MUQARNAS

OLEG GRABAR

MUQARNAS

AN ANNUAL ON THE VISUAL CULTURE
OF THE ISLAMIC WORLD

FRONTIERS OF ISLAMIC ART AND ARCHITECTURE: ESSAYS IN CELEBRATION OF OLEG GRABAR'S EIGHTIETH BIRTHDAY

EDITED BY

GÜLRU NECİPOĞLU
JULIA BAILEY

VOLUME 25

THE AGA KHAN PROGRAM FOR ISLAMIC ARCHITECTURE
THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY SPECIAL VOLUME

BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2008

MUQARNAS

Sponsored by:
The Aga Khan Program for Islamic Architecture at Harvard University and
the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Note to Contributors: Muqarnas will consider for publication articles on all aspects of Islamic visual culture, historical and contemporary. Articles submitted for publication are subject to review by the editors and/or outside readers. Manuscripts should be no more than 40 double-spaced typed pages of text (not including endnotes) and have no more than 15-20 illustrations. Exceptions can be made for articles dealing with unpublished visual or textual primary sources, but if they are particularly long, they may be divided into two or more parts for publication in successive volumes.

Both text and endnotes should be double-spaced; endnotes should conform to the usage of the *Chicago Manual of Style*. Illustrations should be labeled and accompanied by a double-spaced caption list. Authors are responsible for obtaining permission to reproduce copyrighted illustrations and for supplying the proper credit-line information.

For the transliteration of Arabic and Persian, *Muqarnas* uses the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* system, but with the omission of subscript bars and the substitution of *q* for *ḳ* and *j* for *dj*; for Ottoman Turkish, authors are given the choice of the *EI* system or modern Turkish orthography. All transliterated words and phrases in the text and transliterated author's names and titles in the endnotes must follow this system. Exceptions are proper nouns (names of persons, dynasties, and places) and Arabic words that have entered the English language and have generally recognized English forms (e.g., madrasa, iwan, mihrab, Abbasid, Muhammad); these should be anglicized and not italicized; placenames and names of historical personages with no English equivalent should be transliterated but, aside from *ʿayn* and *hamza*, diacritical marks should be omitted (e.g., Maqrizi, Fustat, Sanʿa). A detailed style sheet and further information can be obtained from the editorial office. Write to the Managing Editor, Aga Khan Program, Sackler Museum, 485 Broadway, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138. E-mail: muqarnas@fas.harvard.edu; fax: 617-496-8389.

ISSN 0732-2992
ISBN 978 90 04 17327 9

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

In Tribute to Oleg Grabar vii

Bibliography 1993–2007 viii

Patricia Crone, "Barefoot and Naked": What Did the Bedouin of the Arab Conquests Look Like? 1

Michael Cook, The Namesake Taboo 11

Gülru Necipoğlu, The Dome of the Rock as Palimpsest: ʿAbd al-Malik's Grand Narrative and Sultan Süleyman's Glosses 17

Eva R. Hoffman, Between East and West: The Wall Paintings of Samarra and the Construction of Abbasid Princely Culture 107

Yasser Tabbaa, Andalusian Roots and Abbasid Homage in the Qubbat al-Barudiyyin in Marrakech 133

Nasser Rabbat, Design without Representation in Medieval Egypt 147

Sheila S. Blair, A Brief Biography of Abu Zayd 155

Scott Redford, A Newly Read Inscription on the Walls of Antalya, Turkey 177

Cynthia Robinson, Marginal Ornament: Poetics, Mimesis, and Devotion in the Palace of the Lions 185

Howayda Al-Harithy, Weaving Historical Narratives: Beirut's Last Mamluk Monument 215

Jonathan M. Bloom, The "Fatimid" Doors of the Fakahani Mosque in Cairo 231

Lisa Golombek, From Timur to Tivoli: Reflections on *il giardino all'italiana* 243

Anthony Welch, The Emperor's Grief: Two Mughal Tombs 255

David J. Roxburgh, "The Eye Is Favored for Seeing the Writing's Form": On the Sensual and the Sensuous in Islamic Calligraphy 275

Tülay Artan, A *Book of Kings* Produced and Presented as a Treatise on Hunting 299

Mika Natif, The SOAS *Anvār-i Suhaylī*: The Journey of a "Reincarnated" Manuscript 331

Marianna Shreve Simpson, Mostly Modern Miniatures: Classical Persian Painting in the Early Twentieth Century 359

TÜLAY ARTAN

A *BOOK OF KINGS* PRODUCED AND PRESENTED AS A TREATISE ON HUNTING

In the Topkapı Palace collection is an early-seventeenth-century manuscript secured in a fine leather binding, an Ottoman Turkish translation of a medieval Arabic text, *ʿUmdat al-mulūk*, bearing the title *Tuhfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn*.[1] It is composed of three parts, the first on hippiatry (the treatment of horse diseases) and hippology (the study of horses), the second on horsemanship, and the third on hunting. Written on burnished paper in clearly legible *naskh*, it is illustrated with 164 miniatures of superb quality. These are certainly the work of two exceptional artists; so far, however, they have been overlooked by art historians, probably due to their subject matter.[2]

ROYAL PROJECT, UNIQUE DOCUMENT

The sumptuous, purplish-brown leather binding of the *Tuhfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn* is embossed in gold, with a central lobed medallion and pendants and lobed concave corner brackets, all decorated with floral and cloud motifs. The field of the doublure and flap is filled with gilded cloud bands on a ground of densely spiraling blossom-scrolls. The spine is marked by a well-wishing poem in Arabic: "To the owner [of this work] felicity and success; may he live as long as pigeons coo" (*Li-ṣāḥibihi saʿāda wa-salāma wa ṭūla 'l-ʿumri mā nāhat ḥamāmatun*). The dedication medallion and the beginnings of the first two chapters are illuminated. Chapter endings, too, are illuminated with elegant floral designs. Page borders are plain, but the illustrated pages and interlinear spaces are often accompanied by gold illumination in the headings. Even at first sight the calligraphy, illuminations, illustrations, and binding together testify to a royal project. Eventually, this impression is confirmed by direct evidence.

On both sides of the first folio, we find two frontispiece miniatures (1a and 1b), each showing a gathering of men in a kiosk. On folio 1a, six people are shown on the ground floor and another four on the upper story of the kiosk; both parties are praying with their hands raised and open, and possibly facing Mecca. On folio 1b, four men in a single-story kiosk are sitting side by side, albeit in couples, expressing close companionship as each member of a twosome embraces the other with one arm while simultaneously grasping the other's opposite arm with his free hand. It is plausible to regard the two miniatures in question as reflecting both on the patron/sponsor and on a particular group that was responsible for the production of the manuscript, perhaps comprising the translator-author of the text, the artists of the paintings, the calligrapher, and even the binder, the illuminator, and any assistants.[3]

On folio 1a, there is also a note in red ink in the upper margin that reads "Illustrated Horse Training" (*Muṣavver te'dībü'l-ḫayl*),[4] as well as the seal of Sultan Ahmed [I, r. 1603–17]. In a circular dedication medallion on the next folio (2a), both the title of the manuscript and its patron are identified in gilt lettering:

> *Tuḥfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn*, the Gift of Kings and Sultans, has been translated into Turkish upon the order of his majesty, the sultan of the sultans of the world and caliph of the owner of justice and beneficence, Sultan Ahmed Khan son of Sultan Mehmed Khan son of Sultan Murad Khan, may God support his reign and sultanate. This book includes the books of veterinary medicine, horsemanship, and the hunting of wild beast and bird. God bless our master Muhammad, his family, and all his associates.[5]

On folio 4a, the original from which this book is translated is identified as the "Main Subject of Kings" (*ʿUmdat al-mulūk*), a book dealing with veterinary science, horsemanship, and the science of hunting beasts and birds, penned by a certain Amir Hajib ʿAshiq Timur.

Unfortunately, a close study reveals that some pages of text and miniatures are missing, while others are in disarray. Moreover, much of the final chapter is lost, together with the epilogue and the colophon. Never-

theless, what has survived is of considerable importance. Today, in the manuscript collections of Istanbul, as well as in those built on material dispersed from the Ottoman capital and earlier Islamic courts, there are numerous medieval treatises on horses and horsemanship, which, like medieval European treatises on hippology, deal primarily with descriptions of horses, the art of riding, and the prevention and treatment of horse ailments. In the hands of numerous copiers, translators, and/or compilers, the contents of these manuscripts, single, merged, or combined, have changed so much that it is not always easy to establish their origins, authors, or patrons.[6] In our case, however, there is a definite attribution to an original work by Amir Hajib ʿAshiq Timur. Moreover, in addition to (or in spite of) this lineage, the seventeenth-century manuscript in question appears to be strictly and literally unique—not only because it is opulent but also because it incorporates a section on hunting. As opposed to the overwhelming number of medieval Islamic works on the veterinary sciences that deal with the horse, treatises on the hunt are extremely rare. Furthermore, their subject matter is mostly limited to the birds of prey that were used in hunting. Also, among those that are available to modern scholarship, there is none that can be related either to our text or to any other text attributable to Amir Hajib ʿAshiq Timur.[7] Dedicated to Ahmed I, the *Tuḥfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn* may have been compiled and prepared around 1610, at a time when military campaigns were becoming less frequent and hunting was emerging not only as a semi-routinized substitute but even as a personal passion of the young sultan. The identification of the patron and/or sponsor behind the production of the manuscript as a whole—and especially of the section on the merits of the royal hunt—as well as that of the two artists involved in its production (here designated "Painter A" and "Painter B") can provide new perspectives for the understanding of early-seventeenth-century politics at the Ottoman court.

The present study is limited to an exploration of the contents of the third chapter on hunting.[8] Oleg Grabar, elaborating on "the epic" as one of "the major themes of Persian painting," has remarked that

> ...the stories of the *Book of Kings* also appear in other texts than that of Firdawsi. This was possible because certain stories, especially those connected with Bahram Gur and Khosraw Parviz, were reinterpreted in other genres, but also because many of the stories of the *Book of Kings* appear in the guise of a relatively small number of general subjects or activities (battle, hunt, feast, etc.) to which the heroes of the tales devote themselves, and thus the illustration gives a particular flavor to each manuscript. One could call these general subjects "subject-types" and distinguish them from the particular subjects of each story.[9]

What I shall be presenting below demonstrates that not only the "subject-types" of the *Book of Kings*—battle, hunt, and feast—but also the "person-types"—that is, its combatants, hunters, and partying royalty—appear in the *Tuḥfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn*, where they turn out, in both the text and the miniatures, to have lives of their own.

THE UPS AND DOWNS OF THE OTTOMAN ROYAL HUNT FROM THE LATE FOURTEENTH TO THE EARLY SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

Starting with the eldest son of Orhan Gazi (r. 1324–62), Süleyman Pasha, who is reported to have died when his horse tripped and fell during a hunting party in 1357, the Ottoman royal hunt is often noted by the chroniclers as part of court life and routine.[10] It was in the sixteenth century, however, that Süleyman Pasha's incomparably more famous namesake, Süleyman I (r. 1520–66), emerged as the epitome of the ferocious hunter-sultan. Again and again, chroniclers described him and artists of his time portrayed him as participating in hunting parties.[11] This distinctive topos was also retrospectively applied. The *Hünernāme*, or Book of Talents, which was planned to expound on Süleyman I's military prowess, not only pictured him as *the* Ottoman royal hunter but also breathed new life into the hunting images of a few of his long-gone predecessors, such as Murad I, Beyazid I, Mehmed I, and Süleyman's father, Selim I.[12]

Both Murad I (r. 1363–89) and Beyazid I (r. 1389–1402) are known to have patronized extensive hunting establishments, incorporating a task force of around five to six thousand people, including those stationed in the hunting preserves.[13] The janissary corps, generally agreed to have been introduced under Murad I, incorporated titles such as *ṭurnacıbaşı*, *ṣamsuncubaşı* (*sansuncubaşı/seksoncubaşı*), *zaġārcıbaşı*, and *segbānbaşı*, all of whom were officers charged with the care and management of rare and cherished hunting dogs. The implied absorption of members of an earlier, already existing hunting establishment into the new

army of royal guards has been interpreted as a by-product of Murad's predilection for the hunt.[14] Elsewhere, his numerous and most valuable hunting dogs are said to have worn lavish silver collars.[15] Murad I is also credited with having constructed a comfortable hunting lodge at Çömlek (also spelled "Çölmek"), a seemingly inexhaustible game preserve to the north of Edirne that remained a favored hunting station for centuries.[16]

As for Murad II (r. 1421–44, 1446–51), an anonymous *Ġazavātnāme* (heroic poem of military exploits) on the Izladi and Vidin campaigns records him as having witnessed Karamanoğlu being repulsed in 1442 while he was enjoying a hunting party.[17] He is said to have treasured a thousand hounds and more than two hundred hunting birds.[18] Another source records Murad II's hunting at the summer pastures of Sakar, Keşerlik, and Çöke, all in the vicinity of Edirne.[19] His son Mehmed II (r. 1444–46, 1451–81) and grandson Beyazid II (r. 1481–1512) also frequently hunted in and around Edirne,[20] often making use of Murad I's hunting lodge at Çömlek/Çölmek, the center of the Çöke district.[21] Mehmed II is also noted as being at Çöke when he issued orders to Malkoçoğlu Bali Bey to launch raids directed at Hungary. Similarly, Beyazid II is described as receiving ambassadorial envoys from Egypt, India, and Hungary at his hunting lodge. Such observations attest to the routinization of hunting as part of the official duties of the sultan.[22]

Even after the conquest of Constantinople, Mehmed II and his son Beyazid II often returned to Edirne, and hunting parties in the already established parks and woodlands resumed.[23] Selim I spent the winters of 1513–14[24] and 1515–16[25] in Edirne, where he hunted intensely. In 1518 and 1519, he is reported as hunting at Gümülcine (Komotini), Karasu Yenicesi, Filibe (Plovdiv), and also in the vicinity of Edirne.[26] Quite noteworthy is his unusual hunting trip to Trabzon.[27] Thus it comes as no surprise that Selim I's hunter portrait should have been included in the first volume of the *Hünernāme*.[28]

As already indicated, the reign and career of Süleyman the Lawgiver represented both a continuation of the hunting activities of his predecessors and, at least with regard to how those activities were portrayed, a turning point. Numerous Ottoman chronicles abound in references to the extent to which he too was absorbed by hunting.[29] In September 1521, immediately after the conquest of Belgrade, Süleyman is to be found hunting at Uzuncaova—while he was still mourning the death of his son, Prince Murad, and while preparations for the Rhodian expedition must have been imminent.[30] In later years and decades, during his numerous westbound expeditions through and much further beyond Edirne, the sultan hunted as the army marched on. Of all the various locations that he frequented, the woodlands (*ḳoru*) in the vicinity of Yanbolu seem to have been the most favored during his reign.[31]

As with so many other things, a certain change seems to have set in after the Süleymanic era, though it is not easy to pinpoint just what was involved. At the very least, it appears that Süleyman's immediate successors, that is to say his son, his grandson, and his great-grandson, did not sustain the same level of hunting activity, or perhaps did not do so willingly and enthusiastically. Among other things, this might have been because the imperial hunting reserves developed and exploited over previous centuries were now more difficult to manage and maintain. For example, while Selim II (r. 1566–75) had no real interest in hunting, he did take care to act in accordance with established court custom. Thus, following his enthronement and as soon as he arrived in Edirne, he issued several imperial decrees towards the protection of the hunting grounds in the vicinity.[32]

There are other ambiguities. Selim II's occasional hunting processions have been painted by a group of European artists whose works are not regarded as reflecting direct observation. Instead, these paintings are agreed to have been based on an original, possibly by local artists, that was acquired in Istanbul about 1575 by David Ungnad, the Habsburg ambassador.[33] At the same time, the court painter Nakkaş Hasan, who in the *Şehnāme-i āl-i Osman* of 1596 depicted Selim II as using a mace to strike wild animals being brought to him, all the while remaining seated on a throne under a canopy, may have been resorting to subdued yet deliberate sarcasm.[34] Murad III (r. 1575–95), who acquired a reputation as a mystic and a patron of the arts, was never noted by the chroniclers of the time as participating in any kind of martial activity, including hunting. However, Michael Heberer, a former galley slave, testifies that in 1588 he had the opportunity to watch Murad III hunt rabbits in the royal gardens on the shores of the Bosphorus.[35] Murad's son Mehmed III (r. 1595–1603) also appears to have been physically inactive. And yet, when Mehmed III had to participate in the Eger campaign, he left Istanbul in July 1596, together with all the palace huntsmen in his

retinue, and as he traveled he hunted officially and visibly at Halkalı, Benefşe, Çatalca, Silivri, Arablu Deresi, Çorlu, Karışdıran, Burgaz, and Hasköy.[36] It may therefore be possible to infer that while, after Süleyman I, participation in royal hunting parties was clearly not a personal choice, let alone an obsession, the next three sultans nevertheless regarded it as a duty, a regnal obligation that they complied with. Moreover, even when the sultans were not consumed by hunting, they often took measures to ensure that the game reserves were jealously guarded and carefully and routinely maintained.

