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I. Introduction

From the beginning of the eighteenth century, Ottoman historical writing was dominated by *vekâyi‘nûvis* (official historiographers), who continued to record Ottoman history and were consecutively appointed from around the beginning of the eighteenth century to the end of the Ottoman Empire. Such continuous historical writing as this is very rare, not only within the Ottoman Empire but also in the whole of the Islamic world. Regardless of this rarity, study of these official historiographers has been insufficient so far. The formation of the institution of official historiographer has received especially little attention. That the first official historiographer was Na‘îmâ is generally agreed, although some studies on this subject agree that institutionalization starts from Râşid: C. Woodhead notes in her article, “WAKG-NÜVîS,” in *EP* that “Na‘îmâ is generally recognised as the first WAKG-NÜVîS, commissioned around 1110/1698-9 ... It is likely, however, that a formal post was not instituted until the appointment in 1126/1714 of Râşid. A general pattern emerged whereby each WAKG-NÜVîS was expected to continue the narrative from where his predecessor had finished...” (Woodhead 2002, 57). This information is of value to our investigation. Thomas (1972, 41), Kütükoğlu (1994, 105) and Bond (2004, 64-68) take the same view. In these and all other studies to date on this subject, however, many scholars have not examined the careers of “official historiographers” thoroughly and consequently regard the formation process as static. Furthermore, no speculation has taken place concerning the reasons for institutionalizing official historiographers and the procedures for historical writing that official historiographers adapted.

The purpose of this paper is to reconsider the formation process of the Ottoman official historiographers and their ideas by examining the supposed first four of them, Na‘îmâ (d. 1716), Şeffîk (d. 1715), Râşid (d. 1735), and Kûcükcelebicâde (d. 1769). The questions we must examine are illustrated by the following:

(1) Was the position of official historiographer really instituted in 1714, as accepted by modern scholars? Why was this institution of official historiographer created?

(2) How and why did the early official historiographers want to write their histories? What history did the Ottoman government want to make the official historiographers record?

The Term of *Vekâyi‘nûvis*

Before entering into a detailed discussion, we need to clarify the term
vekāyi‘nūvis. According to B. KütÜkoğlu (1994, 103), this term has two meanings. On the one hand, it refers to the instituted official historiographers, subjects of this study, who were appointed successively and recorded consecutive chronicles. On the other hand, this term sometimes means ad hoc official historians who were ordered by Sultans and statesmen to prepare chronicles of given periods. The historians Nergişi Mehmed Efendi, İbrahim Mülhimi2 and 'Abdu’r-rahmân ‘Abdî Paşa3 belong to the latter type. Because of the ambiguous meaning of this term, it is not effective to examine whether the term vekāyi‘nūvis was used in sources or not. We should, instead, examine their actual careers and works.

Moreover, vekāyi‘nūvis was sometimes substituted for in sources by the term vaka‘nūvis. Because KütÜkoğlu (1994, 104) said that these terms had no difference in meaning, this usage is not important here. Though KütÜkoğlu did not say so, the term vakta‘nūvis was also used sometimes. I found that vakta‘nūvis was used in Şefiknâme (SN, 54 and 88) and the History of Raşid (RT, 1/4 and 6). In Şefik’s case, I could not distinguish usage of vakta‘nūvis from the other expressions, as Şefik used only vakta‘nūvis in his work. Raşid called himself both vakta‘nūvis and vekāyi‘nūvis at his second appointment, and thus we know that he did not distinguish these terms. We might well assume that these terms did not differ from each other and the variation was simply orthographic.

II. The Formation Process of the Official Historiographers

1. Careers and Works

1-1. Na‘îmâ Mustafa Efendi (c. 1655-1716)4

1-1-1. Career

Na‘îmâ was born around 1665 in Aleppo. After he arrived in Istanbul, he occupied some scribal posts. Late in the seventeenth century,5 the Grand Vezîr Amcazâde Hüseyin Paşa appointed him to complete a draft of Ottoman history (no longer extant) by Şarihü’l-Menârzâde (d. 1657).6 Na‘îmâ not only completed this draft but also used other chronicles to write a supplement for the years up to 1659.

Na‘îmâ did not mention himself as vekâyi‘nūvis in his work.7 The first mention of him as vekâyi‘nūvis was in Zübde-i Vekâyi‘ât,8 where Defterdâr Sari Mehmed (d. 1702) reported that vekâyi‘nūvis Na‘îmâ took a daily allowance of 120 akçe from the Istanbul customs revenues (İstanbul gümrüği mukâta’asî)9 and was given an Imperial deed (berât) (ZV, 731).10

In 1114/1702, Amcazâde was dismissed as Grand Vezîr, but Na‘îmâ
continued to write his history under the patronage of the new Grand Vezir, Morali Hasan Paşa. Due to the dismissal of Morali Hasan in 1116/1704, Na'îmâ resigned from his task of writing history. After holding other scribal posts, he died in 1716.

1-1-2. Work

Na'îmâ described his work, Ravzatü'l-hüseyn fi hulâsati ahbârî'l-hâfikayn, so-called the History of Na'îmâ, covering 1000/1591 to 1070/1659. “Hicrî 1000” had a symbolic meaning for Muslims.

This chronicle is divided into two parts. The first part spans 1591-1654 and the second part 1654-1659. Na'îmâ was hoping that he would continue his work to “the present,” that is, around 1704 (NT, 6 (supplement)/2). Due to the downfall of his patron, however, he couldn’t meet this goal. He used other chronicles, especially Şarihü'l-Menarzade’s draft and Fezleke-i Tavârih, as his sources, so his work includes little original information.

1-2. Masrafažâde Şefik Mehmed Efendi (?-1715)

Masrafažâde Şefik Mehmed Efendi is not usually regarded by modern studies as among the official historiographers. As Küütükoğlu (1994, 112-113) counted him, however, Şefik is worth considering here.

1-2-1. Career

Şefik’s career is not so clear. He might had occupied some scribal posts and participated in the peace conference at Karlovitz in 1699. In 1114-5/1703, supposedly, the then Grand Vezir Ramî Mehmed Paşa ordered him to write a book explaining “the Edirne Event,” a revolt that happened in that year and caused the dethronement of Sultan Mustafa II; Şefik therefore wrote Şefiknâme (Book of Şefik) at this time. The Grand Vezîr’s appointment seems questionable because it was only documented in the nineteenth century (AZ, 50) and no contemporary sources mention it. Şefik, however, called himself vákia 'nûvis-i dîvân(650,644),(716,699)hâne twice in Şefiknâme (SN, 54 and 88). We cannot entirely deny the possibility of Şefik’s appointment to vekâyi ‘nûvis.

