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FOREWORD

Edwin Binney, 3rd and the Portland Art Museum have had a long and rewarding association. Dr. Binney has been a friend and patron of the Museum for almost twenty years. He was a Trustee from 1965 to 1971 as well as a member of the Art Committee from 1969 to 1971. The Museum’s French collection, particularly that portion of it devoted to the 18th century, has achieved its present importance largely through Dr. Binney’s interest and generosity, and he has been generous in other areas as well.

The Portland Art Museum presented the first exhibition of Dr. Binney’s Persian and Indian Miniatures in 1962. Since then, we have had the privilege of helping Dr. Binney organize Rajput Miniatures in 1968 and Mughal-Decani Miniatures in 1973.

We feel particularly honored that he has chosen the Portland Art Museum to organize and circulate Turkish Treasures from the Collection of Edwin Binney, 3rd. This exhibition has a special importance beyond the beauty and interest of the objects in it because it offers a rare opportunity for American viewers to see a branch of Islamic art not well represented in public collections in this country—or, in fact, anywhere in the world outside of Istanbul. Although some of the larger museums, like the Metropolitan Museum of Art, have fine pieces to illustrate one or another aspect of Ottoman book art, Turkish Treasures provides a uniquely comprehensive view of the subject, from 1453 (the date of the fall of Constantinople) to the 20th century.

We have been pleased to watch the growth of Dr. Binney’s Islamic collections. Although he started collecting Turkish miniatures late, he has, in a relatively short time, brought together one of the world’s two most important private collections. Moreover, his long-time interest in the arts of the book has been expanded to include related decorative arts—textiles, metalwork, ceramics and wood. As shown together in this exhibition, they provide a rich view of a remarkable culture, which for several centuries was of dominant influence in the affairs of Europe.

Donald Jenkins, Director
Portland Art Association
PREFACE

"You're writing another Turkish catalogue?" asked a well-meaning friend. An affirmative reply evoked further questions: "What for? Isn't one enough?"

Actually, there had been more than one. I explained that there had been an additional supplement to the original catalogue when the collection was exhibited in Los Angeles and Honolulu after its first showing at The Metropolitan in New York.

"But isn't that enough for Turkish art?"

The explanation was longer this time: that there are only rare, scattered examples of the Ottoman book arts in the United States, and that even the big museums which do have more comprehensive groups of Turkish ceramics and textiles seldom show more than a few at any one time.

"How about the great collection in the Topkapi in Constantinople?"

The question provided the opportunity for a short historical and linguistic aside on my part: I explained that Byzantine Constantinople was now Turkish Istanbul. Furthermore, when the Smithsonian Traveling Exhibition Service circulated a supremely important group of Ottoman works from the Topkapi Saray Museum (the finest section of the exhibition Art Treasures from Turkey) between 1966 and 1968, the problems of logistics and diplomatic protocol forced the levying of so high a rental figure that only the richest American museums could afford to show it. It was seen only in Washington, Boston, New York, Cleveland, Los Angeles and Seattle.

"Now, because this collection belongs in America and a smaller museum is circulating it, the lower rental and shorter transportation fees will allow many museums to have it whose visitors could not view the larger exhibition from Turkey."

"But has the collection grown so much since it was last seen to warrant a new catalogue?"

My pride broke through my strongest resolutions to be modest. "It is now almost double the size it was in Los Angeles and Honolulu. New acquisitions like the genealogy (Cat. No. 57) and the very early genre scene in the Arifi manuscript (Cat. No. 13) alone merit separate articles. In fact, the chronological
range of the Ottoman Arts of the Book section has been extended backward about forty years with the inclusion of the earliest manuscript (Cat. No. 1) which dates from 1483, when the Turks finally conquered the Byzantine capital and made it their own.

"And Walt Denny, who helped so much with the original catalogue, has agreed to write the sections on ceramics (his particular specialty) and textiles. This latter group has grown from two single examples in Los Angeles to a decent, if small, overview of Turkish textiles."

I did explain that no rugs were included here inasmuch as they are more popular in character and execution while the exhibited textiles were produced for a more courtly and sophisticated clientele. "Of course, if a fine court carpet appears on the market, it may well be included!"

"I'd better see the show," he concluded. "Where's it going to be?"

I told him and returned to my catalogue writing.

Edwin Binney, 3rd (1979)

Preface to the 1973 Catalogue

"The materials available [to trace the history of Turkish painting] are too fragmentary, and are likely to remain so till the whole extent of the contents of Turkish libraries is revealed. Turkish fine manuscripts and miniatures elsewhere are not very numerous."

(L. V. S. Wilkinson, introduction to Minorsky, The Chester Beatty Library, a Catalogue of the Turkish Manuscripts and Miniatures, 1958)

"One of the major reasons for the neglect of Turkish pictorial art is the fact that there was, and still is, very little first-rate or well-documented material in European museums and libraries, and probably even less in those of the United States. The vast majority of it has remained in Turkey where it was at first almost inaccessible."

