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This thesis is an historical and literary analysis of the principal work of the late 16th century Ottoman historiographer Mehemmed ibn Mehemmed el-Fenârî, known as Ta‘lîkî-zade. The author held the post of șehnâmeci, or official court historiographer, for a short period during the reigns of Murâd III and Mehemmed III.

After an introductory survey of the development of Ottoman historiography up to the early 16th century, the first section of the thesis presents an account of the office of the șehnâmeci through the careers and works of its five occupants (of whom Ta‘lîkî-zade was the fourth) during the period of its existence c. 1565–1605, an attempt being made to discover the reasons leading to the establishment of the post and those contributing to its demise within a mere fifty years. There follows a biography of Ta‘lîkî-zade, drawn principally from information contained in his six works, all of which exist only in manuscript, four of them being campaign monographs, recording from first-hand observation the events of the eastern campaigns of 1534 and 1535, and the opening years of the Ottoman-Habsburg war in Hungary in 1593-4 and 1596. The two remaining works belong to the panegyric genre known as șemâ'îl-nâme.

In this study, the Șehnâmê-i Hûmâyûn is analysed in respect of both its literary and its historical value. In the latter case it represents an eye-witness account by an intelligent observer, reporting events from the standpoint of the Commander-in-Chief's retinue in the nucleus of the Ottoman army. As a literary work, it is an example of the elaborate Ottoman prose
of the period. The unique manuscript of 123 folios is given in edited transcription with grammatical notes and an appraisal of its literary style. Even among the highly regarded prose-writers of this period, Ta'liği-zade stands out as an accomplished and original writer, and his works deserve to be better known in the literary history of the Ottomans.
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A BRIEF SURVEY OF OTTOMAN HISTORIOGRAPHY
PRIOR TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF
THE ŞEHNÂMEÇİLİK

The earliest historiographic account of the nascent Ottoman state survives from the beginning of the fifteenth century. It was composed by the poet Ahmedî, not as an independent history of 'Osmân and his descendants, but as an extra chapter appended to his meşnevî, the İskender-nâme. Ahmedî had several times revised his work for different patrons, and it was most probably whilst under the protection of Süleyman, son of Bâyeyzîd I, that he wrote the section dealing with the Ottomans. It is this account which is generally regarded as the starting-point in a study of the development of Ottoman historiography.¹

During the later years of the reign of Murâd II, as the dynasty recovered its former possessions in Anatolia and consolidated its rule in the Balkans, and, more particularly, after Mehmed II's conquest of Constantinople in 1453 provided an imperial capital, the Ottoman court developed an increasingly rich artistic and literary life, in which historiography played a significant role. Later sultans, in particular Bâyeyzîd II and Kanûnî Süleyman, took an active interest in the promotion of historical writing, personally commissioning several works. The post of şehnâmeçi as established

¹ V.L. Ménage, "The Beginnings of Ottoman Historiography", in Historians of the Middle East, ed. Bernard Lewis and P.M. Holt (London 1962), 169-70, is of the opinion that Ahmedî's chapter on the Ottomans was largely based on an earlier prose chronicle which probably came down to the middle of the reign of Bâyeyzîd I.
by Süleyman in the later part of his reign was the first of its kind in that it provided for a permanent, salaried court historiographer. Although the post appears to have lapsed in the reign of Ahmed I, after an existence of little more than fifty years, it may be seen, in principle, as the forerunner of the vak‘a-nūvīslik. In 1699 Na‘īmā, the first vak‘a-nūvīs, began a systematic compilation of Ottoman history from the year 1591, i.e. 1000 A.H., an official historical account which was carried on by his successors in that post practically without interruption until the collapse of the Empire.

With the histories written during the reign of Mehmed II and, more especially, during that of his son Bāyezīd II, which combined the diverse historical traditions then existing into a more unified and comprehensive account, and, at the same time, established high literary standards for the composition of such historical works, it may be said that Ottoman historiography reached its maturity.

The most fundamental type of historical record, the simple calendar of events, or takvim, was one source utilized either directly or through an intermediary by late fifteenth-century historians. These were compiled annually by the

---

1. See below, p. 59.

2. This is fully discussed by V.I. Ménage, A Survey of the Early Ottoman Histories, with Studies on their Textual Problems and their Sources (unpublished PhD thesis, London 1961), and summarized in his article "The Beginnings of Ottoman Historiography", op. cit., 168-79.
court astronomer, who copied the takvim of the previous year (adding one year to each date, as the system of chronology was retrospective) and added to it the events of the new year; these included not only records of battles and agreements, of accessions and deaths of sultans etc., but also information on natural disasters, such as fires, floods, earthquakes and plague, and astrological observations. Five such takvims remain from the mid-fifteenth century, although it may be assumed from the information recorded within that this type of calendar was first compiled some years previously,\(^1\) although by the time of Bâyêzîd II they had been superceded as primary sources by more sophisticated historiography, later examples have been discovered which indicate that such chronological compilations were made even in the sixteenth century.\(^2\)

Side by side with the royal calendars there existed a strong tradition of popular histories, anonymous chronicles known generally as the Tevârîh-i Âl-i 'Osmân.\(^3\) A number of these survive which, although varying considerably in content, all begin at about the same period and are held to derive from one source.\(^4\) These Tevârîh incorporate into

---

1. For the text of a 15th century Ottoman takvim and its relationship with earlier Islamic calendars, see Osman Turan, İstanbul'un fethinden önce yazılmış tarihi takvimler (Ankara 1954).


3. Apart from the works already cited, see also H. İnalcık, "The Rise of Ottoman Historiography", in Historians of the Middle East, op. cit., 152-67.

the historical framework various tales taken from the
corpus of popular stories known as menākib-nāmes. These
tales, some pure legend, others with a certain basis in
fact, usually deal only with one hero, recounting his
marvellous exploits and praising his exemplary character.
A second type of account included in the Tevārīḥ is the
Gazā-nāme, the description of a single campaign, usually
depicting the valiant sultan victorious over his infidel
enemy; the most well-known example of this type of narration
is the Gazavāt-i Sultan Murād, which tells of Murād II's
Varna campaign of 1444. Echoes of the popular accounts of
the menākib-nāme and Gazā-nāme type can be found in the
literary historiographic tradition, Gazā-nāmes in particular still
being composed at the end of the eighteenth century.¹

The most notable of the popular histories is that of
'Asikpaşazâde, a collection of tevārīḥ and menākib written
mainly during the reign of Bāyezid II, probably from notes
compiled over a number of years, and thus unlikely to be
influenced to any important degree by the Sultan's promotion
of historical writing, and displaying none of the literary
embellishments present in other contemporary works. His
history was one of the first to break away from the tradition
of universal histories culminating with a section devoted

¹. Cf. A.S. Levend, Gazavāt-nāmeler (Ankara 1956). Four
of Ta'liki-zade's works, the Gürçistan Seferi, the
Tebrizîye, the Şehname-i Hûmâyûn and the Esri Fethi
Ta'rihi, in as much as the principal topic of each one
is a single campaign, may be held to belong to the
Gazā-nāme tradition.
to the Ottomans; it was based exclusively on the history of the house of 'Oğmân and was widely used as a source by later historians. Its great value lies in the fact that ' Ağıkpaşazâde lived a very long, active life, participating in campaigns and personally witnessing the development of the state, so that he was able to provide a detailed personal account for most of the fifteenth century, a crucial period in the history of the Ottoman empire.

'Ağıkpaşazâde's history was the main source used by Neşri in his final volume of the Cihân-nûmâ dealing with the Ottomans. Among other sources used for this work were a takvim, and an anonymous chronicle composed early in the reign of Bâyezîd II.¹ Ménage's thesis is that the diverse historical accounts, calendars, chronicles and popular histories, came together in this way during the period of development under the aegis of Bâyezîd II. This corpus of historical material remained the basis for all subsequent histories, although these varied greatly in tone, language and style, depending on the interests and level of education of the authors and their audiences. Such literary styles ranged from "the naive and credulous piety of the redactors of the Anonymous Chronicles to the immense learning of the future Sheikh Ül-Islâm Kemâlpaşazâde; the models of some writers were the popular vitae of heroes of the faith, of others scholarly Universal Histories, of others the rhyming

panegyrics of sultans, *shāhnāmes*, which sought to emulate Firdawsī, and of others again the vast Persian histories of a single dynasty or ruler".¹

In the sphere of literary history, works relating solely to the Ottoman dynasty, as distinct from universal histories terminating with the Ottomans, also flourished in the reign of Bāyezīd II, who actively encouraged their composition. He was fortunate in being surrounded by a large number of artists, poets and learned men, most of whom had been attracted to Istanbul during the previous twenty-five years. Meḥmed II sought to be protector and promotor of knowledge and literature as befitted a great sovereign, and in this way to create a learned and artistic court in his capital commensurate with the new-found grandeur of the sultanate. During his reign — and also for at least a century following — a more or less constant stream of men made its way to Istanbul from the Timurid, and later the Shi‘ite Safavid, and from the Türkmen lands to the east, in particular at times of severe political unrest in those areas. A few, such as the astronomer 'Alī ῾Usçu, came at the personal invitation of the Sultan, but the majority were those of inferior talents attracted by the prospect of patronage and reward.

Laṭīfī mentions the Sultan's great interest in poetry, and above all his admiration of Cāmī, who nevertheless refused Meḥmed's invitation to settle in Istanbul; he also

says that the Sultan provided an income for thirty poets at court:

"... Ve naştı-u-inşa'ya daḫı ol mertebede rağbetleri ve ehline ol derecede hüremetleri varmış ki, diyar-ı Hindde Ḥāce-ı Cihāna ve vilâyet-ı 'Acemde Mevlânā Câmîye her sâl bi'n 'aded filürü irsâl olınmüş. Ve şu'arâdan daḫı otuz nefer şā'ir sahiyânesin ve 'ulûfesin yir imaş. Ve kimi tevarîhini naştı-u-inşa idüb, kimi kıṭ'a-vu-kaşâ'idle medâ'îh dirler imaş".¹

However, despite this, only a relatively small proportion of those aspirants arriving at Istanbul were able to secure patronage; the remainder were forced to take up other occupations or to engage in trade in order to earn a living.²

The influx of a large number of Persian speakers had a profound effect upon the development of Ottoman literature. Persian was already a fully-developed literary language, and quickly became dominant at the Ottoman court. Whilst competency in Persian became one of the chief requirements of an educated man, Turkish was relegated to second place, thus creating an insuperable barrier between the culture of the Turkish populace and that of educated members of society.

The classical works of Persian literature were taken as models both by immigrant Persian and by Turkish writers: the

1. Latîfî, 62-3. 'Aşık Čelebi (21a) also remarks on the provision of monthly salaries of 1,000 akçe for those without other means of earning a living, saying that it is innovation, "ihtirâ".

Hamse of Nizami was greatly admired, so too the Sehnâme of Firdevsi; the histories of Juvayni and Vaşaf were considered the quintessence of historical literature. The pre-eminence of the Persian language in poetry and belles-lettres was maintained for at least a century, imposing the 'arûz metres and conventional motifs upon poets of the time, and the inşâ style of composition upon prose writers. The language was considered especially suitable for the panegyric in praise of the Sultan; two early examples of Sehnâme writing by immigrant poets, Kâşi from Baku and Mu'âli from Tus, were written in Persian. The first works composed by the sixteenth-century Sehnâmecis were written, as a matter of course, in Persian; towards the end of the century, however, Lokmân composed works in both Persian and Turkish, while his successor Ta'liki-zâde wrote only in Turkish, as commanded by Mehmed III:

"Sehnâme-i Hümayûn Farsîce söylenmeyüb, söylenenî tâkça-ı ferâmûs-ğâne-i nisyâna çonlub, zebân-ı Rûm-ı dil-pesend-ı merûm üzre söylenstûn".¹

Just as Mehmed III required history to be written in the language of general currency in his empire, so too did Bâyezîd II, one hundred years earlier, seek to utilize Turkish as one aspect of his encouragement of historiography and to place that language on a literary level equal to that of Persian. Whereas the popular histories had been written chiefly to entertain when read aloud, the motive behind Bâyezîd's commissions

¹. Sehnâme-i Hümayûn, 12b.
was undoubtedly propaganda, on behalf both of the Ottoman state and of himself as sultan. Historians were encouraged to emphasize the origins of the Ottomans as heirs of the Selçuks of Rûm, so legitimizing their claim to rule over large areas of Anatolia, and again to bring out the ğâzi aspect of their advances in the Balkans. At the same time, Bâyezîd felt the need to defend himself and strengthen his position as sultan; his struggle against Cem had brought into the open deep divisions in society and had weakened loyalty to the person of the sultan. Furthermore, the spread of Safavid propaganda in Anatolia in the latter part of Bâyezîd's reign was regarded as a serious threat to Ottoman stability, since a considerable proportion of the peasant population was suspected of sympathizing with the Şah and his Türkmen followers. For such reasons, Bâyezîd II was anxious for histories to be produced in Turkish, in order to reach a wider audience.

Nevertheless, the two major works written at Bâyezîd's command were both intended as models of stylistic perfection, elegant compositions designed to reflect the dignity of the state and thereby impress foreign rulers, in particular those of Iran and Mamluk Egypt. The Neşt Bihişt of İdrîs-i Bîdîsî, written in Persian, and the Tevârîh-i Al-i 'Ogmân, in Turkish, of Kemâlpaşazâde were both products of the last years of Bâyezîd's reign. İdrîs, who belonged to a family of 'ulemâ in Bitlis and fled to Istanbul on the collapse of the Ak Köyunlu state, was highly regarded as a mûnsî, and it was as

a stylist, rather than as a historian, that Bāyezīd com-
missioned him. The history he produced, written in the
style of Juwaynī and Vaṣṣāf, is one of the most elaborate
examples of Persian ingā to be found in Ottoman literature.
As a complement to this work, the theologian and poet
Kemālpaṣazāde wrote his Tevārīḥ in ornate Turkish prose,
in rhymed sec', adorned with āyets and passages of Persian
and Turkish verse, demonstrating that this language could
rival Persian in literary elegance. It is interesting to
note that, presumably because of the superior prestige of
the Persian language at that period, it was the Heqst Bihist
which was the more highly-regarded work and proved the more
popular as a source for later historians; the Tevārīḥ-i Al-i
'Ōgmān was largely ignored, systematic use of it being made
only in the nineteenth century by the historian Īayrullāh
Efendi.¹

* * *

Sultan Süleymān was a great patron of poetry, art and
literature, as well as being a most successful and magnificent
sovereign whose personality and achievements provided excellent

¹. Ibn Kemāl, Tevārīḥ-i Al-i 'Ōgmān : VI Defter, ed. Ş. Turan
(Ankara 1957), XCI-XCIV. V.L. Ménage, PhD thesis,
on. cit., 267-73, nevertheless considers Kemālpaṣazāde's
work to be outstanding in comparison to that of his con-
temporaries and successors because of his scholarly,
almost "scientific" approach — placing events in their
logical sequence, dealing with each according to its
importance, and including few irrelevant digressions.
material for literary works. At the beginning of his reign, however, certain historians, prompted by the new ruler, turned their attention to the previous sultan, Selim I, who, although victor over Şah Ismâ'îl and conqueror of Syria, Egypt and the holy cities of Mecca and Medina, had left behind him a reputation for cruelty and ruthlessness which was considered damaging to the sultanate. The historical works known generally as Selim-nâmes were each an attempt to present a more favourable picture of Selim I by careful treatment of certain aspects of his life and reign, and to exonerate him from the severities which had earned him the nickname "Yavuz". These histories were so successful in influencing their readers that by the time Üvoca Sa'deddin Efendi compiled his section on Selim I in the Tâcu 't-Tevârîh, the Sultan had become widely accepted as an heroic figure.

The Selim-nâmes may be considered to form part of the şehnâme genre in Ottoman historiography. Works of this type may be found early in the reign of Mehmed II; the primary purpose was "to glorify in a high literary form the exploits of the reigning Sultan, but occasionally şahnâme writers composed also general histories of the Ottoman house. For

1. Ahmed Uğur, The Reign of Sultan Selim in the light of the Selim-name literature (unpublished PhD thesis, Edinburgh, 1973), discusses eight works of this type written early in the reign of Suleyman, including those by Idris-i Bidlîsi, Ishâk Çelebi, and in particular that of Kemâlpaşaçâde. The later accounts of Üvoca Sa'deddin Efendi and 'Alî are also surveyed.

2. Ahmed Uğur, op. cit., 18-19. During this period yavuz lost its original meaning of "bad, evil", and came to signify instead "stern, severe".
their own time they produced generally original works based on first-hand information".¹ Two early şehnâmes were Hâzifî's Gazâ-nâme-i Rûm, praising the career of Mehmed II before he ascended the throne for the second time in 1451, and Mu'âli's Hünkârnamê, a similar history wider in scope, including a section on the campaign against Uzun Hasan in 1473.² Both authors composed their works shortly after arriving in Istanbul from Persian-speaking lands; although these works contain a considerable amount of historical information, they were obviously designed primarily as panegyrics in praise of Mehmed II, whose favour and patronage were thereby sought.

The model for such works was the Şâhnâmê of Firdevsi, which was greatly admired throughout the Ottoman Empire at all levels of society; during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries many copies of it were commissioned, often provided with beautiful miniatures by leading artists. It was by emulation of Firdevsi's classic, employing the megnevî form and the mutekârib metre, introducing metaphors derived from the Şâhnâmê, that Ottoman writers hoped to utilize the general popularity of the original Persian work, thus to flatter the Sultan by associating him with valiant heroes the like of Feridûn and Rûstem.

The collection of Selîm-nâmes, in seeking to exculpate Selîm I and, further, to elevate and glorify him, may be considered to belong to the şehnâme tradition. The very

1. H. İnalcık, op. cit., 163.

2. Cf. R. Anhegger, "Mu'âli'nîn Hünkarnâmêsî", TD c. 1, s. 1 (1949), 145-66, where this work is described as "bir kahrımanlık destanı" (p. 149).
success with which they achieved their aim may have been one of the principal factors which induced Süleyman to create the official post of gehnâmeçî some years later. As mentioned above, Bâyyezîd II sought to use historiography to enhance the prestige of the sultanate and his own position as sultan. Although in retrospect his grandson Süleyman appears to be the epitome of the all-powerful Ottoman pâdishâh, yet he, too, may have turned to gehnâme literature as a form of personal reassurance with regard to his leadership and direction of the empire.

In the latter part of his reign, Süleyman was unable to achieve impressive victories worthy of comparison with the conquest of Hungary or that of Irak in the 1520s and 1530s. However, the fact that he continued to lead campaigns until his death at Sîgetvâr in 1566 suggests that he was fully aware of the necessity to retain personal command of the army and through it to control and direct the energies of the state. In the last fifteen or twenty years of his reign, the ageing Sultan was faced with tension and intrigue in palace circles centred around members of his own family. This ultimately resulted in the deaths of the gehzâdes Muştafa and Bâyyezîd, two of his most capable sons, who were becoming focal points for ambitious elements in the state and were obviously potential rivals with their father for the sultanate. With the example of Bâyyezîd II's enforced abdication before him, Süleyman no doubt felt the insecurity of his own position. The development of the gehnâmemcilik in the 1550s may thus be seen in the light of his desire to boost not only his own prestige as
sultan, but also his own morale.

* * * * *

Whilst this study is principally concerned with a literary and historical analysis of the history written by the şeynämeçi Ta‘lîkî-zâde, it must be recognized that such works stand aside from the main stream of Ottoman historiography. Nevertheless, despite the apparent tendentiousness of şeynäme literature and its relative unreliability as a source of historical information, it would be wrong to disregard these works for such reasons. They provide us with examples of a particular historical viewpoint pertinent to the period in which they were produced, indicating a certain conception of history then prevailing. While it is undeniably true that works such as the histories of Selânikî and Peçevî retain more value as a documentation of events, one can perhaps glimpse more of the general spirit of the age from the unconcealed self-congratulation of the şeynämes.

The works which have come down to the present as the major historical references are not, however, those compiled by these early court historiographers, which remain comparatively few; rather, they are the productions of individuals of diverse outlook and training who wrote for a variety of reasons, principal amongst these being personal satisfaction and career advancement. Some of these histories, generally those written in the hope of attracting patronage and reward, also aspire to the inşâ style of the bombastic court historiography. The majority, however, are less ornate, more purely factual and informative, and directed towards a wider audience.
Although many historical writers composed their works under a poetic mahlas, they were primarily neither historians nor poets, and did not rely on their writing to earn a living. Many were employed in one of the government departments, often as a kâtib in the imperial dîvân, or as a defterdâr in the central or provincial bureaucracies; alternatively, they may have held various posts in the imperial household or in the retinues of paşas or vezîrs. Both 'Ali and Peçevî held posts in the Ottoman chancery and themselves served as provincial defterdârs; in addition, they participated personally in several of the campaigns of which they wrote. Similarly, Hasan Begzâde spent several years serving as tezkireci to successive serdârs during the Hungarian war of 1593-1606, and afterwards took up a post as defterdâr. The works of these authors are valued for their detailed and personal accounts of contemporary history.

Another sixteenth-century historian, Selânikî, presented a different view of events; he held a number of minor posts varying from pay-master to the troops on the Persian front, to acting as host and chaperone to the visiting Jân of Gilan in 1591. Since he spent most of his life in Istanbul and was able to observe the life of the city at close quarters, his history takes the form of a diary, recording daily affairs in the capital and noting events on the frontiers as news of them was received.¹

Prominent members of the 'ulemā, such as the şeyhū ʾl-İslâm ʿUcca Saʿdeddin Efendi, found the occasion to present their own historical viewpoint; the taʿrīh of Münneceṃ-başı, composed in the last quarter of the seven¬teenth century originally in Arabic, was regarded as an important source by later writers as well as by contemporaries, and was translated into Turkish within thirty years of com¬pletion. Similarly, histories were written by high govern¬ment officials — the nisâncı Celâl-zâde in particular being noted for his historical works.

The authors mentioned above are known for their general histories of the Ottoman dynasty, i.e. works beginning with an introduction, often quite brief, on pre-Ottoman Muslim dynasties, but devoted primarily to the history of the house of 'Osmān, depending for the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries on works such as those of 'Aşıkpaşazâde, Neşrî and İdrîs-i Bidlîsil, and then incorporating more personal information and eye-witness accounts as they approached their own day. Such works reviewing the overall development of the state are one feature of historical writing in the Ottoman Empire.

Another is the ʿazâ- nakme tradition. Monograph accounts of a single campaign (or a small group of related campaigns) were generally written by those who had participated personally in them, usually in an official capacity or in the retinue of the serdâr. These accounts generally present a detailed personal view of events in the manner of that given in the Gürçistân Seferi by Taʾlîkī-zâde, who took part in the campaign of 1584 as one of the kâtibs in the service of Ferhād Paşa.
A number of these ḥazā-nāmes, written under a poetic maḥlas, are in verse throughout, such as the Ḥecā‘at-nāme of Ḥafṣah, dealing with the final campaigns of Özdemir-oğlu 'Osmān Paşa, or the Zafer-nāme of Nedīm, describing the Austrian campaign of 1694.

These campaign monographs serve to illustrate in greater detail events which fall into the natural sequence of a general history. The latter, designed to convey information and to present it in an orderly manner, rather than to impress by literary elegance, are the basic accounts for the history of the Ottoman Empire during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.
Şehnâmece is the term most frequently used by Ottoman writers to designate the sixteenth-century court historian. Three variant forms are found, each compounded of the word şehnâme and a Persian suffix: şehnâme-ğûy, şehnâme-nûvis and şehnâme-ğvân. Whereas 'Ahdî employs neither the term şehnâmece nor any of its alternatives, the first of these variants is the only one used by 'Âşık Çelebi, who introduces his biography of 'Arif thus: "şehnâme-ğûylükle ma'rûf". Ǝînalî-zade and 'Âli use both the terms şehnâmece and şehnâme-ğûy, whilst Selânîkî, although twice using the term şehnâme-ğvân, generally prefers şehnâmece, thus indicating that it was becoming accepted as the usual designation. Ta’lıki-zade uses both şehnâmece and şehnâme-ğûy, but over all shows a preference for the former. The term şehnâme-nûvis is found in comparatively modern works, formed probably by analogy with the more well-known vak’a-nûvis.

Şehnâme-ğvân is the term preferred by Pakalâîn for his principal entry dealing with the şehnâmece,¹ following the lead of the nineteenth-century vak’a-nûvis Lütfî Efendi.

However, şehnâme-ğvân was also the name used for the specific group of people who earned a living giving public recitations from the Şähnâmé of Firdavsî. A long tradition of public raconteurs can be traced in the Muslim world from the days

---

¹. M.Z. Pakalâîn, Tarih Deyimleri ve Terimleri Sözlüğü III (İstanbul 1954), 318-19.
of the cahlîye, providing amusement and entertainment both at court and in the market-place, for educated elite and illiterate poor alike. In pre-Ottoman Turkey, epic tales of the folk heroes of the Oguz tribes of Central Asia became intermingled with Arabic and Islamic stories; one group of raconteurs, known as meddâh, were differentiated by their specialization in stories of the Prophet, ‘Alî and other early Muslim heroes. By the beginning of the fifteenth century, more tales were being translated and incorporated from the Persian, in particular the Şehnâme of Firdevsî. Its popularity led to the designation of a specialist group of story-tellers, the şehnâme-hVâns, who had memorized word for word large portions of the text. At the entertainment level, şehnâme-hVâns, some of whom, such as Mehdi (d. 1630), were recognised poets in their own right, were found at the Ottoman court even at the end of the seventeenth century. Thus the general usage of the term şehnâme-hVân is to describe the public raconteur of Firdevsî's epic, not the early court historiographer.

As the fifteenth century progressed, Ottoman court literature, heavily influenced by Persian classical works, began to diverge widely from the popular tradition. Persian verse in the 'arûz metres, lavish panegyric and ornate inşa composition contributed to the formation of a literature for the educated elite, inaccessible to the illiterate masses.

1. For further discussion of the meddâh and the şehnâme-hVân in the Ottoman Empire, see F. Köprülü, Edebiyat Araştırmaları (Ankara 1966), Chapter XI, Meddah, 361-412.
However, one link between popular and court literature is seen in Firdevsi's Şahnâme, which, as already pointed out, was recited for the entertainment of all levels of society. As a literary medium, however, works with the name and style of this Şahnâme were considered the most suitable vehicles for panegyric of the Sultan. In this may be seen a positive attempt to associate the Sultan with the Iranian heroes and with the general prestige of the epic.

The existence of a şehnâme genre of historical writing from the time of Mehmed II has been pointed out in the previous section. The Ǧazānâme-i Rûm of Kâṣîfî and the Hünkârnâme of Mu‘âlâ may both be regarded in this light, as may the Fethnâme of Kâvâmî and the Şehnâme of Mâhremî, both of which were presented to Bâyezîd II. The Turkish poet Şehdî is described by Necîb ‘Aṣîm as the chief forerunner of the şehnâmeçis.¹ He was a native of Anatolia, an accomplished poet and a person of some consequence, "zümre-i ümenâdan".² According to ‘Aşık Çelebi, he was able to overcome the fact that he was Turkish in a court dominated by Persians and their

¹. Necîb ‘Aṣîm, ‘Osmânlî Ta’rîh-nûvisleri ve Müverrihleri : Şehnâmeçiler, in TOEB, vol. I, nos. 1-12 (İstanbul 1911), 425-35. Ahmed Refik, ‘Alimler ve Sanatkârlar (İstanbul 1924), 82, believes the post of şehnâmeçî to have been established by Mehmed II. It is, however, almost certain that the institution of the şehnâmeçilik occurred only with the appointment of ‘Arîf.

². ‘Aşık Çelebi, 253a-b. Similar notices are given by Şehî and Kânalî-Zâde. F. Babinger, Mehmed le Conquérant et son Temps (Paris 1964), 566, gives a slightly different account: he represents Şehdî as a rich contemporary of Mehmed II from Kastamonu, unknown until he arrived at court to present to the Sultan rich gifts he had brought from Iran; his perfect knowledge of Arabic and Persian gained him entry to literary circles, where "il entreprît donc de louer dans le style de Ferdousî les hauts faits du Sultan son protecteur".
language: "Egerçe Rûmîdûr, emmâ luğat-ı Pârsiyeyi ašlı ile bilmegin maktûb-ı erbâb-ı kemâl itmişdûr [sic!]". At the behest of the Sultan he undertook the writing of a history of the Ottoman dynasty in thegehname metre, but died having completed only 4000 beyts.¹ This work is not known to be extant, examples of his poetry being represented by a handful of beyts, principally Persian, found in thetezkîres.

The number of officialgehnâmecis is considered to be five: ‘Arif, Eflâtûn, Lokmân, Ta‘lîkî-zâde and Ḥasan Hûkî.² They held the post in succession for a period of about fifty years, from the mid-1550s to early in the reign of Aḥmed I, when thegehnâmecilik appears to have lapsed. The biographies of thegehnâmecis which follow serve to indicate the development and character of their office.³

‘Arif

Fetâullâh Çelebi, known generally by hismahlas ‘Arif (or ‘Arîfî) is the most well-documented of thegehnâmecis. The principal source for his biography is‘Âgîk Çelebi, who was both a contemporary and a friend; ‘Ahdî’s notice is, by comparison, brief, whilst that ofKhânilî-zâde may be regarded

1. ‘Âgîk Çelebi, 253a. Şehî, Hest Bihîst (Istanbul 1325), 67, gives the figure as 10,000 beyts.
3. Ta‘lîkî-zâde’s biography is treated more fully in a separate section.
as supplementary. 1

‘Arif’s father Derviş Celebi was an expert calligrapher and proficient in the composition of ingā prose; Persian by birth, he served in the household of Şah Tahmāsb’s brother Elkas Mīrzā, governor of Şīrāz, as nīsāncī. 2 At some point in his life, presumably while he was still a young man completing his education, Derviş Celebi had travelled to Egypt, 3 and met the celebrated şeyh of the Ḥalvetī order,

1. Ḍaşık Celebi, 165a-66b, ‘Arif; ‘Abī, 121b-22b, ‘Arifī; Kınali-zade, 170b-71a, ‘Arif. Ahmed Tevhid, 107, quoting from Lokmān’s Hünernāme, gives his predecessor’s full name thus: “Arif maḥlaš sehname-guy Fethullāh ibn Kātīb Derviş-i Şirāzī”, but provides no further information about him. A short notice in SN Zeyl, 31, el-Mollā Fethullāh, appears to be taken mainly from Ḍaşık Celebi. ‘Alī, Künhū ’l-Abbār, 604a, allocates only five lines to ‘Arif, but agrees that he was a fine poet, composing better Persian verse than any of his contemporaries. OM III, 116, Fethullāh ‘Arif Efendi, provides a very brief biography and lists seven works attributed to ‘Arif, including the Şehname and the Sefernāme; those works which are purely poetical and without historical interest are not discussed in this study.

2. Ḍaşık Celebi, 165a. Cf. von Hammer, Geschichte der Osmanischen Dichtkunst II (Pest 1836), 464, who interprets Ḍaşık Celebi’s (possibly ambiguous) entry differently, taking ‘Arif himself to have been Elkas Mīrzā’s nīsāncī, instead of Derviş Celebi. Also, Babinger, GW, 87, taking his information from a brief entry on ‘Arif in the Sicill-i Osmānī IV, 8, says that the poet acted for a short time “als sehnameği in Dienstein des Prinzen Elkas Mīrzā”. The sixteenth-century sources used here do not specifically mention ‘Arif as having been in the service of Elkas Mīrzā (although it is quite probable that he was); they merely give the post held by his father Derviş Celebi.

3. Kınali-zade, 170b, reads as though Derviş Celebi accompanied Elkas Mīrzā on his flight to Istanbul in 954/1547, and then visited Egypt and married the şeyh’s daughter. If this were so, then ‘Arif could have been no more than 15 years of age when he died in 969/1561-2!
Şeyh İbrâhîm Gûlşenî, whose daughter he subsequently married. 'Arif, the child of this marriage, spent part of his childhood in Egypt, before returning to Iran with his father, and became his grandfather's favourite:

"Şeyh İbrâhîmûnâ nebîresi ve nefs oğlu olmâla, nefsî oglûndan aşabb vâris-i maâhabbet-i keşiresi idi".2

His relationship to the Şeyh is mentioned by all the biographers, to whom it was obviously a fact of some importance.

In none of these accounts are we told how or when 'Arif came to Istanbul; it seems probable that both he and his father were in the service of Elkâş Mîrzâ and that he arrived in the Ottoman Empire with the latter in 954/1547. He quickly became acquainted with the learned and literary men of the day and established himself as an equal amongst them:

"Rûmda nûşû-vu-nemâ bulmış. Akvâmda Fethullah Çelebi dîmekle mevşûf ve kemâl-i ma'rîfetle ma'rûf; el-âhkâk, ol 'árif-i devr-i zamân ve kâşif-i esrâr-i tehân, 'îlm-i hey'ât-u-hendesde bî-mîgl-û-hem-tâ, edâ-yî suhanda 'ärif-i müşkil-gûsâ ... "3

In the usual manner of a poet seeking to call attention to

1. Şeyh İbrâhîm (d. 940/1533-4) was himself an accomplished poet in both Persian and Turkish. He was also one of the many learned men admired by the Ottoman sultans and invited to their capital; he arrived in Istanbul in 935/1528-9. Cf. Sw Zeyl, 67-8.
2. 'Âşık Çelebi, 165a.
3. 'Ahâî, 121b.
his poetical talent, he composed nazîres to poems by other well-known poets (amongst whom 'Aşık Çelebi names Hâkânî, whilst 'Ahâd mentions a Hamse composed by 'Arif in the style of that of Nişâmî):

"Bir derecede ki şûrefâ-ya mütekaddimûn ve müte'aḥḥirûn muşannan-ı-u-mûheyyâ kaşâ’idine nazîreler diyûb, envâ-ı iltizâm-ı mâ-lâ-yelzem kîlmîsdur, ki 'aql-ı ħurdedân mutâla’asında ḥayrân kalur".¹

No specific date is given for 'Arif's appointment as şehnâmecî, nor is mention made of a ferman of appointment similar to that recorded by 'Ahâd in the case of 'Arif's successor Eflâtûn. Neither 'Aşık Çelebi nor 'Ahâd use the term şehnâmecî in the designation of a particular person in the way that Kinalî-zade, whose tezkâre was completed twenty years later in 994/1536, employs it; 'Aşık Çelebi prefers the Persian equivalent, şehnâme-gûy. The existence of a tradition of şehnâme writing from the reign of Mehmed II has already been established. It would appear from 'Aşık Çelebi's account that the post of şehnâmecî developed gradually as a result of 'Arif's work on the history commissioned by Süleymân:


¹. 'Ahâdî, 121b.
It would appear, therefore, that 'Arif's career was at first similar to that of many other poets at the Ottoman court. By presenting various examples of his poetry to Süleyman he succeeded in gaining the Sultan's favour; for this he was rewarded with a daily stipend of 25 askes. He was then commissioned to write a history of the Ottoman dynasty in the gehname metre. As his work progressed, the satisfaction of the Sultan increased; 'Arif's salary was steadily raised.

1. 'Aşık Çelebi, 165a-b. 'Ahdi, 121b, gives a very brief notice: "Padişah-1 cihanun sa'adetle taht-1 kayğara cülüs itdugi zamandan ve tevâriş-1 Al-1 'Osmân yüz bih beyt Şâhname dimidür".

2. 'Arif was probably only one of a number of poets commissioned to write a gehname at this time. The nakabendi seyyah and poet Gubârî received a similar injunction from Süleyman in 1551; cf. 1. Parmaksizoğlu, "Abdurrahman Gubârî'nin hayatı ve eserleri", TD c. 1, s. 1-2 (1949-50), 349, 354.
until it reached 70 akços per day,¹ and he was on several occasions rewarded with special gifts. When 20,000 or 30,000 beyts of the Şehnâme had been written, Süleyman ordered the appointment of a group of calligraphers and painters to copy and illustrate the work; they were housed in a separate building specially constructed for the project. Thus, it was in recognition of 'Arif's achievement that a special department was created for the preparation of his manuscript; that, over a period of time, this department had come to be regarded as a permanent establishment is indicated by the appointment of Ef láfún to succeed 'Arif shortly after the latter's death.

