In conclusion, it is possible to infer a chain of events, which show the close ties between the Ottoman and Persian realms during the second half of the sixteenth-century. The Ottoman admiration for the Timurid court of Sultan Ḥusain led to the Ottoman book collectors desire for including copies of the Majālis al-Ushāq, a text which they believed was composed by Sultan Ḥusain himself, in their libraries. Since the Ottoman demand was met by Shiraz copies of the text, it must have been part of the reason for the increased production of this text in Shiraz. Deluxe copies of the Majālis had up to eighty-five illustrations, many of which illustrated incidents that took place in urban venues. Thus, a new genre of painting which contained urban scenes developed in Shiraz. These compositions were then used in copies of the Persian classics affecting their illustrative cycles as well.64

An Accomplished Artist of the Book at the Ottoman Court: 1515–1530

Ayşin Yoltar-Yıldırım

The Topkapi Hamse of Ali Şir Nevai (Topkapi Palace Library, H.802) is known to have been copied in 937/1530–31 by Pir Ahmed bin Iskender according to its colophon.1 It has been suggested to have been produced in the Ottoman realm, most likely at the Ottoman court.2 The Topkapi Hamse is an important manuscript in the study of Ottoman arts of the book since it is one of the few dated manuscripts attributed to the court production of Süleyman the Magnificent (1520-66). It is copied in nastālīq script and has several finely illuminated pages and miniatures. Above all, it has an exquisitely decorated lacquer binding which has been the focus of recent scholarship. The binding is a good example of the “soz” style that is thought to have been created by Şah Kalû in the Ottoman palace workshops and disseminated to other media.3 On the other hand, the miniatures of the manuscript are found to be reflective of the early Ottoman style with a peculiar stylistic eclecticism that has led

---

64 I have presented a shorter version of this paper for the 11th International Congress of Turkish Arts at Utrecht in September 1999. I have also sent this version to be published in an internet site not yet specified by the organizers of the conference. Parts of the paper are taken from my doctoral thesis, “Arts of the Book in Sixteenth-Century Shiraz” (New York University, 2000). The system of transliteration follows that of the International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies (IJMES). For Turkish words I have chosen to use the modern Turkish spelling. This brings a problem, however, since some words and many names are identical in Persian and Turkish. When I use such a word in a Persian frame, I use the transliterated version. If, however, I use it in a Turkish context, then I use its modern Turkish spelling. An example for such usage is the spelling taşkira for referring to Sīr Mīrzā’s work, Tuhfet-i Şansı, and the spelling teşkire when referring to Sēbî Bey’s work Hərət Rüşgəz.

1 Fehmi Karaçay, Türkçe Yazma Kataloğu (Istanbul, 1961) no. 2299.
3 Çağman, Soliman le Magnifique et son temps, p. 201.
bindings in the most “typical” Ottoman manner. Since the miniatures, illumination, and the binding were never thought of as the product of a single artist, there was also no need to reconcile the variations in the “Ottomanness” of the respective parts of the book. Now we can ask if it is significant that Pir Ahmed was making miniatures in an older style than the binding of the same manuscript. Was it his training or patronage that resulted in his different approach to the miniatures and binding? Or are we too selective in our art historical judgements when we decide what was the norm at a given time? Even though a definite answer is not sought here, the colophon of the Topkapı Hamse and other similar examples may be important to further analyze these questions.6

The Artist: Pir Ahmed bin İskender

In terms of Pir Ahmed’s identity we have some archival information that may be related to him. For example, we find a person named Pir Ahmed Çelebi as the member of the Cemaat-i kitâbî-i hizne-i amire (Society of court calligraphers) in an undated register that is attributed to 1537 or 1542.7 We also find a Mehmed bin Pir Ahmed, who is possibly the son of Pir Ahmed, in the ehâ-i hırf (artists) register of 932 Rebi’ül-âhir 1526.8 Mehmed bin Pir Ahmed is listed in this register as a member of the Cemaat-i amînerîe9 and is mentioned to have joined the group during Selim’s reign (1512–1520). We may then suggest that Pir Ahmed himself could also have started working at the court during the reign of Selim. During Süleyman’s reign Pir Ahmed was one of the court scribes until at least 1530–31. His colophon in the Topkapı Hamse attests that he was not only a good scribe but also a good illuminator, illustrator, and binder.