(Richard Ettinghausen, introduction to Turkey, Ancest Miniatures, 1963)

"Firstly, the greater part of the rich collection in the Istanbul libraries has been inadequately described in the past. The second difficulty is far more serious— the scarcity of material outside Turkey."

(G. M. Meredith-Owens, Turkish Miniatures, 1963)

"Of all the schools of painting from Islamic countries those of Turkey are most rarely represented in Western collections since the vast majority of the original output has been kept in Istanbul, particularly in the library of the Topkapi Palace Museum."

(Richard Ettinghausen, in Islamic Art from the Collection of Edwin Binney 3rd, 1966)
than in western Europe. A few important single paintings are in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, and the Freer Gallery, Washington, D.C. Others are in the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York, the Cleveland Museum of Art, and a few private collections while single miniatures exist in Worcester and Providence.

The Metropolitan Museum of Art has a collection, rather than a few separate items, largely by default. When that Museum sought to highlight its Turkish holdings in all media in its Bulletin of January 1968, only eight leaves with miniatures could be reproduced with the ceramics, metalworks, rugs, and textiles.

This catalogue presents a collection of Ottoman manuscripts and miniatures. I have no illusion that each of the pictures can match in aesthetic merit those in New York or Boston. On the other hand, this is probably the largest and the most well-rounded group existing outside of Istanbul, London, Paris, Vienna, and Dublin. With this thought in mind, I wish to dedicate the catalogue to:

Those whose previous works have helped me to understand and love Ottoman miniature painting, and those who may possibly use and value this token of my collecting mania.

Three scholars (as well as some others whose names are listed in the Bibliography) who have assisted me personally in the preparation of this catalogue: Richard Ettinghausen of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the dean of international Islamists, G. M. Meredith-Owens of the University of Toronto, and Walter B. Denny of the University of Massachusetts. Without their continued kindness in the sharing of their specialized but vast knowledge, the complex problems of attribution and dating could not have been resolved as fully as they are herein. My thanks are also extended to Suzan Akkan of the Library of the University of California, Los Angeles, who helped with preliminary translations, and to Marie Lukens Swietochowski of the Metropolitan Museum for her careful reading of the proofs and her meticulous scholarship. (And for the 1979 catalogue, the names of Professors Sinasi Tirk and Wheeler Thackston, both of Harvard University, must be added to the list of colleagues and friends from the 1973 catalogue. Special thanks must go also to Dr. Esin Atl of the Freer Gallery, Washington, D.C. for her kindness in providing photographs of the originals of Cat. Nos. 26, 44.)

And here I offer a note on the transliteration of Turkish. One of the changes brought about by Atatürk, founder of the Republic of Turkey, was the abandonment of the Arabic alphabet in favor of the European. The complex richness of Turkish vowel sounds, for which written Arabic had no equivalent, greatly hampered an accurate transcription of the language. Only in recent times, by the use of numerous diacritical marks, can modern Turkish be properly written. The proliferation of various accents, however, presents difficulties for the Western reader. Accordingly, it has seemed wise in this catalogue to simplify many of the proper and specialized names: for example, nakhsh-ename rather than nakhsh-esneme; Genc Osman, rather than Cem Osman; Yildirim rather than Yilidir; and the very recognizable Solayman the Magnificent instead of Suleyman. One Turkish letter can only be approximated. The undotted i, used for the common unvoiced vowel sound, provides too great a challenge to typesetters and proof-readers of English. In its place I use an unaccented o, as in Topkapi, rather than a dotted i, as did the makers of the delightful movie Topkapi, about a daring robbery in the old sultans' palace.

E. B., 3rd
INTRODUCTION

Even before the advent of Islam, Turkish nomadic tribes ranging between the Caspian Sea and Lake Baikal (the present Soviet Central Asia) were known to their more cultivated neighbors, the Chinese to the east and the Sassanians in Persia to the south. Many in the western group of these nomads were converted by the proselytizing force of the Islamic religion and turned their attention toward the Muslim world. By the ninth century, Turks were holding important positions throughout the Near East, and one dynasty, the Tutanids, ruled Egypt in semi-autonomy under the weak suzerainty of the caliph of Baghdad. The military strength of Mahmud of Ghazna, a Turkish leader who carved out his own principality, carried Islam permanently from what is now Afghanistan into North India at the end of the tenth century. Other Turks, the Seljuks, controlled the whole of the caliphate after 1038, except Egypt and North Africa, and, as the ruling family split into separate branches, reigned over many smaller domains in the Near East. The Seljuks in Persia were succeeded by the Mongols, and they in turn, in the fourteenth century, by the descendants of Timur, another Turkish conqueror. Former Turkish slaves in Egypt, the Mamluks, controlled that country from 1250 to 1517, and a later branch of the Timurids ruled India as the Mughal emperors until 1857. Politically, then, Islam owes much to the Turks.