The Şehnâme is the first of two historical works known to have been written by 'Arif; it takes the form of a Persian megnevî, in the mütekhârib metre of Firdevsi's epic. A.S. Levend, misled by Kâtib Çelebi's entry in the Keşfû 'A-ţünün describing the work as dealing with the reign of Selîm I, classifies the incomplete copy found in Ankara University amongst the Selîm-nâmes.² A complete copy of the work, comprising around 60,000 beyts³ is located in Topkapı Sarayi, under the catalogue heading Sulaymân-nâma; this manuscript contains 69 miniatures, many of which have been studied by modern scholars as fine examples of the Ottoman

¹. This is the figure given by 'Asîk Çelebi; a daily stipend of 60 akços is mention in 31 Na Zeyî, 31.

². Çazavat-nâmeler, 31.

³. 'Asîk Çelebi, 165b, gives the finished work as 60,000 beyts, whilst 'Ahdî, 121b, mentions a figure of 100,000 beyts.
style of painting. ¹ Miniatures feature prominently in the extant works of the sixteenth-century şehnâmeçis, the works of Lokmân in particular being lavishly illustrated. According to the manuscript in Topkapı Sarayı, the Şehnâme was completed in the middle of Ramazân 965 (late 1558). The text begins with a short introduction on the reign of Selîm I (presumably the part seen by Kâtib Çelebi), but is principally concerned with the reign of Sûleymân to the year 1553.

According to ‘Âşık Çelebi, there were, despite the general approval given to this Şehnâme, a small number of jealous and discontented rivals who attempted to discredit ‘Arif in the eyes of the Sultan:


‘Âşık Çelebi himself defends ‘Arif from his critics:

"... bir şâ’ir hezâr zârî-vu-zîr ile bir gazel diyüb, içinden bir beyti yâ iki beyti nâ-hemvâr

¹. TSPYK, 61, no. 160. Although the author's name is not given, the work proves, by comparison with the Ankara copy to be the Şehnâme of ‘Arif. Ivan Stchoukine, La Peinture Turque d'aprêš les Manuscrits Illustrés, 1re partie, de Sulaymân 1er à ‘Osman II, 1520-1622 (Paris 1966), 59-60, 111-13, discusses the style of some of these miniatures and gives five of them in reproduction.

². ‘Âşık Çelebi, 165b.
olsa, ehl-i hakkı katında ma'zür olur ve 'hükm gâlibûndür' diyû cümlesi eylûkle manzûr olur. Ol hesab üzere, faraża altmış bini beytinden on bini ya yîgîrmi bini [beyt] medhûl ya ma‘lûl, ya ehl katında gayr-i mağbûl olsa, yine kırk bini eyû beyt bâkî kalur. Ìnsâf idicek kırk bini eyû beyte kim mûlikdûr? Bu kadar ebyata mâlik olmak ìnsâfdûr".1

'Âşık Çelebi mentions in particular the nakkâş başı Şâh Kûlî and "Nâmi nâm bir 'Acem levendi" who together intrigued against 'Arif, fabricating inferior verse in his name. 'Ahdî, in his notice on Eflatûn, describes that poet's attempts to discredit 'Arif.

The second historical work by 'Arif is mentioned only by 'Âşık Çelebi and is not known to be extant.2 It is said to be an account of the naval expedition to India in 945/1538 by the vâlî of Egypt, AVEDIM SÜLEYMÂN Paşa, which was intended to ensure trade and pilgrimage routes for Muslims in the face of Portuguese aggression. The work was written in Turkish, in response to the Paşa's enquiry as to whether 'Arif was capable of composition in that language:

"Merhum bir gün Süleymân Paşaya varur. Paşa 'Türkî şi’r dimege dahi kâdir misin?' dedûkde, Süleymân Paşanû Hinde varub feth itdürû[ni] iki bini beytle dâsitân idûb, bâhî-î remelde Türkî nazm itmûdûr".3

1. 'Âşık Çelebi, 165b.
2. Gazavât-nâmeler, 76, where it is entitled Sefernâme.
3. 'Âşık Çelebi, 165b-66a.
'Arif died in 969/1561-2. Apart from his ability as a poet, he was proficient in astronomy and geometry: "'ilm-i heyyāt-u-hendesde bī-miṣrī-ū-hem-tā". Necib 'Aṣīm records that he had studied the sciences of reasoning and tradition, "'ulūm-ī akkiyē-vu-naḳ̣lıye", and that he was known as a calligrapher, "ve 'Acem țarzīnda gāyet guzel ḏāṭṭ-ī dīvānī yazduğī terācīm-ī aḥvāl kitāblarında mezkūrdur".

'Āṣik Čelèbi tells of certain works of art produced by 'Arif which were particularly admired: one of these was a painting of an ideal human form, "the idol of imagination", which 'Arif then embellished by describing in verse each limb and member of the body; a second novelty produced by 'Arif was the model in marble of a rose:

"Ve fenn-i şīrden māˈadā, kendi icaḍ-u-ibdā' ve teˈliy-ū-iḥtīrāˈˈıdandan ˈŞanemū ˈl-ḥayāl' dīrler bir nesne tertīb itmişdīr ki, naḵṣ-ī nigārīna göre būt-ī Čīn bir şuret-ī bī-maˈnā ve ˈṣanem-ī deyr-ī Ferḥār bir seng-ī nā-tīrāṣādēdūr; yaˈnī bir maḥbūb şuretdūr ki, Māṇī gőrse şuret-ī bī-cān kalur, ve rūḥ-ī muṣawvver di̇dūkleri şuretine cānlar virūr. Aˈţāsāndān her ˈuẓvīnda Menlānumī kendinüfī ol ˈuvt vaṣfīnda birer rubāˈˈīsī yā bir iki beyti yazılmışdūr. ... Ve bir ˈameli ǧūl peyda itmişdūr; șak-u-bergī ve şikāf-u-"
tergi, reng-ü-rüya ve berg-ü-büyül ‘aynîdûr. Gül-î
gülzârdan rûçhâne hezâr bârdur ki, ol zağm-î pür-
{{hâr ile pür-hâr-hârdur, ve bu gül bi-şârdur. Nihâyet,
andan meşâm-î câna bûyî-î fenâ gelîr; bunda egerçî
bûdan şemme yok, hele âdeme bir kaç gün gülî yûz
göstîrîr bekâ gelîr”.

Eflatûn

‘Aîf’s successor as şehnâmeccî was another Persian
poet, Eflatûn ibn Şeyh Dervîş Mehmed-î Şîrvâni. ‘Ahdî is
the principal source for his biography; neither ‘Aşık Çelebi
nor ‘înâli-zâde mention him in a separate notice. Although
Eflatûn used the mahlaş Esîrî when writing Turkish verse,
and ‘îzânî when composing in Persian, he was generally
known to his contemporaries simply as Eflatûn. 2

Eflatûn served in the household of Elkas Mîrza in
Şîrvâni as secretary, kitâb-dîr, and was one of the leading
poets in that region. Thus, he would have been in the
prince’s retinue at the same time as Dervîş Çelebi and,
presumably, ‘Aîf, pursuing a similar type of career. Elkas
Mîrza fled to Istanbul in 954/1547 to ask Süleymân for aid

1. ‘Aşik Çelebi, 166a-b.

2. ‘Ahdî, 46b-47a, where Eflatûn’s name is given merely as
Eflatûn-î Şîrvâni; his full name as given here is that
found in the article "Hünername" by Ahmed Tevhid (TOEM
in his revolt against Şah ʿAlamī; he left, a few months later, having been promised assistance. His cause, however, was ill-fated; in 956/1549 he surrendered to his brother the Şah, and was subsequently imprisoned by him. Whilst it would seem that ʿArif remained behind in Istanbul after the prince’s departure, Eflaṭūn, according to ʿĀdī, arrived in the Ottoman capital at a later date, after the failure of Elkaş Mīrzā’s rebellion:

"Āhir-i feterāt-i Elkaşīde, ki birāderi olan Şah ʿAlamīdan çağub Rūma geldügi maʿlüm-i edənivu-akāsidūr, be-ṭarīk-ī seyr Eflaṭūn diğer gün şehr-i İstanbula gelüb, erkān-ī devlet ve ‘ayān-ī ḥażret ile ihtilāṭ idüb".¹

Eflaṭūn was one of those jealous rivals who criticized ʿArif’s Şehname. At the Ottoman court, where poets were numerous and therefore bound to be in competition with each other for the favours of influential people, professional jealousies were only to be expected. However, it would appear that Eflaṭūn made ʿArif the particular target of his intrigues, in which he was assisted by the nakkās başı Şah Ḥulī. The fact that both ʿArif and Eflaṭūn had had connections with Elkaş Mīrzā and were probably known to each other before coming to Istanbul, suggests an intense personal rivalry of long-standing, which would have been aggravated by ʿArif’s good fortune. ʿĀdī gives the following account

¹ ʿĀdī, 46b.
of Eflatun's behaviour:

"Padisahun futuhatin nazm iden 'Arif mahlaq ile istihar bulan Fethullah Celebinuf ba'zi terzikatina vakif olub; mezkur ile hayli sa'irane ve 'arife mubahhege ve mudeale idub; bir kaç beytin gebt kilub, 'arz-i hâl tarik[i]-yle Sultan Suleyman Padisaha sunda."¹

Eflatun's attempts to discredit 'Arif met with the Sultan's wrath, and it was only by the intervention of friends that his life was spared.² 'Ahdi, nevertheless, has sympathy for Eflatun, considering it unfortunate that he had, presumably through his conflict with 'Arif, gained the reputation of being a bad poet; despite his ability as an artist and calligrapher, his qualities were underestimated:

"... bi-'t-ťab' envâ-'ı ma'rifetle mûzeeyen-û-ârâste, ve şanâ'i-'ı nazm-ı pâki bilmekle pîrâste; ve hatt-i nesta'lik yazida hös-nûvîs-i zaman, ve tezhib-û-taşvîrde Mânî-yi cihân ve Bîhzâd-ı devran; hayfâ ki mezkur yârân arasinda bed şî'r dimekle meşhûrdur".³

However, notwithstanding the Sultan's earlier wrath and the poet's reputation for writing bad verse, Eflatun was appointed, on 'Arif's death in 969/1561-2, to the post of

¹ 'Ahdi, 46b.
² Necib 'Asim, 429.
³ 'Ahdi, 47a.
which he had long coveted. 'Ahdī remarks upon
the fermān commissioning Eflāṭūn with the composition of
a şehnāmecī:

"Behr-i ḥāl Eflāṭūna fermān-ī hūmāyūn oldī ki,
Sultān-ī Ferīdūn-ī zamānuñ hünerlerin nażm ide.
El-ān ol fermān kabūl idūb; kiṣṣa-perdāz ve yārān-ī
mābeynede gūyāllīla mümtāzdur".¹

Lokmān, in the introductory section to his Hūnernāmē,
gives a highly favourable account of his predecessor's
poetical abilities. He makes no mention of Eflāṭūn's repu-
tation as a bad poet, but, on the contrary, tells of long
years spent in the quest for knowledge, of Eflāṭūn's dream
of Nīzāmī, which inspired him to write poetry, and of the
excellence of his work:

"Ve Şeyy Nīzāmī hazretlerin vāki'ada gördüb, cevāhir-i
nażm-ī ābdāri rişte-i taḥrīre çekmesine ve ilhām-u-
vāridātī şikā-ī niyyetle dergāh-ī Feyyāz-ī 'ale
'1-īflākdan tāleb itmesine icāzet virüb ... li-hāzā
kīrk beş yıl mīkārī aḵdām-ī iḵdām ile sa'y-u-kūşīg
idūb; āyirū '1-emr, men tālebe şey'en vecede-[hū]²
üzre, gōnca-ī mūrād ve bezm-ī māskūd mütrettēb ve
āgyārdan hālī-ü-āzāde olub; mūteveccih oldūkça

1. 'Ahdī, 47a. Although this passage does not say so explicitly,
it probably implies that Eflāṭūn was actually appointed
şehnāmeci. This may be questioned, however, since another
work of similar nature was commissioned at about the same
time from Lokmān (see below, p. 35). Also, 'Alī does not
mention Eflāṭūn in his survey of the şehnāmecis. On the
other hand, since Lokmān refers in the Hūnernāmē to Eflāṭūn
as his predecessor, there is no doubt that he was at some
time appointed to the post and that this was probably quite
soon after the death of 'Arif.

Amongst Eflatun's works Lokman mentions a Ḥamse of 30,000 beyts, written in imitation of that of Cemî; a Persian and a Turkish dīvān, and a biography of the Prophet written in verse. No separate historical works by Eflatun are known; he was, however, engaged in writing a work on the life of Sultan Süleyman, of which he managed to complete only a small portion before he died. Lokman, his successor as şehnāmeci, incorporated some of this work in his own Hūnernāme. From information given by Lokman we know that Eflatun died in Muḥarram 977/June-July 1569.

Lokman

On Eflatun's death in 977/1569, the şehnāmecilik passed to the Seyyid Lokman ibn Seyyid Hüseyn el-'Āṣūrī 'l-ḥüseynī 'l-Urmevî. Information for his biography is scarce since, although his poetical abilities were acknowledged by contemporaries, Lokman was obviously not regarded primarily as a poet; he does not appear to have written under a mahlas and

1. Ahmed Tevhîd, 103-9. This article quotes at some length from Lokman's Hūnernāme the information he gives about Eflatun.

2. Lokman's full name as given here is that found in Necîb 'Āṣam, 430, where the information is principally derived from the şehnâmeci's own works, in particular the Hûnernâme and the Şâhnâme-i Selîm Hân. See also Ahmed Tevhîd, 103-11; Ahmed Refîk, 'Alîmler ve Sanatkârkar, op. cit., 81-94; ÖM III, 135-6; GOW, 164-7.
is not accorded a separate notice in any of the tezkires. It is worthy of note that he came originally from Urmiye, a town in Azerbaycan not far from Tebriz; thus he was the third successive şehnâmecci to hail from the eastern, Persian-speaking lands.

Lokmân was a member of the 'ulemâ and during the early stages of his career practised as a kâdi; in 970/1562, whilst serving as kâdi in the town of Harîr, near Mosul, he was commissioned to write a şehnâme:

"Ol ğinde bu bendeleri nâzîm-ı şehnâmeyeye me'mûr, ve Harîr kâdîsi olmâyla, anda ğâzî bulmuşmagûn sene-i mezbûre [970] Zi 'l-ka'desinûn evâsitînda bir mubârek sa'at ihtiyâr olûnub, müşrûû ileyh begler-begûnû [şehrizûr beglerbegisi Muzafer Paşa] râyî şehîfî-yle bu 'abdî naẖîf bismillâh diyû temel-i laṭîfin važ' idûb". 1

This commission was made shortly after the death of 'Akif, but during the period when Eflâtûn is assumed to have been acknowledged official şehnâmecci. Although Lokmân does not indicate whether the request came from the Sultan himself, or, as may have been probable, from his patron Şokullu Mehmed Paşa, the work was completed in a short time and presented to Süleymân under the title Şâhname-i Hümphûn. 2 Although the manuscript is not known to be extant, mention

2. V. Minorsky and J.V.S. Wilkinson, The Chester Beatty Library: A Catalogue of the Turkish Manuscripts and Miniatures (Dublin 1958), 22. The information on this şehnâme is contained in two folios added at a later date, after Lokmân's death, to the Dublin copy of the Zübedetî 't-Tevârîh.
of its existence provides evidence of Lokmān's literary achievements prior to his appointment as şehnāmeci.

'Ali, Lokmān's contemporary, devotes two folios in the Kūnhū 'l-ʿAḥbār to the post of şehnāmeci; of its occupants up to his own time he admires only 'Arif, and makes no mention whatsoever of Efīṭūn. 'Ali's contempt for Lokmān is undisguised. Initially the two men would have had similar careers which, in the competitive atmosphere of late sixteenth-century Ottoman palace circles, led to intense personal and professional rivalry. 'Ali served as private secretary to Lālā Muṣṭafā Paşa and accompanied him on many expeditions; however, the sudden death of the Paşa in 933/1580 temporarily dimmed 'Ali's hopes of a distinguished career. Lokmān, on the other hand, had succeeded in gaining the patronage of the influential vezīr Şokullu Meḥmed Paşa, to which association 'Ali attributes his appointment as şehnāmeci.¹ As the author of both a Turkish and a Persian dīvān, 'Ali could feel well qualified to criticize Lokmān:

"Sultan Süleyman oğlu Selim Han zamanında, anlar ki vefat eyledi [i.e. 'Arif], Meḥmed Paşa-yı Tavilūn kātib-i sırri idi, 'ulūv-i himmetini ıgbāt eyledi, ya'nī ki müddet-i 'ömринde penc beyt şi're kâdîr olmān, ve şafahāt-i rūşgārda bir kiṭ'asî şöhret bulmān, Lokmān nām sevād-hanı enâm, kužāt içinde ecnebîlik ile bed-nām olan bir şaḥṣi ağarr zi'āmetle şehnâme-guy-ı hākānī eyledi. Merhūm Sultan Selim Han

¹ Lokmān was also patronized by Ḥūna Sa'deddīn Efendi, at whose request he composed the Kayfetü 'l-insâniye fi şemâ'ili 'Ogmâniye, the earliest copy of which is dated 987/1579.
Lokmân's appointment was accompanied by enrolment in the corps of müteferrika and the provision of a zi‘āmet, of which the nominal value was 30,000 akçe. Thus he received his salary in the form of a fief, in contrast to ‘Arif, who was paid a daily stipend; Eflatun’s income was probably calculated also on a daily basis, and it is therefore most likely that the zi‘āmet and enrolment in the müteferrika corps were procured for Lokmân by Şokullu Mehmed Paşa. ‘All records that Ta‘líkî-zâde was also granted müteferrika status, thus indicating that this had become the normal method of providing for the upkeep of the şehnâmeçi.

Concurrently with the post of şehnâmeçi, Lokmân also held that of kâgid emîni, in which capacity he was charged with the supply of paper, pens and sundry writing materials to members of the imperial household. Although this appointment is not mentioned in the text of his manuscripts, reference to it occurs incidentally in a note on folio 2b of the first volume of the Hünernâme which lists payments made — "kâgid emîni Seyyid Lokmân vasiṭası-yle virilen para" — to the

artists, calligraphers and illuminators working on the manuscript. Ta‘likī-zade does not say whether he, too, held this post during his period as şehnâmeçi.

In the second volume of the Hûnernâme Lökman, after a few lines of information on his predecessors ‘Arif and Eflatûn, gives the date of his own appointment to the şehnâmecilik, which is presumed to follow fairly closely upon Eflatûn's death, as the end of Muḥarrūm 977/early July 1569. He occupied the post for a little over twenty five years, and composed ten major works. In addition to these, Lökman also translated into Turkish portions of Persian classical works, such as the poem Mihr-ū-Müsterî by the fourteenth-century Tebriz poet Muḥammad ‘Aṣṣār, and composed a number of gazels, kasîdes and other short poems.

Of Lökman's principal works, four are written in Persian verse, five in Turkish prose and one in Turkish verse. The Persian works were, with the exception of the Şâhînşâhname-i Sultan Murâd, composed during the earlier years of Lökman's tenure of the şehnâmecilik, i.e. before 1583. From this

1. N. Anafarta, Hûnernâme : Miniyatürleri ve Sanatçılari (İstanbul 1969), ix-x.
2. Ahmed Tevhîd, 107. Necîb ‘Aşım remarks in a footnote (p.430) that in the Şâhînşâhname-i Selîm Han Lökman gives the date of his appointment as Sevâl 976/April 1569, i.e. three months earlier. This may be either a date at which Lökman was assigned as assistant to Eflatûn (in the same way as he himself had two assistants towards the end of his period of tenure) as suggested by Necîb ‘Aşım, or it may be a more exact recording of Eflatûn's death.
3. This number does not include the Şâhînşâhname-i Hûmâyûn mentioned above, which was presented earlier to Süleymân, nor the Oğuzname, which was written in 1599 when Lökman was no longer attached to the şehnâmecilik.
time onwards his Şehnâmes were, aside from this one exception, Turkish compositions. Thus he was the first Şehnâmeci to compose prose works in Turkish for presentation to the Sultan; that this was accepted, and indeed desired, is demonstrated by Mehmed III's injunction to Ta'îlîkî-zâde to write not in Persian, but in the language of common usage. Lokmân's works, both originals and later copies, are richly illustrated by leading artists of the period, and miniatures from them are frequently cited as examples of the best Ottoman painting.

Lokmân's major works are as follows:

1. Şehnâme-i Selîm Han: probably Lokmân's first composition as Şehnâmeci and the earliest surviving work attributed to him. Although dated tentatively by Stchoukine to around 1570, it was probably completed after the death of Selîm II since Lokmân, in the Hûnernâme, says it covers the whole of that sultan's reign. It is a work in Persian verse.

2. Ta'rih-i Sultan Süleyman Han: a second work in Persian verse, completed in 936/1578. A title on the initial folio reads "Tetimme-i âhvâl-i Şâhîngân-î hûlî-âşîyân Sultan Süleyman Han — tæbe gerã-hû — ez güftar-î bendê-î Lokmân",

1. Şehnâme-i Hûmâyûn, 12b.
thus indicating that the manuscript is intended as a supplement to an earlier work dealing with the beginning of Süleyman's reign; it may be assumed that this is the Şähnâme-i Hümayûn referred to above. The narrative of this second work commences after the suppression of the revolt of Şehzâde Bâyezîd in 966/1559, and finishes with Süleyman's death at Szigetvar in 1566.

In the introduction to the second volume of the Hûnername, Lokmân lists the works he has already written, amongst which the following occur:


None of these five volumes relating history down to the end of the reign of Süleyman are known to exist as separate works under these titles; however, Ta’rîh-i Sultan Suleyman Yân is possibly an alternative title for the final volume in the series, since its narrative begins at the time of the battle between the şehzâdes Bâyezîd and Selîm (later Selîm II) at Konya in 966/1559. Since the precise contents of the Şähnâme-i

¹ Ahmed Tevhîd, 107.
Hūmāyūn are not known, that work cannot be related accurately to any of the other four titles mentioned in the Hūmernāme.

3. Kiyāfetū 'l-insāniye fi ṣemā' ili 'Ogmāniye: the earliest manuscript is dated 987/1579. This is a work of Turkish prose describing the physical appearances of the twelve Ottoman sultans from 'Ogmān to Murād III. In his preface to the work, under the heading "Der sebeb-i telīf-i risāle", Lokmān explains that the need had been felt for a book detailing the appearances and personalities of the sultans. A number of miniatures and portraits had been painted by various artists and he, Lokmān, had been asked to provide a text to accompany these pictures.

4. Şahīnsāhnāme: completed 989/1581, and

5. Şahīnsāhnāme-i Sultān Murād: completed Šafer 1001/November 1592. Although composed separately, these two works are closely related in both form and subject matter: both are written in Persian verse, although by the time the second work was composed Lokmān had largely forsaken this form of composition for that of Turkish prose. It is thus certain


2. 1 copy: Edhem and Stchoukine, Manuscrits orientaux, 3-4, no. III; the manuscript is here incorrectly ascribed to 'Alā ed-Dīn Mansūr-i Shirāzī, who was, in fact, the calligrapher. Stchoukine, in La Peinture Turque d'après les Manuscrits Illustrés, 63 and 82, rectifies this and attributes the work to Lokmān.

that the second work was intended as a continuation of the first and resembled it in form.

Murād III is the subject of both şehnâmes: the first contains 58, and the second 95 miniatures, painted by a team of artists. Through their paintings, manuscripts such as these provide a wealth of information on the dress, customs and way of life of the Ottoman court at the end of the sixteenth century: Murād III is depicted arriving at Topkapı Sarayı, receiving foreign ambassadors, or viewing a parade of wild animals in the At Meydanı; at the same time, events of the Persian war of 1578–90 are shown, in particular the execution of the Mān of the Crimean 'Ādil Girāy. In view of the large number of miniatures they contain, it is quite likely that these two şehnâmes were also compiled mainly to provide a textual framework on which the illustrations could be displayed.

6. Zübdetü 't-Tevârîḫ:¹ completed in 991/1535, this is the work referred to by Lokmān in the Hûnernâme as the "tōmār-i neseb-nâme-i hūmāyūn".² A Turkish prose work, it is primarily a genealogical account dealing with the prophets from Adam to Muḥammad, with the twelve Shi‘ite imāms, the caliphs and the sultans down to Murād III. For the reigns of Süleymān, Selîm II and Murād III the narrative becomes an increasingly detailed chronicle of events.

---

1. 5 copies: TSTYK I, 241-2, nos. 733, 734; K. Çağ, Türk ve İslam Eserleri Müzesindeki Minyatürli Kitaplar Katalogu (İstanbul 1959), 59-60, no. 10; Rieu, British Museum Catalogue, 54-5, Or. 1135 (entitled Mücmelü 't-Tōmār); Minorsky and Wilkinson, Chester Beatty Catalogue, 21-5, no. 414. Cf. Stchoukine, 74-5, 121-2.

7. **Silsilenâme:** dated 991/1533, a work in Turkish prose which in content closely resembles the Zübdetû 't-Tevârîh and is probably a derivation from it. Commissioned by the vezîr-i a'zam Siyâvûs Paşa, it also deals with personages from the early prophets down to the Ottoman sultans.

8. **Hünername:** (i) dated 992/1534-5, and


In the second volume of the **Hünername**, Lâkmân lists the works he has already written and then explains how he intends to complete the **Hünername**, a Turkish prose work, in four volumes:

"Al-i 'Ogmân-i selîmâ hûnerin yazdi nújüst
Yân Süleymân hûneri ışbu ikincide tamâm
Yazilub bulur üçincide Selîm Yân itmâm
Rûkn-i çârûnda ecilden eger olursa emân
Yân Murâdu hu hûneri hep kilînur anda beyân"  

Ahmed Tevhîd based his article "Hünername" on this second volume of the work; he was at the time unaware of the existence of the first volume, completed four years earlier. The first book deals with the history of the Ottoman state to the end of the reign of Selîm I and contains 45 miniatures by the


celebrated nakkaş 'Oğman. The second volume, with 65 miniatures again attributed to 'Oğman, is devoted entirely to the reign of Süleyman, describing his habits, way of life, administration of justice, etc. Incorporated in this volume are a number of verses from an unfinished şehnāme by Eflaṭūn, several of which, according to Lokmān, needed to be corrected or improved.¹ These two volumes of the Hünernāme — there is no evidence that Lokmān was able to write the third and fourth books and so complete his plan — are highly regarded for the quality of their illustrations; Stchoukine considers that they represent the apogee of Ottoman historical painting of that era.

10. Şehnāme-i Al-i 'Oğman:² dated 999/1590-1. In contrast to Lokmān's previous manuscripts, this is a work in Turkish verse. The first half of the text is an account of the Ottoman rulers from Erṭogrul to Selim II, with an increasing amount of detail for the later reigns; the second half is a detailed account of the events of the two years immediately prior to the date of completion, covering the concluding stages of the war against Iran, and the grand vizierate of Sinān Paşa, 1589-91.

There remains one further manuscript attributed to Lokmān, the Oğuznāme.³ Written in 1599 when Lokmān was no

---

¹ Ahmed Tevhīd, 105.
² 1 copy: Rieu, British Museum Catalogue, 186-7, Add. 7931.
longer şehnâmeçi, this is a short work of only 9 folios entitled "İcmâl-i âhval-i Ėl-i Selçuk ber mücib-i naql-i Oğuzname". The Turkish narrative tells of the emigration in the mid-thirteenth century of a group of Turks under the leadership of one Şari Saltık from Seljuk Anatolia to settle in the area of the Dobruca in the Balkans. This work is by no means original: it is a redaction of part of the Oğuzname, or Selcükname, of Yazıcı-oğlu 'Ali, which was itself translated c. 1424 from the Persian history of the Seljuks of Rûm by Ibn Bibi.  

Lokmân served as şehnâmeçi for twenty five years, during which time he received various honours and rewards which 'Ali considered unmerited:


During his final years as şehnâmeçi Lokmân had two assistants, also known as şehnâmecis to distinguish them from the group of artists and calligraphers. Ta‘lîkî-zâde was the first of these. Again ‘Alî voices surprise at his appointment, having seen no evidence of Ta‘lîkî-zâde’s ability to write poetry:

"... dîvân-ı ھâkânî kâtiblerinden Ta‘lîkî-zâde nâm zü-fûnûn ve mâ-şadak-î sitr-i cûnûn ‘ömrinde bir beyt nâzâm itmemişken, Türkî ve Fârisî bir müfred ile şöhret virmemişken, ekâbirden birini vâsiţa tutundu. Ol daî múteferrikâlîkla şehnâme-gûyluk manşibin berât itdûrdi. Üç satîr mîkdârî bir ser-i sîhan inşa idûb; âzâz-î nâzâm itdûgine anî ‘alâmêt gönderdi. Ūikmet ٦ûdânûndur". 2

The second assistant şehnâmeçi was a "Türkmen-i A‘câm" known as Nutkî. He was not, as Ta‘lîkî-zâde had been, a kâtib in the imperial dîvân, nor had he served as secretary to a powerful statesman as had Lokmân; according to ‘Alî, he was merely one of the many nedîms who waited upon Murâd III and provided him with entertainment through song, dance, jest, foolery and story-telling. Nutkî was one of these last, a kîssa-hvân. His appointment as assistant to Lokmân leads ‘Alî,

2. Ibid., 604b–605a.
despite the fact that he had little personal regard for the şeynämecî, to lament the declining standards which could lead to the elevation of a mere raconteur to such a post:


The introduction of Nutkî to the şeynämecilik was probably no more than caprice on the part of the Sultan, who wished to reward his nedîm. Nutkî is not mentioned again by 'Alî, and no account of him whatsoever is given by Selânikî; it is likely that he did no more than draw a salary. However, the nickname "şelâse-i müllevvege", or "corrupt trio" which, according to 'Alî, was applied to Lokmân, Ta'liki-zâde and Nutkî, must have proved extremely damaging to the şeynämecilik, and may be regarded as a factor contributing to the demise of the post.

A certain confusion surrounds Lokmân's removal from office. Since the matter is not discussed in the Künhû 'l-Aḥbâr, we must rely on the information found in Selânikî's history.² He records Lokmân's dismissal in the middle of

¹. 'Alî, 605a.
². Ta'liki-zâde does not mention his predecessor Lokmân in any of his works; nor does he supply the date of his appointment as assistant şeynämeci or as şeynämeci in his own right.
Muharrem 1004/mid-September 1595; the reason given was that Lokmân had failed to produce a new work to mark the accession of Mehmed III and had instead attempted to present to the Sultan verses he had seen previously whilst gehzâde. Mehmed III was angered, dismissed Lokmân and appointed Ta’lîki-zâde in his place:

"Lâkin cülüs-i salṭanat-1 cihân-bânî-yi Sultan Mehmed Han váki‘ olalidan berû bu nazm-u-nesrden tâze dâsitân ve kaşîde ve terci‘-bend ile muţayyed olmayub, kendüyi ‘izz-i huşûr-1 şehinşâhîde andîrmamîş, belki sâbiţâ yaptığı eczâyi, ki Pâdişâh-1 zemîn-û-zamân hağzetleri daţi şehzâde iken seyr itmişler idi, yine ani göstermegin bâ‘is-i ‘itâb, belki mazhar-1 ‘âkîb ola-yazub; şehnâmecilikden ref‘ buyurîldî".1

Selânikî states merely that Ta’lîki-zâde came from the ranks of the imperial kâtibs to succeed Lokmân, leaving aside the question of Ta’lîki-zâde having served for some time as assistant şehnâmeci.

In an entry for the middle of Zi ‘l-Hicce of the same hicrî year 1004/August 1596, Lokmân is again mentioned as şehnâmeci. He had set out with the Sultan’s retinue on the Hungarian (Egri) campaign, but had requested, and been granted, permission to turn back to Istanbul in order to finish a şehnâme which had been commissioned by the late sultan Murâd III. To Ta’lîki-zâde, who was also travelling with the army, was assigned the task of composing a şehnâme of the Sultan’s

1. Selânikî, 133b.
campaign:

"Evāsīt-i Zī 'l-Hiccedeşähnâmeçī Seyyid Lokmân ordū-yā hūmāyûndan geldi. 'Mukaddemâ Sultān Murād Ḥān-ı muğfur fermānî ile dàiştânîlî tekâlī eleyûb, ğârclari kemā-kâne cānim-ı mirîden edā olınmak içûn âhôm-ı šerîfe birle Ḥatt-ı hūmāyûn 'inâyet olınub; Pâdişâh-ı 'Aleme-penāh — hûlidet hilâfet-hû — nâmîna ibtidā olınan Şehinşähnâmâ seferden 'avdet idînce itmâm olın' diyû seferden 'afv olınub; ve 'Taʿlîkî-zâde Efendî dâhî kemā-kâne şehnâme-i hūmāyûn Ḥidmetinde sa'y-ı mevfûr eleyeler' diyû fermān olûndûğûn inhâ eleyûdî." ¹

There is no indication that Lokmân did complete this work, which may have been the third of the projected volumes of the Hûnernâmê. His association with the şehnâmecilik probably ceased soon after Meḥmed III’s return from Hungary, when it was discovered that the work commissioned by Murâd III was still unfinished. The only work attributed to Lokmân after this period is the short manuscript of the Qûznamê.

A certain amount of confusion arises from the fact that Selânikî still refers to Lokmân as şehnâmecî in an entry dated almost a year after first recording his dismissal. This may be accounted for by the fact that on the first occasion Lokmân was not dismissed altogether from the şehnâmecilik, but was merely obliged to yield his place as baş şehnâmecî to Taʿlîkî-zâde and be relegated to the post of

¹. Selânikî, 157a.
assistant to the latter, in which capacity he may have set out on the 1596 campaign.

The date of Loğmân’s death is unknown. In the berat of appointment issued to Ta’lîkî-zâde’s successor Hasan Hûkmî in Cemâzi ’l-âhir 1010/December 1601, he is mentioned as still living and holding a post as defterdâr; the berat also says that the appointment was at the request of the former şehnâmegci:

"Sâbiğa şehnâmegci olan Loğmân ri’âyet olınduğunu üzerine şehnâmegcilik hizmetine ta’yîn edilmiş vàye-i serîr-i a’lâma ’arz olınduğda, sâbiğa olan şehnâmegci ri’âyeti-yle virilsün diyü hatt-ı hûmâyûn-ı sa’âdet-makrûnumla fermân-ı ‘âlî-şânûm şâdir olmâğın, bu nişân-ı hûmâyûn-ı mekrûmet-nûmûni virdüm.”¹

Hasan Hûkmî

Ta’lîkî-zâde was succeeded as şehnâmegci in 1010/1601 by the kâtib Hasan Hûkmî, whose canditure for the post, as shown above, had been supported by the former şehnâmegci Loğmân. Information for his biography relates principally to his later career and is derived mainly from the entry by Resmî Ahmed Efendi in the Sefînetü ’r-Rû’esâ, which is reproduced as follows on folio la of Ta’lîkî-zâde’s Şehnâme-i Hûmâyûn:

"Ketebe-i divâniyenûnû şâhîb-imtiyaz-u-insâ-abdâz- larîndan olduğuına, mensûr-ı atide meşûr olduğu

¹. Şâri ‘Abdullâh, 23lb. Other copies of this berât are found in Resmî Ahmed Efendi, Sefînetü ’r-Rû’esâ (Istanbul 1269), 28–30; Cemâleddin, ‘Ogmanlı Ta’rîh ve Müverrihleri (Ayîne-i Zürefâ) (Istanbul 1314), 40–3.
Thus it may be seen that his appointment as şehnâme was the first post of any importance held by Hasan Hükmî. It was probably in this capacity that he participated in the campaign against Safavid Persia led by the serdar Çigala- zade Sinân Paşa in 1013/1604; the army accomplished little on this occasion, and no şehnâme appears to have been written.

No works in the şehnâme genre have, in fact, been attributed to Hasan Hükmî and it is evident that his appointment as şehnâme was merely a stepping-stone on the road to a more important career. He apparently held the post for only a short period of about two years, since in the year 1012/1603-4 he is again ranked among the katibs of the imperial divân, numbered thirteenth in a list of forty, and drawing a daily stipend of 60 akçes. The date and circumstances of his dismissal from the post are unknown, and there appears to be no record of any further appointment to the post of şehnâme.

1. Taken from Sefînetü 'r-Rû'esâ 28, incorporating the initial entry and the substance of a marginal note on Hasan Hükmî's final appointment as re'îsü 'l-kütâb. This hâsîye also states that his post at the time of this last appointment was that of atîl u mukâbelecisi. Cf. Dns V, 329. Two examples of his îngâ style may be found in Sari 'Abdullâh's Dîstûrî 'l-îngâî, 143b-145a, and 162b-165a.


