margin—fifteen for most, and nine or seven for those pages with illuminations. Though illuminated text pages were usually indicated with a simple dot placed in the margin next to the beginning and end of the section to be illuminated, additional markers consisting of a horizontal line and three dots in triangle formation above or under it were also used in a few places.62 These markings indicate that TSK R. 1537 was used to plan the rhythm and spacing of the final copy.

The creative ways in which the extensive marginal additions were incorporated into the final manuscript highlight how important regulating the rhythm of the manuscript was for its creators. One means of absorbing extra material was to create illuminated pages, which, as noted, all comprise seven or nine lines, fewer than the usual fifteen lines of verse found on the regular text pages of the final manuscript. Certainly some of this illumination was intended to draw attention to the content and prompt the reader to dwell on it—hence, the fewer lines per page. All of the illuminated pages come right before (and in one case after) a painting—itself already a marker of the importance of the relevant topic.63 Some of these images depict singular subjects, of greater symbolic significance than others, and would have therefore been chosen for lavish attention. Selim II receiving news of his father’s death and the presentation of gifts from the Safavid shah are cases in point (figs. 4 and 16). Other instances, however, suggest that the illuminated pages were a way to incorporate extra text without changing the order of the rest of the book. The beginning sections of the text, it must be remembered, were modified significantly between the British Library draft and the Topkapi manuscripts. The large portions of new text would have complicated the layout process, a complication eased somewhat by the presence of illuminated pages. Surely the two paintings relating to the Cyprus and Tunisia campaigns, which are both preceded by illuminated pages in the final version, were singled out in this way because they contain significant portions of text that had been added in the margins of TSK R. 1537 (figs. 32 and 38). The planners of the manuscript found a way to absorb those additions by altering layout schemes to insert extra folios in between. Otherwise, their subject matter is no more or less significant than other illustrations depicting other events from the same campaigns. The presence of illuminated pages on which lines of poetry are diagonally arranged demonstrates how intentional and well orchestrated the layout of the manuscript was. The planners were clearly willing to go to great lengths to retain the visual organization of the manuscript.

Some of the textual additions were made expressly for aesthetic purposes, e.g., to line up titles with the text of the sections they contain, or to place the title at a certain point on the page. An example is TSK R. 1537, fol. 50a, where there is a note saying that the two couplets before the title should be on the same line (ikisi bir sațür)—and this is how it appears on fol. 60b of the final manuscript. The additions on folios 67a, 67b, and 70a from TSK R. 1537 all include one or two verses that do not change the meaning of what is described in the preexisting text, but simply elaborate on similar themes; one or two couplets are thus added for the sake of visual order. The insertions on folio 70a (fig. 44), for example, elaborate further on how easy it had been to capture
Fig. 44. Şehnâme-i Selîm Hân, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, R. 1537, fols. 69b–70a. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)

Fig. 45. Şehnâme-i Selîm Hân, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, R. 1537, fols. 35b–36a. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)
the castle whose siege had already been detailed in the text.

Unfortunately, the draft does not provide direct instructions to the painters about the content or appearance of the illustrations. What it does specify is where the paintings should be located and the number of lines to be included on the same page. These two factors, of course, indirectly determined the size and subject matter of the illustrations. All of the images in the main narrative—those that come after the portraits of the individual viziers—are indicated on TSK R. 1537 with the words “location of painting” (mahall-i taşvîr). With five phrases inserted into its margin, folio 36a (fig. 45) provides an apt example. The top one, in red ink, is a correction to the section heading, and I will turn to it below. The other notations relate to the spacing of the image. The second one from the top, linked to the text by a straight line, reads “location of painting”; the third phrase qualifies it by saying “after six lines” (altı saatîrdan soña). Turning to the final copy, we see that indeed there are six lines before the painting on the corresponding page (fig. 12, fol. 41b), and that the image comes immediately after the indicated hemistich, written on the same line as the title for the next section. The fourth phrase, “page complete,” is indicated by the word sahife and the letter mim, shorthand for tamam, meaning “complete.” The scribe would thus know to continue copying the text onto the next folio. As a reminder, the last annotation further clarifies where the next line of poetry should go: “on the facing page” (karsu sahife). And indeed, the finished right-hand page consists only of the six lines and the painting, which comes directly after the title. The first line of text, describing the waters of the enemy terrain, is found above the other half of the picture on the facing page.

An even more intricate example can be found on folios 44b–45a of the draft (fig. 46), corresponding to folios 51a–54a (figs. 47, 48, and 16) in the finished product. The title of the section is “On the Presentation of Gifts by the Persian Envoy during the Kissing-of-the-Feet of the Sultan.” Folios 53b–54a of the final version contain the well-known depiction of the Safavid envoy.
Fig. 47. Şehnâme-i Selîm Hân, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fols. 51b–52a. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)

Fig. 48. Şehnâme-i Selîm Hân, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fols. 52b–53a. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)
These changes in the pages leading up to the illustration meant that the image had to be moved as well. The repetition of the phrase “location of painting” in red ink on the draft is a result of this alteration. The painting was moved two lines down so that it could be spread over two facing pages and incorporate a certain amount of text. The lengthy inscription in the left margin of fol. 45a of the draft further clarifies the desired changes: “The two distiches indicated by three dots should be written at the beginning of [each of] the two pages, then [comes] the location of the painting.” The second inscription reads: “And this line should be written on two pages so that there are three distiches on [each of the] two pages.” The final result, however, does not take into account this last instruction, as there are only two distiches per page, not three.

The most important result of this change in pagination has to do with the text-image pairing. Instead of coming after lines describing the Safavid envoy, the painting now follows lines relating to the actual presentation, detailing the gifts “of all kinds of beautiful decorated things: an illuminated Qur’an with a grand decorated binding, great books, and shāhnāma.” It is tempting to conclude that this was a deliberate effort to associate the most appropriate lines of poetry with the image, especially because the verse on the same page as the painting is actually describing the scene before our eyes.

The effort to line up specific verses with their relevant image was a concern throughout the planning process. The depiction of Sokollu Mehmed Pasha’s audience, illustrated in both the British Library draft and the final copy in the Topkapı (figs. 49 and 6), is a case in point. The text praising Sokollu is the same in all three drafts, but there are two lines (four distiches) that have been moved to correspond to the painting depicting his court. The content of these verses is as follows:

You are the just grand vizier,
Vizier to Selim of Süleymanic stature.
I am your slave Lokman, in your hands of generosity;
I am the eulogizer of the shāhs with the writing of shāhnāmas.
Into your council of justice
Women and men and children of Muslims and others came,
Mehemmed of name and that is a good name,
Faith and the world find their wishes through you.

Fig. 49. Audience of Sokollu Mehmed Pasha. Şehnâme-i Selim Han, Istanbul, ca. 1571. British Library Board. All rights reserved. Ms. Or. 7043, fol. 15a. (Photo: courtesy of the British Library)
Accordingly, the depiction of Sokollu’s court includes women, men, and children in both versions! In fact, the British Library image incorporates these lines into the painting. The scenes depicting the courts of the other viziers include only generic images of men with petitions, standing around, waiting, and conversing. Clearly, the specific image of Sokollu’s court was inspired by these few lines, and a concerted effort was made to keep the lines most pertinent to the image as physically close to it as possible in both of the illustrated drafts.

These two examples amply demonstrate that the pairing of text and image was very deliberate in the Şehnâme-i Selîm Hân. There are various instances throughout the editorial process in which the effort to insure the proximity of an image to the desired lines can be discerned. In the case of the Safavid envoy presenting gifts to Selim II, the order was determined in the margins of the non-illustrated draft. The image of the audience of the grand vizier, however, had already been worked out in the British Library draft. The non-illustrated Topkapı draft has no special markings in the place of this painting; indeed, it is not even indicated. Yet the wording reflects the final order, in which the two lines cited above appear in the same sequence as in the final, illustrated copy. The format already worked out, image follows word in the final instance.

