Universiteit Leiden
The Netherlands

Scions of Turan: Illustrated epic manuscripts of the 16th-century Abū'l-Khairid Uzbeks and their cross-dynastic exchanges

Comstock-Skipp, J.K.

Citation
Comstock-Skipp, J. K. (2022, October 18). *Scions of Turan: Illustrated epic manuscripts of the 16th-century Abū'l-Khairid Uzbeks and their cross-dynastic exchanges*. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3483626

Version:	Publisher's Version
License:	Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden
Downloaded from:	https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3483626

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Jaimee K. Comstock-Skipp holds a BA with Highest Honors (2009) from the University of California, Berkeley in Near Eastern Studies. She obtained a first MA (2012) from the Williams College Graduate Program in the History of Art (USA), and a second MA (2015) from The Courtauld Institute of Art (UK), where she studied Mongol through Safavid book arts. She completed her PhD at Leiden University's Institute for Area Studies (2022), and is a visiting fellow at the Oxford Nizami Ganjavi Centre (UK) between 2022—2023.

Scions of Turan

Jaimee K. Comstock-Skipp



Scions of Turan

Illustrated Epic Manuscripts of the 16th-Century Abū'l-Khairid Uzbeks and Their Cross-Dynastic Exchanges

Jaimee K. Comstock-Skipp



Propositions

Related to the subject of the dissertation:

1. Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* is not solely the "national epic of Iran", but was significant across the broader Turco-Persianate sphere.

2. A 'ruler-*nāma*' is a chronicle with heroic and historic contents, written in prose or verse, taking one dynastic leader, or the broader dynasty he leads or those from which he succeeds, as its subject.

3. Multiple texts can be classified as versions of *Shāhnāma,* taking translated, truncated, and ruler-*nāma* forms.

4. Bukhara emerged as a center for the production of illustrated manuscripts post-1529.

5. The Irano-Islamic shift in political governance from Turco-Mongol customs actually took place in Abū'l-Khairid Transoxiana before it did in Safavid Iran.

6. Geography, such as the proximity between Herat and Bukhara as opposed to Herat and Tabriz, played a greater role in artisanal cross-dynastic transit than political and confessional adherence.

Related to the field of the subject of the dissertation:

7. The 16th-century dynastic polity administering Transoxiana from Samarqand and Bukhara is more accurately referred to as "Abū'l-Khairid," and not Shaybānid/Shībānid.

8. The "Persian miniature" tradition is better phrased as "Turco-Persianate arts of the book."

9. Illustrated manuscript production is essentially a collaborative process, with textual and artistic components completed in tandem or at different times and in different places.

10. When an original date is present within a colophon, it refers to the scribal completion. Illustrations, when not pasted in, must be contemporaneous with or postdate the indicated year.

11. Stylistic coexistence does not always imply coterminous production; different pictorial modes can be practiced within a center and workshop, and a common style can be practiced at different times and in different places.

Related to societal subjects:

12. Art is not separate from political or economic matters.

Scions of Turan

Illustrated Epic Manuscripts of the 16th-Century Abū'l-Khairid Uzbeks and Their Cross-Dynastic Exchanges

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van
de graad van doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,
op gezag van rector magnificus prof.dr.ir. H. Bijl,
volgens besluit van het college voor promoties
te verdedigen op dinsdag 18 oktober 2022
klokke 16.15 uur
door

Jaimee K. Comstock-Skipp geboren te Californië
in 1987

Promotores:

Prof. dr. G.R. van den Berg
Prof. dr. I.B. Smits

Copromotor:

Dr. E.G. Paskaleva

Promotiecommissie:

Prof. dr. P.M. Sijpesteijn
Prof. dr. J.J.L. Gommans
Prof. dr. C. Melville, University of Cambridge
Prof. dr. F. Schwarz, Austrian Academy of Sciences

Fieldwork in Tajikistan was made possible with a Fulbright Foundation Student Grant, and research in Uzbekistan was completed while on an Erasmus+ Fellowship at the Al-Beruni Institute for Oriental Studies, and Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies. Other funding came from the Juynboll Foundation, RCMC/FEL Junior Fellowship at the Nationaal Museum van Wereldculturen, Barakat Trust, Iran Heritage Foundation, Leiden University Fund, Orient Institut Istanbul, and Netherlands Institute in Turkey Residency Fellowship.

Table of Contents

Summary vi

Acknowledgements viii

List of Maps and Figures ix

Foreword xix

Abbreviations xx

Public repositories xxi

Introduction 1

I. Faraidūn's sons made manifest: Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* and the interwoven historical contexts of the Abū'l-Khairids in Transoxiana, Safavids in Iran, and Ottomans in Anatolia 1

II. Abū'l-Khairid *Shāhnāma* versions situated in the context of manuscript production in Transoxiana 3

III. Body chapters situated in the context of manuscript production in Transoxiana 14

IV. Methodology: colophons and the conundrum of classification 18

Chapter 1 – New century, new dynasty: the Timurid to Abū'l-Khairid transition in Transoxiana and early Abū'l-Khairid manuscript production (1480–1529) 21

I. The Timurid to Abū'l-Khairid transition, and ensuing struggles between the *kızılbaş* (*qizilbāsh*) and the *yeşilbaş* 22

II. Early Abū'l-Khairid ruler-*nāma* in the context of older and contemporary dynastic chronicles (circa 1500–1529) 25

III. Productions of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* in the late Timurid to early Abū'l-Khairid dynasties (visual focus) 43

IV. The illustrative program of the *Fatḥnāma* 52

V. The path to the "Bukhara School": Herat—Samarqand—Tashkent—Bukhara 56

VI. Conclusion 62

Chapter 2 – Artisanal and material migrations between Khurasan and Transoxiana, and from the Uzbeks to the Ottomans (1530–1557) 63

I. Overview of illustrated Abū'l-Khairid manuscript production between 1530–1557 64

II. Second-generation illustrated Abū'l-Khairid ruler-*nāma* in Transoxiana 75

III. Abū'l-Khairid *Shāhnāma* and ruler-*nāma* copies and their connections to the Ottomans (1530–1550) 87

IV. Conclusion 107

Chapter 3 – From the Khan to the Sultan: the Abū'l-Khairid *Shāhnāma* in the Topkapı (H.1488) and manuscript production under ʿAbdullāh b. Iskandar Khan 109

I. Khan made Shah: ʿAbdullāh's political and cultural motivations to produce a Firdausian *Shāhnāma* 110

II. Manuscript production in ʿAbdullāh Khan's Bukharan *kitābkhāna,* late-1550s through late-1570s 112

III. Gift-giving (*pīshkash*) and the politics of presenting manuscripts 130

IV. Conclusion 147

Chapter 4 – Turk amongst Tajiks: the Turkic *Shāhnāma* translation located in Tajikistan (CWH 1032) and manuscript production during the Abū'l-Khairid annexation of Khurasan (1588–1598) 149

I. Turkic translations of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* in the Ottoman empire 150

II. Turkic translations of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* in the Abū'l-Khairid appanages 153

III. Historical context in Khurasan between 1560–1600 155

IV. The visual program to the Tajikistan *Shāhnāma* 167

V. Conclusion 174

Chapter 5 – New century, new dynasty: artists and *Shāhnāma* manuscripts during the Abū'l-Khairid—Tūqāy-Tīmūrid transition in Transoxiana and exchanges with India (1598–1620) 177

I. Ottomans in decline, Mughals on the rise 178

II. Historical background on the Jūchid split and its impact on manuscript production 180

III. Firdausian *Shāhnāma* manuscript completion in Samarqand ca. 1600–05 182

IV. An additional Firdausian *Shāhnāma* manuscript from Samarqand: Cherniaev's *Shāhnāma* ca. 1605–10 (ARB 872) 191

V. The appeal of India 198

VI. Tūqāy-Tīmūrid *Tīmūr-nāma* copies 207

VII. Conclusion 213

Conclusion 216

I. Scions of Turan 216

II. Abū'l-Khairid *Shāhnāma* copies 218

III. Abū'l-Khairid inheritors 221

Appendices 223

1: Table of takeovers 223

2: Periodization of Abū'l-Khairid arts of the book 226

3: Correspondence between Ottoman and Abū'l-Khairid rulers, ca. 1500–1598 226

4: Manuscripts produced for ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz and his courtiers ca. 1530s–1550s in the workshop of Sulṭān Mīrak, *kitābdār* of Bukhara 231

5: Manuscripts produced for ʿAbdullāh Khan and his courtiers ca. 1550s–1570s in the workshop of ʿAbdullāh Muṣavvir, *kitābdār* of Bukhara 233

6: Abū'l-Khairid manuscripts gifted in the 16th century 237

Figures 244

Bibliography 401

Curriculum Vitae 428

Summary

This dissertation investigates the arts of the book in the Abū'l-Khairid dynasty. Often and inaccurately called Shībānid, the Abū'l-Khairids occupied what would become Uzbekistan and surrounding territories across the sixteenth century. It focuses on specific illustrated works of battles and biographies composed in Persian and Turkish; the manuscripts encompass *Shāhnāma* productions and other works of epic poetry and dynastic history. The political and artistic strength of the Abū'l-Khairids was short-lived, but significant. Their leaders exchanged embassies with the Ottomans in Turkey and Mughals in India, and sparred with the Safavids in Iran. Although the official dates of the Abū'l-Khairid dynasty span 1500–1599, the examination extends the margins by two decades on either side. The focus is on the copyists and illustrators who contributed to the book creations, even if they worked in other artistic centers and political regions at other times.

These manuscripts, and the scribes and painters contributing to them, fostered extended cultural exchanges between khans in Central Asia and their regional counterparts: Safavid shahs, Ottoman sultans, and Mughal emperors. These interactions were not confined to high echelons, however, and the study also traces the migrations of artistic talent across courts and commercial hubs during periods of dynastic rivalry and economic strain. Ambassadors, pilgrims, merchants, scholars, and artisans transported the objects. In the analysis, art is not separate from political, religious, economic, or intellectual matters but synthesizes art, history, geography, politics, economics, the movement of manuscripts, and the social relationships of the individuals engaged in their manufacture and transit.

Samenvatting

Deze dissertatie onderzoekt boekproductie en boekverluchting ten tijde van de Abū'l-Khairidische dynastie in Centraal-Azië, een dynastie die vaak ten onrechte wordt aangeduid met de term Shībānieden-dynastie. De Abū'l-Khairieden heersten over het grondgebied van het huidige Oezbekistan en de gebieden daaromheen gedurende de zestiende eeuw. Het proefschrift richt zich op geïllustreerde handschriften in het Perzisch en Turks, en spitst zich toe op geïllustreerde werken waarin oorlog en strijd centraal staan. Deze werken hebben daarnaast ook een biografisch aspect. Het corpus handschriften dat bestudeerd is behelst producties van het *Shāhnāma,* andere epen in verzen en dynastieke geschiedenis. Hoewel van korte duur, was de politieke en artistieke impact van de Abū'l-Khairieden aanzienlijk: tijdens hun bewind kwamen diplomatieke uitwisselingen tot stand met de Osmanen in Turkije en de Mughals in India; ook konden de Abū'l-Khairieden zich meten met de Safavieden in Iran. De Abū'l-Khairidische dynastie was officieel aan de macht van 1500–1599. Deze studie besteedt echter ook aandacht aan de twee decennia voor en na hun regeerperiode. Het proefschrift focust op de kopiisten en illustratoren die bijdroegen aan het tot stand komen van de geïllustreerde handschriften, en neemt daarbij ook de invloed van ateliers buiten het Abū'l-Khairidische gebied in ogenschouw.

De handschriften die het onderwerp vormen van deze studie - naast de schrijvers en schilders betrokken bij de vervaardiging van deze handschriften - droegen in hoge mate bij tot een uitgebreid netwerk van culturele uitwisseling tussen de Abū'l-Khairidische khans in Centraal-Azië, de Safavidische shahs in Iran, de sultans in het Osmaanse Rijk en de Mughal-keizers in het Indiase

subcontinent. Interactie vond echter niet alleen plaats onder de hogere klassen van de samenleving: deze studie laat dan ook zien hoe in een periode die gekenmerkt werd door dynastieke wedijver en economische spanningen, artistiek talent zich bewoog tussen vorstenhoven en commerciële centra. Ambassadeurs, pelgrims, kooplieden, geleerden en ambachtslieden waren alle betrokken bij het transport van objecten zoals handschriften over een groot gebied. In deze analyse staat kunst niet los van politiek, godsdienst, economie of wetenschap. Het proefschrift poogt juist kunst, geschiedenis, geografie, politiek en economie in relatie tot handschriften, en de individuen betrokken bij het vervaardigen en circuleren van deze handschriften, in kaart te brengen.

Acknowledgements

This dissertation project began in fire (northern California, 2017), and ended in plague (Covid-19 pandemic, 2021). Professors Ivo Smits, Gabrielle van den Berg, Dr. Elena Paskaleva, and classmate Jake Benson have helped me add "Dr." to my name.

I thank my family in California and Texas for being a patchy Wi-Fi call away and putting up with my nomadism; my British family hosting me across the pond; "Big Jaimee" Uhlenbrock; Ellen Watson and Ron Welch; Pepita and Stephen Hurd, whose support continues from beyond; the Qassemi-Talebi family in Mashhad; Irna Hofman, truly my *apa*; *dodar* Ramazon and his family; *ocha* Halima in Dushanbe; Zarrina Salimjonova in Khujand; those who treated me to many an *osh* meal in the course of fieldwork.

Librarians all over the world have been instrumental: Ursula Sims-Williams, Michael Erdman, and Merve Çakır. Established sages sent me copies of their work: Semiha Altıer, Lola Dodkhudoeva, Joo-Yup Lee, R.D. McChesney, Charles and Firuza Melville, Ali Rezaei Pouya, Zukhra Rakhimova, Francis Richard, August Samie, Florian Schwarz, Lâle Uluç, and Thomas Welsford.

I cannot thank enough the Empress of Istanbul, Linda Robinson, and the Emperor, Jim Geary, for providing me with my most favorite spot on earth to live. Also inhabiting it was Negar Kazemi and her warm family, Enis Dinç, Melis Taner, Jérémie Berlioux, Katie Hal, and Sasson Chahanovich. I physically and mentally survived the outbreak of the pandemic in Tashkent thanks to: Aftandil Erkinov, Sanjar Gulomov, Oysara Madalieva, Fayz Mahmud, Elyor Makhmudov, Hilola Nazirova, Komiljon Rahimov, Gulchehra Shavkatovna, Gulandom Yuldasheva, and Mavluda Yusupova.

Some *dūst* and *dugona* individuals deserve mention: Brittany DeAvilan, Brandon Buckner, Asim Saeed, Negar Habibi, Kyara Klausmann, Sabrina Maras, Marintha Miles, Natasha Morris, Naciem Nikkhah, Aeron O'Connor, Stephanie Pearson, Hannah Pool, and Jordan Quill have given me years worth of wisdom and love.

Lastly: my beloved Mohsen Qassemi. If I ultimately cannot crawl into the ivory tower, I will join my wandering dervish outside of it.

List of Maps and Figures

Maps

Map 1: The Turco-Persianate sphere. 2

Map 2: Abū'l-Khairid conquests under Shībānī Khan. 9

Map 3: The Tūqāy-Tīmūrid domain, ca. 1605. 178

Figures

Figure 1. Sām recognizes his son. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. LACMA M.73.5.409.

Figure 2. Bahrām Gūr slaying a dragon. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. DMA 1.2014.128.A-B.

Figure 3. Bahrām Gūr slaying a dragon. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. KMM ms. 5986, f.691b.

Figure 4. Shah Shāpūr consulting advisors. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. MAH no. 1971-107/431.

Figure 5. Bahrām Gūr slaying a dragon. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. TSMK ms. R.1549, f.379b.

Figure 6. Gushtāsp slaying a dragon. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. BL ms. Or. 13859, f.208r.

Figure 7. Rustam rescues Bīzhan from the pit. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. TSMK ms. R.1549, f.185b.

Figure 8. Rustam seated with Kai Khusrau. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. TSMK ms. R.1549, f.229b.

Figure 9. Shīrīn visits Farhād at Bisūtūn. Niẓāmī, *Khamsa*, 1501. TSMK ms. R.863, f.66v.

Figure 10. The poet Shādī presents a book to Shībānī Khan. Shādī, *Fatḥnāma*, undated. ARB ms. 5369, f.19r.

Figure 11. Tīmūr's troops attack the city of Khiva (Urganj). Yazdī, *Ẓafarnāma*, scribed in 1467, illustrated ca. 1480-1506. JHUL ms. Garrett 3, ff.115r-116v.

Figure 12. Shībānī lays siege to Samarqand. Shādī, *Fatḥnāma*, undated. ARB ms. 5369, ff.213r-214v.

Figure 13. Shībānī's troops attack Tatkand. Shādī, *Fatḥnāma*, undated. ARB ms. 5369, ff.206r-207v.

Figure 14. Tīmūr surveys the remains of the defeated Qipchaq army in the town of Nerges in Georgia. Yazdī, *Ẓafarnāma*, scribed in 1467, illustrated ca. 1480-1506. JHUL ms. Garrett 3, f.282v.

Figure 15. Shībānī Khan sits in front of a yurt with his lover. Shādī, *Fatḥnāma*, undated. ARB ms. 5369, f.54r.

Figure 16. Tīmūr's accession scene in Balkh. Yazdī, *Ẓafarnāma*, scribed in 1467, illustrated ca. 1480-1506. JHUL ms. Garrett 3, f.83r.

Figure 17. The invention of the game of chess in Iran. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. TSMK ms. H.1509, f.305r.

Figure 18. Isfandiyār slaying a dragon. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. TSMK ms. H.1509, f.213a.

Figure 19. Māh-i Dil receives a letter from Shībānī. Shādī, *Fatḥnāma*, undated. ARB ms. 5369, f.44r.

Figure 20. Bahrām Chūbīna in female attire. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. TSMK ms. H.1509, f.368b.

Figure 21. Bīzhan brought before Afrāsiyāb. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1451, Yazd. TIEM ms. 1945, f.187v.

Figure 22. Bahrām Gūr marries Ārzū, the daughter of Mahiyār the jeweler. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1451, Yazd. TIEM ms. 1945, f.391v.

Figure 23. Sultan Maḥmūd Bahādur brings Muḥammad Mazīd to Shībānī Khan. Shādī, *Fatḥnāma*, undated. ARB ms. 5369, f.146r.

Figure 24. Battle between the armies of Iran and Turan. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1451, Yazd. TIEM ms. 1945, f.232v.

Figure 25. Detail: The Chinese Khaqan and his son Farhād enthroned. Navāʾī, *Kulliyāt,* dated 1521. NLR ms. Dorn 559, f.79r.

Figure 26. Bahrām Gūr talks to the artist Mānī, who offers him Dilārām's portrait. Navāʾī, *Kulliyāt*, dated 1521, Tashkent. NLR ms. Dorn 559, f.184r.

Figure 27. Detail: Shaikh Suhrawardī invites the calligrapher Yāqūt to sit next to him. Navāʾī, *Kulliyāt,* dated 1521. NLR ms. Dorn 559, f.49v.

Figure 28. Shāpūr II. Kūhistānī, *Tārīkh-i Abū'l-Khair Khānī*, dated 1543. ARB ms. 9989, f.76v.

Figure 29. Ghāzān Khan beneath his tent in Urjan giving a feast for his nobles. Kūhistānī, *Tārīkh-i Abū'l-Khair Khānī*, dated 1543. ARB ms. 9989, f.173r.

Figure 30. Enthronement of Abū al-Khair. Kūhistānī, *Tārīkh-i Abū'l-Khair Khānī*, dated 1543. ARB ms. 9989, f.213v.

Figure 31. Abū al-Khair after destroying the troops of Samarqand. Kūhistānī, *Tārīkh-i Abū'l-Khair Khānī*, dated 1543. ARB ms. 9989, f.224v.

Figure 32. Chinggis Khan assigns lands to his sons. *Tavārīkh-i guzīda-yi nuṣratnāma,* ca. 1540-62. BL ms. Or. 3222, f.43b.

Figure 33. Ūgtāy Khan and his retinue. *Tavārīkh-i guzīda-yi nuṣratnāma,* ca. 1540-62. BL ms. Or. 3222, f.50v.

Figure 34. Tribute paid to a Chinggisid prince in 638 AH (1241). Rashīd al-Dīn, *Jāmīʿ al-tawārīkh*, ca. 1430. BNF ms. Sup Pers 1113, f.137r.

Figure 35. Abū al-Khair and his followers. *Tavārīkh-i guzīda-yi nuṣratnāma,* ca. 1540-62. BL ms. Or. 3222, f.118v.

Figure 36. Shībānī's assault on Samarqand. *Tavārīkh-i guzīda-yi nuṣratnāma*, ca. 1540-62. BL ms. Or. 3222, f.130v.

Figure 37. The death of Chinggis Khan. Rashīd al-Dīn, *Jāmīʿ al-tawārīkh*, ca. 1430. BNF ms. Sup Pers 1113, f.14r.

Figure 38. Entertainment in a garden. Anthology, ca. 1545-50. TSMK ms. R.1964, f.107a.

Figure 39. Tīmūr enthroned. Hātifī, *Tīmūr-nāma*, dated 1541. TSMK ms. H.1594, f.34v.

Figure 40. Enthronement scene. Jāmī, *Bahāristān,* dated 1548. MCG ms. LA 169, ff.12v-13r.

Figure 41. Enthronement scene. Jāmī, *Bahāristān*, dated 1551. MIA ms. 52.13.

Figure 42. Battle scene. Hātifī, *Tīmūr-nāma*, dated 1541. TSMK ms. H.1594, f.63r.

Figure 43. Hunting scene. ʿAṭṭār, *Manṭiq al-ṭair,* ca. 1530. BL ms. Add. 7735, f.84r.

Figure 44. Folio with the poetry of Khwājū Kirmānī, undated. In Basil Gray, *Oriental Islamic Art: Collection of the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation* (Museu Nacional de Arte Antiga: Lisbon, 1963), illus. 131.

Figure 45. Folio painted by Maḥmūd Muẕahhib. Jāmī, *Tuḥfat al-aḥrār*, ca. 1551–56. NMAA ms. S.1986.46, f.2.

Figure 46. Battle scene. Hātifī, *Tīmūr-nāma*, dated 1551. HAM 1957.140, f.137.

Figure 47. Enthronement scene: Tīmūr holding court in a garden. Hātifī, *Tīmūr-nāma*, dated 1551. HAM 1957.140, f.34.

Figure 48. Badīʿ al-Zamān conversing with Sultan Selim I. Shukrī Bitlīsī, *Selim-nâma*, ca. 1525-30. TSMK ms. H.1597-98, f.140r.

Figure 49. Reception of the Iranian ambassador in Amasya. ʿĀrifī, *Süleyman-nâma*, dated 1558. TSMK ms. H.1517, f.600a.

Figure 50. Shībānī Khan celebrating his victory over Andijan in a garden setting. Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ, *Shībānī-nāma*, dated 1510, illustrated ca. 1535-43. ÖNB cod. mixt. 188, f.166b.

Figure 51. Shībānī Khan defeats Bābur at Sarpul. Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ, *Shībānī-nāma*, dated 1510, illustrated ca. 1535-43. ÖNB cod. mixt. 188, f.47b.

Figure 52. Death of the rebel leader Kalender. ʿĀrifī, *Süleyman-nâma*, dated 1558. TSMK ms. H.1517, f.248a.

Figure 53. Süleyman inspecting prisoners after the Ottoman siege of Vienna. ʿĀrifī, *Süleyman-nâma*, dated 1558. TSMK ms. H.1517, f.297a.

Figure 54. Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ presenting his manuscript to Shībānī Khan in the garden of his summer residence near Samarqand. Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ, *Shībānī-nāma*, dated 1510, illustrated ca. 1535-43. ÖNB cod. mixt. 188, f.188b.

Figure 55. Outdoor entertainments. Niẓāmī, *Khamsa*, ca. 1530-45. TSMK ms. H.764, f.53a.

Figure 56. Bahrām Gūr in the black pavilion. Niẓāmī, *Khamsa*, ca. 1530-45. TSMK ms. H.764, f.189a.

Figure 57. The defeat of the town of Karakul. Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ, *Shībānī-nāma*, dated 1510, illustrated ca. 1535-43. ÖNB cod. mixt. 188, f.38b.

Figure 58. Illuminated frontispiece. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1556. ARB ms. 1811, ff.8r-9v.

Figure 59. Illuminated frontispiece. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1564. TSMK ms. H.1488, ff.1b-2a.

Figure 60. Binding impressed with panel stamp. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1564. TSMK ms. H.1488.

Figure 61. Rustam defeats the white div. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1564. TSMK ms. H.1488, f.94a.

Figure 62. Rustam defeats the white div. Illustration on silk, undated. Present location unknown. Reproduced in B.W. Robinson, et al., *Islamic Painting and the Arts of the Book: The Keir Collection* (London: Faber and Faber, 1976), entry III.227.

Figure 63. Young Rustam lassoing the colt Rakhsh. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1564. TSMK ms. H.1488, f.66r.

Figure 64. Dārā and the herdsmen. Saʿdī, *Būstān*, dated 1488. DAKM ms. Adab Farisi 22, f.10a.

Figure 65. Manūchihr in battle. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1564. TSMK ms. H.1488, f.41r.

Figure 66. Battle scene from dispersed manuscript. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. DMA K.1.2014.750.

Figure 67. Detached folio. Yazdī, *Ẓafarnāma*, undated. HAM no. 1965.477.

Figure 68. Tīmūr's troops lay siege to a fortress in Khurasan. Hātifī, *Tīmūr-nāma*, dated 1568. ARB ms. 2102, f.45v.

Figure 69. Attack on Kai Khusrau's castle. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1564. TSMK ms. H.1488, f.297r.

Figure 70. Rustam kills Suhrāb. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1564. TSMK ms. H.1488, f.116v.

Figure 71. Tīmūr surveying his troops beneath an umbrella. Hātifī, *Tīmūr-nāma*, dated 1568. ARB ms. 2102, f.69v.

Figure 72. Illustrated frontispiece. Hātifī, *Tīmūr-nāma*, dated 1568. ARB ms. 2102, ff.105r-106v.

Figure 73. Reconstituted illustrated frontispiece. Hātifī, *Tīmūr-nāma*, undated. BL ms. Add. 22703, ff.1r and 87v.

Figure 74. Battle scene 1. Hātifī, *Tīmūr-nāma*, undated. RAS ms. Persian 305A, f.70r.

Figure 75. Battle scene 2. Hātifī, *Tīmūr-nāma*, undated. RAS ms. Persian 305A, f.76v.

Figure 76. Loose folio inscribed *amīr Tīmūr ṣāḥib qirān*, undated. GMAA no. B.11.5r.

Figure 77. Garshāsp smiting a div. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1535, illustrated ca. 1580s. TSMK ms. H.1514, f.46v.

Figure 78. Illustrated frontispiece. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1535, illustrated ca. 1580s. TSMK ms. H.1514, ff.1r-2v.

Figure 79. Illustrated frontispiece. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. TSMK ms. R.1544, ff.1r-2v.

Figure 80. Bahrām, son of Gūdarz, defeated by the Turanian army. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. TSMK ms. H.1503, f.181a.

Figure 81. Zāl and Rustam visit Kai Khusrau. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. TSMK ms. H.1503, f.162r.

Figure 82. Ruler (Qul Bābā?) at a feast. Saʿdī, *Gulistān*, undated. Bruschettini collection.

Figure 83. Gathering of dervishes. Ḥāfiẓ, *Dīvān*, dated 1581–86. TSMK ms. H.986, f.21b.

Figure 84. Loose folio. Jāmī, *Haft aurang*, undated. LACMA no. M.73.5.577.

Figure 85. Gathering in a pavilion. Ḥāfiẓ, *Dīvān*, dated 1593. BLO ms. Elliott 163, f.55b.

Figure 86. Illustrated colophon. Jāmī, *Silsilat al-ẕahab*, dated 1592. AHT no. 83.

Figure 87. Rūdāba and Zāl seated in a pavilion. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. CBL ms. Pers. 295, f.76v.

Figure 88. Siege scene. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. CBL ms. Pers. 295, f.232v.

Figure 89. Illuminated frontispiece. Şerif Âmidî, Turkic *Shāhnāma* translation, undated. CWH ms. 1032, ff.1r-2v.

Figure 90. The court of Kayūmarṯ. Şerif Âmidî, Turkic *Shāhnāma* translation, undated. CWH ms. 1032, f.7r.

Figure 91. The accession of Iskandar. Şerif Âmidî, Turkic *Shāhnāma* translation, undated. TSMK H.1522, f.369v.

Figure 92. Faraidūn attacks Żaḥḥāk. Turkic *Shāhnāma* translation in prose, undated. HAM no. 1985.230.

Figure 93. Żaḥḥāk's vizier announces Faraidūn's arrival. Şerif Âmidî, Turkic *Shāhnāma* translation, undated. CWH ms. 1032, f.14r.

Figure 94. Faraidūn enthroned. Şerif Âmidî, Turkic *Shāhnāma* translation, undated. CWH ms. 1032, f.21v.

Figure 95. Outdoor entertainment scene. Jāmī, *Dīvān*, dated 1576. BL ms. IOL P&A 48, f.71a.

Figure 96. The death of Īraj. Şerif Âmidî, Turkic *Shāhnāma* translation, undated. CWH ms. 1032, f.29r.

Figure 97. Pious man attacked by a drunkard. Saʿdī, *Muntakhab-i Būstān*, dated 1527. AHT no. 66, f.11v.

Figure 98. Tūr's attempt to ambush Manūchihr. Şerif Âmidî, Turkic *Shāhnāma* translation, undated. CWH ms. 1032, f.35r.

Figure 99. Sultan Maḥmūd captures the Qaisar of Rum and brings him to Tīmūr. Hātifī, *Tīmūr-nāma*, dated 1581. Private collection, f.155v.

Figure 100. Tīmūr's forces storm the walls of Damascus. Hātifī, *Tīmūr-nāma*, dated 1581. Private collection, f.138v.

Figure 101. Manūchihr slays Salm. Şerif Âmidî, Turkic *Shāhnāma* translation, undated. CWH ms. 1032, f.38r.

Figure 102. Battle scene from *Iskandarnāma* section. Niẓāmī, *Khamsa,* dated 1579–80. NLR ms. PNS 272, f.234b.

Figure 103. Rustam lifts Afrāsiyāb. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1535. TSMK ms. H.1514, f.172r.

Figure 104. Zāl climbs Rūdāba's hair. Şerif Âmidî, Turkic *Shāhnāma* translation, undated. CWH ms. 1032, f.49r.

Figure 105. Zāl climbs Rūdāba's hair. Şerif Âmidî, Turkic *Shāhnāma* translation, undated. BL ms. Or. 7204, f.55b.

Figure 106. Zāl climbs Rūdāba's hair. Şerif Âmidî, Turkic *Shāhnāma* translation, undated. TSMK ms. H.1520, f.48a.

Figure 107. Abdürrahman Gazi climbs the fortress of Aydos. Arifi, *Shāhnāma-yi āl-i ʿUs̱man*, vol. IV (*Osmanname*), dated 1558. Private collection, f.70b.

Figure 108. Zāl climbs Rūdāba's hair. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, 1604. AIIT ms. 2.01 BD, f.37v.

Figure 109. Outdoor gathering. Saʿdī, *Muntakhab-i Būstān*, dated 1527. AHT no. 66, f.2v.

Figure 110. Frontispiece. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, 1604. AIIT ms. 2.01 BD, ff.1r-2v.

Figure 111. Bīzhan comes to Manīzha's tent. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1556. Painting attributed to Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī. ARB ms. 1811, f.191v.

Figure 112. Tahmīna approaches Rustam's bed chamber. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1556. Paintings attributed to Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī. ARB ms. 1811, f.84v.

Figure 113. Faraidūn defeats Żaḥḥāk. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1556. Paintings attributed to Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī. ARB ms. 1811, f.21r.

Figure 114. Rustam rescues Bīzhan from the pit. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1556. Paintings attributed to Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī. ARB ms. 1811, f.204v.

Figure 115. Luhrāsp enthroned. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, 1600. BL ms. IO Islamic 301, ff.185b-186a.

Figure 116. Shīrīn weeps at the grave of Khusrau. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. BL ms. Or. 14403, f.534v.

Figure 117. Rustam rescues Bīzhan from the pit. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, 1564. TSMK ms. H.1488, f.247r.

Figure 118. Rustam rescues Bīzhan from the pit. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. BL ms. Or. 14403, f.153v.

Figure 119. Siyāmak attacked by the div Khazarvān. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, 1604. AIIT ms. 2.01 BD, f.10r.

Figure 120. Siyāmak attacked by the div Khazarvān. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1564. TSMK ms. H.1488, f.18b.

Figure 121. Shāpūr enthroned. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. BL ms. Or. 14403, f.367v.

Figure 122. Frontispiece. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, 1602. NLR ms. PNS 90, ff.1r-2v.

Figure 123. Jamshīd carried by divs. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, 1604. AIIT ms. 2.01 BD, f.12r.

Figure 124. Mosaic spandrels to the Shīrdār madrasa on Rīgistān square, Samarqand. Built between 1619–36.

Figure 125. Luhrāsp enthroned. Manuscript belonging to General Cherniaev. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. ARB ms. 872, f.219r.

Figure 126. Luhrāsp enthroned. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, 1600. PUL ms. O-16/7249.

Figure 127. Garshāsp seeks to wed the daughter of the Qaisar in Rum. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, 1602. NLR ms. PNS 90, f.61r.

Figure 128. Żaḥḥāk enthroned with the daughters of Jamshid. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated illustration. LACMA M.83.27.2.

Figure 129. Ruler seated in a pavilion surrounded by courtiers and attendants, one of whom is leading in a Christian priest. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated illustration. FMC PD.144-1948.

Figure 130. The execution of Afrāsiyāb in front of Garsīvāz. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated illustration. BM 1948,1009,0.55.

Figure 131. The trial of Siyāvush. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. BL ms. Or. 14403, f.267v.

Figure 132. Faraidūn assaults Żaḥḥāk. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, 1610. LACMA M.78.9.5.

Figure 133. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, BKBM ms., shelfmark unknown.

Figure 134. Painting attributed to Bijapur in the Deccan, ca. 1600–10. V&A IM.14&A-1913.

Figure 135. The death of Sultan Bahādur of Gujarat. Abū'l-Faẓl, *Akbar-nāma*, 1602. BL Or. 12988, f.66a.

Figure 136. Portrait of Prince Salīm, dated 1600. RIOS Album E-14, f.3a.

Figure 137. Faraidūn assaults Żaḥḥāk. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, 1601. PFL ms. 59G.

Figure 138. Amīr Khusrau Dihlavī and Ḥasan Najm al-Dīn before ʿAlā al-Dīn Fīrūz Shāh. Bāiqarā, *Majālis al-ʿushshāq*, dated 1606. ARB ms. 3476, f.72b.

Figure 139. Tīmūr wins a victory over Amīr Sayyid ʿAlī Hamadānī in an argument. Bāiqarā, *Majālis al-ʿushshāq*, dated 1606. ARB ms. 3476, f.75a.

Figure 140. Rustam kneels over his victim. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. PUL ms. O-15/7248.

Figure 141. Rustam rescues Bīzhan from the pit. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. PUL ms. O-15/7248.

Figure 142. Reconstituted illustrated frontispiece Left: "Seated Princess," NMAA S1986.304. Right: "Man Reading," LM OA 7109.

Figure 143. Man in *chakdār jāma.* Signed by Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī, undated. Reverse contains lines written by Mīr ʿAlī Haravī. ARB no. 30.

Figure 144. A Tūqāy-Tīmūrid khan receives a Mughal emissary in a *chīnī-khāna.* CSMVS, shelfmark unknown.

Figure 145. Saʿdī visits the temple of Somnath, painted by Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī. Saʿdī, *Būstān*, 1615. CBL ms. Pers. 297, f.159b.

Figure 146. Tīmūr's campaign in India. Hātifī, *Tīmūr-nāma*, undated. BL ms. Add. 22703, f.65v.

Figure 147. Battle scene. Hātifī, *Tīmūr-nāma*, undated. BL ms. Add. 22703, f.21r.

Figure 148. Soldiers committing atrocities on a city's inhabitants. Hātifī, *Tīmūr-nāma*, undated. BL ms. Add. 22703, f.2r.

Figure 149. Tīmūr's troops lowered in baskets to attack the inhabitants of Nerges in Georgia. Hātifī, *Tīmūr-nāma*, undated. BL ms. Add. 22703, f.55v.

Figure 150. Manūchihr defeats Tūr. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1556. Painting attributed to Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī. ARB ms. 1811, f.31v.

Figure 151. Fallen warrior in the battle between Kai Khusrau and Afrāsiyāb. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. BL ms. Or. 14403, f.319r.

Figure 152. Aulad leads Rustam to the White Div's cave. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, 1604. AIIT ms. 2.01 BD, f.62v.

Figure 153. Tīmūr before the captive Tūqtamīsh Khan. Yazdī, *Ẓafarnāma*, 1628. ARB ms. 4472, f.219r.

Figure 154. Tīmūr celebrates his victory over Tūqtamīsh Khan. Yazdī, *Ẓafarnāma*, 1628. ARB ms. 4472, f.288a.

Figure 155. Tīmūr lies with Dilshād. Yazdī, *Ẓafarnāma*, 1628. ARB ms. 4472, f.152b.

Figure 156. Tīmūr's attack on the Sīstānīs. Yazdī, *Ẓafarnāma*, 1628. ARB ms. 4472, f.170a.

Figure 157. Bārmān's victory over Qubād. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, 1601. PFL ms. 59G, f.51v.