3. Ibid., 435.

4. For şehnâme works commissioned in the seventeenth century, see below, p. 63.
It may be noted in passing that Hasan Hükmî's later career is of interest as evidence of the subtle change in the relative standing of the nişâncı and the re'îsü 'l-kütţāb, which is considered to have taken place from the end of the sixteenth century onwards.¹ In 1023/1614-5 he was appointed re'îsü 'l-kütţāb for the first time and four years later, in 1027/1618, in accordance with an accepted hierarchy of promotion, became nişâncı. A century, or even fifty years earlier, such an appointment was highly esteemed and often carried with it the rank of vezîr or beglerbegî; neither were conferred upon Hasan Hükmî. His next recorded appointment in 1030/1620-1 was again that of re'îsü 'l-kütţāb, followed by a third term of office in 1048/1638. This in itself suggests that the office of re'îsü 'l-kütţāb, rather than that of nişâncı, was by then the one for which there was most competition, and that it was therefore considered the more influential.

The character of the şehnâmeçilik

Certain salient features of the şehnâmeçilik emerge through a study of the careers and writings of the five holders of that office. The differing origins and cultural backgrounds of the şehnâmecis from 'Arif to Hasan Hükmî may be taken as indicative of a changing attitude to the post and

¹. See the articles "Re'îsü 'l-kütţāb" and "Nişâncı" in Volume 9 of the İslam Ansiklopedisi, 680-2 and 300-2 respectively.
to the literary contributions required from its incumbents. The first şehnâmeçi, ‘Arif, was primarily a Persian poet, an emigré from the strife-torn lands of Şāh Ṭahmâsb. Although his first language was Persian, he was competent in the use of Turkish as a poetical medium; knowledgeable in various sciences, such as astronomy and geometry, he was also a practised calligrapher and skilled in the production of other forms of art. Aside from his personal reputation, he enjoyed a certain prestige through being the grandson of the famous Egyptian şeyh ʿIbrāhīm Gülşenî. His successor Eflâtūn, also a Persian refugee, was said to be an accomplished poet in both Persian and Turkish, a calligrapher and an artist. Lokmân, the third şehnâmeçi, was a native of Azerbayjan, and therefore continued the line of şehnâmeçis with eastern, Persian-speaking backgrounds. Although he was not known primarily as a poet, having an established career as a kādi, the fact that he composed four full-length works in Persian verse testifies to his poetical ability.

Lokmân was appointed şehnâmeçi in 977/1569. More than twenty years elapsed before the appointment of Ta‘lîkî-zâde; by contrasting the latter’s qualifications with those of his predecessors, we may observe evidence of a new attitude towards the şehnâmecilik formed during the intervening years. Firstly, Ta‘lîkî-zâde did not originate from a Persian-speaking area; he was descended from a prominent Turkish family from western Anatolia, highly-respected in the legal profession. Secondly, although he did use a mahla, he was not a poet, but a kātib, proficient in the composition of inşâ Turkish
in accordance with the practices of the imperial chancelleries in which he had been trained. Despite the fact that he had a command of Persian sufficient to allow him to read Persian histories, to converse in the language and to compose short sections of poetry, he is not known to have composed a major work in that language. His appointment as şeyhâmecî was due to his ability to write insâ prose, not Persian verse as was the case with his predecessors. Hasan Hükmi, the last şeyhâmecî, was also a kâtib specialising in Ottoman insâ, and was presumably also of Turkish origin.

The first şeyhâmecî, then, was an established Persian poet of no mean accomplishments, whose panegyric of the Sultan was in the accepted şeyhname style — employing the Persian megnevî form and the mütekârîb metre. In contrast, the final occupant of the post was relatively young and unknown, selected from amongst the kâtibs of the dîvân-ı hümâyûn for his ability to write elegant Turkish prose.

'Arif and Eflatûn both died whilst in occupation of the şeyhâmecilik; Lokmân, in view of his 'ilmîye background and his long service as şeyhâmecî, was, on his dismissal from the post, given office as defterdâr. Both Ta'liqî-zâde and Hasan Hükmi, however, merged back again into the ranks of the dîvân kâtibs. For Ta'liqî-zâde, who was probably relatively advanced in years at this period, there was no other appointment of note. Hasan Hükmi, however, proceeded to a successful career as re'sû 'l-küttâb and nişâncî. From such evidence we can see that by about 1600 the şeyhâmecilik had become very closely associated with the secretarial class and was
no longer a purely literary appointment; by this time it may not have had a particularly high status, being viewed perhaps as one of the first stages through which a kâtib might further his career.

The development of the şehnâmecilik as an institution in itself continued at the same time as the stature of its individual occupants altered. We have seen how the post of şehnâmeci evolved gradually as a result of Süleyman's satisfaction with the progress of the work he had commissioned from 'Arif. During the course of the work's composition, the poet's stipend was increased from 25 to 70 akçes per day; when the manuscript was only half-finished, copyists and artists were assigned to it and special premises set aside for them:

"Kitâb yigirmi otuz bifi beyt oldukda, kâtibler ve nakkâşlar ta'ýîn itdiler; ve başka kâr-ğâneler binâ idûb, vażâ'îf-û-revâtîb tebyîn itdiler".¹

The provision of this separate building would signify the definite establishment of the office of şehnâmeci. The kâtibs appointed to copy the manuscript were probably seconded from amongst the divân kâtibs, and the artists recruited from various groups or individuals working in Istanbul at the time. More than a dozen artists (including the nakkâş 'Ogmân), calligraphers and illuminators are mentioned as receiving payment via Lokmân in 990/1582 for work on one of his manuscripts,²

1. ʿAṣâk Çelebi, 165b. See above, pp. 25-6.
whilst in Hasan Hükmî's berāt of appointment reference is 
again made to the "şehnâme hâdmetinde olan kâtibler ve 
muşavvir ve mügehibler". However, from the sources used 
for the present study it has not been possible to ascertain 
whether the assignment of such calligraphers and artists 
was on an ad hoc basis only while a major şehnâme was being 
prepared, or whether the şehnâmeci's office maintained a 
permanent staff.

Little information is available on Eflatûn's period 
as şehnâmeci; although he occupied the post for about eight 
years no work of his survives and there is no indication of 
how the post may have altered during his tenure. Lokmân, on 
the other hand, was şehnâmeci for about 25 years, during which 
time the status of that office appears to have been considerably 
enhanced. In contrast to 'Arif (and presumably to Eflatûn 
also), who was paid on a daily basis, Lokmân received his 
salary in the form of a 30,000 akçe fief with which was 
associated membership of the prestige müteferrika corps. 
Ta'liki-zâde was salaried in a similar manner; concerning 
Hasan Hükmî there is no information. Lokmân also held the 
post of kâgid emîni, which must have carried with it an addi-
tional salary, albeit small, and was frequently in receipt 
of special rewards and favours from the Sultan.

'Ali notes that in later years Lokmân had two assistants, 
Ta'liki-zâde and Nûtîhî, who were also designated şehnâmeci

1. Sarî 'Abdullâh, 282a. (See Appendix.)
to differentiate them from the kātībs and artists at work in his department. Although the appointment of the kisserhvan Nuṭkī is probably symptomatic of the general increase in the Ottoman bureaucracy during the reign of Murād III, that of Taʾlīkī-zāde, a competent man of letters, suggests that there was a serious desire to enlarge the şehnāmeccilik's department. Thus in 1592, while Taʾlīkī-zāde was composing the Şemāʾînāme, and Lokmān was engaged upon the second volume of the Şahinsāhānāme, the şehnāmeccilik is seen as a thriving institution.

The berāt of appointment issued to Ḥasan Ḥükmi in 1010/1601— it itself an elegantly phrased specimen of inşā writing— enjoints the new şehnāmecc to continue the work of his predecessor:


1. 'Alī, 604b-605a.
From this document there appears no reason to doubt that the work of the şehnâmeçı Ta'liki-zade had fulfilled the expectations of the Sultan in recording the events of the empire and that Hasan Hükmü was expected to produce similar accounts. He is not charged with the composition of a şehnâme as such on a specific topic, but rather with recording in elegant prose the occurrence of campaigns and battles on frontiers both far and near, and the everyday affairs of the state — "każa'yâ-ýı dîvânîye ve vakâ'i'-i yevmîye". This could be interpreted as an instruction to the şehnâmeçı to compile a regular chronicle of events, for which purpose it might be assumed that he would have been given access to official records and letters.

Two of Lokmân's works, the Zübdetü 't-Tevârîh and the Şehnâme-i Al-i 'Ogmân, contain long sections in the nature of a true court chronicle. The later sections of the Zübdetü 't-Tevârîh, which deal with sixteenth-century rulers from Süleyman onwards, give detailed historical information on each sultan's rule, describing events year by year. For the reigns of Selîm II and Murad III the narrative is an extremely detailed but purely factual account — not inşâ prose comparable to the ornate passages in Ta'liki-zade's Şehnâme-i Hümâyûn — of day by day events: names, dates and places are carefully recorded, as are the appointments and dismissals of kâdîs, beglerbegis and other high officials; the ceremonies, gifts and presentations connected with the accessions of both Selîm II and Murad III are recounted over several folios. The later section of the Şehnâme-i Al-i 'Ogmân is similarly
detailed concerning the concluding stages of the Persian war and the grand vizierate of Sinān Paşa, 1539-91.

Lokmān obviously utilized administrative records for such passages, and it would therefore not be improbable for Hasan Hükmī to have been charged with a similar undertaking. If so, this would represent a new attitude to the work of the şehnâmeçī, in that he was no longer primarily responsible for the elegant panegyric of the Sultan but was to become a true official historiographer and forerunner of the vak‘a-nūvis.¹

The apparent abolition of the şehnâmeçilik shortly after Hasan Hükmī’s appointment seems curious in many respects. In 1601 it appears to be a thriving institution and it is surprising that it should cease to exist at a time when the general tendency was towards an increase in government departments and an expansion of the bureaucracy. If we lay aside the previous hypothesis that Hasan Hükmī’s work was to be more in the nature of an official chronicle, and review the earlier motives underlying the writing of şehnâme literature, we may gain a further insight into the changing role of the şehnâmeçī.

¹ Lewis V. Thomas, A Study of Naima (New York 1972), 40-1, in discussing the office of vak‘a-nūvis, mentions the possibility that "Naima’s appointment as vakayınūvis may have been regarded at the time as the reinstitution of an official post — the keeping of an official daybook — which had lapsed". He concludes, however, that the office of official historian as held by Na‘īmā had, in fact, "no demonstrable direct connection with an earlier Ottoman institution", and refutes the idea held by certain nineteenth-century Ottoman writers that the vak‘a-nūvislik was a continuation of the office of court historiographer as developed under the şehnâmeçis. The information on the şehnâmeçilik presented in this thesis provides no firm evidence for challenging his conclusion, the remarks made above concerning the possible nature of Hasan Hükmī’s role as şehnâmeçī being, at present, conjecture.
The Şehnâme genre in Ottoman literature is generally understood to imply eulogistic works intended to flatter the Sultan by recounting his glorious military exploits in a language and style reminiscent of Firdevsi’s Şehnâme — thereby increasing the prestige of the dynasty and gaining reward for the author of the work. ‘Arif’s Şehnâme was of this type, composed in Persian, in the mutekârib metre; similarly, Lokmân’s first two works as Şehnâmeçisi, the Şehnâme-i Selîm Han and the Te’rîh-i Sultan Sûleyman Han. In addition to the loftiness of their language, such works were also noble by virtue of their illustrations — ‘Arif’s manuscript, for instance, contains 69 miniatures. However, the fact that these works had been specially commissioned by the Sultan himself (or, as would happen in isolated cases, by an influential statesman) removes the importance of the element of flattery associated with an independent poet’s dedication of such a work to the Sultan. Moreover, since these manuscripts were destined solely for inclusion in the palace library, their potential propaganda value was considerably reduced, since few people would ever have access to the finished work.

The majority of Lokmân’s works were commissioned by Murâd III who, although not a warrior sultan about whose personal bravery on the field of battle a typical Şehnâme could be composed, was nevertheless an active patron of art and literature. Lokmân’s writing was thus directed away from the military aspect of the Ottoman dynasty to works of the şemâ’ilnâme type, in which he described the personal qualities of individual sultans as manifested in their habits, customs
and pastimes — the two volumes of the Şehingânâme (containing 53 and 95 miniatures respectively) describe Murâd III in this manner, whilst the second volume of the Hûnername (with 65 paintings) gives a similar account of Süleyman. The large number of miniatures contained in each of these unique manuscripts leads to the conclusion that the paintings were considered to be at least as important as the text, if not, in fact, the prime reason for the compilation of the volume. In the Eyafetti '1-insâniye fi şemâ'ili 'Osmânîye Lokmân declares that the text of that work was composed expressly as a commentary upon the paintings.¹ Such works should, therefore, be viewed less as vehicles for panegyric or propaganda, but more as objets d'art intended to enrich the Sultan's private collection. Ta'lîkilâ-zâde's Şemâ'îlnâme also falls into this category.

However, the two later works composed by Ta'lîkilâ-zâde in his capacity of şehnâmecî — the Şehnâme-i Hûmâyûn and the Egri Fethi Ta'rîhi — are monograph accounts in the Gazânâme tradition. They indicate a reversal of the trend towards şemâ'îlnâme works and a reversion to the şehnâme type, perhaps suggesting that both the scope and the desire for further şemâ'îlnâmes had diminished. It probably also reflects a personal preference on Ta'lîkilâ-zâde's part, since his earlier works, the Gürçistân Seferi and the Tebriziye, are also of the Gazânâme type. On the other hand, with the exception of Mehtmed III's Egri campaign of 1596, material for an heroic

¹ Eyafetti '1-insâniye fi şemâ'ili 'Osmânîye, British Museum Add. 7830, 4a-b.
gehnamê was not readily available. Since the sultans no longer campaigned in person, gehnâmes of the original type could only be composed if based upon the exploits of the vezîr-i a'zam or serdâr, as Ta'liki-zâde attempted to do in the Gehnâmê-i Hûmâyûn.

It is likely that Mehmed III did not view this development favourably. That the gehnâmeci, employed to eulogize the Sultan, should instead sing the praises of one of his household, a mere slave no matter how elevated his stature, may well have appeared as a slight to him, emphasizing his own non-participation in military affairs and thus detracting from the traditional prestige of the Ottoman ruler as Fâzî and head of the army. From this point of view, the abolition of the gehnâmecilik appears as a natural consequence of the loss of its raison d'etre, i.e. the portrayal of the victorious Sultan's deeds of valour in tune with the original Sânâmê epic. Under Murâd III, Lôkmân had maintained his position by writing gema'ilâmê literature, playing down the military in favour of the personal qualities of the sultans. When Ta'liki-zâde attempted to return to the heroic gehnâmê genre of historiography, it soon became apparent that this had become outdated and could no longer be used to good effect in heightening the sovereign's prestige. Therefore, in this light too may we view the apparent attempt — presumably unsuccessful — to alter the role of the gehnâmeci by charging Hasan Hükmi with the function of imperial chronicler.

The suggestion that the gehnâmecilik was abolished in consequence of the fact that the sultans were no longer active militarily is reinforced later in the seventeenth century during the reigns of 'Ogmân II and Murâd IV. Both rulers
aspired to recreate the Sultan's role as military leader, taking personal command of their armies. As an adjunct to this, both commissioned the writing of şehnâmes; they did not, however, re-establish the şehnâmecilik. At the request of 'Ogmân II, Ğânî-zâde Mehtmed Efendi, known by the mahlaş Nâdirî, composed his Şâhnâme, a Turkish work of some 2000 beyts in the mütekârib metre; it deals with the reign of 'Ogmân II from his accession to the throne in 1027/1618 to his return from the Polish campaign of 1030/1621. 1 Another şehnâme said to have been commissioned from Taşköprüzâde Kemâl ed-Dîn Mehtmed is not known to be extant. 2 The Müderris and poet Mûlhimî was commissioned by Murâd IV to write the Şehsâhnâme, a work in Turkish verse, also in the mütekârib metre, which recounts the life of Murâd IV from childhood to his return from the Baghdad campaign of 1048/1638. 3 Thus it can be seen that, in the eyes of 'Ogmân II and Murâd IV, şehnâme historiography had retained a certain value and was considered a necessary element in the creation of a proper image for the Sultan. On the other hand, rulers such as Mehtmed III and Ahmed I, who had little or no inclination for personal participation in war, were not concerned to encourage or support the şehnâmecilik; hence its disappearance in the

1. Gazavât-nâmeler, 104-5; Necîb 'Âsim, 493. Ğânî-zâde was a member of the 'ulemâ, rising to the rank of kat'asker of Rûmîli, cf. ŞN Zevl, 702-4, 'OM II, 349-50 (where his Şâhnâme is said to cover the reigns of Mehtmed III and Ahmed I).


3. Gazavât-nâmeler, 109-11; Necîb 'Âsim, 498-9; 'OM II, 12-13. Murâd IV had also commissioned the poet Nergisî with the composition of a şehnâme on the Revân campaign of 1635 but this was never written, due to the poet's accidental death while setting out from Istanbul.
first decade of the seventeenth century.

It has been suggested that şehnâme literature may well have played a particular role in the days of Bâyezîd II and Sûleymân in reassuring the Sultan of the strength of his own position at times when his authority appeared threatened by dynastic strife.¹ From the reign of Selîm II onwards, competition for the sultanate within the Ottoman house ceased to exist: Murâd III succeeded Selîm II without difficulty, while Mehmed III was clearly marked out as his father's successor by being the only one of Murâd III's numerous sons to be sent out of the palace to a provincial governorate. The young Ahmed I also succeeded to the throne without opposition in 1603. It thus appears that, by the first decade of the seventeenth century, the fear of dynastic strife had, for the time being, receded and the reigning Sultan could feel secure in his position. Thus he would not require the constant adulation of şehnâme literature as a form of reassurance. From another point of view, therefore, the value of, and necessity for, maintaining the office of şehnâmeci may be seen to be diminished.²

Taken as a whole, the extant works of 'Arif, Lôkmân and Ta'îlîk-i-zâde represent a very specialized attitude towards the writing of history. Although şehnâme literature derived its original inspiration from the style and popularity of Firdevsî's classic, the works of the sixteenth-century Ottoman şehnâmecis were not produced to satisfy any popular demand. They are, rather, symptomatic of the Ottoman sultans'?

---

¹. See above, p. 13.

². It should be noted that the return to şehnâme literature under 'Ogman II and Murâd IV occurred at a time when the Sultan's position was again threatened, this time by harem politics and the fear of deposition.
belief in the superiority of their state, which reached the apogee of its power during the period in which the şehnâmeçilik existed; they may be regarded as a mirror in which the qualities and achievements of the dynasty are reflected in consummate artistry and elegant literary style. The şehnâme genre forms part of the general flowering of poetry and prose which blossomed in the sixteenth century in the settled atmosphere of the imperial capital.

With two exceptions — Lokmân's Kiyâfetü 'l-însâniye fi şemâ'ili 'Ogmânîye (eight copies) and his Zühdetü 't-Tevârih (five copies) — few of these şehnâmes were ever copied, and most exist in one manuscript only. This arises partly from the fact that, as the Sultan's commissions, these manuscripts were immediately deposited in the palace library where access to them was severely restricted. It would be wrong to suggest that these works were little admired simply because of any linguistic complexities they may contain, since the works of many contemporaries of the şehnâmeçis who were equally, or more highly, proficient in literary and poetical composition were appreciated and imitated. Moreover, the standard of composition in the works of the şehnâmeçis is not uniform: the Turkish prose works of Lokmân do, at times, display a very pedestrian style in their narrative sections; Ta'limi-zâde's Erâr Fethî Ta'rihî, whilst a typical example of a şazânâme in the megnevî form, lacking neither historical interest nor stylistic appeal, is nevertheless composed in a much simpler Turkish than any of his previous prose works. All copies of the two works by Lokmân mentioned above are richly illustrated with
miniature paintings, which may suggest that duplicates were made primarily for the purpose of acquiring a collection of paintings, rather than from admiration of the text.

As historical sources, the works of 'Arif, Lokmān and Ta'liki-zāde vary greatly in value. The ṣemā'īlnāme manuscripts in general merely repeat what were to contemporaries well-known, traditional stories of the early prophets, the first Muslim rulers and successive dynasties; they have only a very weak claim to be called historiography. On the other hand, those works of Lokmān mentioned previously which contain long detailed sections drawn from official records may provide much information for which other documentation is now lacking. Similarly, Ta'liki-zāde's works in the ḵazānāme tradition, being eye-witness accounts of particular campaigns, must retain a certain historical value as the personal observations of a contemporary and participant.

However, it cannot be claimed that the works of the ṣehnāmecis exerted any particular influence upon either contemporary or later writers, nor that they were appreciated by them. The scarcity of biographical material on the ṣehnāmecis shows a lack of interest in, or even of knowledge about, them. When Ta'liki-zāde's ṣehnāme-i Hūmāyūn came into the possession of the Emīr Mehmed 'Arif in the middle of the eighteenth century, he was unable to find information about the author of his manuscript and could discover only the briefest information about Ta'liki-zāde's fellow ṣehnāmecis 'Arif and Ḥasan Hūkūm. Tegkīre notices are few: 'Arif's entry in the Meṣā'irū 'ṣ-Ṣu'ārā is the most detailed, but
mainly, one suspects, because he was a personal friend of 'Aşık Çelebi; similarly, 'Ahdī had sympathy for Eflāṭūn. Lokmān was not primarily a poet and is not mentioned at all in the tezkires; for Ta‘lîkî-zâde there is only a brief, three-line entry in the Tegkire-i  Rıza — were it not for the auto-biographical sections in his works practically nothing would be known about him. Hasan Ḥükmi's appointment as ğehnâmeci is brought to the attention almost incidentally, through its being a prelude to his later successful career as re'ısı 'l-küttāb.
There are comparatively few sources for a biography of Mehem ibn Mehem el-Fenari, the şehnâmeÊ Ta'liki-zade. His own works provide the most important information, since in the opening section of each it is the author's custom to introduce himself, bringing forward his connection with the distinguished Fenari family, and giving an outline of his career to date.

Few references are to be found in the biographical literature of the period. The Tegkire-i Rizâ, compiled in 1050/1640-1, reads merely "Lazakiyeli Ta'liki-zade Mehem Çelebi, şehnâmeÊÊç, with a note that he died, "Şehid", in 1003/1599-1600. The most detailed of the secondary sources is the article by Necib 'Asim, who appears to have drawn most of his information on Ta'liki-zade's life from the şehnâmeÊÊç's own writings. His account of this şehnâmeÊÊç is in general reliable, although he differs from Rizâ over the date of Ta'liki-zade's death. Pointing out that in the berat of appointment to the şehnâmeÊÊçilik of Hasan Hükmü, dated Cemâzi 'l-'ahir 1010/December 1601, it is not

1. Tegkire-i Rizê, 39. Ta'liki-zade himself makes no mention of his place of origin, nor to the fact that he came to Istanbul at a certain date in order to complete his education or to seek employment. On the other hand, the reference given below to his uncle Karakaş-zade Firi Beg from Aydin shows a family connection with the Lazakiyeli/Denizli area.

2. Necib 'Asim, 422-4. 'OL III, 34, gives a short, but on the whole accurate account; following Rizê, Ta'liki-zade's date of death is given as 1003; the Gürçistan Seferi, the Tebriziye and the Şehnâme-i Hümayûn are listed as his only known works. An addition at the end of the entry — eg'âri da vardur — would indicate the existence of individual poems; these, however, have not come to light.
stated that his predecessor Ta‘līkī-zāde had died, merely that he had left the capital, "diyār-i Āhāra gitmekle", Necib 'Āsim concludes that Rižā is wrong in placing his death in 1003. Furthermore, Necib 'Āsim discovered a clerk named Ta‘līkī-zāde listed seventeenth in a register of 40 dīvān kātibs for the year 1012/1603-4, holding a 60 akçe zi‘āmet, which would indicate that his absence from the capital had not been of long duration. In view of this, he suggests that Ta‘līkī-zāde died not in 1003, but in 1013, the confusion being caused by a dating error in the Tēzkire-i Rižā.

However, the phrase دیوان رازی may with equal validity be read "diyār-i Āhāre", "to the last world", thus supporting the tēzkireci's statement that Ta‘līkī-zāde died in 1003. Also, the lakab Ta‘līkī-zāde is not so unusual that it might not also have been borne by another kātib. In which case the individual named in the 1012 register cited above may have been a different person entirely. For lack of further information, no definite conclusion can be drawn, although the earlier date seems more likely, considering Ta‘līkī-zāde's practice of writing gehnāmes on the basis of personal observation of, and participation in campaigns; it is quite probable that he died, gehid, on the Hungarian campaign of 1003/1599.

The most detailed account of Ta‘līkī-zāde's early career is that given in the Şemā’ilnāme. This was the first work written by him after his appointment as assistant gehnāmecı to Lökman; thus he made a special effort, not only in the language and presentation of the main part of the text, but also in bringing forward his own claims to recognition by a lengthy discourse on his own career. The Egri Fethi Ta‘rīhi,

1. Şari 'Abdullāh, 231b.
composed some five or six years later, supplements the information contained within the Şehnâme-i Rûmâyûn, whilst the Gürçistân Seferi and the Tebrizîye provide more specific details about the author's participation in the eastern campaigns. The Şehnâme-i Rûmâyûn contains only a short auto-biographical section, whilst his first work, the Fırâsetnâme, gives no information apart from the author's name.

Ta'liki-zâde is extremely proud of his connection with the Fenârî family, probably the most prominent and well-respected family in the Ottoman legal profession during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.¹

Kemânân-i Âl-i Fenârîdenem
O fâhir nesebden bâkiye benem
Atam u dedem nesl-i emcâduña
Kâlib şâdî ile âidmet ecđâduña
Kimi müftî vü kimi beglerbegi
Veli kâzî-'askerden eker begi
Fenârî soyinda görüb meyremen
Ne mansûb virilse idüb ma'dilet²

He considers the association of the Ottoman dynasty and the

---

¹. Cf. J. R. Walsh, "Fenârî-zâde", EI² II, 879. More detailed accounts of various members of the family are to be found in the references to the Sekâ'îkî 'n-Nu'mânîye and the Zeyl-i Sekâ'îk mentioned in the above article.

². Egri Fethî Ta'rihi, 6a.
Fenārī family to have been of great importance for the prosperity of both, and for the welfare of the state; the presence of a member of the Fenārī family in the imperial divān had seemed practically a requirement of government.

He compares their role with that of other eminent families in early Muslim states:


Devlet-i ʿAbbāsiyede Āl-ī Berāmika, ve eyyām-ī Mervāniyede Āl-ī Mihelleb, ve devlet-i ġarrāṣaʿādet-ī cihān-ārā-ya-ī Āl-ī ʿOgmānda nesl-ī Fenārī firāq-ī bāl ve refāq-ī ḫāl ile kāmgāri sūrmislerdūr. 1

The author usually introduces himself as "Mehmed ibn Mehmed el-Fenārī, eş-şehir bi-Taʿlīki-zāde". 2 The mahlaṣ Şubhī by which he is sometimes known appears only three times in his works. He first refers to himself as Şubhī in the introduction to the Gürçistān Seferi, and secondly in the colophon of that work; the mahlaṣ is found again in the final beyt of the Tebrīziye. 3

1. Şemāʾʿilnāme, 9a.
2. Cf. Firāsetnāme, 4a: "Mehmed ibn Mehmed ibn Mehmed el-Fenārī".
Since Ta'liki-zade does not mention his father as having held any particular post, we may conclude that he was not one of the more prominent members of the Fenari family. Of his mother's family, there is only a passing reference in the Semai'lname to one of his maternal uncles, Karaağaç-zade Piri Beg, who was living in the province of Aydin during the reign of Selim I. It is quite possible that Ta'liki-zade's father died at a comparatively early age, leaving his son in the care of his mother and her relations in Aydin; the author records in the Semai'lname that he had visited the island of Sakız (Chios) in the period before it came under Ottoman control — i.e. before 1566 — which is further evidence to suggest that he spent at least part of his youth in the Aydin area. The fact that he was not brought up in Istanbul may have had a somewhat adverse effect on his career and could go a long way towards explaining the gehnameci's insistence on his Fenari ancestry and the apparent failure of well-placed relations to assist him in finding a suitable post. At almost every stage in the narrative of his career, Ta'liki-zade expresses his feelings of neglect and frustration, complaining constantly that he was overlooked when promotions were made. Although such pleas were often no more than conventional utterances


in the mouths of all poets of the age, it would appear that Ta‘līkī-zāde did not embark on his career under the most favourable circumstances, and probably had few influential friends to help him, so that his complaints may often have had some justification. On the other hand, he was averse to the use of patronage as the principal means of gaining remunerative posts, and declares his unwillingness to imitate the numerous ill-educated and unworthy men who manged to achieve success by flattery and attachment to the retinue of a high government official or pasha:

"Emgālūm menāşib-i ‘āliye ve hem-sālūm maṭālib-i gāliyeye i’tilā eleyüb; ben merdüm-i dīde gibi mihrāb-niśīn-i kūnc-i tārīk-i ḥamān, ve dūr-i şemīn-āsā ‘ummān-i ǧamānda dermānde-i demān kalub; kūr-dīlān-i ḥod-bīn-i a’yān-i rūy-i zemīnden şemīn-dāst-u-taṭallu’, mārda mūrūvvet, pīr-zendebīn fūtūvvet, Iblīsden istīmān1, zindīkden īmān tevakku‘ itmek gibi idūgini bilmek ile, kem-ḵadr-i bālā-niśīn ḍālānlarā ser-fūrūd itmek tācīn terk, ve ni’ām-i Ni’m-i l-Vekile tevekkül sāzīnī berk eleyüb; der gibi her kese açılmak bābīnī mesdūd, ve yārān ḥoštbe tbine varmağı bidrūd kīlb; dāmān-āsā nā-sezālarubīn pāyina sūrinmegi2 lā’ik, ve riḍā gibi her redī[-yi] nā-rāstubīn boynubān şalınmagi2 mizācumā muṭābīk görinmeyüb; rezāyā-yi

1. استعمال
2. If sūrinmegi and şalınmagi are to be read as accusatives the verb must be active, görinmeyüb; alternatively, if the passive verb is retained, sūrinmegi and şalınmagi should be read as nouns.
rzgara m&berete m&beretde izabe-i 'az&bdan erinmeyub; ve sebil-i sel&metden r&h-1 mekr-#-
%ad&'ate iz azdurmayub, ve &ara g&mlul&ere sim-i
sep& [y&dzinden, ve zi&] y&zl[lerere] zeri &r&-i
&te&-t&b &cin y&z &zurmayub; minnetle &b-1 &hay&
zehr-i mem&t, ve bi-minnet ni&-i aru ni&-1 d&ru
g&rilub". 3

* * * * * *

Ta"lik"-zade's recorded career began when he obtained
a post as k&tib in the household of sehzaed Mur&d (later
Mur&d III) on the latter's appointment as sancak begi of
Manisa in March 1562. 4 There is no indication of the means
whereby Ta"lik"-zade was awarded this post, whether it was
due to his promise as a calligrapher, or whether on this
first occasion one of his father's relatives put his name
forward as a suitable candidate. He remained in Manisa in
Mur&d's service until the latter became sultan in 1574 on
the death of Selim II. Ta"lik"-zade used these twelve years5

1. Cf. TS, iz azitmak.
2. &r& K&k&l&l&r, sem &d& &lolo &r& iz &m
ay&n, y&z &e&
3. &m&iln&me, 9b.
127-8, provides information on the various officials
appointed to a sehzaed's household.
5. In the &m&iln&me, 11b, the following beyt states that
Ta"lik"-zade/
to acquire knowledge in various fields and to perfect his writing of both poetry and prose.

Eyledüm ‘ilm-û-fažli cāna ğidā 'ilm-û fâlî cāna nûr-î hüdâ ‘ilm-i kâf içre kâmyâb oldum Hem mu ‘ammâda nâmyâb oldum

Karz-î şîr-û ‘arûz u reml-û-ţâseb Fenn-i mîkât u ‘ilm-i uşturlâb

Maţika lâ-kelem ‘ömrûm şarf Bîlmîş idim beyâni harf-be-harf

Şîr-û-insêma eyleyûb inşâr¹ Medh iderdi Kemâl ile Vaşşâf

Nice olur bilûrdi dürr-î ferîd Nazm[-u-]negrûmi görse mevârîd²

* * *

İdûb on iki sâl ḥidmet mûdâm
Olur ay başına bir yîl tamâm

(5 cont'd) Ta'lıkâ-zâde served Murâd III in Manisa for only 10 years:

Ḥidmet-i şâh-î ‘alemi on sâl

Eyledûm bi 'l-gûdûvvi ve-'l-âşâl

Since all other references indicate the length of time to have been 12 years, it may be assumed that "on sâl" is merely an approximation designed to fit the metre (ḥafîf) of the beyt.

1. אסף

2. Şemâ’îlnâme, llb.
Nevertheless, despite Ta‘lîkî-zâde’s application to work and study, and his faithfull service to the qezâde, he still found himself without the recognition and reward he sought.

Velîkin benüm kadrum bilmemi
Sezâvâr-ı sâhânesin kılmadı
Yaşum gibi gözden bırákdı beni
Derûnum gibi oda yakdı beni
Delûb bağrumi ney gibi rûzgâr
Yağub ‘ûd-veş cânum nâr-ı ‘âr

1. Egri Fethî Ta’rîhi, 6a-b. It is unlikely that any of the translations or literary essays mentioned here ever received any currency. Ta’lîkî-zâde makes no mention of them elsewhere.

2. Egri Fethî Ta’rîhi, 6b.
On the accession of Murād III, Ta’līkī-zāde returned to Istanbul and was enrolled amongst the kātibs of the imperial divān. He was several times sent into the provinces to carry out local censuses, a task which was not to his liking.

"Girū, bu ḥāme-āsā, tīg-i melāl ile şikāfte-vūnizār, ve nāme-miğāl pīğide-vū-naḥīf-ū-zār, divān kitābetinde īkrār olinub; der-gāh-u-bī-gāh mülāzemet-i dergāh ile merreten ba‘de uḥrā ‘alā mā hūve ’l-āḥrā taḥrīr-i vilāyetеs gönerilüb; ḵalem gibi rāst-ḥūlyuklar ve nāme-miğāl sepīd-rūlyuklarum müstelzim-i infisāh-1 āmāl-ū-ūmniyāt-u-me‘ārib ve istincāh-1 maḵāṣid[-u-] maṭālib iken, beyṭa-1 ʿumidūmi gu‘bede-bāz-1 felek-i nā-sāz enbān-1 ḥirmandā nihān, ve beyṭa-yī baḥtumi muḵāsāt-1 dehr gamām-1 gumūmda pinhān eyleyüb; ḥāk-i zillet-ū-maḡāk-1 mezelletde ḵodi."¹

He implies that due to these periods of absence in the provinces he was several times overlooked when promotions were made, and accordingly failed to gain the advancement he felt was his due:

"ūc dört kerre ḥākkum alinub, birer bāṭil-i bī-ḥüner-i ‘ātile virildi".²

Although disappointed and frustrated, he was nevertheless determined not to seek the patronage of those officials he

---

1. Tebrizīye, 8a-b.
2. Ibid., 8b; earlier on the same folio Ta‘līkī-zāde writes: "iki def‘a ḥākkum alinub".
Having spent twelve years as a kātib in the household of gehzâde Murâd, and several more years as a dīvān kātibi without receiving any particular sign of recognition or token of appreciation of his work, Ta‘lîkî-zâde decided to leave Istanbul and take part in the eastern campaigns against Safavid Persia as a break from his unrewarding routine:

"'a-generic, ṣuver-i 'acâ'ib-i dûnyâ-yi mir’ât-ı seferde şekl-ı temâşâ itmek içûn, raḥs-ı reh-vâr-ı sefere 'inan-ı 'azîmeti üstûvûr 'kilûb'.

In 991/1583 he joined the group of kâtibs working under the supervision of Iâm 'Ali Çelebi in the retinue of the serdâr Ferhâd Paşa, in whose service Ta‘lîkî-zâde witnessed the rebuilding of the fortress of Revân and the construction of a new fortification at Tömanîs the following year, 1584.