After that, the Grand Vezîr Şehid ‘Ali Paşa, who was nominated in 1125/1713, ordered him to describe the reign of Sultan Ahmed III. This appointment is believable because it is mentioned by Şefik himself (MŞ, SK 3a; BL 3a-3b) and a contemporary writer, Şeyhî (Şeyhî, 466). He was also appointed as kücük evkâf muhasebecisi at the same time (Şeyhî, 466). He died in 1715, soon after this appointment.
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1-2-2. Work

His first work, Şefiknâme, explains only "the Edirne Event." At the latest, it was written by 1706—the year the oldest manuscript was copied (Aktepe 1979, 385). We can suppose that this work had a good reputation in the Ottoman Empire, because two commentaries were written (Celâle 'd-dîn; 'Abdûlallah). His second work is Muvazzaf-ı Şefiknâme (Digest of Şefiknâme). In spite of Şehid 'Ali's order to record the reign of Ahmed III, this work also primarily explains the Edirne Event.

Neither of these works take on the character of a chronicle in the usual sense. On top of that, they have no relationship at all to the histories of Nâ'imâ and Râşid. Şefik cannot therefore be considered a consecutive official historiographer. Şefiknâme is difficult to decipher because he wrote in a very complicated style. His work is enigmatic and difficult to understand, probably because he did not want to criticize anyone directly (Aktepe 1979, 385). Muvazzaf-ı Şefiknâme was also regarded as a kind of rewriting of Şefiknâme to be clearer and easier, by Şehid 'Ali's order.¹⁶

1-3. Râşid Mehmed Efendi (?-1735)¹⁷

1-3-1. Career

The date of Râşid's birth is unknown. His father was kâdi, and so Râşid also chose a career as ulemâ. During the period when Râşid occupied the position of müderris, he was first appointed by the Grand Vezir Şehid 'Ali Paşa in order to chronicle the reign of Ahmed III in 1126/1714 or 1127/1715.¹⁸ İsmet Efendi (İsmet, 91), who wrote the biographical dictionary of ulemâ in the nineteenth century, mentioned that Râşid was a successor of Şefik to vekâyî 'nûvîs. Râşid himself and any contemporary sources did not refer to this, however, and Râşid also said there were no vâkta 'nûvîs before him (RT, 1/6). İsmet's statement is not as reliable, as he was not contemporary.

Râşid was so much in favor that Şehid 'Ali ordered him to write Fethnâme (Notice of the Conquest) at the time of the campaign of the Peloponnesus (RT, 4/170) and even wanted to appoint Râşid to Nişancı.¹⁹

After Şehid 'Ali died in the battle of Petrowaradin in 1128/1716, Nevşehirli İbrâhim Paşa (the deputy of the Grand Vezir 1716-8, the Grand Vezir 1718-30) seized power and the so-called "Tulip Period" began, lasting until 1730. The then deputy of the Grand Vezir, Nevşehirli (who soon became the Grand Vezir), again gave an order to Râşid, instructing him to continue recording his chronicle of the reign of Ahmed III. At this time Nevşehirli had reissued (tecdid) an Imperial deed (berât) about the appointment of Râşid (RT, 1/9).
Soon after that, Nevşehirli married Ahmed III’s daughter, Fatma Sultan (7. Rebi‘ül-ievvel 1129/19. 2. 1717). At the wedding feast, Nevşehirli amended his order from recording the reign of Ahmed III to continuing the History of Na‘ímā (RT, 1/10). At that time Râṣid took one kese as the reward for chronicling (RT, 5/453). This fact has been touched on briefly in some studies (for example, Küçükoğlu 1994, 113-114), however, it deserves more than a passing notice. This change of the order was crucial for the formation of the continuous official historiographers, as it was from this time that the continuous chronicling of the Ottoman history began.

Nevşehirli favored Râṣid as Şehîd ‘Ali had. Hüseyn-âbâd (Prosperity of the King), the garden that Nevşehirli made, was named by Râṣid (RT, 5/305). He also wrote vakfiyye of the library and medrese (RT, 5/452), which were built by Nevşehirli. He occupied vekâyi ‘nûvûs until 1135/1723. After leaving this post, he held posts of high rank of ulemâ successively and died in 1735 (Subhî, 66b).

1-3-2. Work

The History of Râṣid spans the years from 1071/1660 to 1134/1722 and is divided into three parts: the first part covers 1660 to 1703. Using other chronicles, it includes little original information. Though it is said that he also used Na‘ímâ’s Yevmiye Ceridesi (the daily record), which is not extant (Küçükoğlu 1994, 112; Özergin 1964, 634), there is room for further investigation. The second is from 1703, when Ahmed III ascended the throne, to 1718; from 1714 on it includes original information (he had oral informants [RT, 4/286 and 5/147]). The final part is from 1718, when Nevşehirli was appointed as the Grand Vezîr, to 1722. Sûrnâmê (Book of Festival) and two Şefâretnâmêses (Report of Envoy) were quoted in this part. Most of the second part was written at the time of the first appointment. The remainder of all three parts was recorded during the second appointment.

1-4. Küçükçelebizâde İsmâ‘îl Âsim Efendi (1685-1769)

1-4-1. Career

Küçükçelebizâde was born in 1685, occupied posts as an ulemâ, and was trained in literature (Baysun 1945, 371). Küçükçelebizâde succeeded to the post of official historiographer after Râṣid in 1135/1723, also holding the post of müderris. Like Râṣid, he had Nevşehirli’s favor.

When he left this post is not clear. The date of his resignation might be 1143/1731, because he was given arpalîk as an officer of kâdi in that year (Râmiz, 156). After occupying some posts, he was finally elevated to the highest
post of үlemа, Շեյҳу’л-Իսլամ, and died in 1769.

1-4-2. Work
Küçükcelebizade recorded his account, covering the years 1134/1722 to 1141/1728, as a continuation of the History of Rаşіd. His work includes many descriptions of ceremonies and festivals during the Tulip Period, as well as campaigns against Iran in 1723.