Foreword

Travels throughout Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, and Iran solidified my interest in the *Shāhnāma* and illustrated manuscripts, but also the circumstances when Central Asia became politically separated from Iran, thus during the Abū'l-Khairid branch of the Shībānid dynasty in the sixteenth century. They have been largely overlooked in examinations of the "Gunpowder Empires" to date, perpetuating the misconception that only the Ottomans, Safavids, and Mughals inherited from and contributed to Turco-Persianate cultural forms.[1] My study remedies this and treats the Abū'l-Khairid arts and administration in depth, as allies and rivals to these regional polities at different times, acting both independently from and interdependently with them.

In this dissertation, particular manuscripts weave in and out of the narrative and surface in disparate chapters. I make reference to dispersed loose folios which have been found in auctions and libraries, and separate illustrations that have been gathered and pasted in original sixteenth- and seventeenth-century albums. Unpacking the scribal and visual programs of intact codices proves to be a messy affair that can span different times and places, spilling into different sections and topics. Chapters proceed chronologically based on the date of Abū'l-Khairid intervention(s) in a manuscript. Thus, the reader will encounter the same manuscript in another chapter treating another time period in which a different component of the manuscript's manufacture is discussed. Tales written out earlier can have illustrations added later, and paintings can continue to be reworked and repainted long after the first layer of pigments has dried.

My transliterations of Persian names and literary titles mostly follow the *International Journal of Middle East Studies*' rules and spellings, with the exception of individuals and texts from the Ottoman realm written out in a hybrid form accounting for some Modern Turkish spelling with Persian pronunciation (Mustafa ʿÂli, Şerif Âmidî). "Samarqandī" is used as a *nisba* for individuals, but "Samarqandi" distinguishes the geographic location of production. I do not differentiate Ottoman Turkish from Chaghatai and use the adjective "Turkic" to refer to the language of "Turki." Chronicles of the lives of individuals with proper names in the titles are written separating out the name

---

[1] Marshall Hodgson's influential coinage from 1974 has become an entrenched but recently invigorated concept. In comparison, the sixteenth-century Ottoman bureaucrat Mustafa ʿÂli had a more nuanced outlook despite his limited vantage. To him, the four polities of the Islamicate world encompassed Ottomans, Safavids, Uzbeks, and Mughals. Mentioned by Naindeep Singh Chann, "Lord of the Auspicious Conjunction: Origins of the *Sāhib-Qirān*," *Iran and the Caucasus* 13 (1999): 99.

component when present (*Tīmūr-nāma, Süleyman-nâma*), but works lacking eponyms (*Shāhnāma, Fatḥnāma*) do not. Titulature (shah, great khan) remain untransliterated when used colloquially, but take vowel markers when are part of a proper name (Sulṭān Mīrak, Shāh Budāq). Geographic names and famous figures are unvowelled and follow common spelling practices, as are better-known dynastic names (Timurid, Safavid). Lesser known, the "Abū'l-Khairid" and "Tūqāy-Tīmūrid" dynasties are distinguished by punctilious diacritics. I convert Hijri calendar dates to CE equivalents and state the lower-end of the date range. For example, 1535 refers to 942 AH. Where an original month is expressed (Ẕū al-qaʿda 1012), the Gregorian equivalent reflects more accuracy (April 1604).

Abbreviations

app.: appendix
b.: born; also *bin* (Arabic, son of)
ca.: circa
ch.: chapter
d.: died
f.: folio
ff.: folios
fig.: figure
figs.: figures
fl.: flourished
ftn.: footnote
ms.: manuscript
mss.: manuscripts
no.: number
nos.: numbers
pl.: plate
pls.: plates
r.: recto; also regnal date
v.: verso
§: section

Public repositories[2]

AHT:	Art & History Trust, Houston.
AIIT:	Ancient India and Iran Trust, Cambridge UK.
AKM:	Aga Khan Museum, Toronto.
AMA:	Afghanistan National Archives, Kabul.
ARB:	Abu Rayhan Biruni Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan, Tashkent.
ASB:	Asiatic Society of Bengal, Kolkata.
BKBM:	Bharat Kala Bhavan Museum, Varanasi.
BL:	British Library, London.
BLO:	Bodleian Library, Oxford University, Oxford.
BM:	British Museum, London.
BNF:	Bibliothéque Nationale de France.
BOA:	Ottoman Imperial Archives, Istanbul.
CAI:	Chicago Art Institute.
CBL:	Chester Beatty Library, Dublin.
CMA:	Cleveland Museum of Art.
CSMVS:	Chhatrapati Shivaji Maharaj Vastu Sangrahalaya, Mumbai.
CWH:	Center of Written Heritage at the National Academy of Sciences of Tajikistan, Dushanbe.
DAI:	Dar al-Athar al-Islamiyyah, Kuwait.
DAKM:	National Library of Egypt, Cairo.
DC:	David Collection, Copenhagen.
DMA:	Dallas Museum of Art.
FMC:	Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, UK.
GMAA:	Grassi Museum of Applied Arts, Leipzig.
HAM:	Harvard Art Museums, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.
HAS:	Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest.
HDA:	Croatian State Archives, Zagreb.
IM:	Israel Museum, Jerusalem.
IOM:	Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, Saint Petersburg.
IUL:	Istanbul University Library, Istanbul.
JHUL:	Johns Hopkins University Library, Baltimore.
JRL:	John Rylands Library, University of Manchester, Manchester.
KBOPL:	Khuda Bakhsh Oriental Public Library, Patna.
KCL:	King's College Library, Cambridge University, Cambridge, UK.
KMM:	Malek Museum and Library, Tehran.
KMSM:	Library of the National Consultative Assembly (Majlis Library), Tehran.
LACMA:	Los Angeles County Museum of Art.
LG:	Library of Geneva.

[2] Private collections not yet fully available to the public, such as Cartier, Colnaghi, Kevorkian, Khalili, Kelekian, and Marteau, will be written out in full.

LM:	Louvre Museum, Paris.
MAH:	Museum of Art and History, Geneva.
MBF:	Martin Bodmer Foundation, Geneva.
MCG:	Calouste Gulbenkian Museum, Lisbon.
ME:	Museum of Ethnography, Ankara.
MFA:	Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.
MFAL:	Museum of Fine Arts, Lyon.
MIA:	Minneapolis Institute of Art.
MIK:	Museum of Islamic Art, Berlin.
MKG:	Golestan Palace Museum, Tehran.
MLM:	Morgan Library and Museum, New York.
MMA:	Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
NLE:	National Library of Egypt, Cairo.
NLR:	National Library of Russia, Saint Petersburg.
NMAA:	National Museum of Asian Art, Washington, D.C.
NMI:	National Museum of India, New Delhi.
NMVW:	Nationaal Museum van Wereldculturen, Netherlands.
NOL:	Nuruosmaniye Library, Istanbul.
NYPL:	New York Public Library, New York.
ÖNB:	Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna.
PFL:	Princeton Firestone Library, Princeton University, Princeton.
PUL:	Punjab University Library, Lahore.
RIOS:	Russian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Oriental Studies, Saint Petersburg.
RRK:	Rampur Raza Library, Rampur.
SAM:	Seattle Art Museum.
SB:	Staatsbibliothek, Berlin.
SDMA:	San Diego Museum of Art.
SJM:	Salar Jung Museum, Hyderabad.
SL:	Süleymaniye Library, Istanbul.
SPBGU:	Saint Petersburg University Library named after Gorkii, Oriental Department.
TIEM:	Museum of Turkish and Islamic Arts, Istanbul.
TMoCA:	Tehran Museum of Contemporary Art.
TSMK:	Topkapı Palace Museum Library, Istanbul.
UML:	University of Michigan Library, Ann Arbor.
UUL:	Uppsala University Library.
V&A:	Victoria and Albert Museum, London.
VMM:	Victoria Memorial Museum, Kolkata.
WAM:	The Walters Art Museum, Baltimore.
WCMA:	Williams College Museum of Art, Williamstown.
WCRL:	Windsor Castle Royal Library.

Introduction

I. Faraidūn's sons made manifest: Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* and the interwoven historical contexts of the Abū'l-Khairids in Transoxiana, Safavids in Iran, and Ottomans in Anatolia

Although its tales come from oral traditions that had circulated in centuries prior, the *Shāhnāma*, or Book of Kings, was first put into verse by the Persian poet Firdausī who completed it in 1010 when he lived in Khurasan in the northeastern zone of present-day Iran. The work consists of epic poetry numbering over 50,000 couplets and has generated a legacy of illuminated manuscripts. After beginning with the mythical creation of the world, the next section records legendary tensions that warrant a partition between Iran and Turan (the name for Transoxiana or Central Asia in poetry). This was based on the natural dividing line of the Oxus River, even if it was only geographic and not cultural. The text also justifies a partnership between Turan and Rūm.

The tale that brings about these regional divisions is Firdausī's early account of King Faraidūn and his three sons Īraj (the youngest), middle brother Tūr, and the eldest Salm.[1] The youngest is the favorite, and Faraidūn apportions his vast empire into three and distributes the sections to his heirs. He gives his hot-headed son Tūr the eastern regions beyond the Oxus River until Khotan on the frontiers of China, seemingly coinciding with the broad Shībānid domain of the early modern period. King Faraidūn then allots the western lands to his firstborn Salm which encompasses Rūm, or Ottoman-controlled Anatolia, and bestows the Iranian heartland upon Īraj which was a region comparable to the sixteenth-century Safavid realm. Angry with their father's inheritance decisions, the older brothers kill the youngest and launch the enmity between Iran and the regions to the east and west of it. This particular tale is pivotal in instigating the great rivalry between Persian and Turk that recurs in much of Firdausī's epic. The third and final historical section transcribes the exploits of actual figures and regnal events from the Achaemenian, Ashkanian (Parthian), and Sasanian dynasties.

One would be mistaken, however, to take Firdausī as a historiographer. His chronology is at times confused, but his words were actually used at times by military commanders to incite real armies to battle. Foes drawn from the stories' different epochs were cast as contemporary rivals in period political rhetoric.[2] *Shāhnāma* legends would overlap with actual historical battles and play out in real

---

[1] Analysis of this "pivotal myth...[of] political cosmogony" is carried out by Abbas Amanat, "Divided Patrimony: Iranian Self-Image in the Story of Faridun," in *Shahnama Studies I,* ed. Charles Melville (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 2006), 49-70.

[2] Robert Hillenbrand, "The Iconography of the *Shāh-nāmah-yi Shāhi,*" in *Safavid Persia: The History and Politics of an Islamic Society*, ed. Charles Melville (London: I.B. Tauris, 1996), 53-78.

geographic spaces, allusions that were not lost on the participants actually fighting in Iran and Transoxiana at the time. The literary plight of the three brothers and the tripartite division of their father's dominion in Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* structure my analysis of the real world exchanges across the Abū'l-Khairid (Shībānid Uzbek), Safavid, and Ottoman spheres across the sixteenth century. To these I add later interactions with India increasing early in the seventeenth century. This blending of literary fiction and historical fact, and in particular the story of Faraidūn's partition and its significance to political and cultural relations centuries ago and today, has motivated my studies of the history, geography, and art of the Turco-Persianate sphere in the early modern period (Map 1: The Turco-Persianate sphere). The stories and the manuscript arts they inspired do not belong to Iran alone, however. Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* is an ideologically-charged text and it serves us as a rich source for mining its resonance in different cultural contexts and periods.



Map 1: The Turco-Persianate sphere. Map originally labeled "The Persianate world" taken from the preface to Abbas Amanat and Assef Ashraf, eds., *The Persianate World: Rethinking a Shared Sphere* (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2018).

II. Abū'l-Khairid *Shāhnāma* versions situated in the context of manuscript production in Transoxiana

Shāhnāma manuscripts from the medieval through the early modern periods with verses by the poet Firdausī were overwhelmingly copied out in Persian. This study terms these materials "Firdausian," and regional centers located within today's borders of the Iranian nation-state copied a majority of the extant productions. Whereas many scholars have focused on these Firdausian *Shāhnāma* manuscripts and other titles from the Iranian heartland, limited attention has been given to the political and artistic connections between the regions flanking it: Ottoman-controlled Anatolia and Shībānid–administered Transoxiana (the Abū'l-Khairid Uzbek branch). Scholarship has held that the artists of Transoxiana seldom illustrated Firdausī's *Shāhnāma*, and this is verifiable.[3] Based on the quantity extant today, the books written and read in Persian most favored by rulers in early-modern Transoxiana were those of Jāmī, Saʿdī, Niẓāmī, Hātifī, and Amīr Khusrau Dihlavī. A handful of Navāʾī's collections of Turkic poetry was also produced. Some copies of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* written and/or illustrated by Abū'l-Khairid artisans were exchanged as gifts between heads of state or seized as loot to line the shelves of courtly libraries, and commercial versions of varying quality were peddled by merchants and/or scribes and artists to sell to those made wealthy through religious, military, and economic means. These Firdausian Abū'l-Khairid *Shāhnāma* manuscripts were both products of and contributed to broader Turco-Persianate arts despite their small number.

With the exception of a few single articles and short manuscript monographs on Firdausian *Shāhnāma* copies produced in Transoxiana, fuller examination and their connections to other artistic centers have gone unnoticed. They languish as unresearched historical documents and material objects. What is more, mistaken stylistic attributions and misleading colophons have obscured an understanding of manuscripts held to be of Transoxianan origin and so they have evaded analysis. However, some work has been done such as the pioneering classification schema of Turco-Persianate arts of the book done by B.W. Robinson, but his diagram labeled "Persian Painting" from 1967 includes the "Bukhara style" designation as a mere offshoot of the broader Safavid category, in turn spawning the Mughal and Khurasan styles beneath it.[4] Robinson was merely following British and European typological

---

[3] Asserted by B.W. Robinson, *Persian Paintings in the India Office Library: A Descriptive Catalogue* (London: Sotheby Parke Bernet, 1976), 188; Karin Rührdanz, "The Samarqand Shahnamas in the Context of Dynastic Change," in *Shahnama Studies II: The Reception of Firdausi's* Shahnama, eds. Charles Melville and Gabrielle van den Berg (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 213-33.

[4] B.W. Robinson, *Persian Miniature Painting from Collections in the British Isles* (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1967). Robinson developed this concept earlier in *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Persian Paintings in the Bodleian Library* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958).

conventions, privileging Timurid and Safavid arts which scholars over in the Soviet Union found problematic. In articles written in the early 1950s, academicians in the Academy of Sciences of Uzbekistan and Tajikistan criticized these approaches that placed Central Asian arts under Iranian headings, going so far as to accuse "foreign scholars" (implying inhabitants outside of the USSR) of not understanding schools of manuscript painting in Transoxiana and instead articulating their own "bourgeois point of view."[5]

Greater specificity and nuance have come in recent decades. With regard to previous scholarship on the materials of my focus, there exists a grouping of illustrated *Shāhnāma* manuscripts during the transition from the fifteenth to the sixteenth century which have been examined by the scholar Semiha Altıer. All of the manuscripts in the group were likely penned together during the end of the Timurid dynasty between the 1480s through the first years of the 1500s and were made for commerce rather than courtly commission.[6] Other scholars concur that artists with Timurid training searched for new patrons among the early Abū'l-Khairids in Herat after the shift in regional dynastic control in 1507.[7] Writing several articles on book arts in Central Asia, Karin Rührdanz has provided an extended study of a group of *Shāhnāma* manuscripts created in Samarqand between 1600–04.[8] Elsewhere, she has suggested an Ottoman provenance to another set with one exception scribed in Bukhara in 1535.[9] Norah Titley offered object analysis of an early *Shāhnāma* from Transoxiana that came into the British Library, and Güner İnal overviewed the singular courtly *Shāhnāma* copy from Bukhara that is dated 1564.[10] Russian-speaking scholars have briefly referenced seventeenth-century Uzbek *Shāhnāma* works as part of book compilations on Turco-Persianate painting formerly in USSR collections, most notably Galina Pugachenkova, Olimpiada Galerkina, and Mukaddima Ashrafi-Aini.[11]

---

[5] G.A. Pugachenkova, "Miniatiury 'Fatkh-name'—khroniki pobed Sheibani-khana iz sobrania instituta po izuchenniiu bostochnykh rukopisei Akademiii Nauk UzSSR," *Trudy: Sredneaziatskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta. Arkheologia Srednei Azii* 11, no. 3 (1950): 121.

[6] Semiha Altıer, "Şiban Han dönemi (1500-1510) Özbek kitap sanatı" (PhD diss., Hacettepe University, 2014), 215.

[7] Yves Porter, "Remarques sur la peinture à Boukhara au XVIe siècle," *Cahiers d'Asie centrale*, 5/6 (1998): 147-67.

[8] Rührdanz, "The Samarqand Shahnamas."

[9] Karin Rührdanz, "About a Group of Truncated *Shāhnāmas*: A Case Study in the Commercial Production of Illustrated Manuscripts in the Second Part of the Sixteenth Century," *Muqarnas* 14 (1997): 118–34.

[10] Norah Titley, "A Shāhnāma from Transoxiana," *British Library Journal* 7, no. 2 (1981): 158-71; G. İnal, "Topkapı Sarayı Koleksiyonundaki Sultani Bir Özbek Şehnamesi ve Özbek Resim Sanatı İçindeki yeri" (Eng. summary "A royal Uzbek Shahnameh in the Topkapı Palace Museum and Its Significance for Uzbek Painting"), *Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı / Journal of Art History* 6 (1974-75): 303-32.

[11] G. Pugachenkova and O. Galerkina, *Miniatiury Sredneĭ Azii/Miniatures of Central Asia in Selected Examples from Soviet and Foreign Collections* (Moskva: Izobraziteľnoe iskusstvo, 1979); M.M. Ashrafi, *Bekhzad i razvitiya bukharskoi shkoly miniatiury XVI v.* [Bihzad and the development of the Bukhara school of miniatures in the 16th century] (Dushanbe: Donish, 1987).

Oleg Akimushkin, and Larisa and Lola Dodkhudoeva have updated and strengthened this work.[12] Other references to select manuscripts have served nationalizing projects in the wake of Uzbek, Tajik, and Kazakh independence.[13] In other articles and entries, Yves Porter, Francis Richard, Barbara Brend, and Barbara Schmitz have delineated manuscript trends in Central Asia and *kitābkhāna* practices in Transoxiana which I have incorporated into my research.[14]

I have also followed the lead of other scholars who have examined more traditional *Shāhnāma* materials but have moved beyond questions of style and provenance to contextualize the works into larger socio-political and economic settings. Robert Hillenbrand's critique of the most masterful *Shāhnāma* produced in Safavid Iran is a fine case study for relating manuscript illustrations to their historical context.[15] Lâle Uluç has taken another approach to determine how the *Shāhnāma* in general has been received by an Ottoman audience outside the Iranian tradition, which Serpil Bağcı has also explored.[16] Using these publications to guide my scope and structure in order to focus on the creation and reception of the *Shāhnāma* outside of Iran proper and specifically in Central Asia, my methodology fluctuates between treating select copies of Abū'l-Khairid *Shāhnāma* versions as single case studies, and as collective manuscript groups with similar production circumstances.

Formal analysis is a means to link artistic centers and manuscript production sites when there is no other information. However, a contextualist approach is also vital that is grounded in published secondary sources covering historical events occurring at the time when the illustrated manuscripts were created. I have situated myself in the region and time period of their production through the lens

---

[12] Oleg Akimushkin, "Biblioteka Shibanidov v Bukhare XVI veka," in *Bamberger Zentralasienstudien. Konferenzakten ESCAS IV Bamberg 8.-12. Oktober 1991,* eds. Ingeborg Baldauf and Michael Friederich (Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 1994), 325-41; O. Akimushkin, et al., "The Shaybanids (Bukhara, 1500–98) and the Janids (Ashtarkhanids) (Bukhara, 1599–1753)," in *History of Civilizations of Central Asia*: *Vol. 5: Development in contrast: from the sixteenth to the mid-nineteenth century,* eds. Chahryar Adle, et al. (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 2003), 580-84.

[13] A. Madraimov, Sh. Musaev, E. Ismailova, *Oriental Miniatures: The Collection of the Beruni Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan: Volume 1, 14th-17th Centuries* (Tashkent: The Beruni Institute of Oriental Studies, 2001); Mukaddima Ashrafi, *The Tajik Miniature: Bukhara School XVI-XVII-th Centuries* (Tajikistan: A. Donisha, 2011); M. Kh. Abuseitova and L. N. Dodkhudoeva, *Qazaqstan tarikhy shyghys miniatiuralarynda = Istoriia Kazakhstana v vostochnykh miniatiurakh = History of Kazakhstan in Eastern miniatures* (Almaty: Daĭk-Press, 2010).

[14] Porter, "Remarques sur la peinture"; Barbara Brend, *Perspectives on Persian Painting: Illustrations to Amir Khusrau's* Khamsah (London: Routledge, 2016); Barbara Brend, "A Sixteenth-Century Manuscript from Transoxiana: Evidence for a Continuing Tradition in Illustration," *Muqarnas* 11 (1994): 103-116; Barbara Schmitz, "BUKHARA vi. Bukharan School of Miniature Painting," *Encyclopædia Iranica;* Barbara Schmitz, "Miniature Painting in Harāt, 1570-1640" (PhD diss., New York University, 1981); Francis Richard has been very supportive in offering me portions of his own collected research files and images.

[15] Robert Hillenbrand, "The Iconography of the *Shāh-nāmah-yi Shāhī,*" in *Safavid Persia: The History and Politics of an Islamic Society*, 53-78.

[16] Lâle Uluç, "The *Shāhnāma* in the Lands of Rum," in *Shāhnāma Studies II*, 159-80; Serpil Bağcı, "From translated word to translated image: The illustrated Şehnâme-i Türkī copies," *Muqarnas* 17 (2000): 162-76.

of Audrey Burton's publications on the history of sixteenth-century Bukhara and its residents, and I have gained a broader understanding of the Uzbek realm and its connections to other regional powers within Transoxiana and beyond through R.D. McChesney's and Florian Schwarz's numerous articles.[17] They further the pioneering fieldwork done decades earlier by Martin Dickson. Devin DeWeese, Maria Szuppe, and Maria Subtelny have examined cultural and literary production in early-modern Central Asia that complements my analysis of the illustrative programs when present in the works they have analyzed. In seeking local scholarship on the region, I have relied on in-depth chapters in the UNESCO series *History of Civilizations of Central Asia* edited by Chahryar Adle, et al., that illuminate histories and particular dynasties of Central Asia.[18]

The rarity of Firdausian *Shāhnāma* copies with components of production in Transoxiana makes the few available copies significant objects through which to analyze the cultural and historical milieus in which they were created. As creations of courtly and commercial workshops, the works reflexively illuminate their makers and era(s) of production. Given that the focus of this dissertation is on Abū'l-Khairid *Shāhnāma* copies, it is vital to equally unpack what is meant by the dynastic heading "Abū'l-Khairid", and parse the selection of subject matter interpreted to be of "*Shāhnāma*" derivation.

II.i. The Abū'l-Khairid component to the "Abū'l-Khairid *Shāhnāma*" copies: historical and dynastic information

Abū'l-Khairid (early-modern Uzbek) arts of the book occupy a curious position in scholarship, at times considered "too Persian" to be grouped with art forms from Turkic-speaking regions. The arts of this dynasty have also been considered "too Turkish" to be categorized alongside other Persianate dynasties: the Metropolitan Museum of Art website refers to the group as Turco-Mongol;[19] the Austrian scholar Joseph von Hammer writing in 1828 called them "die türkische Dynastie Scheibani;"[20] Svat Soucek characterizes them as "Turks like the Timurids;"[21] and even their contemporaries in the late

---

[17] The following correctives are enormously beneficial in explaining academic divisions between British, post-colonial South Asia scholarship on the one hand; and Imperial Russian/Soviet Central Asia: Florian Schwarz, "Safavids and Ozbeks," in *Safavid Persia in the Age of Empires: The Idea of Iran,* ed. Charles Melville (London: I.B.Tauris, 2021), 357–374; R.D. McChesney, "Barrier of heterodoxy?' Rethinking the Ties Between Iran and Central Asia in the 17th Century," in *Safavid Persia: The History and Politics of an Islamic Society*, ed. Charles Melville (London: I.B. Tauris, 1996), 231-67.

[18] Adle, et al., *History of Civilizations of Central Asia.*

[19] "Central and North Asia, 1400–1600 A.D.," in *Heilbrunn Timeline of Art History,* New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art <http://www.metmuseum.org/toah/ht/?period=08&region=nc> (2000).

[20] Joseph Hammer-Purgstall, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches: Grossentheils aus bisher unbenützen Handschriften und Archiven* (Pesth [Budapest]: C.A. Hartleben, 1840), 351.

[21] Svat Soucek, *A History of Inner Asia* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 149.

sixteenth century referred to the Abū'l-Khairid Shībānids as "Turks" and "Tatars" in Ottoman records written by the chronicler Mustafa ʿÂlī.[22]

In affixing linguistic categorizations, the imbrication of Turki and Persian in the Ottoman, Safavid, Mughal, and Abū'l-Khairid realms in the early modern period must be acknowledged, with dynastic rulers frequently making use of both languages in their correspondence and personal poetry. As Ferenc Csirkés aptly points out, "there was no linguistic or cultural homogeneity in the age at all."[23] One ought not to be anachronistic and equate dynastic borders with current national demarcations and assume the languages presently spoken within them have stayed constant, for "linguistic affiliation as a key to identity is more the product of modern ethno-nationalism."[24] In the period and region of our focus, bilingualism and fluid identities were more common than they are now particularly among the elites who could afford an illustrated work of poetry.

As an example of this, the Safavid shah Ismāʿīl I was prolific in employing Firdausian *Shāhnāma* allusions and references when he would write his own Turkic poetry. Writes the translator Vladimir Minorsky: "It is a remarkable fact that while [the Ottoman] Sultan Selim and Shah Ismāʿīl both possessed poetic talents, the former wrote almost exclusively in Persian, and the latter, under the pen-name of Khatai, almost exclusively in Turkish."[25] It is significant that the Ottomans later devoted the most attention to works in Turki, but the Persian language and literature remained paramount to the Abū'l-Khairids.[26] Although Transoxiana has been historically referred to as Turan or Turkestan to emphasize the expanse's linguistic differentiation from Iran, Persian would be retained as a literary and administrative language in Central Asia for centuries. In taking over Timurid literary heritage, the Abū'l-Khairids introduced nomadic elements into Turkic and Persian literary traditions, but the latter remained the lingua franca in Central Asia until the Russian imperial armies forced their way into the

---

[22] Joo-Yup Lee, *Qazaqliq, or Ambitious Brigandage, and the Formation of the Qazaqs: State and Identity in Post-Mongol Central Eurasia* (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 131.

[23] Ferenc Csirkés, " 'Chaghatay Oration, Ottoman Eloquence, Qizilbash Rhetoric': Turkic Literature in Safavid Persia," (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2016), 388.

[24] Ibid., 23-24.

[25] V. Minorsky, "The Poetry of Shah Ismail I," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 10, no. 4 (1942): 1007a.

[26] Maria Subtelny, "The Poetic Circle at the Court of the Timurid Sultan Ḥusain Baiqara and its Political Significance" (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1979), 174.

region during the 1860s.[27]

II.i.a. Shībānid, Uzbek, or Abū'l-Khairid?

Applying a dynastic descriptor to the group here scrutinized is surprisingly problematic. The term "Uzbek" has been used indiscriminately to refer to the Central Asian rivals to the Timurids and Safavids across multiple centuries. Although it is currently connected to a modern nation-state delineated by different borders and containing within it different peoples than those of half a millennium ago, period Persian-language sources used the term "Uzbek" for a tribal confederation from the Qipchaq steppe descended from Jūchī, the eldest son of Chinggis Khan. Following the death of the great khan, a line traced through Jūchī's son Shībān (active in the thirteenth century) ruled the Golden Horde (1242–1502) in the northwestern sector of the Mongol Empire. It is this Shībān who spawned the Shībānid designation. Later, separate strains of these Shībānids held power in Siberia (Tāibughids),[28] Khwarazm (ʿArabshāhids),[29] and Transoxiana (Abū'l-Khairids) by the late fifteenth century. Narrowing our focus, the Abū'l-Khairids took root under Abū al-Khair Khan who united various nomads of the Qipchaq steppe under the name "Uzbek." Joining together Jūchid and Chaghataid lines through intermarriages, these (proto-)Abū'l-Khairids persisted in Transoxiana as allies-cum-adversaries of the Timurid princes who grew weaker as the fifteenth century passed.[30] Upon Abū al-Khair Khan's death in 1467, his grandson Muḥammad Shāh-Bakht (1451–1510), better known as Shībānī Khan, took over control and surpassed his grandfather's territorial gains.[31] The moniker Shībānī was actually a pen-name for the poetry he composed.

---

[27] Aftandil Erkinov, "The Poetry of Nomads and Shaybānī Rulers in the Process of Transition to a Settled Society," in *Central Asia on Display: Proceedings of the VII. Conference of the European Society for Central Asian Studies,* eds. Gabriele Rasuly-Paleczek and Julia Katschnig (Vienna: LIT Verlag, 2004): 145.

[28] Consult D.N. Maslyuzhenko, "The Siberian Branch of the Shibanid Dynasty in Sh. Marjani's Studies," *Zolotoordynskoe obozrenie/ Golden Horde Review* 7, no. 3 (2019): 485–96; Allen J. Frank, "The western steppe: Volga-Ural region, Siberia and the Crimea," in *The Cambridge History of Inner Asia,* eds. Nicola di Cosmo, Allen J. Frank, Peter B. Golden (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 250-53.

[29] Also referred to as Yādigārid, named after Yādigār Sultan, descended from his great-grandfather ʿArabshāh, who ruled to the north of the Aral Sea ca. 1458 [Yuri Bregel, *An Historical Atlas of Central Asia* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 48].

[30] Maria Subtelny notes Shībānī Khan's strategic marriages into the Chaghataid lines, including female relatives of Bābur and Sulṭān Maḥmūd: the Timurid governor of Tashkent between 1487-1508 ["Art and Politics in Early 16th Century Central Asia," *Central Asia Journal* 27, nos. 1-2 (1983): 132, ftn. 42].

[31] The leader's full name recorded by the chronicler Wāṣifī is Muḥammad b. Shāh Būdāq Sulṭān b. Abū'l-Khair Khān [Robert W. Dunbar, "Zayn al-Dīn Mahmūd Vāsifī and the Transformation of Early Sixteenth Century Islamic Central Asia" (PhD diss., Indiana University, 2015), 22]. McChesney lists his various names: "Moḥammad Šībānī, (*aka* Šāhī Beg, Šaybāq, Šaybak, and Šāhbaḵt)" in "CENTRAL ASIA vi. in the 16th-18th Centuries," *Encyclopaedia Iranica*. Among his contemporaries, Bābur in the *Bāburnāma* refers to him as Shībāq (wormwood) Khan, alluding to a component to make hallucinogenic drugs. Muḥammad Ḥaidar calls him Shāhī Beg Khān in *Tarikh-i Rashīdī*; Abū'l Ghāzī, author of *Shajara-yi Turk*, calls him Muḥammad Shāh-Bakht (reported in Subtelny, "Art and Politics in Early 16th Century Central Asia," 121, ftn. 1).

The appellation “Shībānid” has frequented scholarly literature to refer to these sixteenth-century Abū’l-Khairid Uzbeks in Transoxiana, but Yuri Bregel spells out what is erroneous about this Shībānid designation. He writes: “Shībānid” technically applies to the Jūchid agnates specifically descended from [Shībān]—the grandson of Chinggis Khan—and not the later Shībānī Khan who was born almost three hundred years later.”[32] Thus, “Shībānid” is an imprecise and overly broad label that refers to the rulers of the Golden Horde through the Abū’l-Khairid leaders. It is for this reason that I use the more accurate term “Abū’l-Khairid” to refer to the administration that reconstituted and resurrected Chinggisid rule in Central Asia initially under Abū al-Khair Khan, but was successfully carried out by his grandson Shībānī Khan. The extent of my research allows me to assert that only the Jūchid branch of Shībānids in Transoxiana —the Abū’l-Khairids of the sixteenth century— produced illustrated manuscripts.



Map 2: Abū’l-Khairid conquests under Shībānī Khan (outlined). Map taken from August Samie, “The Shibanid Question: Reassessing 16th Century Eurasian History in Post-Soviet Uzbekistan” (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2020), 32. Modified from Peter Sluglett and Andrew Currie, *Atlas of Islamic History* (London: Routledge, 2014), 56-57.

[32] Yuri Bregel, “Abu’l-Khayrids,” *Encyclopædia Iranica*, online edition, available at http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/bukhara-iv (accessed on 18 February 2015). McChesney’s concise account of the dynastic origins is also informative (“CENTRAL ASIA vi. in the 16th-18th Centuries”).

Shībānī Khan took Samarqand in 1501 which remained in Abū'l-Khairid hands for the next century, and incrementally extended his control over much of Transoxiana which culminated in taking Herat for the first time in 1507 (Map 2: Abū'l-Khairid conquests under Shībānī Khan).[33] Shībānī Khan met his end in late November 1510 by the sword of Shah Ismāʿīl, but the dynasty he helped form continued under the leadership of his relatives. Samarqand was the seat of the great khan (usually the oldest member of the ruling house) but with power also dispersed across the cities of Balkh (the presumptive heir's seat), Bukhara, and Tashkent. These were separate appanages (governing centers) overseen by the main base in Samarqand.[34] Bukhara is the city most commonly associated with the Abū'l-Khairids, but its cultural and political florescence would come later in the third decade of the sixteenth century under the military commander and great khan ʿUbaidullāh b. Maḥmūd (r. 1533–40), finally becoming the de facto capital in 1557 under ʿAbdullāh Khan b. Iskandar (great khan between 1582–98). These three —Muḥammad Shībānī, ʿUbaidullāh, and ʿAbdullāh Khan— are the most important figures who contributed to the consolidation of the Abū'l-Khairid state (see App. 2: Periodization of Abū'l-Khairid arts of the book).

When differentiation is significant and specific periods are being discussed, I use the dynastic designation of "Abū'l-Khairid." I deploy "Uzbek" when referencing abstract concepts associated with the region of Transoxiana and the early modern period that are not dynastically specific (such as its geographic location, cultural centers, and social groupings, e.g. military commanders, artisans, spiritual leaders). "Uzbek" (as with "Kazakh") gradually acquired ethnic, cultural, and political nuances to imply Islamicized Mongols, but these are not intended in this study. In the early-modern Turco-Persianate realm, the term "Uzbek" referred to nomadic groups and tribal elites. Those among the sedentary population living in the same area were called Tajiks, Sarts, and Chaghataids, or by the center from which they hailed; that is to say, by *nisba* suffixes indicating origin, for example Urganchī (from Urgench), Tāshkantī (from Tashkent), Khujandī (from Khujand), Samarqandī (from Samarqand), etc.[35]

---

[33] 11 Muḥarram 913 / 23 May 1507.

[34] Information on appanage divisions found in Soucek, *A History of Inner Asia*, 154; N. Kılıç, "Change in Political Culture: The Rise of Sheybani Khan," *Cahiers de l'Asie Centrale*. 3/4 (1997): 48-67; Joo-Yup Lee, *The 'Ancient Supremacy:' Bukhara, Afghanistan and the Battle for Balkh, 1731-1901* (New York: E.J. Brill, 1996), 32-33; Lee, *Qazaqliq,* 116.

[35] Information derived from Richard C. Foltz, *Mughal India and Central Asia* (Karachi and New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 17; and Yuri Bregel in "Uzbeks, Qazaqs and Turkmens," in *The Cambridge History of Inner Asia,* 228-229.

"Uzbek" was wielded in period Safavid chronicles as a group designation that later became a term of abuse akin to the labels "Turk" or *qizilbāsh* (red-headed, implying Safavid partisans based on their headwear).[36] When used pejoratively, it applied to "an unlettered person, a bumpkin or a rustic."[37] In other empires such as those of the Muscovites and Ottomans, Joo-Yup Lee has uncovered instances in which early-Mongol (Chinggisid) and post-Mongol groups descended from the Jūchids (i.e. the Abū'l-Khairids) were both referred to as Tatar. So, to the Ottomans, the classifications of Tatar, Uzbek, Mongol, and Abū'l-Khairid denoted the same peoples.[38]

The Abū'l-Khairids continued to use the designation *mughul* (Mongol) after Muḥammad Shībānī Khan established the khanate, although this connection to their non-Muslim and nomadic roots proved problematic.[39] In his commissioned Turkic-language biography the *Shībānī-nāma*, Shībānī Khan implored of the poet Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ: "'Let the Chaghatay (Timurids) not call me an Uzbek,' implying he had already risen above his nomadic counterparts."[40] The Abū'l-Khairids lived in an age when identity was constructed mostly on religious confession bisected between Sunni and Shi'ite branches, at least at the administrative level. It thus seems natural that Sunni Abū'l-Khairids based in Samarqand and Bukhara, and Sunni Ottomans with their capital in Istanbul, would want to team up to remove the Shi'ite Safavids as an obstacle in their path and unite and join their empires. However, political expediency better explains their fraternity more than their being co-religionists.[41]

---

[36] Schwarz, "Safavids and Ozbeks," 359-60.

[37] R.D. McChesney reports that it was outsiders who used the term 'Uzbek' in a pejorative sense to refer to the entire state, rulers, and military supporters. Leaders of tribal groups in early-modern Transoxiana were usually identified by their tribal name, never as Uzbek ["Islamic culture and the Chinggisid restoration: Central Asia in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries," in *The New Cambridge History of Islam. Vol. 3: The Eastern Islamic World Eleventh to Eighteenth Centuries,* eds. David O. Morgan and Anthony Reid (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 241]. Soucek provides the etymology to the general name of Uzbek, derived from the khan of the Golden Horde who ruled from 1312-1341 (*A History of Inner Asia,* 145). Subtelny reports that the term Uzbek at the turn of the fifteenth century indicated uncouth, uncultured characteristics ("Art and Politics," 133). In circa 1500, the Uzbek group name lost significance as other dynastic, regional, or tribal designations were more common. Safavids conflated tribesmen, Turks, and Uzbeks [Edward Allworth, "Chapter 3: Names and Tribes," in *The Modern Uzbeks: From the Fourteenth Century to the Present: A Cultural History* (Stanford: Hoover Press Publications, 1990), 39].