Most of the rulers of these Turkish dynasties patronized painters, as, of course, did their non-Turkish allies and rivals. It does seem awkward, however (despite the insistence of modern Turkish art historians) to remove from the geographic unity of Persian, Indian, or Mamluk painting those parts for which Turks were patrons in order to create a pan-Turkish school. Instead, let us concentrate on the painting produced for one particular dynasty of rulers that rose and fell in the country that still bears the name of its larger racial family—Turkey.

Near the end of the thirteenth century and the beginning of the fourteenth, there appeared in the troubled territorial politics of the Anatolian peninsula a force of new Turks, under the leadership of a warlord named Osman, or Othman. The decline of the more centralized authority of the Seljuks of Rum, as Anatolia was then called, and petty wars among the Christian principalities that
The development of the sultans as art patrons, however, in no way detracted from the success of their armies. If few works date from the reign of "the Conqueror," the rule of this son Bayazid II Solyman (1484-1512) saw the production of a group of manuscripts (Cat. Nos. 3 and 4.).

The short reign of Selim I Yavuz ("the Grim," 1512-1520) was little more than a series of wars—in Europe, Persia, and Egypt. The occupation of the Iranian capital Tabriz in 1534, upon successful completion of the war against Shah Ismail the Safavid, was crucial for the future of Ottoman art. Seven hundred families of artists were brought back to Istanbul after the campaigns. A similar mass migration occurred after the conquest of Egypt in 1517. There, Selim ended the rule of the Mamluk Turks and assumed the title of caliph when the last of the later Abbasids, who had been pensioners of the Mamluks, was deposed. Thereafter the sultans were not only territorial princes, there were religious heads of Islam, at least for the orthodox Muslims. The Mamluk domains that were now added to the burgeoning Ottoman Empire included Syria, Palestine, and Arabia, as well as Egypt. From each of these newly conquered territories, the best artists of every kind were sent to Istanbul to practice their crafts and teach native Turks to master them also. Selim, despite his military talents, was also an accomplished poet in both Turkish and Persian. He wrote under the pen name of Selimi (a later manuscript containing his collected poems ot Divan is exhibited as Cat. No. 36). This dichotomy of talents is common among many of the Ottoman sultans. Selim's son Sulayman Kanuni ("the Lawgiver") to the Turks, but called "the Magnificent" in Europe; 1520-1566) dominated the whole of eastern Europe and the Near East as did his contemporary, Emperor Charles V, in the West. Serbia was overrun and Belgrade captured (1522), the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem were defeated and forced to evacuate their citadel on the island of Rhodes, and, in 1526, Hungary was conquered and her king killed at the Battle of Mohacs. Three years later Vienna was besieged, although unsuccessfully. Persia was again invaded and Tabriz captured several times. The Magnificent Sultan was still the greatest territorial prince in the world! The ateliers of his painters strove to produce works worthy of his position, and his head scribes produced the nishaan, or legal monogram (Cat. No. 8) that introduced his imperial jami, or decrees. An early work, intimately connected with the sultan as he prepared for the campaigns of 1526, is the small manuscript prepared at Samandia in Serbia on the eve of his Hungarian victory (Cat. No. 6).
During this formative period, miniature paintings in a distinctive kind of "provincial Persian" technique began to appear with increasing regularity (Cat. Nos. 3, 4, 5, 7). With time and practice, the Persian and Turkish painters working for Turkish patrons adopted artistic conventions that became easier to identify as non-Persian (Cat. Nos. 9, 13).

It is exactly from the reign of Salâyman that we begin to have some knowledge of the sadr al-adil, or court atelier. Part of a register was recently found by Oktay Aslanpaşa in the Topkapı Museum. In it are listed sixteen painters, including three portraitists (mawāzu), and thirteen specialists in mural decorations and flowers (nakhshā). Dr. Aslanpaşa is certain that these figures reflect the presence of artists brought from Tabrīz in 1514. Later in the century the historian Mustafa Ali wrote a didactic account of Turkish painters and calligraphers, the Menâqil-i Hümûnverān (1587), in which he mentioned the artists of his time. Supplementing these two records, we have registers of the artists' guild, particularly those of 1525-26 and 1557-58. From these sources we find that the Imperial studio included, in addition to Turkish painters, Hungarians, Albanians, Circassians and Moldavians, as well as the expected Persians with their Turkish-born sons. It is obvious that Persian influence was paramount. Persian had always been the language and literature of culture in the non-Arab Muslim East, and Persian painting, particularly that from the courts of the Timurid princes, ranked supreme. The Treasury in the Topkapı Palace already contained important Persian manuscripts seized during campaigns in Iran. Yet it was exactly at the time of the strongest Persian influence that Ottoman Turkish painting began to find a style of its own and to experiment in fields far from the Persian models.

Persian miniature painting was firmly wedded to Persian literature. The national epic, the Shah Namah of Firdawsi, together with the Khamsah (Quintet of Tales) by Nizami, the poetical romances of Jami, the Hūstān and Gulistan of Sa'di, and the Divān of Hafiz were the works most often illustrated by Persian painters. The characters portrayed might be clad in contemporary fashion, and the principals might, as a delicate compliment to a reigning prince, resemble living people, but all were essentially figures of fantasy. Even if the stories concerned semi-historical personages, the people illustrated were of legendary grandeur: the hero Rustam, the handsome Khusraw who loved the fair Shirin, or Majnūn who died of love for Layla, like Romeo for Juliet. Even when the Persians made a formal portrait of a king or courtier, it was most often an idealized likeness.