There was no one uniform way in which the final details of the Şehnâme were determined. The Topkapı draft is not perfectly consistent in the way it was edited, or at least in the way the edits were marked. There are places where page breaks and the locations of paintings as they are found in the final copy are not indicated and others where they are. Inconsistencies resulted from the fact that a team of artists collaborated on the project, and because their working methods involved both written and verbal communication. They simultaneously consulted the two drafts as they prepared the final copy. The work on the final manuscript probably proceeded quire by quire, which also explains some of the inconsistencies—different quires might have been prepared in different settings.

It was difficult to determine how many folios made up a quire. Folios 94b, 96a, 104b, and 124b of the Topkapı draft have notations using the term çüz (volume or quire) in them. The most explicit one, on folio 96a, reads: “Beginning of volume [or quire]. Musa still has not submitted the ruling for the second volume; it should be requested.” The next notation is on folio 104b, marking the end of a çüz. These notes do not refer to the draft, however, as they do not all appear at the ends of folios. A comparison with the final copy (TSK A. 3595) clarifies the situation. When we line up the texts of the two manuscripts, the beginning of the quire corresponds to folio 115a in the final manuscript and the end to the last line of folio 124b. In other words, there were ten folios to each quire in the final manuscript, and the progress of the work on the quires of the final manuscript was noted in the draft.

Another inscription pertaining to the copying process is on folio 66a of the Topkapı draft (fig. 50), corresponding to the last few lines of folio 78b of the final manuscript. In fact, there are a few related notations on this page. The first one reads “delivery of paper” and gives the name Hüsrev. The double lines drawn on either side of the text block underneath the annotated verses mark off the section that was delivered to, or by, a certain Hüsrev. The transcription was to then continue with the lines indicated by the circled note “beginning of the writing” (ibtidâ-i kitâbet), found just below. In addition to the title, the word kitâbet, which I have translated here as “writing,” could also refer to illuminated text on the same page as a painting. In the other margin, the location and size of the next illustration are indicated with the words “location of painting, one page.”

Most of the titles in the draft are accompanied by a repeating word indicating that they are to be illuminated. I have not been able to make out the word exactly; it is possible that it reads cüst, meaning “beautiful” or “elegant,” or çasb, meaning “to glue,” which might refer to the way in which gold leaf was applied to the page. The annotation appears twice on folio 36a (fig. 45), just below each title. The same word is found on folio 102a, referring to the text that is to be illuminated (fig. 51). There the instruction reads: “This page shall be written as seven illuminated lines.” Indeed, the lines of that page are illuminated in the final copy, as, of course, are all the titles in the manuscript. Another shorthand notation that occurs in a few places comprises the letters šâd and ḡâ‘ (s and h). This is an abbreviation for either the word taših, which means “to edit” or “emend,” or the
Fig. 50. Şehnâme-i Selim Han, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, R. 1537, fols. 65b–66a. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)

Fig. 51. Şehnâme-i Selim Han, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, R. 1537, fols. 101b–102a. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)
word ṣaḥḥ (“correct”), also used as an editorial mark. In other words, the sections that had been edited were marked in this way to indicate that it was all right for the scribe to copy them.⁸⁰

From this material, it is possible to reconstruct the various steps in the production process. One of the first questions that comes to mind in such a reconstruction concerns who actually made the red markings. Lokman himself is the most likely candidate. Numerous documents in the Ottoman State archives in Istanbul contain decrees sent to the court historian, as well as requests he sent to the Imperial Council regarding raises or promotions to be given to scribes, illuminators, painters, binders, and others who worked on manuscript projects under him. He appears in these documents as the one responsible for hiring and dismissing those involved in the manuscript project, as well as determining how the income from the dismissed employees should be spent. He was also the one who submitted requests for paper and other supplies. It is clear that the position of court historian was as much an administrative as an intellectual one. Lokman was a project director in the full sense of the word, responsible for finances, human resources, and artistic and intellectual content.⁸¹ Consequently, the notations on the Topkapı draft were most likely his.

The lack of detailed instructions on this draft implies that there was a certain amount of verbal communication between Lokman and the artists working under him. What we see on paper are only the traces of these discussions—reminders of the important points agreed upon in earlier meetings. Such a method of communication is supported by the relationship between the two drafts. The first eleven paintings are not marked on the TSK R. 1537 copy, probably because the previous draft, BL Or. 7043, already contained initial versions of these paintings. In determining where the paintings would go, the two drafts were used in conjunction with each other. Clearly, when the time came to create the final copy, the team of artists had access to the earlier draft and made use of its thirty-one folios. Its larger size would provide the perfect canvas on which to practice laying out compositions and correcting lines.

Who, besides Lokman, was involved in the production process? Archival documents yield the names of three artists (naḵḵāṣ) who worked on the Selim Hân project: Osman, ʿAli, and İbrahim Peykeri. According to Çağman, İbrahim Peykeri worked solely on the illumination and not the illustrations.⁸² Sinan, the first scribe to work on the project, was dismissed on September 1, 1573 (4 Jumada I 981), after which two other scribes—İlyas b. İbrahim, who worked on the final copy (kātīb-i beyāţ), and Haydar b. Süleyman, who penned a draft (kātīb-i müsvedde)—contributed to the project. Musa Ahmed was responsible for ruling the pages (cedvelkeş).⁸³ As also noted by Çağman, the colophon at the end of TSK A. 3595 names İlyas as the scribe, attesting to the scenario whereby Sinan was replaced by İlyas b. İbrahim.

The editorial annotations suggest that the scribe used the non-illustrated Topkapı draft as he transcribed the text. He appears to have made notes on it, such as “page complete,” put small dots next to lines that he wrote diagonally so that they could be illuminated, and made other similar notations. While copying, the scribe would also have had to refer to the markings in the draft indicating where the paintings were to be placed. Thus, I believe that what we have in TSK R. 1537 are partially instructions for the scribe and partially notes made by him to mark his progress as he moved along. The notes relating to other aspects of the production process, such as the ruling of sections or the delivery of paper, were ones that would have directly affected the scribe. I will return to larger conclusions about the production process later, but suffice it to say here that TSK R. 1537 provides ample evidence for a team of artisans—ruler, scribe(s), painter(s)—working under the supervision of a leader—in this case Lokman. This team had easy access to other books, such as the two drafts, which suggests that they were probably working together in the area where the books were located. Continuous interaction between the artisans is also implied by what is missing from the drafts we have examined, i.e., more specific instructions for painters and illuminators. Thus, just as the planning and approval process was a collective one, so, too, was that of the physical production of the book.

I would now like to turn to the textual changes indicated in the Topkapı draft and a consideration of the contents of the Şehnâme-i Selim Hân. Some of the margins are filled with lines to be inserted into the final version, as well as with corrections of the section headings.
Indeed, the most consistent edits in the Topkapı draft relate to the titles of sections, almost all of which were crossed out and changed, the final version usually noted in the margin. Many of these edits do not alter the meaning of the titles at all, but are more flowery renditions conveying the same idea; others use fewer words that would fit into a single line heading. A few examples should suffice. The title edited in the example we looked at earlier (fig. 12) reads “The Commander Raising a Tent Facing the Rivers of ʿAqara [near Basra]” in the final manuscript. However, the original title was “The Arrival of the Commander in the Lands of the Enemy and the Raising of a Tent Facing ʿAqara.” First, the word “commander” was inserted before the word “raising” in this title, at the center of the block of text. That was obviously deemed insufficient, and the new title was written in the margin as “The Commander Raising a Tent Facing ʿAqara.” Yet somehow, in the transfer from the draft to the final copy, the word “rivers” was also inserted in the title, so that the commander’s tent is said to face the “rivers of ʿAqara,” as opposed to just “ʿAqara.” In the final analysis, the title was edited to be more specific and succinct. It was thus short enough to fit into a single line spread across two columns of text. Indeed, all of the titles in the finished manuscript fit into a single line spanning two columns; some are more packed than others, but no title takes up two lines. This was probably one of the criteria the editors used when correcting the longer titles in the draft.