---

6 I demonstrated a similar case with a full reading of the colophon of the Metropolitan Museum of Art’s Khurasan and Shirin of Hatîf (69. 27) dated to 1498–99. See my forthcoming article in the proceedings of the eleventh conference of ICTA held in Utrecht in 1999.


9 Ańberînîcî was someone who made fragrant necklaces. See note 31 in Barkan 1953–54, p. 311.
The Munich Yusuf ve Züleyha

In order to gain more insight into the artistic achievements of Pir Ahmed, we should also consider the 921/1515 Munich Yusuf ve Züleyha of Hamdi (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Turc 183). This manuscript has been known to scholars since it was first exhibited in 1910 in Munich. First its lacquer binding was published in 1924 by Emil Grätz, who thought the binding was made by a Persian master. In 1974, the manuscript was published by N. Şöylemezoglu who clearly showed that according to the colophon the manuscript was copied, illustrated, gathered, and bound in 921/1515 by a single artist whose name was not given. Şöylemezoglu suggested that such expertise in various arts of the book was uncommon and that the colophon indicated that the artist was proud of his work. Şöylemezoglu also mentioned a similarity between the miniatures of the Munich Yusuf ve Züleyha and the Topkapı Hamse of Neval. Since the Topkapı Hamse was suggested to have been produced at the Ottoman court by Ivan Stouchkine, Şöylemezoglu ascribed the manuscript to the Ottoman court in Istanbul as well. Later this link was further analyzed by Filiz Çağman and Zeren Tanrıoğlu who concluded that the miniatures of both the Munich and the Topkapı manuscripts were executed by the same artist. Since we now know from the Topkapı colophon that Pir Ahmed was the illustrator, we can then suggest that he was also responsible for “copying, plates, gathering and binding” of the 1515 Munich manuscript. In fact, a comparison of the two colophons supports this suggestion.

The Colophons

The Munich colophon reads in Turkish:

Kissâ-i Yusuf ve Züleyhâ
dürbânî mithârek Hûlâ
Hat ve levha ve mucev veldî hem
Olub bir kütün elinden eda
Murad buna esâlemekden hâyen
Hemîn hem kû cüre ebl-i sofâ
Kûslû rahmetine gûrik anâ Hâk
Kî ol derdî-i mendi ducean ana^17

May [the book of] the story of Yusuf ve Züleyha
Be blessed by God for its owner.
The calligraphy, the plates, the gathering together [of the pages],
and also the binding

^14 Stouchkine, La peinture turque d’après les manuscrits illustrés, pp. 52–54.
^15 Çağman and Tanrıoğlu, Topkapı Saray Museum, Islamic Miniature Painting, cat. no. 136.
^17 My reading of the colophon on fol. 259r. Şöylemezoglu mistakenly noted the page as 259v. (Şöylemezoglu, “An illustrated copy of Hamdi’s Yusuf ve Züleyhâ,” fig. 1.)
Have been performed by the hand of one person.

My purpose in making this known
Is only this: May the connoisseurs see it;
May he [the artist] be overwhelmed by God’s Mercy,
So that that sufferer is remembered through prayer.19

The Topkapı colophon reads also in Turkish, even though the main text is in Chagatay Turkish.19

(Ba) defter ki ehyâ-i pîr-süzâr
Kül sahibine müthârek Hüddî
Hat ve levha ve meçûf ve cildî hem
Bahâb (hir kıçının elinden) edâ
Muradn bunu (cylemekden) beyan
Badur cân nazâr kilsa ehl-i sefa
Hüddî cêlesîn gark-i rahmet (ami)
Ki ol müstemonî (dua dan âra)

May (this) book that [consists of] burning distiches
Be blessed by God for its owner.
The calligraphy, the plates, the gathering together
[of the pages], and also the binding
Have been performed by (the hand of one person).
My purpose (in making) this known
Is only this: May the connoisseurs see it;
May he [the artist] be overwhelmed by God’s Mercy,
So that (the poor one) is remembered (through prayer).20