[38] Lee, *Qazaqliq,* 74, ftn. 2.

[39] Ibid., 134.

[40] Subtelny, "Art and Politics in Early 16th Century Central Asia," 137.

[41] R.D. McChesney's convincing assertion is elaborated in "Barrier of heterodoxy."

II.ii. The *Shāhnāma* component to the "Abū'l-Khairid *Shāhnāma*" copies: reception and subject matter

As it was mentioned but is worth stressing, the Abū'l-Khairids claimed legitimacy through direct patrilineal descent from Chinggis Khan's eldest son Jūchī. This is akin to the mythical Salm of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* in terms of primogeniture, although the region they administered aligns with the legendary realm Faraidūn conferred to the second-born Tūr. It is impossible to determine whether Abū'l-Khairids of any social standing, from commoners to courtiers, felt any affinity to certain Turanian characters within the work. But at the administrative level, as the sixteenth century went on, political power in Transoxiana took the form of dynastic succession privileging birth order, and adherence to more egalitarian Chinggisid customs loosened.[42] Earlier, in the first three decades of Abū'l-Khairid leadership succession was by seniority coupled with skill. The heads of appanages were related to Shībānī Khan whether as an uncle or a nephew, and had their own authority but were subordinate to the great khan in Samarqand. This dispersal of power meant that "succession could not be predicted. This made it difficult for power to accrue to the Khanate and raised the level of conflict among the eligibles. The institution of heir apparency…evolved in response to this problem."[43] By the mid century, administrative developments under ʿAbdullāh Khan became more centralized and the ruling khan styled himself more as a shah in consolidating territory and commissioning manuscripts. Coinciding with this, ʿAbdullāh was the patron of the single royal Firdausian *Shāhnāma* copy. The stories within it and the very act of its patronage resonated with his newly procured power.

II.ii.a. Firdausian *Shāhnāma* copies, Turkic-language translations, truncated versions, ruler-*nāma* specimens

This study gathers a focused corpus of manuscripts never before brought together, and classifies them as "Abū'l-Khairid *Shāhnāma*" copies. In so doing, it functions as a nuanced study of manuscript production in sixteenth-century Transoxiana. Firdausī's work is of course an obvious inclusion in the aggregated works, but the actual tally of this title is quite small. This disinterest is discussed in my first body chapter. It does not seem to be the case that the Abū'l-Khairids associated the text explicitly with Firdausī, or as a proto-national epic promoting Iranian identity which is how it is often perceived today. As Transoxiana came under Muḥammad Shībānī's control half a millennium after Firdausī put down

---

[42] The Mongols did not initially recognize primogeniture for succession. This became practiced and preferred perhaps through exposure to the settled populations of Transoxiana and Iran.

[43] McChesney, "CENTRAL ASIA VI. In the 16th-18th Centuries."

his pen, there is a period reference that suggests Muḥammad Shībānī had an affinity to Firdausī's original Sāmānid patrons with their capitals in Samarqand and Bukhara.[44] But the traditional *Shāhnāma* composition did not sustain his interest, or those of his successors.

In light of this, beside Firdausian productions I have opened up the available data to incorporate other works inspired by Firdausī's phrasing and articulation that held greater appeal to the Abū'l-Khairids. The corpus I justify grouping together encompasses illustrated texts with themes and contents pertaining to Turco-Persianate rulers and events during their reigns, and their placement in the trajectory of world history and dynasties. These include Turkic-language translations of Firdausī's original (sometimes referred to as *Şehnāme-i türkī*), and truncated copies emphasizing the later epic cycles of legendary *Shāhnāma* heroes (Barzū, Farāmarz, and Garshāsp among them) at the expense of the historical section of Firdausī's original text. Forming another category, I have also selected illustrated specimens with historiographical contents written in verse and prose, and term these "ruler-*nāma*" in my study. This ruler-*nāma* neologism refers to dynastic chronicles and biographies of rulers who lived in the recent past, or within three centuries of the date of their original composition. In the context of sixteenth-century Transoxiana, these objects consist of biographies of Tīmūr and accounts of events during the reigns of Abū'l-Khairid rulers.

When the historical contents in these ruler-*nāma* are executed in verse with meter, existing scholarship has referred to my ruler-*nāma* sub-genre as epic writing, or *ḥamāsa sarāyī* / *shāhnāma navīsī* for Timurid and Safavid chronicles about their rulers.[45] Ottoman compositions also encompass this material, and may have motivated early Abū'l-Khairid to commission their own versions. These personalized epics compare actual dynastic leaders to mythic characters from the *Shāhnāma*. Emulative of Firdausī in style and/or subject, these works include material about an actual figure or dynasty currently holding power at the time of the manuscript's creation or from a century or two earlier. My definition of ruler-*nāma* is expansive, and includes heroic (embellished, perhaps) and more straightforward (dare I say mundane) chronicling in the corpus. Focusing on materials of Abū'l-Khairid creation, these ruler-*nāma* fully or partly copy Ilkhanid works (e.g. *Jāmiʿ al-tawārīkh*), Timurid epic biographies (*Tīmūr-nāma*, *Ẓafarnāma*), and early Ottoman dynastic chronicles in Persian and Turki

---

[44] Charles Melville quotes Muḥammad Amīn's *Muḥīṭ al-tawārīkh* (Ocean of Chronicles, ca. 1699) in his 2016 LUCIS talk: "Perceptions of History in Persian Chronicles of the Sixteenth–Seventeenth Centuries," forthcoming. With the victories of Muḥammad Shībānī over Tīmūr's capital Samarqand and the acquisition of Bukhara, he "'placed his feet on the throne of the sultanate of the Samanids', thus suggesting long-term continuities rather than change."

[45] Barry Wood, in his dissertation "Shāhnāma-i Ismāʿīl: Art and cultural memory in sixteenth-century Iran" (PhD diss., Harvard University, 2002) makes extensive use of Ẕabīḥ Allāh Ṣafā's *Ḥamāsa sarāyī dar Īrān* (Tehran, 1344/1965).

(*Eskandar-nâme*, *Bāyazīd-nāma*). In verse and prose, of heroic and historic contents, ruler-*nāma* laud particular leaders and chronicle their rise to power and the enemies defeated on their paths to consolidating it.[46]

Factoring these grouped materials into my analysis—original Firdausian, truncated versions with Firdausī's mythical and legendary sections, Turkic translations of Firdausī, as well as the versified and prose dynastic chronicles of ruler-*nāma*—exposes cultural and artistic exchanges that Firdausian *Shāhnāma* materials produced in Abū'l-Khairid workshops alone cannot prove. What frequently arises from isolating these titles is a perplexing process of joint Ottoman—Uzbek manuscript production. Not all of the manuscripts were official projects taken up by the courtly workshops designated as *kitābkhāna*, *nakkaşhane,* and *taṣvīrkhāna* across the Turco-Persianate sphere. When present, colophon information can refer to a named scribe with a nisba and date and location of production that assert an Uzbek provenance for the text.[47] But upon closer inspection the illustrations at times appear foreign to workshops in Transoxiana and come from outside the region, added decades after the ink dries. The extent of this coordination is not fully known, but understanding political events encapsulated in Appendix 1:Table of Takeovers provides a framework to then read the visual material given the textual lacuna.

III. Body chapters situated in the context of manuscript production in Transoxiana

I have divided Abū'l-Khairid arts of the book in Transoxiana into five periods, with certain battle outcomes and ascensions of rulers motivating my divisions for artistic periodization (consult App. 2 for a schematic of this information). The five body chapters to my dissertation each tackle these individual phases through a visual and textual reading of illustrated *Shāhnāma* works. With regard to the broader arrangement of the chapters, each section will weave in illustrated and text-only historiographical material made in the Turco-Persianate sphere.

Although the official dates of the Abū'l-Khairid dynasty span 1500–1599, I am extending the margins by two decades on either side to better analyze the chronological scope of illustrated materials encompassing the preceding Timurid dynasty and succeeding Tūqāy-Tīmūrid dynasty in my study. The

---

[46] These include copies of the *Tīmūr-nāma* and *Jāmiʿ al-tawārīkh*, but not Niẓāmī's *Iskandar-nāma*, for example. My emphasis is on stand-alone titles and dynastic chronicles, and not sections to *Khamsa* versions.

[47] Bruno de Nicola in a private conversation posits that a nisba indicates absence and not provenance; it more often distinguishes individuals by their origins when they are physically in another locale. A nisba, in essence, marks a non-native, "outsider" status.

Tūqāy-Tīmūrids continued the patronage of illustrated manuscripts but on a reduced scale in comparison to the Abū'l-Khairids, and manuscripts produced during the transition of power testify to artisans continuing their practice without concern for courtly matters so long as they could find buyers of their produced works.

The *longue durée* (1480–1628) fully captures the gamut of early-modern Abū'l-Khairid artistic production by focusing on the copyists and illustrators who contributed to their book creations. Some of these artisans in the first generation worked in the courtly and commercial Timurid kitābkhāna(s) in Herat but later served the early Abū'l-Khairid overlords. This is the topic of the first body chapter. It examines Firdausian *Shāhnāma* manuscripts produced during the Timurid—Abū'l-Khairid transition in Central Asia. At the other end of the era comes the final body chapter also on Firdausian *Shāhnāma* manuscripts made on the cusp of the Abū'l-Khairid—Tūqāy-Tīmūrid power shift. It identifies artisans who had worked in the Abū'l-Khairid centers of Bukhara and others in Khurasan but who promptly congregated in Samarqand at the *fin de siècle* to prepare manuscripts at the onset of Tūqāy-Tīmūrid rulership in the first few years of the 1600s.

Chapter 1 includes the first decades of Abū'l-Khairid power and artistic developments prior to a significant early Abū'l-Khairid siege of Herat (1529). Manuscripts from the early Abū'l-Khairid workshops of Samarqand and Tashkent in this early period are characterized by an indebtedness to Timurid traditions. Some of the masters who had worked for the Timurids to produce manuscripts continued to work for the new Abū'l-Khairid overlords in the appanages of Samarqand and Tashkent throughout the 1520s. In 1528 at the Battle of Jam, the Safavid shah Ṭahmāsp defeated the Abū'l-Khairid military leader ʿUbaidullāh Khan near Nishapur.[48] But during a few months between 1529 and 1530, there was a migration of artists and scribes who had formerly served Safavid patrons into the Abū'l-Khairid domain.[49] Thus, I have made 1529 the division between the first political and artistic period from the second, and explore this in Chapter 2.

In addition to Herati kitābkhāna staff working directly in the new Abū'l-Khairid workshop in Bukhara in this second phase (1530–1557), materials scribed earlier in Herat when it was ruled by the Timurids were taken to Transoxiana where spaces left for illustrations were filled but in a new style inspired by contemporary artists who had previously worked on Safavid commissions. This second

---

[48] Martin Dickson, "Shah Tahmasp and the Uzbeks: The Duel for Khurasan with 'Ubayd Khan 930-946/ 1524-1540," (PhD diss., Princeton University, 1958), 129-31.

[49] Ebadollah Bahari, "The Timurid to Safavid Transition in Persian Painting. Artists in Limbo: New Evidence," *Iran* 52, no. 1 (2014): 157.

period is marked by artistic heights with captured (or invited) artisans working in the courtly Bukhara kitābkhāna. The accompanying Chapter 2 dwells on ruler-*nāma* depicting the lives of Tīmūr, Chinggis Khan, and the latter's descendants through to the Abū'l-Khairids. Sections also analyze two truncated Firdausian *Shāhnāma* manuscripts naming scribes coming from cities administered by the Abū'l-Khairids in Balkh and Bukhara. The Firdausian *Shāhnāma*s' illustrative programs however appear to derive from ateliers outside the region and time period, linked to non-courtly Ottoman workshops posited to be in Baghdad in the late sixteenth century. Another instance of joint Ottoman—Uzbek manuscript manufacture separating scribal and visual programs examines the *Shībānī-nāma* manuscript held in the National Library of Vienna. Its text was composed and perhaps transcribed early in the Abū'l-Khairid domain, but its illustrations come from an Ottoman workshop responsible for important dynastic panegyrics in Istanbul. Why a work dedicated to an Abū'l-Khairid leader would have similar illustrations as courtly Ottoman manuscripts in the 1550s is not so transparent, and I employ mid-century correspondence across the realms to offer an explanation.

It is my argument that only in the third period (1557–1575) can we call Abū'l-Khairid manuscripts quintessential products of a "Bukhara school." At this time, the tradition really comes into its own and is linked to the patronage of the powerful ruler ʿAbdullāh b. Iskandar. This is covered in Chapter 3. Its start in 1557 corresponds to the point at which ʿAbdullāh headed the Bukharan appanage and began eliminating his rivals to create a centralized state.[50] The sixteenth century's sixth through eighth decades were fruitful and prosperous years in the Abū'l-Khairid domain, marked by strengthened political, cultural, and commercial exchanges with India, Turkey, and Muscovy. The artistic standardization of the third period's figures and set compositions in courtly Abū'l-Khairid manuscripts is associated with ʿAbdullāh Muṣavvir in works produced for ʿAbdullāh Khan, pointing to a productive partnership between the patron and painter in the 1560s. ʿAbdullāh the artist was the pupil of the master Shaikhzāda who had worked in courtly Safavid workshops, and who was in turn the pupil of Bihzād. This very chain of artistic transmission actually sums up Abū'l-Khairid manuscript traditions across the decades very nicely, comprising Timurid, Safavid, and local Abū'l-Khairid models in varying concentrations depending on the era. ʿAbdullāh's style dominated the third period up until his death posited to be sometime in the 1570s.

---

[50] Akimushkin, "Biblioteka Shibanidov," 334. McChesney explains: "by the middle of the sixteenth century, the Perso-Islamicate tradition of the fixed 'throne place' and 'abode of sovereignty' had completely eclipsed the Chinggisid idea of the moveable yurt as royal centre and Bukhara had taken the mantle of 'capital' from Samarqand" ("Islamic culture and the Chinggisid restoration," 285).

Chapter 3 analyzes ruler-*nāma*, among them illustrated biographies of Tīmūr, and unillustrated chronicles commemorating ʿAbdullāh's own heroics. Particular attention is paid to the sole courtly Abū'l-Khairid *Shāhnāma* of Firdausī. It is a lavish, albeit unfinished, illustrated copy and this chapter details the circumstances of its east-to-west transfer from its 1564 creation in Abū'l-Khairid Bukhara, to its arrival in Istanbul in 1594 as a gift to the Ottoman sultan Murad III. This move carries overt political significance especially when compared to Shah Ṭahmāsp's earlier gifting of his own exquisite *Shāhnāma* version in 1568 to Sultan Selim II when the latter assumed rulership, and parallels are drawn in a section that analyzes Abū'l-Khairid gift-giving (*pīshkash*) and politics at play in the courtly transfer of manuscripts.

The fourth period (1576–1598) covers the remaining years of the sixteenth century and of Abū'l-Khairid dynastic control, and shifts attention to the Khurasan region and artistic contributions and collaborations in the workshops there. The 1570s witnessed ʿAbdullāh the artist's death and ʿAbdullāh Khan's decreased interest in manuscripts. This resulted in the quality and quantity of manuscript productions to taper off in Bukhara. Artists faced limited resources and were forced to find new patrons outside of the courts, and so catered to the military aristocracy and religious leaders. Many painters were now hired to work on a single manuscript, to assemble unfinished copies, or to add pictures to manuscripts that had been scribed earlier.

Chapter 4 treats a *Shāhnāma* translation that I posit migrated from west to east: from Istanbul to the environs of Herat. I am the first to recognize that its Turkic verse is by the poet Şerif Âmidî, which links it to Turkic-language *Shāhnāma* creations from the Ottoman sphere. However its incomplete illustrative program connects it to Khurasan in the 1580s/90s when it was at a crossroad of Safavid and Abū'l-Khairid disputes, as much over territory as for the Timurid legacy of political administration and culture.[51] With the Abū'l-Khairids' securing control of Khurasan between 1588–98, rather than having artisans flock to the Abū'l-Khairid capital, artists and scribes formerly employed in Bukharan workshops left them and found work in the new Uzbek province carved out of eastern Iran and relocated there to produce commercial copies. Some of these artisans went southwards to India, and still others returned from the subcontinent to converge in Khurasan at this time after an earlier exodus there.[52] Khurasani productions from workshops in Mashhad and Herat intended for both Safavid and

---

[51] Schwarz, "Safavids and Ozbeks," 362.

[52] Abolala Soudavar, "Between the Safavids and the Mughals: Art and Artists in Transition," *Iran* 37 (1999): 49-66.

Abū'l-Khairid patrons were exported back to Bukhara and into India, where some works were reassembled and assimilated into local productions.[53]

The final body chapter covering the fifth period (1599–1628) sits somewhat uncomfortably in that it covers the state of arts and politics in Transoxiana after the termination of Abū'l-Khairid power. After the Safavids retook the Khurasan province in 1598, the region to remain under Uzbek control was ruled by a rival offshoot to the Abū'l-Khairids, the Tūqāy-Tīmūrids. At this time, the Ottomans saw their fortunes decline in the late sixteenth century. This is in contradistinction to emerging states in India—Mughal, Deccan, and others—which were becoming powerful. We see a shift in artists, poets, and scribes from all over migrating to the subcontinent to seek lucrative employment opportunities; artists formerly working for the Abū'l-Khairids followed suit, and/or served the new Tūqāy-Tīmūrids in Transoxiana. Chapter 5 examines a group of commercial Firdausian *Shāhnāma* manuscripts from Samarqand, and a ruler-*nāma* illustrating the biography of Tīmūr. These materials elucidate artistic relations between Transoxiana and India in the late-sixteenth through early-seventeenth centuries that textual sources do not explicitly state.

IV. Methodology: colophons and the conundrum of classification

Reluctant to wed art completely with politics, I begrudgingly acknowledge that labeling a manuscript "Abū'l-Khairid" implies that the copyists and illustrators were at one point agents of or adherents to the Abū'l-Khairid state. This poses several challenges since proof of political persuasion from the era is limited and artists and scribes were very much migratory and could have completed projects in one center then would go to another if the offer was good. What is more, very rarely are the illustrated manuscripts the result of unified workshop practices working from start to finish, and the staff of a previous dynasty stayed on in the region to carry out the projects of the new overlords. This thesis provides insight into the artistic process of filling in a previously-scribed text with fresh illustrations, termed in the literature so far published on this practice as refurbished, heterogeneous,

[53] Porter, "Remarques sur la peinture."

composite, amalgamated, and reincarnated manuscripts.[54] In courtly Abū'l-Khairid arts of the book, the textual component could be a work scribed during the Timurid era, or if written out in the first half of the sixteenth century, the copyist may have previously served the Timurids in prior decades but now found employment with the new dynasty in the region and continued to work there. This is a key point: artisans likely went about their work despite shifts in power, with the mentality that "a job's a job"; vocational prospects outweigh in importance political loyalty.

In my estimation, previous scholarship has placed too much emphasis on colophons wherein information about the time and place of transcription is used to classify an entire manuscript. Many of the materials in this study are not the results of a unified scribal and illustrative program nor are all the components of their manufacture attributable to one center, so the delegation of tasks and the components necessary for completion need to be accounted for. Manuscripts that have been labeled "Shībānid" or "Uzbek" in museum and library catalogues are frequently reformatted manuscripts that were previously transcribed in other centers or in earlier times.[55] Some of the texts to these manuscripts were taken from leftover stockpiles in Herat and were brought to Bukhara during different periods; or, they were written out in Bukhara but illustrated in the Ottoman realm.

Characterizing these manuscripts as Abū'l-Khairid often obscures more than it clarifies; in most of the case studies I present, it only refers to one stage of production out of several. It is necessary to distinguish the place of transcription from the place(s) of illustration in a single manuscript. By exploring the mobility of artists, styles, genres, and the books themselves, my goal is to elucidate the production and transmission processes of Abū'l-Khairid manuscripts. I problematize scholarly

---

[54] Investigations of such material are found in François Déroche, ed., *Les Manuscrits Du Moyen-Orient: Essais De Codicologie Et De Paleographie: Actes Du Colloque D'istanbul* (Istanbul: Institut Français d'Etudes Anatoliennes d'Istanbul et Bibliotheque Nationale, 1989); Marianne Barrucand on "hétéroclites" manuscripts in "Considerations sur les Miniatures Sefevides de la Bibliotheque Nationale," *Etudes Safavides*, ed. Jean Calmard (Paris-Tehran, IFRI: 1993), 28-29; Priscilla P. Soucek and Filiz Çağman, "A Royal Manuscript and Its Transformation: The Life History of A Book," *The Book in the Islamic World: The Written Word and Communication in the Middle East*, ed. George N. Atiyeh (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995), 179-208; Zeren Tanındı, "Additions to Illustrated Manuscripts in Ottoman Workshops," *Muqarnas* 17 (2000): 147-61; Mika Natif, "The SOAS *Anvār-i Suhaylī*: The Journey of a 'Reincarnated' Manuscript', " *Muqarnas* 25 (2008): 331-58; Bernard O'Kane, "Reconciliation or estrangement? Colophon and paintings in the TİEM Ẓafarnāma and some other controversial manuscripts," *Muqarnas* 26 (2009): 205-27. Also consult the many explorations by John Seyller to get an overview of Mughal practices: "The Inspection and Valuation of Manuscripts in the Imperial Mughal Library," *Artibus Asiae* 57, no. 3/4 (1997): 243–349; "Recycled Images: Overpainting in Early Mughal Art," *Humayun's Garden Party: Princes of the House of Timur and Early Mughal Painting*, ed. Sheila Canby (Bombay: Marg Publications, 1994), 79; "Overpainting in the Cleveland *Ṭūṭīnāma*," *Artibus Asiae* 52, no. 3/4 (1992): 283-318. Marianna S. Simpson and Massumeh Farhad examine "peripatetic projects" in *Sultan Ibrahim Mirza's* Haft Awrang: *A Princely Manuscript from Sixteenth-Century Iran* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997).

[55] Information on this process is in Adle et al., *History of Civilizations of Central Asia,* 581. Pugachenkova and Galerkina give more detail on the results of particular raids, stating that several Timurid and Safavid manuscripts were brought to Bukhara after the nine-month siege of Herat by ʿAbdullāh Khan (in 1574) and his son's rout of Mashhad in 1598, followed by the seizure of the library (Pugachenkova and Galerkina, *Miniatiury srednei azii*, 47). Manuscript refurbishment in Bukhara was also the subject of Karin Rührdanz's Bahari Lecture presented at SOAS on March 11, 2020: "A History of Miniature Painting Between the 1540s and 1560s in Central Asia."

attributions that privilege scribal dates at the expense of other components: illustrations executed later, multiple styles within a single manuscript, and those coming from different centers. My reading treats the book objects as palimpsests and emphasizes their totality, with cautious reliance on stylistic and formal analysis through manuscript comparisons when colophons and other textual documentation are lacking or limited. With this approach, I have uncovered political and historical dimensions through the physical transit of manuscripts across regions, and within the illustrative programs of the actual manuscripts themselves. The outcome is to uncover and explain heretofore unsubstantiated Uzbek exchanges with other regional powers through visual and textual materials. Existing scholarship has noted some of these parallels based on inference and visual affinities, but I derive my analysis from historical documentation and nuanced stylistic comparisons.

The manuscripts testify to trans-regional traffic involving painters, illuminators, and copyists. The objects these individuals produced circulated between Ottomans and Uzbeks, and Uzbeks and principalities in India. By focusing on the time period spanning the late fifteenth century through the early seventeenth, I overlay Abū'l-Khairid *Shāhnāma* productions and make connections across periods, places, and pages. Art is not separate from political, religious, economic, or intellectual matters, and my study endeavors to demonstrate this truism that might seem commonplace, but will be elucidated with unexamined manuscripts that have languished for too long in world collections.

Chapter 1

New century, new dynasty: the Timurid to Abū'l-Khairid transition in Transoxiana and early Abū'l-Khairid manuscript production (1480–1529)

After heady days of cataloguing and classifying illustrated Persian and Turkic-language manuscripts in the mid-twentieth century, more recent studies of Turco-Persianate arts of the book have turned away from courtly productions and well-documented centers. They have instead shifted to edges and margins, be they geographic or dynastic. The fall of one dynasty and the rise of a new one is a transition of obvious cultural and historical import, and the changeover between the Timurid and Abū'l-Khairid dynasties in Transoxiana is one such opportunity to trace artistic continuities and departures. It also allows us to ascertain the significance of Firdausī's epic to the newly powerful Abū'l-Khairids in their productions of traditional Firdausian copies and early dynastic chronicles. The embers of this material naturally begin in the (metaphorical) ashes of the preceding Timurid workshops. I will focus on the earliest ruler-*nāma* text commissioned by the dynastic founder Shībānī Khan and illustrated during his lifetime: the *Fatḥnāma-yi khānī*. Alongside this, I will examine a grouping of Firdausian *Shāhnāma* manuscripts copied and illustrated during the transition from the fifteenth to the sixteenth century which are carried out in two styles. However, coexistence does not always imply contemporaneity and stylistic analysis must take into account possible migrations of artists who individually practiced different styles, as well as the mobility and reworking of the manuscripts themselves as the objects were transported across centers and time periods.

This chapter demonstrates how the categorical label "late Timurid" can also be interpreted as "early Abū'l-Khairid" in treating the manuscripts under discussion. In the absence of textual documentation about artistic practices in Transoxiana on the cusp of the sixteenth century, I continue the work of scholars who have examined a group of Firdausian *Shāhnāma* manuscripts from this region and time period. It is possible that the manuscripts were produced using courtly Herat models in a commercial workshop in that city and/or in Samarqand based on visual analysis and political fact. The original Timurid artists working in these sites also contributed to other early Abū'l-Khairid manuscript productions in the Tashkent appanage (governing center). Combining Firdausian *Shāhnāma* copies with

ruler-*nāma* commissions, this chapter inserts them into the broader trajectory of Abū'l-Khairid arts of the book during the first three decades of Uzbek rule in Transoxiana by looking at their underpinnings. The 1529 end date corresponds to a significant seven-month siege of Herat by Abū'l-Khairid troops led by Shībānī's nephew, the military commander-cum-great khan ʿUbaidullāh b. Maḥmūd in 1528; this will be covered in Chapter 2. After this event Abū'l-Khairid painting styles underwent a marked shift, but our present focus is on the early illustrated manuscripts prior to this. In sum, I affirm that the origins of Abū'l-Khairid painted arts did not begin in Bukhara as is often maintained, but naturally progressed from earlier Timurid models in Herat and Samarqand which then converged with local productions in the Abū'l-Khairid appanage in Tashkent. But first some historical context to set the scene.

I. The Timurid to Abū'l-Khairid transition, and ensuing struggles between the *kızılbaş* (*qizilbāsh*) and the *yeşilbaş*

During the first half of the fifteenth century, the core part of Transoxiana—implying the cities and environs of Bukhara and Samarqand— were fully connected to and integrated with Iran. But that would be the last time Iran and Transoxiana were administered by the same ruler. Courtly upheavals took place as a result of natural deaths in the Timurid realm (notably the ruler Shāh Rukh's in 1447) and those who met unnatural ends (Ulugh Beg was assassinated in 1449). By 1454 the Oxus River became the de facto marker of two territorial entities: Khurasan with its capital in Herat, and Transoxiana administered from Samarqand.[56] Abū al-Khair Khan, grandfather to Muḥammad Shībānī Khan, began as a mercenary horseman on behalf of Timurid princes fighting amongst themselves for regional control.[57] Abū al-Khair Khan was given a daughter of Shāh Rukh in appreciation for assisting the Timurid ruler Abū Saʿīd to secure control of Samarqand in 1451. Abū al-Khair died in 1467 before his eponymous dynasty could take root. This would be brought about by his grandson Shībānī Khan (1451–1510), who had similarly assisted the Timurid dynast Sulṭān Maḥmūd (d. 1495) to stave off repeated attacks on Samarqand by his nephew Ẓahīr-al-Dīn Bābur, the future founder of the Mughal

[56] The separation was not formally recognized or institutionalized, but was an administrative division. It was also a natural geographic separation with some cultural distinctions, with Herat and the Iranian side being more agrarian, and Samarqand and broader Transoxiana nomadic, and is explained in Stephen Dale, "Ch. 11-The later Timurids c. 1450-1526," in *The Cambridge History of Inner Asia: The Chinggisid Age*, eds. N. Di Cosmo, A. Frank, & P. Golden (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 199-201.

[57] McChesney, "CENTRAL ASIA VI. In the 16th-18th Centuries."

dynasty in India.[58] Prince Maḥmūd awarded Shībānī Khan his own daughter in marriage along with the governorship of Tashkent in 1487.[59] Shībānī Khan later turned against the very Timurids he had served and took Samarqand from Sulṭān Maḥmūd in 1501, launching his own dynastic line glorifying Jūchid descent from Chinggis Khan.

The Abū'l-Khairid Shībānids considered themselves as the liberators of Samarqand and not its conquerors. The Abū'l-Khairids had viewed the Timurids as usurpers given that Tīmūr married into the Chinggisid bloodline to gain his legitimacy, wedding a princess descended from Chinggis Khan's younger, second son Chaghatāi (which incidentally has reverberations to the younger Īraj character from the *Shāhnāma*). Whereas the Timurids adopted various titles, such as mirza, sultan, amir, or beg, they never used khan. This was in contradistinction to the Abū'l-Khairids who, on the other hand, were Chinggisids by blood descent through the eldest son Jūchī. They deployed the coveted rank of khan and extolled this status in their dynastic chronicles.[60]

Samarqand would be the main Abū'l-Khairid base, with control incrementally extending over much of Transoxiana and culminating in the Abū'l-Khairids taking Herat in late 1507. In the period of early Abū'l-Khairid victories, the defeat of Badīʿ al-Zamān Mīrzā (d. 1514) in Herat in 1507 and the taking of this vibrant cultural center that had been shaped by the preceding magnanimous ruler Sultan Ḥusain Mīrzā Bāiqarā (d. 1506) was a prize greater than Samarqand. McChesney compares the territorial control of Shībānī after he captured Herat to the reign of Tīmūr's son Shāh Rukh who had died half a century earlier; both were in a competitive tie second to Tīmūr's own conquests.[61] When asked where to place his capital city Shībānī Khan is said to have responded, "'Let our capital be our

---

[58] Bābur's first attempt to take Samarqand was in 1497, followed by another siege in 1501, and again between 1511-12. Covered in Maria Subtelny, "Bābur's Rival Relations: A Study of Kinship and Conflict in 15th-16th Century Central Asia," *Der Islam* 66, no. 1 (1989): 104.

[59] Shībānī's governorship of Tashkent is covered by John-Louis Bacqué-Grammont, "Les événements d'Asie centrale en 1510 d'après un document ottoman," *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique* 12, nos. 1-2 (January-June 1971): 196. The piecemeal collapse of the Timurids is covered in McChesney, "CENTRAL ASIA VI. In the 16th-18th Centuries." Shībānī's marriage functioned to bring together the Chaghataid and Jūchid branches of the Chinggisid tree.

[60] Subtelny, "Art and Politics in Early 16th Century Central Asia," 131.

[61] McChesney, "CENTRAL ASIA VI. In the 16th-18th Centuries." In securing their victory, Elena Paskaleva has suggested the Abū'l-Khairids must have destroyed *waqf* documents in Samarqand and Shahr-i Sabz since none can be found today; it was common practice for a new dynasty to destroy what came before it, undermining old heritage to create it anew (personal communication).

saddle,' one more version of the notion that ruling depended on the sovereign's ability to move."[62] In an obvious effort to supplant the previous dynasty, Tīmūr's very capital Samarqand was ultimately selected as Shībānī's seat, Bukhara was assigned to his younger brother Maḥmud Sulṭān, and Tashkent was given to Shībānī's uncle Suyūnch.[63] Following Shībānī's demise, Samarqand was the main power base with other cities governed by semi-independent male relatives.

With the collapse of the Timurids, the Abū'l-Khairids faced a new threat in the coeval Safavid dynasty in Iran. Abū'l-Khairids and Safavids would clash across the sixteenth century for control of Herat and broader Khurasan. Apart from sartorial distinction with Safavid qizilbāsh/*kızılbaş* in red-topped turbans, and some accounts describing Abū'l-Khairids as *yeşilbaş* (green-turbaned),[64] administrative and dynastic delineations did not culturally or linguistically manifest themselves in an obvious manner. Despite the tendency for scholars to valorize the intellectual brilliance of Herat and Samarqand in the Timurid period, and yet marginalize these same centers along with Bukhara when administered under the Abū'l-Khairids, a few individuals have pointed out that there were indeed more continuities than changes. Writes Svat Soucek, "in most areas of life —language, upbringing, general mode of living, economic policy, and sport and entertainment— there is nothing to distinguish the Timurid and Jochid ruling groups. In terms of political administration the differences are more philosophical than practical."[65] I argue that the same was true in Khurasan as it went back and forth between Safavid and Abū'l-Khairid control.

---

[62] Shībānī Khan's ultimate selection of Samarqand, as opposed to Bukhara, as his residence and center of power is quoted in Monika Gronke, "The Persian Court between Palace and Tent: From Tīmūr to ʿAbbas I," in *Timurid Art and Culture: Iran and Central Asia in the Fifteenth Century,* eds. Lisa Golombek and Maria Subtelny (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 20. McChesney also confirms this: after Shībānī's death, Samarqand was awarded jointly to Kūchkūnchī and Muḥammad-Tīmūr, the son of Muḥammad Shībānī. This arrangement "reflected the ancient status of Samarqand as 'capital' and therefore the appropriate seat for a head of state, as well as the fact that Samarqand had been Muḥammad Shībānī's center and thus properly belonged to his lineage" (McChesney, "CENTRAL ASIA VI. In the 16th-18th Centuries"). Bregel disagrees with Samarqand functioning as an early capital, stating, "there was no permanent capital: the sultan who would be elected as a khan would remain in the capital of his appanage which was his powerbase" ("Abu'l-Khayrids," *Encyclopædia Iranica*).

[63] Early Abū'l-Khairid history and appanage divisions are in Lee, *Qazaqliq,* 116. Information on Suyūnch's reign in Tashkent is given in U. Sultonov, "Toshkent mulki Shaiboniilar davrida: Suyunchkhozhakhon khonadoni boshqaruvi haqida airim mulohazalar (XVI asr)," *Uzbekiston Respublikasi Fanlar Akademiiasi Abu Raihon Berunii Nomidagi Sharqshunoslik Instituti* 17 (2014): 7-14.

[64] The *yeşilbaş* (mallards, literally "green heads") associated with ʿUbaidullāh are named in a letter ʿUbaidullāh wrote to Süleyman dated 1534 (BOA TSMK.E 5905). It is translated in Jean-Louis Bacqué-Grammont, "Ubaydu-llah han de Boukhara et Soliman le Magnifique. Sur quelques pièces de correspondance," in *Soliman le Magnifique et son temps. Actes du colloque de Paris, Galeries Nationales du Grand Palais, 7-10 mars 1990, Études turco-safavids, XVII,* ed. G. Veinstein (Paris: École du Louvre, École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, La Documentation Française, 1992), 493. Bacqué-Grammont cites other period sources that confirm the Uzbeks were elsewhere referred to by *yeşilbaş* in "Une liste ottomane de princes et d'apanages Abu'l-Khayrides," *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique* 11, no. 3 (Juillet-septembre 1970), 425. "A lord of the *yeşilbaş*" is also mentioned in correspondence dated 1550 to refer to a caravan leader originating from Bukhara in Toru Horikawa, "The Shaybanid Dynasty and the Ottoman Empire: The Changing of Routes between the Two States according to Archives in Istanbul," *Bulletin of the Society for Western and Southern Asiatic Studies, Kyoto University* no. 34 (March 1991): 43. The color symbolism of red Safavids and green Uzbeks is also in Allworth, *The Modern Uzbeks*, 57-58.

[65] Soucek, *A History of Inner Asia*, 149; McChesney, "The Chinggisid restoration in Central Asia: 1500-1785," 279.

Shībānī Khan was able to enjoy his leadership over the dynasty he helped to establish only briefly, for in early December 1510 at the Battle of Marv in present-day Turkmenistan, Shībānī Khan was conquered then divided.[66] The victor Shah Ismāʿīl fashioned his skull into a gilded drinking cup, and is recorded to have sent Shībānī Khan's head stuffed with straw to the Ottoman sultan Bayezid II (d. 1512) as a warning that he could be next. In an alternate account, the head (or additionally a severed hand) was dispatched to the Mamluk sultan Qānṣuh al-Ghūrī, whom we will encounter again in Chapter 4 §II.[67]

Early Abū'l-Khairid rule was precarious, and a year after Shībānī's death every major city that had originally been taken slipped from Abū'l-Khairid hands due to the combined strength of the Safavids and Bābur's proto-Mughal armies. The main appanages were soon reacquired, and Samarqand was ruled jointly by Shībānī's son Muḥammad-Tīmūr (d. 1514) and Shībānī's other uncle Kūchkūnchī before the latter took over between 1514–30. Kūchkūnchī's court administered the most stable period in the history of the Abū'l-Khairid polity and was an important center of Turkic literary production, with several translations of original Persian works produced and copied in unillustrated volumes.[68] This brings us to our next sections on early Abū'l-Khairid manuscript productions and the role of ruler-*nāma* and the *Shāhnāma* early in the dynasty.