Instances of shortening section titles abound in the Şehnâme-i Selîm Han. In the section describing Iskender Pasha’s suppression of rebels, the original title, “The Accomplished Commander Receives News of the Defeat of the Lowly Enemies,” was replaced with “Informing the Commander of the Defeat of the Seditious Ones.” On the subject of the Cyprus campaign, a title that initially read “The Announcement of the Situation to the Commanders of the Victorious Army on the Cyprus Campaign” became, in the final version, “The Announcement of the Situation to the Group of Victorious Soldiers.”

At other times, a decision was made to highlight a different aspect of the relevant section by altering the title. In the discussion of North African affairs, the heading that originally read “The Elite Officer Learns of the Rebellion of the Ruler of Tunisia and Informs the Sultan’s Court” was replaced with “The Arrival of the Imperial Decree to the Commander of Algeria to Conquer Tunisia.” In other instances, a title that described the sending of a message was replaced with one relating its arrival, or vice versa. There were also instances where a person’s name was replaced with his position, or again, vice versa. Various changes of emphasis were thus achieved by changing the title. Indeed, the exact wording of a title was clearly regarded as very important, as is attested by one that was changed three times on folio 60b in TSK R. 1537 before it found its final shape. There was also one heading that was not originally in the draft, but was added in the margin: “The Sultan Visits Eyub,” which refers to Selim visiting the tomb of Eyub al-Ensari as part of the customary Ottoman accession ceremonies in Istanbul. Though this visit was described in the text, it was not initially highlighted by a title, the insertion of which draws more attention to the event.

The additions of long text sections in the margins of TSK R. 1537 point to even larger shifts in emphasis in the final manuscript. Indeed, the incorporation of these amendments significantly affected the appearance and contents of the final version of the Şehnâme-i Selîm Han. These changes once again intimate that the subject matter of the book was closely correlated with the shifting power dynamics at court: the insertions privilege the courtiers who rose in importance during the final years of the project. A few distinct subjects received extra attention in the final copy—for example, the accession of Selim II, especially his accession ceremonies in Istanbul before he marched further west to meet the Ottoman army on its way back from the Szigetvár campaign. The aforementioned addition of a title to the section describing his visit to the tomb of Eyub al-Ensari (folio 23b) was one aspect of the heightened emphasis placed on the Istanbul accession, and the marginal extension on folio 34a of TSK R. 1537, which was incorporated in TSK A. 3595, folios 38a–b, is another. The marginal text almost doubles the description of the festivities in Istanbul in honor of the sultan’s accession. Additional details relate how the city was decorated “almost as if it were a wedding house,” while its stores were full of artful objects; even the ships in the harbor were decked out, and the Galata quarter was all lit up, as if with silver.
The accession of Selim II was a delicate subject to say the least, as I explained in my discussion of the changes made to the British Library manuscript. Selim’s accession in Istanbul took place against the grand vizier’s advice, but following that of his tutors. His visit to Eyub el-Ensari’s tomb could be interpreted as a revolt against the status quo privileging the grand vizier and the military. Lokman’s description of the festivities in Istanbul and the highlighting of Selim’s visit to Eyub al-Ensari’s tomb were a way to put a positive spin on a tense situation. The description of the urban festivities emphasizes the public’s joy and enthusiasm for their new sultan and the visit to the saint’s tomb establishes Selim’s position as the new ruler of the Ottoman state. The illustration of his accession in Belgrade (fig. 5) as opposed to the accession in Istanbul (fig. 43) takes some of the pressure away, and shows Selim’s viziers, especially his grand vizier Sokollu Mehmed Pasha, by his side, with the army paying homage to their new sultan.

Amendments to the final manuscript also served to showcase the architectural patronage of Selim II, in particular the building of the Büyükçekmece Bridge by Sinan, and the additions made to the Ka’ba (figs. 28, and 52–54), also under the supervision of the chief architect.92 The new sections brought with them illustrations, which, of course, drew even more attention to these subjects. Even though the Ka’ba project was discussed to a certain extent in the original text, large portions of the final text were marginal additions from the Topkapı draft, and the “location of painting” note (on fol. 79b of the draft) is associated with the newer material (fig. 53). Why were Selim’s architectural projects, in particular these two, added so mindfully? Certainly the prestige of architectural patronage was an important factor, but that was already a part of the manuscript, which had initially included the Selimiye Mosque in word and image.

Perhaps the answer lies in what aspects of the Büyükçekmece and Ka’ba projects were emphasized in the Şehnâme. The bridge in Büyükçekmece is described as having been begun during the reign of Süleyman, but completed under Selim, “with the income from Bogdan and Rus.” The usefulness of the bridge and the appearance of its environs are also detailed. The main empha-
Fig. 53. Şehnâme-i Selim Hân, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, R. 1537, fols. 79b–80a. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)

Fig. 54. Şehnâme-i Selim Hân, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fols. 94b–95a. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)
sis is on continuity between the deeds of father and son. The claim to have sponsored the Büyükçekmece Bridge and its environs, along with the acknowledgment that they were begun under Süleyman, allowed the sultan to align himself with his forebears, who had engaged in similar acts of “colonization of space through settlement” and cultivation. Of course, continuing a project begun under Süleyman presented the sultan as the legitimate heir to his father’s traditions.

The renovations at the holy sanctuary of Ka’ba also carried connotations of Süleymanic traditions, as this was another project begun during his reign. For Süleyman, the Ka’ba had been an important aspect of his development of the Hajj route, which in turn enhanced the sultan’s image as universal caliph. Lokman’s words attempt to mold Selim’s image with similar caliphal eminence by emphasizing the long history of the Ka’ba renovations and placing him at the end of that tradition. Beginning with the “situation” of the building from the time of Adam to the Prophet Muhammad, and from then until the present, the author includes Selim in a long line of embellishers of the holy sanctuary. The sections detailing the pre-Süleymanic additions to the structure are from the margins of the draft TSK R. 1537, but the contributions of Sultan Süleyman, the description of Sultan Selim’s generosity to the sanctuary and its environs, the report of the commander (Sinan Pasha) on the progress of the renovations, the appointment of Ahmed Beg, the governor of Jidda, to oversee the renovations, and the enlargement of the foundations are part of the original text of the draft.

The marginal notes on folio 79b of the draft also include the intended location of a painting illustrating the beginning of the new construction project. The image (fol. 95b, fig. 28) depicts the progress of the renovations. In the bottom margin are the bodies of three animals sacrificed during the ground-laying ceremony. The lower part of the painting details the workers, while at the center is the black cube of the Ka’ba, placed within the keyhole-shaped precinct around it. The qadi and sharif of Mecca are pictured praying in the upper right, the building supervisor, Ahmed Beg, and the architect are shown on the left side of the image, deep in conversation. These verses incorporated into the painting proclaim that the qadi and sharif of Mecca worked in unison on this project. The full cooperation of the local authorities and the industrious activities of the workers bolster the image of the all-encompassing power of the universal caliph, and possibly also attest to the legitimacy of the entire enterprise, as implied in the absence of resentment and tension at the local level. Text and image seem to convey that here in the provinces, so far away from the capital and the palace, pious activities in the name of the sultan are proceeding with utmost efficiency and harmony, with the full support of local subjects and religious functionaries. With its message of an efficient and just administration, the painting also contributes to the mapping of the Ottoman social hierarchy onto the manuscript.

The nature of the marginal additions reveals that the intention to link the legacies of Süleyman and his son Selim had been there from the inception of the Şehnâme, while the decision to emphasize pre-Ottoman developments came later. The inserted text allowed Lokman to extend the tradition beyond the father-son duo, perhaps with an eye towards the next generation, under whom he finished the project. The marginal additions following the painting certainly suggest as much. These words, into whose midst the painting was inserted, praise the Ottomans and their acts of generosity, and describe the domed arcade surrounding the sanctuary, as well as the repairs to the harbor of Alexandria and Selim II’s charitable deeds in the Yemen. Lokman states that the domes were completed during the reign of Selim’s son Murad, under the guidance of a wise vizier, most certainly Sinan Pasha, who oversaw the repairs of the Alexandria harbor. These marginal additions must have been made after 1576–77, the date of completion of the domes. The Şehnâme was thus updated during the long years of its production to incorporate some recent developments, and to burnish the image of the current sultan as much as those of his ancestors.