One of the most important characteristics of the History of Küçükcelebizade is that he started to record ibktа (reappointment) when he wrote appointments and dismissals of officers (KT, 49, 87, 122-123, 169, 266, 301, 379-380, 466, 524, 551, and 561-562), though neither Na’ilmа nor Rаşіd had mentioned reappointments. Official historiographers successoral to him followed this style. 24

2. The Formation Process and the Reason for It
Up to this point I have presented an overview of the careers and works of four historians who were normally regarded as the continuous official historiographers. We can now propose answers to questions posed in the introduction above.

2-1. The Process of Institutionalization
Table 1 presents summaries and diagrams of the careers of four historians. What Table 1-1 makes clear at once is that no one was appointed during approximately ten years immediately after Na’ilmа’s dismissal. One could suppose that the appointment of Şefik by the Grand Vezіr Rаmі filled in this blank, but this appointment was dubious, as we have seen (chapter II, 1-2-1). It is certain that Şefik and Rаşіd were appointed as “official” historiographers in the vezirate of Şehіd ‘Alі about ten years later, after Na’ilmа’s dismissal. As indicated above (chapter II, 1-2-2), Şefik’s works and Rаşіd’s have no relationsip, and Rаşіd never mentioned Şefik. It is evident that Rаşіd’s first and second appointments, and Küçükcelebizade’s, were successive.

It follows from this that the appointments of Na’ilmа, Şefik and Rаşіd were not related. The consecutive appointment as a special quality of the official historiographer appeared during Rаşіd’s second appointment.

Was the continuous official historiographer therefore institutionalized in 1714? Though most studies would accept this, some problems should be noted. Because Rаşіd’s first appointment in 1714 was only to record the reign of Ahmed III as we have seen (chapter II, 1-3-1), we should regard that this
appointment was ad hoc duty (see Table 1-2, which indicates the continuity and relationship of their works). It is important to remember that Râşid, who was reappointed by Nevşehirli, was ordered to continue the *History of Na‘îmâ* in 1717. The fact that Nevşehirli changed his order suggests that the continual historical writing, which is a special feature of the official historiographers, started at that time.

In the Ottoman Empire, many “temporary” official historians were appointed by Sultâns or statesmen before the “continuous” official historiographers were institutionalized. For example, we can identify Nergisi, Mülhimî and Abdî, who were called *vekâyi nüvüs* and wrote ad hoc chronicles, as examples. Certainly they were officially appointed, but they never composed continuous chronicles nor were appointed consecutively. I consider the appointments of Na‘îmâ, Şefik and Râşid (until Nevşehirli changed his order) to have been “ad hoc,” like Nergisi and the others. It was not until after Nevşehirli changed an order in 1717 that the continuous historical writing appeared. The result of this study shows that a change from “the temporary official historian” to “the continuous official historiographer” happened in 1717. After the appointment of Kûçükçelebizâde, continuous chronicling and appointing of official historiographers were fixed as the established institution.

2-2. The Reason for the Foundation

With the above as a background, we turn now to the next question: why was the institution of the official historiographer created? The answer to this question is expressed best by statements of Nevşehirli and İbîrahîm Müteferrika. Râşid narrated what Nevşehirli had explained about the importance of continuous historical writing:

[Nevşehirli] made understand that for kings and ministers history is more indispensable than a group of wise people. Then he said that the history of the Ottoman will be completed by a binding thread if my reed pen records from the last year of the deceased Na‘îmâ’s history to 1115 [1703] which this humble author’s work started [That is why Nevşehirli changed his order to continue the *History of Na‘îmâ*]... (*RT*, 1/10).

Then their contemporary, İbîrahîm Müteferrika, who published *the History of Na‘îmâ* in 1734, explained in the editor’s preface:
In this condition [publication of the History of Na‘îmâ], the period from 1000 [/1591] to 1071\textsuperscript{25} is covered by this excellent book [the History of Na‘îmâ]. Then the histories of Râşid Efendi, who wrote a supplement to the History of Na‘îmâ, Küçükçelebizâde Efendi, Samî Efendi and Şâkir Efendi span 1000 to the present time. It will be inspired by that the events of the ever-lasting highest Empire will continuously be recorded. Hereafter the events and deeds in the ever-lasting highest Empire, which are decorations of new pages, will be written by pens of the official historiographers and a lots of copies will be printed by a printing office as far as God wills (NT, 1 (Miiteferrika’s preface)/17).

These two contemporaries’ statements show that they had a clear vision that consecutive historical writing would be useful, even indispensable, for the Ottoman Empire. This vision might have motivated the institutionalization of continuous official historiographers.

III. The Ideas of the Official Historiographers

Turning now to our second question: how and why did the early official historiographers want to write their histories; what history did the Ottoman government, represented by Nevşehirli, want to have Râşid record? (From chapter II, we know that Şefik did not have any relationship to the other vekâyi ‘nûvîs. That is why he is excluded in this investigation.)

1. The Purposes and Way of Writing

1-1. Na‘îmâ

1-1-1. Purpose

Na‘îmâ’s main purpose in writing history is to teach lessons to people because history includes a lot of useful admonitions (NT, 1/4-5). This opinion is similar to that of Kâtib Çelebi (Kesf, 1/271), who derived it from the work of Taşköprüzâde (Taşköprüzâde, 1/281-282). Indeed, Na‘îmâ’s work contains a philosophy of history that owes something to Kinalzâde, Kâtib Çelebi and Ibn Haldûn,\textsuperscript{26} as well as admonitions to statesmen derived from the seventeenth century reform memorandum (nasihatnâme). Significantly, he listed five points for administrative reforms in the preface of the second part (NT, 6, [Supplement]/52-54). The summary is given below:
1. to balance the accounts
2. to not pay the allowance late
3. to normalize armies
4. to rule for the ease of the people, prosperity of the realm, augmentation of income, and benefits of local governors
5. to prevail on behalf of the Sultan's authorities

His other purpose is to praise and legitimatize his patron's deeds (NT, 1/11). This is also a popular purpose of Ottoman historical writing. For instance, Na'imâ tried to legitimize the treaty of Karlowitz, which was concluded by his first patron, Amcazâde, in 1699. There were strong objections to this treaty, so Na'imâ had to defend Amcazâde by citing the treaty of Hudaybiya, concluded between Muhammad and inhabitants of Mekka in 659. It was popular in the Islamic world that the treaty was used as an excuse when making peace with infidels (Khadduri 1955, 235). Other than that, he glorified his second patron, Morarli Hasan (for example, see NT, 6 [supplement]/3-4).