Certainly, Turkish artists illustrated the Persian texts, both in the original Persian (Cat. Nos. 3, 7, 13, 21) and in Turkish adaptations (Cat. Nos. 4, 20, 23, 37), and therefore retained affinities with Persian pictorial usage. But literary genres almost completely absent from Persian tradition were espoused during the reign of Salâyman "the Magnificent" and were continued thereafter.

The illustration of a history of the reigning sultan, or a posthumous tribute to his rule, became the most important non-Persian kind of painting in Turkey. It was a sort of "public relations" effort, a monumental presentation of the world conquerors, of the physical grandeur of their persons and courts, and of the invincibility of their huge armies. These large works and the individual portraits (Cat. Nos. 15, 31, 33, 40) and illustrated genealogies (Cat. No. 37) that appeared for the same purpose, do not portray people seen through a rosy-tinted lens as in Persia. They are valid social documents, with a powerful tendency toward realism. This series of works begins with a Selim Nâmeh prepared early in the reign of Salâyman as a tribute to his father. There follows a Salâyman Nâmeh for "the Magnificent" himself in 1558. 4 During the reign of Selim II "the Sot" (1566-1574) who gave a Koran (Cat. No. 14) to the mosque he founded in Edirne and whose portraits are in this collection (Cat. Nos. 15, 40), a History of the Seige of the Hungarian city of Székesfehérvár was also completed. The major painter of his court, the retired admiral-director of the Imperial shipyards, Haydar Rais, called Nigari (1484-1574), may be the artist who copied the portraits after Clouet and Cranach (Cat. Nos. 12a, 12b). He certainly is responsible for the large miniature, right half of a double page composition, probably featuring his patron's likeness in the left section (Cat. No. 11).

Under Selim's son and successor, Murad III (1574-1595), Ottoman miniature painting reached its apogee.

Historical works continued to be written and illustrated for the new sultan: histories of his father (the Shah Nameh of Selim Khan by the historiographer Logman), of his grandfather (the Tabaqat al-mandārik in Vienna), and the biography by the same Logman in the Beatty Library, Dublin, as well as of himself (Logman’s Shahnameh Nâmeh in two volumes dated 1581 and 1592, in the University Library, Istanbul).

Histories of individual military campaigns in Georgia in 1578-1579 (two in the British Museum and one in the Topkapı Saraylı), in Persia from 1578 to 1583 (University Library), in Genjeh in 1588, and previously in Arabia and...
Tunisia under Sinan Pasha (University Library) were also produced for the same Imperial patron. Chief of these works, also linked to Murad III, was the Hünier Nameh, again by Loqman, in two volumes dated 1584 and 1589, the first containing forty-five miniatures, the second sixty-five in the Topkapı Sarayi. (The second volume, treating the reign of Sultan I, was exhibited in the United States from 1966 to 1968. Cat. No. 19 in this catalogue is related to illustrations contained in it.)

The Surnameh, or Festival Book, commemorating the celebrations for the circumcision of Murad's son, the future Mehmet III, which lasted for fifty-two days and nights, contains 437 illustrations (in the Topkapı Sarayi). It was considered too valuable to send to America. These historical works were only part of the output of the Imperial ateliers.

Ottoman illustrated religious texts may have been produced even earlier than the first historical works. (The early Sulayman Nameh of the Beatty collection, which can be dated about 1500, concerns the Biblical Solomon rather than his Turkish namesake.) Copies of similar texts by Fuzuli, Lami's Chelebi and the ubiquitous Loqman appeared commonly during the reign of Murad III also, but a religious manuscript such as Cat. No. 9 is uncommon in the middle of the sixteenth century. The religious texts of the latter part of the century are as lavish as the historical works and just as typically Turkish, rather than Persian. Islamic literature had few illustrated texts on religious subjects, and in this area, the Turks experimented rather than copied. (For leaves from religious works, see Cat. Nos. 22, 32a, 32b, 35.)

Elegant line drawings, often heightened with gold and colors, were also common during the reign of the royal connoisseur. A group of marvellous dragons fighting over mythological beasts or lurking in fabulous vegetation (Cat. No. 10) come from the previous reign, but continued to be made under Murad III. These dragons reflect a Chinese influence comparable to the known Imperial predilection for blue-and-white porcelain ware of the Ming dynasty. Compare Ceramic numbers 3, 4, 5 for Turkish adaptations of Chinese porcelain. Similar drawings, somewhat later, feature humanoids and other animals (Cat. Nos. 38, 47). Another foreign influence, this time from Transoxiana, is shown in a series of Oriental princesses, or harem of the Islamic paradise, several of them inscribed with the name of the Ottoman painter Vali Jan, a pupil of Sivayush the Georgian (Cat. No. 24). Other similar drawings show Mongol or Uzbek prisoners (Cat. No. 25).