The Ka’ba renovations served other purposes besides enhancing the pious images of the Ottoman sultans and linking them to Islamic traditions. In addition to being related to the Cyprus campaign, one of whose justifications had been to secure the pilgrimage routes, the nature of the renovations was determined by other contemporary events, such as the building of boats for the navy in the aftermath of the Ottoman disaster at Lepanto. Stone had to be used for the renovations, since wood was needed to build ships after the defeat at Lepanto. The successive overseers of the Ka’ba project were the governors of Egypt, all of whom subsequently
served in important positions in the Imperial Council, and were among the significant power wielders of the period. Among those involved were the three important members of Selim II and Murad III’s courts, Koca Sinan Pasha, Lala Mustafa Pasha, and Piyale Pasha. Thus, the heightened emphasis on the Ka’ba renovations, attained through the insertion of extra text and a painting, was related to the careers of all of these men. However, a particular effort seems to have been made to highlight the contributions of Sinan Pasha, whose name was specifically mentioned in connection with his oversight of the Ka’ba renovations and of the repairs to the harbor in Alexandria.

Another topic that received increased coverage in accordance with the marginal additions found in the Topkapı draft was the Cyprus campaign of 1571. The early stages of the operation, such as the arrival of the navy on the island and its organization and camp setup, were followed by elaborations on various aspects of the expedition, filling the margins of numerous folios of the draft (fols. 57b, 70a, 72a, 84b, 91a, 101b, and 104b). Most of the additions augment the textual account of the campaign, but those on folio 104b are geared towards the visual (fig. 55). The additions here appear to have been made so that the page with the relevant image could contain a line describing how the Venetian commander’s skin was severed from his body. That is precisely what we see in the illustration (fig. 33, TSK A. 3595, fol. 125b). The commander’s skin, intact and retaining its shape, hangs on a pole, while the remainder of his body lies on the ground—a very direct and literal image-text relationship was thus established. Other than this gruesome detail, the additions made were geared towards providing further information about one of the few campaigns of Selim II’s reign, led by his tutor and vizier Lala Mustafa Pasha.

Other added sections found in the Topkapı draft relate to the Tunisian campaign undertaken by Sinan Pasha (TSK R. 1537, fol. 54b); Piyale Pasha’s exploits with the navy along the Venetian-controlled coasts of the Adriatic Sea (fol. 82b); Behram Pasha’s exploits in the Yemen (fol. 90a); and Ahmed Pasha’s Ethiopian battles (fol. 115b, which adds extensive material, and allows

Fig. 55. Şehnâme-i Selim Han, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, R. 1537, fols. 104b–105a. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)
The production of the Şehnâme-i Selîm Hân. These were all significant military successes of Selim II’s reign. The capture of various castles in Tunisia, the victory over the Venetians for Cyprus, and the suppression of rebels in the Yemen, which led to the Ethiopian and Indian Ocean campaigns, were amply illustrated in the manuscript, partially as a result of the marginal additions found in the Topkapı draft.

The embellishment of these topics with further detail calls attention to not only the high points of Selim II’s reign, but also those responsible for them. The power and rivalry of the commanders involved in these campaigns—in particular Koca Sinan Pasha and Lala Mustafa Pasha—lasted well into the reign of Murad III, the period of the manuscript’s completion. It seems highly appropriate, therefore, that the roles of these commanders would be elaborately described in the Şehnâme-i Selîm Hân. The detailing of gifts brought by Sinan Pasha and others after the conquest of Cyprus (which had been achieved under the command of Lala Mustafa Pasha) is another case in point. This description was also expanded later, to almost twice its original length.100 The importance of the sultan’s deputies certainly appears as a major theme in this manuscript, beginning with the first illustration of the arrow piercing the target under the dome of the Imperial Council, and continuing with individual portraits of all of the viziers in both the Topkapı and the British Library illustrated copies.

ŞEHNÂME-I SELÎM Hân: THE FINAL ANALYSIS

The Şehnâme-i Selîm Hân was completed on January 12, 1581 (9 Dhu’l-Hijjah 988). By that time, Sokollu Mehmed Pasha had been dead for over a year (October 1579), and Sinan Pasha was grand vizier. The constitution of power at the Ottoman court had changed significantly during the decade in which the book was produced and the Imperial Council was no longer the main force in the palace. The sultan himself was the target of constant criticism—for not going on campaign with the army, for allowing his unofficial companions to wield power, and for generally straying from the militarily-oriented legacy of his grandfather, Suleyman. Many of Sokollu’s supporters had been ousted from the ranks of the bureaucracy during the earlier years of Murad’s reign. However, by 1581 the new circle of influence around Murad must have ceased to feel threatened by Sokollu’s legacy, as some of his allies were eventually allowed to return to the court. For example, Feridun Ahmed Beg, who had been dismissed from the position of chief of the chancery in 1575–76 (983), was reinstated in February 1581—mere weeks after the completion of the Şehnâme-i Selîm Hân. Did the improved fortunes of Feridun Ahmed Beg play any role in the push to complete this project, which had been dragging on for ten years? Lokman’s repeated eulogies to him, incorporated into the multiple descriptions of his own appointment as court historian, would certainly seem to indicate a correlation.

When considered in the context of the dynamics of the Ottoman court of the 1580s, the choices that were made during the production of the Şehnâme-i Selîm Hân gain in significance. The ways in which the contents of the final manuscript diverged from the British Library draft have been discussed in detail above. The gist of those changes was a de-emphasizing of Sokollu’s centrality in favor of a more equitable distribution of praise among the viziers of the Imperial Council. These changes appear to have affected the beginning sections of the manuscript, which were finished before the remainder of the book. The amendments to the later sections of the text, evident in the extensive additions in the margins of TSK R. 1537, clearly underline the achievements of Sinan Pasha, known as the conqueror of the Yemen and Tunisia, and Lala Mustafa Pasha, the conqueror of Cyprus, who were influential viziers of the Imperial Council. These two men were in rival camps not only to each other but also to Sokollu Mehmed Pasha. It is most probable, especially when the completion of the Ka’ba domes in 1576–77 is taken into account, that these editorial choices were made during the early years of Murad III’s reign, when Sokollu Mehmed Pasha’s power was being seriously contested by those in Murad’s retinue. This contestation was even more acute than the jealousy the grand vizier faced from the companions of Selim II. Lokman may have started the project hoping to aid not only his own fortunes but also those of his patron Sokollu Mehmed Pasha with exuberant praise of the grand vizier, but he was certainly not allowed to complete the project in those terms. He had to cater to the tastes and interests of the new players in the arena of...
power. The political forces of the 1570s are thus explicitly manifest in the contents and appearance of the Şehnâme-i Selim Han.

The quest for a more positive image of the Ottoman sultan was equally a motivation for the commissioning of the Şehnâme-i Selim Han. Some of the changes were aimed at refining the imperial image portrayed in the manuscript. The concept of a sultan acting through deputies was a spin on the negative image of a ruler who had let go of the reins of government in favor of feasting in the palace. That the Şehnâme was intended as a public relations document for both Murad III and the memory of his father is evident from the added emphasis on those projects with links to Süleyman’s legacy. Hence, Selim’s architectural patrimony—parts of which had been inherited by his son—was cast as a continuation of Süleymanic trends. The manuscript as a whole embodied a new imperial image, which extended to include those in the sultan’s retinue. In the end, the Şehnâme-i Selim Han served as a locus where the changes in the nature and constitution of the Ottoman ruling elite were negotiated and recorded.