With Ahmed I (r. 1603–17) the Ottoman royal hunt took another turn. The chronicles of his time abound in references to hunting parties, often concluding with sumptuous banquets.[37] In early June 1604, six months after he had ascended the throne, the sixteen-year-old sultan was at the palaces of Davudpaşa and Halkalı to bid farewell to his army and his grand vizier, who were embarking on a campaign to the western front while Ahmed busied himself hunting birds with falcons or watching performances of horsemanship.[38] In early November 1604, the sultan received the news of the birth of his first son while he was at a hunting party at Rumeli Bahçesi.[39] In early October 1605, he was hunting at Çatalca and on the spur of the moment decided to visit Edirne, perhaps out of a need to emulate his prodigious forebearers who had routinely set out on Europe-bound campaigns from Edirne after the completion of the hunting season. On this occasion, however, no hunting is recorded either on the arduous three-day trip, during his eight-day stay there, or on the way back. Likewise, when he traveled to Bursa the next month, he did not engage in any hunting on the way.[40] Nevertheless, possibly in response to manipulation by courtiers frustrated by his immediate predecessors' lack of interest in war leadership and deficient martial skills, the young sultan from this point onward began to demonstrate an overwhelming commitment to hunting in the royal gardens of Istanbul: at Üsküdar, Göksu, Kandilli, Tokat, and Beykoz on the Asian side; at Sarıyer and Feridun along the European shores of the Bosphorus; and at Ayazağa, Haramideresi, Kağıthane, Karaağaç, and Halkalı on the Golden Horn.[41] Still, these hunts were on a relatively small scale and close to home. A major break came in December 1612 when, setting out from Davudpaşa, Ahmed hunted all the way to Edirne, organizing parties at Filorya (Küçükçekmece), Büyükçekmece, Silivri, Çorlu, Karışdıran, Burgaz, Babaeski, and Hafsa. He then spent the rest of the winter hunting in and around Edirne, enjoying drives at Çömlek, Kurdkayası, and Karaağaç that lasted for days.[42] On April 15, 1613, the royal party left Edirne and hunted relentlessly on the road as they headed first for Bolayır and Gelibolu to visit the tomb of Süleyman Pasha "the Hunter," and then for Istanbul.[43] On May 14 the sultan finally returned and made a ceremonial entry into the capital with a pomp-and-circumstance procession as if he were returning from a victorious military campaign.[44] He promptly left the imperial palace again, this time for the palace at Üsküdar, where he stayed for forty-five days and hunted in the royal gardens. Over the rest of the summer, he continued to hunt as he visited the palaces and gardens at İstavroz, Tersane, Davudpaşa, and Halkalı; there was also a drive at Çatalca.[45] The following winter he once again moved to Edirne and hunted along the way.[46] While at Edirne, he organized drives lasting for many days and nights in the royal hunting grounds of Çömlek.[47]

Mustafa Safi reports a royal bag of eighteen deer, 150 hares, forty foxes, and several wolves taken on one occasion; regarding another, he speaks of a bag of twelve deer, 127 hares, thirty-three foxes, and one wolf.[48] Large as these numbers may seem, as royal hunts go they are relatively modest. The tallies suggest that Ahmed I had been practicing this royal sport purely as an elite pastime involving demonstrations of chivalry and gallantry. Hunting reflected the sultan's need to show off his military prowess in the absence of opportunities for (potentially) victorious campaigns during his reign.[49] No longer an overactive youth but now a vigorous young man, Ahmed I was a make-believe conqueror who modeled himself on Süleyman I. Although no miniature painting has survived that depicts him during the chase or in any other hunt-related setting, there is a document referring to a now-lost scroll picture of him in a procession to the hunting park at Davudpaşa, with the kind of pomp and display that had been established during the reign of Süleyman I.[50] Hasan Bey-zade Ahmed, Topçular Katibi ʿAbdülkadir, and Mustafa Safi also repeatedly refer to the Süleyman-like posturing and behavior of the young sultan. He used the hunting lodge at Çömlek, rebuilt by Süleyman I and called *bār-gāh-ı Süleymānī*, as a reminder of his great-grandfather's might and magnificence.[51] He was apparently perceived as so promising a replacement for his great-grandfather that European observers were even willing to accept an equestrian portrait of Süleyman I as

a representation of Ahmed I.[52] In any case, Ahmed I came to patronize the entire hunting establishment of the court, which included no fewer than thirty falconers (*doġancı*) in the *Enderūn* (inner section of the palace)—three in the Privy Chamber, seven in the Treasury, and twenty in the Imperial Wardrobe. At the same time, in the *Bīrūn* (outer section of the palace), there were 271 goshawk keepers (*çaḳırcı*), 276 peregrine falconers (*şāhīnci*), and forty-five hawk keepers (*atmacacı*)—nearly six hundred men in all.[53] It was a machine capable of wholesale slaughter on a much more massive scale.

THE *TUḤFETÜ'L-MÜLŪK VE'S-SELĀṬĪN* AND ITS "HUNTING TREATISE" COMPONENT

It was probably at this juncture that the *Tuhfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn* was translated (or compiled or adapted) for Ahmed I. By way of introduction, the text presents a compendium of Islamic references to the horse. It is followed by a stately eulogy of Ahmed I, who is said to have understood the importance of noble horses, gallant riders, the veterinary sciences, and chivalry. Like the early Islamic conquerors, the Ottoman sultan is portrayed as having had to rely on the power of the horse to vanquish and rule. We then come to statements reflecting on Ahmed I's predilection for horse racing and hunting, expressed in terms of his eagerness to campaign against the internal enemies of his realm:

> His noble highness holds race horses and strong-hearted horsemen in great favor, and his high-flying hawks willingly go out for fresh air in the form of a ride in the desert and in the wide fields to hunt the partridge-hearted subjects and the gazelle-hearted peoples of the kingdom.[54]

This passage subtly reflects an underlying tension concerning the diverse values embodied in hunting. We understand from period chroniclers such as Mustafa Safi, who was also the sultan's imam and confidant, that many of Ahmed I's contemporaries disapproved of the sultan's passion for hunting. Such total engagement meant pleasure, and "any kind of pleasure was regarded with suspicion and could be linked with sin, particularly lust. This attitude was so entrenched in the medieval mind that pleasure often engendered a sense of guilt in the psyche of believers."[55]

At the Ottoman court, too, the baying of the hounds, the bustle and excitement of splendidly clad riders, the thrill of the chase, and the triumphant beat of the small kettledrums were all components of the highest form of enjoyment. In court circles and among the ulema, there seems to have been considerable discussion surrounding the young Ahmed's devotion to his hunting routine, the consensus being that it was infringing on the sultan's regular Friday prayers. There were also complaints about lavish spending on the royal hunt, specifically the cost of maintaining vast hunting parks and preserves, which denied commoners access to forest resources and, even worse, withdrew large tracts of land from cultivation. Court officials repeatedly recommended economizing on the royal hunt: in their view, it was a major source of economic strain, with spending for it (on robes, carriages, palaces, parks, hounds, horses, and, of course, hunters) contributing greatly to the rising burden on the imperial treasury.

In his *Zübdetü't-Tevârîh*, Mustafa Safi repeatedly defended his master against such charges.[56] He found it necessary to explain that beyond pleasure, hunting involved a serious motive.[57] For the feudal elites of medieval Europe and the noble warriors of Asia, prowess in the art of hunting was an important aspect of social life. It provided (or sustained) essential training for chivalry and warfare and, in times of peace, served as a substitute for the battlefield. The above quotation, linking the sultan's absorption in hunting, horses, and horsemanship to his military prowess in fighting the empire's internal and external enemies, should also be read in this vein.

Questions of authorship

In neither European nor non-European pre-modernity does the elite interest in hunting necessarily translate into an abundant literature covering all aspects of this key practice: there are major, albeit varying, lacunae in both literatures. In the medieval West, for example, there was prolific writing on venery, but it contains remarkably little on the role of the horse in the chase. In medieval literature from the Islamic lands, even though there are plenty of manuscripts on beasts in general and horses in particular, they provide little information on hunting. This is the reason that the "Treatise on Hunting" incorporated into the *Tuhfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn* is so significant, even though the original on which it was based is currently missing and its author remains obscure—despite the

folio 4a attribution of the original (as a whole) to a certain Amir Hajib ʿAshiq Timur.

Given customary practice at the time, it cannot be ruled out that what was rendered in Ottoman Turkish as the *Tuhfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn* was a compilation and conflation of two or more works. In fact, the text itself hints at this possibility in several places. On folio 201b, for example, we learn that the text comprises, first, a study of the horse and its ailments; second, a study of horsemanship, which inevitably goes hand in hand with veterinary science; and third, a revised and abridged version of a work by a certain Shuʿayb.[58] Unfortunately, I have been able to identify neither Shuʿayb nor his work. Folio 201b further asserts that what follows will concern a certain Bakr(?) and the "science," culture, and practice of hunting.[59] This second person may have been Abu Bakr al-Baytar ibn Badr al-Din, also known as Nasiri (Naseri) ibn al-Mundhir (d. 1340), who was the author of *Kāshif hamm al-wayl fī maʿrifat amrāḍ al-khayl* (ca. 1339–40); this book on hippiatry was based on earlier works such as *Kāmil al-ṣināʿatayn (al-bayṭara wa 'l-zarṭafa)*, composed by a certain Ibn Akhi Hizam in the ninth or tenth century.[60] Like his father before him, Abu Bakr was chief veterinary surgeon at the Mamluk court. He served in the palace of Sultan Muhammad al-Nasir (r. 1294, 1299–1341), to whom his treatise was dedicated—hence the title "Naseri," which came to be applied to both the work and its author. Several copies of Naseri have been located, and a few are still in Istanbul.[61]

How can this assertion be made compatible with that other claim by the translator of *ʿUmdat al-mulūk* into Ottoman Turkish, set out on folio 4a, that the original was composed or compiled (*te'līf etmişdir*) by a certain Amir Hajib ʿAshiq Timur? George Sarton has noted that a Syrian writer named Muhammad ibn Lajin al-Husami al-Tarabul[u]si al-Rammah (hence his nickname, "the Lancer of Tripoli") composed a manuscript on cavalry tactics entitled *Bughyat al-qāsidīn bi 'l-ʿamal fi 'l-mayādīn*. The work was dedicated to Amir ʿAshiq Timur Sayf al-Din al-Mardini, who was the Mamluk governor of Aleppo until his death in 1388.[62] This second reference to either the same or a very similar name raises the possibility that the person to whom the original of the *Tuhfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn* is attributed may have been the work's patron rather than its author.

The secondary literature on medical or military manuscripts of medieval Islamic vintage has so far yielded no further information on Amir Hajib ʿAshiq Timur as the patron of a manuscript on hunting. Numerous works on veterinary science and cavalry training compiled under the Mamluk sultanate consisted mostly of material from earlier writings dating back to the ninth or even the late-eighth century, i.e., to the time of the Abbasid caliphs of Baghdad. Furthermore, in Arabo-Islamic manuals, a chain of authority from master to student was also usually provided. Either or both of these dimensions—recopying from earlier works and master–student connections—might account for the references to Shuʿayb or Bakr. In the absence of any such lineage, it is still plausible that the *Tuḥfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn* is at least partially a descendant of a treatise from the latter part of the fourteenth century dedicated to ʿAshiq Timur, Amir of Aleppo. The master–student chain of lineage might have then extended back from him to a certain master of the hunt, another "Amir," who not only knew the chase but was also a close and longtime servitor of his ruler—as the other epithet,"Hajib," in reference to a prince's chamberlain, suggests. We also know that hunting masters often moved on to higher posts and greater successes, as did many an *amīr-i shikār* (master of the hunt) in the Mamluk kingdom.[63]

As with the author(s) of the original treatise(s), the identity of the Ottoman Turkish translator/compiler also remains unclear. In the preface, he repeatedly states that the translation had been ordered by Ahmed I. He also complains bitterly about the task assigned him, which, he says, has cost him a great deal of his treasured lifetime. He reveals nothing further, however, about himself, the immediate patron, or the circles in which the manuscript was produced. This raises the possibility that the work was never actually completed (as opposed to the idea of a completed manuscript that was subsequently broken up). Towards the end of this article, I will argue that the miniatures, more than anything else, provide us with clues regarding the identity of the patron and his motives for the production of such a sumptuous manuscript.

On the provision of hunting grounds, hunting aids, and hunting associates

The chapter on horsemanship concludes on folio 202a, the same page on which the chapter on hunting commences. There is no illuminated title page similar to the two previous ones, but a fine floral decoration in gilt accentuates the beginning of the new chapter, which unfolds with a preface on hunting grounds,

hunting aids, and hunting associates (202a–202b). This section, abounding in Islamic references, seems to derive from a medieval text on hunting. Next comes a section expounding on issues related to justifying the royal hunt (202b–203b). It is followed by what reads as a "mirror of princes" (*naṣīḥatnāme*) (203b–206b), as well as comments regarding the preparations for and purposes of the royal hunt (204a–205a), and a discussion of how to conduct oneself during the chase (205a–206a). I believe this last section is original, addressing Ahmed I in particular and possibly written by his courtiers. The text then continues with several sections on practical issues related to hunting organization. The repetitiousness of these sections seems to have been the result of stringing together various texts, perhaps those of Shuʿayb and/or Bakr. The chapter on hunting ends abruptly on 217b, with a new section heading on hunting dogs, which would have been followed by the section on dogs, and possibly by one on birds of prey. These lacunae are lamentable, since their absence leaves the seventy-two miniatures that follow, starting on 218a—nearly half of the miniatures in the manuscript—bound and presented with no accompanying text whatsoever.

At the beginning of the chapter on hunting (202a–202b), three ideas are set forth: first, that someone must provide the hunting grounds and facilitate the hunt; second, that hunting affords both the provider-facilitator and the hunter the opportunity to come into contact with the people; and third, that certain components of hunting, such as the aids and the associates, serve to define the roles of the confidants of the hunter. No mention is made of the prey that is the object of the hunt. Hence, hunting is portrayed as a royal obligation that sovereigns take upon themselves as part of their commitment to state and society.

In a fashion typical of medieval Islamic treatises the author alternates between between hunting and hunting grounds in the ethereal world and the physical world, as hunting becomes a metaphor for the search for absolute truth. It is God who provides the hunting reserves and facilitates the hunt, while the skill of hunting for (i.e., chasing, pursuing, or following) the truth (i.e., knowledge or belief) is passed on to the followers of the Islamic faith with the help of the Prophet Muhammad, the caliphs, and the great sultans. In the physical world, hunting lets sovereigns familiarize themselves with the realities of their subjects' lives. Like their lassoes and hunting eagles, the sultans' kindness and generosity extend far, helping them to rule justly. Similarly, the attendants and courtiers who make up the royal hunter's most intimate and reliable cohort assist the sultan in fulfilling his obligations.

Translated into everyday life, this passage reads as an introduction to the importance of knowing where hunting grounds in the wild are located and how to preserve them, as well as how to turn such areas, as well as deserts and oak groves, into well-kept game reserves for the enjoyment of royal hunters and their associates.[64] Hunting grounds could be either "natural" or "man made," but whether a forest or a royal garden was involved, the woods and wild animals needed to be maintained. There were hunting places in the wilderness intended for royalty only—*ḳoru*s known as *şikārgāh-ı selāṭīn*, *ṣaydgāh-ı ḫāṣṣa*—and the state took strict measures for their protection. Neither local fief holders nor the *reʿāyā* (literally "the flock," that is, subjects of the realm) were allowed to hunt or graze their animals in, or benefit from the forest products of, these jealously guarded hunting preserves. Wardens (*ḳorucu*s) of janissary background strictly supervised these reserves to prevent their abuse and destruction. Although Ottoman royal gardens were not exactly the paradise gardens of Indo-Iranian culture, royal hunting parties were integral to them.[65]

This same passage (202a–202b) also emphasizes the daily duties of the sultan's hunting associates, that is, those who cared for the royal hunting aids—the hounds, birds, and cats—taming and training them and driving them during the hunt. Known collectively as *şikār ḫalḳı*, these men were not menial servants but honored and influential officers of the court and the janissary corps. The principal duty of the master of the hunt (*şikār aġası*) was to ensure safe and productive hunts for the sultan. With the help of skilled assistants, he procured and trained the hunting aids, oversaw their care, and maintained their trappings and other hunting equipment. The master of the hunt was also responsible for all preparations, including recruiting drovers or huntsmen from nearby villages, sealing off the hunting grounds, supplying food for the horses and hunting aids, and properly setting up camp for the sultan and his retinue. Despite the careful stage management and a plethora of special measures and precautions, the sultan's safety was always a primary concern for the master of the hunt.

Excelling in the chase was not sufficient qualification for this position; the master of the hunt also

had to be a close and longtime servitor of the sultan. Indeed, the sponsor of the *Tuḥfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn* should be looked for among those hunting officers who not only had a visible place of honor in the court hierarchy but also perceived themselves as the true confidants of the sovereign. It is worth noting that in several instances Mustafa Safi identifies Ahmed I's intimate hunting companions by name.

On the justification of the royal hunt

Justification of the sultan's lust for the hunt is found on folios 202b–206b. The author begins by recognizing the efforts of the just sultans to eliminate the internal and external enemies of the state, artfully relating their success to developments in the veterinary sciences that had in turn led to improvements in horsemanship. Following these advances in horsemanship, the threats posed by external enemies (those outside the borders of the lands of Islam) were repelled, and the bloodthirsty, leopard-like tyrants living within Islamdom were also overthrown.[66] If as a consequence of his engagement in chivalry the sultan had become increasingly fond of hunting,[67] it was for a good cause. A love of the hunt had long been perceived as a lust for pleasure, if not for blood. To deflect accusations that the sultan had so given himself over to the pleasures of hunting that he was neglecting his royal duties, the author/translator argues that hunting is also a means for the sovereign to inform himself of the affairs of the state and his subjects' living conditions; he might then implement any regulations he deemed necessary as a result of these interactions with the populace.[68]

In another clearly defensive reference, this one to the ethereal world, the author states, "Because hunting is a way for merriment and joy, [it is] a mental course towards the absolute truth consisting of four stages: traveling on the road to God, traveling in God, traveling with God, and traveling for God; it is the highest post one may achieve and the greatest effort one may exert."