Another unusual genre, typically Turkish rather than Persian, was the use of marbled paper on which layers of different colors were manipulated to produce extremely complicated patterns (the boards of Cat. No. 6 and the border of Cat. No. 67 are good examples). Decoupage work, the cutting out and pasting of different colored papers to produce a realistic design, was also experimented with (Cat. No. 39). The most typical product of the ateliers of Murad III in the present exhibition, however, is Cat. No. 17, an extremely rare manuscript with many kinds of miniatures, including two portraits of the sultan himself.

The death of the greatest of the royal patrons did not curtail the production of important books and pictures. During the reign of his immediate successors, Mehmet III (1595-1603), Ahmet I (1603-1617), Mustafa I (1617-1618 and 1622-1623) and Osman II (1625-1622), literary, historical and religious manuscripts continued to be made for the sultans. Of the last-named genre, the Fat Nameh (Book of Divination) by Kalendar Pasha was prepared for presentation to Ahmet I (Cat. No. 99 may be from a similar work, or from a Persian prototype or adaption of it). Couriers and private citizens also commissioned works. The non-Imperial manuscripts have a charm and simplicity that distinguishes them from the more complicated royal works, whether translations from Persian romances (Cat. Nos. 37, 48), or historical writings (Cat. No. 51, from a manuscript probably prepared for Sultan Osman II). Other non-royal collectors no doubt desired the small and simple series of sultans' portraits (Cat. Nos. 31, 33) in contrast to the Imperial ones (Cat. Nos. 40a, 40b, 50).

A final genre of painting typical of the Turkish tradition and scarcely seen in the Persian is the exact delineation of buildings and places. This architectural and cartographic interest began early and continued until the end of the Ottoman Empire. As early as 1513 the Turkish mapmaker-sailor Pir Reis pictured America on the western edge of the Atlantic Ocean (the map is in the Topkapı Sarayi). This was not an isolated example. Scarce twenty years later, the court geographer and historian Matrakçı described the Menseli Nameh (Itinerary), by means of text and geographical designs, the invasion routes of Sulayman "the Magnificent" in his first expedition against Persia (1534-1536).

From this kind of view of the world, it was a short step to miniatures showing the important buildings of the sultanate. The holy sites of Islam, the Ka'ba at Mecca (Cat. No. 17, fol. 27v; 76, fol. 143r; 77, fol. 80v; 100, fol. 8v; 102) and the tomb of the Prophet at Medina (Cat. Nos. 26, fol. 144v; 90, fol. 81r; 100, fol. 39r), as well as the mosques of the capital (Cat. No. 84) and other major cities,
provided subjects for Turkish painters in a way they never did for their Iranian contemporaries. Even in a narrative picture such as Cat. No. 58, the architecture of the cities in the background receives greater attention than the episode taking place in front.

The decline in artistry in the seventeenth century is not immediately apparent. One evidence of it is a general coarsening and increase in size of the figures, with an emphasis on the head, which is often too large for the body (Cat. Nos. 6a and 35 show early instances of this tendency). Another is an accent on caricature, never far removed from Turkish folk art. The beginning dervish of Cat. No. 56 and the Porters, or wild youths, of Cat. No. 68 are excellent examples.

Unlike the first half of the seventeenth century, which continued the literary genres and artistic conventions of the Classic Period, the second half of the century appears extremely barren. The reason is twofold. Mehemet IV (1648-1687) removed the center of his court from Istanbul to Edirne. Shorter-lived successors continued the practice, two of them at the end of the seventeenth century even holding their personal coronation ceremonies there instead of in the seat of the Empire. With the removal of the sultan to another city, the painters of the royal atelier must have followed him also. We know almost nothing of the works produced in the new court, and subsequent destruction of the Edirne Palace (which was blown up by the Russians during the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78) in addition to other disasters and enemy occupations, certainly explain the absence of any royal paintings attributable to this time.

In 1718, Ahmet III (1703-1730) moved back to Istanbul. With his reign, “the Era of Tulips,” we again find numerous paintings in the royal collections, but of a completely new kind.

These later sultans became more and more indolent and pleasure loving. Fewer of them campaigned actively with their troops. Uprisings in the conquered provinces depleted the energies of the armies and consumed much of the revenue without gaining lands or prestige. The historical works that eulogized the expanding state and its monarchs were abandoned. Individual genre scenes (Cat. Nos. 59, 66) or portraits of barefoot beauties and their retinues (Cat. No. 65), as well as flowers satisfied the many aesthetes among the later rulers. Another great Sur Namah, or Festival Book (like that of Murad III mentioned above), was prepared by the poet Yehbi to commemorate the circumcision of four of the sons of Ahmet III in 1720/21. This manuscript was exhibited in the United States in 1966-1968. Its 138 miniatures, many of which use the same architectural background to record the processions of the different guilds before the sultan in the Hippodrome, are a tour de force of the court painter Levni. He and his slightly younger contemporary Abdullah Bukhari (see Cat. No. 57) were the last great painters of the Ottoman tradition. But royal decrees with the distinctive higher showing the sultan’s monogram were still necessary (Cat. Nos. 64, 81, 95), and courtiers or rich townsmen had their distinctive flourishes copied on decorations (Cat. No. 83). Series of royal portraits were also produced (Cat. Nos. 84, 88), as they had been for earlier reigns.