This aim to praise and legitimatize is restricted, however, to the prefaces of his history, as he himself wrote (NT, 1/11; Thomas 1972, 117). To give an example of Na'imâ's fairness, he did not hesitate to criticize the act of atrocity by the Grand Vezir Köprülü Mehmed Paşa (d. 1661) when he massacred insurgents of Abaza Hasan Paşa (d. 1659), even though Köprülü Mehmed was the founder of "the Köprülü family" to which Na'imâ's patron, Amcâzâde, belonged (NT, 6/395-396). That is why we can point out that his main end might be the former one.

1-1-2. The Way of Writing

He illustrated how to write history with seven points (NT, 1/6-8), which I extracted here from a translation by Thomas (1972, 112-114).

1. They [historians] must be reliable in what they say, and must not make foolish statements or write spurious tales...
2. They should disregard the disquieting rumors... Instead they must prefer the reliable documented statements...
3. ... he should not be content simply to tell the story but should also incorporate useful information...
4. Historians should speak frankly and fairly... they must criticize and censure great men of praiseworthy works, they should never be unjust...
5. Historians should abandon overly varied phraseology and overly
obscure expression. Instead they should choose easy phrases which the reader can fully grasp...\(^{30}\)

6. Historians should quote in full any interesting correspondence of which they can get hold, useful anecdotes, verses...

7. Historians, provided that they understand the science of planetary influences, should record the influences...\(^{31}\)

As to Na‘îmâ’s application of these methods to his main body, Thomas’s evaluation was that “within the limits of his time and place he unquestionably did try to measure up to them” (1972, 117). We can accept Thomas’s evaluation for the present. Moreover, Na‘îmâ’s claims are unique in Ottoman historiography, even though some of them are not original with Na‘îmâ.\(^{32}\)

1-2. Râşid

1-2-1. Purpose

Râşid had two purposes in recording history:

[historiographers] showed the great benefit that would be an ornament for the tongue of the memory with the good names of predecessors until the Last Day and would be useful to loosen difficult knots in a lot of matters of successors \(\left( RT, 1/4-5 \right)\)

for the memory of the King’s beautiful deeds will be famous and forever until the Last Day, and for the exalted eulogies of world-possession will be spread and expanded around, this humble author was ordered to work diligently to write... \(\left( RT, 1/9 \right)\)

The former quotation expresses that history gives lessons and admonitions to people, the latter one that history is useful in praising of the Sultân. These two aims are peculiarities common to the first and second appointment of Râşid.\(^{33}\)

We can say that his main goal was clearly focused on praise and the legitimation of the Grand Vezîr, the absolute deputy of Sultân, rather than on giving admonitions. In spite of his above statement, he never made reference to a philosophy of history and admonitions. Sometimes he gave accounts that looked as if their subjects were related to reform memoranda (for the first appointment, see \(RT, 3/149\); for the second, see \(RT, 5/119-120\)). He was only describing, however, that some problem such as ending the oppression of people—one of the main subjects of reform memoranda—had already been
solved by Sultan or the Grand Vezir. Raşid never told what statesmen should do. This behavior was not intended to provide counsel for policymakers but, instead, was to praise statesmen who solved problems. In that meaning, Raşid was different from Na‘imâ and authors of reform memoranda.

On the other hand, he openly glorified and defended his patron, and criticized his patron’s enemies. For example, during the first appointment, he applauded Şehid ‘Ali’s conquest of Peloponesus and Crete (see, in particular, RT, 4/152-154). His praise is in striking contrast to the comment of Fındıklı Mehmed Silâhdar, who was a contemporary historian and severely criticized Şehid ‘Ali as cruel, rude and avaricious (NusretNAME, 865).

During his second appointment, Raşid extolled to the skies the fruits of the treaty of Passarowitz, which was concluded by Nevşehirli in 1714. In contrast to Raşid’s eulogy, however, Giovanni Emo, a foreign contemporary observer and an envoy of Venice, reported that no one praised this treaty in the Ottoman Empire (Shay 1978, 18-19). Actually, even Sultan Ahmed III, who favored Nevşehirli greatly, was passive as to making a peace. On top of that, Sultan wanted to continue war, being angry against Austria (Zinkeizen 1857, 557-558). Raşid never mentioned that Sultan hesitated to proceed with peace-making. To support Nevşehirli’s peace move, he instead attacked political opponents of Nevşehirli (RT, 4/392 and 5/6-7), who included Hacı Halîl Paşa (the Grand Vezir, 1716-1717), Nişancı Mehmed Paşa (the Grand Vezir, 1717-1718) and Na‘im Efendi (Şeyhü‘l-İslâm, 1716-1718). Raşid blamed them, and stressed Nevşehirli’s wise insight, which proceeded with peace-making (RT, 5/20-21 and 25). Even in the Tulip Period, after concluding that treaty, discontent was still present among Ottomans as to Nevşehirli’s passive tactics. Raşid’s strategy was to praise how the Imperial Treasury became so rich thanks to peace-making. Raşid acclaimed the plentifulness of the Imperial Treasury at many points in his work (RT, 5/119-120, 185, 260, and 311).

This aim of his is also evident from the seventeen documents, including hatt-i hümâyûn, kâime, mektup and nâme-i hümâyûn, that he quoted in his work. Almost all the documents are concerned with applause and justification for his patron’s policies (see Tables 2-1 and 2-2).