"Tûkûz yüz toksan bir ta'rîhinde vezîr-i Ağaf-sifat-ı huçeste-tedbîr Ferhâd Paşa-yi kişver-guşa 'hâzretleri

1. Şemâ'ilnâmê, 10a.
2. Ibid., 12a-b.
Revân kal'esi binasına ıhlâs-1 niyyet olındukda, ḥidmet-i kitâbet-i sefer-i şuret-eşere nâmzed olan kütûb-1 ma‘arif-me’ābla hem-‘inân Revâna revâne olub; kal’e binâsında üstâcîlarla yarışub, ve irğadîlarla toza ̀çoprağa karışub, ve Kızılbaş-ı ilhâd-āheng ile sitiz-ū-cengde olub; sene-i gânîyede Tomânîs-i vaḥzet-enîs seferin seferleyûb; bu esfâr-ı mıḥnet-āgârda envâ‘-ı metâ‘ib-i maḥzûret ‘l-‘avâkîb ve eşnâf-ı âfât-ı şiddetü ‘l-mâḫāfât çekûb”.

During these campaigns Ta‘lîkî-zâde was not merely a passive spectator of events, but played an active part in building operations and in engagements with the enemy. After a successful encounter with a hostile force of Georgians and Kızılbaş near Tiflis, the Ottoman commander Riḍvân Paşa assigned Ta‘lîkî-zâde the task of conveying news of the victory to the serdâr Ferhâd Paşa at Tömanîs:


1. Tebrîziye, 9a.
2. Gürücistân Seferî, 30b.
However, despite this potential improvement in Ta’lîkî-zâde’s fortunes, Ferhâd Paşa himself was not so favourably disposed towards him. On receipt of the news of Ridvân Paşa’s victory, the serdar ordered rejoicing and festivities, made promotions, awarded fiefs and increased the salaries of practically everyone concerned. For Ta’lîkî-zâde, however, there was nothing but disappointment; the text of the Gürçistân Seferi ends on a very dismal note:

“fevka 'l-gayet nevâziş-ü-ri‘ayet olnub; mücmelen ırsâ-yı merâsim-i mürâsât ve irfâ-yı mûvâfâtdâ dakîka nâ-mer‘î kalmadâ. Ve benden âyri, 'nâ-murâd kaldum' dir olmadâ”.¹

The following year, 993/1585, Ta’lîkî-zâde was attached to the retinue of the new serdar ‘Özdemir-oğlu ‘Ogman Paşa, and took part in the campaign to capture the former Safavid capital, Tebriz. He succeeded in gaining the attention of ‘Ogman Paşa and became his chief secretary. From this time onwards, and even after ‘Ogman Paşa’s death later in 1585, Ta’lîkî-zâde’s fortunes began to improve.

"Bu ḥâkîr-i ḥâkister-ü-ḥâk-i genâ-güsterûn ıncâda ḥâkisterin ma‘lûm buyurub; feth-name-i hûmâyûn-1 cîhân-gûsâ bu hebâ-yı menşûrûn ıncâsî-yle olmagân, fark-ı ḥâksârînâ ḥûrûd-âsâr ziya-nîgâr club; ḥâsîdân-ı ẖâsîd ve ẖâsîdân-ı ḥâsîd tebâh, ve gözleri ẖâgîd-âsâ şeşîd ve yüzleri midâd-mânend siyâh oldî.”²

¹. Gürçistân Seferi, 32b-33a.
². Şemâ’ilnâme, 13b.
"Ekser mekâtîb-i belâgat-esâlîbî bu bende-i hâkister-û-hâk-i genâ-güsterdûn inçâsî-yeledûr."¹

Neither the Gürcistân Seferi nor the Tebrîziye manuscript bears any date to indicate when it was completed, although both were certainly written before Ta‘lîkî-zâde received his appointment to the gehnâmecilik (since this is not mentioned in either work), and most probably contributed greatly to his success in this direction. It is most likely that each work was written as soon as possible after the events it describes took place, i.e. the Gürcistân Seferi during the winter of 1534-5, and the Tebrîziye in 1535 or 1536. In the second work Ta‘lîkî-zâde records his receipt of a tîmâr, presumably at the hands of 'Ogman Paşa:

"Çün bu bende-i kalîlû 'l-bîzâ‘at-i keğirü 'l-içâ‘at yedi sene sefer-i 'Acem itmişken, bir âkçe tîmâr-i mahlûl pezîrâ-yi hüsûl olmayub, beş bîfî akçe tîmârcîk ihsân itdi."²

If Ta‘lîkî-zâde’s statement that he had spent seven years on campaign is to be understood literally, then he must have participated in all the principal campaigns of the war, from that of Lâlâ Muştafâ Paşa in 1578 onwards; if so, it is strange that in none of his works is there even a passing reference to these earlier events. On the other hand, Ta‘lîkî-zâde is not reliable with regard to dates or periods of time;

1. Tebrîziye, 9b.
2. Ibid., 10a.
"yedi sene" may be simply a random figure indicating that he felt himself to have endured the rigours of campaign life for an inordinately long time.

The auto-biographical account in the Şemâ'îlnâme passes directly from the Tebriz campaign of 1585 to Ta'liki-zâde's appointment as şehnâmecî, giving no indication of the length of time which elapsed between the two and providing no date for the latter.¹ There is no reference to either Lôkmân or Nutkî; the impression given by the Şemâ'îlnâme is that the author was appointed sole şehnâmecî. At no point in any of his works does Ta'liki-zâde mention his predecessors in the şehnâmecilik.

The Şemâ'îlnâme is the first work to have been composed by Ta'liki-zâde as şehnâmecî; according to the Şehnâme-i Hûmâyûn it was completed shortly before Ta'liki-zâde departed on the Yanîk campaign of 1593-4.² Neither 'Ali nor Selânîkî

1. In the Egri Fethi Ta'rihi, 6b, the account jumps from the accession of Murâd III to Ta'liki-zâde's appointment as şehnâmecî, without any reference whatsoever to the intermediate years spent as a divân kâtibi and on campaign.

2. Şehnâme-i Hûmâyûn, 4b, where the date of presentation to Murâd III is given as "ignâ ve elf ta'rîhinde". From a chronological point of view, this dating raises a problem: the serdâr Sinân Paşa left Istanbul for Hungary on 29 Sevval 1001/29 July 1593 (Dms III, 130), and by the opening of the year 1002 was advancing towards the Hungarian fortress of Vesişprem; if Ta'liki-zâde had departed in his retinue at the commencement of the campaign he could not have been in Istanbul to present the Şemâ'îlnâme to Murâd III in the year 1002. This may be explained by the fact that Ta'liki-zâde had not originally intended to take part in the campaign, but, later, disappointed by the cool reception given his new work (Şehnâme-i Hûmâyûn, 11b), he had departed "giryân-u-süzân" for Hungary and had joined the army at a later date.
reveal the date of Ta'liki-zade's first association with the şehnâmcilik: 'Ali mentions the "gelâge-i mülevvege" of Lokmân, Ta'liki-zade and Nu'çî after his account of the accession of Mehmed III in Cemâzi 'l-âhir 1003/January 1595, but fails to indicate how long the arrangement had been in existence; Selânikî, although supplying a definite date for Lokmân's replacement by Ta'liki-zade, does not mention the fact that the two had previously worked side by side in the şehnâmecilik. Thus it has not been established exactly when Ta'liki-zade became assistant şehnâmecî: most probably he returned from the east to Istanbul shortly after the death of 'Osman Paşa and was received back into the ranks of the divân kâtibs for a while before achieving his long-desired promotion.

In the Şemâ'îlnâme Ta'liki-zade describes the time of his appointment to the şehnâmecilik:

"Bu gâker-i kemîn ve bende-i ǧamîn sançag-ı hûmâyûndan ni'îmet-i ihsânlarî-yle mürebbe, ve i'ânet-i 'inâyetleri-yle mu'abbâ olduğu âyîne-i 'ilm-i 'alem-ûmûlâyînda nûmâyân olman, menâşîb-î refî'a ile ser-efrâz olmasî-çûn ḥâtti-ı hûmâyûn-î bende-nevâz 'inâyet buyurduklarî rûz-ı pîrûz-ı ǧam-û zîdânûn pes ferdâsî kaylûle vâki'.

(2 cont'd) On the other hand, Ta'liki-zade's sense of historical time must be regarded as suspect: 1002 may simply be an error for 1001. This is supported by the fact that in the Şehnâmê-ı Hûmâyûn there is a very detailed account of Sinân Paşa's meeting with the ehî-ı vükûf in Belgrade which took place in Zi 'l-Hicce 1001, at which Ta'liki-zade was obviously present.


2. Ta'liki-zade himself does not refer to his return; 'Ali, 604b, records that on his appointment as şehnâmecî he came "divân-ı hâkânî kâtiblerinden".
According to 'Ali, Ta'liki-zade was assisted in this promotion by a higher official of some importance:

"ekâbirden birini vâsiţa tutundı. Ol daţi müteferrika-
lıkla şehnâme-güylük manşûbin berât itdûrdi". 2

There is no reference in the Şemâ'îlnâme to any such assistance, nor to whom the person providing it might have been.

At this point the auto-biographical narrative in the Şemâ'îlnâme ceases. Shortly after completion of the work and its unfavourable reception by Murâd III, 3 Ta'liki-zade left Istanbul, again in a state of despondency, to participate in the Hungarian campaign led by the vezîr-i a'zâm and serdâr Sinân Paşa, which continued for some eighteen months, from the latter half of 1593, through 1594 and into 1595. He writes from first-hand experience of the army's progress, its capture of several Hungarian forts and the principal achievement of the campaign, the successful siege of the important fortress of Yanîk, situated on the very furthest border of

1. Şemâ'îlnâme, 14a.
2. 'Ali, 604b. For information on the müteferrika corps and its members, see M. Tayyib Gökbilgin's article "Müteferrika", İA 8, 853-6; also İ.H. Uzunçarşılı, op. cit., 428-31.
3. Şehnâme-i Hûmâyûn, 11b.
Ottoman and Habsburg lands. Besides making a note of events for the future writing of his şehnâme, Ta‘lîkî-zâde found himself once more in the thick of the fighting, and fell ill as a result of the conditions he experienced:

"[bu bende] Tata ko l’esinüf fethinde yûriyüs oldu kadın, bizüm ‘askerümüzüün ömünde Hendekü ün ênârında bulunub; giddet-i ḥarb ve ma‘arret-i dârîbdan hastedir düşüb, yîgîrmi gün humming-yi muhrîkadan dil-hirâs tarihü 'l-firâs [club], henüz nàkîh[-u-] nâ-ten-durust, ve nesîm-i bîmâr gibi zebûn[-u-] süst iken, böyle ceng-i cân-âheng içinde [i.e. the siege of Yanîk] (beyt)

Kemân-ı keyânî vû tîr-i ḥadeng
Birâder bûved merd-râ rûz-i ceng

mażmûn-ı ‘ibret-nûmânînca, çeşm-i sûzen gibi [kâfiri gözédûb], ve kemânî ḳatî bağırlu dilber gibi sûneye çekûb". ¹

Towards the end of the Şehnâme-i Hümâyûn there is a short section, in the nature of a postscript, giving a brief account of certain events of the autumn campaign of 1595 led by Sinân Paşa against the rebel voyvode Michael of Wallachia. The brevity and inaccuracy of the narrative indicates that Ta‘lîkî-zâde was in this instance writing from second-hand information. From Selânîkî’s record of the dismissal of Lokmân in Muḥarrrem 1004/September 1595, it may be assumed that

¹. Şehnâme-i Hümâyûn, 63a.
Ta'liki-zade had not taken part in the campaign, and was probably in Istanbul, engaged upon the writing of the Şehnaime-i Hümâyün:

"divan-ı 'Ali kâtiblerinden nazm-i şir-u-inşāda kâmil ve dâniş-i 'ilm-u-ebeb ile fâzîl, mümtezü 'l-aqrân, şâhibî 'l-neseb ve-'n-neseb Ta'liki-zade Meşmed Çelebi Efendiye dergâh-ı 'Ali mûteferrikâli-ğâle şâhnameciliği ta'yîn, ve hâzîne-i 'âmireden 'âdet-i kadîme üzre hil'at-i fâhîre ile teşrif buyurulub; vüzerâ-yi 'üzam ile girûb, pâye-i serîr-i sâltanata yüz sürdü. Fî evâsi't-î şehr-i Muḥarrem, sene 1004."¹

In the introductory section of his next work, the Eğri Fethi Ta'rihi, Ta'liki-zade celebrates his elevation to the post of şehnâmeçi:

Beni Şâha şehnâme-gûy itdîler
Tenûm mûyeden lîk mûy itdîler
Bu bî-devlet oldî çû devlet-sitâ
Velî bar-î şâm itdi kadûm dûtâ
Kemâl ehline kefîş—gerdân club
Çubâr-î kef-i pây-î merdân club
Firâzende-i kadîr-i şâhân benem
Sitâyende-i Cem-külâhân benem
Şecâ'at-sitâ nahl-bend-i şâhân
Zemîn-sây-i sümûm-i semend-i şâhân

¹. Selânikî, 133b. 'Ali's opinion of Ta'liki-zade's suitability for the post of şehnâmeçi contrasts with that of Selânikî, see above, p. 46.
Du’ā-ḥāvan-ı ikbāl-ı ḥakāniyem
Sehnā-gūy-ı İskender-i gāniyem
Be-ḥakk-ı Hūdā-yı cihān-āferin
İder sözlerüme cihān "Aferin!"\(^1\)

During the 1596 campaign, in which Mehmed III led his army in person to the capture of the fortress of Egri and the subsequent battle of Haçova, Ta’līḵī-zāde was given the task of writing the official account of the Sultan's progress, the work which had originally been assigned to Lokmān.\(^2\) Whilst describing the desperate fighting in and around the Ottoman camp, Ta’līḵī-zāde relates his own part in the battle:

Bu kemter de ‘arz ideyem ḥālūmi
Başumdan geçen cümle aḥvālūmi
Kişi gördüğinden hikayet ider
Başından geçenden rivayet ider
Cü küffār-ı bī-dīn başub ordumuz
Tolub gebr-ı bī-dīn ile yurdumuz
İraḵdan görüb aňlادuḵ yirimüz
Görümedük emmā biri birimüz
Ṣūtūbān u sā’isle ḥar-bendemüz
Gürizān olub gitdi her bendemüz

\(^1\) Egri Fethi Ta’rīḥi, 6b-7a.
\(^2\) See above, p. 48.
Yıkılmış yatur haymeler zernigün
Güsiste-țınâb u şikeste-sütün

Ne kılmış içinde 'adu almamış
Hzânesi håli büyük kılmamış

* * *

'Adu yir yüzün garâk-1 gün eylemiş
Yeşil sebzeyi lâle-gün eylemiş

* * *

Gözüm yaşı seyl-ı firâvan olub
Başum/ ğişiyä gibi gerdân olub

Bu sevdâ ile nice dem ağladum
Deli görlümi olmege bağladum

Sögbü nefsüme kendüme söylediüm
Trub hâsta câñuma levn eyledüm

"Cihan öldü sen zinde kalmak neden?
Zamân yög ola sen var olmak neden?"

* * *

Degişdüm hemân yoklîga varlığı
Virüb cânî aldum ölüm erligi

* * *

Bu cism-i nahif ü vüçûd-ı za‘îf
Olub ol dem içre peleng-î ‘anîf

* * *

Eger bulmasam dahi tîg-û-sinân
Dişûm tirnâqum yiter idi hemân

1. Egri Fethi Ta’rîhî, 53a-b.
The Eğri Fetih Ta'rihi, completed in 1597 or 1598, is the last work attributed to Ta'lihi-zade.¹ It is most likely that he died in 1602-1609 whilst in Hungary with the retinue of the vezir-i a'zam and serdâr Dâmâd İbrâhîm Paşa.²

Ta'lihi-zade was probably more than 60 years of age at the time of his death. The date of his first important post, as kütîb in the household of Şehzade Murad in Hanisa, may be taken as 1562, by which time he must have been at least twenty years of age and have completed a good education and a training in calligraphy. This would place his birth around the year 1540. Apart from his pride in being a member of the Ferrari family, the gehnâmecî does not mention any close relative nor any children who may have held posts in the legal or secretarial professions. In providing autobiographical data, he displays the conventions of the time, on the one hand complaining of injustice in promotion and meagre reward, whilst on the other taking pride in his heritage and the superiority of the Ottoman state.

---

Ta'lihi-zade's personality is revealed clearly through his writings. He emerges primarily as a sincere and cons-

1. According to the following beyt (73a), the manuscript was completed within a year:

   Bu bir sâlde bu fâkîr-ü-kemin
   Çeken nazma bir böyle dürr-i zemin

2. See above, pp. 68-9.
cientious servant of the state, as a man of good education possessed of an independent and enquiring mind. He was deeply concerned by changing standards in society and government, which he considered could only be for the worse.

Zamâne hayâlât-ı bengî gibi
Perişân olub mûy-î zengî gibi
Dönüb 'aksine devr-i çarş-ı berîn
Emîn ḥâ'în olmişdi ḥâ'în emîn

[ Habâ'îs] -pesend olub ehl-î kalem
Cebân oldî âşâb-ı tabl-û-‘alem

A‘âlî edâni maḳâminda ḫâr
Denî şâhib-ı mesned-ı iftiḥâr¹

* * *

Bir alay ḥâbiq-ı ḥiyanet-pesend
Olur mâl-i şâhi ile ercumend

Taṣî ṭogri içinde egri olan
Minâre gibi ser-bülend-î cihân

Daği rûznâmecî vû vezne-dâr
Yek-êş dúzd bâşed yek-êş perde-dâr

Aşîlmîş terâzû açîlmîş devât
Dimişdîr ikisi ḥâkînda rûvât

Alur biri şuâdînî yazî ile
Birîsi uğurlar terâzû ile²

1. Şehnâme-i Hümayûn, 109a.
2. Ibid., 109b.
He laments in particular the sale of offices:

Çapu çapu dirlik gezüb it gibi
Mezâd olnub mâl-i meyyit gibi
Filürîle manşîb ’alâ mâ yeğâ
Alub şatmada şâhib-i irtisâl

In his relationship to the eminent Fenârî family he took great pride, and was dismayed to see evidence of an increasing lack of respect for such genuinely learned men, whose influence on the conduct of central and local government was being superceded by that of ill-educated men of inferior character.

Velî nice mollâ-yî şâhib-fünûn
Olur dest-fersûde-i devr-i dûn
Düzenmez nigârin-i ra’nâ gibi
Görinmez kitâb içre ma’nâ gibi
Yüzine baḵar yok migâl-i kitâb
Su’âline bir kimse virmez cevâb
Çâlur bî-nümûd ism-i mûbhem gibi
Zevâyâ-yî endûhda ğam gibi
Çü devletlûler itmez ikbâl âna
Cefâlar ider ḵavm-î cûhhâl âna

1. Şehnâme-i Hûmâyûn, 110a.
2. Egri Fethî Ta’rîhi, 5b–6a.
In the Egri Fethi Ta’rîhi he describes symptoms of
disorder in the provinces of which he must have gained
first-hand experience during the periods he spent as a
tahrîr kâtibi. The sipâhi system is being undermined, the
peasantry are suffering in consequence, and there are fewer
brave and expert soldiers available for service with the
army.

Yine Türklerdür kurâyî yalân
Re’âyâyî zûlm âteşine yalân
İder Türkler bir birine kûnî
Hased odina yanar ’âmri gûnî
Ya’kâr cânînî nîr-î reşk-û-hased
Ta’kâr boynîna ṭavî-î ḥablûn mesed
Şaatî tarlasını bozar çiftini
Yolar koparur başının ziftini
Virûr cümle mâlin sipâhi olur
Cihânûnî belâ-î yi siyâhi olur
Re’âyâyî şîr-î be-heybet olur
Veîî ceng vaqtinde ‘avret olur
Dirîğa ki oldî sipêh-keş cebân
Sûrisi-yle beg olur oldî çoban¹

Ta’lıki-zâde considers that literary and historical
works are especially valuable in providing a thread of

¹. Egri Fethî Ta’rîhi, 5a.
continuity in a transient world: unlike the rose, which must soon wither and die, a book once written is a thing of beauty for all time.

Gülistända açılsa verd-i țarî
Gider az zaman içre zîb-û-ferî
Eger bitse bir tâze nâzûk nihâl
Halâşî fenâ şarşarîndan muhâl
Muhaşşal ne kim olur ise şâhîh
Zevâli muşarrer fenâsî şârîh
Bu fânî cihân içre Şâhâ müdâm
Benûm țidmetûm bâkî-vû-mûstedâm
Eger tünd bâd olsa yüz yîl vezân
Fenâ virus bâg-ı bahâra țazân
Bu ferğunde bostâna itmez țûger
Bu zîbâ gülistâna virmez țârâr
Muţarrâ olub dâ‘îmâ gülleri
Perişân olmaya sünbûleri\textsuperscript{1}

In the Gürcistân Seferî, Ta‘lîkî-zâde records a conversation he held, originally in Persian, with the envoy of a Georgian prince; he was obviously in agreement with his companion’s views on the relationships of nobles and scholars to powerful rulers:

\textsuperscript{1} Egri Fethî Ta‘rîhî, 7b.

Thus, Ta'lıkî-zâde was always conscious of the fact that he was writing not only to gratify the Sultan and to establish his own reputation, but that he also had a responsibility for conveying to posterity the aspects and achievements of his time in the best possible light.

In the grammatical commentary accompanying the edited text of the Şehnâme-i Hûmâyûn and in the literary analysis of the manuscript, frequent reference is made to Ta'lıkî-zâde's originality in the use of grammatical constructions and to the peculiarities of his vocabulary and phraseology. Although closely bound to the patterns of ingâ composition, he still manages to retain a considerable degree of independence in expression and the use of imagery. Similarly, he is not content to confine the content of his writing to a strict

¹. Gürçistân Seferî, 13b.
narrative of events, but frequently digresses onto topics of local or personal interest. Aside from the standard device of driving home a point with an anecdote or moral tale from earlier episodes in history or legend,\textsuperscript{1} he introduces interesting details of local history or phenomena which had aroused his curiosity. His information, colourful but not always factually correct, was gained either at first-hand or through a reliable local informant with whom he conversed during the course of a campaign. He recounts, for instance, the legend of the hâcerû 'l-matar, a stone which was said to induce rainfall;\textsuperscript{2} a chapter in the Tebriziye is devoted to information on the Safavid side of the war, which Ta'lïkî-zade had at first-hand from leading citizens of the city after its capture;\textsuperscript{3} the information on the Serbian monastery of Milegeva and its biblical frescoes\textsuperscript{4} was probably derived from descriptions given by local Muslim begs who had dealings with the monks.

In contrast to the heart-felt frustration and despondency which is particularly noticeable before Ta'lïkî-zade's

\begin{enumerate}
\item For example, the hikâyet of Harrûn-î Reşîd and his astronomer, used to illustrate a point in the narrative of the seizure and burning of the remains of St Sava (Şehnâme-i Hümayûn, 35b) or the migâl of 'Âkil ibn Abî Tâlib, in reference to the attitude of the people of Tebriz to Ottoman rule (Tebriziye, 22b-23a).
\item Gürcistân Seferi, 9b-10a.
\item Tebriziye, 24a-33b.
\item Şehnâme-i Hümayûn, 32a-33a.
\end{enumerate}
appointment as șehnâmeci, there is yet an undercurrent of determined optimism running through his writing. The following beyt from the Șemâ'îlnâme expresses Ta'liki-zâde's outlook on life despite the vicissitudes of fortune:

Her nice kim faqīrem gönlüm yine șanīdûr
Bağlandı ise baftum țalbûm yine müşāde

1. Șemâ'îlnâme, 12a.
THE WORKS OF TA’LĪKĪ-ZĀDE

In the European collections of Turkish manuscripts seven titles are attributed to Ta’līkī-zāde; in chronological order, dating from c. 1574 to c. 1598, these are: the Fırsəttnāme, the Gürçistān Seferi, the Tebrīzīye, the Ta’rīh-i Al-i ʿOgmān, the Şemāʾilnāme, the Şehnāme-i Hūmāyūn and the Egri Fethi Ta’rīhi. Five of these manuscripts are unique; the Ta’rīh-i Al-i ʿOgmān and the Şemāʾilnāme are a draft and a revised version respectively of the same text. The Gürçistān Seferi and the Tebrīzīye, which deal with two consecutive campaigns in the Caucasus during the Ottoman-Safavid wars of 1578-1590, and the Şehnāme-i Hūmāyūn and the Egri Fethi Ta’rīhi, dealing with the Hungarian campaigns of 1594 and 1596, are historical monographs written from the author’s first-hand knowledge of events. All the manuscripts, except the Tebrīzīye and the Ta’rīh-i Al-i ʿOgmān, are illustrated with miniature paintings in the Ottoman style of the late sixteenth century. With the exception of the Egri Fethi Ta’rīhi, which is a composition in verse, the manuscripts display a marked consistency in prose style, use of vocabulary and grammatical constructions.

The edited text of the Şehnāme-i Hūmāyūn presented in this thesis may be taken as a characteristic example of Ta’līkī-zāde’s style; a majority of the observations made in the literary analysis of the text may be held to apply equally to his earlier works. A study of the content of this manuscript and the varying emphases placed upon certain
features of the narrative reveals the author's attitude to the writing of official historiography and the position of the şehnâmedi at this time — part panegyrist, part historian. Historical and literary analyses of the Şehnâme-i Hümâyûn are given below in subsequent chapters. There now follows a survey of Ta‘lîkî-zâde's other six manuscripts.

**Firâsetnâme**

The unique copy of this manuscript is located in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris; a note on the fly-leaf states that it was added to the manuscript collection on 15 March 1900.¹ The work does not bear an imperial Ottoman seal, and thus it is not clear whether the manuscript was ever presented to the Sultan or was received into his private collection.² It is a work of 62 folios, containing five miniature paintings.³

Although the manuscript is not dated, there are several indications that it may be the earliest surviving work attributable to Ta‘lîkî-zâde. Firstly, the author identifies himself as "Mehmed ibn Mehmed ibn Mehmed el-Fenârî":⁴

---


2. An apparent erasure on folio la may, however, have removed the Sultan's seal.


4. Firâsetnâme, 4a.
he does not use the fuller description "eq-şehîr bi-Ta'liki-zade", nor the mahlas Subhi. There is no allusion to the reputation of the Fenari family, nor any mention of their long service to the state — there is, in fact, no autobiographical information whatsoever in this work, nor any hint of the complaints of neglect and frustration voiced in later works. This humble introduction, together with the fact that in this text only Ta'likl-zade provides his grandfather's name, suggests that the author was then little known and a comparatively young man. Secondly, in dedicating the work to the reigning sultan, Murad III, the author states that it was written in haste ('icalete '1-vakt); it is possible that it was composed at short notice as a gift for Murad on his accession to the throne in 1574. Finally, and to quell any doubts that this is a work by Ta'likl-zade, a comparison of the text, folios 2b-3b, may be made with folios 120a-b of the Semâ'ilnâme: the latter section is taken almost verbatim from the earlier work, with certain amendments, usually the extension and improvement of sec' constructions. From such evidence it is possible to consider the Firâsêtnâmê as the earliest of

1. Nevertheless, it has not been possible to identify which member of the Fenari family this may have been; the name Mehmed occurs very frequently in the genealogy.

2. Firâsêtnâmê, 2b.

3. Also, the rubâ'i on folio 4a is identical with that on folio 12b of the Şehnâmê-i Hûmâyûn.
Ta’lîkî-zâde’s seven known manuscripts, probably composed in 1575 or shortly afterwards.

The text is similar in style to that of Ta’lîkî-zâde’s other prose works, the basic Turkish narrative being frequently interrupted by snatches of Persian poetry and quotations from the Koran, hadîg and Arabic proverbs. The character of the work closely resembles that of the Şemâ’il-nâme, although the anecdotes and illustrative features of the latter are drawn principally from the Ottoman and later Islamic periods, whereas the Firâsetnâme culls its examples mainly from the lives of şeyhs of an earlier era, such as Şâfi‘î and Ḥâjjâlî. It is a "traité de physiognomonie", describing how the true character of a man may be discerned from his outward features.

A short introduction, in a carefully constructed inşâ style, is followed (folio 4a) by a section entitled "Mukaddeme der firâset" in which the term is defined. There follow two sections, or fasls, the first dealing primarily with the effect of varying climates upon the human temperament and appearance (12a–24b), the second describing characteristics to be noted in the process of firâset (24b ff.). The language employed in these two fasls is a more straightforward narrative Turkish, appropriate to the discursive, story-telling nature of the text. The manuscript concludes (6ab–62a) with eight Turkish beyts seeking the Sultan’s favour for both the work and its author.
The sole copy of this manuscript of 33 folios is located in the Topkapı Sarayı Library, Revan 1300, and is described in the catalogue of that collection under the title Gazavāt-i ‘Ogmān Paṣa.\(^1\) Since the original title of the work is missing — the space provided for it at the head of the first folio of the text, 1b, being left blank — the manuscript is known by various names. Folio la bears a later title Ta’rīḫ-i Gazavāt-i Özdemir-zāde ‘Ogmān Paṣa, from which the above catalogue entry is taken. This is, however, inaccurate; the work does not deal with any of the campaigns of Özdemir-oğlu ‘Ogmān Paṣa, but with the operations of the main Ottoman army in the Caucasus under the command of the serdār Ferḥād Paṣa during the year 992/1584. The work has also been termed the Revānīye\(^2\) but this, too, is misleading since it does not cover in detail the more important campaign of the previous year, 991/1583, during which the fortress of Revān was captured and refortified by Ferḥād Paṣa. The text is concerned with the events of the following year, which may to some extent be considered an extension of the Revān campaign, since Ferḥād Paṣa remained serdār and had wintered in Erzurum in preparation for a new offensive deeper into the Caucasus; on the other hand, Ta’līkī-zāde himself refers to the Revān and Tömnānīs

---

1. TSTYK I, 232-3, no. 704. The manuscript contains one miniature, f. 10b, depicting Ferḥād Paṣa holding council outside a newly-constructed fortress, probably Tömnānīs.

2. ‘OM III, 34; GOW, 167-8.
campaigns as two separate operations\(^1\) and would probably have preferred a more distinct title for the work. The manuscript has also been called simply Tarihçe.\(^2\) While this avoids the erroneous implications of the two previous titles, it gives no indication of the subject of the work. For this thesis the alternative title Gürçistan Seferi is preferred,\(^3\) which recognizes the inaccuracy of the earlier titles and is more specific than Tarihçe.

The author identifies himself as "bu ḥaḵīr-i nā-murād ve dil-gīr-i nā-ḵād ḵangīn-i nā-kām ẕubhī-yi mūstehām es-ḵehr bi-Ta'liḵī-zāde" (3a).\(^4\) This is the first of his works in which Ta'līḵī-zāde identifies himself by the mahlas ẕubhī; it does not appear in the Şemā'ilnāme, the Şehnāme-i Hūmâyūn or the Egri Fethi Ta'rīhī. Although modern writers frequently refer to him as ẕubhī, it seems likely that he was not generally known thus among his contemporaries: Selānīḵī refers to him as "Ta'līḵī-zāde Meḥmed ẕelebī Efendi"

1. Tebrīzīye, 9a; Şemā'ilnāme, 12b.
2. Bekir Kütükoğlu, Osmanlı-İran Sivāsi Münâsebetleri I, 1578-1590 (İstanbul 1962) and, following him, F. M. Kirzioğlu, Osmanlîlar'ın Kafkas-Elleleri'ni Fethi (1451-1590) (Ankara 1976). According to the latter, the work contains a number of miniature paintings, whereas in fact there is only one. He also refers to Ta'līḵī-zāde as "sefer kātibi", which might imply that he had a post of some importance; the manuscript itself merely says that he was one of a group of kātībs working under the supervision of Lām 'Ali ẕelebī.
3. A. S. Levend, Ḟazavāt-nāmeler (Ankara 1956) 91, introduces this title as more appropriate than Ta'rīh-i Ḟazavāt-i ẕedemir-zāde 'Osmān Pāşa.
4. Only later in the text does Ta'līḵī-zāde allude to his descent from the Fenārī family (29b). The mahlas ẕubhī occurs a second time in one of the beyts of the colophon (33a).
and 'Alī calls him simply "Ta'ilīkī-zāde".¹

The Gürçistan Seferi is similar in format to the Şehnâmé-i Hūmâyûn. It comprises an introduction, in which Ta'ilīkī-zāde sketches his career very briefly and describes his appointment to the corps of kātibîs employed on the eastern campaign under the supervision of Lâm 'Alī Çelebi, the former re'isû 'l-küttâb; there follow six chapters (5b onwards) narrating the course of events in Georgia during the campaigning season of 1534. The chapter headings are in Persian, usually in the form "Güftâr ender ... ".

The theme of the narrative is Ferhâd Paşa's campaign of 992/1534 in Georgia. Having strongly fortified Revân the previous autumn, the serdâr's intention was to consolidate the Ottoman position in that region of the frontier by capturing and refortifying a number of strongholds guarding the route to Tiflis. At that time Tiflis was in Ottoman hands, but was in constant danger of being isolated from the Ottoman frontier provinces by the attacks of local hostile Georgian and Kizilbag troops. The chief fortress to be occupied by the Ottomans in 1534 was Tōmânîs. From here Ferhâd Paşa appointed a new beglerbegi for Tiflis and sent him thither in the company of the Beglerbegi of Anatolia, Riğvân Paşa, and forty thousand men with a convoy of arms and provisions for the garrison (14b-16a). At Tiflis Riğvân Paşa was met by Dâ'ûd Yân, a Georgian prince and former ruler of Tiflis, who desired to render obedience to the Sultan.

¹. Selânikî, 133b; 'Alî, 604a. Bekir Kütükoğlu and F. M. Kirzioglu both refer to the author in footnotes as Şubî. 
On the return journey to Tömenis, the forces of Ridvân Paşa and Dâ'ûd Hân were ambushed and almost defeated by a combined force of Georgians, led by Dâ'ûd's brother Simûn, and Kızılbaş, led by İmâm Külü Hân. The timely arrival of a relief force finally ensured an Ottoman victory (23a-27b). Ta'llkl-zade, who had been sent with the reinforcements, was assigned by Ridvân Paşa to ride ahead with the news to Ferhâd Paşa at Tömenis. The safe arrival of Ridvân Paşa and Dâ'ûd Hân at the camp was celebrated, and many of the successful participants — but excluding Ta'llkl-zade! — rewarded with an increase in salary or with promotion.¹

The text concludes (33a-b) with a number of Turkish beyts in which Subhî dedicates his work to the reigning sultan, Murâd III. The manuscript bears no date of completion.

As in the text of the Şehnâme-i Hümayûn, the narrative sequence of the Gürcistân Seferi is frequently interrupted to allow for anecdotes from earlier periods of Islamic history, and for digressions of historical or local interest. On the one hand, Ta'llkl-zade recalls the legend of the hâcerû 'l-maţar, which was current amongst the Arabs, the Persians and the Uzbeks (9b-10a), whilst on the other, he reports a conversation he held, originally in Persian, with an envoy from the Georgian prince Minûçehr who had arrived at the Ottoman camp during the building of the new fortress of Tömenis; one of the main topics discussed was the ambiguous

¹. The narrative may be compared with the purely factual account presented by Bekir Kütükoğlu, op. cit., 135-41, for which a study was made of all the principal contemporary histories. Cf. also F. M. Kirzioglu, op. cit., 351-5, where certain details are taken from Ta'llkl-zade's account.
position held by the late Mîrzâ 'Alî Paşa, former beglerbegi of Tiflis, on the Ottoman-Safavid border; another was the unfavourable position of men of letters at the court of a ruler preoccupied with military affairs (11a-13a).

**Tebrîziye**

The only known copy of the Tebrîziye manuscript is located in the Topkapı Sarayi Library, catalogued as Revan 1299, under the title *Murâd-nâme veyâ Tibrizîye.* As in the case of the Gürçistân Seferi, there is no visible title on the first folio of the text; in contrast, however, to the title *Revâniye* for the previous work, *Tebrîziye* is appropriate here, since the text deals fully with Özdemir-oğlu 'Osmân Paşa's Tebriz campaign of 1585; it is the title most generally used for this manuscript. It is a work of 59 folios, containing no miniature paintings. Although it, too, bears no date of completion, it was probably written fairly soon after the occurrence of the events it describes, and certainly before Ta'îlîkî-zâde became şeynâmeçî, since this appointment is not mentioned therein.