There are also more mundane reasons for sovereigns to engage in the hunt, which, according to the author, require no further explanation. For example, he states that hunting helps instill and develop courage and that sovereigns would not engage in war if their hearts were not made brave and fortified by hunting, which inoculates the soul with power.[69] Hunting also helps to overcome unnecessary pride and unjustifiable laziness.[70] If sovereigns were too inclined to the pleasures and luxuries of life, they would remain passive and unconcerned about the oppressors and the oppressed.[71] Additionally, hunting helps to overcome excuses, for some sovereigns might try to hide their reluctance to fight oppressors and oppression behind the pretext of preserving peace and welfare.[72]

Those sultans and sovereigns who, refraining from hunting, are too fond of secluding themselves and socializing with women neglect the moral principles of their realm and reign and become overly subject to customs, traditions, and diversions.[73] These are mores that are characteristic of the lower strata of society. Whenever a ruler adopts the habits and morals of the masses, this becomes a crucial reason for his downfall.[74] The sultan's subjects, soldiers, and household would then dare to attack him,[75] and the enemy would not allow him to stand firm on his feet.[76] The leading dignitaries and ministers of his realm would render decisions independent of him and the high officials working in the public tax offices and the treasury would hide his money from him and cheat him.[77]

A counsel for princes

After the section on justifications of the hunt, the text continues in the format of a *naṣīḥat-nāme* (203b–206a). The author/translator begins by advising the sultan that he should personally lead his army to war, even if it might fall on his generals to lead in the field during actual combat. However, the author/translator also provides counterarguments to this counsel, suggesting that he and perhaps also the faction he represented were caught on the horns of a dilemma. If the sovereign were to decline to personally lead the army, the author argues, each of the forces with a potential for challenging his reign—his subjects, including the militia, and his internal and external enemies—would resort to deceptions, such as providing misinformation or exaggerating the threat posed by his enemies to convince the sultan that they alone were his true confidants, whose counsel he should heed. They would thus, according to the author, gradually take over the country and the sultanate.[78]

Those who, through their cumulative experience in politics and the secrets of state policy, have arrived at learning and wisdom and are aware of this problem nevertheless dare not suggest that the sultan personally participate in battle.[79] Despite what they believe in principle, the author, and most likely his party, ultimately advise the sultan not to commit himself to fight-

ing in the flesh, because they fear that the treachery and trickery of war might lead to his injury or death.[80] If the sultan were to suffer bodily harm, the whole country would be imperiled, and the enemy could triumph; but if the sultan were to survive, even with the army defeated, it would still be possible for the empire to endure.[81] Hence, according to the author, the supreme ruler of the ancient state and the great sultanate should not participate in combat in person.[82] Nevertheless, the sovereign might defy and repulse the enemy through the force of his spirit and character, while his associates and warriors fight and sacrifice their souls on his behalf.[83]

Following from, and overlapping with, the debate over the sultan's participation in battle is the problem, expressed in the very same lines, of martyrs who die on the battlefield in the absence of their sovereign.[84] What haunted the Ottoman mind was the belief that on Judgment Day the sultan would be held responsible before God for the bodies and souls of the soldiers who were thus lost or injured fighting on his behalf. To persuade his audience, the ruling elite, that this was not an absolute dictum, the author claims that the idea is relevant only in those cases in which the sultan acts entirely on his own account, rather than in accordance with the Prophet's directives, thereby causing unnecessary casualties on the battlefield.

Finally, the author turns to the problem of the sovereign's weaknesses, which derive from the sultan giving himself over to luxury and pleasure. Experienced in politics, the class of learned scholars have paid particular attention to this sort of moral defect, which was born out of affluence and comfort. Counseling frugality, they have striven to remove such desires from the hearts of their sovereigns, and to mend their moral principles damaged by softness and tenderheartedness.[85] However, with respect to actual politics, it has not been not possible for the learned class to dictate the sovereign's behavior.[86]

Predators as the measure of rulership: more on hunting as a metaphor for statecraft

After stressing the need for sultanic severity and firmness, the author revisits the problem of the sovereign personally leading his army into battle. When military forces, armies, and commanders engage in warfare on behalf of Islam, as well as for the honor, fortitude, and impregnability of the state, the sultan is secure, and the enemy cannot harm him.[87] But when the sovereign himself is observed marching out, he comes within the reach of the enemy and its spies.[88] For this reason, men of learning have had to encourage their sovereigns and fortify their hearts and souls before they engage in battle, thus enabling them to leave behind their concerns about their unassailability, might, and resilience. In this endeavor, hunting once more plays an instrumental role.

Almighty God intervened in the affairs of the caliphs and earthly sovereigns; through acts of revelation, He inspired the hearts of the ruling elite/men of learning, and taught them how to use different training methods to tame the wild beasts and the birds. As a result, these wild beasts and birds became accustomed to them, befriended them, and submitted to them.[89] When they (the ruling elite/men of learning) released them (literally, "sent them"), they returned; when they called out to them with instruments the beasts understood their calls and responded to them. When some beasts tried to escape, they tied them down, and the beasts have remained to serve humanity. And they (the ruling elite/men of learning) have presented them to their sovereigns.[90]

Thinking about all that might hinder a sovereign from making war, and believing that hunting might help, they (the ruling elite/the men of learning) arranged hunting parties for their princes and instructed them to take part in the chase. After that, once their sovereigns' hearts became fond of hunting, the men of learning told them further that they had to choose a correct time for hunting and that they had to take with them their treasure (i.e., financial resources), as well as their hunting instruments.[91] The ruling elite/men of learning also instructed them (the sovereigns or princes) in such matters as shooting at hanging (swinging) objects and making up-and-down movements like lowering a bucket into the water. They did all this in a proper manner, according the sultans the respect and special concern due them.[92]

Preventing familiarity from breeding contempt and suppressing potential rivals

According to the next section, a sultan setting out into the wild on a hunting expedition benefits greatly. He overcomes the boredom caused by prolonged stays in the city and by not traveling to the countryside.[93] He is able to rest and relax, breathe fresh air, gaze at the sky, and take advantage of the good health

imparted by the air.[94] And he has the opportunity to go horse riding.[95]

When the sultan and his close associates chase wild animals, he is able to push his horse to jump and to play, unlike in the capital, where, continually surrounded by a great many people, he does not have the chance to engage in such pursuits. On the hunting grounds, however, there are no rivals or observers. If he were to try to do any of the aforementioned activities in the city, among the common people, it is possible that one among the lowest in rank of his soldiers might say, "I am more stable in the saddle, I am more powerful, and I am a better rider than the padishah."[96] The people might thus make snide remarks about the sultan, who would no longer appear as dignified in their eyes; the sultan should not have to endure this sort of humiliation. And if (one day), feeling the need to participate personally on the battlefield against the enemy, the sultan personally sallies forth from the security, firmness, and durability of his sultanate, may he do so sheltered by his troops and soldiery, lest it be the end of the world.[97]

Once they have demonstrated their riding skills, princes should regard it as desirable to look for their prey among leopards, tigers, (wild) dogs, and hawks—the ferocious predators among birds and beasts—and to take their sport with them.[98] As the sultan pursues and hunts these predators, he will gain courage and self-confidence; as he observes their many ways, he will note how fiercely they seize and grab, and how ferociously they rage. As he fights these beasts and overcomes some of them, he will observe how they seek to evade pursuit through all kinds of trickery and thus make their escape. After witnessing all sorts of situations in which predatory beasts hunt, the sultan's character will come to partake of their temper and nature.[99] The sultan thus acquires characteristics such as strength, determination, focus, and greatness, as well as public spirit, a sense of protectiveness toward his realm and his subjects, and perseverance against his enemies. By watching and observing the behavior of predators and those they prey upon, the sultan learns how to wage war. Brave fighters and warriors who acquire and apply their martial skills in this way are able to defeat the enemy on the field of battle.

Personally ready for combat and the battlefield, the sultan also derives power, zeal, and courage from the enthusiasm of all the champions and warriors around him, from the energy and zeal that they display in the name of God, from how they tear apart, smash, and slay the enemy, and from their yells and shouts of triumph.[100] Before he engages in warfare, the sultan observes on the hunting grounds the courage, effort, perseverance, and audacity of the leopards, tigers, hounds, falcons, hawks, and all the other beasts and birds used for hunting. Seeing how fiercely they grab, knock down, and tear their prey to pieces, the padishah's self and soul also gains motivation, valor, daring, and aggressiveness.[101] The sultan thereby perseveres against, and triumphs over, the infidels from neighboring states. As for any tyrants in his own lands, the sultan comes forth bearing the sword of justice, cleanses his country, and, saving his subjects from such oppression, he takes them back again.[102]

Maintaining monopoly over a "royal art"

Hunting has not been prescribed for rulers and sultans as a means of sustenance, for, unlike other hunters, they do not need to eat what they have bagged.[103] It could be that what the sovereign really seeks to conquer and cultivate is knowledge, and that the prize he really pursues is the hearts and minds of his subjects, who have been entrusted to him by God. For people who are animal-like in their qualities cannot be influenced by any sermon or advice, since the only things that will have any effect on them are the policy, sword, justice, and fury of the sultan.[104]

> We have sought out the ends of the world, o prince, for the sake of the hunt,
> Master the knowledge of the hunt, so that you may capture the bird of the heart.
> Release the royal falcon of your zeal, to the summits that guard your kingdom,
> For they have goshawks' talons, those gain-seekers who are now being born.[105]

It is for this reason that hunting has been prescribed only for sultans and sovereigns, while soldiers and members of the troops have not been permitted to hunt.[106] And if hunting has come to be allowed, it is because of the grace that has been bestowed on princes rather than on hunters and drovers. So it has been that padishahs themselves have descended on hunting grounds, accompanied by a plethora of predatory beasts and gamebirds.[107] For soldiers and subjects alike there is nothing more dangerous than having their lord (or commander) designated as a keeper (or watchman) during a hunting party. It is a great betrayal, for it has happened many times that

when people commanding large numbers of soldiers, drovers, and troops have taken to the field in pomp and glory to pursue the hunt, their enemy has by craft and guile succeeded in hunting and seizing them. For this reason, the hunt is not meant for anyone but the ruler.[108]

When the sultan uses hunting as a pretext to go out and observe the conditions of the subjects living under his rule, this leaves nobody with any special connection or influence: his sultanate admits of no partners, of no one who has the right to use the same pretext for going out in the same way. But every now and then this has happened. To guard against it, the sovereigns have thus reserved hunting as their own privilege, and prohibited it to the common people.[109] They have also prohibited all others from keeping and caring for hawks and predatory beasts like dogs or leopards, since, as the sovereigns used to say, "This (hunting) is a royal art."[110] And nobody who was not one of them had the right to be like them; so (only) the princes could go out hunting. And as they were getting ready, they would warn the drovers in their retinue that the soldiers were allowed to hunt only predators and nothing else, so that, especially when they brought forth the enemy, their paths would not be entangled and their horses would not be exhausted; for there have been times when, in pursuing wild beasts, horses have lost their footing and been lamed.[111]

Modes of conduct during the hunt

In a section entitled "the first stage of hunting" (*evvel merātib-i ṣayd*), we find a discussion of the most suitable weather conditions for the hunt. One has to ascertain whether it is going to be cloudy or clear: this depends on the month of the year, the (natural) environment, and the climate (what we would today call an ecosystem). Knowledge of the appropriate times for hunting helps in determining when and where various kinds of prey are to be found.[112] The author/translator elaborates further on what to look out for in order to make an accurate weather forecast (206b). Quoting a hadith in Arabic, he relates how the Prophet Muhammad forecast rain by observing different tones of color in different parts of the clouds (207a). The author/translator then discusses rainclouds, lightning, and thunderbolts (207b), and also incorporates an anecdote about a dialogue between an old blind shepherd and his young daughter (208a).

In the next section, on "modes of conduct during the hunt" (*ṣayd içün çıḳıldıḳta vāḳiʿ olan ādābı beyān eder*), the author counsels that the sultan, while on hunting expeditions, should inquire about the needs and problems of his subjects.[113] He also advises that the people be given advance notice of hunting parties because timid women and those who hold their persons dear might not be able to suffer the impetuousity and brutality displayed by the (hunting) attendants.[114]

There follows a discussion of the correct ways of forwarding complaints to the sultan by the abused (208b). This, in turn, is followed by a set of suggestions for the guards, watchmen, and criers, who are also instructed to keep track of the hideouts where game might take cover, as well as their water holes or drinking spots. The hunting attendants are warned that in order to avoid frustrating the sultan the basic routines of the game animals should be studied very carefully (208b). It is recommended that the same tactics that prove useful in discovering enemy hideouts be tried on wild animals. Their dens, holes, lairs, nests, and burrows should be raided, and (the equivalents of) spying and treason should also be resorted to as necessary tools for success (209a). The author further advises including in the sultan's hunting retinue a scholar of Islamic jurisprudence, a muezzin (as an expert for calculating the time to call for prayers), a secretary, poets well versed in pre-Islamic and Islamic poetry, a pharmacist, and others whom the sultan may need to rely on when he is out in the countryside (209b).

Following some hadith and anecdotes about Caliph ʿUmar and hunting (210a) appear a number of other stories that are not directly related to the Ottoman royal hunt. One narrates the plight of the caliph who, during a hunting party, finds himself lost in the desert until some Bedouins come to his aid (210b). An explanation of the virtue of an expression of impatience (210b–211a), "There is no power nor strength but in God" (*Lā ḥawla wa lā quwwata [illā bi 'llāhi]*), is followed by another anecdote relating to the caliph who, having observed the intolerable living conditions of his subjects, is said to have gathered his viziers after a hunting party to discuss the people's difficulties, needs, and troubles (211b) and to have found it necessary to make changes in the tax-collection system (212a). A statement on the need to employ attendants to clean the face of the sultan's horse and to hold his falcon is accompanied by a hadith describing how

the Prophet wiped perspiration from his horse with the skirt of his gown. Yet another story explains how the Prophet speared an onager on his way to Mecca. Some of his companions ate its meat, while others used its skin for clothing, upon which the caliph was asked, "Was it sent by God to be consumed by us?" A further story relates to the caliph Mutawakkil's commitment to hunting: upon return from his hunting parties, he was known to have paid indemnities for the damages caused by his horses to fields under cultivation (212a–212b).

According to the section on "The Manners of the Hunting Attendants" (212b: *bu faṣl ol ḫiẕmetkārlaruñ ādābın beyān eder ki*), those attendants chosen to walk or ride beside the sultan should be very sensitive to the sovereign's needs. In the winter, if they want to address the sultan, they should avoid standing in the sun for warmth, because the horse might stomp and scratch, perhaps kicking dirt on the sultan. The hunting attendants should also be well trained. When an archer shoots an arrow he should say, "I shot in the name of the glory and might of the sultan (213a: *Pādişāhuñ ʿizzet ve devletine atdum*).

Hunting birds and hounds

Birds of prey used for hunting (*bu faṣl yırtıcı ve avlayıcı olan ṭuyūruñ beyānıdur*) are examined in a section beginning on 213b. In a discussion apparently based on earlier treatises, certain foreign species (*tarʾuk* and *sunġur*) are compared and contrasted with those better known in the Ottoman world, such as falcons (*doġan*), peregrine falcons (*şāhīn*), hawks (*atmaca*), and goshawks (*çāḳır*), whose wing coloring, tail and neck lengths, and other characteristics are described (214a). In accordance with the ancient theory of humors, birds of prey are classified into three groups, depending on the nature of their blood (*dem*), phlegm (*bālġam*), and wind (*rīḥ*). The symptoms of the ailments these birds are prone to are listed, and also related to their defining characteristics (214b). A section on raptors (*faṣl-i cevāriḥ*) includes a discussion of the first historical figures said to have used falcons while hunting (214b–215a). Other sections highlight the role of the falconer (215a: *bu faṣl doġan ile ṣayd eden kimesneyi beyān eder)*; provide detailed descriptions of falcons (216b: *bu faṣl doġanuñ tafṣīlin beyān eder*); show how to identify the males of each species (217a: *bu faṣl yırtıcı ve avlayıcı ḳuşlaruñ erkeklerüñ dişilerinden bilmeyi beyān eder*); document the methods used by natives of Khorasan to deliver of birds of prey (217a: [*bu*] *faṣl ehl-i Ḫorāsān avcı olan ṭuyūru nice getürürler anı beyān eder*); and explain how falcons are trained (217a: *bu faṣl doġanuñ teʾdībin beyān eder*). The next page displays a miniature of a leopard accompanied by its handler or caretaker (218a).

The beginning of a new section on hunting with hounds (218b: *bu faṣl ṣayd-ı kilābı beyān eder*) is indicated by the depictions of an attendant with three hounds; on the opposite page, however, are depicted three falconers (figs. 1–2). Unfortunately, the rest of the text is missing, and the miniatures that follow appear in no definite order, all coming to an end on folio 253b. What is likely to have been there? A comparison with a thirteenth-century hunting treatise, which offers a good example of the medieval literature on this subject, may give us some idea of the format and contents of the sections that might have been planned. The manuscript in question was presented to the caliph as well as to Imam al-Mustansir Billah, also known as al-Mansur bi-Fadl Allah, who was a military commander under Abu ʿAbdallah Muhammad b. Yahya, who in turn reigned over much of North Africa between 1249 and 1277. It is commonly referred in the relevant literature to as "al-Mansur's book."[115]

The first three volumes of al-Mansur's book have been lost; in published form we have only what remains of the fourth volume. The treatise opens with a section on predators, enumerating them and setting out their distinguishing features. A discussion of hounds details their superior qualities, their breeding seasons, and their various merits and flaws, as well as how to feed, raise, train, and hunt with them; other matters having to do with hounds of special quality are also addressed. The reader also learns about their various eye, ear, throat, and abdominal diseases, as well as rabies, and about treatments for wounds, cuts, swellings, ulcers, abcesses, warts, and tumors. The treatise also considers hunting without the aid of animals before turning to the targets of the hunt—birds and fish as well as quadrupeds.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE MINIATURES

The miniatures appended to the section on hunting in the *Tuḥfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn* illustrate not only hunters and their animal aids as mentioned in the text but also aspects or activities for which there is no textual counterpart. This includes, most strikingly,

Figs. 1 and 2. Hunting aids: attendants with falcons and hounds. Topkapı Palace Museum Library, H. 415, fols. 218b–219a. (Photo: Hadiye Cangökçe, courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)

illustrations of warriors in various types of training or combat positions (figs. 3 and 4, 5 and 6). It may be that the inclusion of these fighters was intended to highlight the function of the hunt as a military exercise. This conjecture seems to be further supported by the fact that most of the warriors—mounted or not, but also in full armor—are shown training in "nature," not only with various inanimate targets but also by hunting boars, lions, snakes, birds, goats, gazelles, and even, oddly enough, ostriches (figs. 7 and 8). Curiously, there are also depictions of cavalrymen wearing war masks, even while riding horses,[116] together with other riders on giraffes, elephants, or camels. Even if we had not been told anything about the origin or original form of this manuscript, this by itself would point to a Mamluk model for these miniatures.[117] In any case, also included in this section are illustrations of wrestlers paired off against one another. Further on, there is a double-page representation of a form of longeing, with two warriors riding in circles, their horses constantly changing lean and direction.[118]

Contrasting to all these scenes of combat or combat training are several depictions of royal hunting parties, in which the sultan, the sultana, and her ladies-in-waiting figure prominently (figs. 9 and 10). These genre paintings are remarkable not only because they relate to the social setting of the royal hunts, but also because they exemplify the artistic style of the age. Furthermore, this group of miniatures, more than any other, embodies one of the messages that the patron of the manuscript in question appears to have wanted to convey (to judge from the numerous textual refer-

Figs. 3 and 4. A cavalryman with a club-like weapon, opposite a horseman spearing a wild boar from his saddle. Topkapı Palace Museum Library, H. 415, fols. 243b–244a. (Photo: Hadiye Cangökçe, courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)

Figs. 5 and 6. A king hunting wth his falcon, opposite a heavy cavalryman wielding a bared sword and riding an armored horse. Topkapı Palace Museum Library, H. 415, fols. 219b–220a. (Photo: Hadiye Cangökçe, courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)

Figs. 7 and 8. Two kings on horseback, one shooting at an antelope and the other at a lioness. Topkapı Palace Museum Library, H. 415, fols. 246b–247a. (Photo: Hadiye Cangökçe, courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)

Figs. 9 and 10. A party or gathering of women during a royal hunt, opposite a huntsman on horseback shooting a charging bear. Topkapı Palace Museum Library, H. 415, fols. 245b–246a. (Photo: Hadiye Cangökçe, courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)

ences and repetitions)—namely, that while it is normal for luxury, pleasure, and even various kinds of lust to be commonly associated with royal hunting parties, there is much more to hunting than these self-indulgent aspects.