1-2-2. The Way of Writing

In the preface of the second part that he wrote in his first appointment, he made clear that he intended to write his work in chronological form, because that style was easy to refer for readers (RT, 3/7). Several types of writing structure are found in the Ottoman historiography, including the chronological
history of Na‘îmâ and Râsid, and non-chronogical history.\textsuperscript{35} Râsid proclaimed the merit of the former.\textsuperscript{36}

In the first preface, which was described in his second appointment, he explained how he wrote his history, as can be seen in the following quotations:

\begin{quote}
For spreading a table of benefit, by the way of blooming attractive expressions like roses and being simpler like a mirror than gold dust of obfuscation, I follow Na‘îmâ’s example (\textit{RT}, 1/10).
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
It was applied to record year-by-year, following Na‘îmâ in arrangement and explanation. For success, something was summarized, others were detailed and some matters were objected to and corrected according to requests of my duty (\textit{RT}, 1/10).
\end{quote}

Râsid declared that he followed Na‘îmâ’s style here. Based on these statements, Thomas (1972, 117-118) proclaimed that “Raşid notes that he himself follows Naïma’s example in matters of the division, organization, and presentation of material, in adopting the annals framework as his system, in presenting some narratives complete in one section, breaking other narratives up into sections and articles, and also—where necessary—in carefully contradicting false accounts and practicing fairness.” His interpretation, however, is exaggerating what Râsid said, because the former citation mentioned only “concise style,”\textsuperscript{37} and the latter one did not include any specifics.

1-3. Küçükçelebizade

1-3-1. Purpose

Küçükçelebizâde did not explicitly express his aim to write history.\textsuperscript{38} However his accounts suggest that his purpose was to praise and legitimate the deeds of his patron Nevşehirli, especially the campaign aginst Iran and the treaty with Russia.

According to reports of Emo and Bonnac, who were the envoys of France, there were a lot of complaints against Nevşehirli’s policy, because the Ottoman people did not want to battle with Muslims in Iran, but with Christendom (Shay 1978, 91; Aktepe 1958, 100). Küçükçelebizâde never mentioned these complaints, however. He only praised these campaigns and this treaty.

The treaty with Russia, which admitted the rule of Russia over Dagestan, where Sunni people lived, caused people to be offended. And then it raised the “Revolt of Patorona Halîl,” that led to the dethroning of Ahmed III and the
execution of Nevşehirli. The later Ottoman historians, such as Şem‘dânîzâde Fındıklı Süleyman Efendi (d. 1779) and Mustafa Nûrî Paşa (d. 1890), are united in their belief that Nevşehirli should be blamed in that point (Şem‘dânîzâde, 1/14; NV, 3/28-29). In contrast to their opinion, Küçükçelebîzâde regarded this conclusion as admirable, which was match for the treaty of Passarowitz and for support of Nevşehirli’s policy as Râşid did.

1-3-2. The Way of Writing
Küçükçelebîzâde explained how to write history:

The order (fermân) was issued that I continue to narrate the story from the finished point of Şehnâmê where the aforementioned master [Râşid] left his reed pen. Then I started to describe from the beginning of sacred Zilkade 1134, imitating his work as much as I can and avoiding use of strange words and quoting aphorism as pseudo-scholars do (KT, 7).

In this passage, he declared that he would write his work, using a concise piece of writing in the way Râşid had written in this concise style, as mentioned above (chapter III, 1-2-2). This is the exact style Râşid used to imitate Na‘îmâ.

2. The Styles and Ideas Adapted by the Official Historiographers
As we have seen (chapter III, 1-1-1), the History of Na‘îmâ included a philosophy of history, critiques of sources and proposals for reforms. For that reason, the History of Na‘îmâ has been highly esteemed by the Ottoman, and also modern, historians.

Râşid explicitly declared he imitated Na‘îmâ’s style. Can we say Râşid actually did follow Na‘îmâ? In fact, Râşid wrote no philosophy of history, criticism of sources, or admonitions to policies. He never imitated Na‘îmâ, despite his assertion in his second appointment. The two works have quite different characters. In my opinion, Râşid’s style in the second appointment should be regarded as continuing his own style during the first appointment rather than following Na‘îmâ. We can appreciate the remarkable contrast between Na‘îmâ’s style and Râşid’s.

Küçükçelebîzâde basically followed Râşid’s style. On this point, we can regard his chronicle as similar to Râşid’s, from the viewpoint of not only style but also political aim. Küçükçelebîzâde’s style was not highly esteemed as that “notably superficial and frequently little more than a court chronicle” and “a
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wholly characteristic expression of the frivolity and complacency (Walsh 1965, 20)." The same indication could be applied to Râşid. Whereas his comment could be proper and approved, we should also note that their styles, which are characterized by no philosophy and no critiques and are uninteresting for modern historians, might have been "intentionally" selected by Râşid and Küçükçecelebizâde (or Nevşehirli). They believed it was more important to praise and legitimize the patron’s policy rather than present intellectual argument, such as that which elicits admiration from modern historians.

A further point should be clarified: why did Nevşehirli choose the History of Na‘imâ as the topic with which Râşid succeeded? One reason may be that Nevşehirli was fond of reading the History of Na‘imâ (RT 5/404-405). Other than that, and perhaps more important, we should give heed that Na‘imâ and Râşid shared the same purpose, which was to support the making of peace with European countries. That is why it is understandable that Nevşehirli, who carried on a peace move, selected the History of Na‘imâ, whose discourse might help him.

IV. Conclusion

It is crucial for the foundation of this office that continuous historical writing by the Ottoman official historiographers started in 1717. That characteristic separates "continuous official historiographer" from "temporal, ad hoc official historian." Of course we should not rush to assume that the entire institution was created at this time. This system was perhaps becoming well-ordered throughout the Tulip Period. To give an example, that Küçükçecelebizâde started to record reassignment of officials might mean the development of historical writing.

This foundation was prepared by the awareness of the Ottoman people that continuous historical writing was indispensable for the Ottoman Empire. Adding to that, we could suppose that the development of the bureaucracy, advancing through earlier centuries, had an effect on the institutionalization of the official historiographer. This is too involved a subject, however, to be treated here in detail. It needs further investigation.

Finally, we confirmed that their works were characterized as praising their patrons and avoiding "lofty" argument. Some modern scholars regarded them as uninteresting but, because they composed their own histories from the then "actual" viewpoints, we should not judge them from a modern sense of values. This is a truth little understood in our time, but very essential.
APPENDIX
The Special Secretariat of the Official Historiographer?

We can suppose that the facility for using some documents was accorded for *vekayî 'nûvis*, because they cited documents in their works (see Table 2). It is also natural to suppose that continual historical writing of this kind must have required institutional support (Baysun 1945, 374; Uzunçarşılı 1948, 64; Kütükoğlu 1994, 107-108). It is said that the special secretariat of official historiographers, entitled "the Secretariat of the Official Historiographer (*vak'anûvislik kâlemî*)," supported their composing. This secretariat, whose chief was the official historiographer, was under the Imperial Cabinet (*divân-i hûmâyûn*) and the Office of the Grand Vezir (*bâb-i asâfi*) (BOAR1, 7, BOAR2, 290). However, the study of documents (*bergeler*) and registers (*defteler*) classified as belonging to this secretariat, which were stored in the Ottoman Archives (*Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivî*), has been neglected, and there is little agreement as to their character. I investigated the relationship between these documents and the official historians through an examination of those documents and registers.