II. Early Abū'l-Khairid ruler-*nāma* in the context of older and contemporary dynastic chronicles (circa 1500–1529)

This section synchronically and diachronically contextualizes the earliest Abū'l-Khairid ruler-*nāma* copies. It examines other ruler-*nāma* from the previous Timurid dynasty in the area that the Uzbeks came to inhabit, and those of the Abū'l-Khairids' Safavid and Ottoman contemporaries in the other domains of the Turco-Persianate sphere. The cursory review of these early versions enumerated

---

[66] The date of the battle outcome is reported in Bacqué-Grammont, "Les événements d'Asie centrale en 1510 d'après un document ottoman," 199.

[67] For more on Shībānī Khan's dismemberment, read the section on Qizilbāsh envoys to various courts bringing body parts in Barry Wood, ed. and trans., *The Adventures of Shāh Esmā'il: a Seventeenth-century Persian Popular Romance* (Leiden: Brill, 2019), 284-288. For more on skull-drinking and the poetry this act inspired in contemporary Mamluk and Safavid societies, read Rasool Jafarian, "The Political Relations of Shah Ismāʿīl I with the Mamluk Government (1501-16/907-22)," in *Iran and the World in the Safavid Age*, eds. Willem Floor and Edmund Herzig (London, New York: I.B. Tauris, 2012), 31-47. Jafarian cites Ḥasan Beg Rūmlū in *Aḥsan al-tavārīkh* who wrote that the head was sent to Bayezid (ftn. 57). This is repeated by Hassanein Rabie who writes on the Safavid envoy to the Mamluk sultan who arrived in Cairo in June 1511 and presented gifts which included a small box containing the head of the "Ozbeg Khān" ["Political Relations between the Safavids of Persia and the Mamluks of Egypt and Syria in the Early Sixteenth Century," *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 15 (1978): 78].

[68] Devin DeWeese, "Chaghatay literature in the early sixteenth century: notes on Turkic translations from the Uzbek courts of Mawarannahr," in *Turkish Language, Literature, and History: Travelers' tales, sultans, and scholars since the eighth century,* eds. Bill Hickman and Gary Leiser (London: Routledge, 2017), 99-117.

here proceeds in chronological order based on original textual creation.[69] Extended visual analysis of the chronicles with depictions added after the text was written out will be given in the next chapter which continues the discussion of mid-century Abū'l-Khairid ruler-*nāma* versions.

The ruler-*nāma* produced at the onset of the sixteenth century for individual dynasties all reflect a tendency to clearly delineate a "self" from an "other." They represent regional competitors and enemies as barbaric and deviant. The Ottomans grouped together Iranians and Turanians as foils for their own Roman refinement. The Abū'l-Khairids in their quest to secure legitimacy simultaneously rendered the preceding Timurid dynasty as illegitimate and their Kazakh and Safavid contemporaries as uncivilized and non-Muslim.[70] The Safavids deployed Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* the most literally to promote timely parallels in their latest battles with Turan and Anatolia. They erected and exaggerated linguistic, geographic, and confessional distinctions between their Sunni neighbors cast as the allied Turkic forces of Tūr and Salm, and designated themselves as Iranian, Persian, and Shiʻite.[71] It is true that the Ottomans and Abū'l-Khairids elevated Turkic literature in their domains, but Persian maintained its primacy in Central Asia.

II.i. The legacy of Firdausī in ruler-*nāma* productions prior to the Abū'l-Khairid dynasty and its contemporaries

Abū'l-Khairid ruler-*nāma* connect to a long tradition of biographical-historical epics appropriating elements of the *Shāhnāma* that were written in the Turco-Persianate sphere. Those presented here comprise the "greatest hits" which are versified; they are not authoritative. Barry Wood in the section to his dissertation "The Evolution of the Historical Epic in Iran" enumerates specimens that accord with my definition of ruler-*nāma*.[72] The first historical epic explicitly written on Firdausī's model to celebrate a living Islamic patron was the *Shāhan-Shāhnāma* written by Majd al-Dīn Muḥammad Pāyīzī to praise ʿAlā al-Dīn Muḥammad Khwārazmshāh (r. 1217–38) as the second

---

[69] Information on these and other works has been compiled by Yuri Bregel, "HISTORIOGRAPHY xii. CENTRAL ASIA," *Encyclopædia Iranica*; C.A. Storey and Yu.E. Bregel, "Istoria Srednei Azii: (I) Bukhara," in *Persidskaya literatura: Bio-bibliograficheskiĭ obzor* II (Moscow, 1975), 1116-61; M.Kh. Abuseitova and J.G. Baranova, *Pis'mennye Istochniki Po Istorii I Kul'ture Kazakhstana i Central'noi Azii v XIII-XVIII vv: (biobibliograficheskie Obzory)* = Written Sources on History and Culture of Kazakhstan and Central Asia in XIII-XVIII Centuries: Bio-Bibliographical Surveys (Almaty: Daik-Press, 2001).

[70] Ali Rezaei Pouya mentions Uzbek historiography did not emphasize confrontation with Shi'ism or the Safavids whereas Safavid historiography frequently couched military tensions as confessional rivalry. "Intertextual analysis of the History of Abū'l-Khair: an overview of the text and a case study of the Pishdadian section based on Gérard Genette's transcript" [in Persian], *Proceedings of the Fourth Conference on Literary Textual Research* (Āzar 1396 [November-December 2018]), 614.

[71] This is a reading by Hillenbrand, "The Iconography of the *Shāh-nāmah-yi Shāhī*."

[72] Wood in his dissertation makes extensive use of Ṣafā's *Ḥamāsa sarāyī dar Īrān.*

Alexander. Next came the *Ẓafarnāma* of Ḥamdullāh Mustaufī Qazvīnī (d. 1349, completed in 1335) to take up where Firdausī left off. This work covered the Islamic conquest of Iran up until the author's age at the cusp of the Ilkhanid and Injuid periods, with the explicit purpose of renewing the *Shāhnāma* text. Subsequent dynastic heads would seek to insert themselves into this genre, causing a snowballing and expanding of Firdausian material to serve their legitimizing aims.[73]

Although Tīmūr was involved in the chronicling of his own career, overseeing what his Uighur and Tajik (Persian) secretaries were documenting, there is no surviving *Tīmūr-nāma* copy that was produced in Tīmūr's lifetime that he might have read himself.[74] Here it is worth reiterating that Shībānī Khan, in contradistinction, played a role in the completion of his *Fatḥnāma* manuscript, *and* survived to admire the final product. Tīmūr would sometimes verify, sometimes censure what his scribes had put into writing, but the completed *Tīmūr-nāma/Ẓafarnāma* chronicling his life and exploits was commissioned by his grandson Ibrāhīm Sulṭān and was written in Persian prose (with ample appropriations of Persian poetry) by Sharaf al-Dīn ʿAlī Yazdī.[75] This influential text was completed in the 1420s which is two decades after the warrior's death. It matches Tīmūr with the legendary Alexander. Yazdī made the Mongol imperial house tangential so as to aggrandize Tīmūr and supplant Chinggis Khan.[76] Akin to Shībānī's scorn for Firdausī's flights of fiction at the expense of historical fact, Yazdī also "regarded Ferdowsi's epic with the contempt of a 'real historian' for the work of fantasy and exaggeration[.] …[H]is praise of Timur was genuine, for the feats he carried out really happened, unlike Ferdowsi's false flattery of the kings and heroes in the *Shahname*, which was all boasting and tomfoolery."[77] Despite this critique, Yazdī lifts verses directly from Firdausī to fit actual victories and events, and emulates the meter, vocabulary, and sentiment of the original bard. Yazdī even reuses passages on the Iranian army's victory over the Rumis (Romans) in Antakya as it is related by Firdausī, simply changing the original word "Īrān" with "Tūrān" to cast Tīmūr's victory over the Ottoman Sultan Bayezid as a comparable event in which it is the living Turanians who are prevailing over their western

---

[73] Melville

[74] Evrim Binbaş, *Intellectual Networks in Timurid Iran: Sharaf Al-Dīn 'Alī Yazdī and the Islamicate Republic of Letters* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 166.

[75] Charles Melville, " 'Ali Yazdī and the *Shāhnāme*," in *International* Shāhnāme *Conference: The Second Millennium (Conference Volume)*, ed. Forogh Hashabeiky (Sweden: Uppsala University Library, 2014), 125.

[76] John E. Woods, "The Rise of Timurid Historiography," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 46, no. 2 (April 1987): 105. The earliest illustrated copy made in Shiraz and completed in 1436 exists in dispersed pages across multiple collections.

[77] Melville, "Yazdī and the *Shāhnāme*," 118.

neighbors.[78] One *Tīmūr-nāma* copy of Yazdī scribed in 1467 was particularly influential and has lavish illustrations by Bihzād that were added later in the 1480s, or anytime until the death of its patron Sultan Ḥusain Bāiqarā in 1506 (JHUL Garrett 3, figs. 11, 14, 16). Literary and pictorial elements from this particular work spread to many other manuscript illustrations of historiographic and lyric nature that were produced in Transoxiana, and suggests this manuscript and/or its designs stayed within the realm where it was studied and used by Abū'l-Khairid artists in the sixteenth century.[79]

Yazdī's *Ẓafarnāma* composition inspired another version of the great hero's life written in the waning years of the Timurid dynasty, this time by the nephew of the esteemed Timurid poet Jāmī, Hātifī (1454–1521). Hātifī penned his *Tīmūr-nāma* rendition between 1492–98, drawing inspiration from Niẓāmī's Alexander figure and from Firdausī's *Shāhnāma*.[80] Hātifī considered the composition to be part of his own quintet of poems, akin to Niẓāmī's classic *Iskandar-nāma* in verse and its place in his *Khamsa*. In essence, Tīmūr both in Yazdī's and Hātifī's versions becomes a second Alexander. Composed for Bāiqarā around the same time the Garrett manuscript was being illustrated, Hātifī's *Tīmūr-nāma* along with Yazdī and of course Firdausī would be the main sources in Persianate historiographical writing across several dynasties contemporary to and following the Timurid era. Hātifī's *Tīmūr-nāma* would be copied and illustrated in Abū'l-Khairid workshops throughout the sixteenth century more than the Yazdī version; subsequent chapters will contextualize these later productions.[81]

II.ii. The legacy of Firdausī and Yazdī in the early Safavid dynasty

Safavid interest in ruler-*nāma* compositions was more delayed than in the Abū'l-Khairid sphere. The first came nearly ten years after Ismāʿīl I was enthroned as the shah of Iran in 1501, and most of

---

[78] Melville, "Yazdī and the *Shāhnāme*," 120.

[79] As further evidence of the manuscript's stay in Transoxiana, seals indicate it was later held in the Mughal imperial library. This will be covered in Ch. 5.

[80] Biographical information in Michele Bernardini, "HĀTEFI, ʿABD-ALLĀH," *Encyclopædia Iranica*. The vowels in Tīmūr's name actually ought to be shortened to fit with the Firdausian *mutaqārib* meter the work employs (Wood, "*Shāhnāma-i Ismāʿīl* [dissertation]," 48).

[81] Compare the quantities of Yazdī versions with those of Hātifī produced in Abū'l-Khairid and Tūqāy-Tīmūrid workshops:
-Yazdī: ARB 4472; BL IOL 3448.
-Hātifī: BL Add. 22703; ARB 2102 and 2204 (unillustrated); RAS Persian 305A; NLR Dorn 446; BL 7789; ÖNB Mixt. 1161; TSMK H.1594; HAM 1957.140 and 2014.392; GMAA no. B.11.5r; IOM S-378; Sam Fogg auction [Crofton Black and Nabil Saidi, *Islamic Manuscripts* Catalogue 22, (London: Sam Fogg Rare Books and Manuscripts, 2000), entry 33].
-Stylistically ambiguous Hātifī manuscripts: WAM W.657; Sotheby's auction 18 October 2019, lot 140; Sotheby's auction 21 April 1980, lot 199; WAM W.648; NMVW no. WM-30922.

the other dynastic chronicles would be written nearly a century later under ʿAbbās I.[82] Shah Ismāʿīl commissioned his own chronicle of his feats (the *Shāhnāma-yi Ismāʿīl*) upon his conquest of Herat in 1510.[83] This early Safavid undertaking was initially carried out by the elderly Hātifī upon Ismāʿīl's request to have an original work written by the same author of the *Tīmūr-nāma* but in praise of himself. The writing would be finished in 1533 by Hātifī's pupil Qāsimī (Mīrzā Muḥammad Qāsim Gunābādī) after the shah's death in 1524 and he explicitly acknowledges his debt to Niẓāmī, Jāmī, Hātifī, and Firdausī, and it is onto them he sought to "graft his own poem."[84] Qāsimī would also pen an eponymous chronicle for the following ruler: the *Shāhnāma-yi Ṭahmāsp*, which sometimes gets combined with the *Shāhnāma-yi Ismāʿīl* to form one of the five components of the poet's *Khamsa*.[85] Akin to Hātifī and Niẓāmī before him, the first two Safavid rulers were inserted into a trajectory of succession derived from literary precedent connecting the current ruler to Alexander and Tīmūr. Sometimes these ruler-*nāma* stood alone, other times the works were included alongside others in a compendium of the poet's oeuvre.

Barry Wood calls Hātifī's text on Tīmūr from the 1490s "the last great historical epic of the period prior to Shah Ismāʿīl's commission of his own *Shāhnāma*" (that is to say, the *Shāhnāma-yi Ismāʿīl* finished by Qāsimī in 1533).[86] Wood's study bridges late-Timurid through early-Safavid historiography but does not account for the writing of history in Transoxiana that temporally comes in between them, and which proves to have been prolific. Eleanor Sims has also overlooked Abū'l-Khairid contributions to illustrated history writing in only focusing on the Safavids. To her, the paucity of the genre during the reigns of the first two rulers of the Iranian dynasty was due to Ismāʿīl and Ṭahmāsp already possessing an epic historical text of their "own" (that is to say, Firdausī's *Shāhnāma*). Firdausian copies were commissioned when the need arose to produce a work of dynastic propaganda; to Sims it was not necessary for Safavid chroniclers to compose a text to the reigning monarch anew.

---

[82] Safavid political authority was based on the dynasty's descent from Shi'ite imams and territorial connections to mythical ancient kings popularized in Firdausī's *Shāhnāma.* Detailed in Gülru Necipoğlu, "Word and Image: Ottoman Sultans in Comparative Perspective," in *The Sultan's Portrait: Picturing the House of Osman,* ed. Selmin Kangal (Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası, 2000), 51-52.

[83] Wood, "*Shāhnāma-i Ismāʿīl* [dissertation]," 47.

[84] Ibid., 81.

[85] Not to be confused with Ṭahmāsp's personal Firdausian copy, the *Shāhnāma-yi shāhī.* Information on Qāsimī's oeuvre is in Wood, "*Shāhnāma-i Ismāʿīl* [dissertation]," 57-58.

[86] Wood, "*Shāhnāma-i Ismāʿīl* [dissertation]," 47.

As a result of this purportedly closer connection to Firdausī's work, the Safavids did not create other alternatives as did the Ottomans and Abū'l-Khairids.[87]

In examining early Safavid and Abū'l-Khairid ruler-*nāma* works side-by-side, the differences between them become noticeable. Abū'l-Khairid historiographies were not as keen to connect their dynastic founders to their Timurid rivals, preferring resemblances to Chinggis Khan and Alexander before him. The Safavids instead promoted a tripartite linkage of the mythical Alexander, Tīmūr, and the dynastic founder Ismāʿīl. In some surviving Safavid manuscripts of Hātifī's *Tīmūr-nāma*, the work is written alongside Qāsimī's *Shāhnāma-yi Ismāʿīl* so as to make overt parallels between Tīmūr and Shah Ismāʿīl.[88] Other events liken the exploits of Shah Ismāʿīl to legendary feats from the *Shāhnāma* composed half a millennium earlier.

In the Safavid realm, the conflation of Firdausī's literary Turanian armies with Abū'l-Khairid troops was intentional. The *Shāhnāma* in this period served in the creation of a Safavid identity defined linguistically as Persian-speaking and geographically as Iran-inhabiting.[89] Colin P. Mitchell remarks on the prevalence of *Shāhnāma* "metaphors, similes, and long-standing tropes, which had been developing in medieval Persian literature since the tenth century" between 1500–32 in the Safavid realm.[90] Safavid victories over the Abū'l-Khairids at various moments— Shībānī's defeat at the hands of Ismāʿīl in Marv in 1510, ʿUbaidullāh later thwarted by Ṭahmāsp at the Battle of Jām in 1529 (examined in the next chapter)—provided Safavid secretaries and court chroniclers with ample fodder, casting Turanian armies as living Uzbeks. In Safavid historical chronicles as in Firdausian *Shāhnāma* manuscripts produced in Safavid workshops, legendary and living Turanians wear black and white *kalpak* headwear that connects them to their Mongol roots.[91] Shifting from this historiographical context in Iran, let us proceed to a discussion of the genre in the Ottoman sphere.

---

[87] Eleanor Sims, "Turks and Illustrated Historical Texts," in *Fifth International Congress of Turkish Art,* ed. G. Fehér (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1978), 756.

[88] For more on the texts to these manuscripts read Michele Bernardini, "Hatifī's *Tīmūrnameh* and Qāsimī's *Shāhnāmeh-yi Ismāʿil*: Considerations for a double Critical Edition," in *Society and Culture in the Early Modern Middle East: Studies on Iran in the Safavid Period*, ed. A.J. Newman (Leiden, Brill: 2003): 3-18.

[89] Hillenbrand, "The Iconography of the *Shāh-nāmah-yi Shāhī.*" According to Wood, Ismāʿīl explicitly cemented a personal identification with the *Shāhnāma*, commissioning courtly Firdausian copies, giving his own sons the names of Iranian characters, and shouting out Firdausian verses on the battlefield to motivate his soldiers ("*Shāhnāma-i Ismāʿīl* [dissertation]," 82-83).

[90] Colin P. Mitchell, *The Practice of Politics in Safavid Iran: Power, Religion and Rhetoric* (London: IB Tauris 2012), 66.

[91] *Kalpak* today refers to Kyrgyz, Uzbek, and Bashkir national headwear. It resembles the type of cap worn by figures in manuscript paintings that are engaged in outdoor pursuits such as hunting and battling. My exploration of the headwear in period Safavid and Abū'l-Khairid contexts will be published in a forthcoming issue of the *Iran* Journal of the British Institute of Persian Studies.

II.iii. The legacy of Firdausī, Yazdī, and Hātifī in the Ottoman dynasty (prior to 1520)

Compared to the longevity of the Ottoman dynasty, the Safavids and Abū'l-Khairids were upstarts. Hence the Safavid need to connect themselves to mythical dynasties in Iran, and the Abū'l-Khairid presentation of themselves as the inheritors of Chinggis Khan in attempts to cast the newly-founded dynasties as natural rulers perpetuating established traditions. Taking 1399 as their date of origin, the Ottomans had already been in power for a century by the time Safavid and Abū'l-Khairid powers became established, and so naturally had more dynastic chronicles written and illustrated up until the period of our focus in the first decade of the sixteenth century. The poet Ahmedi wrote the Turkic-language *Eskandar-nâme* epic, which is the earliest chronicle of the origins of the Ottoman dynasty. The work also includes chapters from Firdausī's *Shāhnāma*, an account of Mongol rule in Anatolia, and regional history including Bayezid I's reign through events in 1410. It emphasizes the Ottoman "Islamizing and sharia-enforcing profile of the early ghazi sultans."[92] This concept, and Ahmedi's work itself, would be significant to Shībānī himself; it is probable that this text and others from the Ottoman sphere inspired Abū'l-Khairid ruler-*nāma* productions.

Other early works versifying the history of the House of Osman as a unique genre were composed during the reigns of Mehmet II and Bayezid II, between 1451–1512.[93] Uzun Firdevsî (b. 1453–ca. 1517), having prepared a Turkic translation of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* in 1472, collated an encyclopedic Turkic-language *Süleyman-nāma* on the legendary prophet king and presented six sections to Mehmet II. Firdevsî gave the remainder of the eighty-one volumes to Mehmet's successor Bayezid II upon the former sultan's death, but the work's length met with disfavor.[94] Ahmet Uğur stipulates that by now there was emerging a new interest in more focused ruler-*nāma* by the Ottoman sultans, as opposed to general histories. Successful chroniclers "intended to isolate a period rather than to incorporate it into a broad summary …[and] its subject matter was recent enough to be still alive in the memories of many who would read it, and the historian's penchant for the fabulous and the miraculous had to be restrained accordingly."[95] So too in the Ottoman realm, as in Timurid and Abū'l-

---

[92] Devin DeWeese, "A Sixteenth-Century Interpretation of the Islamization of the Mongols Attributed to Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī," *Mawlana Rumi Review* 5, no. 1 (2014), 95; Yıldız, "Ottoman Historical Writing in Persian," 441.

[93] Sara Nur Yıldız, "Ch. 9: Ottoman Historical Writing in Persian, 1400-1600," in *A History of Persian Literature (Book 10): Persian Historiography,* ed. Charles Melville (London: I.B. Tauris, 2012), 436-502.

[94] Bekir Biçer, "Firdevsî-i Rûmî ve Tarihçiliği," *Selçuk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi* no. 18 (2005): 245-261.

[95] Ahmet Uğur, *The Reign of Sultan Selim I in the Light of the Selim-name Literature* (Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 1984), 4.

Khairid Transoxiana, a favoring of realism and focused attention on a shorter timespan, with a distancing from the encyclopedic and the fantastic, was the rule.

Turkic and Persian historical chronicles were produced alongside each other in the Ottoman realm in the second half of the fifteenth century.[96] Of those composed in Persian, there are two written by men born in Iranian cities under Timurid administration. Maʿālī from Tus, akin to Firdausī, wrote his Persian *Khunkār-nāma* (book of the sovereign) and extolled Mehmet as "Shah of the Shahs of the World and Emperor" in 1474. Another poet, Malik Āhī, is thought to have originally been from the Āq Quyūnlū Turkoman realm. His *Shāhnāma-yi Malik-i Āhī* (*Bāyazīd-nāma*) from 1486 derived much inspiration from Firdausī.[97] A copy of the latter is considered "the first illustrated Ottoman *shahname* [ruler-*nāma*] using Ferdowsi's *Shahname* as a model" with illustrations added in 1495; we will return to this manuscript in the next chapter.[98]

Bayezid II commissioned Idris Bitlisi (d. 1520), who had experience as head of the Āq Quyūnlū court chancery in Tabriz before the Safavid conquest of the city, to pen the Ottoman dynastic historical narrative *Hasht bihisht* (eight paradises) in Persian. It was completed in 1506 and contains a chapter on each of the first eight Ottoman sultans, closing with a versified account of the civil war during Bayezid's reign. The *Hasht bihisht* emulates Yazdī's high style but uses lots of biblical and qur'anic narratives. Ali Anooshahr comments on its contents which expose "a deep problematic relationship between the Ottoman ruling elite and 'Turkestan' around the turn of the sixteenth century."[99] While being knowledgeable of the origins of the Ottoman dynasty in Inner Asia, Turkestan to Idris Bitlisi was a combination of Chinggis Khan, Karamanid leaders, Tīmūr, Uzun Ḥasan (the famed Āq Quyūnlū Turkman leader), and Shah Ismāʿīl all being "satanic" impingements on Ottoman westward expansion. In essence, the Ottomans associated themselves with the Romans and Caesars of Alexander the Great

---

[96] For an expansive study of illustrated Ottoman histories, consult Emine Fetvaci, *Picturing History at the Ottoman Court* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013).

[97] The name Āhī was originally misread as Ommi/Ümmi in the *Bāyazīd-nāma* labelled *Shāhnāma az guftār-i Malik Āhī* (TSMK H.1123, ca. 1495). My gratitude goes to Sara Nur Yıldız for directing my attention to this error, having deployed the name Ommi in her book chapter and later realizing the corrected form ("Ottoman Historical Writing in Persian"). While not replicating the content of Firdausī's epic, versified histories drew upon its ideals of kingship. Yıldız writes: "The linking of contemporary concerns with the tradition emulated for centuries provided an effective source of ideological authority for a text. Thus, Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* provided a blueprint for political behavior in its invocation of unwavering loyalty to the dynastic house and ruling shah, especially when confronted with the foibles and imperfections of a less-than-perfect monarch" (450-55).

[98] Āhī states this outright, claiming the inspiration for his imperial discourse came from Firdausī, and the source of his poetic style to be from Niẓāmī (Yıldız, "Ottoman Historical Writing in Persian," 457, 461).

[99] Ali Anooshahr sums it up further: "By the end of the sixteenth century, this binary eventually came to assume a broader group identity, whereby 'Turk' stood for the older ways of Central Asia and 'Rumi' for a composite, nonethnic identity" [*Turkestan and the Rise of Eurasian Empires: A Study of Politics and Invented Traditions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 49].

along with Firdausī's "Iranians." Enemies and undesirable groups were then elided as literary Turanians, although these actual peoples inhabited the Safavid Iranian expanse (and before the Safavid dynasty, the region overseen by Turkmens and Timurids) along with Abū'l-Khairid Turan. To the Ottomans, all these groups were designated as barbarians, Turk, Tatar, and ʿAjam/Persian to be contrasted with their self-designation as Roman/Rūmī.[100] This is in contradistinction to earlier Ottoman histories of the fifteenth century, which forged connections between the Seljuqs in Central Asia with the early Ottomans through the common ancestor Oghuz Khan.[101] The sixteenth century witnessed some aloofness in Anatolia at times towards those whom they interpreted as rash younger brothers in Transoxiana as the Ottomans gained impressive victories in the Hijaz and Mediterranean. As the tide turned against them at the end of the century with European and Safavid victories, a shift in Ottoman rhetoric again emphasized fraternity with the "East" and invoked Oghuz genealogy.[102] This move to socially and geographically align or distance themselves from the Abū'l-Khairids, and the relationships between individual sultans and khans later in the century, will be covered in Chapters 2 and 3.

Literary and fictional exploits from the *Shāhnāma* were harnessed to serve real political objectives in Ottoman ruler-*nāma* works. Ideals of kingship were invoked to promote unwavering loyalty to the dynastic house. Firdausī's work itself was broadly appreciated as a great literary classic, but it also had a "reputation as a work of history and record of military exploits, exemplary nobility, divinely sanctioned kingship of Iranian monarchy" to be used as a "source of inspiration to Ottoman historians seeking the image of their own sovereigns in figures described by Firdausī."[103] But the Ottoman panegyric writers incorporated more "pre-digested" material in drawing on Hātifī's *Tīmūr-nāma* and Yazdī's *Ẓafarnāma* versions which, as was mentioned, themselves drew heavily on Firdausī.

---

[100] Anooshahr, *Turkestan and the Rise of Eurasian Empires*, 50. Following Süleyman's capture of Baghdad in 1536, later Ottoman historiography would equate the Ottoman conquerors as successors to the Sunni Abbasid caliphate supported by the Seljuqs after an "infidel" Mongol interlude (Necipoğlu, "Word and Image: Ottoman Sultans in Comparative Perspective," 46).

[101] Anooshahr, *Turkestan and the Rise of Eurasian Empires*, 33. This was not without some tension: in Ottoman accounts of universal Islamic histories ending with Mehmet II's accession in 1451, the chronicler Şukrullāh's Persian-language *Bahjat al-Tawārīkh* presents the Chinggisids as "rapacious rulers" and"asserts the political superiority of the Oghuz Turks of the western branch. Ottoman legitimation is derived from their status as defenders of the faith and not merely through their lineage (Yıldız, "Ottoman Historical Writing in Persian," 444).

[102] Anooshahr, *Turkestan and the Rise of Eurasian Empires*, 33-34.

[103] Wood, "*Shāhnāma-i Ismāʿīl* [dissertation]," 232.

II.iv. The legacy of Firdausī, Yazdī, and Hātifī on the early Abū'l-Khairids

Scholarship has held that the artists of Abū'l-Khairid-controlled Transoxiana had little interest in the *Shāhnāma* of Firdausī, but they have never asked *why*.[104] I believe this issue cannot be dismissed in ethno-linguistic terms that are anachronistic to and uncharacteristic of the period.[105] Rather, reasons for this disinterest are to be found in the early Abū'l-Khairid ruler-*nāma* productions from the first decade of the sixteenth century. I treat them as barometers of the first dynastic ruler Shībānī Khan's personal tastes. Indeed, one of them, the commissioned *Fatḥnāma-yi khānī,* provides the key to understanding the very reasons why Firdausī's heroes elicited a tepid response, yet there was heightened interest in biographical epics of Abū'l-Khairid dynasts. Increasing linguistic individuation between Turkic and Persian speakers that emerged in the century before our sixteenth-century focus might also be a contributing factor, but one ought not to ignore the strong presence of Turkic and Persian literary patronage—and bilingualism—amongst elites in the sixteenth century and well beyond. Persian was the official language of the Abū'l-Khairid khanate perhaps as a means to shed their nomadic origins. However, around the same time that the *Fatḥnāma* was being composed in Persian, Shībānī Khan himself was asking his court poets to translate the *Shāhnāma* into Turki, although we do not know if this task was fully completed beyond a few lines.[106]

Abū'l-Khairid history writing exposes conflicts that are not overtly stated in the ruler-*nāma* but are evident through intertextual analysis of the written contents. In the early period of Abū'l-Khairid dominion there were dynamic processes of identity formation amongst the nomadic immigrants originating in the Qipchaq plain in relation to the sedentary population in Transoxiana. This encompasses a negotiation of Mongol customs with Perso-Islamicate culture and traditions.[107] My contribution to the scholarly discussion is to look at the ways the Abū'l-Khairids draw on Firdausī and other literary allusions from the latter (Perso-Islamicate) source. I emphasize titles carrying illustrations that are contemporary to the text or were added later by Abū'l-Khairid workshops and those outside

---

[104] Asserted by Robinson, *Persian Paintings in the India Office Library*, 188; Rührdanz, "The Samarqand Shahnamas," 214.

[105] To some scholars the Abū'l-Khairids have been viewed simplistically as mere "Turks" uninterested in the Iranian/Persian-language work. This ignores the Persian lingua franca of the dynasty and also the wider appeal of Firdausī's work that transcends the modern Iranian nation-state.

[106] Consult Osman G. Özgüdenli, "Šah-nāma Translations i: into Turkish," *Encyclopædia Iranica*; and M. Fuad Köprülü, "Çagatay edebiyati," *İslâm ansiklopedisi*, 3, part 24 (Istanbul, 1945): 309. Sultan Murad III had the Persian *Shāhnāma* of Firdausī translated into Turkish and illustrated at his court but then at the same time had the history of his own ancestors written in Persian by the *Şehnâmeci*.

[107] Pouya, "Intertextual analysis of the History of Abū'l-Khair," 613.

Transoxiana (a topic that will be covered in later chapters arranged by the eras of modification or completion).

Shībānī himself possessed a copy of a Turkic-language *Eskandar-nâme* (presumably Ahmedi's text).[108] Whereas Safavid military leaders quoted passages from Firdausī to incite their armies, Shībānī is reported to have relied on the *Eskandar-nâme* and "proudly compared his blockade of the Kazakhs with the building of Alexander's dam against the Gog and the Magog."[109] It has even been suggested that "history-conscious Central Asians knew of Alexander's ancient thrust into the region and of his legacy[, …claiming] kinship with the ancient Greek commander."[110] Shībānī is even purported to have carried the book with him on his campaigns and "identified with the Alexander history and legend to the end of his days."[111] However, Ahmedi's version is in fact a universal history culminating with events in the formation of the Ottoman dynasty up until 1410; if the copy in Shībānī's hands were this very work, he would need only to flip a few pages to reach the Ottoman ruler-*nāma* section. No wonder he would want a similar text about himself.

In seeking to establish a new dynasty as a true heir to and blood descendant of Chinggis, Shībānī sought versified epics of his own origins and personal exploits recounted. Thus, the *Eskandar-nâme* text directly inspired Shībānī, and also explains his sympathy towards the Ottomans and his desires to emulate their merged piety and militantism.[112] Shībānī Khan had a keen interest in having his deeds chronicled and contributed to their registering. He personally compiled palace chronicles and world histories created in the courts of the Ilkhanids and Timurids.[113] He was able to do so upon securing power and resources in taking Samarqand from the Timurids. Altıer states the earliest Abū'l-Khairid ruler-*nāma* works (*Fatḥnāma*, *Nuṣratnāma*, *Shībānī-nāma*) were written and produced in

---

[108] DeWeese, "A Sixteenth-Century Interpretation of the Islamization of the Mongols," 94-95. DeWeese cites Bannāʾī who writes that a copy of the *Iskandar-nāma* written in Ottoman verse was presented to Shībānī at Sïghnāq.

[109] Anooshahr, *Turkestan and the Rise of Eurasian Empires*, 99. The original source is Khunjī's *Mihmānnāma-yi Bukhārā* from 1509.

[110] Allworth, *The Modern Uzbeks,* 54.

[111] Ibid. Allworth also adds that Ahmedi's didactic work was "well regarded in Turkistan and the Qipchaq Plains…[and its status was] required reading for Shaybaniy Khan."

[112] DeWeese, "A Sixteenth-Century Interpretation of the Islamization of the Mongols," 95.

[113] Lola N. Dodkhudoeva, "K voprosu ob instrumentakh formirovaniia imperskoi ideologii v period pravleniia shibanidov," in *SrednevekovyĬ vostok: problemy istoriografii i istochnikovedeniia. Pamiaati Geroiaa Sovetskogo Soiuza akademika Z.M. Buniiatova* (Baku: Ilm, 2015), 59.

Samarqand before the acquisition of Herat. Following Shībānī's brief takeover of the former between 1507 and 1510, production might have moved to that site.[114]

Unable to remove the Chaghataid pedigree of the Timurids, the early Abū'l-Khairid administrators sought to assimilate intellectual and familial links to the Timurids through intermarriages with daughters and sisters of previous Timurid heads of state.[115] Shībānī Khan himself supported the remaining Timurid poets during his occupation of Herat between 1507–10.[116] After the Safavids reconquered the city, Abū'l-Khairid patronage continued and the leaders of appanages desiring bound manuscripts welcomed fugitive artists from this city into their courts. It is notable that the majority of the earlier Abū'l-Khairid chroniclers we will encounter had previously served other dynasties and figures before employment in Shībānī's court. Bannāʾī and Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ had served the Timurids.[117] Khunjī had worked in the Āq Quyūnlū court. Only Kūhistānī and Shādī were fresh to Abū'l-Khairid patronage, but their oeuvre was inflected through exposure to previous manuscripts and materials of Ilkhanid and Timurid production. According to Maria Subtelny the Uzbeks "took great pains to adopt and perpetuate the tradition of court patronage of cultural activities that had become the hallmark of their predecessors. …The real motivation was political and was intimately linked to their quest for legitimacy as a new Islamic power in what was for them a new cultural sphere."[118]

II.iv.a. *Nuṣratnāma*

Yuri Bregel gives a chronological overview of history writing in Central Asia and begins with the *Tavārīkh-i guzīda-yi nuṣratnāma* (selected chronicles from the book of victories; to be shortened as *Nuṣratnāma* hereafter) compiled in 1504.[119] The *Nuṣratnāma* has no stated author, although a blank

---

[114] Altıer, ""Şiban Han dönemi (1500-1510) Özbek kitap sanatı," 212.

[115] Shībānī Khan married Sulṭān Maḥmūd's daughters (Subtelny, "Art and Politics," 132).

[116] Lamia Balafrej, *The Making of the Artist in Late Timurid Painting* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2019), 218.

[117] Bannāʾī's previous patrons included Bāiqarā and Bābur.

[118] Subtelny, "Art and Politics," 123.

[119] For information about the *Nuṣratnāma* consult Bregel, "HISTORIOGRAPHY xii. CENTRAL ASIA"; Semiha Altıer, "Semerkand Sarayı'ndan Tarihe Bir Bakış: Mes'ud Bin Usman Kuhistânî'nin Tarih-i Ebu'l Hayr Han'ındaki Minyatürler," *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2013 Bahar (18): 12; Abuseitova and Baranova, *Written Sources on History and Culture of Kazakhstan and Central Asia,* 28-39; Brend, "Sixteenth-Century Manuscript from Transoxiana," 103; Olga V. Vasilyeva and Oxana Vodneva, *Kist i Kalam: 200 let kollektsiam Instituta Vostochnykh Rukopisei: Katalog Vystavki* (Sankt Peterburg: Gosudarstvennyi Ermitazh, 2018), 168. The original work includes events that took place in May 1504. Two copies of the *Nuṣratnāma* exist: BL Or. 3222 with later illustrations, and another unpainted copy ca. 17th century formerly in Saint Petersburg's Institute of Asian Peoples (ms. 745) that Lerkh found in either Khiva or Bukhara in 1859. A.M. Akramov notes the BL ms. has a stamp associated with Shāh Jahān ["Tavārikh-i Gūzide, Nusrat-nāme, kak istochnik po istorii Uzbekistana XV-nachala XVI veka," *O'zbekistonda ijtimoiy fanlar* 8 (1963): 57]. Both the Saint Petersburg and London copies are incomplete. The London manuscript breaks off in the midst of a Hisar campaign, and there are numerous repetitions and diacritical errors and spelling mistakes in the Saint Petersburg text.

space in the London copy (BL Or. 3222) was reserved for a name. Some scholars have suggested Shībānī authored portions of this Abū'l-Khairid ruler-*nāma* himself.[120] It is a prose Turkic-language chronicle with some Persian poetry derived from Saʿdī's *Gulistān* that provides a history of Turco-Mongol tribes derived from *Oghuz-nāma* accounts of the mythical origins of the Turks.[121] In other places it lavishly details Chinggis Khan's reign and his descendants through Abū al-Khair. Some parts copy Ilkhanid chronicles such as the *Jāmīʿ al-tawārīkh* of Rashīd al-Dīn, and *Tārīkh-i jahāngushāy* of Juvainī for information on Chinggisid tribes, which are in essence Ilkhanid ruler-*nāma* composed for Mongol patrons who had converted to Islam and sought legitimacy from Persian-speaking subjects. It covers Shībānī's siege of Samarqand and victory over the Timurids and pairs these feats with past Mongol conquests. The illustrated *Nuṣratnāma* in the British Library will be treated in the next chapter since the paintings were added decades after our present focus (Chapter 2 §II.ii).

