

On two manuscripts by Abū Bakr b. Bahrām al-Dimashqī (d. 1102/1691) related to W. and J. Blaeu's *Atlas Maior*

Sonja Brentjes*

Ebu Bekr ed-Dimeşki'nin (ö. 1102/1691) W. ve J. Blaeu'nun Atlas Mayor'uyla ilgili iki yazması

Öz ■ Ebu Bekr ed-Dimeşki'nin Flemenk haritacılığının zirvesi olan Joan Blaeu'nun *Atlas Mayor* çevirisinin birçok versiyonu olduğu söylenir. Ancak yazmaların detaylı bir çalışması yapılmamıştır. Bu makale, Adnan Adıvar ve daha sonraki araştırmacıların, daha uzun olan dokuz ciltlik versiyona (Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi, B 325-33) nispetle “esas çeviri” olarak kategorize ettikleri iki versiyonu karşılaştırmaktadır. Metinlerin yapısının ve onlara eşlik eden haritaların tetkiki, Nuruosmaniye 2996 ve eskiden Evkaf 1506 olarak bilinen Türk ve İslâm Eserleri Müzesi (TİEM) 1975 numaralı yazmaların, eserin farklı muhtasarlara olarak ele alınması gerektiğini gösterirken, yazar-çevirmen Ebu Bekr ve ondan sonra gelen müstensih ve harita atölyelerinin yeni malzeme ve Katip Çelebi'nin *Cihânnümâ'sı* başta olmak üzere eski çalışmalarla süregelen alışverişlerine de şahadet ediyor.

Anahtar kelimeler: Coğrafya, haritacılık, Katip Çelebi, İbrahim Müteferrika, Ebu Bekr ed-Dimeşki, *Atlas Mayor*, Joan Blaeu.

This paper, dedicated to Thomas Goodrich to whom I owe gratitude for continued collegial help and exchange, has a very modest aim. It will address an issue introduced in 1943 by Adnan Adıvar and raised again by G.J. Halasi-Kun in 1986. This issue concerns the nature of two manuscripts containing texts ascribed to Abū Bakr al-Dimashqī, one preserved in the former Nur-i Osmaniye Library, now part of the Süleymaniye Library (Nur 2996), the other, extant previously in the Evkaf Museum (1506), is now found in the Museum of Islamic and Turkish

* Researcher (wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter), Max Planck Institute for the History of Science (Max-Planck-Institut für Wissenschaftsgeschichte).

Art (TIEM 1975). Adivar considered these two manuscripts to “contain the basic translation” of Joan Blaeu's *Atlas Maior* (1665) finished by Abū Bakr and his collaborators in 1685.¹ Halasi-Kun followed this evaluation and claimed that it was correct according to “general consensus.”² This ‘general consensus’ did not reach very far though. Franz Taeschner had claimed already in a paper published in 1926 that at least one of these two manuscripts, namely Evkaf 1506, contained “die 2bändige kürzere Ausgabe.”³ Since Halasi-Kun knew this work by Taeschner it is puzzling that he did not consider Taeschner's evaluation as a possible alternative to Adivar's position.⁴

The evaluation of the content of these two manuscripts and the question as to how their texts and maps relate to the translation of the *Atlas Maior* is complicated by a number of factors. Halasi-Kun speaks of the order of Sultan Mehmet IV to Abū Bakr to produce “an amended translation,” but without giving any reference or textual evidence for it. As far as I can judge, the text of the introduction in both manuscripts in truth makes no such claim. Hence, the information may come from the nine-volume version in the library of the Topkapı Sarayı Museum (B 325-33), which I could not verify because of the library's closure for several years. Halasi-Kun might have referred though to comments made by the French ambassador to the Sublime Porte, Marquis de Nointel, who wrote on June 6, 1675, to Louis XIV that his Ottoman informant, the historian Hezārfenn, had pointed to the royal wish for economic and other practical, not out-of-date historical and cultural information.⁵ My study suggests, however, that at the stage of cultural transformation represented by the two manuscripts analyzed in this paper such practical information alone was not considered any longer satisfying. A second problem consists in the description of the two manuscripts as comprising of six volumes each. It remains unclear to me in which sense each of the single-volume manuscripts should be considered as containing six volumes, while the Topkapı Sarayı version consists indeed of nine physically separated items. It is not even possible to describe the texts in the Nur-i Osmaniye Library and the Museum

1 A. Adnan Adivar, *La Science chez les Turcs ottomans* (Paris: G.-P. Maisonneuve, 1939), 134-5.

2 G.J. Halasi-Kun, “The Map of *Şekl-i Yeni Felemenk Maa İngiliz* in Ebu Bekır Dimişki's *Tercüme-i Atlas Mayor*,” *Archivum Ottomanicum* 11 (1986), 51-70, at p. 53, fn 10.

3 Franz Taeschner, “Zur Geschichte des Djihānnumā,” *Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen*, 2/29 (1926), 99-110, at 106, fn 2.

4 Halasi-Kun, “The Map of *Şekl-i Yeni Felemenk Maa İngiliz*,” 52, fn 8.

5 Heidrun Wurm, *Der osmanische Historiker Hüseyn b. Ğafer, genannt Hezārfenn, und die Istanbuler Gesellschaft in der zweiten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 1971), 43-4.

of Islamic and Turkish Art as being composed of six major units of text. The manuscript in the Museum of Islamic and Turkish Art separates physically two parts from each other by an empty folio and a new *‘unwān* at the beginning of the second part. The first part is dedicated to a general introduction and the description of Africa, Asia and the New World. The second part deals exclusively with Europe. Nur 2996 contains a different structure. After its general introduction, it describes Africa followed by Asia, Europe and the Americas. A third problem is the information given by Halasi-Kun that the Evkaf Museum once possessed a second manuscript (1504) of a work by Abū Bakr related to the translation of the *Atlas Maior*. This manuscript was said to comprise of two volumes in which 116 maps could be found. Moreover, Halasi-Kun claimed, referring to Taeschner, that it was dated to the year 1648.⁶ This claim is, however, an obvious mistake, since Taeschner had written that it was Evkaf 1506 that the Museum had dated to 1058 h/1648.⁷ Such a date, as both authors highlighted, would exclude the manuscript firmly as a witness of Abū Bakr’s work on the *Atlas Maior*, since the *Atlas Maior* came into the hands of Mehmet IV only in 1668 as a gift by the new Dutch ambassador Justin Colyer. Its translation was finished seventeen years later.⁸ The manuscript today extant in the Museum of Islamic and Turkish Art identified by the Museum’s librarian Sevgi Kutluay with the former Evkaf manuscript 1506 is however undated. Furthermore, Sevgi Hanım kindly informed me that it was the only geographical manuscript the Museum possessed.