The wording of the two texts is almost identical, differing only in a few places. Thus I have used Stöylemezoğlu’s English translation of the

19 The reading of the words between the parentheses is somewhat problematic but the general meaning stays essentially the same. There appears to be some spelling mistakes, omissions, or different spellings by the calligrapher. I used the Munich colophon as the basis for my reading. Since the Munich colophon is composed of eleven syllables per line and some of the lines of the Topkapı colophon also follow this system, I chose to read all the lines in this fashion except for the first line which is ten syllables. Here the first letter can be read as ‘je’ and the second as ‘re’ (the letter vav elsewhere does not have a long tail). Thus the word ‘por’ (wing) can also be read and the word ‘por-e’ can be reconstructed to satisfy the eleven syllable format. However calligraphers did not follow such formats strictly and there could be other possible readings of the words in parentheses. I am thankful to Ervan Schick for discussing these issues with me.
20 My translation of the Topkapı colophon.

Munich colophon as a model for my translation of the Topkapı Hanme as well. We may then almost be certain that we are faced with two works of Pir Ahmed executed fifteen years apart.

Comparison of the Manuscripts

Çağman and Tanind’s observations on the similarity of the miniatures of the two manuscripts will not be repeated here, but it is now valid to compare not only the miniatures but the two manuscripts in their entirety to understand the stylistic changes Pir Ahmet went through in fifteen years. This comparison may also be useful to understand the differences between the patronage of the arts of the book during the reigns of Selim I (1512–1520) and Suleyman the Magnificent (1520–1566).
Size

When we compare both manuscripts in terms of their physical qualities it becomes apparent that the 1515 Munich manuscript was less ambitious compared to the 1530–31 Topkapi manuscript. The Munich Yusuf ve Zuleyha is a small manuscript which measures 105x175mm whereas the Topkapi Hamse is a larger manuscript measuring 185x295mm. Although size can not be used as a criteria for luxury manuscripts, it is important to note that almost no illustrated manuscript before Süleyman’s reign reached the size of the Topkapi Hamse. Most Ottoman illustrated manuscripts from the second half of the 15th century and early 16th century follow the small size of the Munich manuscript. Thus, it is possible to suggest that Pir Ahmed was aware of the new standards of luxury books during the reign of Süleyman.

21 The Dublin Sīleymannāme (Chester Beatty Library, Ms. 406) is the only exception to this rule with its extraordinary size measuring 510x443mm.
Calligraphy

Surprisingly, the Munich and the Topkapi manuscripts were copied neither in the same style nor in the same script. The Munich manuscript is copied in vocalized naskh in two columns and the Topkapi Hamse in nasta’liq in four columns. If the colophons of each manuscript were not known to us, we would not have guessed that Pir Ahmed was equally qualified in both scripts. However, such qualifications were not unheard of among known calligraphers.22 It might just be necessary here to note that the choice of the script for a certain manuscript probably relied on the language of the work and its previous copies. For example, while Pir Ahmed preferred vocalized naskh for Yusuf ve Züleyha, the Turkish masnavi of Hamdi, he chose nasta’liq for Nevai’s Hamse which was composed in Chagatay Turkish. It is possible that earlier copies of Nevai’s text, which Pir Ahmed made use of, were also copied in nasta’liq script following the trend in Husain Bayqara’s court in Herat as well as other centers in Iran. Considering the fact that Pir Ahmed copied and illustrated one manuscript in Western Turkish (Ottoman) and another in Eastern Turkish (Chagatay), we can not easily know if he understood both languages well. However, he used Western Turkish in both of his colophons.