The long and thorough planning process, evident in the drafts of the Şehnâme-i Selim Han, involved the collaboration of a group of artisans, scholars, and members of the Imperial Council. Through careful manipulations of textual content and layout, shifting emphases via titles, illustrations, and illuminated pages, and very deliberate image-text pairings, the makers of the Şehnâme-i Selim Han created an account of the reign of Selim II that not only presented the sultan in a positive light, but also highlighted the contributions of his deputies. In the end, this group of auteurs—including the grand vizier, the numerous scholars who critiqued the manuscript, the official author Lokman, and the artists, illuminators, and scribes who collaborated on the project—produced a consolidated work of art with multiple targeted messages that not only pleases the eye and attests to the refined and educated tastes of its final patron, Sultan Murad III, but also manages to account for the contributions of many in his entourage—whether in the introductory sections relating to the making of the book, or in the main narrative detailing the events of Selim II’s reign.

That an illustrated history created in a court setting should have political undertones is no surprise. What is extraordinary about the Şehnâme-i Selim Han (and a number of other Ottoman examples) is that it carries multiple, often incompatible messages that bring an unprecedented plurality of meaning and purpose to the manuscript. This multivalency is clearly a product of the collective mode of production so visible in the Şehnâme-i Selim Han. The careful aesthetic choices evident in the drafts examined here resulted in a rich manuscript that continues to unveil its meanings to successive generations of audiences.
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APPENDIX

List of Current and Missing Illustrations of TSK A. 3595

1. fol. 9a: Audience of Şemseddin Ahmed Karabaği with Lokman and the potential artist and scribes for the manuscript
2. missing: Selim II in the Tower of Justice watching the Imperial Council
3. fol. 13a: Audience of Selim II with Grand Vizier Sokollu Mehmed Pasha and Lokman
4. fol. 24b (facing page with half of image missing): Sokollu Mehmed Pasha’s messenger arrives at Prince Selim’s camp
5. fol. 26b (facing page with half of image in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts): Selim II enthroned in Belgrade
6. fol. 27a: Audience of Grand Vizier Sokollu Mehmed Pasha
7. fol. 28a: Audience of Second Vizier Pertev Pasha
8. fol. 29a: Audience of Third Vizier Piyale Pasha
9. fol. 29b: Audience of Fourth Vizier Ahmed Pasha
10. fol. 30a: Audience of Fifth Vizier Zal Mahmud Pasha
11. fol. 30a: Audience of Sixth Vizier Lala Mustafa Pasha
12. fols. 41b–42a: Iskender Pasha’s tent facing the rivers of ‘Aqara (near Basra)
13. fol. 43a (facing page missing with half of image): The battle at ‘Aqara
14. fol. 45b: The execution of the ruler of Ju-yi Tawvil (in the Gulf region)
15. fol. 48b: The story of the crafty jackal entering the Ottoman camp
16. fols. 53b–54a: The presentation of gifts to Selim II by the Safavid envoy
17. fol. 55b: The Selimiye Mosque
18. fol. 56b: The Büyükçekmece Bridge
19. fol. 59b: The display of the hippopotamus head from Egypt
20. missing: illustration relating to Shah Tahmasp’s agent seeking permission to perform the pilgrimage
21. fol. 65a (facing page with half of image missing): The conquest of Tunisia
22. fol. 68a: Shah Tahmasp’s agent Ma’sum killed en route to the Hajj
23. fol. 72b: Özdemiroğlu Osman Pasha’s battle with the enemy at Ta’izz during the Yemeni campaign
24. fol. 75b: Özdemiroğlu Osman Pasha crossing the Shabaka pass
25. fol. 79a: The conquest of Shibam castle in the Yemen
26. missing: illustration relating to the Yemeni campaign
27. fol. 84a (facing page with half of illustration missing): The attack on Kawkaban castle in the Yemen
28. fol. 90a: Behram Pasha’s conquest of Habb castle in the Yemen
29. fol. 91b: The envoy of the Yemeni governor asking the commander for peace
30. fol. 95b: The renovations at the Ka’ba
31. fol. 102b: The Ottoman army lands on Cyprus
32–33. missing: illustrations relating to the Cyprus campaign
34. missing: illustration relating to the battle of Dukagjin during Piyale Pasha’s naval campaign to the Dalmatian coast
35. fol. 117a: The conquest of Dukagjin castle in Dalmatia
36. fol. 119a: The siege of Famagusta castle in Cyprus
37. fol. 122a: Lala Mustafa Pasha’s execution of Venetian commanders
38. fol. 125b: The flaying of the Venetian commander Bragadino
39. fols. 130b–131a: Hüseyin Pasha’s battle at Navarino
40. fol. 138a: Ahmed Pasha’s battle with the Ethiopians
41. fol. 143a: The execution of the voivode of Moldavia during Siyavuş Pasha’s Moldavian campaign
42. fols. 147b–148a: The conquest of Little Bastion castle (also known as La Goulette or Ḥalq al-wādī) in Tunisia
43. fol. 150a: The conquest of Bastion castle (also known as Nova Arx, a new fortress constructed by the Spanish between the city walls and the lake) in Tunisia
44. fol. 152a: The display of the rhinoceros sent as a gift by the Ethiopian ruler
45. The funeral of Selim II (left half of double-page composition in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, right half missing)
46. fol. 156a: The Aya Sofya Mosque

Fig. 1. Audience of Şemseddin Ahmed Karabaği with Lokman and the potential artist and scribes for the manuscript. Şehnâme-i Selîm Hân, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fol. 9a. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)
Fig. 2. Selim II in the Tower of Justice watching the Imperial Council. Şehnâme-i Selim Han, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fol. 11a. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)

Fig. 3. Selim II’s audience with Grand Vizier Sokollu Mehmed Pasha and Lokman. Şehnâne-i Selim Han, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapi Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fol. 13a. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapi Palace Museum Library)
Fig. 4. Sokollu Mehmed Pasha’s messenger arrives at Prince Selim’s camp (facing page with half of image missing). Şehnâme-i Selîm Han, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fol. 24b. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)

Fig. 5. Selim II enthroned in Belgrade. Şehnâme-i Selîm Han, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fol. 26b, and Museum of Fine Arts, Boston Francis Bartlett Donation of 1912 and Picture Fund, 14.693. (Photograph © 2009, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston)
Fig. 6. Audience of Grand Vizier Sokollu Mehmed Pasha. Şehnâme-i Selim Hân, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fol. 27a. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)

Fig. 7. Audience of Second Vizier Pertev Pasha. Şehnâme-i Selim Hân, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fol. 28a. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)
Fig. 8. Audience of Third Vizier Piyale Pasha. Şehnâme-i Selim Han, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fol. 29a. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)

Figs. 9, 10, and 11. Audiences of Fourth Vizier Ahmed Pasha, and on the left, of Fifth Vizier Zal Mahmud Pasha and of Sixth Vizier Lala Mustafa Pasha. Şehnâme-i Selim Han, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fols. 29b–30a. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)
Fig. 12. Iskender Pasha’s tent facing the rivers of ‘Aqara (near Basra). Şehnâme-i Selim Han, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fols. 41b–42a. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)

Fig. 13. The battle at ‘Aqara (facing page missing). Şehnâme-i Selim Han, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fol. 43a. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)
Fig. 14. The execution of the ruler of Ju-yi Tawvil (in the Gulf region). Şehnâme-i Selim Hân, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fol. 45b. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)

Fig. 15. The story of the crafty jackal entering the Ottoman camp. Şehnâme-i Selim Hân, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fol. 48b. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)
Fig. 16. The presentation of gifts to Selim II by the Safavid envoy. Şehnâme-i Selīm Ḥān, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fols. 53b–54a. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)

Fig. 17. The Selimiye Mosque. Şehnâme-i Selīm Ḥān, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fol. 55b. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)
Fig. 18. The Büyükçekmece Bridge. Şehnāme-i Selīm Ḥān, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fol. 56b. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)

Fig. 19. The display of the hippopotamus head from Egypt. Şehnāme-i Selīm Ḥān, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fol. 59b. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)
Fig. 20. The conquest of Tunisia (facing page with half of image missing). Şehnâme-i Selim Han, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fol. 65a. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)