In the following two sections I give a survey of the maps found in TİEM 1975 and Nur 2996. I will also highlight some of the particularities that characterize each of the two texts. My conclusion will be that neither of the manuscripts contains a translation of the text of the *Atlas Maior*, but two different compilations of material derived from the *Atlas Maior*, Katip Çelebi’s *Cihan-nüma*, and other sources that need to be carefully investigated and determined by an Ottomanist.

Maps, textual structure and particularities of TİEM 1975

MS TİEM 1975 was donated as a *vaqf* by Grand Vizier ‘Alī Shāhin who served less than a year, from 30 April 1785 to 25 January 1786, in this position. On p. 2 Abū Bakr is described as the slave (*bandah*) of Sultan Mehmet IV after whose titles the standard formulaic expressions follows which indicates that the sultan

6 Halasi-Kun, “The Map of *Şekl-i Yeni Felemenk Maa İngiliz*,” 53.

7 Taeschner, “Zur Geschichte,” 106, fn 2.

8 Halasi-Kun, “The Map of *Şekl-i Yeni Felemenk Maa İngiliz*,” 52-3.

had passed away.⁹ This posits the time of production of the manuscript between 1693 and 1786, i.e. after the death of Abū Bakr himself. As the comparison of several of its maps with manuscripts of the *Cihan-nüma* and with Ibrahim Müteferrika's map of Iran (1142 h/1729) clarifies, at least some of its maps were produced after 1729. The manuscript's scribe was 'Abd al-Raḥmān Sarrāj-Zādah.¹⁰

The manuscript consists, as already emphasized, of two physically separated parts. Its first part discusses the foundational concepts of geometry and astronomy, some instruments, the climates and measures of distances followed by the description of Africa and Asia. The second part carries *dar bayān-i iqlīm-i avrūpā* (On the Explanation of the Climate of Europe) as its title, but includes also - surprisingly within the text about Europe - a chapter on the Americas called *bāb-i qism-i rābi'* (Chapter of the Fourth Part).¹¹ This header indicates that its place originally was at the end of the translation as is the case in the *Atlas Maior*. The visually most striking aspect of the manuscript is the coloring of many, albeit not of all of its maps which it shares with numerous maps of MS Topkapı Sarayı R 1636. In contrast to other manuscripts of Abū Bakr's works and also of copies of Katip Çelebi's geographical writings the painter/s of these two manuscripts used mostly strong colors: a darkish green, an olive green, a darkish pink, brown, ochre, orange, and a saturated yellow. This overall color scheme does not exclude that several maps also use lighter yellows and greens. Such lighter colors can be found for instance in the double-hemisphere map as a complement to the mainly saturated dark colors used for grounding and for the islands or some parts of Africa such as Congo or Guinea.¹² This implies that both manuscripts were produced in the same workshop. Since MS Topkapı Sarayı R 1636 is labelled *muhtasar* in the catalogue this could suggest that TİEM 1975 indeed is an epitome too. The inspection both of text and maps confirms this assumption.

MS TİEM 1975, which is paginated, contains altogether 44 maps and 1589 pages. The first part ends on page 975. The second part begins on page 985. Between the two parts an isolated map of Europe is included, which is called *Memālik-i Rūm Īli*, a term that usually designates European provinces of the Ottoman Empire, but stands here for all of Europe.¹³ The maps follow the structure of the text with two main exceptions. A map of the New World follows as the second map of the manuscript immediately after the depiction of the Earth in

9 MS Istanbul, TİEM 1975, p. 2, 5.

10 MS Istanbul, TİEM 1975, p. 1589, 18.

11 MS Istanbul, TİEM 1975, p. 1057, 32-3.

12 MS Istanbul, TİEM 1975, pp. 53-4; 82.

13 MS Istanbul, TİEM 1975, pp. 981-2.

form of two hemispheres and comes before Africa, a place that traditionally is reserved for Europe.¹⁴ Its textual environment does not seem to have an unequivocal relationship to the mapped region since it treats the division of the terrestrial sphere in longitude and latitude and tells the story of the expeditions patronized by Caliph al-Ma'mūn (r. 813-833) with the goal to determine anew the length of 1° of a meridian.¹⁵ The second exception is the repetition of a hemisphere of the Old World and its placement at the end of the manuscript, i.e. at the end of the description of Europe while its traditional place is that of the first map.¹⁶

The series of maps shows similarities with features in MS Nur 2996, but is much more closely related to the set of 42 maps in MS Istanbul, Köprülü Library, Hacı Ahmed Paşa 173 as can be seen in Table 1. One such similarity is the fact that a map of Europe precedes the beginning of the part about Europe.¹⁷ As the version in MS TIEM 1975, the Köprülü manuscript twice presents hemispherical maps, once as its first map showing both hemispheres together and once as its third map with the Old World alone.¹⁸ A third agreement between these two manuscripts can be found in the presence of a map of the Nil. MS Nur 2996 differs in these three points insofar as it presents the two hemispheres separately as its maps 1 (Old World) and 2 (New World), offers three maps of the Nil and has no map of Europe before its first regional map of a part of this continent, namely Thrace identified as Rūm İli.¹⁹ The second part of the two series is almost identical except for some differences in placement and the disappearance of the map of southern Greece in the Köprülü manuscript. Both sets apparently share a common ancestor. The first part of the two series shows also connections among the two manuscripts, albeit to a lesser extent. A special point is the presence of regional maps of western Asia, in particular Iran, since this feature is not appropriated from the *Atlas Maior* but, as I will argue in section 2, from Katip Çelebi's *Cihan-nüma*.

The relationship between TIEM 1975 and Hacı Ahmed Paşa 173 on the one hand and Nur 2996 on the other is equally unquestionable, although the much larger number of maps in Nur 2996 may obscure this fact. The three series share in principle the same structural features. They begin their geographical journey at the Atlantic coast of West Africa, travel from there through the entire continent

14 MS Istanbul, TIEM 1975, pp. 61-2.

15 MS Istanbul, TIEM 1975, pp. 60,3-62,37.

16 MS Istanbul, TIEM 1975, pp. 53-4; 1509-10.

17 MS Istanbul, Köprülü Library, Hacı Ahmed Paşa 173, pp. 362-3.

18 MS Istanbul, Köprülü Library, Hacı Ahmed Paşa 173, pp. 7, 23.

19 MS Istanbul, Nur-i Osmaniye 2996, pictures 8, 9, 80, 88, 95, 394.

including its southern parts. Then they proceed to Asia beginning on the Arabian Peninsula, followed by Syria, Palestine, Anatolia, the Black Sea, and the Caucasus Mountains. Subsequently they turn to Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan, and the Indian Subcontinent, followed by China and Southeast Asia. TĪEM 1975 lost Japan, which the other two manuscripts present. At the end, the first two manuscripts describe Europe, while Nur 2996 adds after Europe the description of the Americas. Abū Bakr seems to have privileged this order of Nur 2996 since his very short Arabic survey of the new geography, found in Hacı Ahmed Paşa 176, presents only the map of the double hemispheres and four maps of the continents. The order of the continental maps is that of Nur 2996, i.e. Africa, Asia, Europe, the Americas. The text and map series in TĪEM 1975 and by extension those of Hacı Ahmed Paşa 173 should thus be considered as truncated or incomplete. The producers of these two manuscripts were barely interested in northern Asia, a region where Nur 2996 seems to be particularly strong, and have reduced to almost nothing the New World. The short, two-volume version/s that the two manuscripts represent is/are thus clearly removed from the *Atlas Maior* and hence from the translation as extant in Topkapı Sarayı B 325-33, which follows Blaeu's order, i.e. Europe, Africa, Asia, the Americas.