Calligraphy still retained its supremacy, even into the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, with talented scribes plying their demands craft (Cat. Nos. 74, 75, 89, 91, 92, 93). Korans and devotional manuals were prepared for the devout (Cat. Nos. 70, 71, 72, 73, 85, 96) and manuscripts of guidebooks were still written and illustrated for travellers to the holy places of Islam (Cat. Nos. 76, 77, 90). Finally, pictures were painted for travellers from the West (Cat. Nos. 62a, 62b, 87a-87b), and Turkish men of letters experimented to codify Islamic mores into a pan-European kaleidoscope (Cat. Nos. 78, 79). But with the increasing desire to ape European fashion and art, which began late in the seventeenth century and continued unabated (Cat. Nos. 82a, 82b), Turkish painting sank as low as the political state, which from “The Sublime Porte” had become, by the nineteenth century, “The Sick Man of Europe.”

One supreme legacy remained from the sultans. At the end of the First World War, the Ottomans, like so many of the royal dynasties of Europe, were deposed as political rulers, their empire becoming the Republic of Turkey under Kemal Atatürk, with its capital at Ankara rather than Istanbul. For a time, the cousin of the last sultan took office as caliph, but he was deposed in 1924. Owing to the peaceful way in which the deposition was carried out, the sultans’ palaces were not looted, and no frenzied mobs scattered their treasures. By the time of the Ottomans’ ultimate exclusion from their country, their presence had saved as national heritage, the bulk of their fabulous collections. The new republic, without the interminable pillage that has destroyed or dispersed so many treasures of the past, was strong enough to guard its still undreamed-of riches. This is the reason for the supremacy of the Istanbul libraries in the field of Ottoman painting: most of it—and the major percentage of its greatest works—remains where it has always been, on the banks of the Bosphorus and the Golden Horn.
Notes
1 As orthodox Sunniites, the Ottomans would be expected to interpret religious
structures against figurative representation
in a narrow way. They did not. They
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Fatih. See also Atik (1973).
3 Topkapı Sarayi, Hazine 1597-1598;
Stchoukine, J, 1966, Ms. 8.
4 Hazine 1537; Stchoukine, Ms. 21.
5 Hazine 1339; Stchoukine, Ms. 29.
6 A. 3995; Stchoukine, Ms. 30.
7 Stchoukine, Ms. 32.
8 Stchoukine, Ms. 33.
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11 Hazine 1369; Stchoukine, Ms. 44.
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13 K. 1296; Stchoukine, Ms. 51.
14 Stchoukine, Ms. 54.
15 Hazine 1523, 1524; Stchoukine, Ms. 45.
16 Hazine 1544; Stchoukine, Ms. 39.
17 The Mi'raj Nameh dated 1446 (Bibliothèque nationale) is exceptional, and it
is written in Chaghatay Turkic, with
Uighur script, rather than in Persian.
The Turkman Khwarazm Nameh by
Abu Hulayn of about 1480 (see Gude, Muslim
Miniature Paintings, 1962, nos. 46-49)
was a sort of pastiche of Firdausi's Shah
Nameh, and its illustrations, although of
religious subjects, do not substantially
depart from the mainstream of Iranian
miniatures.
18 Presumed Uighur influence from a simila
Central Asian region may account
for the curious series of mural and de-
mons in the album called "of the Con-
queror" (Topkapı Sarayi, Hazine 2153).
19 Topkapı Sarayi, Hazine 1700;
Stchoukine, Ms. 89.
20 Topkapı Sarayi, Hazine 3593;
Stchoukine, Ms. 88-93.

Arts of the Book
MINIATURES, MANUSCRIPTS AND CALLIGRAPHIES

1 Manuscript of the Salih by al-Bukhari (volume I only).

In Arabic. 244 ff. of naskhi script; 17 lines to the page. Illuminated roundel and aman (double frontispiece). Dated: 857/1453 A.D. Red morocco binding with blind-stamped medallions, rebacked. Size (binding): 10 x 6 7/8 x 1 1/2, 25.4 x 17.1 x 3 cm.

REPRODUCTIONS FOR COMPARES: Sotheby's, April 8, 1979. Lot 202 (color plate of the double-page manuscript), a Koran written for Sultan Mehmet II (1451-1481).

The Islamic calligrapher, whether Arab, Turk, Persian or Indian, always enjoyed the highest place in the artistic hierarchy of Islam, his mission was that of copying the "word of God" as revealed in the Koran. Calligraphers had copied both religious and profane texts for many centuries before the latter began to be illustrated by the painters of miniatures.