Altıer has examined the manuscript and states the anonymous author used Mongol sources (both in terms of subject matter and the language of the consulted materials) that had been transferred to the library of Shībānī Khan in Samarqand. To Akramov, the work is divided into three parts. The first covers Chinggis Khan and his descendants, the second is dedicated to the history of the Dasht-i Qipchaq and buildup to Tīmūr's campaign in Khwarazm, and the third section is more narrative. This last part covers the history of Shībānī and the initial fragility of his fledgling army with internal rebellions even as the last Timurid ruler of Herat, Badīʿ al-Zamān, marched towards them.[122] Melville, however, divides the text in two: the first part is based on Chinggisid sources and includes a discussion of Turkish tribes and the rise of Chinggis and his successors up until the Ilkhanids.[123] The second part details more recent dynasties in the region. Significantly, the *Nuṣratnāma* does not include much information about the Timurids. When it does, it stresses their inferiority to the Abū'l-Khairids: "Timur's father, Taraghay, is called a superintendent of granaries for the Chaghatay…thus belittling the background of the Timurids on account of their association with what was from a nomadic viewpoint

---

[120] The work is full of dates, even giving days and hours of events that suggests the author personally took part in them (Akramov, "Tavārikh-i Gūzide, Nusrat-nāme," 57). Subtelny attributes Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ with writing it but this has yet to be proven ("Art and Politics in Early 16th century Central Asia," 146). Abuseitova and Baranova argue in favor of Shībānī's authorship based on the language using vocabulary, phonetics, and morphology associated with old Qazaq, a Turkic Qipchaq language. It is quite different from that of Navāʾī and Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ (*Written Sources*, 31).

[121] DeWeese, "A Sixteenth-Century Interpretation of the Islamization of the Mongols," 91, 96-97, ftn. 21.

[122] Akramov, "Tavārikh-i Gūzide, Nusrat-nāme," 58. Akramov also reports that the work details trade linkages between Transoxiana, Khwarazm, Qipchaq steppes, Muscovy, and Iran.

[123] Charles Melville, "The Shaibanids between Tīmūr and Chinggis Khan: Visual Dilemmas," LUCIS Lecture at Leiden University, 7 May 2019.

an ignoble activity. In addition, it is noted that Timurids of all ranks can only be styled mirza, which is a much lower title than khan or sultan used to designate the descendants of Chingiz Khan."[124]

The *Nuṣratnāma* justifies Shībānī's leadership in the region through fused Chinggisid and Islamic components. The text discredits those who do not have these attributes: the Timurids lack full Chinggisid blood although they are "correct" Muslims (i.e., Sunni), the Qazaqs have the proper Chinggisid blood but are not fully Muslim, and the Safavids are worst of all in their lackings by having neither Chinggisid descent or Sunni creed.[125] Shībānī's titles in the work affirm his special exalted status and religious roles. He is called *imām al-zamān* (imam of the age) and *khalīfat al-raḥmān* (vicegerent of God), as well as *mahdī-yi ākhir-i zamān* (spiritual and temporal ruler of the end of times), and one line declares: "It is within the entire realm that he is the *khān*."[126]

II.iv.b. *Shībānī-nāma* (Persian and Turkic versions)

According to Bregel, the second group of historical texts covering the reign of Shībānī Khan composed after the *Nuṣratnāma* is a Persian *Shībānī-nāma* version by Kamāl al-Dīn Bannāʾī Haravī (d. 1512), and his expanded version the *Futuḥāt-i khānī*. Not illustrated but with some sparse illuminated headings, the oldest copy of Bannāʾī's *Shībānī-nāma* (ARB 844) was purportedly written out by the hands of Shībānī Khan himself and his secretary Mīrzā Muʾmīn Munshī and is dated 1502; it is not surprising that the title emphasizes the pen name of its poet protagonist. It contains a biography of Shībānī's life up to his conquest of Khwarazm in 1505.[127] Shībānī Khan appointed both Bannāʾī and Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ as his joint *malik al-shuʿarāʾ* to control literary life in Herat during Shībānī's brief rule there between 1507–10. Despite evidence of his being bilingual in Persian and Turki, Bannāʾī tended to write in Persian and his written condescension of Turkic literary productions in prose and

---

[124] Subtelny, "Art and Politics in Early 16th century Central Asia," 132. Only two passages in the work are about Timur. Rieu's catalogue entry calls these "misplaced fragments" and they deal with the retreat of Tūqtamīsh Khan and refuge with Tīmūr (ca. 1380), and the conquest of Khwarazm. These events were included due to being of immediate interest to the Abū'l-Khairids and their aims to take Khwarazm (*Catalogue of the Turkish Manuscripts*, 276-80).

[125] Ibid., 102-03.

[126] Ibid., 101, ftn. 28.

[127] ARB 844 was formerly in the Khiva library of Isfandiyār Khān and discovered in 1910. Other extant copies of Bannāʾī's *Shībānī-nāma* and *Futūḥāt-i khānī* are held in Dushanbe (CWH 778 or 779, ca. 1512, unillustrated). Later copies of ARB 844 are in Tashkent, ARB 3331 (scribed 1910-18), and ARB 1235 which has been translated into Japanese and examined by Kazuyuki Kubo, *Toruko-isuramu jidai chuo Ajia bunka no sōgōteki kenkyū (A Synthetical Study on Central Asian culture in the Turco-Islamic Period),* ed. Eiji Mano (Kyoto: 1997). An English review has been prepared by T. Sultanov and V. Goreglyad in *Manuscripta Orientalia* 3, no. 4 (December 1997): 67-68. Further information is in Parvīz ʿĀdil, "*Shībānī-nāma*," in *Kitāb-i Māh-i Tārīkh u Jughrāfiyā* (Tīr, Murdād, u Shahrīvar 1383 [summer 2004]): 186-90.

verse (and his other witticisms that Bābur relates) remain.[128] Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ, reportedly an unsavory character, composed Turkic-language materials which included a version of the *Shībānī-nāma* written after Bannāʾī's Persian version from ca. 1505.[129] In it, Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ wrote a couplet to please the khan by referring to him as the second Alexander.[130] No longer able to serve Shībānī following the khan's death in 1510, Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ joined ʿUbaidullāh after the occupation of Herat where he served in the court of Bukhara and composed panegyrics prior to his death in 1534.[131] The illustrations to a copy of his Turkic *Shībānī-nāma* (ÖNB cod. mixt. 313) will be discussed in Chapter 2 §IV.[132] Like the *Nuṣratnāma*, it too was illustrated decades after the text was copied out. Unlike the *Nuṣratnāma*, however, the visual project to the *Shībanī-nāma* manuscript came from outside the Abū'l-Khairid dynasty and region.

II.iv.c. Unillustrated Abū'l-Khairid ruler-*nāma*

Another Persian work dedicated to Shībānī Khan was written by Faẓl-Allāh b. Rūzbihān Khunjī (1455–1521) who had previously worked in the court of the Āq Quyūnlū ruler Yaʿqūb b. Uzun Ḥasan (r. 1478–90) and in some Mamluk territories.[133] Khunjī's *Mihmān-nāma-yi Bukhārā* text from 1509 was not so much a biographical history of the khan as a firsthand account of military victories against the Kazakhs, projecting "all the negative cultural qualities of the Turco-Mongol heritage from which the [Abū'l-Khairid] Shībānīds were eager to disassociate themselves."[134] Khunjī considered Yazdī's *Ẓafarnāma* as a crucial text to emulate for its style, and various hadith for its content, with the goal of legitimizing Uzbek rule in Transoxiana.[135] Unillustrated, Altıer ascribes a Herat provenance to a copy

---

[128] Information on these court poets is in Bābur and W.M. Thackston, trans., *The Bāburnāma* (London: Folio Society, 2013), 224-25, 312; Subtelny, "Poetic Circle at the Court of the Timurid Sultan Husain Baiqara," 127, 168; Subtelny, "Art and Politics," 134-135; Annemarie Schimmel, "Some Notes on the Cultural Activity of the First Uzbek Rulers," *Journal of the Pakistan Historical Society* 8, no. 4 (1960): 155; Mustafa ʿÂli, *Epic Deeds of Artists*, 244.

[129] Information on the text is in Samie, "The Shibanid Question," 27-28. Another version of Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ's *Shībānī-nāma* is in Hungary (HAS Török Q.68).

[130] Allworth quotes the translation of P.M. Melioranskii from 1908 (*The Modern Uzbeks*, 55, ftn. 26).

[131] Bābur, *Bāburnāma*, 112-13. Where Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ lived between 1510 and 1528 and what later panegyrics he produced are uncertain. The date of his death is also unknown, but Mustafa ʿÂli reports he had died by the time the *Manaqib-i Hunarvaran* was completed (ca. 1580s). Death date derived from Andras J. E. Bodrogligeti, "TURKIC-IRANIAN CONTACTS ii. CHAGHATAY," *Encyclopaedia Iranica.*

[132] The original text of the manuscript in Vienna and its translation into German are found in Hermann Vambéry, *Die Scheïbaniade: ein Özbegisches Hedlengedicht in 76 Gesängen von Prinz Mohammed Salih aus Charezm*. Vienna: 1885. Earlier, it was published by J. Berezin into Russian in 1849.

[133] Anooshahr, *Turkestan and the Rise of Eurasian Empires*, 85.

[134] Ibid., 86.

[135] Binbaş, *Intellectual Networks*, 201; Subtelny, "Art and Politics," 133.

of Khunjī's *Mihmān-nāma* in the Beruni Institute based on the manuscript's gilding and illumination.[136] Whereas to Firdausī it is the Oxus (*Āmū Daryā*) that demarcates Iran from Turan, to Khunjī it is the Jaxartes (*Sīr Daryā*) that is the important boundary with psychological and symbolic significance demarcating "civilized" Transoxiana from desolate Turkestan.[137] Like Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ, Khunjī would go on to write for the Abū'l-Khairid ruler of Bukhara ʿUbaidullāh too, which demonstrates that the early Abū'l-Khairid workshops functioned initially in Herat and Samarqand; production in Bukhara was not immediate at the onset of the dynasty but would start later.

The significance of Yazdī and Firdausī continued in other historical works coming out of Abū'l-Khairid workshops in the 1520s, all unillustrated. In Tashkent, ʿAbdullāh Naṣrullāhī Balkhī's *Zubdat al-aṯār* in Turkic prose, to intentionally counter the preponderance of Persian-language historical works, was composed in 1525 at the behest of Suyūnch Khwāja's son Sulṭān Muḥammad.[138] The author was a witness to and participant in the events that brought about the end of Timurid power in Transoxiana and the establishment of Abū'l-Khairid sovereignty.[139] Consulting Yazdī and Uighur sources attributed to the Timurid ruler Ulugh Beg, Naṣrullāhī composed a universal history that inserts the Abū'l-Khairids in the line of pre-Islamic, Abbasid, and Chinggisid dynasties. An early section on "Afrāsiyāb's coming to Iran" is interesting in its emphasizing Firdausī's Turanian lord and his victory over Iran. This is followed by sections on medieval dynasties in Transoxiana that end with the Timurids, then a final part on Shībānī that praises the early Abū'l-Khairid victories over Khwārazm, before abruptly ending with Shībānī's death.

---

[136] Altıer has examined this manuscript from the Beruni Institute (ARB 1414) in "Şiban Han dönemi (1500-1510) Özbek kitap sanatı," 215. A facsimile edition of this manuscript with Russian translation was carried out by R. P. Dzhalilova, *Mikhman-name-ĭi Bukhara-Zapiski bukharskogo gostia* (Moscow, 1976). Another copy of the work is in Istanbul (NOL 3431, dated 1509).

[137] Anooshahr, *Turkestan and the Rise of Eurasian Empires*, 96.

[138] Sulṭān Muḥammad was the brother of the later great khan Barāq/Naurūz Aḥmad Khan (r. 1551–56). Subtelny says the work was written at the request of Kīldī Muḥammad ("Art and Politics," 146). DeWeese has traced all known manuscripts of this title and notes an interesting copy scribed in 1569 by Sālār Bābā b. Qulī ʿAlī Sālār Nasāʾī (Kharīdārī), who wrote out Turkic translations of original Persian works "at the behest of Uzbek ruler of Khorezm ʿAlī Sulṭān b. Avānish Khan (d. 1571) ["A note on manuscripts of the *Zubdat al-athār*, a Chaghatay Turkic History from sixteenth-century Mawarannahr," *Manuscripts of the Middle East* 6 (1992): 100]. Bregel quotes Naṣrullāhī being ordered by Kīldī to write a Turkic history of the dynasty in "HISTORIOGRAPHY xii. CENTRAL ASIA." Naṣrullāhī directly states: "it is a surprise that although the descendants of Chinggis Khan who ruled these countries and the descendants of Timur Bek were all Turks, the histories which were written in their name were all in the Persian language. Since they were all Turks, it is necessary that histories will also be written in Turkic. Then I was ordered to write our history in the following words, 'Compose this history in Turkic!' …And since before this time no history was written in Turkic under any king in his time ...This book, therefore, should be considered the invention of His Majesty." Translated sections prepared by Scott C. Levi and Ron Sela, eds., "Part 5, section 35: Zubdat al-athar: The Beginnings of the Shibanid State," *Islamic Central Asia: An Anthology of Historical Sources* (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2010), 204.

[139] Binbaş, *Intellectual Networks,* 207. Levi and Sela suggest he was an official serving Timurids in Balkh, then fled to Herat after the Uzbek conquest.

At the same time the *Zubdat al-aṯār* was written in Tashkent using Yazdī's text as a model, over in Kūchkūnchī's Samarqand court Yazdī's original *Ẓafarnāma* was translated into Turki in 1526 by Muḥammad ʿAlī b. Darvīsh Yār ʿAlī al-Bukhārī.[140] This author would translate other works originally in Persian into Turki such as the *Jāmīʿ al-tawārīkh*. Yār ʿAlī's works were not unbiased translations, and in his rendition of Rashīd al-Dīn's text he replaces the name of the original patron Ghāzān Khan with Kūchkūnchī as the culmination of Chinggisid lineage and presented the work to Kūchkūnchī the same year the translated *Ẓafarnāma* was completed (1526).[141] Yār ʿAlī's Turkic copy of the *Ẓafarnāma* withholds the Timurids a full Chinggisid status, and the translator shortens the long passages that praise Tīmūr in the original and emphasizes the *gurāgān* title and with it Tīmūr's marriage into the bloodline; between the lines is the message that Chinggis Khan's life-force circulated more in his Abū'l-Khairid heirs, and less within the Timurids.

II.iv.d. *Fatḥnāma-yi khānī* (textual focus)

The final specimen of early Abū'l-Khairid ruler-*nāma —Fatḥnāma-yi khānī* (the khan's book of conquests)—is different from the others in that one copy held in Tashkent (ARB 5369) has illustrations contemporary to the written transcription.[142] This singular illustrated copy is generally accepted to be owned by Shībānī Khan himself. It is a small manuscript measuring 21x14 cm with two columns of text; when holding the object, it comes across as being travel-sized and easily carried while galloping on horseback. Its illustrations are evidence that artists who had originally trained in Timurid workshops went on to work for the new leaders in the region and carried out Shībānī's own commissioned manuscript.

The text in Persian verse chronicles Shībānī's beginnings in the Dasht-i Qipchaq steppe region and capture of Samarqand in 1500. Upon taking control of Samarqand, Shībānī Khan sought to chronicle his own deeds, and although no colophon is present, the work was begun before Herat was taken in 1507. As will be explored below, the illustrations appear to harness Timurid talent in both Samarqand and Herat, and the latter site seems the most logical location of completion. Shībānī Khan's brother Maḥmūd Bahādur Sulṭān (father of ʿUbaidullāh Khan, a notable figure to be discussed in

---

[140] NOL 3268.

[141] Information on these translated texts is provided in DeWeese, "Chaghatay literature in the early sixteenth century," 103, 105; Binbaş, *Intellectual Networks*, 218-19.

[142] Studies of the illustrated Tashkent manuscript have been carried out by Altıer: "Şiban Han dönemi (1500-1510) Özbek kitap sanatı"; "Özbek Hanlığı'nın (1500-1599) Bilinen İlk Resimli Tarih Kitabı: Fetihnâme ve Öne Çıkardığı Temalar," *Mimar Sinan Güzel Sanatlar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bİlimler Dergisi* 1 (Spring 2010): 11-23; and Pugachenkova, "Miniatiury 'Fatkh-name'." Other unillustrated copies of this text from later periods are held in St. Petersburg (SPBGU mss. 925 and 962), and two others in Dushanbe (CWH mss. 953 and 1464).

Chapter 2) appointed the poet Muḥammad Shādī with the task of extolling the exploits of Shībānī Khan to be carried out in the literary style of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma.* This *Fatḥnāma* is truly a ruler-*nāma* in asserting dynastic legitimacy through its subject matter of a singular leader, the act of its patronage, its rhymed verse, heroic-romantic subject matter, and its illustration scheme. Shādī is said to have been directly "instructed by Shaibani-khan on the day of Nauruz to create a history of his victories in the style of the *Shahnāma* by Firdowsi."[143] The text furnishes Shībānī with an illustrious pedigree using Yazdī's pragmatic biography of Tīmūr as a model as opposed to Hātifī's fantastical account.[144] The early Abū'l-Khairids and Safavids were engaged in a common process. Akin to the Safavid ruler-*nāma Shāhnāma-yi Ismāʿīl*, the *Faṭhnāma* also stylistically emulates Firdausī. The first rulers of the two dynasties commissioned court poets to make secondary historical epics about their own deeds which shaped the destinies of the dynasties they created. The shah received his own *shāhnāma*, and the *Fatḥnāma* was Shībānī's personal *khān-nāma* with events rooted in Transoxiana. In it, we see the formations of the Abū'l-Khairid manuscript arts (both textual and visual) building on the foundations of the Timurids and appropriating the very manuscripts, artists, subject matter, and visual iconography of the preceding dynasty. The text even co-opts the honorific that historiographers in the previous century had associated with Tīmūr to refer to Shībānī as *ḥażrat-i ṣāḥib-qirān* (lord of the auspicious conjunction).[145]

Despite frequent passages lifted from Firdausī, Shībānī is recorded by Shādī in the *Fatḥnāma* as dismissing half of the *Shāhnāma* as fiction and exaggeration, such as its fantastical elements and the superhuman exploits of the literary hero Rustam. What is more, most of the tales take place far afield. Shībānī was disdainful of these stories' occurring outside his immediate vicinity in Turan, located in Arabia, ʿAjam (Persian-speaking domains), Rome, Hindustan, and China (Khotan).[146] Thus, he decreed that a new work should be written in order to tell his own feats and to "leave the heroes of *Shāhnāma* in the lake."[147] When completed "and clothed in verse" it was intended to "make the *Shāhnāma* seem

---

[143] Madraimov, et al., *Oriental Miniatures*, 83.

[144] Bernardini suggests it was Hātifī's *Tīmūr-nāma* that was "a model to be followed by writers of similar celebratory texts" ("Hatifī's *Tīmūrnameh* and Qāsimī's *Shāhnāmeh-yi Ismāʿil,*" 7).

[145] Allworth discusses the deployment of the epithet to Timur's and Shībanī's titles (*The Modern Uzbeks,* 60).

[146] Pugachenkova, "Miniatiury 'Fatkh-name,' " 126.

[147] Quoted by Altıer, "Özbek Hanlığı'nın Bilinen İlk Resimli Tarih Kitabı," 14.

naked."[148] As the only courtly Abū'l-Khairid manuscript known to have been illustrated during Shībānī Khan's lifetime, Altıer states an important aspect of the *Fatḥnāma* is the simultaneous visualization of the history of Shībānī Khan if not in "real-time," then at a lag of merely five years or so.[149] In particular, it was one of several historical chronicles written in the Abū'l-Khairid sphere between 1500–10, and other similar works continued to be executed in the 1520s locally in Transoxiana and in the other dominant Safavid and Ottoman zones. Prior to a discussion of the *Fatḥnāma*'s illustrations, it is necessary to analyze preceding materials from the late Timurid period encompassing Firdausian *Shāhnāma* and ruler-*nāma* copies out of which the *Fatḥnāma* emerges. Once familiar with the Timurid material, we can better appreciate the *Fatḥnāma*'s incorporation of this pre-existing subject matter and the illustrative styles used to render it. In turn, since this *Fatḥnāma* manuscript marks the inception of Abū'l-Khairid manuscript arts, through it we can also better understand later artistic practices in the workshops administered by that dynasty.

III. Productions of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* in the late Timurid to early Abū'l-Khairid dynasties (visual focus)

Prior to discussing *Shāhnāma* manuscripts from the early Abū'l-Khairid era, an overview of manuscript production and *Shāhnāma* works in particular from fifteenth-century Transoxiana is useful. Comparisons to illustrated manuscripts solidly from the courtly Timurid sphere expose how the *Shāhnāma* grouping under discussion connects with earlier copies of the work as well as the illustrative programs to other manuscript titles in preceding decades.

III.i. Courtly copies for Timurid princes

According to B.W. Robinson, there can be no miniatures earlier than 1437 attributed to Transoxiana, nor can there be works on paper from Tīmūr's capital city Samarqand while he ruled there between 1370 and 1405.[150] The rise of Timurid manuscript arts thus emerged with Tīmūr's progeny, and three singular copies of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* were produced for the three bibliophile sons of Tīmūr's descendant Shāh Rukh (r. 1405–47): Baysunghur's copy completed in Herat, 1430 (MKG 61);

---

[148] Melville translated this passage from f.17v in his LUCIS lecture: "The Shaibanids between Tīmūr and Chinggis Khan."

[149] Altıer, "Şiban Han dönemi (1500-1510) Özbek kitap sanatı," 213.

[150] Robinson claims, "Personally I know of no miniature earlier than about 1437 which I should be prepared to locate in Transoxiana" in *Fifteenth-century Persian Painting: Problems and Issues* (New York: New York University Press, 1991), 47.

Muḥammad Jūkī's undated copy circa 1440-1444, Herat (RAS Morley 239); Ibrāhīm Sulṭan's copy depicting him engaged in kingly activities, undated but circa 1430–35, Shiraz (BLO Ouseley Add. 176).[151] Eleanor Sims has noted that the illustrated subjects are different in each of them, and their individuation attests to the uniqueness of their royal patrons.[152] In contrast, our group of *Shāhnāma* copies contain repeated scenes and iconographic formulae which suggest the illustrations were produced at a quicker rate and were intended for a non-royal audience.

Sultan Ḥusain Bāiqarā's rule in Herat is closer in time and place to the early power centers of the Abū'l-Khairids, but there is no known princely *Shāhnāma* copy from Bāiqarā's reign. Brend has asserted that there were no manuscripts produced for Bāiqarā at all after 1495, which is open to critique.[153] A manuscript of Firdausī's work sold at a Sotheby's auction was scribed in Herat by a certain "Sajan Qulī ibn Shāh" with the remainder of the name missing. The year indicating 1497 is given, and the entry claims the first several miniatures correspond to the late-fifteenth century school in Herat with the rest carried out in a Tabriz style circa 1525.[154] Without having access to reproductions of folios I cannot verify the given information, although it would aid our discussion of book arts produced in this center at the dynastic cusp. When the Abū'l-Khairids superseded the Timurids and took control of Transoxiana, Uzbek leaders seem to have followed the predilection of the late Timurids and avoided princely *Shāhnāma* commissions. Artisans and literati however maintained their interest in the title, attested to by the group of manuscripts to be treated next.

III.ii. *Shāhnāma* copies in transition: the big-figure and little-figure styles

Scholars have affixed dates of production to the Firdausian *Shāhnāma*s of our focus, executed in two main styles, through visual comparisons to other manuscripts of Persian poetry with similar illustrations. The earliest research was done by Russian-speaking academicians. Mukaddima Ashrafi-Aini in 1987 cites earlier scholarship by Pugachenkova and Rempel' in the 1960s who discerned two

---

[151] Eleanor Sims notes that more than the other copies, it was Ibrāhīm Sulṭan's "simplified and narrative manner of painting…[that became] the model *par excellence*—clear in conception and easily repeatable—for the rapid creation of non-princely or even commercial copies of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma*" produced in Shiraz. This is evident in the rendering of figures and horses that served later artists practicing the big-figure style. Information in "The Illustrated Manuscripts of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* Commissioned by Princes of the Houses of Tīmūr," *Ars Orientalis* 22 (1993): 54.

[152] Ibid., 49.

[153] This date corresponds to Bāiqarā's failed campaign to take Hisar. Claim made by Brend, *Perspectives on Persian Painting*, 183. Some manuscripts contradict this, such as a copy of Dihlavī's *Hasht bihisht* dated 1496 (TSMK H.676).

[154] *Sotheby's Catalogue of Oriental Manuscripts and Miniatures*, 13 July 1971, lot 442. Unfortunately there are no reproductions of illustrations in the entry.

styles indebted to Herat in early productions from Abū'l-Khairid workshops based on the size and number of figures in each composition.[155] The anglophone scholars who have explicitly analyzed this group are B.W. Robinson, Norah Titley, and Barbara Brend. Each of them has suggested categorical terms to describe the stylistic differences based on perceived chronological, regional, or visual consonance or dissonance. But to me, the latest analysis by Semiha Altıer is the most informed, and her insights expressed in her dissertation from 2007 treat the materials under discussion most thoroughly. It is incorrect to label them chronologically, as in one style being "late Timurid" and the other "early Abū'l-Khairid." Instead, Altıer uses the terms *büyük figürlü üslup* (big-figure style) and *küçük figürlü üslup* (little-figure style) which are attractive due to their being ahistorical descriptors.

As is true with many mysterious manuscripts lacking concrete evidence of transcription and physical transmission from one place to the next, one can best ascertain the process of their completion through visual analysis of their illustrations. It is unknown precisely for whom, when, or where they were created as none of our *Shāhnāma* copies have colophons or legible dedicatory inscriptions. The big-figure style has been attributed to a timespan between the 1460s through the early 1500s with the other little-figure style overlapping, having been carried out at the very start of the sixteenth century and lasting a short stretch until 1510.[156] When it is present, colophon information to comparable manuscripts ranges between 1483[157] and 1504,[158] but it is imperative to keep in mind that the dates appearing in the colophons of these materials only refer to the textual scribing coming at the end of the Timurid period and cannot be used to definitively date the illustrations. The works do not appear to have a direct relationship with Abū'l-Khairid patrons when Shībānī Khan took control of Khurasan and Transoxiana in early victories. Moreover, it is not likely that Timurid courtly clientele, made uneasy by threats to their power, would have been interested in commissioning manuscripts at this time. Rather it is more likely that the works were produced for commercial purposes catering to anybody with the

---

[155] Ashrafi, *Bekhzad*, 130.

[156] Many samples of the little-figure style are available in Altıer's dissertation.

[157] ʿAṣṣār's *Mihr u Mushtarī* dated Rajab 888/1483 (ÖNB A.F. 315) scribed by ʿInābāl (?). Its illustrated folio is in the "big figure" style of the *Shāhnāma* manuscripts. Catalogued by Dorothea Duda, *Islamische Handschriften I: Persische Handschriften* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1983), 49-50.

[158] Dihlavī's *Khamsa* with little-figure styled illustrations (BL Or. 11327) with two colophons dated 1497 and 1503 (990 is written; 909 is more likely).

resources and inclination to own a classic work of Persian literature, be they subjects of Timurid or Abū'l-Khairid administrators.[159]

All of the manuscripts below might have been penned together during the late Timurid period of the 1480s and 90s, but their illustrations attest to some of the books' confiscation and their subsequent completion by artists who would go on to serve the early Abū'l-Khairid administration. At a later date, they filled in incomplete image boxes where they existed in the works. This explains why the two styles at times coexist within a single bound manuscript, but they never coexist within a single page. In all of the *Shāhnāma* copies in the group, even though it is not associated with mainstream courtly styles, the more elegant big-figure illustrations are never touched or overpainted, likely out of respect for the Timurid dynasty whose artistic traditions are known to have been held in high esteem by all the leading sixteenth-century Turco-Persianate powers (Ottoman, Abū'l-Khairid, Safavid, and later Mughal). Tellingly, in a manuscript containing both styles that will be examined below (TSMK R.1549), it is just the renderings in the little-figure style that get a facelift.

The *Shāhnāma* group permits an exploration of early Abū'l-Khairid manuscript production and processes of confiscating, reusing, and repainting manuscripts with origins in late-Timurid Transoxiana which would continue throughout the sixteenth century in Abū'l-Khairid workshops. The works challenge the claim that there was little interest in Firdausī in Transoxiana for they attest to the *Shāhnāma* being part of the literary canon from the very establishment of the Abū'l-Khairid dynasty. Other copies with illustrations in the two styles could arise as individual manuscripts and loose pages in world collections are better provenanced.[160]

The big-figure style (figs. 1-3, 17-18) is identifiable by having few figures fill a composition (typically there are three people or fewer). Each has large and elongated body proportions and often wears black boots with both heels and toes coming to sharp points. Background mountains painted in a pastel color scheme take periwinkle blue, lavender, pink, and pistachio hues. Despite the stiffness and elegance of the compositions, goofy-faced horses with wild eyes and buck teeth add an incongruous element of humor.[161] The style seems to have derived from Ulugh Beg's court in Samarqand in the

---

[159] Altıer, "Şiban Han dönemi (1500-1510) Özbek kitap sanatı," 193.

[160] Robinson and Galerkina have included RIOS S-822 in this *Shāhnāma* group but to me it is an outlier with illustrations from Shiraz in the 1460s and so has been omitted.

[161] Examples found in Titley, "A Shāhnāma from Transoxiana," fig. 8. B.W. Robinson bluntly rules out Herat as a possible production site in "Two Illustrated Manuscripts in the Malek Library, Tehran," in *Content and Context of Visual Arts in the Islamic World* (Philadelphia, 1988), fig. 10.

mid-fifteenth century and from later artistic developments in Sultan Ḥusain Mīrzā Bāiqarā's Herat, such as attendants and figures within a *Būstān* of Saʿdī from 1488 attributed to Bihzād.[162] Brend has called the big-figure style "Sub-Classical Herat," noting its relation to the courtly Timurid style practiced in late-century Herat but emphasizing its subpar level of execution, and she suggests these manuscripts were produced for minor courtiers in Samarqand or Herat in a workshop that was parallel to the main Herat kitābkhāna.[163] Other scholars rule out Herat altogether.[164] This suggests our group of manuscripts was both scribed and illustrated in Samarqand which had cornered the market for illustrated copies of Firdausī's work in the Timurid domain, despite Sims characterizing the group as "nonprincely…(at least in style if not in intention and execution) or frankly provincial."[165] The only manuscript yet found in this style that has a colophon—but with no named center— is a copy of ʿAṣṣār's *Mihr u mushtarī* in Vienna which contains a date of 1483. Altıer has refined the analysis on the big-figure style and claims it was practiced in both Samarqand and briefly Herat when they were administered by the Abū'l-Khairids early in the sixteenth century.

The little-figure style is characterized by short and squat figures with flat noses, bored-looking faces, and small red lips below thickly-outlined eyes (figs. 4-7, 9). Beasts are not very well-rendered; Bahrām Gūr in one *Shāhnāma* manuscript appears to be slashing a giant eel and not a dragon (fig. 5),[166] and elsewhere in another copy Isfandiyār killing the *sīmurgh* looks more like he is slaughtering a giant chicken.[167] The style emerged in 1500 immediately with the onset of Abū'l-Khairid regional authority with manuscripts featuring figures Brend has called "rubbery and 'weak-chinned.' "[168] Compositions are simple with high horizons dappled by large clusters of vegetation and flowers. To Altıer, the

---

[162] The illustration referred to here is the often reproduced illustration: "Party at the court of Sultan Ḥusain Mīrzā," f.2v, dated June 1488 (DAKM Adab Farisi 22; incorrectly labeled no. 908 until corrected by Jake Benson).

[163] Brend's rich analysis on this sub-classical Herat style that was not necessarily made in that center and the minor courtiers who might have commissioned the works is in "Ch. 6: Classical and Sub-Classical Styles of Herat," in *Perspectives on Persian Painting,* 167-224. Robinson gives his reasoning for the workshop location in "Book-Painting in Transoxiana during the Timurid Period," *Bulletin of the Asia Institute*, New Series, Vol. 5 (1991), 72-74.

[164] Altıer argues that the "big figure" style was practiced in Samarqand at the end of the fifteenth century ("Ṣiban Han dönemi (1500-1510) Özbek kitap sanatı," 218). Robinson bluntly refutes Herat as a possible production site ("Two Illustrated Manuscripts," 96).

[165] Sims, "Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* Commissioned by Princes of the House of Tīmūr," 55.

[166] TSMK R.1549, f.379v.

[167] BL Or. 13859, f.230v, reproduced in Titley, "A Shāhnāma from Transoxiana."

[168] Brend, *Perspectives on Persian Painting,* 196.

illustrations seem like a completely homemade answer to the need for illustrated copies.[169] To her the practitioners of the little-figure style were nomadic artists wandering between Herat and Samarqand, and the style became the preferred and more commonly-applied mode of expression in manuscripts continuing to be illustrated in Herat when Shībānī oversaw it between 1507–10.[170]

These stylistic terms (big and little figure) do not fixate on the quality of execution, nor do they assert one style is older or younger than the other. Altıer suggests these two styles started at around the same time towards the end of the fifteenth century in a second-degree atelier in Herat. This workshop would have functioned in tandem with courtly productions in the same city but produced simpler works for commercial purposes.[171] With political instability in Herat after the fall of the Timurids, Altıer claims both styles "continued to be made for new patrons or some surviving Timurids as Samarkand and Herat came under Uzbek rule" but the small figure style would last longer in the region.[172] Other scholars concur that artists with Timurid training set out to search for new patrons in Herat after the shift in regional dynastic control in 1507.[173] Some artists practicing these styles have also been theorized to have journeyed to the Ottoman and Safavid realms, leaving Herat before Sultan Ḥusain Bāiqarā lost control over it.[174]

The big-figure style used in these commercial manuscripts originated a little earlier than the small-figure style but the styles overlapped and were practiced together around the turn of the sixteenth century. However, the big-figure style ceased around the time Shībānī Khan was killed (1510). The little-figure style seems to have emerged around 1498 as evidenced by other non-*Shāhnāma* manuscripts. Its naiveté and coarseness of execution perhaps points to the political instability in the region with the fall of the Timurids and power struggles between Safavids and Abū'l-Khairids for

---

[169] Altıer, "Şiban Han dönemi (1500-1510) Özbek kitap sanatı," 111.

[170] Ibid., 193, 219.

[171] Ibid., 216.

[172] Ibid., 219.

[173] Porter, "Remarques sur la peinture."

[174] Brend has written a conference paper on the Dihlavī *Khamsa* copies in Istanbul (TSMK mss. H.798, H.799, H.800) exploring this east-to-west migration of artistic talent: "Elements from Painting of the Eastern Islamic Area in Early Ottoman Manuscripts of the Khamseh of Amir Khusrau Dihlavi," in *Proceedings of the 9th International Congress of Turkish Art,* vol. 3 (1991): 423-48. Elsewhere she repeats her fascinating but unsubstantiated premise that the painters of the little-figure manuscript H.799 was "an immigrant in the Ottoman world [… which] would mean that painters were leaving Herat before it fell to the Uzbegs in 1507, perhaps in anticipation of this event, or perhaps because they were already experiencing a diminution of patronage. Had they perhaps learned that confrères who had left earlier were managing to make a living in Constantinople?" (*Perspectives on Persian Painting*, 152, 157).

control of Herat and broader Khurasan lasting until 1510. Despite its being "second-rate," Robinson labelled the style "Proto-Bukhara." In it, he found that it presaged another style that was perfected and practiced after ʿUbaidullāh Khan brought artists and scribes from Herat to Bukhara in 1529 (the subject of Chapter 2).[175]

The only *Shāhnāma* specimen from our group with all illustrations done in a uniform hand is TSMK H.1509. It is undated but is posited to have been produced in 1480 based on the big-figure style of its depictions.[176] KMM 5986 and BL Or. 13859 have compositions in the big-figure style and are thought to derive influence from H.1509 which is held to have been the earliest production in the group. Stray pages from one or more dispersed *Shāhnāma*s in this same elegant style attest to the production of even more manuscripts which no longer exist in bound form. The LACMA folio depicts Sām recognizing his son (fig. 1),[177] and the detached DMA folio in the big-figure style has illustrations from the reign of Bahrām Gūr which appear on its recto and verso.[178] The side with Bahrām Gūr slaying a dragon (fig. 2) is nearly identical to the folio of the same scene in KMM 5986 (fig. 3).[179] Two folios in Geneva (MAH) have little-figure illustrations from the reign of Kai Kāvūs (fig. 4).[180] We cannot know whether these loose pages came from manuscripts in a single style or in combination with big-figure components.

It is problematic to derive connections based on folio size given that trimming and resizing were actively carried out in repairs and modifications, which poses the question: how many millimeters' difference does it take to claim a common workshop and place of production? Putting this query aside, the KMM and BL manuscripts contain both the big-figure and little-figure styles and have the same measurements: the KMM copy measures 32x20 cm as does the BL copy. TSMK mss. H.1509 and R.1549 both measure 33x23 cm. The nearly identical dimensions make these intact manuscripts appear to be from the same late-Timurid workshop which was responsible for sizing and scribing. Most

---

[175] Robinson, *Fifteenth-century Persian Painting: Problems and Issues,* 57.