There are fifteen documents and three registers in this classification, which was coded as "A. VKN. (*Bâb-i Asâfi, vak'anûvislik*)". I examined all of them and compared them with the chronicles of the official historiographers (see Table 3). I found that they were composed of various materials in no particular order, and none of these documents and registers bear directly on the chronicles. Besides, some documents (A. VKN. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5) and registers (A. VKN. 1699 and 1700) might have been written even before the foundation of the official historiographer in the early eighteenth century.

It follows that these documents and registers were probably not the ones given systematically to the official historiographers. This finding leads us to question even the existence of this secretariat. There could be the supporting evidence that two tables of secretariats, which might have been written in the late eighteenth century, never mentioned "*vak'anûvislik kâlemî*".

Though it is possible that this secretariat might not exist, it is reasonable to suppose that the official historiographers might have been supported from secretariats, because Halîl Nûrî Efendi, the late official historiographer (1794-9), mentioned that official historiographers had customarily been given information from some secretariats, such as those of *rîus, tahvîl*, and *teşrifât* (BOA, HH. 48063). A closer investigation of relationships between the official historiographer and secretariats still remains to be done.
THE OFFICIAL HISTORIOGRAPHERS IN THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

Notes

1 He participated in the campaign of Murad IV as vekâyi'ı'nûvis ('Uşâqizâde, 22).
2 He was the last Şehnâmeçi, appointed by Sultan Murad IV, and called himself vekâyi'ı'nûvis in his work (Kütükoğlu 1994, 103).
3 He was ordered to record the chronicle, Vekayi'nâmê, that runs to 1682, by Sultan Mehmed IV (Derin 1988, 74-75).
4 For further details of Na'îmâ's career and work, see Thomas's comprehensive work (Thomas 1972) and Baysun 1945.
5 Thomas (1971, 31) supposed Na'îmâ started to write his work after Amcazade became the Grand Vezîr, though he noted for his history from about 1691. Kütükoğlu (1994, 111) claimed it was 1699-1700 without showing any sources.
6 Menarzade might use Ravzatîl-ebrar, written by Karaçelebîzade 'Abdîl-'azîz and runs from the Creation to 1646, as a main source and add original information (Thomas 1972, 136-139).
7 See Thomas 1972, 36. He supposed that because Na'îmâ believed he should write his work in concise style, he did not use the word vekâyi'ı'nûvis, avoiding nûvis as having originated in the Persian language. I found this dubious, because Na'îmâ used several other words that originated in Arabic and Persian.
8 This work covers 1656 to 1704 and may have been written between 1714-1716 (Özcan 1995, xxxvii).
9 For a discussion of remuneration of vekâyi'ı'nûvis, see İlgürel 1991.
10 Uzuçarşılı (1959, 594) said Na'îmâ had already gotten this allowance under the patronage of the Grand Vezîr Ramî and was given 500 kurus by Amcazâde when he was appointed. It is a debatable point, because Uzuçarşılı did not show any sources.
11 Some manuscripts start from 1574/5 (Aktepe 1949, 36) and Na'îmâ himself said his work started from that year (NT, 6 (supplement)/2). However we should note that his contemporary Kûçüçelebîzâde and İbrâhîm Müteferrika regarded this work as starting from 1591 (KT, 6; NT, 1 (Müteferrika's preface)/17).
12 See, for example, Fleischer 1986, 244.
13 This work was written by Kâtib Çelebi (d. 1657), covering 1592-1654.
14 For general information, see Aktepe 1979.
15 For example, Sâlim, who was Şefîk's relative and wrote a biographical work of poets, did not mention appointment of Şefîk to vekâyi'ı'nûvis (Sâlim, 385-386). Kütükoğlu (1994, 113) also doubted his appointment by Ramî.
16 See MŞ SK, 1a. This comment in the cover of that manuscript might be written by the copyist.
17 Some studies said that a certain Rifâ at succeeded Na'îmâ as vekâyi'ı'nûvis and recorded his history, covering 1171/1669-1660 to 1115/1703-1704, and Râşid used his draft (TCYK 1944, 239-240; Uzuçarşılı 1948, 67). However as a result I researched this manuscript at the library of Sûleymanîye (Ibrahim Ef. 658/3, although TCYK mistakenly recorded it as Fatih 658/3), it might be a part of the History of Râşid.
18 Râşid himself said that he was appointed in early 1126/1714 (RT, 5/451). However, a contemporary, Sadre'd-dinzâde (d. 1736), recorded that Râşid was appointed in 18. 2. 1715 (13. Safer 1127) during the campaign to the Peloponnesus (Sadre'd-dinzâde, 514). It is difficult to decide which is correct. Though normally we should select Râşid's own statement, Sadre'd-dinzâde's is also concrete and believable (Özcan regarded the latter as plausible [1995, lxii]). It also might be possible that he was first appointed in 1714 and then was reappointed at the time of the campaign.
19 Râşid said he refused this offer because of his modesty (RT, 4/159-161).
20 The main sources of the first part are Nusretnâmê and Zûbde-i Vekâyâdî (Özergin 1964, 634). For further details of the relationship, see Köprülü 1947 and Özcan 1995, lxix-lxxxvii.
21 Râşid mentions in the section of "dealings of ser-kassâbân Kara Mehmed Ağa during a
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rout" (RT, 2/417) that he used the draft left by Na‘imā. This is curious, however, because almost the same text appears in Zübbe-i Vekayiât, which is Râşid’s main source, without mentioning Na‘imā (ZV, 627).

To solve this strange situation, we can set up two hypotheses: first, Sari Mehmed used Na‘imā’s draft as his source; second, Sari Mehmed and Na‘imā used a common source. Which is correct remains to be proved.

22 This work, whose author is Vehbi Efendi, treats of the festival to celebrate the circumcision of Ahmed III’s prince in 1719. This original text is over 200 folios in Vienna manuscript (Vehbi), Râşid simply extracted parts of it (RT, 5/226-271).