Table 1: Maps in MSS TĪEM 1975 and Hacı Ahmed Paşa 173

No.	MS TĪEM 1975	MS Hacı Ahmed Paşa 173	MS Nur 2996
1	double hemispheres	double hemispheres	hemisphere Old World
2	The Americas	map of climates	Hemisphere New World
3	Africa	hemisphere of the Old World	Black Sea
4	Maghrib-i aqsá, i.e. north-western Africa	Africa	map of climates
5	Maghrib-i udhunī, i.e. middle Africa	Northwestern Africa	North Pole
6	Iqlīm-i miṣr, i.e. Egypt	Ifriqiyya to Libya	South Pole
7	Khālij-i Nil-i mubâarak, i.e. the Nil	Nil	Africa
8	Asia	Asia	Corsica, Sardinia, Malta etc.
9	Arabic Peninsula	Arabic Peninsula	West Africa
10	Syria	Syria	North Africa 1
11	Palestine and Quds-i sharif, i.e. Jerusalem	Palestine	North Africa 2, i.e. Fes to the Great Atlas

12	Îç İl, here: Anatolia	Anatolia and Black Sea	North Africa, i.e. Fes to Tunis
13	Küçük Anadolu, i.e. Asia Minor	Caucasus Mountains + Caspian and Black Seas	Tripoli to Benghazi
14	Memleket-i Shirvân ve-Dâghistân, i.e. Caucasus Mountains	Tigris and Euphrates, i.e. Cezîre-i 'Irâq	Southwest Africa, i.e. Ghana, Libya interior to Fes
15	Iqlîm-i Cezîre-i 'Irâq	Kurdistân, Adharbayjân	Nil, Red Sea
16	Memleket-i Arminiya (corrected for: Armiya), i.e. Armenia	Mâ varâ' al-nahr to Makrân	Nil, Egypt, Mediterranean
17	Iqlîm-i Irân ve-'Irâq-i 'ajam ve-'arab, i.e. Iran and Iraq with some doubling	Nahr-i Murghâb to Tibet	Southern Nil, Nubia, Aswan
18	Iqlîm-i Mâ varâ' al-nahr, i.e. Transoxania	Tibet to Malaysia	South Africa 1
19	Sind ve-Hind ve-Tibit, i.e. Indian Subcontinent and Tibet	Java-i kabîr, Terra australis and other islands	South Africa 2
20	Cezîre-i Hind ve-Çîn, i.e. India and China	Fürmüsâ, Tâyvân to Memleket-i Shânsî, i.e. Formosa, Taiwan and Shansi	Asia
21	Iqlîm-i Çîn, i.e. China + islands	Japan	Arabic Peninsula
22	Memâlik-i Rûm İli: here all of Europe	Europa	Syria
23	Qism-i Avrûpâ (corrected for: Arûpâ)	Rûm İli	Palestine
24	Sawâhil-i Rûm İli, i.e. Ägâis	Memleket-i Ghrâçiyâ-yi shemâlî, i.e. northern Greece	Anatolia + Black Sea
25	Ghrâçiyâ-yi shemâlî, i.e. northern Greece	Ägâis	Cyprus
26	Ghrâçiyâ-yi janûbî ve-Cezîre-i Mora ve-Girit, i.e. southern Greece and the Peninsula of Morea and (the Island of) Crete	Islands of the Mediterranean	Iran
27	Cezâ'ir-i Aq Deniz, i.e. the Islands of the White Sea (Sicily, Sardinia and Corsica)	Thrace, Macedonia, Scлавonia etc.	Caucasus Mountains, Caspian Sea, Black Sea
28	Iqlîm-i Bosna ve-Erdal ve-Majâr ve-Leh ve-Eflâq va-Boghdân, i.e. Bosnia, Transylvania, Hungary, Poland, Valachia, Moldavia	Black Sea and Sea of Azov	Euphrates - Tigris, Mayâfâriqîn to Başra
29	Qara Deniz, i.e. Black Sea	Denmark, Holstein and Islands	Cezîre, Diyâr Bakr, Arz-i Rûm, Qârş, T'râbzûn, Gurjistân

ON TWO MANUSCRIPTS BY ABŪ BAKR B. BAHRĀM
AL-DIMASHQĪ RELATED TO W. AND J. BLAEU'S ATLAS MAIOR

30	Memleket-i Dāniyā, i.e. Denmark	Baltīqūm, Jermāniyā, Beljiyā, Itāliyā	Tabriz Göle, i.e. Lake Urmia
31	Memleket-i Jermāniyā ya'nī Nemçe, i.e. Germany	Avstriyā, Khırvat, Majār, Istriyā	'Irāq-i 'ajam, Lūristān, Gilān, 'Irāq-i 'arab
32	Memleket-i Nemçe ve-Çeh, i.e. Germany and Czechia	Itāliyā	Cezīre, Azarbayjān, Jibāl ya'nī 'Irāq-i 'ajam, Ṭabaristān, Khurāsān, Fārsistān
33	Memleket-i Itāliyā, i.e. Italy	Sardinia and Corsica	'Irāq-i 'ajam, Azarbayjān, Gilān, Daylam, Ṭabaristān
34	Memleket-i Venedik ve-Ceneviz ve-Milān, i.e. Venice, Genoa and Milan	northern Italy	Daylam, 'Irāq-i 'ajam, Ṭabaristān va-Māzandarān, Qūmas, Khurāsān, Khwārazm
35	Iqlīm-i Pāpā with a small map of şehri Rūmā ya'nī Qızıl Almā, i.e. the Papal State with a small map of the City of Rome, that is the Red Apple	Rome and environment	Jazīrat al-'arab, Lūristān, Jazīrat ya'nī 'Irāq-i 'arab, Khūzistān, Fārs, 'Irāq-i 'ajam
36	Memleket-i Nābuli, i.e. Naples	southern Italy	Hūzistān (sic), Fāristān, Lār, Baħr-i Fāris, Sijistān, Khurāsān, 'Irāq-i 'ajam
37	Cezīre-i Qūrsiqa ve-Sārdiniyā ve-Mālta, i.e. Corsica, Sardinia and Malta	Sicily	Jazīrat al-'arab, Baħr-i Fāris, Gulf of Hormuz, Lār, Kirmān, Sijistān, Makrān, Muḥīṭ-i Baħr
38	Cezīre-i Čičilyā ya'nī Mesinā, i.e. Sicily, that is Messina	France	Kirmān, Khurāsān, Sijistān, Makrān, Zābulistān
39	Iqlīm-i Frānsā, i.e. France	Baljiyā	Baħr-i Shirvān, Khwārazm, Qūhistān ve-Khurāsān, Qara Qalpāq, Mā varā' al-nahr
40	Memleket-i Belçiyā ya'nī Felemenk, i.e. Belgium, that is Flanders	Spain with Portugal as vilāyet (province)	Mā varā' al-nahr, Ṭukhāristān, Khurāsān, Zābulistān, Ghuzz, Badakhshān, Khuṭlān, Turkistān, Ashnāgar
41	Iqlīm-i Ispāniyā, i.e. Spain	England, Scotland, Ireland	Makrān, Sijistān, Khurāsān, Kashmīr, Zābulistān, Ghuzz, Ashnāgar, Qandahār, Sind, Hind
42	Cezīre-i Bārtāniyā ya'nī Inkilis, i.e. the British Isles, that is England	England	Kirmān, Makrān, Sijistān, Sind, Hind, Baħr-i muḥīṭ-i hind
43	Cezīre-i Bārtāniyā ve-Sqūçiyā ve-Hiberniyā, i.e. the Islands of Britain, Scotland and Ireland	no more maps	Makrān, Kābul, Ashnāgar, Sind, Baħr-i Sind, Kashmīr, Hind