The present volume is typical of Islamic religious tradition. It belongs to the Hadith literature: the accumulation of religious writings on dogma or the history of the early holy men similar to the Jewish and Christian non-canonical writings. The introductory roundel with the title of the work (fol. 3r) is immediately followed by a lavishly decorated double-page frontispiece (ff. 3v-4r) which presents not only the beginning of the text but also its realization in elegant naskhi script, surrounded by a formal blue-and-gold illuminated frame.

The fact that the manuscript is Turkish by production, if not by language, is not typical. Its date, 857/1453 A.D., is the year of the final successful assault on the Byzantine capital which was now to become Istanbul. What better way to introduce the Ottoman arts of the book than with a manuscript that is securely attributable to the reign of Mehmet Fatih, "the Conqueror.

2 Two leaves from the manuscript of the Koran with the chapter heading to Surah LXIV At-Taghabun (brown) and LXV At-Talaq (black). 9 lines to the page. 19th century. Size: (each leaf) 15 x 9 7/8, 38.5 x 24.4 cm; (text) a) 9 3/4 x 7 3/8, 25.2 x 18.6 cm; b) 10 x 7 7/8, 25.4 x 18.6 cm.

The copy of the Koran from which these leaves have been removed, and probably most of the others also, must have been a fine one. There is little decoration to
3 Manuscript of the Mantiq al-Tayr by Attar.

In Persian. 171 ff., with 3 miniatures in the Turkish style of ca. 1480-1490, ornate (double frontispiece). Simple leather binding, ca. 1550-1560. Size (binding): 6 1/4 x 4 1/2 x 3/4 in. 7 5/8 x 4 3/4 x 1 1/2 in. A former owner has added the date 3150/1737-38 beneath the otherwise undated colophon, but this addition has nothing to do with the text.


The simplicity and small size of this manuscript mask its huge importance. It is one of fewer than a dozen known manuscripts illustrated with Turkish miniatures that can be dated before about 1500. The Bibliothèque nationale, Paris, possesses the earliest, an Ishandar Nameh by Ahmed, dated 1416 (Stechoukine, i, 1966, Ms. 1, pls. 1, II). Its illustrations look like typical "Arab miniatures," and only its Turkish text and the colophon stating that it was finished at Anaya show that it is the earliest dated Ottoman Turkish illustrated manuscript. (Its miniatures are, however, somewhat later than the date of the colophon.)

The other early texts with pictures date from the reign of Sultan Bayazid II (1481-1512). There are a Kullat at-Dunya dated 1495 in Bombay (Stechoukine, i, 1966, Ms. 2, pl. III); a Khamsah by Amir Khusraw Dihlavi dated 1498 in the Topkapı Saray (Hazine 79A; Stechoukine, Ms. 3, pl. IV); and a Khamsah o Shams dated 1499 in the University Library, Uppsala, Sweden (Stechoukine, Ms. 4). Stylistic similarities to the miniatures in these dated volumes allow attribution to the same period of the undated Salesman Nameh by Sharaf ad-din Musa of Bursa, surnamed "Firdousi the Long," in the Beatty Library, Dublin (Stechoukine, Ms. 5), and the present volume. A Hattif manuscript of 1488-1499, formerly in the Sir Thomas Phillipps collection, now in the Metropolitan Museum (acq. no. 69.27); an Ishandar Nameh by Ahmed, dated 1500-1501, in the Topkapı Saray (Hazine 679); as well as the newly discovered Cat. No. 4, dated 1499-1500, complete this group of early manuscripts. An unpublished manuscript in the Fogg Art Museum and a separate miniature showing Majmun disguised before Layla, in the Kraus collection, are also mentioned by Grube (1972, pp. 207-208).

continued
The miniatures in the present manuscript bear strong affinities to the simple pictures by Shirazi artists at the courts of the Black and White Sheep Turkmen in the second half of the 15th century in Iran. But there are already immediately recognizable Turkish elements. A Persian artist would probably not have painted the flat gold on the wall of the interior scene shown in fol. 50v, nor the absolutely similar gold sky of fol. 62v. The cypress trees standing in orderly rows against the horizon of fol. 95r and in the upper left and right of fol. 62v are also common in Turkish painting. The oversimplification in the placing of figures in a landscape was also common in Shiraz at the time, but not to the extent visible here.

The fact that the text is in Persian rather than Turkish is no reason for drawing back from a Turkish attribution. Many sultans and their courtiers were fluent in Persian, the elegant language of Islam (including Turkey and Mughal India), particularly for the writing of poetry.

The subjects of the miniatures are:

fol. 50v
Shaykh San’ān explains to his non-Muslim sweetheart that he has given up his religion for her. A mullah asks her what she has done to achieve this. (Cf. Robinson, 1958, no. 502, fol. 45a, illustrating a more complete copy of the Manṭiq al-Tayr in the Bodleian Library [Ms. Elliott 246].)

fol. 62v
The king and the thorn-gatherer (Robinson, 1958, no. 504, fol. 52b). The ornamental decoration of the king’s coat and the clumps of carnations and tulips in the foreground suggest that this miniature should be dated somewhat later than the other two.

fol. 95r
The old woman purchases Yusuf (the Biblical Joseph) at the slave market in Cairo (Robinson, 1958, no. 505, fol. 96a).