23 The first report is the one about his journey to France by Yirmisekiz Çelebi, who was send to Paris in 1720. Râşid omitted some parts. When he quoted it (RT, 5/330-367), the omitted part is Yirmisekiz, 1-4 and 76-83 [in Ottoman text]).

The second report, which was written by Dürü Efendi, explained his journey to Iran in 1721. Râşid quoted almost of all this report (RT, 5/372-398).

24 See, for example, Subhi; Çeşmîzâde; Vâsif. They also recorded reappointments.

25 Müteferrika might have mistaken 1170 for 1171.

26 See Fleischer 1984 and Suzuki 1987 for a full account of the acceptance of Ibn Haldîn’s philosophy.

27 For instance, a series of Selîmîmâmes, almost all of which were written in the reign of Süleymân I, might improve Selîm I’s image (Üğur 1984, 2).

28 For example, there was a objection by Nogay Tatar (Abou-el-haj 1969, 471).

29 For Na‘imā’s viewpoint about execution, see Thomas 1972, 92-94. Thomas did not mention Kâprülus’s slaughter, however.

30 Na‘imā reiterated it at another place (NT, 1/12).


32 Mustafa ‘Ali mentioned critics of sources and fairness (‘Ali, 1/43), and ‘Ali and İbrâhîm Peçevi claimed importance of the simple expression (‘Ali, 1/43; Peçevi, 1/5). Historians of the Safavî and Mugâl Dynasties also referred to the same point (Quinn 2000, 57 and 131).

33 The above quotations were derived from the first preface, which was written during his second appointment. For statements in the first appointment, see RT, 3/3-4 and 6-7.

34 See the document relating to this topic, cited in Uzunçarşı 1956, 143. Nevşehirli had to persuade the Sultan to accept the treaty, showing the weakness of the Ottoman army.

35 For instance, Celâlzâde Mustafa’s work (Tabakât) was in chapters according to thematic division, and Hoca Sa‘ded-dîn’s work (Tâc) used regnal division.

36 Though Kappert (1981, 29) indicated that thematic division developed from a chronological one, this could not be accepted in view of Râşid’s opinion, which asserted the merit of chronological writing.

37 ‘Ali Kemal (1334, 17-20) blamed the rhetorical embellishment of the preface of the History of Râşid, as being against his manifest. According to Gokyay (1993, 392), however, one of the typical styles of the Ottoman chronicle is that the preface is rhetorical and the main body is simple. As long as it concerns his main body, we can estimate it as comparatively simple.

38 He wrote when Nevşehirli ordered the Arabic chronicle ‘Iqd al-jumân, whose author was al-‘Aynî, to be translated into Ottoman Turkish, saying that reading history was necessary for statesmen (KT, 358). From that description, he might at least have had a thought that history was useful for statesmen.

39 Gritti, who was the envoy of Venice and a relative of Bonnac, reported that nobody praised this conclusion (Shay 1978, 119; Bonnac, 228).

40 The documents were classified in 1990 (BAKK, i) and the registers in 1989 (BADK, i-ii). These are comparatively new classifications.

41 TSMA, D. 3208/1; D. 3208/2. This information is based on Takamatsu 2005, 204-206.
Table 1  Periods Which Covered by Careers and Works of Vekâyi'nüvis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1-1  Careers</th>
<th>1108</th>
<th>1110</th>
<th>1112</th>
<th>1114</th>
<th>1115</th>
<th>1116</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Na'tmâ (Amcazâde)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na'tmâ (Morali)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Şefik (Şeffînâme)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Şefik (Şehid'Ali)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Râşid (Şehid'Ali)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Râşid ( Nevşehirli)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Küçükçelebiyâde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Şâmi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 1 After the appointment of Amcazâde as the Grand Vezir
- 2 After "the Edirne Event"
- 3 After the appointment of Râşid
- 4 1126 or 1127
- 5 Arrows mean successive appointments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1-2  Works</th>
<th>982</th>
<th>1000</th>
<th>1070</th>
<th>1110</th>
<th>1111</th>
<th>1112</th>
<th>1113</th>
<th>1114</th>
<th>1115</th>
<th>1126</th>
<th>1128</th>
<th>1130</th>
<th>1132</th>
<th>1134</th>
<th>1141</th>
<th>1143</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Na'tmâ (Muriâyazah)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Şefik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Şefik (Şeffînâme)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Şefik (Şehid'Ali)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Râşid ( Nevşehirli)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Râşid ( Nevşehirli)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Küçükçelebiyâde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Şâmi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 1 Arrows mean that he continued to write predecessor's history.
- 2 Râşid ( Nevşehirli 1): before the change of Nevşehirli's order
- 3 Râşid ( Nevşehirli 2): after the change of Nevşehirli's order
### Table 2 Documents Included in *The History of Râṣid* and Küçükcâlebîzâde