44	hemisphere of the Old World		Kashmīr, Khurāsān, Khiṭā'ī, Tibit, Ćin
45	no more maps		Dekkān, Hind to Qānbūyā
46			Siam (corrected for Sifān), Pegu, Laos, Tūnk Kink (Tonkin), Qānbūyā, China, Qūncīn Ćinā
47			Chinese Sea, Sūmātrā, Jāva-i kabīr, Mālāqā etc.
48			Saylān = Sarandīb
49			Sumatra
50			Great Java
51			Borneo
52			Luqdāniyā
53			Vindanao, Gilolo
54			Vindanao
55			China
56			Banda Islands
57			Korea, Japan
58			favqa Tātārları, Qipĉāq Tātārları, Tātāristān, Lūqūmūriyā, Qazāq Tātārları, Qālmūq Tātārları, Nūghā'ī Tātārī, Bulghāriyā, Bada-khshān, Mā varā' al-nahr, Īrān, Ćin, Baħr-i muħiṭ-i sharqī, Baħr-i Tātār, Rūsiyā, Avrūpā etc
59			Turkistān, Dasht-i Qipĉāq
60			Tātāristān, Qara Khiṭā'ī, Khutan etc
61			Baħr-i Khazar = Shirvān
62			Europe
63			Īrāq-i 'ajam, Māzandarān, Baħr- Khazar, Qūmas, Khurāsān, Balkh, Mā varā' al-nahr, Zābulistān, Khuṭlān

ON TWO MANUSCRIPTS BY ABŪ BAKR B. BAHRĀM
AL-DIMASHQĪ RELATED TO W. AND J. BLAEU'S ATLAS MAIOR

64			Khwārazm, Mā varā' al-nahr, Zābulistān, Balkh, Badakhshān, Ashnaghār, Kashmīr, Turkistān
65			Thrace = Rūm İli
66			Eflāq to Salanik
67			Greece
68			Greece to Macedonia
69			the Balkans and Venice
70			juz'-i Memleket-i Maqidūniyā, juz'-i Memleket-i Dālmāsiyā, ya'nī Bosna, juz'-i Memleket-i Müdlāqā (? , error for Noricum?), Memleket-i Istriyā, Venedik körfezi, şehir-i Venedik
71			Aq Deniz, İtāliyā, Maqidūniyā, Venedik-i körfezi, Baħr-i Būliyā, Dālmāsiyā ya'nī Bosna, Cezire-i Kafālūniya etc.
72			Crete and the Aegean
73			Cyprus (?)
74			Bosna, Dālmāsiyā, Khırvat
75			Almān, Bavāriyā, Avstriyā taħtānī, Avstriyā favqānī, Qārīnūlā favqānī, Qārīnūlā taħtānī, Istriyā, Venedik-i körfezi
76			Bosna to Temeshvār
77			Hunghāriya (sic), Vālāqiya = Eflāq etc.
78			Rūm İli to Bulghār
79			Qırmızı Rūsiyā, Plusiyā (sic), Vūlūniyā, Ūqrāniyā
80			Frūmaqiya (? , error for Prūsiyā?) to Vālāqiya
81			Black Sea, Ćerkes, Sea of Azov, Tātārları etc.
82			Baħr-i Dānisqā, Prussia, Litū'āniyā

SONJA BRENTJES

83		Jermāniyā, Litū'āniyā, Ūqrāynā etc.
84		Baħr-i Baltiqūm, Pumarāniyā, Maklanburk etc.
85		Burjundiya, Frānsa, Būhimiyā, Hungħāriyā
86		Venedik-i körfezi, Istriyā, Khırvat, Avstriyā favqānī
87		Avstriyā, Majār, Jermāniyā, Beljiyā = Felemenk
88		Venedik-i körfezi, Dālmāsiyā, Eflāq, Bughdān, Qara Deniz
89		Adria, İtāliyā, Asqlāvūniyā = Bosna etc.
90		Corsica (?)
91		Corsica, Genoa, Milan etc.
92		Rome and Italy
93		Calabria
94		Sicily
95		Sardinia
96		Basqāyā, Lānkidūq, Akvitāniyā, Nurmandiya etc.
97		Qāmbāniyā, Beljiyā, Namūrā, Hülāndiyā, Frīziyā etc.
98		Spain
99		Portugal (?)
100		Britain, Scotland, Ireland
101		England
102		Scotland
103		Ireland (?)
104		Yeni İspāniyā, Yeni Gharnāṭa, Qālifurniya, Amriqā'ī shemālī, Yeni Beljiya etc.
105		Yeni Ankliya, Yeni Fransa, Yeni Beljiya, Virjīniya
106		Memleke-i yeni İspāniyā ve-... ve-Flüridā
107		İspānyūla