The same format is employed for the arrangement of the text: the introduction is longer, and the amount of information on Ta'îlîkî-zâde's career greater than in the Gürçistân

---


2. Only A. S. Levend, *Gazavat-nâmeler,* 90-1, prefers the title *Murâd-nâme.* Other works generally use the title *Tebrîziye,* e.g. *OM* III, 34, and Bekir Kütükoğlu, *op. cit.*, x.
Seferi; the author identifies himself as "Meḥmed ibn Meḥmed el-Fenārī es-şehīr bi-Taʾlīḵī-zāde". The account of his twelve years service in the household of şeyzāde Murād at Manisa, his disappointment at not receiving a more prestigious appointment on Murād III's accession than that of dīvān kātibi, and his annoyance at the frustration of his career hopes since that time are recounted at length in a more elaborate prose style than that used anywhere in the Gūrcīstān Seferi. From a literary point of view, the Tebrīzīye shows throughout a greater degree of skill and care in its composition than would appear from the text of the previous manuscript. The historical narrative, beginning on folio 11a, is divided into eight chapters, the headings of which are in Persian, the majority beginning "Gūftār ender ...".

Taʾlīḵī-zāde participated in this campaign also as a kātib, but in a more important capacity than during that of Tōmānîs the previous year. He mentions that Üzdemir-oğlî 'Oğmān Paşa, recognizing his talent in the art of ingā composition, singled him out to become his principal secretary; in reward for these services, Taʾlīḵī-zāde received a 5,000 akçe tīmār.

The narrative commences with 'Oğmān Paşa's departure from winter quarters in Kastamonu [in Rebiʿī ʾl-Āhir 993/ April 1585] and his march to Tebriz via Erzurum, Çaldırān,

1. Tebrīzīye, 2a-3b.
2. Tebrīzīye, 9b-10a. See above, p. 81.
Hoy, Marand and Süfiyân, where the first conflict with Ḥamza Mīrzā's Kızılbaş troops occurred. Tebriz itself was captured without much difficulty and the work of strengthening the fortifications of the city immediately taken in hand. Ta'liḳī-zâde reports a discussion he himself held with a number of the leading citizens of Tebriz (24a-30a), and, on their authority, relates certain events in, and concerning, the city immediately prior to the Ottoman conquest: their initial pleas for aid had been ignored by both the Şāh [Muḥammad Ḫūdābende] and his son Ḥamza Mīrzā, and it was only on receipt of information from Türkmān Ībrāhīm Ḫān, imprisoned in Erzurum, that the rumours of 'Ogmān Paşa's advance on Tebriz were taken seriously in Kazvîn.

In the Şehnâme-i Hūmâyûn, Ta'liḳī-zâde describes some of the more notable architectural features of Yanık, in particular its church; similarly, in the Tebrîziye he dwells on the Şāh's palace at Şâhîb-Ābād (which 'Ogmān Paşa reduced to the status of a military fortress, hisâr, 30a-b), the mosque built by the Akkoyunlu ruler Uzun Hasan (31b-32a), and the luxurious mansion of Türkmān Emîr Ḫān-ı Leng (33b-36b).

The Kızılbaş army of Ḥamza Mīrzā hovered constantly around Tebriz whilst the Ottomans were in occupation of the city, and frequent skirmishes took place. A plot by the şī'i inhabitants to co-ordinate an uprising against the

1. An account of this campaign is found in Bekir Kütükoğlu, op. cit., 142-61. Cf. also Dnş, III, 80-100.
occupying troops with a full-scale attack from the Kızılbaşg outside was discovered and resulted in a massacre of the citizens. Ta’lîkî-zâde points out that this was a spontaneous reaction on the part of the Ottoman soldiery, and was not carried out in accordance with either the wish or the command of ‘Ogmân Paşa (41b-42b).

During this period the serdar ‘Ogmân Paşa became gravely ill and, shortly after the return march had begun, died. In tribute to him, Ta’lîkî-zâde gives a resumé of his career, listing his principal achievements — quelling an Arab revolt in the Yemen, the conquest of Şîrîvan, holding Demûr Kapu as an Ottoman outpost in Dağıstan, his battles with numerically superior Kızılbaşg forces led by İmâm Kuli Şân, his part in deposing the rebel Şân of the Crimea, Meşmed Girây II, and his conquest of Tebriz (46a-51a).

The narrative concludes with the return march of the Ottoman army under the command of Çığala-zâde Sinân Paşa via Selmâs and Van to Bitlis. Ta’lîkî-zâde allows himself a final digression on the Kurdish Şâns of Bitlis, of whom his own contemporary Şeref Şân was an Ottoman vassal and provided a valuable contingent of Kurds for the Sultan’s army in the eastern campaigns.

The text ends abruptly, with no hâtime. It is concluded by two beyts reflecting Ta’lîkî-zâde’s continued state of misfortune; this is particularly poignant in view of the fact that the death of ‘Ogmân Paşa had recently deprived the author of a valued and potentially influential patron:

Bu ‘âlem IGNALININ cümle mu‘ayyen bir mekânı var
Benüm yokdur mekânım sâye-i dîvardan  góyri
This manuscript is located in the Oesterreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, and is described in Flügel's catalogue of the Arabic, Persian and Turkish manuscripts of that collection. The work bears no original title; a note on folio 1a reads "Gahīb hāze 'l-kitāb, Ta'rif-i Al-ī 'Ogmān, 'Alī Rīzā ibn Sūleymān, sene 1219 [1804-5]"; from this the title Ta'rif-i Al-ī 'Ogmān is derived. It is a work of 154 folios, containing no miniature paintings.

The work is a draft of the Șemā'ılnāme. A comparison of the two manuscripts reveals an almost exact correspondence between the first section of the Ta'rif, to folio 99a, and the Șemā'ılnāme to folio 77b. The text of the Ta'rif is

1. Tebrizīye, 58b-59a.
2. G. Flügel, Die arabischen, persischen und türkischen Handschriften der Kaiserlich-Königlichen Hofbibliothek (Vienna 1865), vol. II, 234-5. Babinger, GOW, 168, understood this manuscript to be the same as both the Șemā'ılnāme and the Șehnāme-i Hümāyûn, whereas, in fact, it is totally distinct from the latter.
3. A majority of the folios bear marginal additions at right-angles to the text in the form of quotations from the Koran, and Arabic, or occasionally Turkish, sayings and proverbs. A note on folio 112b shows that these were later additions, made by the owner of the manuscript 'Alī Rīzā ibn Sūleymān, in Șevvāl 1224/November 1809; they are written in a fine șūlūq hand, indicating that 'Alī Rīzā had received training as a professional calligrapher.
then interrupted and recommenced halfway down folio 99b in the middle of a sentence. Another hand has added a provisional sub-title — "Vaṣf-1 mūlūk-i Cingiziyān" — for this section of the text (which deals firstly with the Mongols and the Jāns of the Crimea); this led Flügel to treat the second section of the text as another, distinct manuscript, although he suspected the style to be that of Taʿlīkī-zāde. This later section of the Taʿrīḥ-i ʿAl-ī ʿOgmān (to folio 145a) is, compared with the corresponding text of the ʾṢemāʿʾilnāme, less complete; section titles are missing and several folios left partially blank. The material was considerably rearranged when incorporated into the ʾṢemāʿʾilnāme; lacunae in the text of the Taʿrīḥ have been supplied in the later manuscript, together with a considerable number of additions and amendments to the text, some quite lengthy.

Although the work claims to describe twenty excellent qualities — "yigirmi ʿaṣāʾis-i ʿaẓīme ve ʿaṣāʾil-i cesīme" — possessed by the Ottoman sultans, only seventeen such attributes are dealt with in either manuscript: a small portion of the text thus appears to have been lost.¹ The contents of the Taʿrīḥ-i ʿAl-ī ʿOgmān will not be summarized here, since the text is for the greater part identical with that of the ʾṢemāʿʾilnāme. Reference in other chapters of this thesis will, therefore, be made solely to the ʾṢemāʿʾilnāme and may be considered to comprehend the Taʿrīḥ also.

¹. i.e. between 145a and 146a of the Taʿrīḥ-i ʿAl-ī ʿOgmān, and between 115b and 116a of the ʾṢemāʿʾilnāme.
It should be noted that the final section of the Ta’rīḥ-i ʿAl-i ʿOgmān (146a-154b), beginning with a résumé of the purported twenty qualities, is no longer a draft of the ʿSemāʾīlnāme, but is itself copied from that work at a slightly later date. Two factors lead to this conclusion. Firstly, the ḫātimetūʾ l-kitāb has been restored to its rightful position at the end of the work.1 Secondly, in a revised and corrected list of the 42 beglerbegiliks of the empire,2 the provinces of Yanık and Papa have been added, neither of which was established as a beglerbegilik until 1594, only to be lost to the Habsburgs again in 1598. Since it is known that the ʿSemāʾīlnāme was presented to Murād III in 1002/1593, before the capture of these fortresses, one may conclude that the final folios of the Ta’rīḥ were copied and amended between 1594 and 1598.

The entire text of the Ta’rīḥ-i ʿAl-i ʿOgmān, including the later additional section, is written in a fine nesh hand which appears to be the work of a single calligrapher. It is probable that this is the hand of Taʿlīkī-zāde himself; in his training as a kātib he would have studied not only the art of insā composition, but also that of calligraphy, and would have been unlikely to have employed a copyist to work on the draft of a manuscript.

1. In addition to the fact that a short section of the text is wanting, several folios of the ʿSemāʾīlnāme were displaced and bound incorrectly into the volume; see following page.

Şemâ'ilnâme-i Al-î 'Ogmân

This manuscript of 125 folios is located in the Topkapı Sarayî Library, Ahmed III 3592, catalogued under the title Şâh-nâme veyâ Şemâ'il-nâme-i al-î 'Ogmân.1 Although folios 1b and 2a are missing, Şemâ'ilnâme-i Al-î 'Ogmân as written in two separate hands on folio 1a probably represents the original title. The work contains twelve miniature paintings, one of which is a detailed representation of Murâd III's residence while şehzâde in Manisa. The Ta'rîh-i Al-î 'Ogmân is an initial version of this work,2 whilst a summary, somewhat inaccurate, of its principal contents is given in the introduction to the Şehnâme-i Hûmâyûn. Although the Şemâ'ilnâme bears no date of completion, information in the Şehnâme-i Hûmâyûn indicates that it was presented to Murâd III in the year 1002/late 1593.3

1. TSTYK II, 371, no. 3030. In view of the fact that folio 40a is duplicated in the manuscript, and also that the microfilm used in this study lacks one of the double page miniatures (with no indication of where it is included), the manuscript is here regarded as having only 123 folios. Some confusion occurred when the separate folios were bound together, and also in the copying of the final folios after 115b, resulting in certain sections being wrongly placed. The correct order of the folios appears to be: 2b-32b; 39a-43b; 33a-38b; 44a-119a; 120a-123b; 119b (the ḥâtime).

2. See previous section.

3. Şehnâme-i Hûmâyûn, 11b. Folios 4b-11b of this work summarize the contents of the Şemâ'ilnâme; points of correspondence between the two manuscripts and the Ta'rîh-i Al-î 'Ogmân are indicated in the notes accompanying the edited text of the Şehnâme-i Hûmâyûn.
The Şemāʿ ilnāme contains the most comprehensive account of Taʿlīkī-zāde's career to date. Following an elaborate and lengthy introduction in which the work is dedicated to the reigning sultan (referred to merely as "ḥaẓret-i Pādişāh"), the author, identifying himself as "Mehmed ibn Mehmed el-Fenārī eş-şehir bi-Taʿlīkī-zāde", recounts the stages of his career through various turns of fortune, culminating in his appointment as şehnāmeći. This is the first work composed by Taʿlīkī-zāde in this official capacity, although there is no indication of when the appointment was made. The author refers to his participation in the Revān, Tōmānīs and Tebriz campaigns, but does not mention his previous monographs on the two latter topics, nor his earlier composition, the Pirāsetnāme.

Taʿlīkī-zāde outlines the considerations which lay behind his composition of the Şemāʿ ilnāme in a chapter entitled "Güftār ender tertīb-i şāhnāme-i cevherî-terkīb" (14b-17b). Just as Firdevsī was commissioned by Sultan Mahmūd-i Gaznevī to versify the Şāhnāme so that it might stand as a model and exemplar of the bravest feats of courage and daring, so Taʿlīkī-zāde determined to compose a work designed to display the principal features which distinguished the rule of the Ottoman sultans and to represent their state

1. Şemāʿ ilnāme, 5b.

2. Şemāʿ ilnāme, 9a. The autobiographical account finishes on folio 14b; the above chapter on Taʿlīkī-zāde's career draws heavily upon this section.
as the ideal of sovereignty. He reiterates the view that literature is principally responsible for immortalizing the great deeds of the past, and that lessons may be learnt from the study of history. In accordance with this, the Şemâ'ilnâme will discuss twenty "hâssa-ı hasene ve şîme-i müstahsene" pertaining to the Ottoman dynasty.

The first two hâssa stress the Islamic heritage of the Ottoman sultans and the inclusion of the holy cities of Mecca and Medina within their domains (21b-24a). The third section, "Mevhebe-i hâliše-ı gâlîse mezîyetû 'l-ibn 'ale 'l-ebdûr" (24a-32b, 39a-43b, 33a-35a), emphasizes the fact that only in the Ottoman family has there been a succession of strong rulers, each of which has built upon the conquests and power of his predecessors. The personal bravery, şecâ'at, peculiar to the members of this dynasty is the subject of the fourth section (35a-38b).

The title "Hâssa-ı hâmise kuvvet-i naşâîye" opens an interesting chapter — which is by far the longest, from folio 44a to folio 78b inclusive — on the value of poetry and literature in the Ottoman empire. After an introduction on the art of poetical composition, including examples in Arabic of the kâmil, hezec, recez and serî' metres, Ta'llîkî-zâde demonstrates the very close links of the ruling family, sultans and şehzâdes down to the time of Selîm II, with

1. This kind of work was a feature of the şehnâmecilik during the reign of Murâd III. See above, pp. 60-1.
the leading poets and literary men of their time. He quotes examples of their poetry and recounts anecdotes concerning their relations with famous poets such as Ahmed Paşa, Hayālī and Bākī. Folios 52b–60b are devoted to an account of the life of Sultan Cem and include information on the papal court in Rome and the election of a pope by the college of cardinals. This is followed by a section on the sehzhades Ahmed and Čorhud, sons of Bāyezīdd II, and later by an account of the lives and poetry of the sehzhades Muṣṭafā and Bāyezīdd, sons of Sultan Süleymān.

The value of Istanbul as an imperial city, its beauty and its importance as a focal point for trade and communications are the themes of the sixth hāssa (79a–81a), whilst the thirteenth and fourteenth emphasize the geographical extent of the empire, and the fifteenth the importance of having command over both land and sea (101b–102a, 102a–b and 102b respectively). The seventeenth hāssa deals with the Sultan's role in maintaining the peace and prosperity of his extensive realms, whilst the twelfth points to the fact that there is no record in previous history to show that a single state has embraced so many peoples of differing race and divergent religious beliefs as does the Ottoman empire (114b–115b and 101a–b respectively). The Sultan is also responsible for appointing minor rulers, and here Ta'lıḳī-zāde is thinking principally of the position of the hāns of the Crimea vis-à-vis the Ottoman state, and gives a detailed account of the origins of the khanate ("On
altinci ğäsga-ı 'ālī-șān şāh-nișān olduklarıldur", 102b-114b).  

The seventh ğäsga (81a-84a) details the sovereign power of the Ottoman state against which no rebel has been successful, whilst the following section deals with leşker-perveri, i.e. the Ottoman military organization, comparing it favourably with the Kızılbaş tribal forces of the Safavid state and the weakness of hostile European rulers who do not maintain a well-trained standing army (84a-92b). The eleventh ğäsga tells of a number of foreign princes who have fled their own countries to seek help from the Ottoman sultans, in particular Leşkeri Mīrzā, brother of the Mogul ruler Hūmāyūn Şāh, and Elḵās Mīrzā, brother of Şāh Tāhmāsb, both of whom sought refuge with, and assistance from, Sūleymān (96a-101a). The ninth and tenth ğaṣā'iš describe the purity of both physical and spiritual tempers of the sultans of the Ottoman house (93a-95b).

The text relating to the final three ğaṣā'is is missing from both the Şemā'ilnāme and the Ta'riḥ-i Āl-i 'Ogmān; both, however, contain the final folios of the work, in which Tā'liḳī-zāde renews his praise of the Ottoman dynasty and recapitulates on certain features of their rule and personal qualities. 2 A ḥātime (119b) consisting of 26 Turkish beyts, concludes the Şemā'ilnāme, renewing the dedication to the Sultan; neither the author's name nor that of the artist or artists who illustrated the work is mentioned.

1. This is the section entitled "Vasf-ı mülük-ı Cingiziyân" in the Ta’riḥ-i Āl-i ‘Ogmān, 99b.
2. A short section from folios 120a-b has been taken from the Fīrāsetnāme, 2b-3b.
The Şemā'ılnāme is typical of Ta'liḵī-zāde's style of prose narration, the basic Turkish text being explained and enlarged by numerous beyts in Persian, Turkish and Arabic, and illustrated by Koranic quotations, hadīs and Arabic proverbs. The format of the work is dictated by its contents, the twenty ḥasā'is, which are preceded by a chapter on the preparation of the manuscript and a preface on some of the pre-Ottoman Muslim dynasties, and followed by a resumé and a ḥātime. The text throughout is characterized by the use of sec' in balanced, rhyming clauses with a large percentage of Persian and Arabic vocabulary, in contrast to Ta'liḵī-zāde's earlier work of this type, the Firāsetnāme, the language of which is predominantly Turkish.

Şehnāme-i Hūmāyūn

In the külliyāt of Ta'liḵī-zāde this is the penultimate work. It was composed, for the most part, in the year 1595, shortly after the occurrence of the Hungarian campaign of which it treats. The contents of this work are described and analyzed more fully from both an historical and a literary point of view in subsequent chapters.

Egri Fethi Ta'rīhi

This is the final manuscript attributed to Ta'liḵī-zāde; the only known copy is catalogued Hazine 1609 in the Topkapı
The original title of the work is given on folio 2b as Şehnâme-i Sultan-i Selâtîn-i Cihân, whilst a later note on folio la describes the manuscript as "Egri fetihi mûte'allik muşavver-û-manzûm ta'rifdûr". From this the alternative title Egri Fethi Ta'rifî has been derived, and is preferred in this thesis in order to avoid confusion with the immediately preceding work, the Şehnâme-i Hümâyûn. The two principal topics of the work are the capture of the Hungarian fortress of Egri — for which Mehmed III was acclaimed "Egri fâtihi" — and the defeat of the Habsburg army at the battle of Haçova, both of which took place in October 1596. It is a work of 74 folios, containing four miniature paintings by one of the leading Ottoman artists of the day, Nakkaş Hasan.

1. TSTYK I, 244, no. 741, under the title Şeh-nâme-i Sultan Mehmed III. The author's mahlas is given incorrectly as Nigarî; this arises from a misreading of the following beyt (73a):

   جکوب قیام تحریر، دژم آلبَدَم
   نکارِی شاهِ عزم آلبَدَم

   Çekûb kayd-i ta'hrîre nazm eyledm

   Nigar-i pey-i Şâna 'azm eyledm

   The mahlas Subhî does not appear in this work. The catalogue entry does not name Ta'likî-zâde as the author of the manuscript.

2. Gazavât-nâmeler, 97-8, where the work is correctly attributed to the şehnâmeçi Ta'likî-zâde.

3. Egri Fethi Ta'rifî, 74a:

   Hüsûsâ ki īstâd-î Bihzâd-zâd
   Hasan nâm mânend-î Mânî-yi râd

   Bu şîrîn/
The Egri Fethi Ta’rīḫī differs from Ta’ilikī-zāde’s other works in that it is written not in prose but in verse, in the mütekārīb metre of the original Şahnāme of Firdevsī. The vocabulary and linguistic style are almost exclusively Turkish; the Arabic content is extremely small, and limited to a few scattered mīrā’s and a handful of short Koranic quotations. Similarly, the percentage of Persian beyts found in the work is negligible; of the eighteen chapter headings of the main narrative (folio 12a onwards), only one is in Persian and the remaining seventeen in Turkish. These usually take the form "Bu dāsitān ... -dūgidūr" and are of varying length, in two cases extending to a second folio and providing in fact a prose account of the verse narrative which follows.

Ta’ilikī-zāde does not identify himself by name in the introduction to this work, stating merely that he is a member of the illustrious Fenārī family; later in the manuscript, whilst describing his own part in the fighting at Haçova, he identifies himself as "şahnāme-gûy-1 faẖīr

(3 cont’d): Bu şirin sözüme halayet virür  
Benim naşmuma naḵši süret virür

Cf. Stchoukine, 94, 135 (who, following Karatay, attributes the work to Nigārī); the miniatures are as follows: (i) Mehmed III receiving Hungarian leaders from Egri (26b-27a); (ii) the battle of Haçova (50b-51a); (iii) the triumphal entry of Mehmed III into Istanbul at the conclusion of the campaign (67b-68a); (iv) a small painting at the foot of the final folio depicting the author, the artist and the calligrapher at work on the manuscript. Reproductions of these four miniatures are given in Zeren Tanındı, "Nakkaş Hasan Paşa", Sanat, no. 6, June 1977, 114 ff.
Ta'liḳī-yi ḥakīr". ¹ He refers to his service with ṣehzāde Murād and his later appointment as ṣehnāmeçi, but does not attempt to provide a complete account of his own career; since he now holds a recognized post at court, his former complaints of neglect and unfair treatment have no place in the Egri Fethi Ta'rīhi. The introduction to the work is instead composed mainly of warning and counsel to Mehmed III on what Ta'liḳī-zâde considered to be some of the less commendable developments evident in government and society of the day. This section may be compared with the chapter in verse entitled "Ja贝尔 ämeden-i müjde-i cülüs-i hūmāyūn" in the Ṣehnâme-i Hūmāyūn. ²

The historical narrative commences with a brief reference to the previous campaign in Hungary which had resulted in the capture of Yanık, and to the continued depredations of the enemy on Muslim lands, which was the reason for undertaking a campaign against Egri. ³ The army, led by the Sultan himself, marched unhindered to Egri and immediately laid siege to the fortress. Despite shortage of provisions due to transport difficulties caused by the loss of some twenty thousand pack animals through disease, and despite heavy rain which increased difficulty of movement, bombardment of the walls was continued and attempts made to lay

3. See below, p. 169. This reference to the Yanık campaign is another indication that the later "postcript" section of the Ṣehnâme-i Hūmāyūn was intended to provide a background for this work and thus link the two manuscripts. *Dns* III, 167-81, provides a chronology of events during this campaign.
mines. On the fall of the outer fortress [11 Šafer 1005/4 October 1596] the Hungarian garrison defending the inner citadel soon concluded that resistance was hopeless; the fortress was surrendered a week later.

Five or six days were spent repairing the fortifications of Egri, appointing an Ottoman garrison and arranging for an adequate supply of provisions. During this period, a Tatar contingent under the command of the kalây Feth Girây Ģân was received into the camp (31a). He brought news of a large concentration of Habsburg forces not far away and encouraged the Sultan to take the offensive in launching an attack upon them. A reconnaissance party, led by the vezîr Ca'fer Paşa, sent to investigate the enemy position, met with defeat and suffered many losses at enemy hands. A council of war was held and the decision taken to attack at once (35a): Ta'lîkî-zâde records the feelings of the Ottoman commanders that it would be preferable to make a stand and fight, rather than be forced to make a long retreat (10 or 15 days) back to Belgrade, which would cause great hardship amongst the troops and, because of the fact that battle had not been joined, would lead to demoralization and a loss of prestige. Accordingly, the army left Egri and took up a battle position. Ta'lîkî-zâde does not comment upon the relative strengths of the opposing positions — in which the Austrian army had chosen its ground and the Ottomans were in the open and on the offensive.1

1. An account of the battle of Hagova is given by Sir Charles Oman, A history of the art of war in the sixteenth century (London 1937), 746 ff.
On the second day battle was begun in earnest, the Ottoman troops being commanded by the vezir-i aʿzam Dāmād Ibrāhīm Paşa. Taʿlīkī-zāde refers to the rout of the Anatolian troops on the left wing of the army, although he does not specify it as such (41a). Advancing in pursuit of the fleeing Anatolian sipahi, the enemy came upon the Sultan's camp and surrounded it; the treasury was seized and a Christian standard erected therein (44b). There follows a vivid account of the desperate fighting centred about the person of the Sultan, Taʿlīkī-zāde reporting the words of encouragement given Mehmed III by the Kapu Ağası, the Silāhdar Ağası and many other officers of the imperial household. The standard of the Prophet was raised aloft, and with this as encouragement the Sultan's retinue succeeded in driving off the enemy. The final defeat of the Austrians left the Ottoman army in possession of a considerable number of abandoned guns and military equipment, much of which was later sent to the garrison at Egri. Before setting out on the return march to Belgrade, a troop review was held: rewards and promotions were made to those who had displayed great courage in the battle, whilst those of the Anatolian cavalry who had fled the field were punished in their absence by being deprived of their fiefs (60b).

1. A number of beyts describing Taʿlīkī-zāde's own participation in the battle are given above, pp. 87-8.

2. The effect of this action on the celâlî disturbances in Anatolia is discussed by M. Akdağ, Celâlî Isyanları 1550-1603 (Ankara 1943), 183-9, who points out that similar punishment had on occasion been meted out by both Selīm I and Süleyman.
The triumphant return march to Istanbul was marked at Belgrade, Sofia and Edirne by public rejoicing and the firing of cannon in salute. On arrival outside Istanbul, the Sultan Valide and leading members of the palace household came out to meet Mehmed III at Da'ud Paşa and prepare a welcome for him (64a-65b). Meanwhile, inside the city the kā'im-makām Ḥasan Paşa organized a public welcome: the streets, shops and houses were decorated as for a holiday, and the people arrayed in their finest clothes lined the route along which the Sultan would pass. Ta'likī-zade describes vividly Mehmed III's ceremonial entry into the city and the tremendous excitement it produced amongst people of every station and from every walk of life; he mentions in particular the Persian envoy, who came with his retinue to offer congratulations on the victory (67b-73a).

The manuscript concludes with a dedication to Mehmed III and an acknowledgement to the celebrated nakkāś Ḥasan, who was responsible for illustrating the work. Although no specific date is given for completion of the manuscript, Ta'likī-zade indicates that the text was composed in the space of a year;¹ thus it was probably presented to the Sultan early in 1598.

---

1. Egri Fethi Ta'rihi, 73a:

Ki kılmışdı Firdevsî gibi imām
Otuş yılda Şehnāmesini tamām
Bu bir sälde ben faẖīr-ū-kemin
Çekem naźma bir böyle dürr-i şemin
In the Egri Fethi Ta’rīḥi, in contrast to his other historical monographs, the Gürçistān Seferi, the Tebriziye and the Şehnâme-i Hümâyûn, Ta’lîkî-zâde introduces into the narrative sequence of the text very little by way of anecdote or of historical or geographical digression; there is no description of the captured fortress of Egri comparable to the information given on Tûmânîs, Tebriz or Yanîk in the previous works. The account is of a more factual nature, with less rhetorical embellishment, and is therefore easier to utilize as an historical source. However, advantages and disadvantages in Ta’lîkî-zâde’s style of recording events may be found similar to those occurring in the Şehnâme-i Hümâyûn: for example, there is a corresponding vagueness with regard to dates and particular military details; on the other hand, the campaign is recorded as an eye-witness account from the single perspective of the imperial retinue, and is particularly valuable in giving information on the desperate fighting in the Sultan’s headquarters during the battle of Haçova.
This unique manuscript of 123 folios is located in the Türk ve İslam Eserleri Müzesi in Istanbul and is described in the catalogue of that collection. Folio 1a bears the seal of Mehmed III, indicating that the work was initially placed in the Sultan's private library, the present Topkapi Sarayi collection. At an unknown date it was removed from the palace library and fell into private hands; a note on the first folio names its owner: "İstisnabe-hü 'l-faqr Emir Mehmed 'Arif ibn Yalil Paşa — 'ifā 'an-hümē". No date is given.

---

1. Kemal Çiğ, Türk ve İslam Müzesindeki Minyatırlılı Kitapların Kataloğu (Istanbul 1959), 56-7, under the title Şah-nâme. Cf. Gazavât-nâmeler, 95-6, in which the Ta'rîh-i Âl-i 'Osmân is wrongly understood to be another copy of this manuscript. This error derives from Babinger GOV, 168, who took the Ta'rîh-i Âl-i 'Osmân, the Şemâ'îl-nâme and the Şehnâm-i Hümâyûn to be three copies of the same work, whereas in fact only the first two are connected. 'OM III, 34, refers only to the single copy of the Şehnâm-i Hümâyûn.

Since this is an illustrated manuscript, it is briefly referred to by Ivan Stchoukine, La peinture turque d'après les manuscrits illustrés, 1re partie, de Sulaymân 1er à 'Osmân II 1520-1622 (Paris 1966), 97. Although the above catalogue entry states that the manuscript contains four miniature paintings, I have seen only three: (i) Sinân Paşa presiding over the council of war at Belgrade, 19a; (ii) the meeting of Sinân Paşa and Gâzi Girây Hân, 54b-55a; (iii) a small painting at the foot of 112b depicting the author Ta'liki-zâde on completion of the manuscript. A reproduction of the second miniature is given in Zeren Tanında, "Nakkâş Hasan Paşa", Sanat no. 6, June 1977, 114.
Another hand, presumably that of the owner Mehmed 'Arif, was responsible for the addition on this same folio of notes on the şehnâmecilik. Under the heading "Egri Fâtih-i Sultan Mehmed [nâmâna] Ta'liğ-i-zâde şehnâmesidür", is a short biography of the first şehnâmeci Fethullah 'Arif Efendi, which is a copy of the notice found in the Zeyl-i Şekâ'ikti 'n-Nu'mânîye, 31. A second, much longer note is entitled "Ta'liğ-i-zâde yirine şehnâmeci olan Hükmü Hasan Efendi tercümesidür". This consists of a brief account of Hasan Hükmü's career, followed by a copy of his berât of appointment to the şehnâmecilik; all of this detail was taken from Resmi Ahmed Efendi's Sefinetü 'r-Rû'esâ, 28-30, which the writer of these notes states he was able to see through the good offices of his friend the former darbâne nâzîrî Râ'if İsmâ'il Beg Efendi.1

On folio 75b this same hand has added a marginal note on the condition of Yanık in later years and a description of the fortress as seen by the writer when passing through Hungary in 1171/1757-3 in the embassy led by Resmi Ahmed Efendi to the Habsburg court at Vienna to announce the accession of Muştafâ III.

The text begins on folio 2b, giving the official title of the work as Şehnâme-i Rûmâyûn. After a preliminary prayer to God, followed by an invocation to the Prophet and salutation

1. Cf. Dng I, 347: Râ'if İsmâ'il Beg/Paşa was appointed re'isü 'l-küttâb in 1774 and later rose to the dignities of vezîr and beglerbegi.
to the sultan, Mehmed III, the words ba‘de-hū open an introductory section (3b-12b) describing how Ta‘līkī-zāde came to participate in the campaign of 1593-4, the so-called Yanık campaign; the main narrative of the work commences on folio 13a with the chapter entitled Ḥāż-ī ḏāsīṭān.

In this work, in contrast to his other compositions, Ta‘līkī-zāde gives practically no auto-biographical information: he describes himself, the humble author of the work, as the descendant of a noble family remarkable for their service to the state, yet he mentions neither his own name nor that of the Fenārī family. In 1002 AH he composed a work describing twenty excellent attributes possessed by the sultans of the Ottoman house, and proceeds to give a resumé of the contents of this earlier work. Although there is not an exact correspondence between the qualities enumerated in this manuscript and those dealt with at length in the Şemā‘īlnāme, there can be little doubt that this is the work referred to.

Having completed this resumé of the Şemā‘īlnāme, Ta‘līkī-zāde returns to tell how, on presentation to Murād III, the

1. In previous works the name "Mehmed ibn Mehmed el-Fenārī", sometimes with the addition of "eş-Şehīr bi-Ta‘līkī-zāde", is found in the early folios. However, in this work and its sequel, the Egri Fethi Ta‘rīhi, the author is identified merely as "Ta‘līkī-zāde" on folios 63a (and 122a) and 53a respectively. The Fenārī family, but not the author's full name, is mentioned on folio 6a of the latter work.

2. Şehnāme-i Hūmâyūn, 4b. See above, p. 82.

3. Appropriate references to the Şemā‘īlnāme (and to its draft the Ta‘rīḥ-i Al-i ‘Ogman) are provided in the notes to the edited text.
work was not well-received; in consequence of this disappointment, the Şehnâmeçi departed "gîryân-u-sûzân" in the retinue of the vezîr-i a'zam Sinân Paşa on the Yanık campaign (11b). He composed this work in accordance with what he had witnessed whilst in the Paşa's entourage. In compliance with the wishes of Mehmed III, the manuscript was written in Ottoman Turkish, rather than in Persian:

"Şâhnâmé-i Hûmâyûn Pârsîc söylenmeyûb, söylenenî tâşqa-i ferâmûş-hâne-i nisyâna konîlub, zebân-i Rûm-i dil-pesend-i merûm ûzre söylenûn".\(^1\)

\(*\quad *\quad *\quad *\)

The Şahname-i Hûmâyûn may be classed as historiography since it is based upon a narrative of historical events. However, in Ta'lîkî-zâde's hands it becomes primarily a vehicle for displaying the finesse and subtlety of Ottoman ingâ prose, the events of Sinân Paşa's campaign providing merely the framework upon which this is constructed. In consequence, it is often difficult to isolate historical facts or derive information from the text. In addition to the fact that Ta'lîkî-zâde pays scant attention to the accurate recording of names, dates or places, his narrative

\(^1\) Şahname-i Hûmâyûn, 12b. In view of the predominance of Persian as a literary language in the early Ottoman state, it had been the principal language employed by the first Şehnâmeçi 'Arif. Ta'lîkî-zâde's predecessor Lokmân composed works in both Persian and Turkish, with a tendency to favour the latter in his later works. All Ta'lîkî-zâde's known works are in Turkish; Persian is used in the Şahname-i Hûmâyûn for chapter headings, beyts and longer sections of poetry.
does not, and was in no way intended to, present a coherent account of the early stages of the war in Hungary. Since he travelled throughout the campaign in the nucleus of the Ottoman army under the personal command of Sinān Paşa, his narrative records events from this single perspective; incidents concerning the serdār and his troops form the backbone of the account; in certain cases — the council of war at Belgrade, 15b–20b, would be a good example — minute details not found in other contemporary histories are given prominence. On the other hand, Austrian manoeuvres and Ottoman counter-measures in other parts of the frontier region are, if mentioned at all, generally noted in brief, just as news of them, or rumour, was received in the serdār's camp.

It has therefore been considered worthwhile to present a summary of the historical content of each chapter, in order firstly to facilitate understanding of the narrative, and secondly to enable the value of the manuscript as an historical source to be discerned. With a view to gaining a more complete picture of Ottoman-Habsburg hostilities during the period of this campaign, reference will be made to other histories, principally the contemporary Ottoman works of Peçevī, Selānikī and 'Alī, and also to Knolles' The Generall Historie of the Turkes,¹ which provides supplementary information on the

---

¹. Richard Knolles, The Generall Historie of the Turkes, 3rd edition, London 1621. Knolles based his narrative of late sixteenth-century affairs very much on the accounts of Genoese and other Italian writers and upon "the credible and certain report of some so honourable minded gentlemen of our owne country, as have either for their honours sake served in these [late] wares in Hungarie, or upon some other occasions spent good time in travelling into the Turks dominions", p. v.
Habsburg conduct of the war. With regard to the principal events, reference will also be made to the histories of von Hammer, Jorga and Zinkeisen, being the first modern European histories to treat fully of the Ottoman Empire, which place the campaign of 1593-4 in the larger perspective of the 1593-1606 war and of Ottoman-European relations in general.