[176] Güner İnal posits a date range between 1460–90 in "Topkapı Müzesindeki Hazine 1509 No. LU Şehname'nin Minyatürleri," *Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı / Journal of Art History* 3 (1970): 197-220.

[177] Acc. no. M.73.5.409.

[178] DMA acc. no. K.1.2014.128.A-B (formerly III.194-195 in older published literature on the materials). Other folios from a Jāmī *Yūsuf u Zulaikhā* in this style are in the same collection (DMA acc. no. K.1.2014.129 and K.1.2014.130, formerly III.196-197).

[179] The Cambridge Shāhnāma Project database gives its folio number as 346v although it is (incorrectly) bound near f.691.

[180] MAH nos. 1991-107/429 and 1971-107/431. Their 24x36 cm dimensions are close to those in the manuscript group.

of the copies would have illustrative programs begun or completed there as well. The illustrative programs to the KMM and BL manuscripts are not uniform and both contain folios with images in the little-figure style. To Robinson, these little-figure illustrations are "unskilled and untutored efforts to imitate [Bihzād's] Herat style of the time, executed shortly before the Herat painters themselves arrived in Bukhara to teach it correctly" after ʿUbaidullāh brought them there in 1529.[181]

III.iii. Palimpsestic TSMK R.1549

A *Shāhnāma* manuscript in the Topkapı (TSMK R.1549) contains no big-figure illustrations, but rather most of its illustrations are in the little-figure style. R.1549's illustration of Bahrām Gūr killing the dragon (fig. 5) follows the same organizational layout of the illustration to Gushtāsp killing a similar sinuous serpent in BL Or. 13859 (fig. 6), but the latter contains fewer figures. BL Or. 13859 has the scene of Mazdak's torture prior to his death (f.336v) in which he is suspended by his feet with his robes falling around him and his legs exposed; Żaḥḥāk is similarly punished and chained upside down to Mount Damāvand in R.1549 (f.19v). Where he is depicted in the "little figure" style, Rustam in BL Or. 13859 manuscript does not appear to wear his distinctive wild-cat helmet. Rustam in the "little figure" style of R.1549 however does (fig. 7), but this is a later addition overpainted by artists outside of Transoxiana. Some other illustrations in R.1549 bear figures wearing distinctive Safavid *tāj-i ḥaidarī* turbans that point to the manuscript's transit westwards where empty picture spaces were filled in by early-sixteenth century artists affiliated with Tabriz (fig. 8).[182] Some of the little figures attributed to Transoxiana bear overpainting and retouching by these painters. One senses a corrective approach in their particular concern to refashion Rustam to suit their own tastes in terms of his feline helmet and garb. It would be logical that R.1549 was taken after Ismāʿīl's victory over the Abū'l-Khairids when the Safavids seized Herat in 1510, for it is known that many manuscripts following this victory were transported to the Safavid capital in Tabriz. With regard to R.1549, Altıer suggests illustrations in this second style were added at this point in Safavid Tabriz. But its peregrinations did not cease there, and an examination of its continued transit offers a clue into the fuller provenance of the object more than a stylistic reading supports.

---

[181] Robinson, "Two Illustrated Manuscripts," 95-96.

[182] This Safavid headwear is distinguishable in ff.47a, 207b, 229b, 286a, 326b.

Following Ottoman victories over the Safavids in Chaldiran in 1514, manuscripts that were owned by Safavid royalty were taken to Istanbul along with Tabrizi artists.[183] It is actually these artists originally trained in the Safavid capital who could have added several complete illustrations and retouched the pages of R.1549, demonstrable in the distinctive Safavid *tāj-i ḥaidarī* turban used in some of the illustrations. I posit that these artistic interventions contributing to the work of late-Timurid scribes and early Abū'l-Khairid artists were carried out in Istanbul workshops in the 1530s through 1540s, and have a visual resonance to a *Khamsa* of Niẓāmī (TSMK H.764) and the aforementioned *Shībānī-nāma* manuscript of Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ which will all be analyzed in-depth in the next chapter.

When analyzing manuscripts containing multiple styles within its covers, it is valid to question whether they are contemporaneous interventions done by multiple artists working in the same atelier. This does not seem to be the modus operandi of the Ottoman nakkaşhane, and Ayşin Yoltar has demonstrated how painters in the Ottoman realm were already refurbishing manuscripts during the late fifteenth to the early sixteenth century. These "illustrators could have chosen unfinished manuscripts to show their talents, perhaps in order to be hired at the court or to be given a reward."[184] Using Yoltar's analysis, I posit that R.1549 was written out in late-Timurid Herat, some little-figure illustrations were later added by early Abū'l-Khairid artists, then the manuscript was brought to a workshop in Istanbul after the Ottoman victory over the Safavids at Chaldiran in 1514, where its illustrations were completed three to four decades later by artists seeking to

> …present illustrated manuscripts to the sultan or other dignitaries at the court in order to receive gifts or to ensure future employment. A newly copied manuscript could have been presented by the calligrapher himself, but an already copied work that was not fully illustrated might have been presented by an illustrator alone since it would have given him a chance to add his own miniatures and participate in this gift-reward system.[185]

Other codicological clues hint at the manuscript's further movements, and R.1549 bears later ownership seals of Sultan Selim II (r. 1566–74) and Osman III (r. 1754–57) which mean the object

---

[183] Fariba Zarinebaf-Shahr's research on pay-lists to artists in the Topkapı palace archives is very illuminating. Read the section on "Tabrizi diaspora artists in Istanbul" in her article: "Cross-Cultural Contacts in Eurasia: Persianate Art in Ottoman Istanbul," in *History and Historiography of Post-Mongol Central Asia and the Middle East: Studies in Honor of John E. Woods*, eds. Judith Pfeiffer and Shohleh A. Quinn (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2006), 535-40. Another study of some artists and manuscripts taken from Tabriz to Istanbul is in Uğur, *The Reign of Sultan Selim I in the Light of the Selim-Name Literature*. Zeren Tanındı also alludes to archival sources that affirm immigrant artists "from Tabriz and other cities in Iran are known to have resided in Amasya prior to being enlisted at the court workshop in Istanbul" ["Arts of the Book: the Illustrated and Illuminated Manuscripts Listed in ʿAtufi's Inventory", in *Treasures of Knowledge An Inventory of the Ottoman Palace Library (1502/3–1503/4)* (Leiden, Brill: 2019), 230].

[184] Ayşin Yoltar, "The Role of Illustrated Manuscripts in Ottoman Luxury Book Production: 1413-1520" (PhD diss., New York University, 2002), 529.

[185] Ibid., 525-26.

ultimately entered and remained in the royal Ottoman collection. In sum, R.1549 is a bit like a portable coloring book, with artists working in various cities and for various dynastic administrations leaving the marks of their labor.

I close this treatment of R.1549 with a related manuscript of another title. A Niẓāmī *Khamsa* (TSMK R.863) dated 1501 has little-figure illustrations from this same time that are similar to the pages in the little-figure style that appear in R.1549 (fig. 9). Women wear an outer robe with long, flowing sleeves over one shoulder and men don tunics with collars lacking buttons. Tufts of vegetation (notably irises), jutting rocks, and startled-looking, big-eyed horses are common details in all of the little-figure illustrations, particularly the *Shāhnāma* manuscripts R.1549 and KMM 5986 that we examined. Ms. R.863 has been suggested to be part of a manuscript group that was produced in Abū'l-Khairid workshops which were later transported by an Abū'l-Khairid ambassador and given to the Ottoman sultan in 1594 and deposited in the Topkapı Palace (this is the subject of Chapter 3).[186] If this is true, then the inclusion of a manuscript in the little-figure style to be given to the head of another empire attests to the value the Abū'l-Khairids afforded to these literary works that were illustrated and assembled at the inception of the Abū'l-Khairid dynasty. Robinson's characterizing them as "unskilled and untutored efforts" was not a view shared by Abū'l-Khairid officials.

IV. The illustrative program of the *Fatḥnāma*

Having properly examined materials and issues relevant to the *Fatḥnāma* we can now fully approach its illustrations. Some of the illustrations to the *Fatḥnāma* have distinct compositional and figural similarities to illustrations in Timurid historical chronicles and *Shāhnāma* illustrations from the Timurid and Turkman realms. To Altıer, its paintings are unique and have their own style suggesting Shībānī had a say in identifying the sections to be illustrated and in preparing the manuscript. The illustrations follow iconographic formulas of *bazm* and *razm* scenes, showing garden entertainments along with the sieges of Samarqand in 1500 and Herat in May 1507. I venture that the very artists of the *Fatḥnāma* might have been those who worked or had trained in the same sub-Herat atelier who produced the Firdausian *Shāhnāma* copies in the big figure style. As was noted above, Shībānī was disdainful of the tales of the *Shāhnāma* and viewed Tīmūr as an interloper. Nonetheless, he seems to have admired the way Timurid artists produced illustrations to these subjects and wanted the same for

[186] Ivan Stchoukine, *Les Peintures des Manuscrits de la 'Khamseh' de Nizami au Topkapi Saray Muzesi d'Istanbul* (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1977), 105-06.

his own manuscript. The first illustration in the *Fatḥnāma* renders the poet Shādī presenting a book to Shībānī Khan (fig. 10), and some venture that the manuscript lying in front of the khan could be a copy of Firdausī's masterpiece which served as a prototype of dynastic chronicles of the Abū'l-Khairids.[187] It is amusing to think that the very big- and little-figure Firdausian *Shāhnāma* manuscripts were admired by Shībānī himself and his contemporaries.

IV.i. Conflating Tīmūr with Shībānī

Tracking the full transit of the Garrett *Ẓafarnāma* (JHUL Garrett 3) from Sultan Ḥusain Mīrzā Bāiqarā's Herat to the library of Johns Hopkins University today is a topic for a separate article; preliminary sleuthing has already been carried out by Mika Natif.[188] However, I would argue that it remained in Transoxiana for a few decades at the onset of the Abū'l-Khairid dynasty, and its elaborate illustrations were fodder for other Abū'l-Khairid manuscript arts across the sixteenth century. More on this will be covered in Chapter 5.

For our present purposes, the *Fatḥnāma* is proof that Bāiqarā's work came into Abū'l-Khairid custody and artists quickly consulted it, or they had access to studies and models of its compositions. Artists tasked with completing the first commissioned illustrations to an Abū'l-Khairid manuscript mined the work for inspiration. The Garrett manuscript has Tīmūr's troops attacking the city of Khiva/ Urganj (fig. 11) that mirrors Shībānī's siege of Samarqand (fig. 12) in the *Fatḥnāma*. Crenelated parapets are inhabited by archers taking aim on the flood of troops storming through the tilted opening of the fortress over which the exultation "*yā muffatiḥ al-abwāb*" (O opener of doors) is boldly written on both the Timurid and Abū'l-Khairid arches; does it address God or the military commanders forcing the gates open? Tīmūr's attack on Khiva is also echoed in Shībānī's troops attacking Tatkand (fig. 13). Soldiers battle on a pink plain, with a fierce warrior dressed in blue in the lower section raising his sword to cleave a fleeing horseman on a black and white mount. In both compositions an indigo military standard is raised against the blue sky in the top right corner. In the Garrett *Ẓafarnāma*, Tīmūr surveys the remains of the defeated Qipchaq army in the town of Nerges in Georgia (fig. 14) astride a horse as an attendant concurrently shields him from the sun and extols his nobility by holding a parasol

---

[187] Claimed by Abuseitova and Baranova, *Written Sources on History and Culture of Kazakhstan and Central Asia,* 131.

[188] Mika Natif, "The *Ẓafarnama* [Book of Conquest] of Sultan Husayn Mīrzā," in *Insights and Interpretations,* ed. Colum Hourihane (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2002), 211-28.

over him. So too is Shībānī Khan rendered beneath an umbrella as he leads row upon row of helmeted troops into battle (fig. 12).[189]

In the *Fatḥnāma*'s two garden scenes in which Shībānī Khan sits under a blue patterned umbrella (fig. 10) and with his lover in front of a yurt (fig. 15), the khan and his entourage appear to be patterned on Tīmūr's accession scene in the court of Balkh within the *Ẓafarnāma* (fig. 16). The poet Shādī (fig. 10) kneels wearing a white and black kalpak like the attendant garbed in a khaki-colored robe above Tīmūr. Shībānī's yurt (fig. 15) is a simpler version of Bihzād's elaborately patterned version but in both the smokestacks are partly covered by blue fabric and trees bloom above it in the outdoor setting. Shībānī is able to legitimately sit cross-legged as a marker of his true Chinggisid status, whereas portraiture of Tīmūr must render him bent-kneed to acknowledge his lame leg and also his lesser descent to the noble khan.[190]

IV.ii. Elements of the big-figure style

With regard to the *Fatḥnāma*'s stylistic connections to big-figure *Shāhnāma* illustrations, there are common details in the rendering of cliffs (pastel-colored with little circles around the edges); animals hiding in mountains in the backgrounds; bulbous shrubs and trees; figures wear white conical caps and Mongol crowns. An illustration from TSMK H.1509 depicting a chess game (fig. 17) has particular resonance with the illustration of Shībānī Khan reclining beneath a canopy as the poet Shādī presents his work to him. In both paintings there are the same white conical caps and Mongol crowns, skinny trees, and a square chess board that parallels the placement of a square fountain between kneeling attendants at the bottom of the compositions. Shībānī's warrior posture (fig. 12) might derive from the figure of Isfandiyār killing a dragon in TSMK H.1509 (fig. 18). Shībānī's consort Māh-i Dil receives a letter written by him that is delivered to her by the ambassador Shukur Shīrīn in a composition of the *Fatḥnāma* (fig. 19). She has the same posture as that of Bahrām Chūbīna wearing women's clothes sent by Hurmuzd in TSMK H.1509 (fig. 20). Māh-i Dil's female attendants adopt similar poses and wear contrasting colors as do female characters in KMM 5986.

---

[189] These helmeted rows resemble an illustration in the Baysunghur *Shāhnāma* from Herat, 1430 (KMM 716, f.109v).

[190] Necipoğlu draws attention to the Turco-Mongol practice in which "the frontal cross-legged position was reserved for ruling members of the Chingiz Khanid dynasty[.] …Minor princes were depicted seated with one bent knee, and vassals were represented kneeling sideways on both knees, a submissive posture signifying homage" ("Word and Image: Ottoman Sultans in Comparative Perspective," 25).

IV.iii. Turkman connections

I have demonstrated how the illustrations to the *Fatḥnāma* bear the traces of artists originally working in Timurid workshops who went on to serve the new Abū'l-Khairid overlords in the region, but Turkman modes of depiction also appear to have directly contributed to several compositions within the *Fatḥnāma*. A Firdausian *Shāhnāma* held by the Istanbul Museum of Turkish and Islamic Art (TIEM 1945) that was scribed in Yazd in 1451 contains several illustrations that are inexplicably echoed in the *Fatḥnāma*. Figures in the TIEM manuscript can be isolated and found regrouped in the *Fatḥnāma*'s picture scheme. The figure leaning on a staff with a short-crowned black and white kalpak is garbed in yellow in the TIEM folio (fig. 21) with Bizhan brought before Afrāsiyāb.[191] This leaning man is also rendered in the *Fatḥnāma* composition in which Shībānī Khan sits with his lover in front of a yurt (fig. 15); he will reappear in an illustration attributed to Khurasan in the 1570s which will be treated in Chapter 4. The general composition to this same *Fatḥnāma* illustration with a seated attendant in yellow kneeling before a cross-legged noble on a red pillow with arm outstretched and a pair of golden ewers on a low table before him is also in the TIEM manuscript (fig. 22) in the scene in which Bahrām Gūr marries Ārzū, the daughter of Mahiyār the jeweler.

Close parallelism in the TIEM *Shāhnāma* and the *Fatḥnāma* is also visible in the folio in which Sulṭān Maḥmūd Bahādur brings the bound prisoner Muḥammad Mazīd to Shībānī Khan seated beside a sinuous purple-blossomed tree (fig. 23).[192] It resonates with the TIEM folio showing Bizhan brought before Afrāsiyāb (fig. 21): a prisoner with head bent in submission and flowering Judas tree (*arghuvān*) divides the captive from the seated arbiter. As for the battle scenes in the *Fatḥnāma*, the right side of the double spread depicting Shībānī's battle near the fortress of Tatkand (fig. 13) has rows of helmeted soldiers on horseback and players of *karnāi* (long trumpets) as there are in the TIEM's depiction of a full-scale battle between the armies of Iran and Turan (fig. 24). Shībānī on horseback beneath an imperial parasol is similar to an Iranian warrior in the act of smiting in the TIEM *Shāhnāma*.

Some scholars have remarked on Turkman artistic elements in the *Fatḥnāma.* Altıer looks at the vegetation and simple compositions in it as evidence of designs transferring from late-fifteenth century

---

[191] The figure again appears in red as Iskandar visits Qaidāfa disguised as a messenger (TIEM 1945, f.336r).

[192] Allworth gives information on Amir Muḥammad Mazīd Tarkhān, the governor of the Otrar district in Turkistan. He opposed Shībānī with superior numbers but Shībānī Khan's brother Maḥmūd Bahādur Sulṭān knocked him from his saddle and took him prisoner. Exhibiting magnanimity, Shībānī treated Mazīd well, forgave his sins, and took Mazīd's daughter as his wife (*The Modern Uzbeks*, 55). Simply put, "Mazīd Tarkhān was the key to the conquest of the cities of Turkestan" (Levi and Sela, "Zubdat al-athar: The Beginnings of the Shibanid State," 207).

Shiraz and Timurid Herat to the early Abū'l-Khairid workshop responsible for the *Fatḥnāma*'s pictorial scheme.[193] Ashrafi-Aini similarly notes a mid-fifteenth century Shiraz influence on the *Fatḥnāma* but gives no evidence to support her claim.[194] How then can one explain the visual transference between mid- to late-fifteenth century Āq Quyūnlū Turkman illustrations and those produced in Abū'l-Khairid Samarqand in the first decade of the sixteenth century? The answer seems to be a bit circuitous due to Timurid and Turkman painting being related to one another; unravelling them seems to be a futile task. It has been established that in the mid fifteenth century there were artistic peregrinations and stylistic exchanges across centers after the death of Shāh Rukh in 1447 which would break up the region into Timurid and Turkman-controlled domains. Norihito Hayashi has researched commercial Turkman styles of painting and has demonstrated how painters working at the Timurid court in Herat left to escape turmoil and pursue patronage elsewhere, such as Shiraz and Yazd which would later be administered by the Āq Quyūnlū Turkmans.[195] Having examined TIEM 1945, Hayashi reports that it "truly belongs to the Commercial Style of the pre-Turkman period" and "has a lot of elements taken from Timurid Shiraz and Herat paintings…before the mid-fifteenth century."[196] He does not find the artwork to be indigenous to the Turkman tribes, but suggests it evidences the movement of Herati artists at this time. Thus, the TIEM *Shāhnāma* illustrations, the big-figure *Shāhnāma* group, and the *Fatḥnāma* all carry visual vestiges from Herat workshops spanning half a century.

V. The path to the "Bukhara School": Herat—Samarqand—Tashkent—Bukhara

Museums and libraries in the world today frequently eclipse and elide the nuances of Abū'l-Khairid book arts in Transoxiana by indiscriminately ascribing materials to Bukhara. B.W. Robinson originally classified Abū'l-Khairid manuscripts and folios as specimens of a "Bukhara School/ Style."[197] The site has since become a shorthand for the totality of manuscript production in post-Timurid Transoxiana without examining the era and materials fully. When Bukharan manuscript

---

[193] Altıer, "Şiban Han dönemi (1500-1510) Özbek kitap sanatı," 214.

[194] M.M. Ashrafi-Aini, "The School of Bukhara to c. 1550," in *The Arts of the Book in Central Asia,* ed. B. Gray (Colorado: Shambhala UNESCO, 1979), 249-72.

[195] Norihito Hayashi, "The Turkman Commercial Style of Painting: Origins and Developments Reconsidered," *Orient* 47 (2012): 169-89.

[196] Ibid., 183.

[197] Robinson, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Persian Paintings in the Bodleian Library*.

production emerged is a matter of some debate and will be covered in the next chapter, but it was not established in the early part of the sixteenth century. Systems and staff already in place in the previous Timurid dynasty were utilized by early Abū'l-Khairids desiring manuscripts. I concur with other scholars who have stated that the earlier *Fatḥnāma-yi khānī* produced in consultation with Shībānī Khan himself was completed in either Samarqand or Herat before his death in 1510.[198] Its illustrations are the product of practitioners of the big-figure style, that is to say, artists who had formerly worked on commercial Timurid manuscripts in non-courtly Herat workshops but who might have also found employment possibilities to the north in Samarqand and served in this new Abū'l-Khairid center.

Pugachenkova and Galerkina have said the Samarqand studio was not well organized in the beginning as a result of the political instability of the period, and they have also declared there is no record of any workshop in Bukhara producing manuscripts prior to the 1530s.[199] Ebadollah Bahari has also confirmed the lack of evidence for a workshop in Bukhara emerging before the sixteenth century.[200] This seems accurate, for the city would become an important artistic center only after 1529 although it had religious prestige prior to this which continued to grow.

The Abū'l-Khairid appanage system in place during the first half of the sixteenth century was not conducive to centralization or unified workshop practices. It is understood that the Uzbeks in the first decade or two of the sixteenth century were preoccupied with administration but managed to create a suitable environment for book arts. These early elites had no artists of their own to make stylistic contributions so they were the likely customers (not necessarily the patrons) for whom the *Shāhnāma* with small and large figures were produced. In the same fashion, Shībānī Khan had to rely on the talent of his Timurid predecessors to craft his own biographical ruler-*nāma*, and the artists already practicing the big-figure style met with his approval.

V.i. Arts of the book amongst Shībānī's successors (and the conspicuously absent *Shāhnāma*)

In addition to the commercial productions of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* in the early Abū'l-Khairid period, there was courtly interest in the work even if no illustrated copies exist. Shībānī's uncle and successor in Samarqand Kūchkūnchī Khan (r. 1512–30) requested literary works originally in Persian

---

[198] In various publications, Altıer contends Samarqand.

[199] Pugachenkova and Galerkina, *Miniatiury srednei azii*, 42.

[200] Ebadollah Bahari, "The Sixteenth Century School of Bukhara Painting and the Arts of the Book," in *Society and Culture in the Early Modern Middle East: Studies on Iran in the Safavid Period,* ed. Andrew J. Newman (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 252.

to be translated into Turki at his court, but the *Shāhnāma* does not appear to have been among them. Moreover, none of these Turkic materials were illustrated.[201] In this time period, the Uzbeks were still trying to establish a polity in Transoxiana. It cannot be expected that a community which has not yet established its order can be active in artistic patronage. Kūchkūnchī's brother Suyūnch Khwāja governed Tashkent between 1512–25. The Persian intellectual Vāṣifī (b. 1485; d. between 1551 and 1566), a cultured tutor and chronicler, originally worked for Timurid royals and functionaries but upon being forced out of his native Herat —due to the advance of the Shi'ite Safavids after 1510— he then served the new Uzbek administration.[202] He described his stays in Samarqand in 1512 with Kūchkūnchī Khan, then Bukhara in 1513 at the emerging court of ʿUbaidullāh, next in 1515 serving in the appanage of Suyūnch Khwāja Khan in Tashkent.[203] Vāṣifī in 1517 began to write his memoirs, the *Badāyiʿ al-vaqāyiʿ*, which was ultimately completed and dedicated to a son of Kīldī Muḥammad in 1538.[204] Vāṣifī reports that while he was in Suyūnch Khwāja's court in Tashkent a *Shāhnāma* version was read out loud, "presumably in Persian, since he says that the errors made in reading it were 'indescribable.'"[205]

This account makes it seem as though the first generation of Abū'l-Khairid patrons were uncultured marauders spending more time in the saddle than reading a book. Unflattering perceptions of these Abū'l-Khairids stem from Bābur's firsthand account of Shībānī that is often repeated by scholars. Bābur complained Shībānī personally corrected the matchless calligraphy of Mīr ʿAlī Haravī and the marvelous artwork of Bihzād. Subtelny reminds us that this is by no means a neutral source, and although it is equally suspect to claim his talents mirrored those in the Timurid courts as some Soviet scholars did, "the fact remains that Muḥammad Shībānī Khan did make an effort to raise himself

---

[201] For more on early Abū'l-Khairid Turkic literary production and patronage under Kūchkūnchī (r. 1512-31) in Samarqand, consult DeWeese, "Chaghatay literature in the early sixteenth century."

[202] Keith Hitchins' entry "WĀṢEFI, ZAYN-AL-DIN MAḤMŪD," *Encyclopædia Iranica*, enumerates Vāṣifī's peregrinations and achievements.

[203] Subtelny, "Poetic Circle at the Court of the Timurid Sultan Ḥusain Baiqara," 51-52.

[204] A description of the work is in Shahzad Bashir, "Section 4.3: Memoir," in *The Market in Poetry in the Persian World* (Cambridge University Press: 2021), online edition.

[205] Subtelny, "Art and Politics," 145.

to the level of his predecessors" and several of his verses primarily composed in Turki remain.[206] Rather than rendering him as a warrior, art historians (Binyon, Necipoğlu, Sakisian, Subtelny, Schimmel) have remarked how the portrait of Shībānī Khan attributed to Bihzād in the Metropolitan Museum of Art presents him as a cultured figure surrounded by writing accessories and with a pious turban on his head.[207] This testifies to Shībānī's literary background, born to Būdāq Sulṭān who himself was purportedly "an educated person, on whose order extensive translations of Persian works into the Turkic languages were accomplished."[208]

A period account by the Safavid prince Sām Mīrzā (1517–67), whose father Ismāʿīl would go on to slay Muḥammad Shībānī, further attests to Shībānī's literary disposition. Sām Mīrzā depicts Shībānī as "an uncivilised and harsh Turk [but he possessed] talents in most arts, so in geometry and painting [and] he had translated Firdusi's *Shahname* into Turkish."[209] Rather than a question of "if," it is a question of "how" Shībānī originally received and absorbed the tales of the *Shāhnāma,* orally or from circulating manuscript copies. Despite this familiarity, instead of Firdausian passages to incite armies, I remarked above that Shībānī was more interested in Ahmedi's Turkic-language *Eskandar-nâme.* The early Abū'l-Khairids' relationship to Firdausī was one of ambivalence, marked by an awareness of Firdausī's work but lacking a commitment to produce a standard (courtly) illustrated copy of it.

Typifications of Timurids and Abū'l-Khairids as "Turks" as a means to explain their disinterest in Firdausī's Iranophilic *Shāhnāma* overlooks both the Persianate educational training the early leaders

---

[206] Shībānī was recorded to have been educated by an Uighur *bakhshī* (a healer and musical figure), and had studied the Qur'an in Bukhara and the tenets of Sufism with members of the Naqshbandiya order with which he became affiliated (Subtelny, "Art and Politics," 136). Schimmel gives a survey of his poetry in "Some Notes on the Cultural Activity of the First Uzbek Rulers," 152-55. Extant copies of his Turkic works include an intact manuscript of his *Dīvān* (TSMK A.2436), a section in the *Bahru'l-hüdâ* poetic collection written in 1508 (BL Add. 7914), and *Risāla-i maʿārif* (BL Or. 12956) scribed by Sulṭān ʿAlī al-Mashhadī in 1510 which Shībānī wrote for his son Muḥammad Tīmūr in 1508. Altıer notes the didactic purpose of his oeuvre covering religion, morality, education, love and beauty, historical events and his own wars, and mysticism ("Şiban Han dönemi (1500-1510) Özbek kitap sanatı," 209). Further information is in A.J.E. Bodrogligeti, "Muhammed Shaybânî's «Bahru'l- Hudâ»: An Early Sixteenth Century Didactic Qasida in Chagatay," *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 54 (1982): 1-56. Shībānī's composed works have most recently been examined in Samie, "The Shibanid Question."

[207] MMA acc. no. 57.51.29. Allworth comments on Shībānī's tripartite drives: religion, education, ambition (*The Modern Uzbeks*, 52). Bihzād's artistic contributions (or lack thereof) to Abū'l-Khairid arts of the book is a topic worth investigating but will not be taken up here. At present I am skeptical that there was anything directly passed along to the Abū'l-Khairid workshops in-person. I instead find his influential role to be via the illustrations and manuscripts left behind in Herat that were taken and deposited in the Abū'l-Khairid libraries and which were consulted across the sixteenth century.

[208] Abuseitova and Dodkhudoeva, *History of Kazakhstan in Eastern miniatures*, 376. Peter Golden concurs: "In reality, Shībānī Khan was well educated by the standards of his time, and his poetry and prose works earned him respect in the demanding literary circles of the region" in *Central Asia in World History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 106.

[209] The original text is in *Tuḥfa-yi Sāmī*. Quoted in Schimmel, "Some Notes on the Cultural Activity of the First Uzbek Rulers," 152.

received, and the courtly atmosphere in which these leaders lived.[210] Soucek comments on Turco-Mongol elites who were fully literate, reading the *Khamsa* by Niẓāmī in Persian and Navāʾī's Turkic version, Rūmī's *Maṯnavī,* and Firdausī's *Shāhnāma*.[211] Stephen Dale explicitly asserts Shībānī's contemporary Bābur's awareness of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma*, which was only second to the Qur'an in his deployment of passages "used to justify or culturally sanctify his opinions and decisions."[212] Dale states that Bābur's frequent citations of it indicates his acceptance and adoption of the epic as his own. Bābur mined it for pithy aphorisms fitting his political and social observations. The *Shāhnāma* must have been used in the schooling of the grandsons of the great Timurid ruler Ulugh Beg— Kūchkūnchī and Suyūnch Khwāja.[213] Firdausī continued to play a role in Abū'l-Khairid princely education and contributed to the education of Suyūnch Khwāja's son Kīldī Muḥammad Sulṭān in Shahrukhiya (ancient Banakat, in between Tashkent and Khujand today), which he administered prior to leading the Tashkent appanage between 1525–32.[214]

V.ii. The court of Kīldī-Muḥammad in Shahrukhiya and Tashkent

As Vāṣifī served Kīldī Muḥammad, he reports that the ruler wanted to know more about other kings regarded as models, so Vāṣifī told him about the preceding Timurid rulers Bāiqarā, Baysunghur, and Ulugh Beg (who was Kīldī's great-grandfather after all), along with older dynastic heads Anūshīrvān the Sasanian, Ismāʿīl Sāmānī, and Maḥmūd Ghaznavī as models of just leaders. According to Subtelny and Schimmel, what is significant about this list is that "all the rulers mentioned by Vāṣifī belonged to the sedentary Irano-Islamic sphere. No nomadic war-lords here. The heroes of Turan must cede their place to those of Iran as the *Shah-nama*…becomes required reading."[215] But despite this interest, no *Shāhnāma* copy exists that was commissioned by Kīldī Muḥammad.

At the same time Vāṣifī was writing his account in 1517, Kīldī's manuscript patronage had begun even prior to his securing power as evidenced by a copy of Navāʾī's *Navādir-i nihāya* scribed by

---

[210] Gülay Karadağ Çınar writes on the later Abū'l-Khairid ruler ʿAbdullāh Khan's educational background but remarks that the parameters fit "every king of Shibanid Khanate." Education encompassed scientific, religious, military, and linguistic training (in two other languages). Skills in calligraphy and Qur'anic study and the art of war were also fostered ["II. Abdullah Han Özelinde Şeybanî Hanlığında Şehzadelik Kurumu," *Turkish Studies: International Periodical For the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic* 10, no. 5 (Spring 2015): 183-200]. DeWeese also affirms Persian language and literature was part of Muḥammad Shībānī Khan's education ("A Sixteenth-Century Interpretation of the Islamization of the Mongols," 93).

[211] Reported in Soucek, *A History of Inner Asia*, 153.

[212] Stephen F. Dale, "Chapter 12: Indo-Persian Historiography, " in *A History of Persian Literature*, 582.

[213] Their descent was through Ulugh Beg's daughter Rābiʿa Begum.

[214] R.G. Mukminova and A. Mukhtarov, "The Khanate (Emirate) of Bukhara," in *History of Civilizations of Central Asia*, 39.

[215] Subtelny, "Art and Politics," 145.

Sulṭān ʿAlī al-Mashhadī which was originally intended for Sultan Ḥusain Mīrzā Bāiqarā but has a seal suggested to belong to Kīldī, and a date of 1518.[216] This manuscript is important to determine artistic developments in the Abū'l-Khairid realm after Shībānī's demise and demonstrates how the little-figure style went on to have a longer appeal than the big-figure.[217] The style's evolution and transfer to the Tashkent workshops in subsequent decades is visible in the manuscript. Artists (having improved their quality of execution) and/or others made their way from Shībānī's Samarqand to the Tashkent and Shahrukhiya appanages of the bibliophile Kīldī Muḥammad. Other manuscripts associated with Kīldī's patronage show a similar transition from the coarser little-figure style at the onset of the sixteenth century to artistic developments in Tashkent in the 1520s such as a *Kulliyāt* of Navāʾī (NLR Dorn 559, figs. 25-27);[218] *Haft aurang* of Jāmī ca. 1525 (BL IO Islamic 1317); and Kāshifī's *Anvār-i suhailī* ca. 1520s (ARB 9109). There is a refinement that associates Kīldī's manuscripts and others in this modified little-figure style of Tashkent in the 1520s as opposed to Samarqand around the year 1500. The painting style of the Tashkent works differs from the official-aristocratic trend of Samarqand with fewer influences from Timurid traditions and more local innovations.[219] The next period would witness even more pictorial shifts—and in personnel—taking place in the Abū'l-Khairid workshops. Some of the artists of the little-figure style in Tashkent dispersed and went to Bukhara, motivated by new prospects there, and others went back to Samarqand where they could rely on the great khan's commissions; more information on these events and Firdausian *Shāhnāma* and ruler-*nāma* manuscripts produced in the 1530s and 40s will be provided in the next chapter.

---

[216] ARB 1995. The seal does not outright name Kīldī Muḥammad but could bear his formal title: *Abu'l Muẓaffar Sulṭān Muḥammad Bahādur Khān*. Ashrafi-Aini asserts it to be Kīldī's title ("The School of Bukhara to c. 1550," 260), but it could belong to another Abū'l-Khairid relative.

[217] Altıer suggests the little-figure style became more and more refined and elaborate and endured in Abū'l-Khairid manuscripts into the 1520s which is manifested by a *Khamsa* copy of Niẓāmī copied by Sulṭān Muḥammad Nūr in 1527 (TSMK H.785) in "Semerkand Sarayı," 15-16; idem "Şiban Han dönemi (1500-1510) Özbek kitap sanatı," 186.

[218] Ashrafi-Aini (citing the earlier scholars Pugachenkova and Rempel') suggests these illustrations were done by the artist Jalāl al-Dīn Yūsuf, mentioned in Vāṣifī's testimony (Ashrafi, *Bekhzad,* 130). In another publication, she mentions the name Jamāl al-Dīn and another artist ʿĀbid working under the chief librarian Maulānā Hajjī Muḥammad ("The School of Bukhara to c. 1550," 260).

[219] Pugachenkova and Galerkina, *Miniatiury srednei azii*, 42. Further information on the connection between Kīldī Muḥammad and Kāshifī is found in Galerkina, *Mawarannahr Book Painting,*11-12.

VI. Conclusion

The foundations of Abū'l-Khairid painted arts were not laid in Bukhara, but gradually came into existence by building on earlier Timurid models in Herat that formed two main stylistic strands in early Abū'l-Khairid book arts: the little-figure and big-figure styles. After his conquests, Shībānī spent most of his time in Samarqand, the old seat of Timurid power, and made it his main base. This bolsters the argument that the *Fatḥnāma* was produced there using talent from Herat. Decades ago, Ashrafi-Aini suggested a Bukharan provenance for the *Fatḥnāma*, theorizing that there must have been painting staff already in place during this early Abū'l-Khairid period.[220] But I am skeptical of any attributions to Bukhara so soon in the sixteenth century, as Bukhara was a site of religious scholarship and jurisprudence in the preceding Timurid period and earlier.[221] Without a concentration of courtly artisans, a workshop could not have formed so quickly with the changeover to Abū'l-Khairid control. In the midst of clashes between Timurids, Safavids, and Abū'l-Khairids over the Timurid heartland at the onset of the sixteenth century, the artisans demonstrate that political loyalty was not as strong as employment prospects in this period. The earliest Abū'l-Khairid ruler-*nāma* to be illustrated, the *Fatḥnāma*, conflated the heroics of Shībānī Khan with Tīmūr. The artists' mentality might be summed up in the following: bosses (be they Timurid or their Abū'l-Khairid rivals) come and go, but the need for employment stays the same.

---

[220] Ashrafi-Aini identifies four individual styles within the seven illustrations to the *Fatḥnāma*, but does not detect the participation of any Herat masters in their production ("The School of Bukhara to c. 1550," 250). To her, a Hātifī *Shīrīn u Khusrau* (BLO Ouseley 19) is from the same workshop as the *Fatḥnāma,* but to Altıer and myself the Hātifī manuscript is in the little-figure style; not the *Fatḥnāma*'s big-figure type of depiction.

[221] Maria Eva Subtelny, "The Making of *Bukhara-yi Sharif*: Scholars and Libraries in Medieval Bukhara (The Library of Khwaja Muhammad Parsa)," in *Studies on Central Asian History in Honor of Yuri Bregel,* ed. Devin DeWeese (Bloomington, Ind.: Research Institute for Inner Asian Studies, 2001), 79-111.