Binding

The Munich Yusuf ve Züleyha has a lacquer binding that is much simpler than the Topkapi Hamse.23 The main field, which is brownish yellow, is symmetrically decorated with black cloud scrolls detailed in gold. The border is decorated with gold lotuses over a black ground. The dark burgundy-colored leather doublures have a stamped central medallion with a cloud and lotus design outlined in gold.24 The binding of the Topkapi Hamse is much more elaborate in its complex design with saz leaves, lotuses, and rosettes in red, black, and gold on black.25 The reddish brown doublures have a stamped and gilded central medallion and four cornerpieces with raised motifs of leaf scrolls and lotuses. The Topkapi binding appears as a masterpiece whereas the Munich binding remains more modest. However, since lacquer was not common at the

24 The flap is missing.

Figure 2

Ottoman court in 1515, the Munich Yusuf ve Züleyha might have brought Pir Ahmed much recognition and fame at the time. In fact, Pir Ahmed and his son might have been among those artists who were brought to the Ottoman court after the Ottoman conquest of Tabriz in 1514. So the 1515 Munich Yusuf ve Züleyha could have been Pir Ahmed’s first work at the Ottoman court.

Illumination

The Munich Yusuf ve Züleyha has a single illuminated title panel at the beginning of the text.26 It consists of gilt scrolls with lotuses and runis symmetrically arranged around a medallion over a dark blue ground. Two similar scroll, runi, and lotus rows top the panel. Other headings with

26 The images of the illuminations in the manuscript have not been published yet.
simple illuminations are found throughout the text. The Topkapı Hamse has a finely illuminated roundel with the name of the author at the beginning of the manuscript, followed by double-illuminated text pages. There are also four other illuminated headings at the beginning of each poem of the Hamse. Dark blue and gold dominate the illumination. The cloud band, which first appears in Ottoman manuscript illumination during Bayezid II's reign,\(^{27}\) is very dominant as a repeat design in gold along the edges of the illumination. Even though the motifs themselves are not innovative for the reign of Süleyman the Magnificent, the design of the illumination in the Topkapı Hamse shows a tremendous elaboration and refinement in comparison to the Munich Yusuf ve Zileyla, just like the lacquer covers. In fifteen years Pir Ahmed must have refined his hand in illumination and his patronage must have allowed him to apply his skills extensively to create a book as exquisite as the Topkapı Hamse of Nevai. The inclusion of such quantity and quality of illumination in an illustrated manuscript seems to have also been a significant achievement of the arts of the book during Süleyman’s reign.\(^{28}\)

**Miniatures**

The Munich Yusuf ve Zileyla has four miniatures, of which two are double-page compositions.\(^{29}\) During my visit to the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in 1997, it became apparent that folio 115, which had a single-page miniature on its recto side,\(^{30}\) had been stolen from the manuscript along with folio 114. Therefore, it was only possible to study that miniature from the microfilm. Surprisingly, the miniatures are limited only to the first half of the manuscript. While this placement seems strange and may indicate a haphazard organization of the book, the two double-page compositions suggest the opposite. Perhaps this awkward placing of the miniatures was not due to the lack of organization of the artist but to his limited resources. The Topkapı Hamse has sixteen miniatures with a higher concentration in the middle. They are approximately three-quarter-page compositions set between the lines of text. When we compare the miniatures of the two manuscripts Pir Ahmed does not seem to have drastically changed his figure style, but his compositions in the 1515 manuscript seem to be simpler and less dependent on architecture.\(^{31}\) In the Munich manuscript he also does not use a style that is recognizably Ottoman. In fact, he is thought to have

---

\(^{27}\) Banu Mahir, "II. Bayezid Dönemi Nakkaşhanesinin Osmanlı Tezhip Sanatına Katkıları," Türkleyici 60 (February 1990), pp. 4–13.

\(^{28}\) My study of the illustrated manuscripts from the reigns of Mehmed II, Bayezid II, and Selim I suggests that in general such a high level in an entire illustrated manuscript was hard to achieve before 1515. Thus the artists who came from Tabriz after Selim’s conquest in 1514 must have been very influential in the total conception of an illustrated manuscript as a luxury book at the Ottoman court. See Ayşin Yolat-Yıldırım, “The Role of Illustrated Manuscripts in Ottoman Luxury Book Production: 1400–1520” (Ph.D. dissertation in progress, Institute of Fine Arts, New York University).