In contrast, it is the self-indulgent aspects of such leisurely activities that are disparagingly emphasized in two copies (perhaps a decade apart) of a contemporary manuscript on eschatology, *Tercüme-i Miftāḥ cifrü'l-cāmiʿ*, which contain miniatures with similar themes relayed through similar compositions. The scene in question relates to an apocalyptic event, the sending of the wind that, it was believed, would take the souls of all true believers so that in the end only the sinful would suffer the apocalypse. It is represented by a group of people engaged in frivolous activities outdoors, that is to say, in "nature"—a setting similar to that of a hunting party.[119] In an illustration in the earlier copy of the *Tercüme*, two women playing a cymbal and a harp accompany a third who is dancing, while yet another woman serves a drink to a youth seated cross-legged on a throne; in the later copy, the female figures are replaced by males, and the cupbearer is replaced by a young man reading a book. The changes in the second copy, which was prepared during the reign of Ahmed I, may have been introduced to please the pious sultan, or some in his immediate retinue, on the assumption that he might not have tolerated representations of women, especially in such a setting.[120]

In the *Tuḥfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn*, representations of ladies in party scenes appear on separate folios, with the sultana and her attendants in one group and the entertainers in another. It is possible that the depictions of the sultana participating in hunting parties were originally meant to be juxtaposed, face to face, with compositions comprising musicians and dancers, so as to create a more impressive double folio of playfulness (figs. 11 and 12). It is also possible that the depictions of the sultana and her ladies-in-waiting were intended to face those of the royal hunter in the company of his attendants, enthroned, wearing his royal insignia (notably the Persian-style crown), and occasionally bearing a falcon on his hand. Most importantly, there is always a person of status seated to the right of the throne, recalling Asaf ibn Barkhiya, the wise and learned vizier of Solomon (figs. 13 and 14). This version certainly recalls a very common model in Islamic painting, the depictions of Solomon and Bilqis, the Queen of Sheba, enthroned outdoors in "nature" and surrounded by animals, birds, and supernatural creatures.

The puzzle of the two painters

Of the seventy-two miniatures included in the third chapter of the *Tuḥfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn*, thirty-five depict some aspect or feature of the hunt (including the entertainment scenes), while thirty-seven are explicitly related to the martial arts. Among the latter are singular figurative representations that strictly follow a compositional model. The figures, mostly static, with only arms and hands moving, are extremely repetitive; only the costumes vary to some extent, displaying non-Ottoman regional origins or social status. Mounted figures are often represented in three-quarter view (figs. 15 and 16), but frontal and rear depictions, and even one in full profile, are also present in the throne and entertainment scenes. The representations of nature are conventional, following standard compositional models consisting of bare, rocky hills and a few trees. Nevertheless, the depictions of the trees are quite distinctive.

Two styles of painting are easily and patently discernible (figs. 17 and 18).[121] They differ, for example, in Painter A's preference for pale colors as opposed to the deep, vivid, and strong colors favored by Painter B. The subtle tones of Painter A's palette and his painterly style contrast with the boldness and self-possession of Painter B. The treatment of depth also differs: while Painter A's landscapes are quite flat, Painter B carefully differentiates between the foreground, middle ground, and background and better conveys the third dimension. Painter B's characteristic eyes, brows, and moustaches add humor to his work. In addition to the stylistic differences between the two artists apparent in their representations of facial features, trees, hills, rocks, and flowering shrubs, and in their respective preferences in color scheme, there is a discrepancy in their painting materials, those of Painter B being of higher quality. Another quite striking difference between the two can be seen in their depictions of the trappings and coverings of the horses: for example, while Painter A's caparisons feature two slits on the side flaps, Painter B's have a single slit at the center of each side flap. It seems plausible that while Painter B was already a mature artist in the 1610s, Painter A might have been an advanced apprentice, working with materials of poorer quality. But probably the situation was more complicated; the circumstances that

Figs. 11 and 12. A king with his falcon at a hunting party, his attendants behind him, talking with a learned man sitting on the ground, opposite a mail-coated cavalryman on horseback shooting at a huge snake. Topkapı Palace Museum Library, H. 415, fols. 232b–233a. (Photo: Hadiye Cangökçe, courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)

Figs. 13 and 14. Two scenes from a hunting party: a falcon-bearing king talking with a learned man, and, opposite, his women, seated or standing separately. Topkapı Palace Museum Library, H. 415, fols. 251b–252a. (Photo: Hadiye Cangökçe, courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)

Figs. 15 and 16. Identically equipped heavy cavalrymen on elaborately caparisoned and armored horses, depicted from both sides to show what was worn or carried to the right or left of the saddle. Topkapı Palace Museum Library, H. 415, fols. 140b–141a. (Photo: Hadiye Cangökçe, courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)

brought the works of the two artists of different caliber together in a royal project deserve scrutiny.

Men of multiple identities and diverse backgrounds infused Ahmed I's court with a new dynamism. One member of this new wave was Kalender Pasha (d. 1616), whose interesting name (unique in Ottoman military-bureaucratic service) and swift rise to high office suggest that his origins might have been in some eastern center of power. Once conscripted, he appears to have conformed well within the newly evolving Ottoman system, benefitting to the utmost from all the opportunities coming his way. Kalender's multifaceted talents and artistic output reveal a man of a complex and compound culture.[122]

In contrast to the "adventurer" Kalender stood Nakkaş Hasan (d. 1623), a celebrated artist in the early-seventeenth-century Ottoman court, who was involved in the illustration of at least twenty manuscripts with historical and literary themes. Nakkaş Hasan was certainly a product of the palace in the "classical" sense. He too, however, was many-sided, and fit in nicely with the new realities of the Ottoman military-bureaucratic elite. When he was appointed agha of the janissaries in early March 1604, immediately after Ahmed I's enthronement, he was already an esteemed artist who had worked with Nakkaş Osman (d. 1598?). Since that master's demise, he had been in overall charge of the palace workshops. Nevertheless, because he was paid for his services elsewhere, his name never appears on the payroll lists of the *naḳḳāşḫāne*. In 1604, Nakkaş Hasan Pasha was also engaged in training the troops preparing for a campaign in Hungary. It would not therefore be illogical to regard him as a potential illustrator of a manuscript on horsemanship. Never-

Figs. 17 and 18. Two heavy cavalrymen fencing, their lances held in both hands, opposite a cavalryman spearing an unhorsed warrior lying helpless on the ground. Topkapı Palace Museum Library, H. 415, fols. 158b–159a. (Photo: Hadiye Cangökçe, courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)

theless, although it seems that he continued even in this period to work as an artist, his style, akin to the miniatures of the Baghdad school, bears no resemblance to that of either Painter A or Painter B in the *Tuḥfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn*.

The career of another celebrated artist of the period, Ahmed Nakşi (d. after 1622), whose early exposure to European art and painting is beyond dispute, is also characteristic of this period of transformation.[123] Like Nakkaş Hasan Pasha, he does not show up in the payroll registers of the *naḳḳāşḫāne*. Ahmed Nakşi's hand is most discernible in his individualized portraits, each executed with finesse and exhibiting a distinguishable physiognomy. While Painters A and B also appear to be quite competent artists, their styles are notably distinct from those of Nakkaş Hasan Pasha and Ahmed Nakşi.

Exploring diverse networks and backgrounds

Despite their anonymity, I believe that the two painters of the *Tuḥfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn* should be sought among the masters of Ottoman painting. The representations by these two painters of horses and warriors, as well as of courtly gatherings, recall, for example, those of the *Şehnāme-i Türkī* manuscripts from more or less the same period, mostly commissioned during the reign of Osman II (1618–22) by lesser statesmen.[124] Furthermore, the bold self-confidence of Painter B is similar to that displayed in some of the illustrations of two *Şehnāme-i Türkī* manuscripts perhaps commissioned in the reign of Ahmed I, one of which is in the New York Public Library's Spencer Collection (figs. 19 and 20),[125] and the other in the Bibliothèque nationale de France in Paris.[126] Two illustrated anthologies of poetry

Fig. 19. Bahram Gur kills a unicorn (*karg*) during his sojourn in India. Spencer Collection, New York Public Library, Ms. Turk 1, fol. 474a. (Photo: courtesy of the New York Public Library)

Fig. 20. Giv and Tus fighting with Kamus. Spencer Collection, New York Public Library, Ms. Turk 1, fol. 246a. (Photo: courtesy of the New York Public Library)

in the British Library also include miniatures reminiscent of Painter B's personal and intrepid style.[127] Furthermore, combined with his rendering of depth, the manner in which Painter B depicts the countryside, especially hills, plants, trees, and rocks—his sense of humor in imbuing the rocks with human faces (figs. 21 and 22) is akin to the mood of Ahmed Nakşi, and, more distantly, to that of the Tahmasp *Shāhnāma*—is reminiscent of elements from other manuscripts and albums of the period.[128] "In several of the illustrations, the artist tried to add realism by placing the trees in dead ground," Meredith-Owens has said of the contemporary miniatures that I find similar in style to Painter B's.[129]

In contrast, the subtle tones of Painter A's palette match other paintings (1616–20?) now in the Spencer Collection of New York Public Library, as well as those in the *Şehnāme-i Türkī* in the Uppsala Universitetsbibliotek (dated 1620, with a record of the manuscript's having taken four years to produce, making it possible to date its commissioning to the last years of Ahmed I's reign),[130] the *Şehnāme-i Nādirī* (ca. 1622),[131] and some other *Şehnāme*s from the same period, including those that are now truncated and dispersed.[132] Two Ottoman *Şehnāme*s now in the manuscript libraries of St. Petersburg also contain miniatures that compare with the output of Painters A and B in the *Tuhfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn*. Yet again, there are albums from the first

Figs. 21 and 22. Two horses in a landscape; rocks in the foreground of the left-hand folio bear a human face in profile. Topkapı Palace Museum Library, H. 415, fols. 53b–54a. (Photo: Hadiye Cangökçe, courtesy of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library)

quarter of the seventeenth century containing individual studies that yield a close match with the output of the two *Tuhfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn* painters.[133]

Who, then, were these industrious artists? Were they employed at the imperial court, or did they work freelance in Istanbul? Were they members of the military-bureaucratic machine, whose careers had therefore removed them at some point from the capital and the *nakḳāşḫāne*? Or were they immigrants to Istanbul? Considering the abundance of miniatures produced for the many *Şehnāme-i Türkī* copies and for other manuscripts of the period,[134] including those of the *Tuhfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn*, could these artists be among those who had been busy at the end of the sixteenth century producing commercial copies (for lesser grandees) in Shiraz or Tabriz or elsewhere?[135] Or should we search for Painters A and B among the Sufi circles of the Ottoman capital? Even if we do not have a clear-cut answer at this point, it is crucial to note that, on the whole, this group of miniature artists, working in the Ottoman capital in the first quarter of the seventeenth century, were more accomplished than their counterparts who were paving the way for the Iranian epic's new visual reinterpretation under the eminent late-sixteenth-century master Nakkaş Osman.[136]

Filiz Çağman and Zeren Tanındı have recently argued that the rich artistic environment created by Mevlevi intellectuals in medieval Anatolia and beyond was still considerably alive in the early 1600s, resulting in the production of a number of *Mesnevi* and illustrated *Şehnāme-i Türkī* manuscripts.[137] A Mevlevi poet and calligrapher, Cevri İbrahim Çelebi (ca. 1595–1654), produced several copies of both texts. In 1978, Esin Atıl also made some keen observations concerning the connections between the illustrations of the various *Şehnāme-i Türkī* manuscripts of the early seventeenth century. For example, regarding the miniatures of the New York Public Library Spencer Collection copy, she

noted that "sixty-eight of the paintings reflect the vestiges of the classical court style, while fourteen were made by the same artist who worked on the Uppsala manuscript with Nakşi."[138] Since then, Barbara Schmitz has attributed sixty-seven of the paintings to "a follower of Osman" (meaning Nakkaş Osman), actually relating the artist in question to the eminent *ser-naḳḳāş* (chief painter) as a son or nephew. She has attributed the other fifteen (note Atıl's division of sixty-eight and fourteen as opposed to Schmitz's sixty-seven and fifteen) to an artist she calls "the Bizhan Master," after his most outstanding work in the Spencer Collection *Şehnāme*. It is directly to Ahmed Nakşi that she has attributed a final twenty-six.[139]

Narrowing the search: pinpointing the patron and the unnamed Painter B

I would argue that one of Ahmed Nakşi's associates in the production of the Spencer Collection *Şehnāme-i Türkī* must have also contributed to the Uppsala, Paris, and St. Petersburg copies, and must be the artist whom I have identified as Painter B in the *Tuhfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selātīn* miniatures.[140] I would further argue that both this prolific painter and his colleague Painter A worked in the Ottoman capital, in close proximity to and in some kind of working relationship with the *naḳḳāsḥāne*—and as equals or near-equals to Nakkaş Hasan Paşa or Ahmed Nakşi, not so much in terms of their origins and training or the artistic circles they belonged to but certainly in terms of the numbers of high-level commissions they received from art patrons in Istanbul in the first quarter of the seventeenth century.[141] It was, indeed, the rise of a new generation of patrons of the arts that generated a more fluid mobility among artists, enabling a new genre of painting to flourish outside the walls of the Topkapı Palace.

The Spencer Collection *Şehnāme-i Türkī* was copied in *nastaʿlīq* by the calligrapher Dervish ʿAbdi-i Mevlevi for Hafız Ahmed Pasha (d. 1632), who was closely related to Ahmed I.[142] Hafız Ahmed had joined the *Enderūn* when he was fifteen; chosen for his voice, he was trained as a *ḥāfız*, one who recites the entire Qur'an by heart. As the boon companion of Ahmed I, Hafız Ahmed likely waited on the sultan during hunting parties in or near the capital. In February 1608, when he was chief falconer (*doğancıbaşı*), Hafız Ahmed was simultaneously promoted to a vizierate and appointed grand admiral.[143] (It was around this time that he recommended Mustafa Safi to the sultan to translate Asafi's *Celāl ü Cemāl* from Persian.[144]) In February 1609, Hafız Ahmed was dismissed as grand admiral and appointed governor-general of Damascus.[145] Following several expeditions against Celali rebels, he joined forces with the grand vizier Kuyucu Murad Pasha and campaigned all the way to Tabriz in 1610.[146] In 1611, he was also dismissed from his Damascus governorship, though not, apparently, in disgrace, since upon his return to Istanbul he is noted to have attended state ceremonies. Not only during various celebrations (such as royal marriages) but in other instances too, he often appeared next to Nakkaş Hasan Pasha (*ittifāk ile cemʿīyet ederler*), who was not only his senior but also, at the time, a vizier in the Imperial Council. One such occasion was the marriage of Ayşe Sultan to Nasuh Pasha.[147] Hafız Ahmed later served as governor-general of Aleppo, Erzurum, Diyarbakır, and Baghdad, and was involved in several anti-rebel expeditions in the east.[148]

Just before his appointment to Diyarbakır in the spring of 1622, he was recalled to Istanbul to be married to a princess, who remains unidentified in the sources.[149] We do not know what then happened to this marriage or the unnamed princess. But four years later, in 1626, Hafız Ahmed is reported to have married Ayşe Sultan—the daughter of Ahmed I whose marriage to Nasuh Pasha he had attended in 1611. (This appears to have been Ayşe Sultan's fifth or sixth marriage to a leading dignitary). Clearly Hafız Ahmed's periodic absences from Istanbul had not prevented him from maintaining his ties with palace circles. What we know of his artistic patronage fits in with this broad picture. A long inscription on folio 591v of the Spencer Collection *Şehnāme-i Türkī* describes the various stages of the manuscript's creation and later repairs. It says (in the New York Public Library's transcription) that the grand vizier and imperial son-in-law (*dāmād*) Hafız Pasha borrowed a manuscript of the Ottoman Turkish translation of Firdawsi's *Shāhnāma* that had been made for the Mamluk Sultan Qansuh al-Ghawri in 906 (1500–1501) by Şerif Amidi Efendi, and persuaded the famous calligrapher Dervish ʿAbdi Efendi of the Mevlevihane (in Istanbul) to copy it for him. Schmitz has dated the preparation of the manuscript to between 1616 and 1620.[150] But the fact that Hafız Ahmed was simultaneously grand vizier and a *dāmād* when he borrowed the *Şehnāme* from the palace library should date the completion of the manuscript to, at the earliest, 1624–25, during his first period in highest office.[151]

Hafız Ahmed's frequent postings to the eastern provinces of Damascus, Aleppo, Erzurum, Diyarbakır, and Baghdad tie in nicely with the additional information that he "brought painters and bookbinders from India to illustrate and illuminate the manuscript" (*maḥṣūṣan Hindden ressām ve mücellid celbiyle tersīm ve tezhīb etdirilüp*).[152] At the same time, the further point that Dervish ʿAbdi-i Mevlevi, the copyist of the Spencer Collection *Şehnāme*, had studied in Isfahan and, upon his return, established ties with Hafız Ahmed Pasha, who is thought to have been close to Mevlevi circles in general, is highly suggestive of the Sufi networks operating in manuscript production in early-seventeenth-century Istanbul.[153] Hence, in a certain way, the networks and backgrounds suggested by Çağman and Tanındı, Atıl, and Schmitz all seem to come together.