ON TWO MANUSCRIPTS BY ABŪ BAKR B. BAHRĀM
AL-DIMASHQĪ RELATED TO W. AND J. BLAEU'S ATLAS MAIOR

108			Qūbā
109			Amāriqā'ī janūbī
110			Brāzīliya, Qribānā (?), Brātuvāriyā (?)

TĪEM 1975 agrees structurally with Nur 2996 in its quite substantial introduction which presents basic terms from two mathematical sciences, i.e. geometry and astronomy, plus the necessary concepts such as longitude, latitude, or climate for geography and mapmaking. A more elaborate description of this introductory part will be given in the following section. A precise comparison of the content of these two introductions needs to be carried out by an Ottomanist. After this introduction, TĪEM 1975 turns in several sections to the discussion of islands, rivers, mountains and seas including a section on the Magellanic Strait, which might explain the earlier presence of a single-hemisphere map of the Americas.²⁰ Then follow brief descriptions of the North and South Poles, but without maps.²¹ On the lower part of this page, part 1 about Africa begins. Integrated into the text of part 1 is information about Ottoman sultans in northern Africa. After them, but still within part 1, TĪEM 1975 turns to prophets like Jesus, Moses, Noah, and Idris, scholars from different disciplines like Ptolemy or Yaḥyá b. a. Bakr, and religious communities like Sabeans and Jews.²² The themes include planets and their influences on terrestrial events, and components of natural history.²³ The inclusion of political history into the discussion of Africa enables Abū Bakr to talk about Ottoman activities in Tunis and Tripoli during the sixteenth century, about the Islamic conquest of Egypt and the defeat of the Mamluks by Sultan Selim in 1517 as well as the Ayyubid sultan Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn and his rule in the struggle against the crusaders.²⁴ The sections on Egypt and the Nil provide Abū Bakr with a renewed occasion of talking about prophets like Joseph, to offer some comments on animals, and to pay attention to the vexed problem of taxes.²⁵ Similarly did Abū Bakr integrate political, religious, economic, and further elements in later sections in Asia such as a list of Ottoman sultans when discussing

²⁰ Ibid., pp. 80-1. For the map see *ibid.*, pp. 53-4.

²¹ Ibid., p. 81.

²² Ibid., pp. III-6.

²³ Ibid., see for instance p. 112.

²⁴ Ibid., pp. 154-5, 183-5.

²⁵ Ibid., pp. 206-8.

Anatolia.²⁶ These few tests of the text of TIEM 1975 leave no doubt that the version found in this manuscript does not contain the “basic translation” of the *Atlas Maior*. They rather suggest that Abū Bakr infused a substantial amount of elements of Islamic elite culture into material appropriated from the translation. A meticulous analysis by an Ottomanist of what appears to be a fascinating fusion of components from different cultural origins is needed to determine the sources of these components and the ways in which Abū Bakr united them into a whole. Since the manuscript was produced in all likelihood in the eighteenth century it may be possible that other scholars as well as workshop employees contributed to various modifications of text and maps as well as the introduction of new maps. Numerous errors in spelling and placing toponyms indicate though that the workshop personnel copied an earlier Ottoman set of maps rather than working directly with Latin, French, or Italian maps. These mistakes also demonstrate that the personnel’s geographical knowledge not only of foreign countries, but of the Ottoman Empire itself was very modest.

Maps, textual structure and particularities of Nur 2996

Nur 2996 is already called in the catalogue of the library a *muhtasar*, i.e. an abbreviation or epitome. This alone may settle the question of its identity. But given the experience that many catalogue entries are unreliable, a closer look at the manuscript was not to be rejected out of hand. The inspection confirmed the claim of the catalogue entry. In the introduction, Abū Bakr clearly labeled this version as a *mukhtaṣar*.²⁷

After the description of the version as an epitome the introduction begins. It focuses primarily on mathematical concepts relevant to geometry and astronomy such as the point, the line, the solid, the straight line, the curved line, the plane, parallel lines, different kinds of angles, cones, different kinds of plane figures (triangles, quadrangles, the circle and its parts), trigonometric quantities (arc, chord, sine, cosine), the sphere, convex and concave orbits, the universe and its parts, lunar mansions, the zodiac, and the distances between the Earth and the planets.²⁸ Then follow discussions of the elements and the climate zones of the Earth. This part indicates that Abū Bakr appropriated here (directly as well as indirectly) standard material of introductions to Arabic, Persian, or Ottoman Turkish treatises on *‘ilm al-hay’a* (planetary theory or mathematical cosmography). The text

²⁶ Ibid., p. 211.

²⁷ MS Istanbul, Nur-i Osmaniye 2996, f 1b,11.

²⁸ Ibid., ff 1b,16-3b,3.

of this part is illustrated by several diagrams and images on the margins among them geometrical objects (right and obtuse angles, the head of a cone, a triangle, a rectangle called interestingly enough *murabba'* which in mathematical texts stands as a rule for a square, a circle with its parts, a sphere), astronomical objects (the universe, lunar mansions, the zodiac, planets, their sizes and distances), instruments (the 'new' armillary sphere, a compass) and a map of the terrestrial zones.²⁹ The Arabic names of individual parts of these drawings as well as several of its inscriptions and annotations may point to the usage of a book on *'ilm al-hay'a* in Arabic by Abū Bakr, if he did not merely follow the teachings he had received and probably provided in *madrāsas* in Damascus and Aleppo.³⁰ One of the illustrations, the circular diagram for the angular distance between Damascus and Constantinople, agrees with the analogous diagram in Katip Çelebi's *Cihan-nüma*.³¹ The difference between the remaining illustrations and the lack of geometrical figures and the comparative depiction of the sizes of the planets imply, however, that Abū Bakr built his introduction if not in opposition to that by Katip Çelebi, so at least independently of it.³² A comparison between Abū Bakr's and Joan Blaeu's introductions reveals that Abū Bakr merged parts of Blaeu's introduction with texts from *'ilm al-hay'a* and probably *'ilm al-mīqāt*. He omitted some parts of Blaeu's introduction in favor of textual elements from his own intellectual tradition. Other parts, such as the units of longitudinal measures, he extended beginning with three Ottoman measures, namely *farsakh*, *barīd*, and *islāmī*, which go back to older Islamic and even pre-Islamic Iranian traditions.³³

After the introduction, the description of the geography of the Earth with its seas and lakes, mountains, rivers, big terrestrial units, countries and regions begins. This overall structure implies that Abū Bakr took in this part as his starting point a tradition of his own cultural environment. In all likelihood, he followed here the structure of the first version of Katip Çelebi's *Cihan-nüma* of which he owned the autograph.³⁴ The subsequent order of the geographical parts of the Earth also deviates from that of the *Atlas Maior* in its restructured sequence of the major units: the North and South Poles come first followed by Africa, Asia, Europe, and the New World. Two maps are placed outside this structure. One of them, the

29 Ibid., ff 2a-6a.

30 Ibid., f 2a, left margin.

31 MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library, Hamidiye 988, f 13b.

32 Ibid., ff 8a-9b, 14b, 15b, 16b-17a; MS Istanbul, Nur-i Osmaniye 2996, 2a-3b, 5a, 6a.

33 Joan Blaeu, *Atlas Maior of 1665* (Köln etc.: Taschen GmbH, 2005), pp. 12-6; MS Istanbul, Nur-i Osmaniye 2996, ff 2b-6a, 16a-21a.