#### Table 2-1 *The History of Râṣid* (the period of the first appointment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Year (Hicr)</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>hatt-ı hümâyûn</td>
<td>1127</td>
<td>vol. 4, 48</td>
<td>The imperial order, commanding to be fair to promote the rank of <em>ulemâ</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>hatt-ı hümâyûn</td>
<td>1127</td>
<td>vol. 4, 50-51</td>
<td>The same as the above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>hatt-ı hümâyûn</td>
<td>1127</td>
<td>vol. 4, 100-102</td>
<td>The imperial order, praising commanders who conquered the fort of Anaboli and giving gifts to them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>hatt-ı hümâyûn</td>
<td>1127</td>
<td>vol. 4, 136-138</td>
<td>The imperial order, celebrating the commander's success in the conquest of Peloponnesus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>hatt-ı hümâyûn</td>
<td>1127</td>
<td>vol. 4, 179</td>
<td>The imperial order, recording promotions of three <em>ulemâ</em>, including Râṣid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>kâ′imeî</td>
<td>1128</td>
<td>vol. 4, 196</td>
<td>The document, declaring the invasion of Peloponnesus, addressed to the ambassador of Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>tercûme-i kağît</td>
<td>1128</td>
<td>vol. 4, 203</td>
<td>Translation of the letter from Austria, which persuaded the Ottoman not to declare war on Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>mektûb</td>
<td>1128</td>
<td>vol. 4, 227</td>
<td>The letter to Austria, written by Şehîd ʿAlî, who condemned that country's interference in the Venice campaign</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i The official document, which was given to the lower person by the higher one (Pakalin 1993, 2/140).
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### Table 2-2  *The History of Râşid* (the period of the second appointment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Year (Hīcrī)</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ruhsatnâme</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>vol. 5, 47-48</td>
<td>The documents, addressed to the Ottoman envoy for the conclusion of the treaty of Passarowitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nâme-i hûmâyûn</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>vol. 5, 57-72</td>
<td>The text of the treaty of Passarowitz with Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nâme-i hûmâyûn</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>vol. 5, 72-82</td>
<td>The text of the treaty of commerce with Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nâme-i hûmâyûn</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>vol. 5, 82-100</td>
<td>The text of the treaty of Passarowitz with Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nâme-i hûmâyûn</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>vol. 5, 134-136</td>
<td>The letter, sent to Vienna with gifts, for confirmation of the treaty of Passarowitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nâme-i hûmâyûn</td>
<td>1132</td>
<td>vol. 5, 201-205</td>
<td>The letter, addressed to the envoy of Austria, to explain keeping peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hatt-i hûmâyûn</td>
<td>1132</td>
<td>vol. 5, 207</td>
<td>The imperial order, praising Nevsehirli, who endeavored to recover the Imperial Treasury at the time when salary was paid to armies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hatt-i hûmâyûn</td>
<td>1133</td>
<td>vol. 5, 276</td>
<td>The imperial order, praising Nevsehirli, who endeavored to recover the Imperial Treasury at the time when the salary was paid to the six cavalry troops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hatt-i hûmâyûn</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>vol. 5, 422-423</td>
<td>The imperial order, praising Nevsehirli</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2-3  *The History of Kükükcelebizâde*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Year (Hīcrī)</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hatt-i hûmâyûn</td>
<td>1135</td>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>The imperial order, making the rank of Kâdi of Medina to be equal with that of Mekka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>fetvā</td>
<td>1135</td>
<td>64-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>fetvā</td>
<td>1135</td>
<td>65-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>'ahdnâme</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>158-169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>hatt-i hûmâyûn</td>
<td>1137</td>
<td>189-190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>hatt-i hûmâyûn</td>
<td>1137</td>
<td>222-223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>hatt-i hûmâyûn</td>
<td>1137</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>hatt-i hûmâyûn</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>temessük\textsuperscript{ii}</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>318-325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>fetvā</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>354-355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>kâ'ime</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>513-524</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{ii} The document, which was written about treaties or pacts with seal (Pakalın 1993, 3/453).
Table 3 Documents and Registers Classified in “the Secretariat of the Official Historiographer”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Date (Hieri)</th>
<th>Size (cm, length x width)</th>
<th>A Style of Handwriting</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Relationship with Official Chronicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.VKN.1</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>20.3 x 14.5</td>
<td>Divanî kirmasi</td>
<td>Ten notes concerning admirals</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.VKN.2</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>27.7 x 20.7</td>
<td>Divanî</td>
<td>About Basrâ</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.VKN.3</td>
<td>3. 1099</td>
<td>37.7 x 21.8</td>
<td>Rûk'a</td>
<td>Explanation of the construction of the canal by Sinân Paşa</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.VKN.4</td>
<td>1107</td>
<td>17.2 x 10.2</td>
<td>Divanî kirmasi</td>
<td>Some appointments and the halts</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.VKN.5</td>
<td>3. 3. 1115</td>
<td>31.9 x 45.8</td>
<td>Divanî kirmasi</td>
<td>About the Edirne Event</td>
<td>Recording the same event (though no direct relationship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.VKN.6</td>
<td>1125</td>
<td>36 x 16.1</td>
<td>Divanî kirmasi</td>
<td>Request of transport of food to Bendir</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.VKN.7</td>
<td>16. 9. 1143</td>
<td>22 x 15.5</td>
<td>Divanî</td>
<td>About riot in Istanbul</td>
<td>Recording the same event (though no direct relationship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.VKN.8</td>
<td>3. 3. 1145</td>
<td>15.8 x 11</td>
<td>Divanî</td>
<td>Change of the Grand Vezir</td>
<td>Recording the same event (though no direct relationship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.VKN.9</td>
<td>3. 22. 1150</td>
<td>31.5 x 22</td>
<td>Divanî kirmasi</td>
<td>Victory to Austria at Banaluka</td>
<td>Recording the same event (though no direct relationship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.VKN.10</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>25.2 x 19.8</td>
<td>Nesih</td>
<td>About Sultan Ahmed Mosque</td>
<td>Recording the relative event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.VKN.11</td>
<td>29. 12. 1182</td>
<td>25.8 x 19.8</td>
<td>Divanî kirmasi</td>
<td>Explaining the border with Poland</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.VKN.12</td>
<td>5. 1189</td>
<td>68.5 x 26.4</td>
<td>Nesih</td>
<td>A table of officials</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Date (Hijri)</td>
<td>Size (cm. length × width)</td>
<td>Style of Handwriting</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Relationship with Official Chronicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.VKN.13</td>
<td>1194</td>
<td>76.2 × 49.9</td>
<td>Nesih</td>
<td>Explaining the battle between France, Spain and England</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.VKN.14</td>
<td>1197</td>
<td>36.7 × 16.4</td>
<td>Divani</td>
<td>Appointment of officials</td>
<td>Recording the same event (though no direct relationship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.VKN.15</td>
<td>5. 1. 1207</td>
<td>24.6 × 19.5</td>
<td>Divani</td>
<td>Imprisoning of officials and the order of the army</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-2 Registers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Date (Hijri)</th>
<th>Size (cm. length × width)</th>
<th>Style of Handwriting</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Relationship with Official Chronicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.VKN.1699</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>44.5 × 16</td>
<td>Nesih</td>
<td>A part of The History of Peçevi (17 pp.)</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.VKN.1700</td>
<td>1109</td>
<td>25 × 17.5</td>
<td>Nesih</td>
<td>A part of a history, explaining defeat at Zenta (8 pp.)</td>
<td>Recording the same event (though no direct relationship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.VKN.1701</td>
<td>2. 1206</td>
<td>31.5 × 18</td>
<td>Rik'a</td>
<td>A copy of the minutes (mazbata) (14 pp.)</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These dates, provided in BOAR 2000, could be mistaken. The correct dates may be later than the ones given here.
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