Turning to the *Tuhfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn*, it is quite possible, indeed probable, that even though its translation is said to have been commissioned directly by Ahmed I, the illustrated manuscript was initiated by Hafız Ahmed Pasha, who was, after all, an aspiring patron of the arts. Closely involved in the royal hunt as chief falconer, he may already have had access, while in that position, to artists in Sufi circles, from among whom he could have hired Painter B and the other team members. The privilege of hunting in the retinue of the sultan conferred not only status but also responsibility. The chief falconer, always in the top ranks of the hunting establishment despite the ebb and flow of Ottoman practice, was at that time its direct head.[154] As such, he had to be even more conscientious than the other hunting attendants and confidants. In a sense, it was his task to address the ruler discreetly and decorously about issues that the sultan's hunting confidants—and/or the particular faction that the chief falconer belonged to—perceived to be menacing both the person of the sovereign and his state, as well as his rulership. This is why parts of the *Tuḥfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn* read like a *naṣīḥatnāme*, a fine example of "mirror for princes" literature.

As provincial appointments took Hafız Ahmed Pasha away from the capital and the court, the completion of the manuscript would have been repeatedly delayed. In the meantime, Ahmed I, to whom it was to be presented, died in 1617. It is quite likely that the Spencer Collection *Şehnāme*, too, was produced under such circumstances in the first quarter of the seventeenth century. After all, of the 108 miniatures of that *Şehnāme*, there is a near consensus on sixty-seven or sixty-eight as being the work of Nakkaş Osman's studio, and on another twenty-six or twenty-seven as being by the eclectic painter Ahmed Nakşi, whose work would come to be more closely associated with the reign of Osman II.

What remains is that crucial middle group of fourteen or fifteen paintings that are typical of the reign of Ahmed I—by somebody whom Esin Atıl describes as "the same artist who worked on the Uppsala manuscript with Nakşi," and whom Barbara Schmitz has chosen to call "the Bizhan Master."[155] I remain thoroughly persuaded that this same unknown painter also created the sumptuous images for the *Tuhfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn*.

A MANUSCRIPT INTENDED AS YET ANOTHER *BOOK OF KINGS*

In his *War in the Middle Ages*, Philippe Contamine refers to the warrior element in hunting, noting that because of the armored cavalryman's key role in medieval armies, "all exercise on horseback [by the knightly classes], notably hunting, could be considered as preparation for war."[156] Richard Almond further elaborates on what was expected of hunting in this regard:

> For a knight should always engage in anything to do with arms or chivalry and, if he can not do so in war, he should do so in activities which resemble war. And the chase is most similar to war for these reasons: war demands expense met without complaint; one must be well horsed and well armed; one must be vigorous, and do without sleep, suffer lack of good food and drink, rise early, sometimes have a poor bed, undergo heat and cold, and conceal one's fear.[157]

In time, of course, as ideology perhaps initially growing out of material thresholds and class divisions came to subsume and represent all such conditions or causal links and to acquire an autonomy of its own, royalty and the rest of the ruling elite also hunted as part of their legacy—it was a birthright, and it was expected of them. Yet another dimension of this complex outlook was that, for the warrior elite organized around a monarchical nucleus, avoiding idleness, and therefore sin, was important, and hunting provided the ideal anodyne of healthy, violent, and enjoyable exercise.

The evidence points to the royal hunt as a large-scale consumer of resources—animal, human, admin-

istrative, and financial.[158] Hence, for example, criticism was leveled at Chinese officials on the grounds that they ignored the disruption of arable and other natural resources, the burden that the royal hunt exerted on the locals who were drawn into its vortex, the fiscal drains entailed by the construction of hunting parks replete with numerous facilities, and the general extravagance it all embodied.[159] Nizam al-Mulk, the eminent vizier of Sultan Malik Shah (d. 1092), reflected the same kind of apprehension when, in his *Siyasetnāme,* he agreed that hunting helped the ruler to establish contact with his subjects but simultaneously warned that excessive involvement would bring misfortune. Malik Shah was, in fact, hugely preoccupied with hunting.[160] All such concerns and criticism led to the need to explore and extol the significance of the royal hunt from the perspective of politics.[161]

As post-Süleymanic sultans abandoned direct and personal leadership of military campaigns, the extended sojourns to Edirne that had been part of westbound expeditions came to an end. The vigorous hunting parties of the recent past in the vicinity of Edirne and further west also became less frequent in the late sixteenth century. Against the background of that recent past, Ahmed I's reengagement with the hunt seems to have been manipulated by the aghas of the court, who may have been yearning for a sultan as grand and victorious as Ahmed's great-grandfather—and who may therefore have been looking for a revival of the hunting tradition as a substitute or surrogate for the grander tradition of the sultan going out on military campaigns. As a result, rather than criticism there seems to have been more and weightier praise, even glorification, of the royal hunt.

The intended royal reader of the *Tuḥfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn* was still quite young when the project started, and also limited in his hunting experience to bird-hunting in the royal gardens of Istanbul. Even without these limiting factors, he may have been regarded as needing some sort of stimulus for reading it. Even if the original was not illustrated, there were certainly Mamluk, or even earlier, illustrated texts in the Istanbul collections that served as models for the *Tuḥfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn*.[162] It may be, however, that these medieval illustrations no longer appealed to the Ottoman eye. In the absence of extant prototypes for the illustrations of a hunting treatise that would suit the aspirations of the Ottoman elite in the early seventeenth century, artists turned once again to the iconography of combats and hunts of the *Shāhnāma* tradition. After all, many of the most competent artists at the time were busy illustrating *Şehnāme-i Türkī* manuscripts for different patrons. Thus, the tripartite Mamluk text was refurbished with miniatures reflecting an acclimatized, Ottomanized vocabulary, though broadly and loosely inspired by the Iranian epic.

The Ottomans had a long history of involvement with Firdawsi's *Shāhnāma* and the imagery and ideas associated with it. Ottoman artists assimilated, transformed, and at times built on the Iranian epic.[163] In the case of the *Tuḥfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn*, the warrior types of the Iranian epic, abstracted from their original narrative contexts or personifying roles, were easily translated into images intended to represent training for the hunt and for combat, both seen as preparation for war. The scenes of feasts and court life also bear an iconographic debt to *Shāhnāma* prototypes. Even though the purpose of the illustrations was to delight and entertain, they contributed in their way to a text that was meant to convince, reassure, and encourage a young sultan and to establish a model for his future behavior—even as it also subtly, politely, and diplomatically made value-loaded statements, including veiled (potential) criticisms.

Earlier advice literature had used aphorisms and didactic tales of ancient kings. In the hunting treatise, statements regarding institutional failure, injustice, and social disruption, relayed by one of the sultan's most reliable men on behalf of the ruling elite (or one faction thereof), were more than insinuations; they were direct and operational. It is also possible that Hafız Ahmed and his political companions sought to derive their power from the ability of the manuscript to appear as if it had arisen from the *Şehnāme* tradition itself. Thus, the *Tuḥfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn* was, in fact, yet another *Book of Kings*.

Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Sabancı University, Istanbul

NOTES

Author's note: I am grateful to Dr. Filiz Çağman, the former director of the Topkapı Palace Museum, for bringing this manuscript to my attention, and also to Dr. Karin Ådahl, the Director of the Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul, who provided me with copies of miniatures from the Uppsala manuscript. I owe many thanks to my colleague Dr. Aziz Shakir (Sabancı University) for the transliterations and translations from Arabic and Ottoman, as well as for locating all the relevant hadiths plus verses from the Qur'an.

1. Topkapı Palace Museum Library, H. 415: 385 x 250 mm, 253 pages, 164 miniatures and two illuminated pages. See F. E. Karatay, *Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi Türkçe Yazmalar Kataloğu*. 2 vols. (Istanbul, 1961), 1:574–75.
2. This despite the fact that Esin Atıl, for one, took emphatic note of the manuscript as early as three decades ago, referring to it as "one of the most original works of the period." E. Atıl, *Turkish Art* (Washington, DC, and New York, 1980), 212. See also M. And, *Turkish Miniature Painting: The Ottoman Period* (Istanbul, 1982 [orig. pub. 1974]), 27. One of the miniatures in the *Tuhfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn*, showing a rider, was included (for comparative purposes) in a rather difficult-to-find and therefore little-known study: G. Renda, *Ankara Etnoğrafya Müzesindeki Minyatürlü Yazma ve Albümler* (Ankara, 1980), fig. 39. So far, only the entertainment scenes in the final "hunting" section of the manuscript have been commented upon: see F. Çağman, "Tanzimat'tan Önce Selçuk ve Osmanlı Toplumunda Kadınlar (C86)," in the exhibition catalogue *Çağlarboyu Anadolu'da Kadın = Women in Anatolia* (Istanbul, 1993), 247.
3. Nevertheless, it is also useful to consider other possibilities. Frontispiece miniatures are usually not directly related to the text. Almost always designed as double-page compositions, these miniatures are sometimes chosen to depict the patron, who often happens to be the ruler, engaged in some kind of courtly activity. In that case, the enthroned prince is frequently depicted in the company of his courtiers—including women, musicians, and dancers—during or after a hunting feast. Such frontispiece miniatures, moreover, often allude to other, archetypal compositions relating to the enthroned Solomon and the Queen of Sheba, Bilqis: see S. Bağcı, "A New Theme of the Shirazi Frontispiece Miniatures: The *Dīvān* of Solomon," *Muqarnas* 12 (1995): 101–11. An allusion to Solomon would not have been surprising for the *Tuḥfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn*, too, because, constantly judged by some of his courtiers against the standards set by Süleyman I, Ahmed I seems to have begun to emulate his great-grandfather: see N. Avcıoğlu, "Ahmed I and the Allegories of Tyranny in the Frontispiece to George Sandys's *Relation of a Journey*," *Muqarnas* 18 (2001): 218–23. Instead, however, we are confronted with a preference for some kind of spiritual gathering. This could, of course, be an allusion to Ahmed I's own devoutness, which earned him the sobriquet "the Pious," and could be related to another court faction who was betting on the sultan's religious rather than his military persona. It could refer to the solidarity of those involved in the production of the manuscript, which is my main suggestion.
4. This note has led to the misidentification of the manuscript as *Te'eddüb el-ḫayl*. See Renda, *Albümler,* fig. 39. Also noted on fol. 1a, and perhaps added in 1961, is the number of folios (253), miniatures (164), and illuminations (2) that we find in Karatay's entry: see n. 1 above. The marginalia indicate that the pagination throughout the manuscript was done after it was put together.
5. *Kitāb-ı Tuhfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn ki sulṭān-ı selātīn-i cihān ve ḫalīfe-i ṣāḥibü'l-ʿadl ve'l-iḥsān Sulṭān Aḥmed Ḫān ibn-i Sulṭān Meḥmed Ḫān ibn-i Sulṭān Murād Ḫān eyyedallāhu mülkehu ve salṭanatehu ḥażretlerinüñ emr-i şerīfleriyle lisān-ı Türkī'ye tercüme olınmışdur ve bu kitāb kitāb-ı bayṭārātı ve kitāb-ı fürūsīyeti ve kitāb-ı ṣayd-ı vaḥş ve ṭayrı müştemildür ve sallāllahu ʿalā seyyidinā Muḥammed ve ālihi ve aṣḥābihi ecmaʿīn*.
6. S. al-Sarraf, "Mamluk Furûsîyah Literature and Its Antecedents," *Mamluk Studies Review* 8, 1 (2004): 141–200.
7. See note 162 below.
8. Elsewhere I explore the first two chapters of the *Tuḥfetü 'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn*, covering the physiognomy, illnesses, and treatment of horses, as well as questions of horsemanship, together with the miniatures in these chapters: see T. Artan, "Ahmed I and *Tuhfetü'l-mülûk ve's-selâtin*: A Period Manuscript on Horses, Horsemanship and Hunting," in *Animals and People in the Ottoman World*, ed. S. Faroqhi and C. Neumann (Istanbul, forthcoming). A more comprehensive examination of the second chapter on horsemanship, focusing on equitation and the handling of arms on horseback, and supported by an analysis of the accompanying miniatures, is being targeted for another study, on which I am working with Halil Berktay. See also T. Artan, "Arts and Architecture," in *The Cambridge History of Turkey*, vol. 3, *The Latter Ottoman Empire, 1603–1839*, ed. S. Faroqhi (New York, 2006), 408–80.
9. O. Grabar, *Mostly Miniatures: An Introduction to Persian Painting* (Princeton and Oxford, 2000), 101–3. For further explorations by Oleg Grabar relating to the *Book of Kings* genre see idem, "Notes on the Iconography of the 'Demotte' *Shah-Nama*," in *Paintings from Islamic Lands*, ed. Ralph Pinder-Wilson (Oxford, 1969); idem, "Toward an Aesthetic of Persian Painting," in *The Art of Interpreting*, ed. Susan C. Scott (Philadephia, 1995), 129–39; and O. Grabar and S. Blair, *Epic Images and Contemporary History: The Illustrations of the Great Mongol Shahnama* (Chicago, 1980).
10. For overviews of the primary sources on the Ottoman royal hunt see A. Özaydın, *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, s.v. "Av"; Ş. Çelik, "Osmanlı Padişahlarının Av Geleneğinde Edirne'nin Yeri ve Edirne Kazasındaki Av Alanları (Hassa Şikâr-gâhı)," *XIII. Türk Tarih Kongresi, Ankara, 4–8 Ekim 1999: Kongre'ye Sunulan Bildiriler* (Ankara, 2002), 1887–1903. For Süleyman Pasha's death see Aşıkpaşazade, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman*, ed. H. N. Atsız (Ankara, 1985), 55; Edirneli Oruç Beğ, *Oruç Beğ Tarihi*, ed. H. N. Atsız (Istanbul, 1972), 38; Neşrî, *Kitâb-i Cihan-nümâ: Neşri Tarihi*, ed. F. R. Unat and M. A. Köymen (Ankara, 1987), 185–86; Kemalpaşazāde, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman: II. Defter*, ed. Ş. Turan (Ankara, 1983), 183–84.
11. The earliest Ottoman miniatures on hunting, dating to 1558, also appeared during his reign, in ʿĀrifī's *Süleymānnāme*, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, H. 1517, fols. 115a, 132a, 177a, 403a (before and after campaigns); and 393a, 462a, 576a (in the company of his princes). See also n. 12 below.
12. Seyyid Loḳmān b. Seyyid Ḥüseynī el-Urmevī, *Hünernāme*, vol. 1, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, H. 1523, fols. 89b, 105a, 116a. The completion of the first volume, including miniatures by Osman, Ali Mehmed Beğ, Veli Can, Molla Tiflisi, and Mehmed Bursevi, is dated to 1584. The second volume, completed in 1588, focuses only on Süleyman I and includes miniatures by six artists: see *Hünernāme*, vol. 2, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, H. 1524, fols. 53a, 80b, 84b, 55b–56a, 63b–64a.
13. İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devletinin Saray Teşkilâtı* (Ankara, 1984 [orig. pub. 1945]), 420–25.
14. Ibid., 421.