\(^{30}\) Söylemezoğlu mistakenly noted this miniature to be on folio 114v. The microfilm of the manuscript and the present sequence of the pages show that folios 114 and 115 were entirely cut out from the manuscript some time after the manuscript was microfilmed.

\(^{31}\) See the bibliography in note 2 for a more detailed analysis of the miniature style.
been one of the artists who came from Tabriz after 1514 based on the similarity of his style in the Munich manuscript to 15th century Timurid painting. However, in the 1530 Topkapı Hanımse Pir Ahmed includes several architectural details that are distinctly Ottoman: the water mill on 45v, the basilical building with a round opening in the tympanum on 117v, or the marble fountain on 209v. Since these details were already common in Ottoman painting in 1515, it is most likely that Pir Ahmed had just come to the Ottoman court in 1515 and was not most trained in such a style. The archival information mentioned above on his son Mehmed bin Pir Ahmed seems to corroborate this stylistic judgement since it suggests that Pir Ahmed may have arrived with his son from Tabriz during the reign of Selim. By 1530 Pir Ahmed seems to have adjusted his style to be more in line with that of the Ottoman taste, as we see in the Topkapı Hamse.

**Conclusion**

In general, we may conclude from the new reading of the Topkapı colophon and the comparisons between the 1515 Munich and 1530–31 Topkapı manuscripts that Pir Ahmed was probably new to the Ottoman court in 1515, and that his multiple talents in all arts of the book must have allowed him to reach a higher position, most likely during the reign of Süleyman the Magnificent. Very elaborate lacquer binding, several high quality illuminations, and several fine miniatures in the Topkapı Hamse may also attest the new standards of luxury illustrated manuscripts produced under the patronage of Süleyman the Magnificent. Thus, Pir Ahmed should not be considered solely as the product of his early training, which was most likely outside of the Ottoman realm, but also of his patronage at the Ottoman court which must have affected his later artistic career.

38) Most miniatures from this manuscript have been published by other scholars. Here only two of those that have not been published are chosen for illustration.
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**Sonsöz**

İrvin Cemil Schick

Mu’tezelle kelâm cilalardan Sümârme, “zaman, kalemlerin izini silmeyi arzu etmez” der. Etmez belki, ama kalemlerin tek hâsın zaman değildir ki... Ve kimisi makineki tefek aqıteyle saldıran men kalem izlerine, kimisi onları sistematiik ihmal yoluya yok etmeye gayret eder.

M. Uğur Derman, kırık kütse senedir yazının yanında savastır. Türkiye’de olsun, dünyada olsun, artık bu davâyhı eşânlanmış olmuş istmi. O kadar ki, altmış beş yaşını kutlamak, buna yardımcı çalışmalarının ve sebatkârliğinin bizlerin yüklediği minnet borsusunu karneña kararına odemeye çalışmak için elinizdeki Armağan Kitabı’ni hazırlamalığa koyulduğunuzu ilan ettirmişiz karşâşiştığımız olagəntüstü ilgîyi büyük türlü izah etmenin yok yoluk sanırıorum.

Üstelik projeimize katkıları sadece sayıca çokluğuna değil, ne kadar geniş bir meslek yelpazesine çevrilikleri de kaydede degerebene. Kitaba katkıda bulunanlar arasında hattatlar (Ali Alpaslan, Davud Bektaş, Savaş Çevik, Hüseyin Gündüz, Talip Mert, Mehmed Özoğuz, Osman Özoğuz, Mohamed Zakariya), çeşitli meşalelerden hüsn-i hat tarih araştırmacıları (Süleyman Berk, François Deroche, Muhammed Ali Karimzadeh Tabrizi, Nabil Safwat, Tim Sunley, Abdüllahmet Tüfenkçıoğlu), müzehanib ve müzezihbeleri (İnci Birol, Eric Broug, Çiçek Derman, Gürbüz Duran, Faruk Taşkale, Kütüphaneler ve müzeziciler (Medine Akgül, Sule Aksoy, İsmail Frühsa), sanat tarihçleri ve araştırmacıları (Funda Berksoy, 

---

ما أن أثبّتُ القَّافِلَةَ نَتَّعَجَمُ فِي ذِرَّةِ الْأَيَامِ