4 Manuscript of the Laila and Majnum by Hamsi.

In Turkish, 125ff., 16 lines to a page. Frontispiece; 7 miniatures. Dated: 905/1499-1500. Leather binding with a floral central medallion, probably 19th century. Size (binding): 7 3/4 x 4 3/4 x 1/2. Size (folio): 11 x 7 3/4 x 1/4. (The date 987/1579 appears twice on fol. 1.) The colophon (translated by Prof. Saussi Tekin of Harvard University): "My God, make us intimate in the two worlds. My God, offer us eternity with the glass of permanence. Oh Hamsi, in 905 this jewel of poetry came to an end."

The miniatures of this unpretentious little manuscript reflect the confused position
of the Turkish artists of the late 15th century. Native Turks, as well as immigrant Persians, had not yet begun to try to establish a new aesthetic that would be less dependent upon previous Iranian traditions. The painter of these illustrations, like earlier Persian-influenced artists (see particularly Cat. Nos. 3 and 7), was very close to Iranian conventions. Several of the miniatures, despite their very small size, could be interchanged with earlier ones in Turkman manuscripts of the second half of the 15th century in Persia. The same rough finish and open simplification in the placement of the figures are common to both. Yet a few non-Persian practices can be noted: the perspective of the "country house" and the cypresses in the third miniature (fol. 39v).

The poet Hannullah Chlebi, called Hamdi (1447/48-1509), was one of the men of letters at the literary court of Sultan Bayazid II "Sofa" (1481-1512). His major work, an adaptation of the Persian Jani's Yusuf and Zeideba, is known in many manuscripts (Kraus Coll. Grabe 219-223, ca. 1580-85; Beauty Library, T 428, ca. 1585-90; British Museum Or. 7111, ca. 1600). His Laila and Majnoon, finished in 1499-1500, also adapted from Jani, is not considered as fine from a literary point of view, and is known in fewer copies.

Contemporary Turkish literature was undergoing the same intense influences as Turkish miniature painting. Two older Ottoman poets, Shahid and Bihshiti, had already written their own adaptations of Jani's Laila and Majnoon, and Fuzuli (Cat. No. 9) was to produce still another within less than fifty years.

A possible additional importance for this manuscript lies in the date of the colophon, 905 A.H., the date of Hamdi's completion of the text. Might the colophon suggest that this is the author's holograph copy?

Despite his reputation during his lifetime, Hamdi is characterized by Gibb in his History of Ottoman Poetry as "not a great poet," but "an industrious and skilful adapter" (vol. II, p. 207).

The subjects of the miniatures are:

- Fol. 14v: Majnum begging before Laila's house.
- Fol. 22v: Laila with her family.
- Fol. 39v: Laila in the country, during spring.
- Fol. 46v: Majnum sees the battle between his tribe and Laila's.

continued
continued

5 A Youth Prostrating himself before a Ruler.
Probably from an *Iskander Nameh* by Nizami, ca. 1500-1525. Size (within borders): 6% x 4%, 16.2 x 10.4 cm.
EX COLL.: KEVORKIAN FOUNDATION, NEW YORK.
This fine miniature is datable only slightly later than those in the early Attar and Hafiz manuscripts (Cat. Nos. 3 and 4). Like them, it is extremely rare and shows the Ottoman artists still closely following Persian traditions. Whereas the earlier miniatures are sketchy and coarse, this one is better painted and more successful in its finished state.
It is probable that the scene depicted is from a Persian text of the *Iskander Nameh* section of the *Khamsah* by Nizami. On the verso of the leaf is an unfinished square, left blank for later inclusion of a small miniature. A notation in a hand different from that of the text’s calligrapher states that it was intended to present Iskander (Alexander the Great) in the Elburz Mountains.

6 Manuscript in masnavi verse in praise of Sulayman I.
8 ff., on paper. Dated: Dhu’l-Hijjah 932/1526, at Samandar (present-day Sivas, in Turkey). Binding: boards covered with marbled paper, probably contemporary. Endpapers more modern. Size (binding): 10% x 7%, 27.6 x 19.7 cm.
PUBLISHED (fol. 1r): DENNY, “A Group of Silk Islamic Banners,” fig. 10, p. 74.
This unpretentious little collection of poems for Sulayman “the Magnificent” (1520-1566) allows a glimpse of the practices of Ottoman book production early in the reign of the greatest of the sultans. The boards (cardboard rather than leather binding) are covered with marbled paper, a Turkish specialty. The recto of the first folio reveals a calligraphic flourish similar to that of the later, more elaborate *taghs* (Cat. Nos. 8, 64, 81, 95). It shows the word *hase* (standing for the word “He,” as the synonym for God, which is shouted by dervishes for talismanic ef-