Chapter 2

Artisanal and material migrations between Khurasan and Transoxiana, and from the Uzbeks to the Ottomans (1530–1557)

The second phase of Abū'l-Khairid manuscript production attests to the solidification of state power in Transoxiana and the increasing importance of Bukhara as an artistic and political center. The start date —1530— corresponds to the outcome of the Battle of Jam. There, the Safavid shah Ṭahmāsp I defeated Shībānī Khan's nephew, the military leader ʿUbaidullāh Khan (in power between 1512–39, officially great khan between 1533–39).[222] Prior to this Safavid victory, Abū'l-Khairid Uzbeks seized Mashhad and took Herat for a second time following the death of Shībānī Khan, occupying Khurasan between 29 October 1529–August 1530.[223] These months are significant because within them there was a migration into the Abū'l-Khairid domain of artists and scribes who had formerly served Safavid patrons. These artisans worked in ʿUbaidullāh's Bukhara appanage which rose in grandeur and prestige, so that a new style typified as "transitional Herat-Bukhara" took root in the 1530s and with time disengaged from Timurid influences to become the quintessential "Bukhara style" later in the decade. Compositional and figural formulas established in Bukhara at this time would continue to be deployed through the 1570s in manuscripts produced for ʿAbdullāh b. Iskandar and other political, religious, and military officials.

The endpoint of this chapter's date range coincides with the onset of ʿAbdullāh Khan's power in May 1557. Prior to this, Bukhara under ʿUbaidullāh had become the de facto political equal to the de jure capital in Samarqand. The manuscript objects presented in this chapter were made in the decades during which power was still officially divided across Samarqand and the other appanages of Bukhara, Balkh, Tashkent, and Herat (when this city was under Abū'l-Khairid control); Bukhara, however, had greater prestige than the others. Alongside an examination of the development of the Bukharan kitābkhāna and the *Shāhnāma* and ruler-*nāma* manuscripts produced in them between 1530–1557, we

---

[222] Martin Dickson, "Shah Tahmasp and the Uzbeks: The Duel for Khurāsān with 'Ubayd Khan 930-946/ 1524-1540" (PhD diss., Princeton University, 1958), 129-31.

[223] Bahari, "The Timurid to Safavid Transition in Persian Painting," 157.

will examine contacts between the Abū'l-Khairids and the Ottomans which became strengthened as the century continued.

I. Overview of illustrated Abū'l-Khairid manuscript production between 1530–1557

After Shībānī Khan's death in 1510, Herat came to be squarely in the hands of the Safavids. Western Khurasan became a fully integrated Safavid province headed by Sām Mīrzā as its dynastic representative. Khurasan was officially Shiʿite but sectarian problems were not yet resolved.[224] Launching his military career by forcing the Timurid dynast Bābur out of Samarqand for good in 1512, Shībānī's nephew ʿUbaidullāh became head of the Bukharan appanage that same year. In the years up to 1529 there was no manuscript production in Bukhara, and artistic activities in Herat would not contribute to Abū'l-Khairid manuscript production again until 1529.

I.i. ʿUbaidullāh's Bukhara pre-1529

Chapter 1 §V overviewed the active Abū'l-Khairid centers translating, copying, and illustrating Persian and Turkic materials in the first two decades of the sixteenth century; I noted that Bukhara was not part of this industry in this period. Illustrations in the little-figure style adorned manuscripts finished in the 1520s for Kīldī Muḥammad when he was in Tashkent and Shahrukhiya. This style, local to Transoxiana, continued to be practiced in Bukhara in the 1530s and would merge with the refinement of Herat following an exodus of scribes and artists.

ʿUbaidullāh had refrained from raiding or attempting to seize Khurasan until 1521, but the chance came to vex the Safavids that spring in Herat. More opportunities arose following Shah Ismāʿīl's death in May 1524 and his ten-year-old son Ṭahmāsp's ascending the throne the following month. ʿUbaidullāh's many strategic moves to take Herat between 1525–29 coincided with Safavid instability and court intrigue as qizilbāsh groups vied to be the young monarch's regents and counselors. During the Abū'l-Khairids' successive raids, Shībānī Khan's successor as great khan Kūchkūnchī (r. 1514–30) had the temerity to send a letter to the governor of Herat acknowledging the difficult position the Safavids were in to be concurrently resisting Uzbeks, Ottomans, and internal

[224] Dickson, "Shah Tahmasp and the Uzbeks," 46.

enemies. It read: "If you surrender Herat to us, you will be rewarded with any part of Turan you may desire and you will be enrolled among the great *umarāʾ* [chiefs] of the Uzbek realm."[225]

At the same time as these events, Abū'l-Khairid Uzbeks were defining themselves as increasingly differentiated from Qazaqs and the ʿArabshāhid Khwarazmians despite having common Jūchid–Shībānid origins and traditions.[226] Abū'l-Khairids and ʿArabshāhids had rival ambitions with regard to Khurasan: Khwarazmians were concerned with raiding and launching sporadic attempts to hold strategic border towns, while Abū'l-Khairids sought direct annexation of the broader region and were the more serious threat to Safavid power.[227] A final attack lasting 1528–29 was officially an Abū'l-Khairid political loss, yet resulted in great artistic gains.

I.i.a. Artistic exodus from Herat

On the morning of 24 September 1528 at the Battle of Jam, Shah Ṭahmāsp defeated ʿUbaidullāh Khan and other appanage heads near Nishapur partly due to superior fire power and advancements learned after the Battle of Chaldiran in 1514. Jam made the Uzbeks conscious of their military inferiority despite ample troops being drawn from the main Abū'l-Khairid appanages. There were also Chaghataid, Qazaq, and Qirghiz contingents.[228] Having the finest kitābkhāna out of all the appanages up to this point, Kīldī Muḥammad also took part in the military campaign but in the process of waging—and losing— this war, there came about a decline in cultural life and artistic creations in his court.[229] The battle at Jam spurred the evacuation of artisans from the Tashkent kitābkhāna to ʿUbaidullāh's Bukhara even before Kīldī's death in 1532. These practitioners of the little-figure style in Tashkent brought with them studies and visual aids to assist in producing similar illustrations in ʿUbaidullāh's Bukhara court workshop.[230]

After leaving Jam, Ṭahmāsp busied himself with the other flank to his empire and waged war in Baghdad. The Abū'l-Khairids took advantage and seized Mashhad and occupied Herat for a third time,

---

[225] Dickson is uncharacteristically remiss in improperly citing the location of this letter, but it is perhaps located in *Afżal al-Tavārīkh* by Fażlī Isfahānī (BL Or. 4678) ("Shah Tahmasp and the Uzbeks," 59-60).

[226] Anooshahr, *Turkestan and the Rise of Eurasian Empires*, 86, 88.

[227] Dickson, "Shah Tahmasp and the Uzbeks," 23.

[228] Information on the battle in Dickson, "Shah Tahmasp and the Uzbeks," 129-31.

[229] Ashrafi-Aini, "The School of Bukhara to c. 1550," 262. Dickson confirms Kīldī Muḥammad fought in the right flank at the Battle of Jām ("Shah Tahmasp and the Uzbeks," 132).

[230] Ashrafi, *Bekhzad*, 236.

lasting between October 1529 through August 1530. ʿUbaidullāh intended to remain in Khurasan although he did not have the full authority to do so as he had not yet been made great khan. These disturbances in Herat in the late 1520s might have factored into artisans' amenability to transfer to centers offering greater stability. The months of the Abū'l-Khairid occupation of Herat between 1529–30 are significant because there was a migration into Bukhara of artists and scribes who had formerly served Safavid patrons in Khurasan.[231] The arrival of these scribes, illuminators, and painters officially marks the start of the "Bukhara School" as ʿUbaidullāh's raids on Herat functioned to replenish the Abū'l-Khairid libraries in terms of staff and materials.

Russian-speaking scholars mainly prefer a "nativist" interpretation of Bukhara's formation as a major center of manuscript production coming from within Transoxiana (and not Safavid Iran).[232] These art analysts assert that the origins of the Bukharan kitābkhāna came from Abū'l-Khairid artists working in Tashkent who relocated to Bukhara, with some also emigrating to Samarqand where they continued to paint in the same styles and reused subjects (this will be debated in §III.ii.c). The best of these masters were taken into the service of ʿUbaidullāh in Bukhara.[233] Other scholars emphasize the role of personnel and materials taken from Herat and the Safavid sphere during ʿUbaidullāh's skirmishes in the region, declaring that these undeniably contributed to manuscript production in his Bukharan appanage.[234] My interpretation combines these two analytical strains to assert: Bukharan manuscript production fully emerged in the 1530s from an artistic marriage of artisans having previously worked in Abū'l-Khairid appanages in Samarqand and Tashkent, and Herat when it was overseen at various times by three dynastic powers (Timurid, Abū'l-Khairid, and Safavid). I hold that Bukhara became the central site in Transoxiana post-1529 for the production of illustrated manuscripts, created anew or by completing materials that were scribed earlier in Herat when the region was ruled by the Timurids. Spaces left for illustrations in these older texts were filled at the whim of Abū'l-Khairid appanage leaders. A "transitional Herat-Bukhara style" would take root in the 1530s and with time disengaged from the earlier Timurid influences in subsequent decades.

---

[231] Porter lists some of the artists taken in "Remarques sur la peinture."

[232] Pugachenkova and Galerkina, *Miniatiury srednei azii*, 42-43; Ashrafi, *Bekhzad*, 141.

[233] Sheila Blair and Jonathan Bloom, eds., "Painting" subsection to "Central Asia," in *Grove Encyclopedia of Islamic Art and Architecture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 406.

[234] Karin Rührdanz, "Die Entwicklung der mittelasiatischen Buchmalerei vom. 15. bis zum 17. Jahrhundert," *Eothen: Jahreshefte der Gesellschaft der Freunde Islamischer Kunst und Kultur* (1998): 113.

ʿUbaidullāh divided his time between his appanage and the main Samarqand capital after ascending the white felt carpet of Abū'l-Khairid sovereignty in 1533 as the great khan, a title which he held until his death in 1540.[235] We will look at some artisans known to have been taken by —or to have followed— ʿUbaidullāh prior to the 1529 exodus and afterwards. An important point to consider in investigating the arrival into the Abū'l-Khairid realm of these artisans formerly serving the Safavids is the degree to which these individuals had agency over their migration. Characterizing the transfer of talent more as an act of Uzbek force than the personal choice of workers in the Herati kitābkhāna tarnishes the Abū'l-Khairids and reinforces their negative reputation amongst scholars and in local communities in Central Asia. 1529 is the date ʿUbaidullāh seized Herat and certain painters and scribes relocated to his appanage center in Bukhara. It was indeed a significant event, but arrivals could have begun earlier and were likely for economic and confessional reasons. The named figures below are just the well-known artisans who crossed dynastic lines and are included to elucidate some points about artistic migration that cannot summarily be typified as acts of dominance and coercion.[236]

Sulṭān ʿAlī al-Mashhadī

The esteemed scribe Sulṭān ʿAlī al-Mashhadī, whose calligraphic style is considered "the classic statement of the eastern, or Khurasani, style of *nastaʿlīq,*" had previously written out lavish manuscripts in Sultan Ḥusain Mīrzā Bāiqarā's Timurid court in Herat.[237] According to the period chronicler Mustafa ʿÂli, Sulṭān ʿAlī's own teacher was Mīr ʿAlī-Shīr Navāʾī.[238] Sulṭān ʿAlī seems to have been perfectly content staying put in Herat and serving the new Abū'l-Khairid administration, and wrote out ʿUbaidullāh's *Dīvān* (under ʿUbaidullāh's pen-name ʿUbaidī) when the Abū'l-Khairids newly conquered the city in 1507.[239] Sulṭān ʿAlī also penned Shībānī Khan's personal writings in the Turkic text *Risāla-yi maʿārif-i Shībānī* in 1510.[240] After Shībānī Khan's death, Sulṭān ʿAlī returned to Mashhad where he died in 1520. In all the centers where he resided, he trained younger scribes who would copy

---

[235] R.D. McChesney, "Zamzam water on a white felt carpet: adapting Mongol ways in Muslim Central Asia, 1550-1650," in *Religion, Customary Law, and Nomadic Technology,* eds. Michael Gervers and Wayne Schlepp (Toronto, 2000), 63-80.

[236] Artisans not presently included but who warrant mentioning are: the scribe Sulṭān Muḥammad Nūr (d. circa 1539) who was the student of Sulṭān ʿAlī al-Mashhadī who worked for Timurid, Safavid, and Abū'l-Khairid patrons in his lifetime.

[237] Blair and Bloom, "Sulṭān 'Ali Mashhadi," in *Grove Encyclopedia*, 256-57. Ashrafi calls him an early "Safavid defector" (*Bekhzad*, 141).

[238] Mustafa ʿÂli, *Epic Deeds of Artists*, 219.

[239] BL Add. 7907. This manuscript's process of completion is discussed by Schimmel, "Some Notes on the Cultural Activity of the First Uzbek Rulers," 161; and Barbara Schmitz, "Miniature Painting in Harāt, 1570-1640" (PhD diss., New York University, 1981), 91.

[240] BL Or. 12956.

works for Abū'l-Khairid patrons. He is an example of an artisan neither leaving by force or on his own accord but instead staying in place to serve multiple dynastic administrations: Timurid, Abū'l-Khairid, and Safavid. Several of his earlier scribed manuscripts that were originally intended for Bāiqarā were taken and later finished and illustrated by Abū'l-Khairid artists in Tashkent and Bukhara in subsequent decades.

Kamāl al-Dīn Bihzād

Bihzād (d. 1535) is similarly purported to have served Timurid, Abū'l-Khairid, and Safavid patrons in that order, and is recorded as having worked for Mīrzā Bāiqarā, Shībānī Khan, and shahs Ismāʿīl and Ṭahmāsp respectively. However, much of the artist's life is unknown or based on anecdotes and unreliable documentation, and his service to the Abū'l-Khairids lacks much evidence.[241] It is unclear by what means he left Herat for Tabriz but it seems to have been in the aftermath of the Safavid victory over the Abū'l-Khairids in 1510. One could say the circumstances were desperate and he was wrested from Khurasan by the Safavids and taken to their capital where he was jealously guarded against the Ottomans during the Battle of Chaldiran.[242] Or, the offer to head Ismāʿīl's kitābkhāna in Tabriz around 1522 carried with it prestige and Bihzād chose to travel there with close relatives and spent his last days in that center.[243] This evinces how the Safavids respected him and accommodated his family; he was enticed into serving the new patrons and not forced. A third scenario is suggested by Bahari who advances the theory that the main Safavid kitābkhāna remained in Herat and it was here Bihzād was its head, later traveling to Tabriz in 1528.[244] Whatever the true circumstances of his relocation, the Safavids are not typically cast as aggressors cruelly extricating the master from his homeland. The Abū'l-Khairids, however, in their similar acquisition of talent are more denigrated. Wherever and whenever Bihzād was displaced from Herat, one thing is clear: his compositions, figures, models, and completed manuscripts were used by artists across the Turco-Persianate realm in Anatolia, Iran, Transoxiana, and India throughout the sixteenth century.

---

[241] Priscilla Soucek, "Kamāl al-Dīn Behzād," *Encyclopædia Iranica*.

[242] The commonly-repeated cave story is found in Mustafa ʿÂli's account.

[243] Bihzād's immigration with his family members is recounted in Soucek, "Kamāl al-Dīn Behzād."

[244] Bahari, "Timurid to Safavid Transition," 158.

Shaikhzāda

Shifting to a second generation of artisans, Mustafa ʿÂli reports Shaikhzāda was a native of Khurasan who studied under Bihzād.[245] Shaikhzāda could have remained with Bihzād in the courtly kitābkhāna in Safavid-administered Herat post-1510, serving there the Timurids, Abū'l-Khairids, and/or Safavids (the sources are not clear). His illustrations to a *Dīvān* of Navāʾī produced for Sām Mīrzā in 1524–27 are his most refined work.[246] However, Shaikhzāda became "a disgruntled Safavid court artist" dissatisfied either on confessional or financial grounds, and it seems he was eager to leave the Safavid workshops.[247] It is reported that Shaikhzāda arrived in Bukhara in 1527 or sometime after 1532, coming on his own accord "in search of more appreciative patrons" who were still enamored of Bihzād's Herat style; Ṭahmāsp was more captivated by innovations currently practiced in his capital Tabriz.[248] Moreover, Shaikhzāda may have been eager to leave behind qizilbāsh infighting taking place in Iran during this same period. The artist is not mentioned in Safavid treatises that give the biographies of painters and scribes employed in courtly workshops. This silence has been interpreted as reflecting Safavid animosity blacklisting former Safavid artists who later served the dynasty's rivals. Although he is thought to have died before he could serve in the courtly workshop of the Bukharan appanage head ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz in the 1540s (to be covered in §I.ii.), Shaikhzāda's broader role in Abū'l-Khairid manuscript arts is significant and it is possible that all artists in Bukhara in the 1530s trained under him.[249] The painter ʿAbdullāh Muṣavvir would be his prized pupil (to be discussed in Chapter 3). The artistic chain of apprenticeship, and perpetuation of Bihzād's techniques, compositions, and figures continued in Transoxiana under Shaikhzāda's tutelage. The three artisans so far introduced—Sulṭān ʿAlī, Bihzād, Shaikhzāda—came from outside the Abū'l-Khairid dynastic sphere but may have served in it on their own accord. Other artisans faced political pressures which resulted in their transferral to Transoxiana.

---

[245] Mustafa ʿÂli, *Epic Deeds*, 264.

[246] The manuscript is in two parts: BNF mss. Sup Turc 316 and 317. It was scribed by ʿAlī Hijrānī between 1524–27.

[247] Barbara Schmitz, *Islamic Manuscripts in the New York Public Library* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 58.

[248] Ṭahmāsp's preferences are stated in Anthony Welch, *Artists for the Shah: Late Sixteenth Century Painting at the Imperial Court of Iran* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976), 175.

[249] Suggested by Akimushkin, et al., "The Shaybanids (Bukhara, 1500–98) and the Janids (Astarkhanids) (Bukhara, 1599–1753)," 582.

Mīr ʿAlī Ḥusainī al-Haravī

The Safavid chronicler Qāżī Aḥmad reports that Mīr ʿAlī (1476–1544) was born in Herat but he grew up in Mashhad, later returning to Herat to study under the scribal master Sulṭān ʿAlī Mashhadī when the latter served in Bāiqarā's court.[250] Mīr ʿAlī remained in Herat while it was overseen by the Safavid administrators Ḥusain Khān Shāmlū and Sām Mīrzā before he was taken to Bukhara by ʿUbaidullāh along with other notables of the city in 1529. The acquisition of these artisans is frequently phrased as abduction, which is supported by Mīr ʿAlī's personal drafting of a poem lamenting his enforced stay in Bukhara due to his coveted scribal skills.[251] Mīr ʿAlī arrived with some of his pupils trained as scribes, illuminators, and painters, and he was appointed director of ʿUbaidullāh's kitābkhāna.[252] Those accompanying Mīr ʿAlī on the journey from Herat to Bukhara might have been the scribe Maḥmūd b. Muḥammad al-Balkhī whom we will examine in the coming §III.i.[253] Another *shāgird* (pupil) with a more illustrious career was Mīr Ḥusain Ḥusainī (Kulangī) originally from Nasaf. Kulangī's earliest work dates to 1535 and the latest that survives is from 1585. Kulangī would go on to be the third official kitābdār of the Bukharan workshops, serving Naurūz Aḥmad and ʿAbdullāh Khan (covered in Chapter 3 §II), as well as Akbar in India (the subject of Chapter 5 §V.ii).[254]

Just as Mīr ʿAlī was taken to Bukhara, so too were several manuscripts that he had previously written out and signed transported from Herat to ʿUbaidullāh's kitābkhāna. There, illustrations were added during the scribe's lifetime and after his death. Few manuscripts copied by Mīr ʿAlī name ʿUbaidullāh as the patron; perhaps he was distracted by his administrative duties as great khan in Samarqand after 1533. More manuscripts reflect the scribe working for and tutoring ʿUbaidullāh's son ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz while the prince was heir to and later head of the Bukharan appanage.[255] Mīr ʿAlī taught

---

[250] Biographical information in Blair and Bloom, "Mir 'Ali Husayni Haravi," in *Grove Encyclopedia*, 536. I can affirm additional information about the whereabouts of his grave also cited by the period chronicler Nisārī: he is buried at the foot of the mausoleum for the Kubrawiyya Sufi shaikh Saif al-Dīn Bākharzī in the Fathobod neighborhood, outside the main tourist center of Lab-i Hauz in Bukhara. My sincere thanks to Ashraf Khodjaev and Komiljon Rahimov for sharing with me this information and leading me on a pilgrimage there. The date of his death is either 1550 or 1544, with the latter more accepted.

[251] Abolala Soudavar states ʿUbaidullāh "forcibly took the celebrated calligrapher Mīr ʿAlī from Herat to Bokhara, where he was compelled to remain until his death" [*Art of the Persian Courts: Selections from the Art and History Trust Collection* (New York: Rizzoli, 1992), 205]. The original text to the poem is in Vladimir Minorsky, trans., *Calligraphers and Painters: A Treatise by Qadi Ahmad, son of Mir Munshi (circa A.H. 1015/1606)* (Freer Gallery of Art Occasional Papers, 1959), 130-31.

[252] Bregel, "Abu'l-Khayrids"; McChesney, "CENTRAL ASIA VI. In the 16th–18th Centuries."

[253] A list of pupils taught by Mīr ʿAlī is given in App. B, no. 39 in Mustafa ʿÂli, *Epic Deeds*, 455.

[254] Maria Szuppe provides information on the scribe Kulangī in "The Family and Professional Circle of Two Samarkand Calligraphers of Persian Belles-Lettres Around the Year 1600 (circa 1010 AH)," *Eurasian Studies* 15 (2017): 345.

[255] Firuza Melville, "Hilali and Mir 'Ali: Sunnis among the Shi'is, or Shi'is among the Sunnis between the Shaybanids, Safavids and the Mughals," *Iran* 59, no. 2 (2021): 249.

many additional non-royal students during his residencies in Herat and Bukhara, and he allowed them to use his signature on their own compositions, which explains the abundance of works ascribed to him.[256] What is notable is that these pupils would serve in multiple dynastic provinces spanning Bukhara, Samarqand, Kashmir, Kirman, Yazd, and Tabriz, which further testifies that artistic practices —although connected— maintain a certain autonomy apart from politics. Many of Mīr ʿAlī's works were later collected by Mughal rulers, with the manuscripts' transfer and modifications indicated through markings that enhanced their cultural prestige in India (more on this in Chapter 5 §V.i.).[257]

Maḥmūd Muẕahhib

Besides Mīr ʿAlī, the other most notable artisan taken by ʿUbaidullāh was Mīr ʿAlī's pupil Maḥmūd Muẕahhib (d. circa 1560), although he too does not seem to have contributed to manuscript productions for the Abū'l-Khairid military leader. The period chronicler Mīrzā Ḥaidar Dūghlāt (1499–1551) attests that the illuminator was active in Bāiqarā's Herat where he completed a portrait of the poet Mīr ʿAlī-Shīr Navāʾī. Maḥmūd Muẕahhib later participated in royal manuscript production for Safavid princes in Herat, then in Bukhara he frequently collaborated with Shaikhzāda and Mīr ʿAlī on manuscript productions.[258] Their refined, ornate compositions initiated an exquisite second phase of Abū'l-Khairid artistic production spanning the 1530s through early 1550s. Alongside illustrations to manuscripts common in the Persian literary canon, his signature appears on loose folios produced in the 1540s that were assembled into albums currently in the Topkapı Palace Library.[259] Earlier scholars mistakenly confused Shaikhzāda with Maḥmūd Muẕahhib but this has been corrected in recent studies.[260] Little identifiable illumination remains that is definitively executed by Maḥmūd Muẕahhib,

---

[256] Information on the economic valuation of Mīr ʿAlī's *qiṭʿa* (calligraphic specimens) is reported by Mustafa 'Âli writing in the late-16th century as fetching 5-6 thousand *akçe* per piece while one of Sulṭān ʿAlī's garnered 4-5 thousand (Blair and Bloom, "Mīr ʿAlī Husainī Harawī," in *Grove Encyclopedia of Islamic Art and Architecture,* 536). Jan Schmidt has found documentation from the early 17th century that a *Shāhnāma* copy was priced at two thousand *akçe* (small silver coin), which is relative to the following daily salaries: 3 *akçe* for a daily laborer, 15 *akçe* for a provincial mullah, 500 *akçe* for a court physician ["The Reception of Firdausi's *Shahnama* Among the Ottomans," in *Shahnama Studies II*, 127].

[257] Balafrej, *The Making of the Artist in Late Timurid Painting*, 222.

[258] Reputable biographical information on the artist found in Porter, "Remarques sur la peinture"; and Mustafa Sümer, "Bir Özbek Nakkaşı Mahmut Müzehhip ve Yayınlanmamış Yeni Minyatürleri," in *Bedrettin Cömert'e Armağan,* ed. Özel Sayi (Hacettepe University Press, Ankara, 1980), 471-80.

[259] Topkapı (TSMK) albums and manuscripts bearing his work are the following: R.1964, EH.2841, H.2169, H.2139, H.2142, H.2162, H.2155, H.2168, H.2161, H.2154 [Zeren Tanındı, "Safevī, Özbek ve Osmanlı İlişkisinin Kitap Sanatına Yansıması: Bir saray albümü ve Şeyhzâde Nakkaş," in *Filiz Çağman'a Armağan* (Istanbul: Lâle Yayıncılık, 2018), 582].

[260] A. Sakisian and Ebadollah Bahari mistakenly conflated Shaikhzāda with Maḥmūd Muẕahhib leading to scholarly confusion. This error has been explicitly corrected by the following scholars: Tanındı, "Safevī, Özbek ve Osmanlı İlişkisinin Kitap Sanatına Yansıması, 580; Abolala Soudavar, "Section VI. Shaykhzadeh vs. Mahmud-e Mozahheb," in *Reassessing Early Safavid Art and History: Thirty-Five Years after Dickson & Welch 1981* (Houston: Abolala Soudavar, 2016), 65-73.

but Soudavar sums up his oeuvre as being Bukharan between 1545 and the 1560s. The final work that bears his name (either a signature or an attribution) is dated 1565, and he likely died in Bukhara.[261]

I.i.b. Motivations for migration

It is striking that all of the above scribes and painters lived in an age that accommodated a range of dynastic servitude. All of them worked in courtly Timurid, Safavid, and Abū'l-Khairid kitābkhāna settings either due to convenience, choice, or force. The decision to remain in Herat or to go to Bukhara has been interpreted by scholars through the lenses of politics and religion, but this is a simplistic explanation of cross-dynastic transit. It is true that sectarian tension was on the rise in the rhetoric of rulers, but its manifestation in day-to-day affairs in the first few decades of the sixteenth century is another matter. According to Dūghlāt, Bukhara under ʿUbaidullāh was reminiscent of Bāiqarā's Herat in decades prior.[262] The similarity between the centers must have been comforting to the émigrés arriving in Bukhara from Herat. We cannot be certain that an artisan made a conscious decision to take a pro-Sunni stance and go to Bukhara to serve the Abū'l-Khairids, or conversely decided to align himself with the Shiʿite cause and relocate to the Safavid capital in Tabriz. Bukhara's proximity to Herat compared to far-off Tabriz might have been another motivating factor; perhaps it did not take much coercion and force to have an artistic master of Khurasani origin venture to the Abū'l-Khairid realm if local employment opportunities in Khurasan were becoming untenable. Thus, geography could have played a greater role in deciding to relocate than political and confessional adherence.

All of the mentioned scribes and illustrators assisted in the creation of the most elite and lavish manuscripts of Abū'l-Khairid patronage. The books most favored, arranged in the order of their frequency of production, are: Jāmī's *Khamsa* (in complete form or single stories); Saʿdī's *Gulistān* and *Būstān*; Niẓāmī's *Makhzan al-asrār*; Navāʾī's *Khamsa* and *Dīvān*; Hātifī's *Haft manẓar*; and works by Amīr Khusrau Dihlavī. These surviving manuscripts confirm that the Abū'l-Khairids were modeling their patronage of classical Persian and Turkic poetry on Timurid archetypes and those of their contemporaries in Safavid and Ottoman realms.

---

[261] Maḥmūd Muẕahhib's final collaboration on a manuscript is a *Yūsuf u Zulaikhā* of Jāmī dated 1565 copied by Maḥmūd b. Isḥāq al-Shahhābī al-Haravī. Formerly in the Kevorkian collection, sold at Sotheby's 23 April 1979, lot 160.

[262] Ḥaidar Mīrzā's original words and their translation are given in Tārīkh-i Rashīdī: *a History of the Kings of Moghulistan*, trans. Wheeler Thackston (Cambridge: Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, Harvard University, 1996), vol. 1 pp. 233-34 (Persian), vol. 2 pp. 182 (English).

I.ii. Bukhara under ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz Sultan and his *kitābdār* Sulṭān Mīrak

ʿUbaidullāh's son ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz took over the Bukhara appanage and its significant manuscript workshops when he ruled there between 1540–50. Before his governance commenced, he had been briefly installed in Khwarazm following ʿUbaidullāh's victory over the neighboring power in 1538.[263] ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz had to contend with continued disturbances from the Khwarazmians while in Bukhara. These threats were ultimately quelled and the border between Khwarazm and Bukhara was settled by 1542. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz was never made a great khan and thus took the lesser title "sultan" which allowed him to remain in the hub of art and culture in Bukhara. As the Abū'l-Khairid ruler with the most manuscripts declared to be dedicated to him (consult App. 4: Manuscripts produced for ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz and his courtiers ca. 1530s–1550s in the workshop of Sulṭān Mīrak, *kitābdār* of Bukhara), it is clear that his full efforts went into patronage unencumbered by administrative duties in Samarqand. There are manuscripts dedicated to ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz carrying dates prior to his official postings in Urgench (Khwarazm) and Bukhara, which are evidence that his bibliophilic interests started early (App. 4, nos. 1-7). The titles produced for his library belie his Sufi inclinations and predilection for Khwāja Aḥrār's Naqshbandi teachings. The texts most reproduced are Jāmī, Niẓāmī, Navāʾī, and Saʿdī works; Firdausī is glaringly absent. Some are previously scribed titles written out by Sulṭān ʿAlī al-Mashhadī and Mīr ʿAlī al-Ḥusainī when they were in the employ of Sultan Ḥusain Mīrzā Bāiqarā in Herat with illustrations later added. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz ordered these and other late-period Timurid texts from Herat to be remargined and refurbished with Bukharan paintings and rebound. These reused Timurid manuscripts functioned to solidify a "spiritual relationship" between the two ages spanning Bāiqarā's Herat with the new Abū'l-Khairid hub in Bukhara.[264] In addition to these works incorporating older material, complete manuscripts were written and painted anew across the 1540s.

ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz kept the Bukharan workshops busy with his patronage. The period chronicler Ḥasan Niẕārī writing the *Muẕakkir al-aḥbāb* reports Mīr ʿAlī was the chief calligrapher (*mālik al-kuttāb*) in ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz's kitābkhāna up until the scribe's death in 1544.[265] The manuscripts he penned while serving Abū'l-Khairid patrons since 1529 number twenty texts out of the fifty-four total works he

---

[263] Historical context on this particular territorial struggle between Khwarazm–Bukhara, launched during an Abū'l-Khairid–Safavid conflict underway in Khurasan, was mostly settled in 1538 (delineated in Annanepesov, "Relations between the Khanates and with Other Powers," 83-84).

[264] Rührdanz, "Die Entwicklung der mittelasiatischen Buchmalerei," 115.

[265] Porter in "Remarques sur la peinture" and Karin Rührdanz discuss the decade in "The Arts of The Book in Central Asia," in *Uzbekistan Heirs to the Silk Road,* eds. J. Kalter and M. Pavalio (London & New York: Thames and Hudson, 1997), 105.

transcribed since 1500.[266] Maulānā Sulṭān Mīrak al-Munshī (ca. 1500–47) was the first appointed kitābdār to the Bukharan kitābkhāna who was responsible for overseeing ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz's projects, refurbishing Timurid materials, and producing fresh complete copies with stenciled borders and colored papers that were innovations at this time.[267] To Niẖārī, Sulṭān Mīrak acquired calligraphic and painting skills through careful study and practice.[268] Niẖārī reports that all the courtly illuminators and painters in ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz's workshop were comparable to "a second Mānī and better than the sons of Bihzād." The numerous lavish manuscripts he commissioned attest to the productivity of the second generation of Abū'l-Khairid artists trained by Timurid masters. These painters were beginning to craft their own visual idioms deploying figural and compositional formulae that would be reused for the rest of the century to illustrate works of classical Persian and Turkic poetry. These artists included the dominant figures Maḥmūd Muẕahhib and Shaikhzāda, and the next generation of Shaikhzāda's pupils ʿAbdullāh Muṣavvir and Shaikhm. ʿAbdullāh Muṣavvir's earliest signed work is found among the illustrations to a *Tuḥfat al-aḥrār* of Jāmī scribed in 1548 for ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, and in it he relies on the figures and compositional forms of Maḥmūd Muẕahhib.[269] ʿAbdullāh and Maḥmūd Muẕahhib were prolific in their contributions to elite manuscripts in the 1540s.[270] They continued contributing to manuscripts for ʿAbdullāh b. Iskandar Khan which will be explored in the next chapter.

Although our understanding of Abū'l-Khairid patronage depends on what manuscripts have survived and are known about, it is valid to state neither Kīldī Muḥammad in the 1520s, ʿUbaidullāh in the 1530s, or ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz in the 1540s sought a personal copy of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* or commissioned a ruler-*nāma*, although they each had the best artisans of the day to be found in Transoxiana operating in their appanage centers. The text to a truncated *Shāhnāma* copied by a scribe from Bukhara in 1535, to be analyzed in §III.i, was illustrated around fifty years later outside of Transoxiana. Illustrations to a *Tīmūr-nāma* copied in 1541 examined in §III.ii do not reflect courtly tastes, and a *Shībānī-nāma* (the subject of §III.iii) which I contend was scribed during Shībānī's

---

[266] Akimushkin,"Biblioteka Shibanidov," 327.

[267] Porter provides information on the *ʿaks-i haft rang* (colored paper technique) invented by Muḥammad Amīn Mashhadī that is described by Niẖārī in "Remarques sur la peinture."

[268] It is uncertain if these skills were a preferred qualification to hold the kitābdār role; was one required to have training in both fields before taking on the leadership role?

[269] Signature visible in CBL Pers 215, f.63v.

[270] Tanındı, "Safevī, Özbek ve Osmanlı İlişkisinin Kitap Sanatına Yansıması," 584.

lifetime was later illustrated by the highest levels of Ottoman workshop personnel. These manuscripts and some other ruler-*nāma* detailing the Mongol origins of the Abū'l-Khairid dynasty illuminate production practices combining labor carried out within the appanages and in the Ottoman realm. Thus, we leave the Bukharan court first for Samarqand and then Istanbul in order to treat these manuscripts in the next two sections.

II. Second-generation illustrated Abū'l-Khairid ruler-*nāma* in Transoxiana

Having already examined the *Fatḥnāma* chronicle in Chapter 1, the earliest illustrated ruler-*nāma* about the Abū'l-Khairid dynasty, we now come to the second generation of illustrated ruler-*nāma* manuscripts. The textual component to the Turkic-language *Nuṣratnāma* written during Shībānī Khan's lifetime was previously examined in Chapter 1 §II.iv.a. In this current section, I will focus on its illustrations and those in the Persian prose *Tārīkh-i Abū'l-Khair Khānī* (History of Abū al- Khair Khan, to be shortened as *TAKK*), both of which derive from mid-century Abū'l-Khairid workshops. Although the *Nuṣratnāma* and *TAKK* denigrate the Timurids in some capacity, it is significant that they are produced alongside *Tīmūr-nāma* copies which praise the rival dynastic founder. But imagine yourself reading these works in the mid-sixteenth century: in all of them, between the lines is the message that Abū al-Khair Khan rose above the Timurids, who in turn became his vassals.

II.i. *Tārīkh-i Abū'l-Khair Khānī* [*TAKK*] (ARB 9989)

Masʿūd b. ʿUs̱mān Kūhistānī (d. after 1540), previously the secretary of Suyūnch Khwāja Khan in Tashkent (r. 1512–25), compiled *TAKK* in Persian prose. As the "only universal history written under the Uzbeks of Transoxiana", textual composition began when ʿUbaidullāh's great uncle ʿAbd al-Laṭīf became great khan in Samarqand in 1540, ruling there until his death in 1552.[271] The only illustrated copy was completed in 1543 and is located in Tashkent today (ARB 9989).[272] According to the Abū'l-Khairid chronicler Nis̱ārī, Samarqand was envied during the days of his government, and the khan promoted studies of history and astronomy.[273]

---

[271] Sholeh Quinn, Persian Historiography Across Empires: The Ottomans, Safavids, and Mughals (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2021), 133. Quinn surmises Kūhistānī had access to Khwāndamīr's *Ḥabīb al-siyār*.

[272] Other *Tārīkh-i Abū'l-Khair Khānī* copies include: ARB 1512 (undated); ARB 5392 (dated 1900, an excerpt from the last section on Abū al-Khair Khan formerly in the Viatkin collection in Samarqand); RIOS S-480 (undated); BL Add. 26, 188 (undated, circa 17th century India, an excerpt from the first section on the early kings of Iran). Dunbar summarizes the scholarly literature on *Tārīkh-i Abū'l-Khair Khānī* in his dissertation "Zayn al-Dīn Mahmūd Vāsifī," 18-19, ftn. 25.

[273] Ali Rezaei Pouya, "Intertextual analysis of the History of Abū'l-Khair: an overview of the text and a case study of the Pishdadian section based on Gérard Genette's transcript" [in Persian]. Proceedings of the Fourth Conference on Literary Textual Research (Āzar 1396 [November-December 2018]), 613.