15. *Rüstem Paşa Tarihi*, fol. 94, as cited in İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devleti Teşkilâtından Kapukulu Ocakları*, 2 vols. (Ankara, 1984 [orig. pub. 1943]), 1:162 n. 4.
16. For Çölmek and other woodlands in the vicinity of Edirne see *370 Numaralı Muhâsebe-i Vilâyet-i Rûm-ili Defteri (937/1530) I: Paşa (Sofya) ve Vize Livâları ve Sağkol Kazâları (Edirne, Dimetoka, Ferecik, Keşan, Kızılağaç, Zağra-i Eski-Hisâr, İpsala, Filibe, Tatarbâzârı, Samakov, Üsküb, Kalkan-delen, Kırçova, Manastır, Pirlepe ve Köprülü)*, ed. Y. Sarınay (Ankara, 2001); Kemalpaşazāde, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman: X. Defter*, ed. Ş. Severcan (Ankara, 1996), 11; Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi,* vol. 3, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi: Topkapı Sarayı Bağdat 305 Yazmasının Trankripsiyonu,* ed. S. A. Kahraman and Y. Dağlı (Istanbul, 1999).
17. Anonymous, *Gazavât-ı Sultân Murâd b. Mehemmed Hân*, ed. H. İnalcık and M. Oğuz (Ankara, 1989 [orig. pub. 1978]), 7.
18. M. Ş. Ülkütaşır, "Çevgen ve Gökbörü," *Türk Kültürü Dergisi* 159 (1976).
19. Edirneli Oruç Beğ, *Oruç Beğ Tarihi*, 83–84.
20. Hoca Ṣaʿdeddīn, *Tāc-üt-tevārīḫ*, 2 vols. (Istanbul, 1862–64), 1:260; 2:40.
21. Edirneli Oruç Beğ, *Oruç Beğ Tarihi*, 127, 132; Kemalpaşazāde, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman: VII. Defter*, ed. Ş. Turan (Ankara, 1991), 399.
22. Edirneli Oruç Beğ, *Oruç Beğ Tarihi*, 127, 132; Kemalpaşazāde, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman: VII. Defter*, 399; Luṭfī Paşa, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman*, ed. Âli Bey, intr. and index by M. S. Tayşi (repr. Istanbul, 1990 [orig. pub. 1925]), 192.
23. Luṭfī Paşa, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman*, 184–86. The chase took Beyazid II further and further away from Edirne, primarily to Uzuncaova, located between Edirne and Filibe (Plovdiv): see Kemalpaşazāde, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman: VIII. Defter*, ed. A. Uğur (Ankara, 1997), 49; idem, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman: X. Defter*, ed. Ş. Severcan (Ankara, 1996), 117. This place was also noted as a royal hunting ground by Josef von Lamberg and Niclas Jurischitz, who stayed in Uzuncaova roughly half a century later, on October 7, 1530. See Benedikt Kuripešić, *Yolculuk Günlüğü 1530* (Ankara, 1989), 41. In 1483, on Beyazid's way from Filibe to Edirne, the nimble locals (*Etrāk-ı çālāk*) were forced to chase game for three days to Uzuncaova: see Hoca Ṣaʿdeddīn, *Tāc-üt-tevārīḫ*, 2:96; Kemalpaşazāde, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman: VIII. Defter*, 49. Beyazid II also hunted at Rila Mountain between Filibe and Sofya. In early 1485, the sultan set out to hunt in the vicinity of Tavaslu, returning to the palace in Edirne only in early March. In late 1489, he hunted at Sakar pasture, and spent some time at Çömlek. This hunting party took him to Gümülcine (Komotini), where there were several drives. Upon his return to Edirne, Beyazid continued to hunt in the vicinity: Kemalpaşazāde, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman: VIII. Defter*, 48, 90, 122, 129.
24. Luṭfī Paşa, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman*, 206, 208.
25. Ibid., 243.
26. Ibid., 281–83; Muṣṭafā Çelebi Celālzāde, *Selim-nâme*, ed. A. Uğur and M. Çuhadar (Ankara, 1990), 444.
27. Hezārfen Ḥüseyin Efendi, *Telhîsü'l-beyân fi Kavânîn-i Âl-i Osmân*, ed. S. İlgürel (Ankara, 1998), 143.
28. Seyyid Loḳmān, *Hünernāme*, vol. 1, fol. 121a.
29. Lütfi Paşa, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman*, 316, 358, 368, 413, 433, 435, 444, 448. Not only his contemporaries but later chroniclers too reflected on Süleyman I's passion for hunting: see Meḥmed Hemdemī Çelebi Solaḳzāde, *Solak-zâde Tarihi*, ed. V. Çubuk (Ankara, 1989), 206–7; İbrahim Peçevī, *Tārīḫ-i Peçevī*, 2 vols. (Istanbul, 1864–65), 1:199, 248; Hezârfen Hüseyin Efendi, *Telhîsü'l-beyân fi Kavânîn-i Âl-i Osmân*, 143. Archival sources, such as the earliest available Register of Important Affairs, also reveal various dimensions of Süleyman's personal keenness for hunting: *Topkapı Sarayı Arşivi H. 951–952 Tarihli ve E-12321 Numaralı Mühimme Defteri,* ed. H. Sahillioğlu (Istanbul, 2002).
30. Kemalpaşazāde, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman: X. Defter*, 117.
31. See, for example, "Yeniçeri Kanunnâmesi," in A. Akgündüz, *Osmanlı Kanunnâmeleri ve Hukukî Tahlilleri*, 9 vols. (Istanbul, 1990–), 9:213.
32. By mid-July 1567 several orders were issued addressing the kadi and *bostancıbaşı* (commander of the imperial guard) of Edirne concerning the protection of the hunting grounds: see M. Şener, N. İşler, and H. O. Yıldırım, eds., *7 Numaralı Mühimme Defteri I–III (975–976/1567–1569)*, (Ankara, 1997–99), 204 no. 74.
33. E. Atıl, *Images of Imperial Istanbul* (Istanbul, 1993), 7–8, 14.
34. Topkapı Palace Museum Library, A. 3592, fol. 39b, illustrated by Nakkaş Hasan Paşa. Also included in this manuscript is a quite similar portrait of Bayezid II (fol. 37b), who was a committed and renowned hunter, so that it would be difficult to regard Nakkaş Hasan's manner as critical or sarcastic, at least with respect to this sultan. On the other hand, Selaniki also talks derisively about hunting hares from carriages "in their known manner" (*…zaḳonları üzre tavşanı araba ile avlayup…*): see Selānikī Muṣṭafā Efendi, *Tarih-i Selânikî*, 2 vols., ed. M. İpşirli (Istanbul, 1989), 1:60.
35. Johann Michael Heberer von Bretten, *Aegyptiaca Servitus*, intr. Karl Teply (Graz, 1967 [repr. of 1610 edition]) = *Osmanlıda Bir Köle: Brettenli Michael Heberer'in Anıları, 1585–1588,* trans. T. Noyan (Istanbul, 2003), 284–85. Furthermore, a tripartite hunting scene is included in the album prepared in his reign: regarding the VNB Codex Mixtus 313 see E. Wellesz, "Die Miniaturen im Album Murad III," *Wiener Beiträge zur Kunst und Kulturgeschichte Asiens* 10 (1936): 55–67; A. E. Froom, "A Muraqqaʿ for the Ottoman Sultan Murad III (r. 1574–1595): Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Codex Mixtus 313" (PhD diss., New York University, 2001).
36. Selānikī Muṣṭafā Efendi, *Tarih-i Selânikî*, 2:613. Most of the time they hunted birds, but they also organized drives at Çatalca, Silivri, and Burgaz. The sultan continued to hunt in the vicinity of Edirne, where he stayed for eleven days in all: see ʿAbdülḳādir Efendi, *Topçular Katibi ʿAbdülkādir (Kadri) Efendi Tarihi* (henceforth *Topçular Katibi Tarihi*), ed. Z. Yılmazer (Ankara, 2003), 124–25, 127.
37. T. Artan, "Feasting in Adversity: Enhancing the Ordinary," unpub. paper presented at the 2007 annual meeting of MESA (Montreal, Nov. 16–20, 2007).
38. ʿAbdülḳādir Efendi, *Topçular Katibi Tarihi*, 407–8.
39. The prince in question was the future Osman II. News of the birth of two other princes also reached Ahmed I at hunting parties: Şehzade Selim was born when the sultan was hunting at Davudpaşa in June 1611; Şehzade Murad (IV) was also born when his father was at a hunting party, this time in İstavroz on July 27, 1612. See Muṣṭafā Ṣāfī, *Mustafa Sâfî'nin Zübdetü't-Tevârîh* (henceforth *Zübdetü't-Tevârîh*), ed. İ. H. Çuhadar (Ankara, 2003), 2:28a, 168a, 179b.
40. Muṣṭafā Ṣāfī, *Zübdetü't-Tevârîh*, 1:28a–29b; 2:50a, 183b–184a;

ʿAbdülḳādir Efendi, *Topçular Katibi Tarihi*, 424–26; Kātib Çelebi, *Fezleke-yi Kātib Çelebi* (henceforth *Fezleke*), 2 vols. (Istanbul, 1869–70), 1:268.

41. In the first volume of *Zübdetü't-Tevârîh,* Mustafa Safi records various anecdotes relating to hunting parties, reflecting on sultanic justice, probity and honesty, piety and charity, reason and intelligence, modesty and humility, and generosity and magnanimity: see 1:24b–25a, 36a, 37a, 29b–30a, 66a–68a. The last section is devoted to the sultan's bodily vigor and skills in horsemanship and, in particular, the hunt: see 1:95a, 97a, 115a, 132a, 137b, 168a–168b, 176a.
42. Ibid., 2:181b–196b. Arriving in Edirne on January 11, 1613, the sultan embarked on daily excursions; he also traveled to hunting grounds in the vicinity, where most of the time he hunted with falcons. Nevertheless, it was in these hunting parks that he was introduced to big-game hunting—chasing boars, wolves, foxes, deer, and hares, with dogs and leopards as his aids. For the narration of the drives see 2:204a–211b for the one at Çölmek; 2:211b–226a for the two at Kurdkayası; and 2:226a for the one at Karaağaç. Apart from these massive organizations, there were seventeen other hunting parties in nearby parks, as well as daily hunting in the royal gardens.
43. Muṣṭafā Ṣāfī, *Zübdetü't-Tevârîh*, 2:230b–255a.
44. Muṣṭafā Ṣāfī, *Zübdetü't-Tevârîh*, 2:255a–258a. See also Kātib Çelebi, *Fezleke,* 1:345–46; Naʿīmā Muṣṭafā Efendi, *Târih-i Naʿîmâ: Ravzatü'l-Hüseyn fi hulâsati ahbâri'l-hâfikayn* (henceforth *Târih-i Naʿîmâ*) 4 vols., ed. M. İpşirli (Ankara, 2007), vol. 2, fol. 94. I am grateful to Prof. Mehmet İpşirli for allowing me to consult his 2007 edition, which at the time was still in press.
45. Muṣṭafā Ṣāfī, *Zübdetü't-Tevârîh*, 2:260a–301a; for the drive at Çatalca in August 1613 see 2:304a–306a and 310a–311a.
46. Starting from Davudpaşa on November 22, the royal party hunted intermittently in some of the staging areas but enjoyed a three-day drive at Burgaz: see Muṣṭafā Ṣāfī, *Zübdetü't-Tevârîh*, 2:326b–336a. They arrived in Edirne on December 4 and returned to the capital on February 25, 1614.
47. Mustafa Safi records this event in verse; see Muṣṭafā Ṣāfī, *Zübdetü't-Tevârîh,* 2:345b–360b.
48. These numbers pertain to the hunting parties in the winter of 1613: see Muṣṭafā Ṣāfī, *Zübdetü't-Tevârîh*, 2:208b for the hunting party at Çölmek, and 223a for the ones at Kurdkayası. In the latter case, though, he notes that these numbers pertain only to whatever game was presented to the sultan. Later, exploring the register kept by Haseki Hüseyin (also referred to as a *ġulām-ı bostānī* and a *mülāzim-i rikāb-ı sulṭānī*), he notes that the first two drives, at Çölmek and Kurdkayası, yielded 365 animals; the one at Karaağaç 144 animals; and the second drive at Kurdkayası sixty animals. The number of game hunted in the winter of 1613 reached 915, including the yields of seventeen other hunting parties in the vicinity of Edirne. The intimate retinue of the sultan, hunting with falcons, bagged about one hundred birds (geese, ducks, partridges, storks, etc.) in the royal gardens, without the assistance of the hunting establishment. For a total list of the game recorded in this period see Muṣṭafā Ṣāfī, *Zübdetü't-Tevârîh*, 2:226a–227a.
49. Rhoads Murphey has noted that one of the themes consistently pursued in Mustafa Safi's *Zübdetü't-Tevârîh* concerns the sultan's ability to perform unexpected, even miraculous, feats of equestrian skill, such as remarkably swift mobilizations (as a result of his good horsemanship, physical stamina, patience in adversity, and disregard for his own personal comfort). Murphey notes, moreover, that Mustafa Safi, unaware of the fact that Ahmed was effectively the first sultan ever to have assumed office without the usual training as governor of an Anatolian province, argues in support of his having all the requisite abilities: see R. Murphey, "Politics and Islam: Mustafa Safi's Version of the Kingly Virtues as Presented in His *Zübdetü't-Tevârîh*, or Annals of Sultan Ahmed, 1012–23 A.H./1603–1614 A.D." in *Frontiers of Ottoman Studies: State, Province, and the West*, ed. C. Imber and K. Kiyotaki (London and New York, 2005), 17.
50. Topkapı Palace Museum Archives D 4155 (1651–52). See also B. Mahir, "Extending the Tradition (1600–1700): Portraits in New Context," in *The Sultan's Portrait: Picturing the House of Osman* (Istanbul, 2000), 298. This promptly brings to mind Selim II's hunting expedition, which was captured for posterity in 1575; see Atıl, *Images of Imperial Istanbul*, 7–8, 14. For a description of the procession entering the capital on October 12, 1612, on their way back from a hunting party at Davudpaşa, see ʿAbdülḳādir Efendi, *Topçular Katibi Tarihi*, 606–9; and Muṣṭafā Ṣāfī, *Zübdetü't-Tevârîh*, 2:176a. For another depiction of a mock entrance, on May 14, 1613, upon the sultan's return from Edirne, see Muṣṭafā Ṣāfī, *Zübdetü't-Tevârîh*, 2:225a–258a. The latter has been embellished by Kātib Çelebi, *Fezleke*, 1:345–46; and Naʿīmā, *Târih-i Naʿîmâ*, 94.
51. Muṣṭafā Ṣāfī, *Zübdetü't-Tevârîh*, 2:208b.
52. Avcıoğlu, "Ahmed I and the Allegories of Tyranny," 218–26.
53. *Ḳavānīn-i ʿOṣmānī* and *Rābṭa-i Āsitāne*, 12, as cited in Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devletinin Saray Teşkilâtı*, 421 n. 5; Mü'ezzin-zāde ʿAyn-ı ʿĀlī, *Ḳavānīn-i Āl-i ʿOṣmān der Ḫülāṣa-i Mezāmin-i Defter-i Dīvān* (Istanbul, 1863–64), fol. 95, as cited in Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devletinin Saray Teşkilâtı*, 422 n. 1.
54. *Tuhfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn,* introduction: *…ḫātır-ı şerīfleri mā'il-i ḫayl-i cevād ve rāġıb-ı fāris-i ḳaviyyi'l-fü'ād olmaġla ve şāhbāz-ı ṭabʿ-ı bülend-pervāzları daḫi şikār-ı kebk-i ḫātır-ı raʿiyyeti ve ṣayd-ı āhū-yi dil-i ehl-i memleketi hevāsı ile ṣaḥrā ve fezāya pervāz etmege rāġıb olmaġla…*
55. R. Almond, *Medieval Hunting* (Stroud, 2003), 25.
56. Muṣṭafā Ṣāfī, *Zübdetü't-Tevârîh*, 1:227a–228a. In addition to countless references to the devoutness of Ahmed I, Mustafa Safi mentions in particular the special care the sultan took not to miss prayer times, even during hunting parties: see Muṣṭafā Ṣāfī, *Zübdetü't-Tevârîh*, 1:36a, 37a.
57. Ibid., 1:144a–159a.
58. *Tuhfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn*, fol. 201b: *…ve biz bayṭaratı fünūnu ile ve ʿilletleri ile ve aña şālih olup aña mensūb olan şey ile cemʿ eyledük ve anuñ ardınca fürūsīyeti īrād eyledük zīrā fürūsīyet maʿnā-yı tabʿide bayṭaranuñ telvīʿidür ve baʿdehu bir muḫtasar latīf ve ḫafīf ki Şuʿayb'dan münaḳḳaḥ ve muḫallaṣdur īrād ederüz…*
59. Ibid., fol 201b: *…ve Bekr ve ṣayd ḫaḳḳında ve anuñ fünūnu ve ḫavāṣṣı ḫaḳḳında ve anuñla ʿamel etmek ḫaḳḳında ve's-selām.*
60. Copies are in London (the British Museum); Oxford (the Bodleian Library); Berlin; Baghdad; and Bursa (Bursa Kütüphanesi). See also Haraççı 1122, copied in 970 (1562–63) by Hüseyin bin ʿAbdullah. The sixteenth-century translation into Ottoman includes only the cures: see N. Erk, *İslam Medeni-*

yeti Çağında Veteriner Tababette Gelişmeler ve 'Naserī' (Ankara, 1959). There is an old French translation of Naseri's Baghdad copy: *Le Nâcérî: La perfection des deux arts, ou traité complet d'hippologie et d'hippiatrie arabes*, trans. N. Perron (Paris, 1852–60).