Fig. 21. Shah Tahmasp’s agent Ma’sum killed en route to the Hajj. Şehnâme-i Selim Han, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fol. 68a. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)
Fig. 22. Özdemiroğlu Osman Pasha’s battle with the enemy at Ta’izz during the Yemeni campaign. Şehnâme-i Selîm Ḥân, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fol. 72b. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)

Fig. 23. Özdemiroğlu Osman Pasha crossing the Shabaka pass. Şehnâme-i Selîm Ḥân, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fol. 75b. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)
Fig. 24. The conquest of Shibam castle in the Yemen. Şehnāme-i Selīm Ḥān, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fol. 79a. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)

Fig. 25. The attack on Kawkaban castle in the Yemen (facing page with half of illustration missing). Şehnāme-i Selīm Ḥān, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fol. 84a. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)
Fig. 26. Behram Pasha’s conquest of Habb castle in the Yemen. Şehnâme-i Selim Hân, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fol. 90a. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)

Fig. 27. The envoy of the Yemeni governor asking the commander for peace. Şehnâme-i Selim Hân, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fol. 91b. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)
Fig. 28. The renovations at the Ka’ba. Şehnâme-i Selim Hân, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fol. 95b. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)

Fig. 29. The Ottoman army lands on Cyprus. Şehnâme-i Selim Hân, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fol. 102b. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)
Fig. 30. The conquest of Dukagjin castle in Dalmatia. Şehnâme-i Selîm Han, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fol. 117a. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)

Fig. 31. The siege of Famagusta castle in Cyprus. Şehnâme-i Selîm Han, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fol. 119a. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)
Fig. 32. Lala Mustafa Pasha’s execution of Venetian commanders. Şehnâme-i Selim Han, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fol. 122a. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)

Fig. 33. The flaying of the Venetian commander Bragadino. Şehnâme-i Selim Han, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fol. 125b. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)
Fig. 34. Hüseyin Pasha’s battle at Navarino. Şehnâme-i Selīm Ḥān, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fols. 130b–131a. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)

Fig. 35. Ahmed Pasha’s battle with the Ethiopians. Şehnâme-i Selīm Ḥān, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fol. 138a. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)
Fig. 36. The execution of the voivode of Moldavia during Siyavuş Pasha’s Moldavian campaign. Şehnâme-i Selim Han, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fol. 143a. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)

Fig. 37. The conquest of Little Bastion castle (also known as La Goulette or Halq al-wādī) in Tunisia. Şehnâme-i Selim Han, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fols. 147b–148a. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)
Fig. 38. The conquest of Bastion castle (also known as *Nova Arx*, a new fortress constructed by the Spanish between the city walls and the lake) in Tunisia. Şehnâme-i Selîm Hân, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fol. 150a. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)

Fig. 39. The display of the rhinoceros sent as a gift by the Ethiopian ruler. Şehnâme-i Selîm Hân, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fol. 152a. (Photo: courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)
Fig. 40. The funeral of Sultan Selim II. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Francis Bartlett Donation of 1912 and Picture Fund, 14.694. (Photograph © 2009, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston)

Fig. 41. The Aya Sofya Mosque. Şehnâme-i Selim Han, Istanbul, ca. 1571–81, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3595, fol. 156a.
NOTES

Author's note: This article was inspired by some of the questions I explored in my dissertation, “Viziers to Eunuchs: Transitions in Ottoman Manuscript Patronage, 1566–1617” (Harvard University, 2005), but was written after the dissertation itself. I am grateful to my advisors, Professors Gülru Necipoğlu and David J. Roxburgh, for their comments on the earlier drafts of the article, and for the extremely helpful suggestions of the anonymous reader for *Muqarnas*. I conducted research for this article in 2005–6 while teaching at Rice University, and wrote it in the fall of 2006 when I was a Humanities Post-Doctoral Fellow at Stanford University. I would like to thank my colleagues at Rice for their encouragement and Professor Seth Lerer and my fellow post-docs at Stanford for their comments on an earlier presentation. In November 2006, I had the opportunity to present my findings in a lecture for the Aga Khan Program for Islamic Architecture at Harvard University Lecture Series: A Forum for Islamic Art and Architecture. I am grateful to the organizers as well as the audience for their probing questions and suggestions.


8. Topkapı Palace Museum Library, Ms. A. 3595 (hereafter TSK A. 3595). Filiz Çağman describes the manuscript and its paintings, and gives a brief account of the introduction: see Filiz Çağman, “Şehname-i Selim Han ve Minyatürleri,” *Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı* 5 (1972–73): 411–42. Çağman also published the two archival documents relating to the project: Istanbul Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi (hereafter IBOA), Kamil Kepçeci Ruus Defteri (hereafter KK) no. 238, p. 197, and no. 225,
As this article was going to press, I found yet another draft of the manuscript in the Topkapı Palace Museum Library (TSK Y.Y. 1203). This must be the draft that Tahsin Öz had in mind when he mentioned additional sheets in the palace library related to this project: see Tahsin Öz, “Hünernamesi ve Minyatürleri,” Gülser Sanatlar Mecmuası 1 (1939): 3–16. Because he did not indicate their shelf marks, it has not been possible until now to locate these sheets. TSK Y.Y. 1203 was known to be related to Lokman’s projects, but its contents had not been determined until I compared them with British Library Ms. Or. 7043 (hereafter BL Or. 7043) and Topkapı Palace Museum Library, Ms. R. 1537 (hereafter TSK R. 1537). Consisting of seventy folios, TSK Y.Y. 1203 appears to be the earliest draft of all, and contains only text and blank spaces for illustrations—no instructions or decorations. Based on a brief comparison of the early parts of the text I have determined that this must be the draft on which the British Library volume was based. My conclusion is strengthened by the fact that on fol. 10a of this earliest draft, there is a blank space left for an illustration, which matches, in both shape and location, the first painting in the British Library volume. The odd outline of the space—narrow at the top and wider at the bottom—matches only the British Library image (see fig. 42); the text surrounding the two is also identical. This brings the number of Şehname-i Selim Han versions to four, but only three are discussed in this article.

TSK R. 1537.
BL Or. 7043.
Çağman, “Şehname-i Selim Han.”

See the Appendix for a full list of the subjects of the current and missing illustrations. My close comparison of the drafts reveals that although there were originally 46 illustrations, there are now 39 left in the book. One of the missing images is also reproduced here (fig. 2). The folio numbers correspond to the current folios of the manuscript. All of the illustrations still in the final manuscript (figs. 1–41) are located together after the Appendix, to give the reader a sense of the book as a whole. A detail of figure 1, as well as figure 2, have been reproduced in the text to aid the reader.

Six paintings are missing from the manuscript altogether, and six of the double-page compositions have lost one of their pages. Of these, two are in the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston: the left halves of both the accession ceremony of Selim II (MFA 14.693) and the funeral of Selim II (MFA 14.694). The right half of the funeral scene is missing altogether. The funeral scene in the MFA Boston has recently been identified as that of Murad III by Nicolas Vatin and Gilles Veinstein in Le serail ébranlé: Essai sur les morts, dépositions, et avènements des sultans ottomans (XIVe–XIXe siècles) (Paris: Fayard, 2003), 413, pl. 8, because his name appears in the text above the image. However, upon consult-

TSK A. 3595, fols. 1b–2a: İn mukhtarlar-i margḥaba va nuska-i maṭbuatā ʿist intikhāb shuda az makhzan-i javāhir-i vāreditāt-i īlāhiyya ǰihat-i tarṣ-i lawha-i pur ǰib ʿu bāhā dībācha-i shāhnāmā-i ʿalīyya-i pādishāh-i jannat makān ve shāhnāmāh-i ādīn ʿašiyān Sulṭān Selim Khān b. Sulṭān Sulaymān Khān tāba şarḥumād. (Folio numbers throughout reflect the current positions of the folios in the manuscript, and do not account for the missing pages. The translations and transliterations are all mine.)