34 I thank Gottfried Hagen for pointing this out to me.

Black Sea, appears immediately after the hemisphere of the New World.³⁵ The other, a map of Corsica, Sardinia, Malta, and ‘Little Malta,’ is introduced between the maps of Africa and West Africa.³⁶ The second deviation may have been the result of a wrong binding. But the map was included at its current spot already at the time when the entire series of maps was numbered. Nonetheless, in content and style it belongs to the *Atlas Maior* and hence to Abū Bakr’s work. It is merely physically misplaced, not an intruder as the earlier map of the Black Sea. This map presents itself as a portolan chart. It does not belong to the *Atlas Maior* nor is it included in most of the other manuscripts attributed to Abū Bakr. It can be found in manuscripts of Piri Reis’ *Kitab-i Bahriye*, among them a copy that also contains a map of the Caspian Sea similar to that of Nur 2996, but not identical with it, and in Ottoman portolan chart atlases of the sixteenth century.³⁷ A careful comparison of handwriting and coloring practice between this chart and the other maps of the manuscript leaves, however, no doubt that it was executed in the same workshop and was inscribed by the same hand as those. The coloring appears to have been the product of a less experienced painter. The colors are difficult to distinguish, almost fully covered by a black or dark grey stroke. They also make the impression of having been dissolved in too much water.

The restructured sequence of the major parts of Abū Bakr’s work is reflected in the 110 maps of the manuscript. Maps 4, 5, and 6 of Table 1 have been painted on the paper of the text. The other maps were painted on paper of a different quality and cover as a rule a double page. They were joined to the text later. Most of these added maps are numbered in pencil by a later hand. The person who numbered them did not count the map of the climates as a map, but included the two poles in her/his counting. These numbers indicate that at least two maps were at the time of the numbering at a different place in the manuscript. Map 64 of Table 1 carries the penciled number 39 and map 75 carries number 85.³⁸ Similarly, the maps numbered 38 and 39 in Table 1 are inscribed with 38 and 40, while no map is placed between them.³⁹ There is no map with the penciled number 36. It might have been lost, or the numerator erred here in the sequence.⁴⁰ Entry 63 of

35 MS Istanbul, Nur-i Osmaniye 2996, after f 10a.

36 Ibid., after f 43a.

37 I thank Tom for reminding me of the existence of the manuscript and its map of the Caspian Sea. MS Baltimore, The Walters Art Museum, W.658.373A, ff 245a and 246a.

38 Ibid., after ff 393, 447.

39 Ibid., after ff 287, 293.

40 Ibid., see between ff 275-285.

Table 1 is an unnumbered map. It also must have been previously placed earlier in the manuscript, because it is found now attached to a text on Europe, while it depicts parts of Iran and Afghanistan. Otherwise, the agreement between text and added maps is fairly reliable. The only other deviation between them is found for map 61 of Table 1 (penciled number 62), which shows the new form of the Caspian Sea introduced into the Ottoman Empire around 1727 by a map of the German map maker and printer Baptist Homann.⁴¹ It is placed at the end of the section on the Nogai Tatars and before the section about *Lūqūmūriyā*.⁴² Map 58 of Table 1 places *Lūqūmūriyā* immediately south of *Tātārīstān*, north of the Kazakh confederation, and thus in substantial distance from the Caspian Sea to the northeast.⁴³ While there is a clear relationship with the analogous maps of the Caspian Sea in manuscripts of Katip Çelebi's *Cihan-nūma* such as MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library, Hamidiye 988 (dated 1140 h/1727) or MS Paris, BnF, Supplément turc 215 (dated 1142 h/1729), the textual environment of the map in those manuscripts is political history of various Islamic dynasties.⁴⁴ Nur 2996's map of the Caspian Sea has a particularly strong visual relationship to that of MS Paris, BnF, Supplément turc 215. They do not merely share the same naming inscription that can also be found in the map of the Hamidiye 988 manuscript, but agree closely in the contours of the lake, the presence of signs indicating shallow grounds at the northern coast, several islands not found in the Hamidiye 988 manuscript, some of the names of territories around the lake, and to some degree, they are also similar in the depiction of the delta of the Volga. Furthermore, the map in the BnF manuscript names the land at the northern coast of the Caspian Sea *Memleket-i Lūqūmūriyā*.⁴⁵ Thus it is possible that this map or one like it inspired the person who joined the map to Abū Bakr's work to place it before the section on this region, although his map names the lands at the northern coast of the Caspian Sea differently, namely *Memleket-i Azdrāhān*, *Memleket-i Khazar* (corrected for *Ḥazaz*) and *juz'-i* (part of) *Memleket-i Dasht-i Qipčāq*.⁴⁶ Both maps are undoubtedly related to Ibrahim Müteferrika's map of Iran printed in 1142 h/1729. Müteferrika's map provides in principle the same visual depiction of the

41 Tom Goodrich identified this map as the source for the Ottoman images of the Caspian Sea in the early eighteenth century in his article "Supplementary Maps in the *Kitab-i Bahriye* of Piri Reis," *Archivum Ottomanicum* XIII (1993-1994), 117-141, p.124.

42 Ibid., after f 384.

43 This map is not numbered by pencil.

44 MSS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library, Hamidiye 988, ff 236a-237a, 308b; Paris, BnF, Supplément turc 215, ff 233b-234b.

45 MS Paris, BnF, Supplément turc 215, f 234a.

46 MS Istanbul, Nur-i Osmaniye 2996, after f 384a, penciled number 62.

Caspian Sea including the above mentioned details as the maps in the two manuscripts. A closer look at Müteferrika's map and its successor in Nur 2996 shows however beyond doubt that the painter of the latter did not directly copy the former. The differences in the execution of the contour of the Caspian Sea, its islands and the course of the rivers and their estuaries are too substantial for such a direct descent. Moreover, while Nr 2996's toponymy at the northern coast of the lake is derived from that of the Müteferrika map, it deviates from it at the southern coast. Thus, the direct source of the map of the Caspian Sea in Nur 2996 was in all likelihood either an extract made from Müteferrika's print or a map added to one of the eighteenth-century manuscripts of the *Cihan-nüma*.