The Ottoman-Habsburg war of 1593-1606 is generally considered to mark a turning-point in relations between the two states. The Ottoman offensive up the Danube valley and into Hungary launched by Süleyman in 1521 resulted by 1541 in the establishment of direct Ottoman control over the major part of the old Hungarian kingdom with the creation of a strong beglerbegilik centred on Buda. A series of minor campaigns over the next few years made little alteration to the frontier but succeeded in inducing Habsburg recognition and acceptance of the Ottoman presence in that region. By the treaty of 1568, which was renewed at regular intervals until the outbreak of open war in 1593, the Habsburgs accepted the status quo, undertaking to pay 30,000 Hungarian ducats annually to the Sultan, who regarded it as tribute for the small portion of Hungary still in the Emperor's hands; also included in this treaty was a clause binding each party to

1. For an outline of Ottoman-Habsburg relations in Hungary during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, see L. Fekete, "Osmanlı Türkleri ve Macarlar 1366-1699", Belleten, c. XIII, s. 52, 663-743. Jorga III, 64-75, describes certain military and administrative aspects of Ottoman rule in Hungary as seen in the mid-sixteenth century.
restrain the constant incursions into the other's territory of local raiding parties which necessitated constant vigilance on the part of border garrisons and caused frequent disputes over the seizure of men and property.¹

During the period 1568 to 1593 the two empires were officially at peace, neither the Emperor nor the Sultan desirous of provoking open conflict, the former embarrassed by financial stringency and the challenge to his authority represented by the Protestant states of post-Reformation Germany, the latter fully occupied by war, firstly in the Mediterranean and later in the Caucasus.²

Habsburg policy since 1522 had been to strengthen their border defences by the construction of a series of forts in strategic areas, and by attempting to repopulate devastated lands through the resettlement of groups of "military colonists", the most prominent of whom were the Uskoks (generally Serbian and Orthodox refugees from lands conquered by the Ottomans), whose unruliness was a constant bone of contention between Ottoman and Habsburg, and was one of the major arguments cited in Istanbul for the declaration of war in 1593.³ The

1. GOR III, 515. Cf. G. Bayerle, Ottoman Diplomacy in Hungary, Bloomington Indiana, 197
3. G.E. Rothenberg, The Austrian Military Border in Croatia 1522-1747 (Urbana, Illinois 1960) details the development and characteristics of the Habsburg system of frontier defence. Cf. Zinkeisen III, 549-54. The Ottoman system of local defence which may be regarded as a counterpart to this is described in C. Orhonlu, Osmanlı İmparatorluğuunda Derbend Teşkilâtı (İstanbul 1967). Both these factors, the construction of palankas and the incursion of raiders, are mentioned in the Şehnâme-i Hümayûn (15b-20b). The Uskoks/
Habsburgs were able to strengthen their defensive system after 1578, due partly to a renewal of interest on their part, and partly to Ottoman involvement in the Persian war of 1578–90. In consequence of the latter, the Ottomans were forced to overlook potentially disturbing border incidents, and even on occasion to discipline frontier units for allowing provocative retaliatory action. 1 Nevertheless, the close of the Persian war in 1590 allowed Ottoman attention to turn once again to the situation in the west; Hasan Paşa, Beglerbegi of Bosna, was chiefly responsible for reasserting Ottoman presence in Croatia and his death whilst besieging Sissek in June 1593 provided a clear casus belli. 2 Added to this was the insult offered by the late arrival of the Emperor's yearly tribute — "an evident signe of violating than of establishing the league". 3

In the first major campaign of the war success fell to the Ottomans, the capture of Yanik in September 1594 being the principal achievement. Although initially hampered by financial considerations and military disorganization, the

(3 cont'd) Uskoks operating from Zengg on the Adriatic coast of Dalmatia almost precipitated an Ottoman-Venetian war in the early 1590s, since the Ottomans held Venice responsible for their restraint; cf. GOR IV, 211-3; Zinkeisen III, 446-52.

2. GOR IV, 216-9; Jorga III, 292-4; Zinkeisen III, 585-90, emphasizing in particular Sinan Paşa's anti-Habsburg outlook. The fact that two grandsons of Selim II were also killed in this encounter heightened the desire for war in Istanbul.
3. Knolles, 1009.
Austrians were able to capitalize on the Ottoman practice of withdrawing into winter quarters for six months of the year and made considerable gains north of the Danube; in August 1595 Estergon, a fortress comparable in stature to Yanik, fell to the Imperial army. At this time however, the main Ottoman army was operating, without success, not in Hungary, but against the rebel voyvode Michael in Wallachia who, in his revolt against Ottoman financial pressures and increased demands for horses and grain for the war effort, had formed an anti-Ottoman alliance with Sigismund Bathory, voyvode of Transylvania, and was receiving encouragement from both the Pope and the Emperor. Unrest and intrigue prevailed in the Principalities for the duration of the war in Hungary, actively encouraged by the government of Rudolf II. Thus the Ottomans were forced to keep their attention on two battlefronts at the same time, with the result that a concentrated effort was not possible in Hungary.

In 1596 Mehmed III led his army in person, capturing the fortress of Egri which lay close to the main supply and communications route between Austria and Transylvania and hence into Wallachia. The battle of Haşova which followed shortly afterwards was the only major pitched battle of the war, lasting three days and resulting in the Ottoman army

being left in command of the field.\footnote{1}{Sir Charles Oman, *A history of the art of war in the sixteenth century* (London 1937), 746-55, gives a detailed account of the battle and a summary of subsequent events to 1606. Cf. I.H. Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi* III(i), 77-81.} Despite this success neither the Sultan nor the vezir-i a'zam returned to the campaign in 1597 and the Ottoman impetus died away, the remaining years of the war consisting mainly of lengthy sieges centred upon the most important strongholds, Yanık, Buda, Kaniye, Estergon and Istołniz-Belgrad.

A number of factors combined to incline the Ottoman empire towards securing peace at the turn of the century.\footnote{2}{Intermittent peace negotiations were carried on in the period after 1596, in many of which the Han of the Crimea, Gâzi Girây II, played a significant role as mediator; cf. C.M. Kortepeter, *Ottoman Imperialism during the Reformation: Europe and the Caucasus* (New York 1972), chapter 8; I.H. Uzunçarşılı, *op. cit.*, 97.} Since the death early in 1596 of Sinân Paşa, the chief protagonist of the war, none of his successors in the office of vezir-i a'zam showed the same eagerness to participate in the war, delegating command to lesser generals who lacked the authority to call upon the full military and financial resources of the state. In Anatolia local unrest centred around dispossessed sipâhîs and bands of adventurers reached alarming proportions, necessitating the use of an army against them, the so-called celâlî rebels. Further east, Şâh 'Abbâs seized the opportunity to profit by the Ottoman involvement in Hungary to recapture those areas forfeited in the treaty of 1590, thus heralding the beginning of a new Ottoman-Safavid conflict.
In November 1606 the treaty of Zsitvatorok concluded the war in Hungary and confirmed the voivode of Transylvania as a vassal of the Sultan. Although little alteration resulted in the Ottoman-Habsburg frontier, the treaty derives importance from the fact that Ahmed I's representatives agreed to recognize Rudolf II as a sovereign of equal stature with the Sultan, addressing him as "Emperor" rather than merely "the King of Vienna", and putting an end to the annual tribute of 30,000 ducats. Although the Habsburgs had failed to make significant territorial gains, they had successfully defended their lands from Ottoman attack and consolidated their border strength, thus providing for the first time in the west a formidable barrier against the Ottomans and a potential springboard for future counter-offensives.

* * * *

The historical narrative of the Şehnâme-i Hûmâyûn is presented below in the form of chapter summaries. Additional information from other sources has been added where appropriate.

enemy forces on the borders of Croatia. With this as the principal cause of the outbreak of open war with the Habsburg Emperor, the narrative proceeds immediately to the appointment of Sinan Paşa as serdar and his arrival at Belgrade (15b). Here a council of war was held to determine the best plan of campaign: local begs informed the serdar of the increasing strength of the enemy in the border regions, their continual depredations on Muslim lands and their establishment of strong forts, or palanks; as a result of long Ottoman involvement in the eastern war against the Safavid Şah, the defences in Hungary had been weakened and the widely-detested administration of Kara Üveys Paşa as Beglerbegi of Buda had allowed the enemy to

1. Cf. Peçevi II, 128-9; Selânikî, 85b; 'Ali, 589b-90a. Both Peçevi and 'Ali ascribe Hasan Paşa's defeat to the recall by the new vezîr-i 'azam Sinan Paşa of reinforcements sent by his predecessor Siyavuş Paşa before they were able to join the Bosnian troops; both writers allude to the personal enmity between Hasan Paşa and Sinan Paşa, claiming that the latter deliberately and maliciously withdrew the relief force. Ta'lîkî-zade, however, whose account throughout is favourable to Sinan Paşa, does not mention this at all; he attributes Hasan Paşa's defeat solely to his own youthful folly, which led him to overstep the mark against the Habsburgs.

2. 'Ali (590b), not one of Sinan Paşa's partisans, criticizes his appointment as serdar on the grounds of his old age and frequently refers to him as "pîr-i bî-tedbîr" or "pîr-i nâ-bâliğ". Ta'lîkî-zade does not mention the discussions which took place between the various factions in Istanbul on the advisability of opening this war, Sinan Paşa being the chief advocate in favour of it; he later refers to other factors which inclined the Ottoman government to war, i.e. the constant border skirmishing and the late arrival of the Emperor's yearly tribute.
make further inroads into Ottoman territory;¹ the enemy fortress of Yanıık was indicated as a primary target, but the serdar was warned that its strong fortifications and abundant provisioning did not render it susceptible to capture except by means of a very long siege. As the campaign season was already well-advanced, Sinan Paşa was advised to march instead against the small strongholds of Palota, Vesperm and Tata, as the most troublesome forts in the Hungarian frontier region, whose garrisons posed a continual threat to the safety of the lives and possessions of the inhabitants of Buda.

Of these places, the first to be besieged was Vesperm, which was taken after a short bombardment (10 Muḥarrem 1003/6 October 1593).² In the same sentence Ta’liki-zade records the capture of Palota, which took place a few days later (21a).

Although Sinan Paşa was aware of the movements of enemy troops in the area of Tata, the advance of winter curtailed the Ottoman campaign season and necessitated a withdrawal to winter quarters in Belgrade, where the troops were paid and a large number of them allowed to disperse until the spring.³ Meanwhile, Austrian troops, establishing them-

---

1. Cf. M. Tayyib Gökbilgin, "Kara Üveys Paşa'nın Budın Beylerbeyliği (1578-80)", Tarih Dergisi c. II, s. 3-4, 17-34.

2. Dng III, 130. Detailed questions concerning the precise dating of specific events or the numbers of troops involved in a given engagement are not discussed in this summary; few dates or numbers are supplied in the text and those which are given cannot always be relied upon.

selves first at Tata and then at Komorn, continued to harass Ottoman frontier posts. Hasan Paşa, Beglerbegi of Buda, gathering all the available forces in his province, attempted to relieve the siege of İstolmî-Belgrad, but met with a severe defeat at the hands of a strong Austrian force (24a), losing a large number of men and a great amount of arms and ammunition (9 Şafet 1002/4 November 1593). Despite the fact that news of this defeat caused great dismay and demoralization when it became known in Belgrade, the serdar himself remained in winter quarters, unable to take retaliatory steps.¹

The enemy next besieged Subotica, an Ottoman town to the east of the Danube north of Belgrade. Ta’lîkî-zade must have received very detailed information on this siege: he gives a long and impassioned account of the brave resistance put up by the defenders of the town, who were eventually obliged to put to death the women and children by their own

(3 cont’d) Vesprem and Palota, before they would go to the winter quarters assigned them. Selanikî (89a, 91b), taking his information from Sinân Paşa’s own dispatches, mentions the demands of the soldiery, some of whom refused to stay in their assigned quarters and returned to Istanbul complaining of the serdar’s treatment of them.

¹. Peşevî II, 137-41, gives a detailed account of the battle at İstolmî-Belgrad, which was one of the principal events of the winter. ‘Alî (592a), is severely critical of the serdar’s inactivity, again placing blame for the defeat of the Ottoman troops on Sinân Paşa. Knolles, 1025-6, gives further details of the battle. Cf. also GOR IV, 221-2; Jorga III, 295, 299-301; Zinkeisen III, 595-6.
hands and themselves to make a desperate attempt to break out through the besieging force (26b-30a).  

(2) Güftär ender āmeden-i ğalebe-i küffar-ı mağlûb ve şehâdet-i gâziyan-ı mînû-mensûb. (30b-31b)

This brief chapter describes the anguish of Sinân Paşa during the winter of 1593-4 and his attempts to boost the morale of his troops, dispirited by the news of Hasan Paşa's recent defeat. Cries for help arrive from another Ottoman stronghold (unnamed) which is on the point of surrender; unfortunately, however, the serdâr had insufficient men and munitions to be able to send a relief force. On hearing that yet another fort was undergoing siege, Sinân Paşa prepared to mobilize the following spring.  

1. A second account of this siege is found in Peçevi II, 140-1. The details are in broad agreement with those given by Ta'lîki-zâde, except for the fact that, according to Peçevi, the majority of the Muslim women and children in the town were able to escape to Pest before the siege was begun and thus only a few "'acüs-u-ţîfl sağır uşaklari" were actually put to death before the flight of the garrison.

2. Peçevi II, 141-3, gives details of the more important activities of the enemy during this period, including their laying siege to Hatvan and Estergon in the early spring of 1594. Selânikî 92a, ff., records the frequent correspondence during the winter between Belgrade and Istanbul, in particular the order for the ağa of the Janissaries to attend the campaign (94a) and Sinân Paşa's requests for extra funds (95a-b, 98a); news is also given of Gâzi Girây's journey through northern Moldavia on his way to join the campaign (98b).  

Knolles, 1027-31, describes in greater detail the movements of the Austrian army, who continued on the offensive in northern Hungary with only a short break in the depth of winter. Although the sieges of Novigrad (which surrendered in March 1594), Hatvan and Estergon represented full-scale offensives on the part of the Austrians, and endangered Ottoman control in those areas, they do not receive more than a passing mention in Ta'lîki-zâde's narrative, since they did not involve the main Ottoman force.
Before the Ottoman offensive got underway in the spring of 1594, an incident occurred in a place called Mileševa in the kazâ of Prepol, in the sancak of Hersek. Ta'likî-zâde describes Mileševa as a strongly-built fortress which had once been in the possession of Miloš Žobile, the legendary assassin of Murâd II. Close to this fortress is a monastery full of precious objects, whose walls are decorated with frescoes depicting biblical scenes. Ta'likî-zâde correctly records this monastery as the burial place of the Serbian saint, St. Sava (although his chronology is at fault, since he says that the saint's body was placed there some 800 years prior to the date of the 1594 campaign, whereas in fact the monastery was founded in 1234 AD and St. Sava interred there in 1237), and describes it as a holy shrine for Christians from all parts of the world. The monastery was extremely rich due to the money and gifts which poured in from venerators of the saint. Ta'likî-zâde hints that the monks in his time were able to buy off the Muslims in the surrounding area and so live in peace (33a). According to his account, Ottoman

1. C. Radojčić, Mileševa (Belgrade 1963), 67-71, in an English resumé of the Serbo-Croat text, gives a brief history of the monastery and describes its frescoes. The account wrongly gives the date 1595 for the burning of the saint's remains; the date 10 May 1594, given by Herman Wendel, "Saint Sava", Slavonic and East European Review 14 (1935-6), 152, would conform to the chronology of Ta'likî-zâde's narrative.

2. Cf. Radojčić, op. cit., 68: Sokollu Mehmed Paşa was "said to have been a pupil at Mileševa before he became a Moslem, and ... was always its powerful protector". After his death in 1579, Turkish financial impositions on the wealthy monastery increased.
anger was aroused against the monastery by the influence of its monks on these local Muslims, and by the discovery of a letter (which Ta‘lîkî–zâde parodies, 32b-34a) from the bâtrîk to the King (of Vienna) pointing out the usefulness of the cult of St. Sava as a focal point of resistance against the Ottoman overlord. On learning the contents of this letter, Sinân Paşa decided to remove the saint’s remains from Mileșeva as a means of undermining the revolt. The sancak begi of Hersek, Ahmed Beg, was entrusted with the task. Although the monks had received prior warning of the threat, Ahmed Beg was able to enter the monastery by trickery, seize the remains and carry them away, pursued by anxious petitioners offering to buy them back at any price. Upon reaching Belgrade, Ahmed Beg delivered the relics to Sinân Paşa, who ordered them to be burnt and the ashes scattered to the winds.

This chapter treats of a particular incident not mentioned in other contemporary Ottoman chronicles but recorded by Serbian and European historians in the context of a popular revolt occurring amongst the Serbian people in the last decade of the sixteenth century. Although the incident at the monastery was obviously of great interest to Ta‘lîkî–zâde, he does not relate it specifically to any wider movement.

During the summer of 1594 the Serbian population in the region around Belgrade staged a revolt: in May of that year a group of Serbians seized some Ottoman supply ships as they sailed up the Danube; in June a sizeable force twice defeated
the Beglerbegi of Temesvar in battle, the second time killing him\textsuperscript{1} and capturing 18 artillery pieces; after seizing a number of small forts near Belgrade, the Serbs then offered their services to the Archduke Matthias, commander-in-chief of the Habsburg army.\textsuperscript{2}

The letter referred to by Ta'liki-zāde was probably one written by Jovan II, Patriarch of Ipek (and thus head of the Serbian church) to Rudolf II. During the period of his patriarchate, 1592-1614, Jovan II made a determined attempt to free the Serbian people from Ottoman rule. Although the burning of the remains of St. Sava failed to crush the revolt, the Patriarch was always dependent on Austrian or other outside help for the success of his cause; with the peace of 1606 such assistance was denied him.\textsuperscript{3} The uprising probably remained fairly small and localized, since it is not mentioned in the Ottoman chronicles. It must, however, be placed in the context of Pope Clement VIII's attempts to incite revolt among the Sultan's Christian subjects in the Balkans. Papal encouragement and the prospect of Habsburg assistance resulted in considerable unrest in both Dalmatia and Albania in the early years of the war, with local orthodox prelates often found at the head of the revolt.\textsuperscript{4}

\begin{enumerate}
\item According to Jorga III, 299, the son of the Beglerbegi.
\item Knolles, 1034, 1033. Cf. I. Hadrovics, Le Peuple Serbe et son église sous la domination Turque, (Paris 1947), 131-5.
\item H. W. V. Temperley, History of Serbia (London 1917), 125-6. Here also the incident at Mileseva is dated erroneously to 1595.
\end{enumerate}
Sinan Paşa assembled his forces and left Belgrade in late spring 1594; marching north he passed into the dāru 'l-ḥarb and laid siege to the fortress of Tata, a sizeable stronghold east of Yanık on the south side of the Danube. Ta'limi-zade gives a longer, more detailed account of this siege, which he says continued for six days.\(^1\) Meanwhile, the Austrian army was seen to have made camp at Komorn on the opposite bank of the river.\(^2\)

During the siege operations, the newly-arrived ağa of the Janissaries, Mehmed Ağa, was dismissed from his post for failing to carry out Sinan Paşa's orders to prepare trenches and earthworks during the night in order to enable the army to open fire on the fortress at first light. He was replaced

---

1. All other accounts say three or four days, e.g. Peçevi II, 145: "Uçinci gün küffar aman ile çakdilar"; Selanikî, 103b (from Sinan Paşa's own fethname): "Uç gün muhaçara olnub, dördinci gün kal'e içinde olan küffar kal'eyi aman ile teslim itdüklerinden sonra, şehr-i Zi 'l-Ka'dentümi Uçinci günü andan danı kalıkub".

2. According to Knolles, 1035-40, Sinan Paşa's march northward caused the Austrian generals to raise the sieges of Hatvan and Estergon and withdraw to their base at Komorn. For some days the two hostile armies marched westward on opposite sides of the Danube in full view of each other, separated only by the width of the river. Unable to prevent the fall of Tata, the Austrian army encamped a short distance away at Komorn. Cf. Selanikî, 103b, and 'Ali, 595a.
in his post by the kapucu başı Hasan Ağa. When the fortress was captured, those inhabitants and members of the garrison who wished to do so were allowed to depart (but without taking their weapons with them), and Tata was occupied by the Ottomans. After a few days respite, the fortress was provisioned, a sancak begi and a garrison were assigned to its defence. In Zi 'l-ka'de 1002 the serdār left Tata.


On the third day's march from Tata, the Ottoman army encamped in the plain of Sanmartin (42b). After giving a brief description of the fort, Ta'likţâzade goes on to tell of the siege preparations. On the second day, after issuing a preliminary summons (which was rejected) to the inhabitants of Sanmartin to give themselves up to the Ottoman state and to Islam, earthworks were thrown up and the siege begun. In a very short time, the fort was surrendered and the Muslims entered. According to Ta'likţâzade, Sanmartin was a papal fief, the administration of which was in the hands of the "King of Vienna"; the town possessed a large lake full of fish, which yielded a considerable yearly income; in addition to this

1. According to Ta'likţâzade's account, there was some justification for the dismissal of the Ağa. Peşevi (II, 145), however, considers that the serdār acted maliciously, "mahzā bağzā-va-ğaraţā", whilst 'Alī (595a) holds that the Bosnian Mehmed Ağa was dismissed "bila sebeb" in order to make way for Sinān Paşa's fellow Albanian Yemici Hasan Ağa. Although Mehmed Ağa was shortly afterwards appointed Beglerbegi of Karaman (Selânikî, 102b), Ta'likţâzade does not specifically mention this.
revenue were taxes on the cultivation of vines.¹

(6) Güftär ender temâşâ-yı ḥâzret-i Paşa leşker-i cihân-güşâ.
(44b-49b)

On departing from Sanmartin, the serdâr held a review of his troops. Ta'liki-zâde enumerates the various contingents: firstly, the müteferrika corps, under the leadership of (Şokullu) Meḥmed Paşa-zâde İbrâhîm Beg; secondly, the Janissaries; thirdly, on the left wing of the army, the Anatolian troops; fourthly, the Syrian troops, and fifthly, forces from the provinces of Rûmili. In addition to these large groups, were innumerable other corps of various origins and kinds.

When the army arrived before Yanîk, preparations were immediately taken in hand for beginning the siege, the digging of trenches being the first task; at dusk a reconnaissance party was sent out to survey the fortress (46b). It was some days before the Muslims were able to complete the arc of trenches around the landward-facing side of the fortress.²

Ta'liki-zâde enumerates a number of small incidents which occurred during this first phase of the assault, details

1. Only ‘Alî (595b) makes any particular comment on the capture of Sanmartin, remarking that although it was only a very small place, Sinân Paşa established it as a livâ, simply in order to enhance his own prestige.

2. The course of the siege of Yanîk may be traced in Peçevi II, 145-8, 153-4; Selânikî, 101a ff.; ‘Alî, 595b-93b; Knolles, 1041-44; brief references also in GOR IV, 223-4; Jorga III, 301-2.
which are usually too particular to appear in the more
general histories. Although many casualties were suffered
on both sides, the blockade was gradually tightened and
enemy sorties curtailed.

* * * * *

Although Ta'li̇kī-zāde describes various aspects of
this formidable fortress of Yanık,¹ a more complete idea
of its location and condition is given by Knolles:

"This citie of Rab is a strong and populous
citie, honoured with a Bishops See, and was
worthily accounted the strongest bulwarke of
Vienna, from whence it is distant about twelve
Germane miles, standing upon the south side of
Danubius, whence the river dividing it selfe,
maketh a most fertile island called Schut; in
the East point whereof standeth the strong citie
of Komara. The defence of this citie of Rab
was committed to Countie Hardek, a man of greater
courage than fidelitie, with a garrison of twelve
hundred choise soldiars, unto whom a little before
the coming of the Bassa were certaine companies
of Italians joyned, who together with the citizens
made up the number of five thousand able men: a
strength in all mens judgement sufficient for the
long defence of that place".²

It was near Komorn (Komara) on this island of Schut
that the Archduke Matthias had stationed his army: from there
it was possible to send continuous supplies of men and muni-
tions across the river into the fortress. Subsequent chapters

---

¹. Also known variably by the name Raab (from the river
Raba on whose banks it was also situated), by the Hungarian
name Gőrvar and by the Latin Iauarimun. The modern name
is Győr.

in the Şehnâme-i Hûmâyûn are principally concerned with Ottoman and Tatar efforts to capture Christian outposts on this island and drive away the Imperial troops so that the garrison inside Yanık would be deprived of all further support and the encirclement thus completed.

Both Ottoman and European historians attest the existence of abundant supplies of food and arms in the fortress when it was surrendered; since they made no serious attempt to raise the siege, it would appear that the Austrian commanders were well satisfied that Yanık could hold out until winter, when it was expected that the Ottoman troops would be forced to withdraw. After the surrender, the governor of Yanık, Count Hardeck, was tried in Vienna, accused of having given up such a well-equipped stronghold without good cause, and was subsequently executed for treason; hence Knolles' comment on his being "a man of greater courage than fidelitie".

(7) Güftâr ender âmeden-i .promise, kâ'an-i mu'azzam sülâle-i selâtîn-i cihân, gülâle-i cebîn-i esâtîn-i kîhân, ve müşerref fermûden-i ordu-yî nusret-tîlkâ-yî zafer-ruy. (50a-58a)

While the siege of Yanık was still in its early stages, news was received of the arrival of the Yân of the Crimea, Gâzi Girây Yân, with a considerable force of Tatars. The serdâr's son Mehmed Paşa, at that time Beglerbegi of Rûmîli, and Hasan Paşa, Beglerbegi of Buda, were sent to meet the Yân and escort him into the camp. On reaching the headquarters,
Gazi Giray and Sinan Pasa exchanged information on the strength of the Tatar force and on the current situation vis-a-vis the enemy; presents were then given to the Han and senior members of his retinue to welcome them on the campaign.¹

According to Ta'lik-i-zade's account, the Han then departed with his men to besiege the fort of Papa, located a little to the south of Yanik (56a). Having captured the two fortlets of Marcil and Ebuduhul, Gazi Giray arrived before Papa; negotiations, which eventually proved inconclusive, were carried on with the inhabitants of Papa on the Han's behalf by one Malkoç Aga. Finally, before a full siege was begun, the Christian garrison secretly fled the fort, news of this being given to the Han by Muslims inside Papa who had been imprisoned in the dungeons and had managed to escape after the flight of the garrison (57a-b). Thereupon, the fleeing Christians were pursued by the Tatars and killed. Papa itself was entered and plundered.²

1. 24 Zī 'l-Ka'de 1002/11 August 1594. Cf. Pecevi II, 148-52; Selanikî, 104a; 'Ali, 595b-96b. Both Pecevi and 'Ali criticize Sinan Pasa's treatment of Gazi Giray, behaving towards him as if he were an equal and not the leading representative of a ruling family which had for over a century commanded respect and deference. This behaviour obviously caused adverse comment in the Ottoman camp directed against Sinan Pasa. Ta'lik-i-zade, however, passes over it in silence. Selanikî's account reports in a single phrase the fact of the Han's arrival, with no other comment upon it.

2. Papa was actually captured after the fall of Yanik, i.e. on 18 Muharrem 1003/3 October 1594, and is here narrated out of historical context.
Meanwhile, Ottoman frontier begs, aided by the Beglerbegi of Karaman, were in operation in the region of Lake Balaton against a number of small fortified settlements.

* * * * *

There appears to have been a certain amount of friction and disagreement during this campaign between Sinan Paşa and Gazi Giray Han. At this date, since the Sultan was not personally on campaign, the presence of the Han was something of a prestige symbol and served to boost the morale of the Ottoman troops. Besides the fact that he brought with him a sizeable contingent of 40,000 or 50,000 Tatars, Gazi Giray Han himself enjoyed a personal reputation as an experienced military commander, gained during his service with Ozdemiroğlu Ogmân Paşa in the Caucasus during the 1580s. Sinan Paşa, who regarded himself as the instigator and leader of the campaign, no doubt resented the presence and prestige of the Han, a considerably younger man, and on several occasions attempted to assert his authority as leader in the fact of opposition from the Han. On welcoming Gazi Giray to his headquarters, Sinan Paşa treated him as if he held no higher rank than that of beglerbegi, sitting on a similar stool and conversing freely with him. For this the serdar was criticized throughout the camp. During the course of the siege Sinan Paşa tried to exercise control over the Tatar troops, refusing

1. C.M. Kortepeter, op. cit., 136-43.
2. Feçevi II, 150. İ.H. Uzunçarşılı, op. cit., 26-31 reviews the Han's status as an Ottoman vassal at the end of the sixteenth century.
to allow them to ravage the surrounding areas, ordering them, against the ğan's wishes, to undertake the most hazardous operation of the siege — swimming the river under enemy fire to make the first attack on the Christian forces on the island of Schut.

Once the enemy camp near Komorn had been overthrown and the principal obstacle to the capture of Yanik thus removed, the ğan was despatched to Papa. 'Alī states that he was deliberately sent there at this time by Sinan Paşa so that the latter could claim all the credit for the fall of Yanik. By recording the fall of Papa immediately after describing the ceremony of welcome for Gâzî Girây, instead of placing it in its historical context at the conclusion of the siege of Yanik, Ta'lıkî-zâde's narrative does give the impression that the ğan was principally involved in operations against Papa and played only a negligible part in the reduction of Yanik. Since Ta'lıkî-zâde was writing an official history of the campaign, his narrative throughout is favourable to Sinan Paşa, the Sultan's representative and deputy, and it is quite possible that the siege of Papa was purposely recorded out of context in order to reserve for Sinan Paşa alone the prestige of having achieved the greater victory.

2. Selânikî, 105b.
Renewed effort was made against the fortress walls; any breaches which appeared were quickly stopped up by the garrison, who continued to make sorties into the besieging forces, in one instance killing two sancağ beşis. Yanık was not yet completely surrounded: on the north side across the river towards Komorn where the Imperial army under Archduke Matthias was encamped, the garrison could come and go and receive supplies. A first, unsuccessful attempt was made to establish an Ottoman foothold on this island. At this point Ta'liği-zâde introduces a lengthy poem in defence of the serdar; it may be assumed that there was at this juncture some criticism in the camp for his failure to complete the blockade.

Despite the advent of the religious festival, Sinan Paşa ordered that there should be no full-scale celebrations, fearing that this would lead to a lack of diligence on the Ottoman part, and thus allow the enemy to attack unexpectedly.

1. Although the text clearly says Ramažan, there can be no doubt that the Muslim festival to which Ta'liği-zâde must have been referring was that of the 'Iid-i adha, or kurban bayramı, occuring on 10 Zi 'l-Hicce. There seems to be no adequate explanation which a pious Muslim like Ta'liği-zâde should confuse the two festivals.
Nevertheless, at dawn the following day, whilst the night sentries were being replaced by a fresh guard, the Muslims were taken unawares by an enemy attack. After initial panic and some loss of ground, they rallied and managed to repulse the attackers (62b), forcing the closure of the fortress gates and trapping those Imperial troops which remained outside.

Ta’lim-i-zade here mentions his own participation in the fighting (63a).

(10) Güftar ender ‘ibre kerden-i leşker-i mangu ve hagm-i bā-hagmet-i nā-maṣbur be-cezire-i Komran, ve kışte geştən-i banan[-u-m]ezribanān-i sīmīn-sitām-u-zerrīn-kemerān. (64a-68a)

The prolonged siege was beginning to cause despondency amongst the Ottoman troops.¹ In the hope of cutting off the enemy's reinforcements, it was decided to construct bridges across the river to enable a larger number of troops to cross over to Komorn. Whilst some boats were built, a number of vessels were at the same time captured from the enemy.

On the morning of 22 Zi ‘l-Ḥicce,² although the enemy had anticipated a renewed attack and had strengthened their

---

1. Cf. Knolles, 1042, where other problems facing the besieging army are noted: "Now began great scarcity of victuals in the Turks campe, so that the soldiours were faine to feed upon unripe fruit and such other unwholesome things: whereof ensued the bloodie flix, with many other dangerous diseases; which raging amongst them did wonderfully consume the Bassaes armie".

2. The text says Zi ‘l-Ka‘de, but this again is an error. The same mistake is found in Selānikī, 104a (taken from Sinān Paşa's dispatch), but is corrected later, 106a, in the text of a letter from the Pān.
defences on the island, under cover of a thick mist the Ottomans launched two boats, each carrying forty men, which landed further up the bank, out of sight of the enemy, and were able to surprise the Christian defence. However, the arrival of the main body of Austrian troops from Komorn spurred Sinān Paşa to send huge reinforcements across the bridge to do battle.¹ At this point Ta‘līğī-zāde voices amazement at the genuine bravery of the infidel army (67b-68a).

(11) Güftar ender āmeden-i banān bā-tertīb ve ceng-i ānān
bā-terhīb. (68a-75b)

This chapter deals with the defeat of the main body of Imperial troops on the river bank opposite Yanik, their withdrawal from the island and the plundering of their camp by the Ottomans.²

Ta‘līğī-zāde first describes the impressive sight of the advancing Christian army, with their multi-coloured banners and standards and shining weapons, themselves clothed from head to foot in grey armour; he voices appreciation of their battle order and the high standard of bravery. He does, however, note the presence of a large number of women among their camp followers — a practice which was not tolerated

1. According to Knolles, 1043, some 10,000 Turkish troops made a full-scale attack across the river, "some in boates, some by other meanes", surprised the enemy headquarters and captured it. Cf. Peçevi II, 146-8; Selānikī, 104a-b; ‘Alī, 597b-98a.

2. Although this confrontation is regarded in the sources as an episode in the protracted siege of Yanik, it must have assumed something of the character of a full-scale battle, albeit of short duration, since the main armies on both sides were involved.
in the Ottoman armies — and recalls the story of Ebu Cehl at Badr, who likewise had many women accompanying his forces, whilst Muḥammed had none.

Sinān Paşa conducted operations from his base outside Yanık, continually sending reinforcements across the river and encouraging the troops. After a fierce battle, with many casualties on both sides, the Christian army was eventually defeated and forced to retreat, abandoning their camp and all their possessions (73a). Taʿlīkī-zađe mocks the defeated enemy: according to his account, the fleeing Christians sent word back to Yanık that they were going to fetch the King and that help was near at hand — false promises which they had no intention of carrying out, made to cover up for the defeat.

The enemy camp was immediately plundered, the Tatars leading the way. All kinds of precious stuffs, piles of muskets and money, large quantities of provisions were seized. Meanwhile, bridge building continued, in order to transport more troops and siege guns across the river so that the fortress could be assaulted from all sides.

Taʿlīkī-zađe here introduces a short digression on the situation in Habsburg Hungary, which he obviously felt was a cause of weakness in the enemy. He recalls that previously the King of Hungary was himself Hungarian whereas his lords were of German origin (?); after the battle of Mohaç in 1526, the King of Hungary had always been a German (i.e. the Emperor) and the nobility Magyar. As a result there was constant friction
between the two, which often ended in bloodshed (75a).¹

(12) Güftär ender feth-i kal’e-i Görvar be-dest-i himmet-i 
giti-güşä-yi hazret-i Paşa-yi devlet-medär. (75b-79b)

The siege of Yanık is taken up again with renewed effort on the Ottoman part. Sinan Paşa, despite fears for his safety voiced by a number of commanders, insisted on going himself into the trenches to encourage the men.² As a result, the Ottoman earthworks were considerably advanced and attempts were made to dam up the river waters which protected one side of the fortress (77a), even to the extent of using the dead bodies of the Christians to fill the water channel. A general assault was attempted, but was foiled on the first day by the explosion of an enemy mine. After three days continuous fighting the assault was called off.

(13) Güftär ender nakb efgenden-i nakb-efgenän ve mûy kerden-i 
küffär-i mûye-künän. (79b-93b)

The first attempts to lay mines under the fortress walls


2. Cf. Selänikî, 104b, quoting from Sinan Paşa’s fethnâme: "bir ferd can-u-gördülenden takayyüd itmemekle, bi-nefsi-hi kendüm meterislere varub, gice ve gündüz toz ve toprağın içinde yatub kalkub; yüdäya ma’lündur ki, eger yürtülüşde ve eger toprağın sürmekde bu muhâlisler ni ileride varub takvît virmeyince, kimse gayret gelmezdi".
were unsuccessful: the enemy heard the sappers, caught them and put them to death. One attempt, however, (80a) was particularly successful and blew a considerable hole in the fortifications. Unfortunately, before the Ottomans could enter through this breach, the garrison dug a trench just behind the broken wall, laid gun-powder in the bottom and covered it with earth. As a result, the Ottoman troops were blown up as they came through the wall.

There follows a lengthy digression, the relevance of which is not immediately apparent, on the fortunes of Sultan Muḥammed Ḫuṭbu 'd-Dīn Ḥāresmāh at the time of Cengiz Ḥān's invasion of his realm (80b–81b).

The fighting continued without a break, resulting in large numbers of casualties. Sinān Paşa encouraged his troops with promises of reward and promotion for valour and achievement against the enemy (83a). Finally, the Muslims were rewarded for their persistence in attack by a sudden request from the fortress for terms on which to surrender.