61. For a comprehensive bibliography of medieval manuscripts on the horse, horsemanship, and hunting in the manuscript libraries in Istanbul see Artan, "Ahmed I and *Tuhfetü'l-mülûk ve's-selâtin*."
62. G. Sarton, *Introduction to the History of Science*, 3 vols. (Baltimore, 1948) 3:1642. Shihab al-Sarraf, in his most recent and significant study on Mamluk *furūsiyya* literature, has also referred to *Bughyat al-qāsidīn bi 'l-ʿamal fi 'l-mayādīn* and the governor of Aleppo to whom it was dedicated. Al-Sarraf, however, has classified the work in question as one of four parts on the art of the lance. Identifying *al-mayādīn* as the exercise itself, al-Sarraf has remarked, "The most current treatise on mayâdîn in the Mamluk period was *Tuhfat al-Mujâhidîn fi al-ʿAmal bi-al-Mayâdîn*, by Lâjin Ibn ʿAbd Allâh al-Dhahabî al-Tarâbulsi al-Rammâh (d.738/1337)." Al-Sarraf also states, "Lâjin and his work should not be confused with his son Muhammad Ibn Lâjin al-Husâmî al-Tarâbulsî al-Rammâh and his work, also on mayâdîn, entitled *Bughyat al-qâsidîn bi-al-ʿAmal fi al-Mayâdîn*, written for Sayf al-Dîn ʿÂshiqtîmûr al-Mârdînî al-Nâsirî, governor of Aleppo (d. 791/1389)." See al-Sarraf, "Mamluk Furûsîyah Literature and Its Antecedents," 174–75. Al-Sarraf adds that two copies of the latter work survive: Ayasofya Library, ms. 3799/1, dated 1378; and Leiden University Library, ms. 1418.
63. T. T. Allsen, *The Royal Hunt in Eurasian History* (Philadelphia, 2006), 90.
64. *Tuhfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn,* fol. 202a: *sükkān-ı ʿālem-i üns ve mülāzımān-ı bārgāh-ı vaḥdet ve ḳuds olan ervāḥ-ı ʿulviye içün ṣaḥrā-yı ʿālem-i imkān ve mīşezār-ı zemīn-ü āsümānı ṣaydgāh edüp.*
65. Allsen, *Royal Hunt in Eurasian History*, 34, 47–48. Compare and contrast G. Necipoğlu, "The Suburban Landscape of Sixteenth-Century Istanbul as a Mirror of Classical Ottoman Garden Culture," in *Gardens in the Time of the Great Muslim Empires,* ed. A. Petruccioli, Supplements to Muqarnas, vol. 7 (Leiden, 1997), 32–71.
66. *Tuhfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn*, fol. 202b: …*Vaḳtā kim bayṭarat ʿilminüñ netīcesi fürūsīyet olduysa ve fürūsīyetüñ netīcesi daḥi ḥudūd-ı İslāmdan ḫāric olan aʿdānuñ maẓarrat-ı defʿi ve bilād-ı İslāmuñ daḥilinde ḥūn ṭabīʿatlu ve fuhūd siretlü olan ẓalemenüñ ḳayd-ı ʿadl-i sulṭānī ile ḳayd ve refʿi olduysa…*
67. Ibid., fol. 202b: …*ve bunuñ ḥuṣūlü sulṭānuñ kendü nefsi ile ṣayd-ı hevāsı ile ṣaḥrāya ve feżāya ḥurūcuna mütevaḳḳıf olduysa…*
68. Ibid., fol. 203a: …*Ve salṭanat umūruna ve raʿiyyet aḥvāline ṣayd bahānesiyle iṭṭılāʿ ve şuʿūrdur ve mūcibiyle tenfīẕ-i aḥkāmdur. Zīrā ferece ve nüzhet ve seyr ü sülūke raġbet ve rūtbet-i ʿuẓmā ve himmet-i kuṣvādur…*
69. Ibid., fol. 203a: *Ve mülūk nefsleriyle ṣol ḥurūba mübāşeret etmezler ki ḳalbı şecīʿ eder ve aña taḳviyet verür. Ve nüfūsda ʿizzi telḳīḥ eder yaʿnī aşılar.*
70. Ibid., fol. 203a: *Ve menfūs olan nüfūs ve ebdāndan nefs-i libās-ı fāḫiri refʿ eder.*
71. Ibid., fol. 203a: *Pes vaḳtā kim mülūkuñ ʿādeti ve refāhiyyeti ve ẕevḳ u ṣafāya niʿmet ve alaya meyl ve sükūn olduysa ḳāhir ve maḫhūra ve ṭālib ve maṭlūba ve ġālib ve maġlūba ve ḫāric ve maḥrūca ve ḳātil ve maktūla ve mübāşeretsiz yaʿnī niʿmete ve nefsüñ ḥuẓūr ve refāhiyetine meşġūl olup memleketinde, ḳāhir olan ẓālimüñ ḳahrından mazlūm olan raʿiyyetüñ maḫhūr olmasından ve aʿdānuñ ʿaskerine ġalebe edüp anları mecrūḥ etmekde ve ḥükūmetinde olan raʿiyyetüñ ḫarc içün maḳtūl olmasından ġayrī ḳatl etmekden ḫabīr olmaya ve ḥükm ve siyāset ile muḳayyed olmaya…*
72. Ibid., fol. 203a: *Ve bu bir ʿādetdür kim meliküñ ḳalbi oldur ve ẕilleti ve ḥorluyu ve ḳorḳaklıġı ve ʿaczi getürür. Ve ṣulḥ etmekde ve ʿāfiyet kesbinde gizlenmeye raġbet eyledüler.*
73. Ibid., fol. 203a: *Ḫuṣūṣan ḳaçan kim nisā' ile ḥalveti ve ṣoḥbeti çoḳ edeler, pes mülūk ve selāṭīnüñ nüfūsları üzere aḥlāḳ-ı reddiye ve ʿörf ü ʿādet-i lehv ġālib olur.*
74. Ibid., fol. 203a: *Ve bu ẕikr olınan aḥlāḳ ʿavāmmuñ ednā ṭabaḳasıdur. Ve her ḳaçan kim melik üzere ʿavammuñ aḥlāḳ ve ʿādeti ġālib olsa pes bu esbābuñ aʿzamından olur.*
75. Ibid., fol. 203a: *Kendü etbāʿı yaʿnī ʿaskeri ve ḥavāṣṣ isi anuñ üzere cür'et edüp hücūm etmesinden ednā saʿy ile.*
76. Ibid., fol. 203a: *aʿdānuñ aña* <203b> *ayak üzere ḳalḳmasında.*
77. Ibid., fol. 203b: *devletinüñ rü'esāsı ve vüzerāsı ve re'y ve tedbīrde ansız müstaḳill olur ve istediklerin ederler ve erbāb-ı devāvīn ve cibāyāt ve ḫarac ve aṣḥāb-ı büyūt-ı emvāl anuñ mālını andan ṣaḳlarlar ve egrilik ederler.*
78. Ibid., fol. 203b: *Pes anlardan her birisi pādişāh üzere telbīsligi ve ḫilāf-ı vāḳiʿ olan şey'i bildürmegi ve daḥi pādişāhuñ aʿdāsından iḫbār etmekle, ḳorḳutmaġı istiʿmāl eder. Pes devlet ve salṭanat anlaruñ olur, pādişāhuñ olmaz. Pes anı ʿacz örter ve ẕillet keşf eder.*
79. Ibid., fol. 203b: *Pes vaḳtā kim pādişāhlara maḥṣūṣ olan siyāseti ve siyāsetüñ sırrını tecrübe ile ʿālim olanlar bu emr-i müşkili gördüler ve anlaruñ ḳudreti olmadı ki mülūka kendü bedenleri ile ḥarb u kıtāle mübāşereti teklīf edeler.*
80. Ibid., fol. 203b: *Mülūküñ helākinden nefslerine ḫavfden ötürü ḥarbüñ ḥīlesinden ve muḥārebenüñ kiẕbinden ve aʿdānuñ aldatmasından yaʿnī aʿdā cengde pādişāha żarar etmesünler deyü ḫavf etdüklerinden aña kendü nefsi ile ceng ü ḥarbe mübāşereti teklīf etmezler.*
81. Ibid., fol. 203b: *Zīrā pādişāhuñ nefsine żarar işābet edicek cemʿ bilād ve memlekete żarar işābet eder ve aʿdā memleket üzere ġalebe eder ve pādişāhuñ nefsi maḥfūz olıcak bi-emrillāh ʿaskerine inkisār gelürse yine cebr etmek mümkündür.*
82. Ibid., fol. 203b: *Zīrā devlet-i ḳadīme ve salṭanat-ı ʿazīme ṣāḥibi olan melik-i ʿazīmü'ş-şān ve sulṭān-ı sātiʿül-ḥükm ve'l-burhān üzere vācib olan budur ki kendü nefsi ile mübāşeret etmege…*
83. Ibid., fol. 203b: *ṣol fiʿile ki anuñ ümerāsından aña ḫidmet eden kimesne anuñ ṭarafından anda ḳāyim olur ve anı edā eder ve melik kendü rūḥu ile ʿadūyu menʿ etmege belki ʿadūya mübāşeret* <204a> *ve anları menʿ etmek pādişāhuñ ʿaṣrī ehlinüñ ve ʿaskerinüñ ve rūḥu iledür yaʿnī anlar pādişāh ṭarafından muḥārebe edüp rūḥların beẕl etmekle vāḳiʿdür.*
84. See n. 83 above.
85. Ibid., fol. 204a: *Pes siyāset-i ḥikemiyyeyi ʿālim olan ʿulemā mülūküñ nufūsunda niʿmetden mütevellid olan şey'üñ defʿinde ve refāhiyyetinden ḥāṣıl olan emrin nezʿinde ki yitecek miḳdārı şey' ile kanāʿatdur ve raḥātdur ve aḥlāḳlarında yumuşaḳlıḳ ve rikḳat gibi olan şey'in izālesinde ihtimām eyledüler.*
86. Ibid., fol. 204a: *Ve siyāset-i ḥikemiyye hükmünde ʿulemāya mümkün olmadı ki mülūka emr edeler.*
87. Ibid., fol. 204a: *Ġazāya ḥurūc etmekle muḥārebe ve muḳātele etmekle ki ḳuvvādlarınuñ ve cüyūşi ve ümerāsınuñ baʿżısı anuñla ḳāyim olur ve daḥi ḥaṣānet ve metānetden* <204b> *ve memleketinüñ nāmūsı ve kuṭrundan ve ḥaddinden ki tenāvül-i aʿdādan masündur.*
88. Ibid., fol. 204b: *ve ṭaşra çıḳmaḳla ṣol emākine ki anlaruñ mülūki*

anlarda münkeşif olur ve aşikāre olur ve aʿdānuñ ve cāsūslarınuñ yedleri anlarda mübāşeret eder.

89. Ibid., fol. 204b: *Pes vuḥūş ve ṭuyūr anlar ile meʾnūs olup ve ülfet edüp anlara münḳād oldılar.*
90. Ibid., fol. 204b: *Pes anları irsāl eyledüler. Ve anlar daḥi rücūʿ eyledüler ve anlara ḫiṭāb eder baʿżı edevāt ile āvāz eyledüler. Pes vuḥūş anlardan fehm eyledüler. Pes anları çaġırdılar ve anlar daḥi anlara icābet eyledüler. Pes ḳaçan kim anları başladılar ve anlar daḥi anlaruñ ḳatında benī ādemden ḥüddām gibi ḳaldılar. Pes anları mülūka ʿarż eyledüler.*
91. Ibid., fol. 204b: *Ve ṣayd içün ḥurūcu mülūk içün tertīb edüp anlara emr eyledüler. Pes mülūküñ ḳulūbu vech-i meşrūḥ üzere ṣayda taʿalluḳ etdikden soñra ʿulemā anlara emr eyledüler kim ṣayd içün vaḳti ve zamānı içün iḫtiyār edeler. Ve yanına hazāyiñ ile ṣayd ālātını aḫz edeler.*
92. Ibid., fol. 205a: *ve ṣayd yerlerinde havāda muʿallaḳ olan nesneyi depretmek gibi ve ṣuya koġayı ṣarḳutmak gibi olan umūra tenbīh edeler ve pādişāhlara lāyıḳ olan himmet ile ihtimām edeler.*
93. Ibid., fol. 205a: *Zīrā pādişāh ṣayd içün ṣaḥrāya ḥurūc etmekle nice fevāyid cemʿ eder birisi budur ki şehirde çoḳ iḳāmet etdikden ve ṭaşra çıḳmamasından ḥāṣıl olan iżṭırābdan tenezzüh ve istirāḥatdur.*
94. Ibid., fol. 205a: *ve havāyı aḫz etmekdür. Ve fezāya nazar etmekdür ve havānuñ ṣıḥḥatidür.*
95. Ibid., fol. 205a: *Ve birisi atı ḳoşmak ve segirtmekdür.*
96. Ibid., fol. 205a: *Tā kim pādişāh tenḥā kendü ḫavāṣṣı ile vaḥşī ḳovmaḳda at ile segirde ve anı oynada ki şehrinde memleketi taḥtında ḫalḳ arasında ana anı eyitmek mümkün degildür. Ve ṣayd mevāṭınında raḳībden ve seyr ediciden tenḥādur. Ve şehrde ḫalḳdan cemʿ-i ġafīr beyninde edicek mümkündür ki ʿaskerinden ve cünūdundan ednā olan kimesne diye ki ben pādişāhdan eyerde daḥi muḥkem otururum ve ḳuvvetüm ziyādedür ve andan daḥi atluyum. Pes pādişāha bu vech ile ṭaş atarlar.*
97. Ibid., fol. 205a: *Ve daḥi nāsuñ gözinde ḥürmetlü görinmez ve pādişāh böyle alçaḳ mertebe aşaġa inmege muḥtāc degildür. Ve pādişāh ḳaçan muḥtāc oldı kendü nefsi ile aʿdā ile ḥarbe mübāşeret etmege ve bedeni ile ʿizz ü salṭanatdan ve metānet ve ṭāḳatden ḥurūc etmege. ʿAsākīr ve ecnādından soñra illā meger kim ʿālemde ḳıyāmet ḳopa.*
98. Ibid., fol. 205a: *Pes mülūk içün ṣayd ve parslar ve ḳaplanlar kilāb ve doġanlar ve ṭayruñ ve vaḥşī cānāvaruñ yırtıcısı ve bunlar ile segirtmek müsteḥābdur.*
99. Ibid., fol. 205a: *Tā kim pādişāhuñ nefsi şecāʿat taḥṣīl ede yırtıcılara* <205b> *mübāşeret etmekle ve anlaruñ çoḳ efʿālin müşāhede etmekle ve anlara meyl etmekle anlaruñ şiddetle yapışmasında ve ġażab etmesinde ve yırtıcıları ṣayd ile ceng etdiklerin ve gāh ḳahr etdiklerin ve gāh saṭvetlerin ve ṣaydın kendü nefsinden envāʿ-ı ḥīle ile defʿ etdigin veyā andan ḳaçdugun müşāhede etmekle ve bundan ġayrī vāḳiʿ olan sibāʿ ile ṣayd aḥvālin müşāhede etmekle pes pādişāh üzere yırtıcıların aḥlāḳı ġalebe eder.*
100. Ibid., fol. 205b: *Pes şiddet ile ʿazm ve teveccühü ve ʿizzeti ve milk ve raʿiyyet üzere ḥimāyeti ve ḥamiyyeti ve aʿdā üzere iḳdāmı bunlar ḳapar ve pādişāhuñ yırtıcılar ile ṣayduñ aḥvālini müşāhede etmesi ve seyr etmesi ḥarb ve cenge onuñ mübāşereti maḳāmında ḳāʾim olur ki cenge mümāreset edüp aña mübāşeret olan bahādırlar ve ġāzīler ʿadūya bunuñ gibi ġalebe edüp bu efʿāl anlardan şādıra olur yaʿnī pādişāh kendü nefsi ile ceng ve ḥarb meydānına ḥāżır olup pehlivānlar ve ġāzīlerüñ cüş u ḫurūşlarından fī sebillillāh ġayret ve ḥamiyyetlerinden ve ʿadūyu yırtup urmaḳdan ve ḳatl etmekden ve ġalebe edüp hayḳırmaḳdan aña ġayret ve ḥamiyyet ve şecāʿat geldügi gibi.*
101. Ibid., fol. 205b: *cenge mübāşeret etmeden ṣayd yerlerinde parslaruñ ve ḳaplānlaruñ ve tazılaruñ ve doġan ile şāhīnüñ ve bunlardan ġayrī ṣayda mensūb olan sibāʿ ve ṭuyūruñ ḥamiyyet ve ġayretlerin ve iḳdām ve cürʾetlerin ve ṣayda ġażab ile yapışup yırtmaḳdan ve yere urmaḳdan nefs-i pādişāhīye ġayret ve ḥamīyet ve cürʾet ve şecāʿat gelüp.*
102. Ibid., fol. 205b: *eger bilādınuñ ḥudūdı civārında olan küffār üzere iḳdām edüp anlara ġalebe etmesidür. Ve eger bilādında zeleme üzere* <206a> *tīġ-i ʿadālet ile ʿazm edüp bilāduñ anlardan taṭhīri ve raʿiyyetüñ anlardan taḥlīṣidür. Anlardan aḫz eder.*
103. Ibid., fol. 206a: *…Ve illā ṣayd mülūk ve selāṭīne ekl içün ve kesb-i ṭalebi içün resm olınmadı. Sāʾir sayyādlar etdigi gibi ve ṣaydı yemege daḥi anlaruñ iḫtīyācı yoḳdur…*
104. Ibid., fol. 206a: *Belki meliküñ żabṭ ve hirāseti maʿrifetinüñ ve min ʿindillāh pādişāha emānet olan reʿāyā ve fuḳarā göñüllerinüñ ṣaydıdur. Zīrā ṣıfat-ı ḥayvāniyye ile muttaṣıf olan nās vaʿz ve naṣīḥatdan müteʾessir olmazlar. Pādişāhuñ siyāset ve seyfinden ve ʿadālet ve ġażabından müteʾessir olduḳları gibi.*
105. Ibid., fol. 206a:

    Çün fezāy-ı dehre çıḳdık ṣayd içün ey şehriyār
    ṣayd-ı ʿirfān eyleyüp dil mürgünü eyle şikār
    şāhbāz-ı himmetin sal ḥıfz-ı ʿālem evcine
    Zīrā çakır pençelüdür şimdi doġan ehl-i kār.

106. Ibid., fol. 206a: *İmdi bu sebebden ötürü mülūk ve selāṭīn içün ṣayd resm olındı ve ṣayd emrinden bir nesneyi ḳuvvādlarından ve ʿaskerlerinden bir kimesneye ṣayd etmege ruḫṣat vermediler.*
107. Ibid., fol. 206a: *Ve anlaruñ zamānında bir kimesne ṣayd etmege ḳādir olmadı. Anlaruñ ṣayyādlarından ve muḳarreblerinden ġayrī mülūk üzere ġalebe olan niʿmetinden ötürüdür. Pes pādişāhlar yırtıcı cānāvarlaruñ ve av avlayıcı ṭuyūruñ çoḳluġu ile ṣayd yerlerine nüzūl eyledüler. Ve ṣayd eyledüler.*
108. Ibid., fol. 206a: *...ve ʿasker ve raʿiyyet üzere bundan żararlı bir nesne yoḳdur ki bir ʿaskerüñ emīri ṣaydda ḥāris ola. Zīrā bu hezelān-ı ekberdür ve nice defʿa vāḳiʿ olmışdur ki nice ʿasker sürücü ve ceyş şāḥibi olan kimesneler ʿizzet ve salṭanat içinde ṣayd içün ṣaḥrāya çıḳdı. Pes anuñ ʿadūsı bir ḥīle ile bir ṣanʿat ile anı ṣayd eyledi ve aḫz eyledi ve ṣayd melikden ġayrī kimesneye lāyıḳ degildür.*
109. Ibid., fol. 206b: *zīrā pādişāh kendü ḥükūmeti taḥtında olan raʿiyyetüñ aḥvālini görmek içün ṣayd bahānesiyle ṭaşra çıḳar ve onuñ ḥükūmetinde ġayrī kimesnenüñ medḫali yoḳdur. Ve salṭanatında onuñ şerīki yoḳdur tā kim ol daḥi ol bahāne ile ṭaşra çıḳa ve lākin aḥyānen vāḳiʿ ola ve mülūk peşīn ṣaydı kendülere maḥṣūṣ etmişler idi.*
110. Ibid., fol. 206b: *Ḫalḳı menʿ ederlerdi ve doġanlardan ve yırtıcıdan pars ve kilāb gibi beslemekden ġayrī kimesneleri menʿ ederlerdi ve derlerdi ki bu mülūküñ ṣanʿatıdur.*
111. Ibid., fol. 206b: *Ve ṣol kimesne ki anlardan degildür anlara beñzemek aña yoḳdur ve mülūk ṣayda çıḳarlardı. Ve ḫāżır olurlardı. Ve cuyūşuñ sürücülerine evvelden tenbīh ederlerdi ki ʿaskeri sibāʿın ṣaydından ġayrī ṣeyʾi ṣayd etmekden menʿ ederlerdi. Ḫuṣūṣan kim ʿadū īlādında oldıḳları zamānda tā kim yollar müşevveş olmaya ve atlar yorulmaya ve vaḳt olur ki at vaḥşī ḥayvanuñ ardınca giderken ökçelenür ve saḳaṭ olurdu.*
112. Ibid., fol. 206b: *ṣayd merātibinüñ evveli bulutlı ve açuḳ olan evḳātı beklemekdür ve bunuñ zamānı şehrün vaż'ı ve heyʾeti ve mizacı ve havāsı ve havāsınuñ evfaḳı miḳdārı üzredür. Ve daḥi ṣayd evḳātınuñ maʿrifeti ki ṣayduñ her cinsi ḳanġı vaḳitde ṣayd olınur ve nirede bulunur.*
113. Ibid., fol. 208a: *Pes mülūk ve selāṭīn ṣayd içün ṭaşra çıḳdıklarında onlara vācib olan budur ki raʿiyyetüñ meʿāribine ve aḥvāllerine*

ve anlaruñ mazlūmiyyetlerine vāḳıf olduḳda anlara lutf edeler ve anlardan ḥācet ṣāḥibi olan kimesnenüñ ḥācetlerini ḳażā edeler.