The map of the Caspian Sea is not the only one that links Nur 2996 with manuscripts of Katip Çelebi's work. The map of the Lake of Tabriz is a direct import from the *Cihan-nüma*. The division of western Asia in a series of regional maps following mostly literary traditions of Arabic and Persian geography has also been borrowed from the same source. Table 2 presents a comparison of these maps and their content. There are two major differences between their iconographic style and cartographic focus. They indicate that while the geographical concept was borrowed, the maps themselves were not copied as such. Rather, Abū Bakr or some workshop painter/s designed modified versions of these cartographic images. The first difference consists in the limitation of the maps of the eastern territories on a fluvial region, for instance the Indus, with its settlements and the occasional mountain chain or lake in the manuscripts of the *Cihan-nüma*. Nur 2996, in contrast, presents an enlarged image, a full-fledged regional map. Abū Bakr or the assumed workshop painter transformed Katip Çelebi's little miniatures into the style of maps of the *Atlas Maior*. He 'occidentalized' the form after he had opted for the 're-transformation' of the content of the Dutch maps into the traditions of Arabic and Persian geography. This was achieved by multiplying the size of Katip Çelebi's small maps, adding a few more mountains, rivers, or lakes to their original content and, above all, by drawing boundaries and adding names of regions, provinces, or principalities. The figure of the Caspian Sea in several of these enlarged versions of maps from the *Cihan-nüma* is still clearly one where the east-west extension is much larger than the north-south extension, i.e. it is based on the lake's form in the *Atlas Maior* which goes back, via Giacomo Gastaldi's maps of Asia, to Ptolemy's *Geography*. Hence nothing speaks against Abū Bakr as the possible author of the decision to follow the structure of western Asian maps as laid out by Katip Çelebi in the *Cihan-nüma* and of the enlarged versions of the maps taken over from this source.

Table 2: Maps of the Cihan-nūma compared with maps in Nur 2996

Region	MS BnF, Supplément turc 215	Nur 2996
Indus, Maṅšūra, Muṭṭān, Baḥr-i Sind	f 133a	map 43, Table 1
Makrān, Panjab	f 134a	map 42, Table 1
Vilāyat-i Makrān, Qandahār, Kābul, Indus	f 137a	map 41, Table 1
Lahūr, Siyālkūt, ... Kashmir	f 142a	map 44, Table 1
Qandahār ... Zaranj, Indus, lake (name illegible)	f 144a	map 37, Table 1
Amū Daryā, Syr Daryā, Badakhshān, Balkh	f 146b	map 40 or 63, Table 1
Kirmān, Lār, Hormuz	f 149a	map 35, Table 1
Iqlīm-i Fāris	f 161a	map 34, Table 1
Khūzistān, Lūristān	f 167a	map 33, Table 1
'Irāq-i 'ajam, 'Irāq-i 'arab	f 179a	map 30, Table 1, only 'Irāq-i 'ajam
Amū Daryā, Khwārazm, Khurāsān, Herat	f 195a	map 38, Table 1
Māzandarān, Qūmas, Baḥr-i Khazar	f 200a	map 32, Table 1
Gilān, Baḥr-i Khazar	f 203a	map 31, Table 1
Khurāsān, Mā varā' al-nahr	f 210a	map 39, Table 1
Kashghār + environment	f 216a	map 59 (?), Table 1
Amū Daryā, Baḥr-i Khazar, Baḥr-i Arlashqū (Aral ?)	f 220a	map 38 (?; Baḥr-i Khazar, Baḥr-i Khwārazm, Amū Daryā, Syr Daryā), Table 1
Tabrīz Göle, Adharbayjān	f 224a	map 30, Table 1
Shirvān, Dāghistān, Baḥr-i Khazar	f 231a	missing?
Baḥr-i Khazar	f 234a	map 61, Table 1

Moreover, the painting style of the maps of the North and South Poles is the same as in several eighteenth-century manuscripts of Katip Çelebi's *Cihan-nūma*, namely those written by the scribe Maḥmūd b. Shaykh 'Abdallāh b. al-

Mustaqīm and finished in 1142 h/1729 as well as other related copies.⁴⁷ Their coloring, however, is less pastel-colored than in the copies written by this scribe. The iconographic style of these *Cihan-nüma* manuscripts differs clearly from the representation of the North Pole in Blaeu's *Atlas Maior*. It differs equally clearly from the iconographic style of the remaining 108 maps in Nur 2996. There can be no doubt that the images do not derive from the translation of the *Atlas Maior*, but from the mentioned type of manuscripts of the *Cihan-nüma*. The content of the map of the North Pole agrees in the manuscripts written by Ibn al-Mustaqīm with that in the *Atlas Minor*, including the fact that one of the little circles in the four corners is empty carrying in the *Atlas Minor* the name of the map. They have lost, however, the toponyms present in the Mercator/Hondius map, while the map in MS Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı R 1629 preserved it like Nur 2996. The toponyms in both copies agree most of the time. Occasionally there are also minor differences such as *sāhil-i avrūpā* (Nur 2996) versus *avrūp sāhilleri* (R 1629) that indicate that the map in Nur 2996 is not a copy of that in Topkapı Sarayı R 1629 or vice versa. The painter of this map (or his predecessor) felt the empty fourth circle a waste of good manuscript space and filled it with four islands.⁴⁸ The same *horror vacui* was felt by the painters of MSS Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı R 1632 (or his predecessor) and Nur 2996.⁴⁹

A comparison with five manuscripts of the *Cihan-nüma*, i.e. MSS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library, Hamidiye 988, Nur-i Osmaniye 3275, Topkapı Sarayı R 1629, Topkapı Sarayı R 1632, and Paris, BnF, Supplément turc 215, indicates that Nur 2996 is most closely related to two of them, constituting a mixed

47 See, for instance, MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye, Hamidiye 988, f 308^a. Compare Hagen, *Ein osmanischer Geograph bei der Arbeit. Entstehung und Gedankenwelt von Kātib Čelebis Ğihānümā* (Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 2003), 417, 424, and *Osmanlı Coğrafya Literatürü Tarihi, History of Geographical Literature During the Ottoman Period*, 2 Volumes, Istanbul: IRCICA, 2000, vol. 1, 91-2, the entry of Hamidiye 988, where the manuscript is falsely described as a copy of the *Levami' al-nūr*. MS Paris, BnF, Supplément Turc 215 is a second manuscript of this group (see Hagen, *Ein osmanischer Geograph bei der Arbeit*, 425). MS Istanbul Süleymaniye, Mihrīşah Sultan 308 was produced apparently in the same workshop (see *ibid.*, 423). The scribe was a member of Süleyman Sa'deddin Efendi Mustaqimzade's (1131-1202/1719-1788) family described by Kellner-Heinkele, although his name does not appear in the biographical material she collected. He was apparently one of Süleyman Sa'deddin Efendi Mustaqimzade's cousins. Barbara Kellner-Heinkele, *Devhatü l-meşâyih*, Einleitung und Edition (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2005), 5-12, 18-19, 35-6.