Sifat-i vukū' (85a): Ta'liḵī-žāde here begins a more detailed account of events just prior to the opening of negotiations. Another general assault had been ordered for the following day, the Anatolian troops, based on the island of Schut, being ordered to fire on the fortress from across the river.

Sifat-i šubh-i ḫuceste-ferr ve kašd-i yūrig-i Anatolī-yi maśūr-u-muẓaffer ve iḥlā-vu-iḥla‘-i kal‘e-vū-kāfir (86b): on the morrow, at the break of day, the Christian garrison, surveying the ranks of Muslim troops drawn up ready for the attack were so overawed that they immediately asked for terms
of surrender. They requested that Ahmed Beğ, the sancak begi of Teke-ili, should be sent to conduct negotiations (87b). An envoy from Hardeck, governor of the fortress, at first proposed that Yanık should not be surrendered into Ottoman hands, but that instead the inhabitants were willing to pay a yearly tribute to the Sultan. This suggestion aroused the serdâr's wrath and was immediately rejected. The Muslim troops who had already begun to celebrate the victory were ordered to resume their positions in the trenches. Hardeck's envoy came a second time, now accepting the surrender of Yanık. Pointing out that the fortress was strategically located and dominated routeways into Austria, Poland and Czechoslovakia, that its fortifications were strong, its granaries full and its storehouses and arsenals stocked with all kinds of weaponry, the envoy asked leave from the serdâr for the garrison to take with them out of Yanık three particular cannon. This request was also refused, and the garrison ordered to leave, taking no possessions with them. The Ottoman soldiers were instructed to observe the safe-conduct and refrain from plundering the evacuating garrison.

On the fourth day after surrender, the Muslims were allowed to enter the fortress and found it, as stated by the envoy, full of stores, goods and provisions (92b).

1. Knolles, 1044, holds Hardeck responsible for this unnecessary surrender, and reports that the Count had had all the garrison commanders sign a document signifying their acceptance of the peace negotiations so that blame should not fall solely upon himself.
The chapter ends with praise for Sinan Paşa, the architect of the victory, although Ta‘liki-zade refers briefly to a few malcontents who had previously criticized Sinan Paşa for his handling of the campaign.


This chapter describes Sinan Paşa’s entry into Yanık with his retinue and the favourable impression made upon them by the fortress. Several features particularly caught Ta‘liki-zade’s attention — the high walls and their battlements, with all their artillery still in position, the ample stores of powder and shot just as had been described, and the governor’s residence.

[Güftär] ender temâşâ-yı zindân ve Azâd kerden-i zindânîyân (94b): the fortress dungeons were discovered, and in them a number of Muslim prisoners chained hand and foot. On being released these men were brought before Sinan Paşa, to whom they complained bitterly of their treatment at the hands of the Christians.

Şifat-ı kilise ki ma‘bed-i ‘abede-i ‘Isâ bûd (95a): this church had been burnt by order of Sultan Süleymân on one of his early campaigns in Hungary, and even in 1594 still lay almost in ruins. According to Ta‘liki-zade the inhabitants had not been concerned to restore it, considering it inevitable that the city would sooner or later fall into Turkish hands.

Der inâhirât-i kible-i kenâ‘is-i Naşârâ (95b): Ta‘liki-zade describes the kible (i.e. the altar) of the church as facing due east, the wrong direction as far as a Muslim is concerned. This is followed by an attempt to explain the early
division of Christianity into three different sects — Nestōrīye, Milyānīye and Ya’kūbiye — due to the machinations of the Devil (96b). He discusses also the Christian custom of venerating idols and images, saying that this originated in the practice of erecting an effigy in memory of a deceased relative; as centuries passed people could no longer remember whom they were venerating and such effigies became objects of purely religious devotion — again due to the wiles of Satan, who pointed out to the mystified congregation that these images were in fact representations of God himself and as such to be worshipped. The section ends with praise and thanks for the emergence of Islam, the true religion.

After surveying this church, Sinān Paşa had it converted into a mosque, removing all traces of Christian worship and installing instead beautiful carpets and rugs. The necessary religious officials were appointed.

A garrison was assigned to the defence of Yanık (97a): the sancak begi of İskenderiye¹ 'Oğmān Beg was given the rank of beglerbegi, the sancak begis of Aydın and Menteşe, together with a number of zu'āmā and sipāhīs, were placed under his command. Teke-ili Begi Ahmed Beg was entrusted with the job of throwing the bodies of the kāfirs into the trenches and burying them.

On the thirteenth day after surrender,² the main army left Yanık and, on the second day's march, reached Komorn.

---

1. According to Ta’līkī-zāde he was beg of Estergon, but Peğevi (II, 154), Selāniki (101a) and 'Alî (599a) are agreed that he was beg of İskenderiye.

2. Yanık was taken on 12 Muḥarrem 1003/27 September 1594.
On Sunday 24 Muḥarrem (9 October 1594), Sinān Paşā left Yanak, and two days later, on the Tuesday, made camp outside Komorn. The primary tasks were again the building of bridges over the Danube and the setting-up of cannon. Although the troops were now allowed to raid enemy villages, there was an increasing scarcity of provisions in the camp: barley in particular was double the normal price until more could be brought in from the surrounding area.

Ta‘līkī-zāde recounts one particular incident in which two boat loads of Ottoman soldiers from the far side of the river, going at daybreak in search of food supplies, found themselves caught in a surprise enemy attack; their presence, however, made the enemy think that their attack had been expected and threw them into confusion, thus foiling the attempt (99a-b).

After a relatively short period it was decided to raise the siege of Komorn and retire to winter quarters. There were, in Ta‘līkī-zāde’s opinion, many reasons for the withdrawal: firstly, winter was fast approaching, with a consequent change for the worse in the weather; secondly, the

1. For the siege of Komorn, see Pecevi II, 155-6; Selanikî, 106b, 108b; ‘Alī, 599a-b; Knolles, 1044.

2. Cf. Selanikî, 108b, where the siege is said to have lasted 16 days, during which time abortive negotiations for surrender of the fortress took place. Pecevi and ‘Alī also refer to these talks, ‘Alī blaming Sinān Paşā for their failure by refusing to accept the garrison’s wish to surrender to Sokullu-zāde Hasan Paşā, rather than to himself or his son Mehmed Paşā (599a-b).
troops were exhausted after the prolonged siege of Yanik and had spent almost all their ammunition; thirdly, a large number of pack animals had died, or were on the point of doing so — many as a result of drinking infected water — the horses falling victim to a particular kind of distemper; fourthly, many of the Janissaries had lost their waterproof outer garments during the siege of Yanik and were therefore without protection against the worsening weather. All in all, the troops were restless and dissatisfied; there was no option but to give up the siege.¹

The return march was by way of Tata, where Teke-ili Ahmed Beg was rewarded for his endeavours at Yanik by being left in charge of the garrison, together with the sancak begi of Karağišar Perviz Beg, each with their sipahis and ample provisions. Having rested two days at Tata, Sinān Paşa retired to Buda, where a few days were spent assigning troops to winter quarters in the newly conquered forts.² His son Meşmed Paşa was stationed at Buda. All the begs and commanders were ordered to keep on the alert throughout the winter and

1. The siege was raised 7 Safar 1003/22 October 1594. Knolles, 1044, also points out that the Imperial army under the command of Archduke Matthias, reinforced by several new contingents, had camped not far away; in addition, the Han and the majority of his troops retired during the course of this siege, intending to return to the Crimea.

2. Peçevi II, 156; Selanikî, 103b. 'Alî, 599b, says that the sancak begi of Karağišar was ordered at Buda to proceed to Yanik against his wishes; his troop was subsequently ambushed by the enemy near İstolmî-Belgrad, and the majority of his men killed or taken prisoner.
be prepared for a full campaign the following spring.

Sinān Paşa himself established his winter quarters in Belgrade, and was involved in preparations for the next campaign when news arrived of the death of Murād III.

(16) Güftār ender āmeden-i ẖabar-i vefāt-ı Ĥazret-ı merhüm-ı saʾīdū 'l-ẖayāt Sultān Murād-ı șehīdū 'l-memāt.¹ (102b-104b)

Sinān Paşa at first attempted to conceal the fact of the Sultan's death by putting it about in Belgrade that the news concerned the death of his own brother Maḥmūd Paşa. However, a courier passing through on his way from Galata to Prague to inform the Emperor gave the correct news to the Christian inhabitants of Belgrade, and it was soon spread throughout the city. There was great gloom and despondency amongst the Muslims. Fearing that the enemy would seek to take advantage of this opportunity to attack Ottoman lands, Sinān Paşa assembled his forces on the pretext of going hunting and marched out of Belgrade. By this means, he succeeded in forestalling any serious attack and in keeping the Christians on the defensive. A message was sent to Buda to warn the Ottoman garrison there of the situation.

On receiving confirmation of the accession of Meḥmed III, a special dīvān was held in celebration (104a). It was announced that the next season's campaign would be against Peş (i.e. Vienna) and instructions sent out to all provincial garrisons.

1. Murād III died on the night of 4/5 Cemāği 'l-evvel 1003/15/16 January 1595.
Ta'lıkî-zâde takes the opportunity to incorporate into the Şehnâme-i Hûmâyûn a megnevi of 382 beyts congratulating Mehmed III on his accession to the throne. He first of all dwells upon the might, dignity and power of the Ottoman sultan with his far-flung kingdoms, comparing his stature with those of the legendary heroes of Firdevsî's Şâhnâmé, but finding it greater than all these. Consequently the death of Sultan Murâd is a cause of great misery and confusion on all sides; this had been alleviated only by his, Mehmed III's, accession, which has turned night into day, winter into spring, and relieved the distress of his people. Reminding the Sultan that his accession is a divine appointment, he impresses upon Mehmed his responsibility for dispensing justice and behaving generously towards his subjects in order that they might prosper.

More specific advice follows, occasioned by Ta'lıkî-zâde's extreme dislike of the increasing evils which he saw in government and society. If the Sultan does not keep firm control over events, preventing corruption and keeping the various classes in their proper order, chaos will result and the prosperity of the state decline (109a-110a). He calls to mind the increasing dislocation of society in the provinces of the Empire, the gradual infiltration of the sipâhî class by those unworthy and unable to make the required contribution in arms and valour to the army of the state; the quest for personal wealth and power is becoming dominant, as seen in the subtle devices of administrative officials. Ta'lıkî-zâde cautions
the Sultan against allowing others to wield power in his name and, to illustrate this point, likens the state to a house rented out by its owner to a tenant who has no interest in the upkeep of the property and lets it go to rack and ruin since he will incur no financial loss thereby; had the owner lived in the house himself, he would have taken care to see that it was repaired and kept in good order (lllb). The Sultan is advised to pay no heed to the outward trappings of wealth and prosperity (ārāyis-i ‘ālem), but to concern himself rather with the basic welfare of his subjects (āsāyis-i ādem, ll3b).

* * * *

The historical narrative resumes (ll5b) with the news that, following the accession of Mehmed III, Sinan Paşa had been replaced as vezır-i a'zam by his rival Ferhad Paşa. Before leaving Belgrade for Istanbul, Sinan Paşa sent messages to his commanders, again warning them to be on their guard lest the enemy should seek to profit by his own dismissal to renew the attack.1

There follows a rather confused and incomplete account of Sinan Paşa's early career, praising him as the defender of the Ottoman state against enemies from all sides; while beglerbegi in Egypt his firm hand had ensured good order in

1. Knolles, 1057, notes an ominous incident: "Sinan Bassa the late General returning towards Constantinople with much treasure ... was by the Vlachians set upon by the way not farre from Belgrade, and stript of all that he had, having much adoe to escape himself with some few of his followers".
the province, the loyalty of the Şerîf of Mecca had been strengthened, that holy city protected from the depredations of Bedouin tribes, and the rebellious province of Yemen subdued. On his return to Istanbul Sinân Paşa became a vezîr, but shortly afterwards was placed in charge of the military arm of the expedition to recapture Tunis after its seizure by Don Juan and the Spanish fleet.

Ta‘lîkî-zăde now returns abruptly to events in the Balkans after Sinân Paşa’s dismissal early in 1595 (118a). He refers briefly to the beginnings of a revolt in Wallachia and Moldavia, pointing to Ferhad Paşa’s failure to deal with the rebels and his inability to prevent them crossing the Danube to raid and plunder. In view of this ineffectiveness, Sinân Paşa was recalled to the capital and appointed ser’asker in his place.

1. Cf. İA 10, 670-5, "Sinân Paşa". He was appointed Beglerbegi of Mısr in Cemâzî ‘l-evvel 975/December 1567, and in Şafer 976/August 1568, after a dispute with Lâlâ Mustafâ Paşa over who should lead the campaign, was appointed serdâr to deal with a revolt in the Yemen; as a consequence of his victory there, he became known as "Yemen fâtihi". Ta‘lîkî-zăde here defends Sinân Paşa’s part in this argument. Cf. Dnâ II, 376-8.


3. There is no reference to his participation in the Persian war of 1578-90, his first appointments as vezîr-i a‘zam, nor his early periods of exile at Malkara.

4. 29 Şêvval 1003/7 July 1595. For the origins and early stages of this revolt, see Peçevi II, 152-3, 158-62, 164-5; Selanikî, 107b ff.; ‘Alî, 600a ff; also Jorga III, 302-14, 315-17.
Ta’līkī-zāde prefaces this chapter with the news that Estergon had been taken by the Christian forces in Hungary, taking advantage of the serdār’s absence. He then resumes the main theme, Sinān Paşa’s Wallachian campaign. Having attempted to strengthen the fortifications of a stronghold north of the Danube (despite the fact that this town was located in a marshy area and strong building materials were hard to find), the march continued. However, the rebel troops took refuge in mountainous terrain and refused to be drawn into open combat, preferring rather a continual harassment of the flanks of the Ottoman army. Although a number of prisoners were taken, the troops became discouraged and restive; this, together with the onset of winter, obliged Sinān Paşa to return to Istanbul (119b).

Meanwhile, news came from Gāzī Girāy Ḫān that, in accordance with Ottoman wishes, he had crossed into Moldavia and ensured the loyalty of the populace to the Sultan; furthermore, an agreement had been reached with the King of Poland on the instalment of a new voyvode in Moldavia as an Ottoman vassal.

2. Ta’līkī-zāde does not give the name of this place; it may be either Kalugeran or Tergovişte, the latter a former stronghold of the voyvode Michael, but at that time in Turkish hands. For this campaign, see Peşevī II, 170-3; Selānikī, 130 ff., 137a-b; ‘Alī, 613b-615a, 616a ff.; Knolles, 1075.
3. Cf. Peşevī II, 174; Selānikī, 139a; ‘Alī, 616b.
A brief reference (120a) to the Ottoman attempt to install an obedient voyvode in Wallachia, and to the defeat of one Wallachian rebel known as Mürteedd Rıdıvan,\(^1\) leads into an account of Mehmed III's preparations for the next season's campaign to Hungary. Finally, in an abrupt change of subject, the narrative ends with an account of the campaign of Hâdım Ca'fer Paşa, former Beglerbegi of Şirvân, to the Hungarian front and his defeat of a rebel force at Temesvár.\(^2\) On the eve of the Sultan's campaign, the situation in Hungary remains unsettled.

* * * * *

The principal theme of the Şehnâme-i Hümâyûn, the Yanık campaign of 1593-4, comes to an end on folio 102b with the serdar Sinân Paşa established in winter quarters at Belgrade at the conclusion of a successful campaign. The accession of Mehmed III provides Ta'lıkü-zâde with the opportunity to offer his congratulations to the new Sultan in a lengthy poem, part eulogy, part counsel, which would have provided a fitting conclusion to this Şehnâme. The historical narrative is, however, resumed from the point where it was left off and brought down quickly through the events of another year to set the scene for the Sultan's campaign of 1596, which forms the subject of Ta'lıkü-zâde's next work, the Egri Fethi Ta'rihi.

---

1. Cf. Selânikî, 142a for the appointment of Mihnea-oğlı Radul as voyvode of Wallachia, and 141b for the capture of Mürteedd Rıdıvan.

This latter portion of the narrative text (from folio 115b onwards) deals only superficially with events, details of which are blurred and the chronology confused. Since it is assumed that Ta‘līkī-zāde composed the major part of his text during the year 1595 and did not participate personally in military operations that year,¹ his knowledge of events could not have been that of a first-hand observer.

The text could have finished most conveniently with the poem dedicated to Meḥmed III, and it is possible that, in his original draft of the work, this is what Ta‘līkī-zāde intended. The year 1595 did not go well for the Ottomans — Estergon was lost to the Austrians and the rebellion in Wallachia increased in intensity, bringing humiliation and defeat for both generals, Ferhād Paşa and Sinān Paşa — and thus provided little material worthy of inclusion in a laudatory work of the kind Ta‘līkī-zāde was engaged upon. It has already been noted that, throughout the Ṣehnāme-i Hūmāyūn, the Ṣehnāmecī is careful to uphold the dignity of the vezīr-i a‘zam, to defend him against his critics and to pass silently over controversial incidents which would not enhance the prestige of the vezīr, nor hence that of the state. This is especially apparent with regard to Sinān Paşa’s Wallachian campaign: although the account is brief, it glosses smoothly over the episode, giving no hint whatsoever that the campaign was a complete failure and almost ended in disaster,

¹. See above, pp. 35-6.
many lives being lost is a desperate effort to cross the
Danube whilst being pursued by rebel forces. 1

The question remains as to why Ta'lli̇ki̇-zāde wrote this
final narrative section, since it deals with another, less
successful phase of the war and does, in fact, serve to
distract attention from the victories of 1594. The last
events recorded occurred in Cemāzi 'l-āhir 1003/January 1596;
shortly before this a move had been made in Istanbul to
persuade Meḥmed III of the necessity of leading the next
campaign himself. 2 After thirty years during which the
Ottoman armies had been entrusted to military commanders
and vezīrs, personal leadership by the Sultan promised a
more prestigious campaign; Ta'lli̇ki̇-zāde was no doubt confident
that the outcome would provide excellent material with which
he as şehnāmeci, the panegyrist of the Sultan, could work.
Therefore, to serve as an introduction to this momentous
campaign, he appended to the main text of the Şehnāme-i Hümāyūn
a resumé of those events of the year 1595 which provided a
background to the Sultan's campagin; the later narrative
section of the work is thus in the nature of a postscript,

1. The following incident as reported by Knolles, 1073; con-
cerning a river crossing earlier in Sinān Pāša's Wallachian
campaign, would certainly not have found its way into
Ta'lli̇ki̇-zāde's narrative: "Sinan himselfe, in making
too much hast to get over the bridge, fell into the deepe
mud, and in that generall confusion of his armie, was like
ynough there to have perished: but as the common proverbe
goeth, 'Seldom lieth the devill dead in a dike', the old
Veiliarde was with much ado drawne out by them of his
guard, and so saved to further mischief". Pegevī II, 171,
and 'Alī, 615a, also report the incident.

2. The entry concerning this in Selānikī, 140b, is dated
"evāsīt-ı māh-ı Rebi'tü'l-āhir". Cf. f. H. Uzunşarşılı, op. cit., 76.
with the purpose of directing attention towards subsequent, greater achievements.¹

* * * * *

In conclusion, the ḫātimetū 'l-kitāb (122a-123a) dedicates the work to the Sultan, with a plea that it should be favourably received. Taʿlīkī-zāde mentions himself by name as the weary author, but supplies no date for the completion of the manuscript.

It may be seen from the foregoing summary of the historical content of the Şehnāme-i Hūmāyūn that such a manuscript appears to be of limited value as an historical source. Even when the literary embellishments of the text are left out of account, this narrative does not present a balanced, nor at times even a coherent, record of events. As befits a work in the şehnāme genre — by which one must here of necessity understand praise of the Sultan through the commendation of his army and his chief minister, deputizing for him at the head of the troops — there is no criticism of the Muslim leaders and only slight rebuke at the intransigence of the soldiery. Incidents which do not fall to the credit of the serdār and/or of the Ottoman army, or which detract from the prestige of the dynasty and state, are mentioned

¹. The question of whether this section of the text was added in the spring of 1596 or after Mehmed III's return from his victories at Egri and Hācova does not affect the hypothesis. However, it is more probable that it was written early in 1596, after Sinān Paşa's final appointment as vezir-i aʿzam, but shortly before his death; it is less likely that Taʿlīkī-zāde would have given an account of Sinān Paşa's career had the latter not been alive and in favour at the time of writing.
briefly (e.g. the loss of Estergon) or are passed over without comment (e.g. the unsuccessful campaign into Wallachia undertaken by Sinân Paşa in 1595).

However, the value of the Şehnâme-i Hûmâyûn as an eyewitness account should not be underestimated. Although Ta‘lîkî-zâde is fairly selective with regard to the details he choses to include in his narrative, those which are recorded show him to be an interested and intelligent observer. His account of the council of war held in Belgrade at the opening of the campaign is a most detailed report of this meeting, and there is no reason to doubt its authenticity. Similarly, the incident concerning the Serbian saint, St. Sava, receives very full treatment, providing a valuable Ottoman record to compare with European accounts of the affair. Scattered throughout the text are references to the techniques then in use of trench construction, bridge building and general siege operations.

In comparison with one of the principal Ottoman histories of this period, that of Peçevî for example, Ta‘lîkî-zâde's work emerges in a poor light. It would, however, be unjustifiable to attempt a serious comparison of two works so diverse in purpose and character. Ta‘lîkî-zâde wrote a polished literary work for his imperial patron detailing a short period of time from his own observations. Peçevî, on the other hand, compiled this section of his long history some forty years after the events of the Hungarian war and had the benefit both of hindsight and of the availability of other written sources, thus enabling him to present a more coherent though less detailed account. In contrast to the Şehnâmeçî, Peçevî had
not received an imperial commission for his work, and was therefore able to present a more purely historical rather than a literary text, in which he could exercise the freedom to criticize.

Thus, for the purposes of research into the history of the Ottoman-Habsburg war of 1593-1606, the primary Ottoman sources must be the chronicles and general histories of such writers as Peçevi, Selânikî and 'Alî. A manuscript like the Şehnâme-i Hümâyûn may then be used to supplement the information contained in such works, and to provide specific details which may otherwise pass unrecorded.
The literary style of the Şehnâme-i Hûmâyûn is here analysed in order to bring out the characteristic elements of Ottoman insâ literature as composed at the end of the sixteenth century. An attempt is made to show how Ta‘lîki-zâde understood the nature of insâ prose and how well he mastered the art of its composition.

His style of writing is based upon that developed during the course of the late fifteenth and the sixteenth centuries in the Ottoman chancelleries. His training as a dîvân kâtib involved copying, studying and imitating letters and documents composed by acknowledged masters of style. Two of the most prominent of these were the nişâncı Tâcî-zâde Ca’fer Çelebi (d. 1515) and Celâl-zâde Muştafa Çelebi (d. 1567). The former is credited with the responsibility for having established the elaborate insâ style for official government correspondence, whilst the latter, who held the office of nişâncı uninterruptedly for a period of twenty three years during the reign of Süleymân, is renowned for his historical works, amongst which are the Tabakatî ‘l-Memâlik and the

---

1. The term insâ as used throughout this thesis designates not 'the art of letter-writing' but rather the particular form in Ottoman literature which imitated and expanded the prose style of the epistolographers.

Selîmnâme. The best examples of letters, fethnâmes, 'ahdnâmes, berâts etc., were gathered into collections known as mecû'a-i münse'ât which were then used as textbooks of style by the kûttâb.

Ta'liki-zâde does not state his indebtedness to, nor his admiration of, any particular stylist and it may be assumed that his own style of writing is based upon the cumulative tradition of the late sixteenth century; in it he combined elements he especially admired from various writers which together formed his own particular mode of expression. His declared aim in the composition of the Şehnâme-i Hûmâyûn is the creation of a true work of art:

kilk-i sihr-sâz-ı câdû-firîb bir müferrîf cevheri
terkûb[-û]-tertîb eleyîb, ḥarâbe-i beyâbân-ı
şayâlde ma'mûre-i şehristân-ı kemâlde 'arz-ı cemâl
eyîlb; bir mahbûb-ı dil-ûkîr ve bir nigâr-ı
cilve-kâr oldû ki, sevâdî zûf-ı miskîn-i perî-
ruyân-ı 'anber-bûy, ve beyâzi cebîn-ı melâfat-ûyîn-ı
'âbir-mûyân-ı mûh-rûy gibi hûş-rûbâ oldû. 12b

The composition of ingâ prose of this kind could not be spontaneous; it was the product of a sustained effort involving much revision, rewriting, correcting and polishing. Whilst on the one hand there is the danger that this may lead to mechanical, lifeless turgidity, on the other, one can sense the pride and satisfaction of a gifted author who creates delicate imagery by the introduction of "new" i.e. different, words or phrases into an otherwise conventional prose.
The following passage is a good example of a well-constructed Ottoman Turkish sentence. It is arranged here to bring out the rhyme system and arrangement of parallel clauses.  

1. Ḥaẓret-i Paşa-yı kal’e-gūsāy
dāhī
ricāsī ḩabūl-i dergāh-ı Ḫūdāvend-ı ṣāre-sāz
ve temennāsī makbūl-ı bargāh-ı Ḫūdā-yı mūhimm-perdāz
oldūğına
secdāt-ı bī-ḥadd
ve maḥāmid-ı lā-yu’add
eyleyūb;
ḥayrū ’l-māl mā unfīka fī sebīli ’llāhi ’l-melīkī ’l-mūṭe’āl
makālīnce,
ayyeb-ı māl-ı maḥmedet-me’āllerinden
ṣūleḥāya şadaḵālar
ve ẓu’afāya nefāḵālar
erzānī buyurdūlar.

Ta’līḵī-žāde first expresses his subject, Ḥaẓret-i Paşa, qualified by a single, conventional epithet, kal’e-gūsāy; this is followed by a clause of explanation in the dative, ricāsī ...
... oldūğına, containing two parallel, rhyming (but not perfectly balanced) phrases in which all elements except the final terkīb are synonymous. There is a typical mixture of words of Arabic and Persian origin. The verbal element of the

1. For the sake of clarity, all extracts quoted in this analysis will be given in corrected transcription; orthographic, syntactical and other discrepancies are dealt with in the notes to the edited text.
first part of the sentence takes the form of two parallel expressions, each composed of an Arabic plural noun followed in Persian iżāfe construction by an Arabic adjectival compound; the Turkish verb eyleytib completes the sense of the phrase. An Arabic adage rhyming in -āl is then introduced; makalince, and in the following ablative clause māl and me'āl, continue this sec' pattern. The final section is in simple Turkish syntax but again using non-Turkish vocabulary: sulehā and zu'afā are Arabic broken plurals to which a dative suffix is added; the indefinite objects sadakalar and nefakalar are, in contrast, Arabic singulars with Turkish plural endings. The whole is completed by a verbal compound composed of the Persian adjective erzānī and the Turkish auxiliary buyurdılar.

Many of the characteristics of Ottoman ingā prose are demonstrated in this sentence. The arrangement of the whole is dominated by the requirements of Turkish syntax whilst the various elements are lent a particular form and dignity through the controlled use of parallel, rhyming clauses containing an admixture of Persian and Arabic vocabulary. The use of Turkish words is here limited to the verbs, to olduğana and daḥı. The Arabic adage — most appropriate to the context, as are the great majority of Ta'lıkī-zāde's quotations in that language — is here neatly incorporated into the sec' pattern so that the flow of the sentence is not interrupted. The sentence as a whole has a neat, concise construction: the subject is clearly expressed, case, plural and verbal endings are grammatically correct, there are no long, unwieldy clauses which might obscure the meaning of the passage or which might be considered superfluous or over-elaborate.
The system of parallel clauses shown in this example is repeated throughout the text with varying degrees of elaboration, rhyme and correspondence:

2(a) nevâle-i cağîm-i dij-hîm ve ḥavâle-i düzaḥ-1 pûr-āvaḥ 71a
(b) piş-nihâd-i himmet-i fîkr-i raşîn ve naşbu 'l-‘ayn-i zimmêt-i rây-1 rezîn 79b
(c) cibilletinde mecbûl olan cerâ’eti çâ’le, ve nihâdinde nihâde olan łużveti fi’le getürûb 15a
(d) evrâk-1 cerâ’id-i leylû-nehârda muharrer ve etbâk-1 ḥarâ’id-i ḥâzan-u-bahârda muârarrerdûr 3b
(e) nûfûs-ı zafer-me’nûs ile, ve debdebe-ı kûs-u-naḵâre ve kevkebe-i leşker-ı ɢazâ-κârė ile ḡârâ’-i melâ’în-ı delâlet-âgâra ‘azm buyurub 45b

In the last example, the sec’ pattern has an irregular appearance: the initial rhyme in -ûs terminates in the middle of a word group (kûs); naḵâre then establishes a new rhyme in -ârê, which is taken up by -kârê, ḡârâ’ and -âgâra; the occurrence of this last element, composed of âgâr and a Turkish dative suffix, is unusual since, in general, Turkish case endings, plurals or other suffixes are not taken into account in sec’ constructions. Also of interest is ḡazâ-kârê: the correct form is ɢazâ-kâr. In adding an e Ta’lîkî-zâde again shows that he is prepared to be flexible in such cases for the sake of the rhythm of the passage as a whole.

The next passage is a similar example of Ta’lîkî-zâde’s competency in însâ composition, and shows his delight in the manipulation of words.
This example introduces a ki clause, a grammatical feature which is today virtually eliminated from modern literary Turkish but which was an integral part of an Ottoman text of this period. Ta'llık-zade makes very frequent use of this device: in contrast to the short example shown here, he often introduces long ki clauses which not only break up the thread of the narrative but also disrupt the correct syntax of the passage into which they are inserted. On occasion the author allowed himself to be distracted by the ki clause and neglected to correct the grammar of his sentence.

Here the phrases beginning ibtidā and intihā are typical of Ta'llık-zade's style: whilst there is an almost exact syllabic and vocalic correspondence between the two, Ta'llık-zade is also playing upon the Arabic roots 'ل Zimbabwe', 'to begin' and 'ل Zimbabwe', 'to reach' (= come to the end). While ibtidā and bidāyet are different forms from the same root, as are intihā and
nihayet, ibtidā/intihā and bidayet/nihayet are pairs formed on the same paradigm but yet completely opposite in meaning. Devran and zaman both have a number of meanings as well as that of 'a period of time'.

The next section displays not only alliteration with repeated use of the letter m, but also a juggling of words and forms:

mānendi (Persian, with Turkish possessive suffix)
mekkūd (Arabic passive participle)
ve migli (Arabic equivalent of mānendi, with Turkish possessive suffix)
nā-mevcūd (Arabic passive participle in construction with Persian prefix, thereby giving it the aspect of a Persian word)

nūzūl-i fūtūhāt-ğümūl is a typical example of the noun-ishāfe-terkīb construction, two or more syllables of which rhyme; e.g.

4(a) ḥuﬀāz-î ǧiřīn-elfāz 97a
(b) bu aḥbār-ı meserret-bār 50a
(c) evreng-i zeberced-reng 60a

kībāb-ī ħiyyām-ī bī-ḥesāb and hem-oenāb-ī ğet-rī sehāb extend this system of qualifiers, as in the following:

5(a) mühimmāt-ī sefer-ī ẓafer-simāt 118b
(b) müddet-ī sehl-ī ḫalīlī ’l-mehlde 15a
(c) vūfur-ī celālet-ī meymenet-delālet 50b
(d) melā’īn-ī pūr-kīn-ī șeneviye-ī müşrikīn 82a
(e) ’azm-ı neberd-ı küffār-ı ne-merd [ ی مرد ] 21a
It may be seen again from the last example that Ta‘lîkî-zâde will, when he considers it necessary, alter the usual form of a word (in this case nā-merd) to fit the rhyme scheme.

The following passage, quoted here in full despite its length, is instructive in several respects. It is the opening section of the main narrative of the text, the Ḥâgāz-i dâsitân, and was obviously intended by Ta‘lîkî-zâde to provide an impressive beginning to his account. It provides ample proof of his lexical knowledge and his ability to weave musical patterns with the words at his disposal.¹ It does, however, reveal a tendency for such passages, elaborately constructed with interposed ki clauses, to become grammatically out of hand.²


¹. Although Ta‘lîkî-zâde obviously took great pains with the use of synonyms, antonyms, homonyms etc., he occasionally shows a “lapse of concentration” by using the same word twice in identical meanings in a single sentence, as he uses sipîhîr in example 6, when he had many alternatives from which to choose.

². Cf. 52b-53b: ha‘ret-i ǧân cenâbîna ... ni‘me ’l-ḥalef; and 68a-b: Evvelâ ... pâyîdâr oldîlar. Both these extremely complex passages suffer from defective grammar.
'ahd-u-emân-ı sipih-r-i dürûg-îmân dürüst-şeymân şanub, ıştiyâl-ı rûzgâr-ı țiile-kâra inanub; tîr-i pertâbî gibi meydâna atıldı. 'Adem seferine ğâzîrlanub, ricâl-ı â'ibe katildi.

The temporal/causal clause introduced by gün extends to cem' olub; a finite verb, oldı, or olmîldî, would be preferable here, but Ta'îîzî-zâde is noticeably inconsistent in the verbal forms he employs with gün/günki and obviously did not consider himself bound by any particular rule:

7(a) Gün bu şaber Budunda vezîr olan Hasan Paşâya irişmîldî,  
(b) Gün Paşanû Bildîrda vâsil oldûğu şaberî ğâzîl oldî, 23a  
(c) Gün Jân-ı 'âlî-şân-ı mu'azzez-û-mükerrem egnâf-ı ta'zîmat ile muhterem olnub, 56a  
(d) Gün ğuzât cenab-ı Vâhibü 'l-hacâta tâzarru'-u-munâcâta mûstagrak iken, 60b  
(e) Gün şahân-ı ser-feraz ... kegret-i memâlik-i vesî'âtû 'l-mesâlik ile mûmtâz olur, 6b  
(f) Gün küffar-ı menhûs tebdîr-ı ma'kûslarî berûye mûn'âkîs olmağla, 21a

In example 6, the subject Bosna Beglerbegisi Hasan Paşa is expressed at the beginning of the sentence and then not referred to again until taken up in the possessive suffix of bagxnda; meanwhile, the subject changes to ğulvâ-ı şebâb-ı civânî ... şebîke-i nakş-ı garûrdur. This list is syntactically related to the rest of the passage only by the phrase bu defîlû ... mağâfât, which results in very loose construction.
After cem' club, the passage presents little difficulty; the subject reverts to Hasan Paşa, using first active and then passive verbs in succession without any cancellation of the -ub ending of the active. Ta'lıkî-zâde frequently incorporates Turkish verbs as an extra rhyming element in his prose: thus sanub, inanub, and hâzîrlanub; atîldî and katîldî. The text provides numerous examples of this:

8(a) birbiri-yelî barışdûrub, ... birbîrînûn yüzine bakmâyannlarî görûşdûrub

(b) Hemân yır oynadî, tašla toprâk kaynadî. Kimi kolındand, kimi belinden bölündi. Kiminûn beynisi bînîsinden taşra bulûndî.

(c) bir çok alârga topin atub, ya'nî 'askeri dâ'îreye uğratmadî, ve sipâh-î ejder-demâr-u-encüm-şûmâr hesâba katmadî.

In certain instances, he appears to alter the verb stem to give a more perfect rhyme:

9(a) rek-î kemân gibî kâni kurdi [نوردنی = kurudî] ve nâf-î sipêr migûllû göbegi burdî

(b) Mûsûlmânlarûn işi sovdî [سوردی = sovdû], her biri yûregin ovdû

(c) yetâmî seksen Mûsûlmânî 'adem-âbâd-î ašlîye gönderdîler, mirvâh-î ermâhîla şem'-î hayâtîn sondîrûlû [شوندریز] 72a

(d) mekân-î ašlî ve kân-î neslîlerine gönderüb, ve kendîleri göñûlden 'inân-î 'azmî gûriz-gâha döndûrûb [دورنعوب] 72b
Finally with regard to example 6, we should note Ta‘lîkî-zâde’s arrangement of the material into two extremely unbalanced sentences. The first, Çûn ... atîldî, describes in elaborate detail the feelings which induced Ҫâsan Pâşa to make his rash attack and his blind belief in its successful outcome. The second sentence in six words tells of the consequence; the short, sharp expression clearly reflects the absolute decisiveness of the defeat.

The use of simile and metaphor are characteristic features of ınşâ prose and figure prominently in this work.