TSK A. 3595, fols. 2b–12b: Dar kārkhāna-yi khayāl-i pur... See Roxburgh, Prefacing the Image, 82–121, for literary metaphors used in album prefaces, including that of creation.

The term pādishāh-i ma nevi (virtual sultan) was used by both Mustafa ʿĀlī and Peçevi when discussing Sokollu Mehmed Pasha’s grand vizierate during the reign of Selim II: see Mustafa ʿĀlī, Şehnāme-i Selim Han, fol. 3a. 7

TSK A. 3595, fol. 3a. 17

TSK A. 3595, fols. 16b–17a: “by order of the treasury of the king of Hüsrev-like country-conquering kings, and the pādishāh of country-adorning rulers, the most just of the rulers of the world, and in accordance with the verse ‘God commands justice and the doing of good’ [Qur’an 16:90]...”

TSK A. 3595, fols. 24a–26b. 20

TSK A. 3595, fols. 2a–30a. 24
26. TSK A. 3595, fols. 9a–12b; TSK R. 1537, fols. 9b–13b; BL Or. 7043, fols. 6a–9a. The text is to be found in all three versions, its fullest incarnation being in the unadorned Topkapı copy, as there are pages missing from the final manuscript.
27. Lokman says here that he had composed the Zafernamā, which is the verse version of Feridun Ahmed Beg’s Nüzhetül-Abbār der Sefer-i Szigetvár (Joyful Chronicle of the Szigetvár Campaign), with the encouragement of Ebussud Efendi. The book is an account of the Szigetvár campaign, during which Sultan Süleyman died, and his son Selim acceded to the throne.
29. For the architectural patronage of Sokollu Mehmed Pasha and Ismailian Sultan, see Necipoğlu, Age of Sinan, 331–68.
30. ‘Ata‘ī, Hadā‘ikāl-Hakâtik, 440–42; Cahid Baltaci, XV–XVI. Asrarda Osmanlı Medreseleri (İstanbul: İrfan Matbaası, 1976), 600; and Abdurrahim Güzel, Karabaği ve Teḥāfütü (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1991), 44.
32. TSK A. 3595, fol. 9a.
33. It must be noted, however, that Lokman does not explicitly state whether the artists gathered by Karabaği are the same ones appointed by the grand vizier later on to work on the project. We can no longer assume, therefore, that these portraits are those of Osman, Sinan, and Ibrahim Peykeri. Nevertheless, the painting does bear witness to the planning process. Karabaği and Lokman, the principal figures here, are part of the group of authors, of course.
34. Lokman describes what he wrote as “from the pronunciation as Jumada I 982 (August 18–September 16, 1574): see Asırlarda Osmanlı Medreseleri (İstanbul: İrfan Matbaası, 1996–) 7043, fols. 6a–9a. The text is to be found in all three versions, its fullest incarnation being in the unadorned Topkapı copy (TSK A. 3595), but the text can be followed from the unadorned draft TSK R. 1537, fol. 10a.
35. Fol. 10, which would have immediately followed the folio with the painting on it (folio 9) is missing from the finished copy (TSK A. 3595), but the text can be followed from the unadorned draft TSK R. 1537, fol. 10a.
36. TSK A. 3595, fol. 9b: Numūna-i taṣvir-i naqqaşārā dar muqābala-i nażar-i sharif āvurda. The names of Sinan and Osman are confirmed by the archival documentation on the manuscript, which will be discussed below. Osman’s name appears in relation to a number of illustrated histories from the last quarter of the sixteenth century; Sinan was appointed as a shahnāme writer (šenhāme-nüvis) in 1569 (IBOA, KK 1767, p. 28b), and also worked on the first volume of the Hünernāme (TSK H. 1523). Thus, his 1569 appointment was not a guarantee of permanent work, nor was his dismissal from the Şehnāme-i Selim Han project a sign that he had been completely removed from the service of the Şehnāmecī. TSK R. 1537, fols. 10a-b: Bī-timāṣālā ‘ān ki khud bi-sa‘ādat dar kuskūk ‘ī ‘advāl ma vaqīrā dar mušaqārā gashtha va az daricha-ī ‘aql ki murād az ‘ān bi-iṣfālāt-i Rūm va Yūnān qafas-ī muḥabbak-ī zarrīn panjara-ī sarāyī kāmkārīst bi-nażar-i marbahat muṭavajjīn-ī muhimmāt-ī din va dawlat shuda va gāshī hūshfarā mawṣalātī mulk va millat dāštā. Va dar tāq-ī ayvān-ī dār ‘ul-ād-ī gūṣā-ī gūṣā nishin liq shakl gūṣa-ī miṣl-ī muḥabbātik kurra-ī zamīn afrākhta va dar muḥāqāq-ī vaṣāt-ī ān dā’ra-ī ṭalānī chūn khātam-ī vizarātī-ī sulṭanī ta‘bīr namāmā.
37. Necipoğlu thoroughly analyzes the physical and symbolic features of the Imperial Council Hall and the Tower of Justice, incorporating numerous contemporary visual and verbal descriptions to support her insightful interpretation: Necipoğlu, Architecture, Ceremonial, and Power, 78–86.
38. Ibid., 82–83.
41. ‘Ata‘ī, Hadā‘ikāl-Hakâtik, 188–90. He had written a sequel to his father’s masterpiece, and was the author of another Ottoman history, composed in Ottoman Turkish. He also translated a number of works from Persian to Ottoman Turkish, and wrote poetry in three languages. After having served for thirty-three years as defterdar (finance director) and being appointed twice as bāṣ defterdar (chief financial officer), he died in November 1574.
43. TSK A. 3595, fol. 13a.
44. TSK A. 3595, fol. 13a: Shud aḥval-ī man ‘arz-ī sulṭanī-ī dīn.
45. Such a vision of patronage, where Lokman’s compositions are discussed in courtly or intellectual group settings, also finds a parallel in the model of poetic patronage put forth by Walter Andrews and Mehmet Kalpaklı, The Age of Beloveds: Love and the Beloved in Early-Modern Ottoman and European Culture and Society (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005).
46. The illustrations of BL Or. 7043 are on fols. 7b, 14a, 15a, 15b, 16a, 16b (two scenes), 17a, and 24b.
47. The folio size is 43.5 x 27 cm, compared to the 34.3 x 23.6 cm of the final manuscript, and the 33.3 x 22.5 cm pages of the Topkapı draft.

48. These discrepancies occurred not because pages were lost or taken out over time as with the missing folios from the final copy, but are rather the result of details that were simply not included. The text flows from one page to the next with no indication of missing pages.

50. BL Or. 7043, fol. 11a:

51. TSK R. 1537, fol. 11b:

52. BL Or. 7043, fol. 7a–b, and BL Or. 7043, fol. 8a, and TSK R. 1537, fol. 11b:

53. There are also a number of lines that were crossed out on this page.

54. BL Or. 7043, fol. 7b.

55. BL Or. 7043, fol. 7b: Khadang-i kamānash bar khīšam az kāmin / Guzāshāta chāh ẖuḵmak az rā-yi zamin.

56. The titles of the sections are as follows: fol. 22a Āghāz-i dāstān; fol. 23a Nāma-i humāyūn bi-ḡirāl-ī Bech; fol. 24a Javāb-i nāma-i humāyūn az ḡirāl-ī Bech; fol. 24b Ziyārāt-i ḥaẓrat-i khudavandīgīr bi-mūjārat-e shāfī. (This section contains an illustration of Suleyman visiting the tomb of Eyyub el-Ensari); fol. 27b Tavājjuh-i humāyūn bi-safar-ī ḥafr-i ṣafar-maqārnūn. (This section contains an illustration of Süleyman visiting the tomb of Eyyub el-Ensari).

57. For an analysis of these tensions, see Cornell Fleischer, Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire: The Historian Mustaфа Ālı (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1986), 41–70.