48 MS Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı R 1629, f 51a.

49 MS Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı R 1632, f 30a.

ancestry.⁵⁰ These two manuscripts are MSS Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı R 1629 and BnF, Supplément turc 215.⁵¹ In the image of the North Pole Nur 2996 displays like these two manuscripts (as well as Nur 3275 and a manuscript of a work by Abū Bakr with a mixed set of maps, namely MS Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı R 1632) mountains on the same two islands. These mountains go back to the map of the North Pole in the *Atlas Minor*. The painter of Nur 2996 worked obviously with an ancestor that was more closely related to the map of the North Pole in Topkapı Sarayı R 1629 than in BnF, Supplément turc 215 (or any of the other studied manuscripts). The colors used by the painter of Nur 2996 differ, however, from both sets found in BnF, Supplément turc 215 and Topkapı Sarayı R 1629. BnF, Supplément turc 215 uses pastel tones (light yellow, light blue, light purple, ochre, and light brown). The same colors can be found in Hamidiye 988 and Topkapı Sarayı R 1634. Nur 3275 replaced light purple, ochre, and light brown by light green, gold, red, and lavender. Their mountains, if present, appear as brown, thin peaks. Topkapı Sarayı R 1629 still shows its origin in this range of colors, having light blue, green, and yellow like Nur 3275 and light purple as well as twice light brown like BnF, Supplément turc 215. Instead of light red and ochre it uses, however, orange and olive green. Its mountains are dark brownish, thin strokes on green meadows. Nur 2996 presents more subdued colors. Washed-out blue and magenta tones dominate, sometimes infused with a bit of grey. In addition, there are a dirty yellow, a dark green, and a watery red. The only light one is the yellowish green used for the mountains the signs of which differ visibly from the ones used in the *Cihan-nüma* manuscripts. In the image of the South Pole Nur 2996 agrees with BnF, Supplément turc 215 in the execution of the grid and its individual elements as well as in the naming of a small island against Hamidiye 988 which, for instance, lacks several of the details of the grid and offers a different version of the name: *Lūqūniyā* (Nur 2996, Supplément turc 215), *Nū Lūtiyā* (Hamidiye 899).⁵² In the placement of the North Pole between the double-hemisphere

⁵⁰ For published maps of European sanjaqs found in the second part of this manuscript (*Cihan-nüma*, version I) see M. T. Gökbilgin, "Kanuni Sultan Süleyman devri başlarında Rumeli eyaleti, livaları, şehir ve kasabaları," *Belleterin* 20 (1956), Pls. 8-16; G. Hagen, *Ein osmanischer Geograph bei der Arbeit*, p. 416, fn 8.

⁵¹ MS Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı R 1629, f 51a. For MS BnF, Paris, Supplément 215 see <http://visualiseur.bnf.fr/Visualiseur?Destination=Mandragore&O=8100275&E=15&I=91997&M=imageseule> and <http://visualiseur.bnf.fr/Visualiseur?Destination=Mandragore&O=8100275&E=16&I=91998&M=imageseule>, accessed 15 April 2011.

⁵² MSS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library, Nur-i Osmaniye 2996, ff 20b, 26b; Hamidiye 988, ff 51a, 52b; Paris, BnF, Supplément turc 215, 60a, 61b.

map and the first continental map, Abū Bakr remained loyal to Blaeu's structure, while in placing the South Pole immediately after it he accepted the procedure applied in the *Cihan-nüma* where the two maps follow each other after the map of the Americas.

A final element to be mentioned that Abū Bakr shares with the *Cihan-nüma* in the manuscripts of 1729 and their relatives is the table of the climates. This table is part of Blaeu's *Introduction*, but not found in the *Atlas Minor*, the main Latin source of the *Cihan-nüma*.⁵³ The numbers in the table of Hamidiye 988 are less corrupt, i.e. closer to those of the *Atlas Maior*, than the numbers in Nur 2996.⁵⁴ This is another witness for the claim that Nur 2996 does not contain "the basic translation" of Blaeu's *Atlas*, but a copy of a text which had already gone through the hands of several copyists.

Conclusions

The difference in illustration between the two manuscripts surveyed here suggests that there was more than one version of a two-volume work ascribed to Abū Bakr. The structure and content of texts and maps in both manuscripts testify to the substantial amount of work that this scholar invested in appropriating the formal and intellectual novelties of the *Atlas Maior* in comparison to geographical works in Arabic, Persian, or Ottoman Turkish. He selected those he considered appropriate, although his criteria remain hidden, and combined them with a number of components well established in his own educational environment. Going beyond similar efforts by Katip Çelebi, he set up his epitomes of the *Atlas Maior* as indebted to *ilm al-hay'a*, the *Cihan-nüma*, stories about the prophets, political histories of Islamic societies and dynasties, stories about the patronage activities of Caliph al-Ma'mūn and the scientific valor of Ptolemy, and of course the *Atlas Maior* itself. Further elements of boundary-crossing were undertaken by the workshops that produced the two surveyed manuscripts such as the inclusion of maps from other contexts and authors. While my paper is only a very modest investigation even of the two chosen manuscripts, the journey was exciting and produced, as I believe, satisfying as well as at times surprising results. They strengthen my conviction that the manuscripts ascribed to Abū Bakr are more than worthy of serious study. I hope that someday some colleagues will find together and obtain the necessary patronage for undertaking the desired thorough

⁵³ Blaeu, *Atlas Maior of 1665*, p. 25.

⁵⁴ MSS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library, Nur-i Osmaniye 2996, f 18a; Hamidiye 988, f 11b.

ON TWO MANUSCRIPTS BY ABŪ BAKR B. BAHRĀM
AL-DIMASHQĪ RELATED TO W. AND J. BLAEU'S ATLAS MAIOR

analysis of Abū Bakr's work, a project that can take ample inspiration from the work of Tom Goodrich.⁵⁵

On two manuscripts by Abū Bakr b. Bahrām al-Dimashqī (d. 1102/1691) related to W. and J. Blaeu's Atlas Maior

Abstract ■ Numerous versions are said to have been produced by Abū Bakr al-Dimashqī (d. 1691) of his translation of that pinnacle of Dutch cartography, the *Atlas Maior* of Joan Blaeu, but no detailed study has been undertaken of the various manuscripts. This article compares two versions classified by Adnan Adıvar and later scholars as “the basic translation,” as opposed to a longer, nine-volume version (Topkapı Sarayı Museum, B 325-33). Scrutiny of structure and accompanying maps reveals that Nuruosmaniye 2996 and Museum of Islamic and Turkish Art (TİEM) 1975, formerly Evkaf 1506, should be considered different epitomes of the main work, testifying to an ongoing engagement of the author, Abū Bakr, and subsequent copyists and mapmaking workshops with the new material and older works, including prominently Katip Çelebi's *Cihānnümâ*.

Key words: Geography, Cartography, Katip Çelebi, İbrahim Müteferrika, Abū Bakr al-Dimashqī, *Atlas Maior*, Joan Blaeu.

55 I thank Feza Günergün (Istanbul), Sevi Kutluay (Istanbul), and Gottfried Hagen (Ann Arbor) for their patient help regarding the access to the manuscript, the acquisition of copies of selected maps, and the discussion of issues of content as well as transliteration.