Simile: 10(a) sîrîsk-i yetîm gibî ‘aştımû ‘l-kaṭatârât
yağmurlar yağub, ve äh-î cân-kân-î sîne-i
mażlûmân-î nâ-muvâfîk-äñter gibî muğâlîf
yiller esûb 119b

(b) Budunuñ içi ‘aşkerden kâсе-î kerîm gibî
hâlî, ve kese-i le’ïm mânendi melâlle
mûlîdûr 22b

c) halka-î müskîn-î ‘anber-fâm-î ʤam-ender-
ʤam-î hûbân-î gün-âşâm gibî birbirine
girîmiş legêker-ï Şâm 45a

(d) Ïl defîlû şop-u-tûfeng atî ki, çûmile fezâyî
cïft surîlîmîs tarla gibî yol yol eyledî. 76b

(e) dîrañt-î hûsk mânendi yîrinde ʧuruyû-ʤaldî 6lb

Metaphor: 11(a) Ḥâzret-i Pâşa-û yî gîï-çuşûnûf gûlistân-î
zâmîrlerinde şadî güllerî şigmîte-vû- handjob,
ve bostân-î serrûret-î selvet-semîrlerinde
esmâr-û sîvûr şad çendân oldî. 50a
11(b) her kes"ûn "his"âr-1 "sab"r-u-"ist"ib"âr"âna ze"el-"[""ghale"l"], b"ûn"âd-1 t"âk-1-ta"hamm"âline "ghale"l
gel"ûb 64a

(c) Nice düza"b"în"û m"âki"yân-1 r"ûh-1 bi-fût"ûh"
z"âviye-i beden-i ke"ş"if"în"ûn"ê tenezz"ûl-1-"t"edenn"î
ey"ley"ûb 79b

The following examples show a typical combination of figures of speech:

12(a) bedr-i 'k"ad"r-i "kad"re ve mehçe-i r"ayet"în"ûn uç1
evc-i bedre väs"îl ol"du"n"ûn g"ibi ş"i"h"âb-1-"s"i"tâb"ê ve
ş"i"m"âl-1-"i"s"tî-1-"c"âl meteris yirîne var"ûb 38b

(b) ke-"n"es"î-1 'l-1-"an"k"e"b"ût fî zev"âyâ-l-1-"b"ûy"ût,
mikn"e"s-1 ş"âv"n-1 Ş"a"mâ"dâ"nî ve mu-1-"c"îzâ-1-1
Res"ûl-1- "Ye"z"dâni b"i"r"le ş"âk"în e"f"l"â"k e"s"av"r"ûr,
ve tâb-1 tâb-1 tîg"û-1 [kav"ûn] kav"ûr"ûr"ûz 47a

The imagery contained in the following passages is particularly effective:

13(a) ordu iç"în"de şa'"îr, şîr"de ma"z"mûn-1 şâ"gş migîllû,
nâ-yâb, bel"ki "kây"m"e-1 c"e"v kâ-1-"i"nât-1 c"e"v"e "çâk"ûb,
mûş"t"e"rî-1-ye yûk"âr"dân aş"ağı bâk"ûb 93a

(b) ol de"fîlû tîr perr"ûn old"â ki, cîs"m-1 k"ûf"fâr "hâne-1
zenbûr ve tâh"t"a-1 mesmûra dûndî 63a

Ta'lıkî-"zâ"de's ability in the composition of elaborate passages of insa" pros is complemented in the Şehnâme-1 Hûmâyûn
by his competent use of various elements of Turkish grammar.
This can be seen to good effect in the following passage:
This one (sentence) is securely held together mainly through the use of the dative case and the participles in -en/-an and -miş, with the instrumental buyurмагъan connecting the two parts. The first phrase shows the use of çikmak and its factitive çıkarmak, of the synonyms hisar/kal’e and bayrak/sancak, and requires hisar gedliği to be understood in two ways — as a breach in the fortress wall, and as the entitlement to draw a salary as the member of a fortress garrison.

The second phrase, kafir ... buyurmağъan, shows the use of the -ince gerund, meaning 'until', and introduces a rhyme in -ä; the imperfective gerund diyü is used in the meaning of nâmına, 'which might be called'. The final phrase uses -miş gibi in the sense of 'as if', and the whole is rounded off by the rhyming verbs üstü and düştü.

The construction of sentences around the dative case ending is a characteristic of this work; e.g.

Here the verbal element is divided: inhâ governs hažret-i Şadr-müşîre, whilst îmâ governs mujde-vü-tebşîre.

In the following example we find two pairs of words with an apparent dative ending which nevertheless cannot be
understood in any of the usual meanings of that case:

15(b) anlar bize câna başa, biz anlara toprağa taşa urduk 82a

Ta’lîkî-zâde seems to be using the dative ending on câna başa and toprağa taşa in the sense of the instrumental, i.e. cânla başla, 'with heart and soul', toprakla taşla, 'with earth and stones'. Since four words are involved, this cannot be considered an orthographic error. Even by the end of the sixteenth century when this manuscript was written, the rules of Turkish grammar had not yet become firmly established and a writer like Ta’lîkî-zâde was able to choose between alternate grammatical forms. Thus the dative may here be used in the sense of ile/-la, 'with, by means of', because of its shorter form which gives a better rhythm to the sentence. This may also be influenced by the use of a pair of imperfective gerunds as in the following phrase:

16  döne döne harık, yana yana Tunaya garık 80b

This repetition not only imparts rhythm but also implies a sense of persistence or continuance in the doing of a thing, which would be particularly appropriate in 15(b) above.

A similar use of the dative case occurs in the following beyt:

15(c)  Bu öslûba ol şâh-ı devlet-ârîn

Şeref-yâb olub oldı devlet-nişin 113a

Bu öslûba should be understood bu öslûb ile according to the sense of the passage.
Due to the lack of a firmly established Ottoman grammatical system, Ta’lîfi-zade did not consider himself bound to consistency in the treatment of case and plural endings. To the unwary reader, this can be a cause of confusion and may at times appear as a flaw in the text. Frequently throughout the work, verbs are left with no expressed subject; in a majority of cases it is clear from the context that this refers to (i) Sinân Paşa, (ii) the Ottoman troops, or (iii) the küffâr, but there are several instances in which the subject changes abruptly without any indication.

In sentences where two elements are subject to the same case or plural endings, we frequently find that only one of these is in the "correct" form, the other is understood from the context:

accusative:

17(a) dirlik lezzetinden ölmek merârethin fera méthode ve şarâb-ı şevki nüş eleyüb 80a

plural:

(b) Anatoli ' askeri ... cebîn-i zara't-îyinleriini üsküffe-î felek-sâda süde, ve cibân-î hak-iştibâhi ... dergâh-î âsümân-fersâda fersüde eleyüb 85a

dative:

(c) tâ kâfirden deyyar kalmayıncaya degin kirub, dil çıkartmadilar. Vakt kalmayıncaya, kılıçların kınlarına katmadı 74a

-ya degin applies to both -inca forms according to the context.
suspension of verbal element:

17(d) kāfirūn ẓafūna ot ṭika-, ve kāfirin sürûb, oçağına od yaka-gelmışlerdûr. Bunlarûf čiragina küffarûn yûregi yagi-yle yana-, ve kefere-i pûr-delâlet ḳâb-1 gafletden bunlarûf silī-yi seyfi-yle uyana-gelmışdûr. 87a

possessive suffix:

(e) Yeñiçeri dilâverleri bâgzâr-1 nûşretûn nesteren, ve nev-bahâr-1 fetûhî semeni olub 44b

(f) Yine ḡâzret-i Paşa-yi ercûmend-i merz-gūşâ-yı rezm-bendûn gelûb, şâdr-1 vezâreti müşerref buyurub, düşmen-i din üzerine ser’aske olub gönderilmesini vech-i vecîh görmeğin 116a-b

-mesini must apply also to the forms in -üb.

The -üb ending is the most frequent verb form to be found in the Şehnâme-i Hûmâyûn, as it is in most works of the period. In the majority of cases, it indicates a past tense in -di or -mîşdi, but may also occur in other constructions. The previous example 17(f) is not one of the more common usages. It is frequently used with, for example, the infinitive:

18(a) mebrnā-yi kelâm Yemen fethine gitmeyûb kalûmk, ve böyle tekâlîf-i mümtene’eyi sedd kılmâk idi 116b

or with the subjunctive:

(b) kazîlân ṭopraḵ kenârîna ḳodîlêr ki, ḳal’ede olanlar görûb, ‘ibret alub, başlarînûn teðârûkîn görelere
Infinitive clauses occur frequently, e.g.:

19(a) kadidi getirmek fermân olunub

(b) her birinuzu müstaqill bir emr varmak lâzım degüldür

(c) ve bi 'l-cümle küffär-1 dün zebün olmak nişâni görindi

The following passage demonstrates in particular Ta'liki-zâde's use of infinitive constructions, a rather confusing series of -üb suffixes, the use of the ablative case and of the future participle.

20 Gün toprak sürmekde nice günler toprak sipâhileri hâkle yeksan olub, mânend-i Elbûrz-ü-Demâwend sûrlen hâk hemser-i eflâk olmış iken, toprak taşımak hendekûn bir rağnesin toldurmayub, bu ma'na ehl-i İslâmûnâyine-i kalbi şubâr-1 küdûretden münkisir-ü-mû'annâ eleyüb; ve sademât-1 topr-1 kal'e-kübdân açılan gediklerden kal'ennûn kapusı kapanmakdan fetühe 'l-bâb umûdi mesdûd olduğuna binâ'en, her kesûn hisâr-1 şabû-u-ıstibârîna zezel-î-[halele], bûnyâd-ı tâkat-ü-taşammûline halel gelüb; her kişi hisâr-1 endûh-u- nijendde esir-ü-şehr-bend olub; şam-u-ğuşşadan gayrî yeyecek ve zehrâb-î eşk-i melâlden ayrî işlecek kalma'dı.

The length of the gün clause is here debatable; Ta'liki-zâde's only rule with regard to this word seems to be that it should occur at the beginning of a sentence. Sademât ... şehr-bend olub again shows Ta'liki-zâde's fondness for juggling the numerous synonyms, antonyms and alliterative combinations.
available to him from the three languages, Arabic, Persian and Turkish.

The passage contains several examples of the use of metaphor and simile, and shows again his idiosyncratic treatment of case endings — āyine-i kalbi ought to be in the accusative case (as bir rahnesin previously) as the direct object of münkəsir-ū-mu‘anā eyleyü. The final phrase contains two parallel clauses showing a basic use of the -ecek form.

The work shows various uses of the subjunctive. It is used in its original meaning:

21(a) Güneş gibi ağa dünyaya yekser
Ola cevher-nümā-yı tāc-u-efer
Ola gādāb u āhrem 'omri bāğī
Ser-effrāz ola her tāzeбудаğī 123a

(b) rāyet-i millet-i beyzā efrāйте ve ğehre-i
saltanat-i devlet-i kīţizā efrāйте olmadan
ğalī olmayā 41b

in the sense of the imperative:

22(a) Belgrad-i 'atād-mu‘tādda taşgīl-ū-iddihār eyleyüb,
der anbār kaldurasın. Ve ne vechle itdūgifi
vuḵū'1 üzre bildüresin. 18b

(b) Sene-i käbilenüh mūhimmatına bi 'l-uşūl ve-'l-fürū'
taşaddū-ŭ-vū-şūrū' eyleyesiz. Ve ta'allūl-ŭ-
bahāneneden kerāne idesiz. 19b

(c) "Yat-u-yarağ üzre olasız" diyü, ğaber-i nuşuset-
egser uçurmağıla 34a
and also in the sense of the aorist:

23 Ve eger şad ḵarān-1 hezār-kīrān muẖāṣara olınsa, ẓaḥā'irine nefād-u-infiṣām gelmeye. Ve eger ḵal'e-i mezbūreden ḵünı e ḵal biḵ  rừng, ẓųz biž tūfeng atılsa, ẓųz yıla deɡın barutına ve findüğına nokṣān ıntımāli olmaya.

According to the context, *gelmez* and *olmaz* should be understood here.

An idiomatic use of the subjunctive is shown in the following:

24 Bizüm diyārımuz gibi köy köy üzre ola böyle değüldür 7a

In elaborate ıntā texts, one does not usually expect to find reflections of the common idiom of the day. In this work, however, idiomatic usage does occur in passages of direct speech or plain narrative.

25(a) Kāfīr ise, mutaṣṣīl Țunaya geçüb, nehb-ū-ıgāretden hālı olmayub; iş işden geçüb, kār cāna ve kār backendVV ana iriṣüb 118b

(b) bir vaḵīye giyāh-1 ḥuṣk iki aşçe ye iken, iki vaḵīyesi bir aşçe ye inıüb; ve bir araba odun seksen pāre ılsın yetmiş aşçe ye bulınmaz iken, altı aşçe ye ıntmke oṭuncınuň bıyıɡın balta kesmez olub 121a

(c) teslīm-i tīğde boynuların kıldan incedür dımecke dıkkat gördiler 28a
As mentioned previously, the text of the Şehnâme-i Hümâyûn presents numerous examples of a subtle play upon words. The following example revolves around the Arabic root 'ā'n 'to be faithful, loyal':

26(a) kâfir-i bî-îmân sevgend-û-eymân ve 'ahd-û-peyman

ile şişär-î amâna girdi, kal'eyi virdi 85a

Three forms are derived from the same root: îmân אַּמָּן, eymân אַּמָּן, and amân אַמָּן; the Persian peyman although etymologically unrelated, is similar in sound and orthography, and contains the similar idea of a promise (to be faithful); 'ahd and sevgend are also synonymous. In contrast, the first word, kâfir, is completely antithetical and tends to dominate the rest of the sentence, thus virtually cancelling the emphasis on the good meaning of the Arabic root.

The cinâs, or word play, in the next example involves three words of completely different meaning, but which are practically identical when written in the Arabic script:

26(b) Nişâne-i tîr-i nažar olmâq içûn ser-i bî-effserin
teninden cûdâ [ ۴'د ], ve peyvend-i kelle-i
cîda [ ۴'د ] itmede cidden [ ۴'د ] tağşir itmeyem 89a

Note that the final verb, when applying to cûdâ should be read ideyem.

The following passages show that word-play is equally effective in sentences not dominated by an Arabic element.

26(c) ve nice za'îm serbest iken, ser-best oldî, ve nice
tezkerelî tîmârî olan teskerelî bîmar oldî; ve

nice toprağ sipâhîsi kara toprağ oldî. 82a
26(d) kāfirūn cengi yukardan olmagla bașdan çıkmak ile,
cengi bașa çıkmaduk 79a

Here baş and çıkmak are used in two different idioms, which
could be translated: "Since the battle was out of [our]
control (başdan çıkmak) because the enemy occupied the higher
position, we were unable to bring it to a successful conclusion
(başa çıkmak)."

26(e) ilk yaz, yazıya beyāna, yazıya yabāna şızmaz çıyüş-ı
naşihat-niyüş ile 'azm-i rezm-i Macir-i fācir
eyleyeler 22a-b

In this passage, ilk yaz, 'spring', is followed by yazı,
'a piece of writing', and beyān, as a near-synonym meaning
'explanation in words'. Yazı is then used in a second meaning,
'mountainous plain, summer camping ground', followed by yabān
in the similar meaning of 'large open space'. This particular
word play is given in verse form in the Egri Fethi Ta’riği:

Ki deryā-yi hāmūn u emvāc-ı kūh
Çamu kāfir olmiş ğırūhen ğırūh
Ki yazıya şızmaz yabāna daḥi
Ne yazıya belki beyāna daḥi 31a

In the poetry contained within the Şehnâme-i Hūmâyûn
Ta’līkī-zâde is especially prone to introducing puns:

27(a) Kīlur kahve içün faḵīre ‘ıtāb
Mūdāmī velī kendū mest-ū-ḫarāb 112b

mūdāmī here means 'continually', but it also implies
the meaning of mūdam, 'wine'.
In the first ḥisrā' sanduqā is the -duk participle of the verb ṣanmak, 'to suppose', whereas in the second ḥisrā' it is the noun sanduk, 'coffin' with the possessive suffix.

(c) Neheng-i ecel yutdı ol ejderi
Ol idi ezelden daği ecederi

Here there is not only the contrast between ecel [الج], 'future eternity' and ezel [الأز], 'past eternity', but the words ejderi [ايجدري] and ecedri [ايجدري] contain a play upon the same consonants ج and ن, the pronunciation of which is almost identical.

The following beyts appear to contain a play upon the graphic similarity between sekiz and -ṣifüz, both written كوز:

Mu‘ayyen sekiz der sicill aḳçeṣhüz
Sicilldür sizüh bāğufuz başçeṣhüz
Mücerred sekiz aḳçe içün hemân
İdersiz bir insâni ḳabre revâń

*  *  *  *

Although the Şehnâme-i Hûmâyûn has been spoken of so far as a work of Ottoman inşâ, this statement must be qualified. The foregoing analysis leaves no doubt as to Ta’lîkî-zâde's ability to combine in his writing the various elements which characterize inşâ prose — the use of rhymed, balancing clauses, of metaphor, simile, alliteration and word-play; the
deft combination of Arabic, Persian and Turkish synonyms and antonyms, extensive use of the Persian īśāfe, Arabic and Persian prefixes (such as bī- and nā-), and the ki clause. The text as a whole is embellished by the regular introduction of poetry — ranging from the single mīrā' to lengthy sections covering several folios — Arabic sayings and Koranic quotations.

However, this elaborate style is not uniformly maintained throughout the work; the narrative varies markedly from ornate īnğa passages to very taut, precise sections of almost pure Turkish. Although at first glance Taʿlīki-zāde may be criticized for this apparent inability to maintain the high standard of composition of which he is capable, on closer examination it becomes evident that behind the seeming inconsistency there is a particular purpose.

Ottoman īnğa prose as developed in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries reflected in its elaborate perfectionism the grandeur and superiority of the Ottoman empire. Its original function in the hands of the münşî was to project in imperial documents the power of the state and to impress the recipients of the Sultan's letters. Similarly, in this work, Taʿlīki-zāde utilizes īnğa prose to full effect when he wishes to convey the power, greatness and dignity of the state through its representatives the serdâr and the ordu-yi hūmāyûn. The personal qualities of the serdâr — his bravery, generosity, justice and piety etc. — are described at length, whilst a particular attitude or state of mind is in the same way effectively presented through extended use of metaphor.
and simile as seen in the following extract:

28 Ḥaẓret-i Paşa-yı kerîm rîkkat-i dil-i râhîmden, gâh nâle-i cân-kâhî âtêşîn ile nîr-ı gayrete yandî, ve gâh pençe-i ǧârâmetî ǧârîb-ı zânû-ı melâmêt kilub, sirîk-ı nedâmêtelî kana boyandî. 22b

Similarly, elaborate language is used to portray the bravery and courage of the troops in battle:


The elements of nature, as manifestations of the power of God, are generally described in elaborate language; similarly the inevitable succession of night and day:

30 Çûn şeb-i müşkîn-fûm perde-i zâlâmi şekdi, ve çet-ı mâhrûṭî-sîmîyî bâlây-ı ǧabrâyâ dikdi, şu’bede-bâz-ı şems-bend-ı leyâl nazzâregiyân-ı ‘âlemûf gozîn bağlándî; leşker-i encûm-ı bi-şûmûr kûlle-i felek-i bedâ’i-‘âgâra ḥâvâdîg şîplîn urub, revzen-ı falâk-ı
Inşā prose, then, is used to good effect in descriptive passages. In contrast, however, when Ta'lıkī-zāde wishes to emphasize the urgency or importance of a particular happening he dispenses with elaborate epithets, similes and unnecessary repetition. A more straightforward Turkish is employed, which is as effective in conveying a picture of purposeful action as ornate language is in the above passages. Contrast the desperate battle scene pictured in example 29 with the following record of a local raid:

31 diyār-ı kūffāra yaraḵ-u-yaḵın ‘azm-ū-aḵın şalub, köylerin yakub yakub, şırpub şalub, mağānim ile sālim-ū-ğānim geldiler

or with the matter-of-fact account of the Ǧān’s conquest of Papa:

32 yarındası Papa kal’ešine varub; kāfirūn piyāde-vü- atlusı muḳātele üçün muḳābele olduğu gibi, leşker-i Tatar-ı dūşmen-şiken-i kāfir-fikenūn muḳāddemleri irişüb; anlar tüfeng-i cân-āheng, bunlar tür[-û-] ḥadeng ile ceng eleyüb; ḥażret-i Ǧān-ı ejder-peyker irişdüği gibi şavlet-i ātes-i ǧism-nākdan leşker ḥāşak gibi gürizân, atı yūrūk olan kal’eye kaṣub, kaṣımayan kılığdan geçüb; iki bīn altı yüz baş
Aside from the conventional epithets applied to the Hân and his Tatar troops, this passage bears little comparison to Ta’lîkî-zâde’s most ornate inşâ prose. The relative simplicity of this narrative style is also partly accounted for by the fact that Ta’lîkî-zâde did not witness the event personally. It is only natural that he should record in greater detail incidents in which he participated and make less effort to maintain an elaborate style when dealing with other topics.

The seizure of the remains of the Serbian saint, St. Sava, from the monastery at Mileştева is for the most part a simple, flowing narrative which Ta’lîkî-zâde again based on second-hand information. He reports it as an interesting but isolated phenomenon and is careful to give a clear, dependable account; the chapter heading indicates his desire to present an accurate record of the incident and reads "Güftâr ender ba’zi ez vaḵâ’î‘, ki der ḥilāl-i sevāniḥ rûy nûmûde, ki itmām-ı kelâm der în maḵām mevkûf başed be-ān". In this case the very simplicity of the narrative serves to emphasize the ease with which Ahmed Paşa accomplished his task and shows that plain language may, in its turn, be particularly effective:

33 Ol gün gelen akge-vü-altun rehâbîn ortaya getûrub, mâ-beynlerinde tevzi‘-u-taksîme meşgûllerken, Paşa ḥažretleri dört yüz adenle irişûb, kırk neferin piyâde eleyûb, berk-ı ḥaṭîf gibi inûb, içeşiye girûb, kadîde doğru yüriyûb; papaslar tuyûb, istikbâle mûbâderet idînce, fi 'l-fevr kîrkîlar
sandugun yirinden kaldurub; alay ile papaslar teveccüh itdükleri gibi, Paşa anlara teveccüh eleyüb; bir çil ağa ve altun ve şuras papaslarra karşı şağub, melâ'ın ağa-vu-altunu cem'ine perişan iken, kiliseden taşra olurlar. 34a–35b

Of the words used in this passage, no more than a quarter are of Arabic origin, and of Persian derivation there are only a handful. The non-Turkish grammatical element is confined to the Arabic phrase mā-beyn (which is placed in Turkish construction), the adverb fi 'l-fevr, and the single instance of the Persian itâfe, berk-i haṭîf. This presents a striking contrast to the examples of inşā prose taken from other parts of the work, as for instance in example 6 above.

The following extract, cast in the form of direct speech, shows that Ta'lîkî-zâde did not hesitate to give his text a colloquial flavour when appropriate:

34 "Kiral dâ'imm sûyler ki: 'Peşûn iki cihetle alınması mümkünür. Biri budur ki, dîvari tağdur, topla tîz yıklub, harab olur. İkinci budur ki, üstü yanında Tunanûn şâğâ vurdur. Şavuldukdançoğra hendekî kuriyu-kalar'. Emmâ bunûn [i.e. Yanyak] şularî şavulmaz kesilmez, ve dîvari toprağ ile toldurma olmayub; âslînda bir kühsar-şekl idi, etrâfîn kesüb, yüzine kiremid ile dîvâr çekdiler. Ol tağdırîce tağ dögilmekden alınır mı?" 90b

We have already seen how Ta'lîkî-zâde adapts various elements of Turkish grammar to his style of writing. He also makes particularly effective use of certain constructions, as
in the following, where repetition is used to convey the intensity of battle:

35(a) bunlar anlara, anlar bunlara tığ-i āteş-iltihāb urub 74a

(b) anlar bize cāna başa, biz anlara ṭoprağa ṭaşa urduk, anlar bizi, biz anlari kirdük 82a

(c) anlar cănlarindan, kılıç anlardan geçdi 71b

Another favourite device involves the use of simile:

36(a) māh-i tābī ḥāle ve mey-i nābī piyāle gibi Tata kal'esini ighāṭa eylediler 36b

(b) kılā'-i İslāmiyeden Şupotika nām ḥiṣār-i rehīn-i nā-üstüvārī, genci mār ve gūlistānı ḫār gibi, ighāṭa-vu-idāre eleydîb 26b

In both these examples the final verb also governs the object in the comparative clause and thus imparts a particular unity to the sentence.

Simple juxtaposition of words or phrases carries the narrative forward with a sense of urgency:

37(a) her birine kīrkar mīkdār yarar, siper-sîne rūmḥ-engüst, ışmîr-zebân debbüs-müst dilâveri 66a

(b) aşağıdan ehl-i İslām, yukarıdan küffār-ī pûr-āgām, gāh meydān-ī tîr-û-kemān, gāh dīvān-ī seyf-û-sînān, gāh neberd-ī külûh[-u-]seng, gāh ḍarb-ī kûpāl-û-tûfeng, gāh rûy-u-müst ve gāh düğ-u-pûşt 79a-b

Ta'liḳi-zāde's style is thus a combination of elaborately constructed Ottoman ışnā prose in primarily descriptive
passages, and less ornate, more recognizably Turkish sections in varying degrees of complexity for sustained narrative. This pattern testifies to his awareness of the use of contrasting literary styles to create the desired impression in the mind of the reader. Taken as a whole, the Şehnâme-i Hûma’yûn is not a work of uniform character and standard. Nevertheless, Ta’lîkî-zâde’s readiness to vary his style of writing in accordance with his subject matter results in an original composition combining flowing descriptive passages with short definitive statements, and demonstrates a particular sensitivity to the use of language.

* * *

The Şehnâme-i Hûma’yûn is studied here principally as a specimen of artistic prose composition. Poetry, which was an integral part of înşâ literature, is frequently introduced into the text in verse sections of varying length. However, Ta’lîkî-zâde was first and foremost a mûnşî, not a poet, and it would be unfair to him to attempt a serious evaluation of his poetical ability on the basis of the poetry found in this manuscript.

It is not clear how much of this was actually composed by Ta’lîkî-zâde. The verses introduced by li-mû’ellifi-hî or li-mûnşî’i-hî account for less than one half of the beyts (excluding the long megnevî section from folios 105a to 115a). The other passages are termed simply msrâ’, beyt, nazm, şî’r or ki’t’a, with an occasional rubâ’î or a passage of Arabic
verse. The proportion of Turkish to Persian beyts in the work as a whole is roughly equal.

A majority of these other verses are probably taken from earlier Ottoman and Persian poets, but, with the exception of short passages in the introductory folios attributed to Firdevsi, Câmi, Hâtifi, Sa'dî and Sultan ‘Ogmân I, there is no indication of their authorship. The Persian beyts in the mütəkərib metre are possibly taken again from Firdevsi’s Şâhnâme. However, the fact that all these sections of poetry are particularly apt in their prose setting gives the impression that a greater proportion of the poetry may actually stem from Ta’lîkî-zade himself and that the terms beyt, nazm etc. may be in many cases merely variants for the formulae li-mü’ellifi-hi and li-münşi’i-hi. Nevertheless, since evaluation of his ability as a poet should properly be based on the Egri Fethi Ta’rlhi, which is composed entirely in verse form, it will suffice here to indicate the purposes for which poetry is used in the Şâhnâme-i Hûmâyûn and its relation to the prose text.

Its primary purpose is to intensify descriptive passages, either by simple repetition of the prose immediately preceeding:

38 Der hâl deryâ-yî aţtar-î cemen semen-endâm hiyâm ile bahrî aţ żarda bâdbân-î sepîd açmiş keştîlere döndi. (li-mü’ellifi-hi)

Ţonanub berg-i sepîd ile dıraţtân-î cemen

Gemîlerdûr şanasîn bahrde açmış yelken

74b
or by adding extra detail:


Sipâhî çû deryâ-ı yuqan be-ceng
Heme tîz kerde be-peykâr çeng

Yelân-ı ser-efrâz-u-şîmîr-zen
Neberd-âzmâyân-ı leşker-ûken

Be-gâh-ı [vegâ] her yek-eş şaff-derî
Ez-îşân yekî v-ez 'adû leşkerî 86b

The following beyt could very well have been prose except for the fact that it falls into metre: (li-mû'ellifi-hi)

40 Ateşîn-dem rûy-ten sengîn-dil ü âhen-êdîû
Magz-küb u 'ömr-rûb u cân-sitân ejder-şadâ
minâre-nişân âteş-feşân tôplarîn oraya getürüb 65b

Example 41 shows the use of a single beyt as a definite link in the narrative:

41 her bir tâş dibinden bîm baş peydâ, ve her bir giyâ
bûûnden bîm siyâh-rûy hüveydâ olmîş iken, (nazm)

Koşanub tîg-i ikdâmî beline
Hamîyet gürzini alûb eline
varub, a'dâ-yı dîni hûk-i siyâhla yeksân-u-mâglûb,
ve râyêt-i İslâm-ı zafer-mensûbî evc-i feleke
manşûb buyurî. 117a

Longer descriptive passages, in either Persian or Turkish, and usually in the mûtekârib or short hezec metres, are used
to enumerate lists of things, such as the description of the frescoes on the walls of the monastery at Mileseva (32a-b), or the dishes provided at the feast of welcome for the Yăn (51a-b).

A second important use of poetry is to incorporate a popular saying into the text. Whilst Arabic proverbs or Koranic quotations are embodied in the prose text, Persian adages are frequently given prominence in the form of a single mísrā':

42(a) Sālī ki nikū-st ez bahār-eş peydâ-st 41b
(b) Ālū çū be-ālū nigered reng ber-āred 23b

Connected with this is the practice of introducing a homily or moral:

43(a) Kal'entūn alınmasına işaret ve fetṣ-olınmasına beşaretdür. Bu deli̇l birle ma'lūm ve bu te'vîl ile mefhūm olur ki, (nażm)

Çū şāhān be-di̇vār gi̇red penāh
Ne-tersed ez-ū düşmen-i ķīne-ghi̇vāh

Hişār-i şehān mī̄qfer-ū-cev̄şen-est
Ne di̇vār-i sȧğt u diz-ī āhen-est 80b

(b) Kesî-râ ki cûr'et bûved bi̇ştir
Seved kü̇ste der ma'reke pî̇ştir 13b

(c) bir kaç edāni-vû-sefîl dürüb-ī ḥürûbdan ḡafîl, (beyt)
Besî ber ḵafā-yi hezîmet me-rān
Me-bâda ki dür ʿiftî ez ʿayrârân
mazmûnîndan bi-ḥabar, tehevîr ile kâfîrûn kâdûn meterisden çûkub, ardîna ķova-gi̇dûb 72a
A third use of poetry is for the inclusion of a prayer:

44(a) Ḥāyet-i devlet-penāh-et dā'imā maṣūr bād
Rub'-ī meskūn der penāh-ī devlet-et ma'mūr bād 119a

(b) In nām be-nām-ī ṣāh nāmī bādā
Der ğeşm-i ʿināyet-ēs kirāmī bādā
Şīrīnī-yi naẓm-ēs be-mezāk-ī ƣusrev
Çün ƣusrev-ū-Şīrīn-ī Niẓāmī bādā 12b

In general, Taʿlīkī-zāde shows himself to be a writer of learning and sensitivity, careful in his use of language and attentive to the nuances of speech rhythm. Since, even at this late period, Ottoman Turkish had not yet developed a formal grammar, he was able to avail himself of this latitude to employ constructions and tropes which today can be criticized as ungrammatical, but which he saw as permissible variations which would contribute to the individual style at which he was aiming. His work may be seen from one point of view as an experimental effort to achieve an artistic objective which would elevate prose to an aesthetic level comparable with that of poetry. Whether the result can be regarded as successful or not, it must be acknowledged that Taʿlīkī-zāde was very much aware of the flexibility of language as an artistic medium, a quality rarely to be found either amongst his contemporaries or his successors.
The system of transcription used in this edition is based upon that employed in the İslâm Ansiklopedisi. Wherever possible, words have been vowelled in accordance with the form in which they appear in the Redhouse Yeni Türkçe-İngilizce Sözlük. When the word or expression is not to be found there, the general practice of employing back vowels with back consonants and front vowels with front has been followed. This does not present an obstacle to the location of the word in the Arabic or Persian dictionaries, and is merely followed in order to give a consistency to the treatment of the sound values of the text.

In certain cases, where modern Turkish has adopted a particular spelling, preference is, however, given to a more archaic form where this is indicated in the text: e.g.

حضرَ دِسْتُورُ : where düstür is preferred to destür
بير : where yir is preferred to yer.

Arabic words which in modern Turkish pronunciation have undergone a slight change in accordance with vowel harmony, e.g. امَان—aman; لازِم—lazım, are transcribed according to their use in the text: in an Arabic phrase the Arabic form is used, e.g. لازم الْامَان bī-emān; لازم الْامَان lazīmu 'l-ı'tikād; in a Turkish phrase the harmonized form is preferred.

Words are given in a modern standardized form when there is a question of consonantal discrepancy: i.e. always kılıç not kılıç; top not tob.
The particle ıle follows vowel harmony only when it appears in the text as a pure suffix, e.g. olmağla, mirvaha-ı ermehla. In the combined form it retains front articulation: bayrakları-yle.

Unless the text indicates otherwise, possessive suffixes will always be written with the rounded vowel ü/u in the first and second persons: sultanum, senûn, tîgûmuz, cânûnûz. In a few instances, where the text indicates an unrounded i/i vowel, this is retained in the transcription, e.g. باسمuz. The third person possessive suffix is always i/i, si/si, leri/lari.

Similarly, the personal endings of verbal forms take the rounded ü/u vowel in the first and second persons, and the unrounded i/i in the third person: eyledüm, -dûn, -di; aldük, -duñuz, -dalar. For the verb substantive, however, the following endings are preferred, retaining a low vowel pronunciation in the first person: -em, -sin, -dur; -ez, -sînûz, -dûrler. In cases where the text indicates otherwise, the alternative vowelling is given, e.g. ضرب، گیرلرûz.

Extended verb stems are not presented in the modern form apart from the harmonization of back and front vowels. Thus the passive is always -il/-il-: edildi, buyûrûldi; the factitive always -dûr/-dur-: itdûrûb, yapûrubûb. The unrounded vowel is used for the reported past -miş/miş: getûrmiş, olmiş.

The Persian iezâfe is indicated by an unrounded high vowel, i/i; the back or front articulation is determined according to the rules governing Turkish suffixes, e.g. kenâre-ı bâm-ı firûze-fâm. Where the iezâfe follows a long vowel (a or ì),
y is inserted as a buffer letter: şâkî-yı ecel, Paşa-yı cihân-güsâ. Back and front articulation of the conjunctive vāv is similarly determined: ceng-ı-neberd, şabâh-u-ahşâm.

In general, preference has been given to Persian izâfe constructions even where an Arabic izâfe would have been possible, e.g. kegret-i memâlîk-i vesî'ätû 'l-mesâlîk, in which vesî'ätû 'l-mesâlîk is treated as a compound epithet to memâlîk, rather than an Arabic adjectival construction in agreement with memâlîk.

Arabic expressions and phrases which had become a familiar part of the written language are not distinguished in the transcription. Others, when presenting no difficulty of understanding, are given in transcription, underlined to indicate the Arabic. In many cases where the transcription or sense of the Arabic is doubtful, the passage is transcribed in the text and then given in the Arabic character in the footnotes; all Arabic verse is treated in this way.

Punctuation

The edited transcription has been punctuated according to the sense of the narrative. "Punctuation marks" do occur regularly in the text but are used to indicate the formation of sec' constructions, rather than syntactical relationships: thus, the following example, where the disregard of Turkish case and plural endings is clearly shown:¹

¹. An asterisk (*) here indicates the punctuation in the text.
A longer passage shows a typical arrangement of "punctuation marks" but demonstrates also the lack of consistency in their use:

This is punctuated in the transcription as follows:

The punctuation marks indicate rhyme, e.g. /gūgār/-vār, but in the case of zebūn-1 /gām-va-ma-glūb/-1 kūrūb are totally misleading. This may, however, arise simply from the copyist's misunderstanding of the text. The separation of Turkish suffixes from the basic elements of the rhyme scheme can be seen from this passage.

Material incorporated in the footnotes includes indication of poetical metres in accordance with the table of metres given at the beginning of Volume II; Persian and Arabic verse is distinguished from the Turkish by (P) and (A) respectively, e.g. Mūt. 2(P), R (A).
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