58. Lokman praises Sokollu as the “shadow of the shadow,” referring no doubt to the title often used for Ottoman sultans, “shadow of God on earth.” He is lauded as the upholder of the faith, the conqueror of Temesvár, guarantor of peace at Nakhchevan, and the defender of the sedition of Bayezid, referring thus to the services he had rendered the Ottoman dynasty throughout his career. The conquest of the castle of Temesvar is discussed in the Futūhāt-i jamīla (Admirable Conquests, TSK H. 1592), which is an excerpt from the Sūleymānnāme (TSK H. 1517). This manuscript describes the 1551 conquest of the castles of Timisoara, Pecs, and Lipva by the Ottomans, and claims many of the victories for Sokollu Mehmed Pasha, instead of his supervisor, Ahmed Pasha. Additionally, Sokollu Mehmed Pasha’s circular seal of 1564–65 is on folio 1a of the manuscript. The year on the seal corresponds to the year Sokollu became grand vizier, further strengthening the connection between him and the manuscript. Zeren Tanıdı mentions the seal and suggests that Sokollu Mehmed Pasha “played an influential part in the production of this manuscript”: Zeren Tanıdı, “Cat. no. 286: Futūhāt-i jamīla [Admirable Conquests],” in Turks: A Journey of a Thousand Years, 600–1600, ed. David J. Roxburgh (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2005), 449. The reference to Nakhchevan relates to the Ottomans’ battles on the eastern front, and “the sedition of Bayezid” is an allusion to Selim II’s struggle with his brother Bayezid for the throne while Süleyman was still alive. Accused of rebelling against his father, Bayezid was defeated in a battle with Selim in Konya. He then took refuge in Safavid Iran, but was eventually killed, leaving Selim the only potential heir to Süleyman’s throne.


60. BL Or. 7043, fol. 15b: Zīr-i awsāf-i vuzarā-ī kirām.

61. In addition to these larger changes, there are a few lines scattered throughout the pages of BL Or. 7043 that were crossed out and rewritten. Not all of them could be deciphered, and the ones that were do not entail major changes of meaning, but rather appear to be improvements in clarity or in rhyme and/or meter.

62. Fols. 50b–51a, for example.
63. The subject matter of these paintings is as follows: Sultan Selim receiving news of his father’s death from Sokollu Mehmed Pasha’s messenger (fig. 4); the audiences of the individual viziers (figs. 6–11); Iskender Pasha’s tent in ‘Aqara, facing the rivers (fig. 12); a jackal’s descent into the Ottoman camp near Basra (fig. 15); the gifts of the Safavid shah presented to Selim II by the shah’s envoy (fig. 16); the Büyüktekmecne Bridge (fig. 18); the renovations of the Ka‘ba (figs. 28, 52–54); Lala Mustafa Pasha ordering the execution of Venetian commanders (fig. 32); and the conquest of Bastion castle (also known as Nova Arx) in Tunisia (fig. 38).

64. Maḥall-i taşvīr. The last six paintings are not indicated thus, but the last section of the draft does not contain many editorial notations.

65. The letter mīm is often found at the conclusion of manuscripts, below the colophon, and must have the same connotation in both cases.

66. The two pages of text extend over so many folios in the final copy because two of those pages are taken up with the painting, while the preceding four pages contain only seven lines each, and are illuminated.

67. Dar pīshkash kashīdan-i qāṣid-i Irānī bi-pāybūs-i sulānī. The literal translation would be: “The pulling of presents by the Persian envoy at the foot-kissing of the sultan.” The “pulling of presents” refers to the almost parade-like format of the presentation of the gifts.

68. Üçer no/k + dot below/t + dot below ī fenüñ iki beytüñ her biri iki /s + dot below ī fenüñ ibtidāsına yazılā ba’d de maḥall-i taşvīr; See fig. 45.

69. Ve bu saḥār daḥi iki saḥifeye yazılā ki iki saḥifeye üç beyt olur.

70. Instead of following Dimaghash tar va kḥāṭirash tāza shud / Nīshātash fazāntar az andāza shud / Bimālīd-i rukhrā bi-pā’-yi sarīr / Kī shud nāmā-i ibrāz-i shāh az mushrī, the text now follows: Shāhīnshāh-i ʿishārat bi-tahsīn kūnān / Shud āhista qāṣid bi-brān rāvan / Khashīdand bavvābā pīshkash / Zi har jins-i maqābūl-i zībā va khush / Taḥsīn muqāhhab kālām-i qādim / Bi jild-i murāsqa’ bi qadr-i ādam / Āqārā-i asākir-i ḥākim-i Tūnus ve ṣuğ kardānash bi-dargāh-i ṣulānī; Āqārā-i masūra bi-safar-i Qibris; TSK A. 3595, fol. 100a now reads: Tām-i hāl bi-jamāʾiyat-i sipāh-i muqāfar farrukh-fāl.

71. BL Or. 7043 fol. 15a; TSK R. 1537, fols. 25a–b; TSK A. 3595, fol. 27a.

72. The same is true of the Cyprus scene.

73. Cūz baṣdur, Māsā’dan ikinci cīzuñ cedveli gelmemiṣdir buyrula.

74. Cūz tamāmdur.

75. Teslim-i kāgūd.

76. The term kitābēt could also mean heading, but there is no section heading next to the inscription, or in the part of the final manuscript that corresponds to these verses.

77. Maḥall-i taşvīr bir saḥife.

78. In some incensions, the word seems to end with an alif, as on folio 102a, and the first “tooth” after the letter ķ (which does not always have its dots) seems tall enough to be a lām.

79. Bu saḥife yedi saḥār čust (or HLSA?) yazılā.

80. Öz, “Hünername ve Minyatürleri,” also discusses the use of the shorthand letters š and ť for the word taşvīr.


82. IBOA, KK no. 238, p. 197, from 10 Safar 989 (March 17, 1581) dates to the year the manuscript was completed and grants raises to the ʿšehnāmeci Lokman, the artists Osman and ‘Ali, and three other unnamed contributors, a scribe, an artist, and a binder, in appreciation of their work on the project. IBOA, KK no. 225, p. 321, dated 4 Jumada I 981 (September 1, 1573), states that the scribe Sinan was dismissed and divides his salary among the others working on the manuscript. Both are discussed by Çağman, “Şehname-i Selim Han,” 415–17.


86. TSK R. 1537, fol. 36a: Sipahdār.

87. TSK R. 1537, fol. 36a: Khayma afrākhtan-i sipahdār dar muqābula-i ‘Aqāra.

88. TSK R. 1537, fol. 35a: Āgāhī yaftan-i sar lashkar-i kāmkār bi daf-i ā dā-yi khāksār, replaced with: Āgāhī-i sardār bi-taṣdarik-i daf-i ashrār.

89. TSK R. 1537, fol. 38a: Iām-i hāl bi-sipahdārān-i ṣasākīr-i mānsūra bi-safar-i Qibris; TSK A. 3595, fol. 100a now reads: Iām-i hāl bi-jāmiʿiyat-i sipāh-i muqāfar farrukh-fāl.

90. TSK A. 3595, fol. 63b: Khabardār-i katkūhād az ẓuḥrīān-i ḥākim-i Tūnus ve ṣuğ kardānash bi-dargāh-i ālti was changed in TSK R. 1537, fol. 53a, to: Vurūd-i farmān-i humāyūn bi- Mīrmīrān-i Jazāyir (jiḥat-i [crossed off]) bi-fath-i Tūnus.

91. TSK R. 1537, fol. 23b.

92. For the bridge and aqueducts, TSK R. 1537, fols. 45b–46a; for the Ka’ba, TSK R. 1537, fols. 78b and 79b. The Selimiye Mosque was already a part of the original draft, and was not further elaborated upon in the margins. For an analysis of these monuments, see Necipoğlu, Age of Sinan, 71–72, 167–69, 238–56.

93. Necipoğlu, Age of Sinan, 71.

94. TSK R. 1537, fols. 78a–79b; TSK A. 3595, fols. 92b–96b.
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