114. Ibid., fol. 208a: *Pes pādişāh ṣayd içün hurūc edicek raʿiyyete evvelden iʿlāmı etmek gerekdür zīrā raʿiyyet içün ḫorḳaḳ ḫātūnlar ve ʿazīzü'n-nefsi kimesne vardur ki ḥicābüñ ve ḫadem ü haşemüñ ṣavlet-i zulletine taḥammül edemez ve mażlūme olan olan* [sic] *ḫātūnlar ḫaẕer ve ḫavf üzerelerdür.*
115. Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā Mustanṣir al-Awwal, *Al-Mansur's Book on Hunting*, ed. T. Clark and M. Derhalli (Warminster, 2001). For a comprehensive analysis of medieval texts on hunting see al-Sarraf, "Mamluk Furûsîyah Literature and Its Antecedents," 184–90.
116. D. Alexander, "Les masques de guerre," in *Chevaux et cavaliers arabes dans les arts d'Orient et d'Occident* (Paris, 2003), 100–101.
117. D. Haldane, *Mamluk Painting* (Warminster, 1978), 79.
118. *Tuḥfetü'l-mülūk ve's-selāṭīn*, fols. 225b–226a. Today, longeing generally refers to a riderless horse on a long leash running in circles around a trainer.
119. Istanbul University Library, T. 6624, fol. 100b. Compare also with a slightly earlier copy of the *Tercüme-i Miftāh Cifrü 'l-Cāmiʿ*: Topkapı Palace Library, B. 373 (1597–98), fol. 243b.
120. There are, however, several similar compositions in an album put together in this same period and known as the *Ahmed I Album* (Topkapı Palace Library, B. 408, fols. 14a, 19a).
121. In the first chapter, the miniatures on 1a and 1b, together with six unlabeled miniatures appended to the end of the chapter (two showing saddled horses, and the other four scenes pertaining to horsemanship) are by Painter A. The remaining forty miniatures of the first chapter are all by Painter B. Thirty-eight of these, representing specific horse breeds, mules, and donkeys are stereotypical; the only variation is in the color of the animals' coats. No riding equipment is represented with the animals in question, and their tails are left to hang loose. Also thrown in are two fantastic creatures, a unicorn-*cum*-pegasus, and an antelope-like quadruped standing on a fish. Furthermore, in contrast to the representations of all these breeds in repose, there are two identical, double-folio drawings that depict horses in motion—possibly jumping over a fence. A third, also identical, representation of a jumping horse is included a few folios later, but the page bearing the hind part of the animal is missing. It is difficult to identify the artist of these three drawings, distributed over five pages. In the second chapter, there are twenty-six more miniatures by Painter A, and a further eighteen miniatures by Painter B. All of the seventy-two miniatures of the third chapter are by Painter A.
122. For this "complex and compound culture" see Artan, "Arts and Architecture," 408–80.
123. A. S. Ünver, *Ressam Nakşî: Hayatı ve Eserleri* (Istanbul, 1949); E. Atıl, "Ahmed Nakşî, an Eclectic Painter of the Early 17th Century," *Fifth International Congress of Turkish Art*, ed. G. Fehér (Budapest, 1978), 103–121; B. Mahir, "Ahmed Nakşî," in *Yaşamları ve Yapıtlarıyla Osmanlılar Ansiklopedisi* (Istanbul, 1999), s.v.; Z. Tanındı, "Transformation of Words to Images: Portraits of Ottoman Courtiers in the *Diwan*s of Baki and Nadiri," *Res* 43: *Anthropology and Aesthetics* (Spring 2003): 131–45. For Nakşi's work see the historical biography *Tercüme-i Şaḳāyıḳ-i Nuʿmāniye* (Topkapı Palace Museum Library, H. 1263), the anthology of poetry *Dīvān-ı Nādirī* (Topkapı Palace Museum Library, H. 889), the annals of the Hotin campaign of Osman II *Şehnāme-i Nādirī* (Topkapı Palace Museum Library, H. 1124), and several copies of the *Şehnāme-i Türkī* (see n. 124 below).
124. Early-seventeenth-century *Şehnāme-i Türkī* manuscripts were based on a verse translation by Şerif Amidi, composed probably in Cairo in 1500–1501 on the orders of the Mamluk sultan Qansuh al-Ghawri, as well as a prose translation by Dervish Hasan Medhi, ordered by ʿOsman II (r. 1617–22). Illustrated copies of the verse translation are found in the Spencer Collection of the New York Public Library, Spencer Turk. Ms. 1 (123 miniatures); the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies (Russian Academy of Sciences), E 8 (two miniatures); and the Edwin Binney, 3rd Collection of Turkish Art at LACMA, M.85.237.32 (six miniatures). Illustrated copies of the prose translation are located in Universitetsbibliotek, Upsala, Ms. Celsius I (twenty-eight miniatures); Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, ms. suppl. turc. 326 (fifteen miniatures); and the St. Petersburg State University Library, no. 1378 (twenty-nine miniatures). For patrons (and calligraphers) from Mevlevi circles see Filiz Çağman and Zeren Tanındı, "Illustration and the Art of the Book in the Sufi Orders in the Ottoman Empire," in *Sufism and Sufis in Ottoman Society: Sources, Doctrine, Rituals, Turuq, Architecture, Literature and Fine Arts, Modernism*, ed. A. Y. Ocak (Ankara, 2005), 501–27. See also S. Bağcı, "From Translated Word to Translated Image: The Illustrated *Şehnâme-i Türkî* Copies," *Muqarnas* 17 (2000): 162–76.
125. New York Public Library, Spencer Turk. ms. 1: see R. Gottheil, "The Shahnâmeh in Turkish: An Illuminated Manuscript in the Spencer Collection," *Bulletin of the New York Public Library* 36, 8 (1936): 8–11, 3 pls.; Atıl, "The Art of the Book," in *Turkish Art*, 214–15 and 217 fig. 112; B. Schmitz, *Islamic Manuscripts in the New York Public Library* (New York, 1992), 254–65, figs. 261–84 and pls. XX–XXII.
126. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, ms. suppl. turc. 326. See I. Stchoukine, *La peinture turque d'après les manuscrits illustrés*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1971), 2: pl. 45; H.-C. Graf von Bothmer, *Türkische Kunst und Kultur aus osmanischer Zeit*, 2 vols. (Frankfurt, 1985), 1:69, cat. 1/31 (fol. 17b).
127. British Library, Or. 4129 and Or. 2709. For Or. 4129 see G. M. Meredith-Owens, *Turkish Miniatures*, (London, 1963), 28 and pl. 21; N. M. Titley, *Miniatures from Turkish Manuscripts: A Catalogue and Subject Index of Paintings in the British Library and British Museum* (London, 1981), pl. 17; and Graf von Bothmer, *Türkische Kunst und Kultur*, 1:67, cat. 1/28. For Or. 2709 see N. M. Titley, *Persian Miniature Painting and Its Influence on the Art of Turkey and India* (London, 1983), 151–57 and pl. 29.
128. For Ahmed Nakşi's rendering of rocks with facial features see *Tercüme-i Şaḳāyıḳ-i Nuʿmāniye*, ca. 1619, Topkapı Palace Museum, H. 1263 (forty-nine miniatures), fols. 159b, 163a. For another period manuscript that illustrates rocks endowed with facial features see *Şerefü'l-İnsān* by Lāmiʿī Çelebi, dated to 1613, an adaptation of an Arabic philosophical treatise, *Ikhwān al-Safāʾ*, on the nobility of man and his superiority over animals. All twenty-six miniatures are by Ustad Muhammad ʿAli, known as Ahtari Shamakhi, whose name appears on

folio 30b. There is no record of this artist in other Ottoman illustrated manuscripts: see Titley, *Persian Miniature Painting,* fig. 54. Another signed miniature from the period is in the Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh, Inv. No. 1888.88 Bl. 11A: see Graf von Bothmer, *Türkische Kunst und Kultur,* 1:67, cat. 1/29 (portrait of Ahmed I, inscribed *el-faḳīr Süleymān*).

129. Meredith-Owens notes the accuracy in the depiction of contemporary dress and the mannerism of the rosebud mouths of the youths in Or. 4129, as well as a strikingly personal style in the rendering of depth: see Meredith-Owens, *Turkish Miniatures*, 28.
130. Universitetsbibliotek, Uppsala, Ms. Celsius I (twenty-eight miniatures). See Graf von Bothmer, *Türkische Kunst und Kultur,* 1:68, cat. 1/30 (fols. 1b–2a, showing the enthronement of Osman II in the second courtyard of the Topkapı Palace). Atıl attributes the paintings in this manuscript to Ahmed Nakşi: see Atıl, "Ahmed Nakşî, an Eclectic Painter," 103–21.
131. Topkapı Palace Museum, H. 1124.
132. See, for example, *Turkish Treasures from the Collection of Edwin Binney, 3rd* (Portland, 1979), 66–67, 70–71, 72–73.
133. See, for instance Topkapı Palace Museum Library, H. 2165, fol. 25b; and British Library, Or. 2709, fol. 26b: depictions of warriors wrestling that are directly comparable to the warriors of H. 415.
134. See, for example, *ʿAjā'ib al-Makhlūqāt*, Topkapı Palace Library A. 3632, in M. And, *Minyatür*, Osmanlı Tasvir Sanatları, vol. 1(Istanbul, 2002), 415.
135. Meredith-Owens regards the six miniatures of Murad III's *Şehnāme-i Türkī*, several of these painted on leaves that bear no relevant text, as "so greatly influenced by the Persian Shirazi style that it is virtually indistinguishable from it..." See Meredith-Owens, *Turkish Miniatures*, 21, as cited in *Turkish Treasures from the Collection of Edwin Binney, 3rd*, 48–50, cat. 23. To this criticism Binney adds (50), "Yet there are a few unmistakably Turkish elements here, for example, the typical pointed helmets of ff. 172r and 262v." See also K. Rührdanz, "About a Group of Truncated *Shāhnāmas*: A Case Study in the Commercial Production of Illustrated Manuscripts in the Second Part of the Sixteenth Century," *Muqarnas* 14 (1997): 118–34.
136. S. Bağcı, "An Iranian Epic and an Ottoman Painter: Nakkaş Osman's 'New' Visual Interpretation of the *Shāhnāmah*," in *Frauen, Bilder und Gelehrte: Studien zu Gesellschaft und Künsten im Osmanischen Reich*, 2 vols., ed. S. Prätor and C. Neumann (Istanbul, 2002), 2:421–50. See also W. Kwiatkowski, *The Eckstein Shahnama: An Ottoman Book of Kings* (London, 2005).
137. Çağman and Tanındı, "Illustration and the Art of the Book," 501–27. The authors note that copies of the Mesnevi were not part and parcel of the collections of Ottoman royalty until the seventeenth century, and that there was a radical change of attitude in the 1600s: "Cevrî İbrahim, a Mevlevî poet and a master of talik script in the first part of the 17th century, who was for a time secretary to the Divân-î Humâyûn (Imperial Chancery of the State) and who, after his retirement, earned a living by copying works for high state officials, is said to have produced twenty-two copies of the Mesnevi." Cevri İbrahim Çelebi copied the *Şehnāme-i Türkī* manuscripts now in St. Petersburg, and might also have been responsible for the Paris and Uppsala copies: see H. Ayan, *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, s.v. "Cevri İbrahim Çelebi"; Çağman and Tanındı, "Illustration and the Art of the Book," 511–12.
138. Atıl, "Ahmed Nakşî, an Eclectic Painter," 108.
139. Schmitz, *Islamic Manuscripts*, 256.
140. Bağcı has argued that most of the miniatures were made by three artists and has described the artist in question as somebody "whose style was very close to [Nakkaş] Osman." Bağcı, "From Translated Word to Translated Image," 166.
141. Z. Tanındı, "Bibliophile Aghas (Eunuchs) at Topkapı Saray," *Muqarnas* 21 (2004): 333–43.
142. Schmitz, *Islamic Manuscripts*, 254–255; V. J. Parry,"Ḥāfiẓ Aḥmed Pasha," in *Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition* (henceforth *EI2*) (Leiden, 1960–2004), s.v.; Mehmed Süreyya, "Hâfız Ahmed Paşa (Müezzinzâde)," in *Sicill-i Osmanî*, 6 vols., ed. N. Akbayar and S. A. Kahraman (Istanbul, 1996), 2:556.
143. İbrahim Agâh Paşa, *Vaḳāyiʿ-i Tārīḫiye* (Istanbul, 1909), fol. 119b, and Muṣṭafā Ṣāfī, *Zübdetü't-Tevârîh*, 96, as cited in Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devletinin Saray Teşkilâtı*, 421 n. 4.
144. Muṣṭafā Ṣāfī, *Zübdetü't-Tevârîh*, 2:140a–140b.
145. ʿAbdülḳādir Efendi, *Topçular Katibi Tarihi*, 547, 555.
146. Ibid., 577, 579, 582.
147. Muṣṭafā Ṣāfī, *Zübdetü't-Tevârîh*, 2:170a; ʿAbdülḳādir Efendi, *Topçular Katibi Tarihi*, 588. By 1626, Ayşe Sultan had been married five more times during the reigns of Osman II and Murad IV: see ʿAbdülḳādir Efendi, *Topçular Katibi Tarihi*, 462, 481, 514.
148. Concerning Hafız Ahmed Pasha's service as governor-general see ʿAbdülḳādir Efendi, *Topçular Katibi Tarihi*, 633 (on Aleppo); 674, 680, 683 (on Erzurum); 702 (on Damascus); 768, 770, 773 (on Diyarbakır); and 787, 788, 801 (on Baghdad). Regarding the expeditions against rebels see ʿAbdülḳādir Efendi, *Topçular Katibi Tarihi*, 656 (for the year 1617); 757 (for the year 1622); and 786 (for the year 1624).
149. A princess previously promised to Karakaş Mehmed Pasha was married to Hāfız Ahmed Pasha: see ʿAbdülḳādir Efendi, *Topçular Katibi Tarihi*, 757. ʿAbdülkadir Efendi dates the Diyarbakır appointment to the meeting of the Imperial Council on December 9, 1621, to be followed by the marriage; however, a *Rü'ūs* Register (*Başbakanlık Arşivi, Kāmil Kepeci Rü'ūs Defterleri* no. 257) records (88) the date of appointment as May 30, 1622.
150. Schmitz, *Islamic Manuscripts*, 254–55.
151. He was twice appointed grand vizier, first in December 1624, and then in October 1631, according to ʿAbdülḳādir Efendi, *Topçular Katibi Tarihi*, 805–6.
152. Schmitz, *Islamic Manuscripts*, 254–55.
153. M. U. Derman, "Derviş Abdi-i Mevlevî." in *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, s.v.
154. İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devleti Teşkilâtına Medhal* (Ankara, 1988 [orig. pub. 1941]), 344, 347; idem, *Osmanlı Devleti Teşkilâtından Kapukulu Ocakları*, 1:169, 200, 367, 2:142; idem, *Osmanlı Devletinin Saray Teşkilâtı*, 205, 311, 328, 337–38, 421–24; H. İnalcık, "Doghandji," in *EI2*, s.v.; A. Özcan, "Doğancı," in *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, s.v.
155. Schmitz, *Islamic Manuscripts*, 254–55.
156. P. Contamine, *War in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1984), 215.
157. Almond, *Medieval Hunting*, 16.
158. M. M. Ahsan, "A Note on Hunting in the Early ʿAbbasid Period: Some Evidence on Expenditure and Prices," *Journal*

of the Economic and Social History of the Orient 19, 1 (1976): 101–5.

159. Allsen, *Royal Hunt in Eurasian History*, 41.
160. Caferoğlu notes a special literary genre called *şikārnāme* that developed during the reign of Sultan Melikşah: see A. Caferoğlu, "Türklerde Av Kültü ve Müessesesi," *VII. Türk Tarih Kongresi (Ankara, 25–29 Eylül 1970): Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler* (Ankara, 1972), 1:169–75, esp. 172.
161. Allsen, *Royal Hunt in Eurasian History*, 95.
162. Only a few treatises on hunting exist in Istanbul libraries: Khalīlullāh b. ʿAbd al-Ghaffār Fāżil al-Kirmānī, *Ṣaydnāma* (in Persian), Süleymaniye Library, Ms. İzmirli İsmail Hakkı 4175; Anonymous, *Ṣayda dā'ir risāle* (in Turkish), Süleymaniye Library, Ms. Serez 1080.
163. S. Bağcı, "Old Images for New Texts and Contexts: Wandering Images in Islamic Book Painting," *Muqarnas* 21 (2004): 21–32.