II.i.a. Textual component

Kūhistānī added to sources that had been originally compiled and composed around 1504 after the capture of Samarqand. This important event motivated other works of first-generation Abū'l-Khairid chronicles. Kūhistānī drew on Mongolian and Uighur records, and Ilkhanid ruler-*nāma* texts that had been composed for Mongol patrons who had converted to Islam and sought legitimacy from Persian-speaking subjects.[274] Similarly writing the bulk of the text in prose, Kūhistānī states he consulted Yazdī and directly weaves together numerous lines of classical Persian poetry taken from the poets Niẓāmī, Saʿdī, Ḥāfiẓ, Khāqānī, Ṣanāʾī, ʿAṭṭār, Jāmī, Anṣārī, Dihlavī, and Firdausī.[275] The scholar Ali Rezaei Pouya has conducted intertextual analysis and concludes Kūhistānī chiefly consulted Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* along with Juzjānī's *Ṭabaqāt-i Nāṣīrī* (circa 1260) and the historical account of Banākatī (circa 1330) to relay appropriate subjects. Pouya highlights an important decision made by Kūhistānī in his deployment of these three sources. Whereas Juzjānī and Banākatī have chapters devoted to Afrāsiyāb, Kūhistānī does not. This is surprising given that the conditions under which the book was written were favorable for the inclusion of a chapter dedicated to the Lord of Turan due to there being actual lived parallels at the time of writing.[276]

Firdausī is the deepest source of inspiration to Kūhistānī to legitimize the reign of ʿAbd al-Laṭīf. *TAKK* is replete with *Shāhnāma* quotations, references, and characters spanning the early kings of Iran from Kayūmarṯ to Yazdigird. Kūhistānī employs adjectives used to describe the heroes of the *Shāhnāma* and fits them to ʿAbd al-Laṭīf Khān himself, equating him with the likes of Rustam and Isfandiyār.[277] The pre-Islamic and post-Islamic kings of Iran are given in succession and link to Abū al-Khair Khan and ʿAbd al-Laṭīf.[278] Kūhistānī states he consulted the work of Yazdī to render his prose emphasizing a single ruler, his predecessors, and progeny. *TAKK* is the only Abū'l-Khairid historical chronicle to include information on the Islamic conquest of Transoxiana.[279] Later sections are based on the narratives of living people who were direct relations of Abū al-Khair who personally related events

---

[274] Juvainī's *Tārīkh-i jahāngushāī* and the *Jāmīʿ al-tawārīkh* by Rashīd al-Dīn.

[275] Pouya, "Intertextual analysis of the History of Abū'l-Khair," 611. Schwarz notes the ways Kūhistānī utilizes material from Yazdī in particular ("Safavids and Ozbeks," 362-63).

[276] Ibid., 626.

[277] Ibid., 611-12.

[278] Ibid., 621.

[279] Altıer, "Semerkand Sarayı," 12.

pertaining to family members, such as Abū al-Khair's sons and Shībānī's uncles Suyūnch Khan and Abu-Manṣūr Kūchkūnchī.

II.i.b. Visual component

Whereas in the *Fatḥnāma* the heroics of Shībānī as a singular heroic figure is the focus, *TAKK* connects the Abū'l-Khairid dynasty to its Mongol roots. The illustrations reinforce this through multiple enthronement scenes following a standardized arrangement across the dynasties depicted. The title is in fact a bit misleading, given that the painting program mainly focuses on Chinggisid rulers and few scenes render subjects and events from the Abū'l-Khairid dynasty.[280]

Charles Melville has remarked on its four delineated sections and the visual material in each.[281] The first part is on pre-Islamic figures, prophets, and caliphate leaders after the spread of Islam. There are thirteen accompanying illustrations that include figures from the historical section to the *Shāhnāma* and some of the legendary characters: Iskandar, Dārā, Bahrām Gūr, Ardashīr, Gulnār, Shangūl, Anūshīrvān, Kai Khusrau, Shirūya, and Shāpūr II. The last figure amusingly dons the Chinggisid *kalpak* headwear (fig. 28) that functions to incorporate him into the Mongol family of illustrious Abū'l-Khairid forefathers. Near the end of this first section are three illustrations depicting Maḥmūd Ghaznavī, the troops of Alp Arslan, and Sulṭān Sanjar.

A second section with ten illustrations covers the rise of the Chinggisid khans and their battles. Multiple colorful enthronement scenes depict larger-scale leaders seated on raised platforms before their entourage wearing turbans or kalpaks; empathetic art historians writing in the Soviet period amusingly noted the "respectfully lined up or seated figures" who captured "the boredom of official court receptions."[282] The illustrations begin with Chinggis Khan and chronicle his Ilkhanid descendants ruling Iran. The pictorial cycle emphasizes Ghāzān Khan (fig. 29), a Chinggisid figure that apparently had particular appeal to the Abū'l-Khairids no doubt due to his conversion and adherence to (Sunni) Islam when he ascended the throne in 1295, and also his administering an expanse encompassing much of Iran to which the Abū'l-Khairids also aspired. As was mentioned in the preceding chapter, Shībānī's successor in Samarqand Kūchkūnchī (the father of ʿAbd al-Laṭīf) had been compared to Ghāzān by the author Yār ʿAlī in his modified translation of Yazdī's *Ẓafarnāma* from

---

[280] Ibid., 16.

[281] Charles Melville, "The Shaibanids between Timur and Chinggis Khan: Visual Dilemmas," LUCIS Lecture at Leiden University, 7 May 2019.

[282] G.A. Pugachenkova and L. I. Rempel, *Ocherki iskusstva srednei Azii [Essays on the Art of Central Asia]* (Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1982), 159.

1526. Ghāzān's reign was marked by religious tolerance, economic stability, and intellectual flourishing.[283] The ruler himself was known to have spoken Mongolian, Turkish, Persian, and possessed an understanding of Arabic, and Rashīd al-Dīn composed the *Jāmiʿ al-tawārīkh* for him. It is into this illustrious past of enlightened and cultured figures that the artists of the Abū'l-Khairid manuscripts insert their rulers. Tellingly, Uljaitū, the Ilkhanid ruler who converted specifically to Shiʿism, is left absent in the Abū'l-Khairid manuscript to rebuff the Safavids.

The section given the least emphasis, with the shortest text and fewest illustrations (two in number), is devoted to Tīmūr and his Chaghataid successors. The work presents the Timurids as vassals of Abū al-Khair and justifies the march of the Abū'l-Khairids into Transoxiana to supplant Chaghataid authority. There is however rendered the victory of Ulugh Beg over ʿAlā al-Daula Mīrzā, which pays homage to Ulugh Beg as the grandfather of Kūchkūnchī and Suyūnch Khwāja, and great-grandfather to Kīldī Muḥammad.[284] The other illustration depicts the (dishonorable) patricide of the Timurid dynast ʿAbd al-Laṭīf (Ulugh Beg's son) at the hands of his own son Baba Ḥusain. ʿAbd al-Laṭīf Mīrzā had in turn murdered Ulugh Beg, and the Abū'l-Khairid chronicle casts aspersion on the vile practice intended to consolidate power as opposed to the system of distributed appanages and shared administration across the centers of a domain.

The final fourth section extols the rise of the Abū'l-Khairids. Its three illustrations present Abū al-Khair in two of them. In the first which depicts his enthronement (fig. 30) he is in an all-male gathering outdoors and wears the same crown that tops the heads of Chinggis, Arghun, and Ghāzān Khan earlier in the manuscript. Abū al-Khair in the second illustration (fig. 31) sits under an awning with his consort after destroying the troops of Samarqand. With the exception of one man holding a staff in the bottom right corner, it is an all-female assembly. The image is reminiscent of the *Fatḥnāma*'s depictions of Shībānī seated with his sweetheart Māh-i Dil in front of a yurt (fig. 15), and beneath an umbrella with the poet Shādī (fig. 10).

Olimpiada Galerkina has drawn attention to illustrations in *TAKK* that copy compositions originally produced in the *Kulliyāt* of Navāʾī created for Kīldī Muḥammad in Tashkent in 1521 (NLR

---

[283] R. Amitai, *The Mongols in the Islamic Lands: Studies in the History of the Ilkhanate* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 27.

[284] Their descent was through Ulugh Beg's daughter Rābiʿa Begum, mentioned in Ch. 1.

Dorn 559).[285] She has noted the similar stonecutters and diggers in the two manuscripts illustrating Iskandar crossing over the Syr Darya in *TAKK* (f.66b), and Farhād with a raised pick cutting through rock in the Navāʾī tale (f.98b). The battle of Sultan Maḥmūd Ghaznawī against the Saljuqs in *TAKK* (f.101b), for example, is composed of groups taken from illustrations in the Navāʾī manuscript (f.55b) and depicted in reverse. Not only are the figures of fighting warriors repeated, but also the weapons, shields, horse colorings and coverings, corpses, and severed heads are also rendered in mirror image.[286]

Beside these whole compositions from the Navāʾī work repeated in the history of Abū al-Khair produced twenty years later, isolated figures also transfer between them. The same or different artists could have been directly acquainted with the Navāʾī manuscript or from tracings of its illustrations.[287] The grouping of five kneeling men on a diagonally arranged carpet beneath Abū'l Khair on f.213v (fig. 30) are rendered in reverse in the Navāʾī manuscript (fig. 27). Abū al-Khair Khan wearing green and mustard-yellow in the same folio directly echoes the Chinese khaqan in multi-colored robes with his hand bent in the same position holding a wine cup in Kīldī Muḥammad's manuscript (fig. 25). However, what I find most striking about the illustrations to *TAKK* is actually how subpar they are compared to the earlier works for Kīldī Muḥammad and ʿUbaidullāh, for example, the *Gulistān* of Saʿdī from circa 1530 (RAS 251, f.92a) painted at the intersection of these two great patrons.[288] The lesser quality of *TAKK* also holds true when viewed alongside illustrations in contemporary manuscripts made for ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz. The latter point is evident when comparing illustrations to a *Gulistān* of Saʿdī dated 1543 (BNF Sup Pers 1958, f.9v) done around the same time as *TAKK*. Scholars have never remarked on these visual discrepancies in quality, nor have they adequately explained the lag of time (two decades) between the earlier materials made for Kīldī Muḥammad and the replications in Kūhistānī's ruler-*nāma* about the Abū'l-Khairid dynasty. The artistic activities in the separate locales (Tashkent, Samarqand, Bukhara) and the relations between them have also remained opaque.

TAKK has been given a Samarqand provenance due to its named dedicatee ʿAbd al-Laṭīf who presided there. This has led to the assumption that there was an atelier in place in Samarqand to locally

---

[285] O. Galerkina, *Rukopis' sochinenii Navoi 1521-1522 gg. iz sobraniya GPB im Saltuikova-Shchedrina v Leningrade: k voprosu o sredneaziatskoi shkole miniatyur [A manuscript of the works of ʻAlī Shīr Navāʾī written in the years 1521-22, in the collection of the Leningrad Public Library: a study of the central Asian school of miniature painting]* (Stalinabad [Dushanbe], 1956), 221-34. She repeats her argument with Pugachenkova in *Miniatiury srednei azii*, 44.

[286] Olimpiada Galerkina, *Mawarannahr Book Painting* (Leningrad: Aurora Art Publishers, 1980), 12.

[287] Pugachenkova and Galerkina suggest this in *Miniatiury srednei azii*, 44.

[288] Robinson considers the illustrations to this *Gulistān* to be the best examples of the Herat-inspired style practiced in Bukhara in the 1530s (reproductions in *Persian Miniature Painting from collections in the British Isles*, 43, pl. 19).

produce manuscripts with lesser-quality illustrations, parallel to a powerful kitābkhāna in Bukhara producing fine works. This reasoning is derived from a reading that attributes one style and method of execution with one locale. To Altıer, the Samarqand kitābkhāna maintained the little-figure style of depiction in its creations from the era of Muḥammad Shībānī until the production of *TAKK* from the mid sixteenth century.[289] However, our findings in the previous chapter bolsters an argument that two parallel workshops in one center can function simultaneously, such as Herat making big-figure style manuscripts in varying qualities for different patrons on the cusp of the fifteenth to sixteenth century. I also demonstrated how both the big-figure and little-figure styles coexisted and were used in the earliest manuscripts made for Abū'l-Khairid customers. Collectively, this information reminds us that the one style/one workshop assertion does not always hold, although at this stage I cannot definitively confirm whether Samarqand housed a manuscript production center parallel to Bukhara.

Little work has been done on the Samarqand kitābkhāna in the sixteenth century, but from my amassed research I have traced how the center maintained the Timurid workshops and prepared manuscripts for the Abū'l-Khairids as soon as the city was taken in 1500. This site housed Mongol sources that had been taken by Shībānī and deposited into his library. These very likely included illustrated copies of Rashīd al-Dīn's histories; Tīmūr himself had taken texts from Ottoman Tabriz and had them in his own library in Samarqand during the previous century, and there they remained for Abū'l-Khairid chroniclers and artists to consult in the production of their own manuscripts. Indeed, *TAKK* is proof of this as is a *Tārīkh-i Chingīz Khān* manuscript (SPBGU OB 950). The latter was copied in late-fourteenth century Anatolia with illustrations added in the early Timurid period, but there are indications of late sixteenth-century overpainting from Abū'l-Khairid Bukhara which attests to the layers of ownership.[290]

In the 1520s when Samarqand was administered by the second great khan Kūchkūnchī, unillustrated works of poetry translated from Persian into Turki were produced there. But with the increasing power of Bukharan workshops, it is my suggestion that there were no manuscripts illustrated in Samarqand between 1515 and 1540. This makes it surprising that *TAKK* would have been illustrated in Samarqand in the 1540s, even considering the lesser quality of its illustrations. After examining a

---

[289] Altıer, "Semerkand Sarayı," 15.

[290] I am indebted to Charles Melville for sharing with me his photos of the history of Chinggis Khan. See Melville, "Genealogy and exemplary rulership in the Tarikh-i Chingiz Khan," in *Living Islamic History: Studies in honour of Professor Carole Hillenbrand,* ed. Yasir Suleiman (Edinburgh: University Press, 2010, 129-50. I wish to explore this late-century Abū'l-Khairid overpainting in more detail.

few more manuscripts to round out our understanding of dynamics in Samarqand and Bukhara, in §III.ii.c. I will posit the existence of a secondary Bukharan workshop responsible for the subpar works to fulfill the growing demand for manuscripts in the Abū'l-Khairid domain.

II.ii. *Nuṣratnāma* (BL Or. 3222): visual component

In the previous chapter I explained that the written component to the Turkic prose chronicle *Tavārīkh-i guzīda-yi nuṣratnāma* (*Nuṣratnāma*) was composed by an anonymous author who relied on Mongol sources. Shībānī himself may have contributed to its authorship. The purpose of the *Tārīkh-i Abū'l-Khair Khānī* was to insert the Abū'l-Khairids into a broader cultural context portraying the Abū'l-Khairids as righteous inheritors and the latest Mongol counterparts to administer the Turco-Persianate realm. In comparison to this cultural and political mission, the *Nuṣratnāma* has an ideological emphasis on the religiosity of the Mongols and Abū'l-Khairids, beginning with Chinggis and the reign of his descendants, and continuing with Abū al-Khair and Shībānī as the culmination of the Mongols' Islamification process.

The illustrated *Nuṣratnāma* in the British Library has been published by Barbara Brend who considers it to be a copy of an original that was composed for Shībānī.[291] The provenance of its illustrations has remained enigmatic as a result of over-reliance on colophon information and marginalia. However, by inserting its visual material into the broader spectrum of Abū'l-Khairid arts of the book, I will contribute new insights on its painting program. There is speculation regarding when the present manuscript might have been transcribed and illustrated. Folio 148b has a note stating "*tammat 97*," which has been interpreted as completed in 907 (1501), but a marginal note in handwriting that differs from the main text on f.149a notes "*sanna 970,"* implying the year 970 (1562). From these discrepant written numbers, Brend has suggested it was produced in Bukhara under ʿAbdullāh b. Iskandar, although the illustrations do not resemble anything produced for him, or for a great khan based in Samarqand.[292] This raises an important point in analyzing manuscripts which Zahra Faridany-Akhavan has expressed: "random numbers on folios cannot be simply accepted as dates… they must be verified within the context of the evidence of the manuscript as a whole" by considering the stylistic consistency of other contemporary manuscripts.[293] Moreover, analysts of the *Nuṣratnāma*

---

[291] Brend, "Sixteenth-Century Manuscript from Transoxiana," 103.

[292] Ibid., 103. Brend names Khusrau Sulṭān, Abū al-Khair's sixth grandson through his second son Khwāja Muḥammad. However, this figure was never an appanage leader or great khan. The name is on f.210v.

[293] Zahra Faridany-Akhavan, "Dating the Hamzanama: A Re-examination," *Marg: A Magazine of the Arts* (March 2015): 22-33.

manuscript's text have stated it is incomplete and breaks off during Shībānī's campaign in Hisar. This means the original colophon concluding the work is missing, if it even existed. Therefore I am not convinced that the *Nuṣratnāma*'s production can be so summarily resolved by the numbers perceived as dates, and derive my analysis from the illustrations themselves to arrive at a fuller understanding of this ruler-*nāma*'s manufacture.

II.ii.a. Illustrative program

Nearly all of the illustrations to the *Nuṣratnāma* are in a style that is foreign to known illustrated Abū'l-Khairid manuscripts with the exception of the first painting. It is unusually ornate and finely detailed, and depicts Chinggis Khan conversing with his four sons (fig. 32).[294] An oversized pair of scholars sits in the lower section. The serene faces, the outdoor setting's geranium leaves, hollyhock flowers, and trees with sparse blossoms recall the meticulous work of Maḥmūd Muẕahhib from Bukhara produced on the cusp of the 1530s–1540s.[295] In the *Nuṣratnāma* composition, the infirm khan sits on a platform with a triangular backing filled in blue and gold illumination that resembles the elaborate borders and thumb-spaces of frontispieces. His sons Jūchī, Chaghatāy, Ūgtāy, and Tūlui—who would administer sections of the conquered domains—wear distinctive Mongol headdresses with owl and eagle feathers that appear in other *Nuṣratnāma* illustrations of Chinggisid khans with their retinue, such as Tūlui (f.93v), Möngke (f.96r), and Ghāzān (f.113v). A few attendants wear it while sitting or standing beneath Ūgtāy (fig. 33). Related feathered headwear is found in other depictions of Chinggisids spanning centuries and media. It is perched atop the heads of Mongols in several Ilkhanid folios of Rashīd al-Dīn's *Jāmīʿ al-tawārīkh* from fourteenth-century Tabriz (SB Diez A, ff.70, 5, 10). A later Timurid copy of the *Jāmīʿ* (BNF Sup Pers 1113) includes the head covering (fig. 34), as do the figures added in the early Timurid period to a *Tārīkh-i Chingīz Khān* manuscript (SPBGU OB 950) that carries some late Abū'l-Khairid overpainting.[296] Although the headwear does not follow a standardized iconography, similar depictions of it are in the folios of the small *Shāhnāma* copies and Kashan tiles,

---

[294] Rieu's catalogue entry names the subject as Tului Khan. Brend and Titley identify the illustration as Chinggis Khan seated with his sons.

[295] Examples include an undated but signed folio (MFA 14.584), a *Tuḥfat al-aḥrār* of Jāmī for ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz circa 1538 (BNF Sup Pers 1416), and illustrations in an Anthology circa 1545-50 scribed by Muḥammad ʿAlī and Mīr Ḥusain Kulangī (TSMK R.1964).

[296] Melville, "Genealogy and exemplary rulership."

both of Ilkhanid provenance.[297] The headgear also appears atop Chinggis Khan preaching in a mosque in Bukhara and on his followers in a collection of epics produced in 1397 Shiraz shortly after the Timurids took control.[298] Such visual equivalence confirms that the Abū'l-Khairid artists had Ilkhanid and Timurid visual materials at their disposal.

Beside turbans and helmets, the only other headwear in the illustrations to the *Nuṣratnāma* is the distinctive white conical *kalpak* with black brim. As I have examined elsewhere, this "Turanian cap" is a marker of Chinggisid origins and in Abū'l-Khairid illustrations it is worn by the generations after the sons of Chinggis Khan.[299] All of Jūchī's retinue wear it (f.76v), as does Abū al-Khair himself and all his followers (fig. 35). Whereas in the *TAKK* illustrations rulers and retinue have mixed headwear which points to the work of an indiscriminate artist, the iconography in the *Nuṣratnāma* is purposefully deployed, which supports a production date following Kūhistānī's illustrated version in 1543.

Mongol pride is further detected in the way the Timurid dynasty is treated in the *Nuṣratnāma*. *TAKK* has a short section dedicated to Timurid dynastic history; the *Nuṣratnāma* also includes condensed information on the dynasty in Transoxiana preceding the Abū'l-Khairids, reinforcing the Jūchids' superior status as rightful Chinggisid heirs. In examining the *Nuṣratnāma* text, Maria Subtelny has pointed out that Timur's father, Taraghay, "is called a superintendent of granaries for the Chaghatay…thus belittling the background of the Timurids on account of their association with what was from a nomadic viewpoint an ignoble activity."[300] This is reinforced in the two illustrations accompanying the Timurid section. In the first, we see Shībānī's assault on Samarqand (fig. 36) which was a momentous accomplishment also included in the earlier *Fatḥnāma* (fig. 12). In the *Nuṣratnāma*'s second illustration to the Timurid section, Bābur's uncles Maḥmūd Khan and Aḥmad Khan—one of whom wears a black and white *kalpak* to mark his own Chaghataid Mongol roots— are shown ignominiously captured in Farghana and brought before Shībānī Khan who sits astride a piebald

---

[297] The 'Small *Shāhnāma'* copies are the subject of Marianna S. Simpson's influential dissertation: "The Illustration of an Epic: the Earliest Shahnama Manuscripts" (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1978). Recently, Adel T. Adamova has suggested not Simpson's Baghdad, but Kashan as a possible site of production in "The Shāhnāmah in Il-Khanid Times," *Proceedings of the Eighth European Conference of Iranian Studies, 14-19 September 2015*, ed. Olga M. Yastrebova (Saint Petersburg: State Hermitage Publishers, 2020), 24.

[298] BL Or. 2780, f.61r.

[299] Sartorial and tonsorial features in paintings of subjects from Transoxiana are explored in my article: "Liberating the 'Turkoman Prisoner': an Assessment of Sixteenth/Seventeenth-century Folios of 'Bound Captives'," in: *The Role and Depictions of Iranian/ Persianate Subalterns from 1501-177*, ed. Andrew J. Newman (Berlin: Gerlach Press).

[300] Subtelny, "Art and Politics in Early 16th century Central Asia," 132.

horse.[301] This pictorial humiliation is paired with textual, and the *Nuṣratnāma* refers to Timurids of all ranks as *mīrzā* which is a much lower title than khan or sultan used to designate the descendants of Chinggis Khan.[302] We can see in the pictorial cycle the emphasis on the Jūchid line of glorious Chinggisid ancestors of the Abū'l-Khairids.

II.ii.b. Timurid prototypes

Brend has analyzed other illustrated folios in the *Nuṣratnāma* and commented on those that derive from Timurid prototypes, and also their relation to works in the Mughal sphere (returned to in Chapter 5 §V.i).[303] To Brend, the *Nuṣratnāma*'s ruler-and-retinue pictures "are more faithful to the fourteenth-century *Jāmīʿ al-tawārīkh* tradition than are the known fifteenth-century treatments of that subject from Fars and Herat," and thus the *Nuṣratnāma*'s illustrations "refer back from the sixteenth century to the fourteenth, taking little account of the fifteenth."[304] This can naturally be explained in ideological terms with the Abū'l-Khairids snubbing their dynastic forebears, but the situation is more complicated for Abū'l-Khairid artists were indebted to Timurid visual prototypes. With the exception of the elegant illustration of Chinggis Khan and his sons, all the other paintings are in a style atypical to Abū'l-Khairid book arts that may derive from the above-mentioned Paris copy of Rashīd al-Dīn's *Jāmīʿ al-tawārīkh*, and other materials in a similar style of the same provenance. Bābur may have directly carried the Paris *Jāmīʿ* with him from Transoxiana into India, but the *Nuṣratnāma* paintings evince that the Paris manuscript or its models were available to Abū'l-Khairid artists.[305] The Paris *Jāmīʿ al-tawārīkh* explains some perplexing elements in the *Nuṣratnāma* illustrations, and also the stylistic decisions taken by the later Abū'l-Khairid artists who expressed the subjects in an archaizing/ historicizing style.[306]

---

[301] Aḥmad Khān and Maḥmūd Khān, sons of the Chaghataid khan Yūnus (grandfather of Bābur), were captured in Akhsi in 1502 while Bābur escaped. The outcome of the battle was that the Abū'l-Khairids became the dominant force in Central Asia and took Tashkent, Andijan, Fargana, and Namangan from the Timurids.

[302] Subtelny, "Art and Politics in Early 16th century Central Asia," 132.

[303] Brend, "A Sixteenth-Century Manuscript from Transoxiana."

[304] Ibid., 108.

[305] Melville suggests another illustrated historical chronicle, *Tārīkh-i Chingīz Khān* (SPBGU OB 950), also played a role in the illustrations of the *Nuṣratnāma* (Melville, "Genealogy and exemplary rulership").

[306] It is worth noting that other copies of Rashīd al-Dīn's work from the Mughal sphere are also executed in a similar archaic style derived from extant folios in the Diez Album (SB A, f.70) and BNF Sup Pers 1113. Compare illustrations in the Mughal copy circa 1590-95 (RRK P.1820 [M.K.85]). Reproductions are in entry IV.1 in Barbara Schmitz and Ziyaud-Din A. Desai, *Mughal and Persian Paintings and Illustrated Manuscripts in the Raza Library, Rampur* (New Delhi: Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts, 2006), 171-79. Also consult Yael Rice, "Mughal Interventions in the Rampur 'Jāmīʿ al-Tavārīkh,' *Ars Orientalis* 42 (2012): 150-64.

In the Paris *Jāmīʿ al-tawārīkh* as in the *Nuṣratnāma*, the figures have tiny feet enclosed in pointed black boots and don robes crossing in the Mongol fashion (left over right).[307] The *Nuṣratnāma* delineates fabric folds on the garments as the Paris manuscript also does. The khans' lobed seats in both manuscripts have bolster pillows. In the earlier *Jāmīʿ al-tawārīkh* manuscript where thrones are more delineated (such as in the death of Chinggis Khan, fig. 37), in later Abū'l-Khairid manuscripts they become "a flat shape with no indication of structure" (Brend's insight).[308] This is evident in the *Nuṣratnāma* enthronements (fig. 33) and the *Tīmūr-nāma* soon to be examined in §III.ii (fig. 39). The Paris manuscript's enthronement scenes (for example, ff.44r and 85r) with the Mongol ceremony of *kāsa-gīrī* (bowl-offering) and placement of vessels atop low tables are common in all Abū'l-Khairid ruler-*nāma* compositions.[309] Several *Nuṣratnāma* illustrations include (undoubtedly halal) wineskins of *kumis* (fermented mare's milk) as part of the Mongol "performance of koumiss-quaffing in a royal assembly" of men.[310] Whereas the Paris *Jāmīʿ al-tawārīkh* frequently includes female consorts beside the khans, the *Nuṣratnāma* excises women completely.

II.ii.c. Provenance

In suggesting a provenance for the pictorial cycle in the *Nuṣratnāma* other than what has been heretofore proposed in other publications, I maintain that the dating of its full production cannot be reliably derived from stray marginal markings. Although the enigmatic numbers that are present could truthfully state the date in which the work was fully completed (1562), this does not rule out that it was begun decades earlier and later finished and presented to an unnamed Abū'l-Khairid leader. The delicate illustration of Chinggis Khan on his deathbed with the artistic touches of Maḥmūd Muẕahhib in Bukhara, or a talented nameless pupil trained by him in the late 1530s or 1540s, is my evidence for an earlier start date. The other illustrations of enthronements in a different style and palette within the *Nuṣratnāma* take a simpler approach in their method of depiction compared to courtly manuscript illustrations painted perhaps at the same time. For example, some kneeling figures and low tables with

---

[307] Sartorial details such as Mongols tying their robes from the left to the right, Turks from the right to the left to accommodate being mounted on horseback in stirrups, are noted by Zukhra Ibragimova Rakhimova, *K istorii kostiuma narodov Uzbekistana: kostium Bukhary i Samarkanda XVI—XVII vekov; po dannym srednevekovoĭ miniatiurnoĭ zhivopisi* (Tashkent: Izdatel′stvo zhurnala "San'at", 2005), 18.

[308] Brend, "Sixteenth-Century Manuscript from Transoxiana," 108.

[309] Abolala Soudavar explains the ritualistic "Mongol practice of *kāsa-giri* (bowl-offering) by which Changizid princes would honour one another" in "The Saga of Abu-Saʿid Bahādor Khān: The Abu-Saʿidnāmé," in *The Court of the Il-khans 1290-1340,* eds. J. Raby and T. Fitzherbert (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 120.

[310] McChesney, "The Chinggisid restoration in Central Asia: 1500-1785," 284.

vessels in the painting of Abū al-Khair and his retinue (fig. 35) are akin to those in a contemporary illustration of entertainment in a garden in an Anthology (TSMK 1964, circa 1545–50) with labor contributed by the finest artisans and who had served ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz; there is no dedication, however, to this ruler in the manuscript (fig. 38).

There is a specificity of rendered headwear in the *Nuṣratnāma* that contrasts the *TAKK* illustrations from circa 1543 which was presented to ʿAbd al-Laṭīf in Samarqand. Although most of the *Nuṣratnāma* illustrations might be contemporary to those in *TAKK*, these manuscripts are rendered in different pictorial modes that are outside the dominant trends of Bukharan painting in the 1540s. It is convenient to classify this visual difference as "non-Bukharan" and therefore arrive at a logical production site in Samarqand, but this deduction has some flaws which will be discussed below. I will instead argue for a secondary workshop site in Bukhara.

Both Kūhistānī and the anonymous author of the *Nuṣratnāma* used original Mongolian language sources that were in the library of Shībānī Khan in Samarqand. Shībānī had inherited illustrated and/or illuminated Ilkhanid and Timurid sources kept in Samarqand that were originally acquired by Tīmūr himself, and these materials remained in that center to be consulted by the producers of the Abū'l-Khairid ruler-*nāma*s.[311] However, our understanding of mid-century Abū'l-Khairid productions is not concrete, and Samarqand could have held the repository assisting in the drafting of textual content, while the personnel and resources to carry out a visual program were based in Bukhara. I acknowledge the irony in my argument for the centrality of Bukhara in the industry of illustrated manuscripts, since I have stated elsewhere that Bukhara has been over-attributed as the location of all Abū'l-Khairid book arts across the century. But only between 1530–1575 does this centralization hold.

In the next chapter I will explore the book patronage of ʿAbdullāh b. Iskandar Khan, whom Brend names as a possible patron of the *Nuṣratnāma*, but the following makes him an unlikely candidate in my view. All the illustrations to his other commissioned manuscripts have their own particular style and reflect his predilection for freshly-made, classical Persian works of poetry; would an older, refurbished Turkic chronicle of his ancestors really be to his liking? If we match historical

---

[311] Ilkhanid materials originating in Tabriz might have first been taken to Samarqand by Tīmūr in 1386 when he captured the Ilkhanid capital. It is documented that Timur's descendent Shāh Rukh in the first half of the fifteenth century continued to possess Ilkhanid Tabriz work of the preceding century, among them folios of the *Jāmiʿ al-tawārīkh* in his library; "artists working for him were probably influenced by this style of an earlier century and passed it down to their successors" (Titley, "A Shāhnāma from Transoxiana," 161). Brend proposes these Ilkhanid materials were consulted to complete the *Nuṣratnāma* ("Sixteenth-Century Manuscript from Transoxiana," 105). Two Mongol histories (*Jāmiʿ al-tawārīkh* ARB 1620, *Tārīkh-i Chingīz Khān* SPBGU OB 950) could be some of these consulted specimens. The former's pasted illustrations are perhaps of Ilkhanid origin, and the latter written out in late fourteenth-century Anatolia contains illustrations that to me appear added in early Timurid Central Asia circa 1430 (see Melville, "Genealogy and exemplary rulership").

events with the *Nuṣratnāma*'s indicated date, we derive significance from the fact that ʿAbdullāh proclaimed his father Iskandar the great khan of Samarqand in 1561.[312] The presentation of an Abū'l-Khairid historical chronicle extolling the dynasty to Iskandar so soon after his accession would be an appropriate move, even if it was a manuscript project that had been started earlier, and not necessarily intended for him.

III. Abū'l-Khairid *Shāhnāma* and ruler-*nāma* copies and their connections to the Ottomans (1530–1550)

The three manuscripts to be examined in this section were written out by Abū'l-Khairid copyists but later owned by Ottoman royals: a truncated *Shāhnāma*, *Tīmūr-nāma* of Hātifī, and the biographical *Shībānī-nāma*. It is rare to find explicit documentation that accounts for the official dispatch of both completed and unillustrated texts between Bukhara and/or Samarqand and the Sublime Porte. However the very presence of these works and others located today in Istanbul suggests the books transited in the mid sixteenth century. Political and artistic coordination between Uzbek troops and Ottoman forces has not been fully investigated, and I will employ these manuscripts to explore these very issues.

III.i. Truncated *Shāhnāma* (TSMK H.1514)

A letter held in the Ottoman Archives containing literary allusions derived from Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* ventured from Istanbul to Bukhara. It was "written, out of friendship and with prayers and greeting, to Bukhara, glory to the house of the reign on 11 Shaʿbān 941 [15 February 1535]" from the Ottoman Sultan Süleyman to ʿUbaidullāh Khan.[313] It is of particular interest in its references to Solomon, Alexander, Caesar, Darius, and Kai Khusrau. Süleyman compares ʿUbaidullāh to these kings prominently featured in the *Shāhnāma* who are at once mythical and historical. Up to this point we still have not seen any Firdausian *Shāhnāma* productions connected to Abū'l-Khairid courts. It is notable however that at the time the above letter was composed, one truncated copy of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* was written out in Bukhara under Abū'l-Khairid rule in 1535 (TSMK H.1514). It was deposited at some point into the Topkapı Palace where it continues to be held. Another truncated copy following a

---

[312] Details on ʿAbdullāh making his father Iskandar the great khan after a struggle for succession with the death of Naurūz Khān explained in Yuri Bregel, "ʿAbdullāh Khan b. Eskandar," *Encyclopædia Iranica.*

[313] The letter (BOA TSMA.E 750 85, originally no. 5905/1) is reproduced and translated in full by Bacqué-Grammont, "Ubaydu-llah han de Boukhara et Soliman le Magnifique."

different textual format carries the name of a scribe from Bukhara and is undated (TSMK H.1503), but it is connected to other later productions from the 1570s and 1580s that are not relevant to the 1530–57 period on which we are presently focusing. TSMK manuscripts H.1514 and H.1503 were not illustrated in Transoxiana, but likely in the Ottoman realm and are part of a broader group of truncated versions of Firdausī's text written and illustrated between 1535–90 in various centers. Only the text to TSMK H.1514 will be examined here. Its illustrations and H.1503 as a whole will be more fully analyzed in Chapter 3 §III.ii.b.

Rührdanz's article on a grouping of truncated *Shāhnāma*s illustrated in a common style has significantly contributed to their study.[314] Rührdanz characterizes the textual components to these truncated *Shāhnāma*s as omitting much if not all the third historical section of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* text, and also including chapters taken from post-*Shāhnāma* epics that go beyond Firdausī's original version. These include sections on heroes hailing from Sistan that in other *Shāhnāma* manuscripts are "dealt with summarily or not at all."[315] Longer interspersed sections covering the exploits of the warriors Garshāsp, Sām, Barzū, and Bahman serve to enlarge Firdausī's epic but do not take a fixed order when they are included in the legendary section. Rührdanz explains how the group of truncated copies textually and visually adhere to a proven standard but with some variation being the aim. Reflecting courtly and common story-telling traditions of the day, the copies shift the focus of Firdausī's sequences to expand his legendary component to the *Shāhnāma,* and usually finish with Firdausī's story of the historical Alexander. As I have mentioned in Chapter 1, Alexander was an important figure frequently referenced in courtly literature across dynasties. Having a Firdausian *Shāhnāma* copy with stories arranged so that they conclude with this ruler's escapades and not the final Sasanian ruler Yazdigird suggests the character resonated with the intended class of owner and the broader (debatably non-Safavid) society receiving the stories.[316] To Will Kwiatkowski who has examined the truncated Eckstein *Shāhnāma* production, "the suspense created by the breaking of the narrative [finishing with Alexander] invites the reader to seek a conclusion beyond the text in his own time …identifying the Ottoman Sultan as the successor to Alexander."[317] To Kwiatkowski, "the

---

[314] Rührdanz, "Truncated Shahnamas."

[315] Ibid., 118.

[316] Rührdanz suggests something similar in her analysis of the Eckstein *Shāhnāma*, questioning whether the truncated *Shāhnāma*s of Ottoman manufacture were meant to imply or justify Ottoman campaigns against Iran. In Will Kwiatkowski, *The Eckstein Shahnama: an Ottoman Book of Kings* (London: Sam Fogg, 2005), 53.

[317] Kwiatkowski, *The Eckstein Shahnama*, 53.

truncated *Shāhnāma*s depict a distinctly Ottoman version of history," but truncated *Shāhnāma* versions would have also appealed to Abū'l-Khairid readers.

The entire manuscript H.1514 in the Topkapı has been catalogued as "Bukharan" or "Shībānid" because of its colophon stating that location and giving the year 1535. The scribe is Maḥmūd b. Muḥammad al-Balkhī, and the nisba implies a Balkh family origin.[318] Bukhara as the location of transcription is squarely in the Abū'l-Khairid domain, and the date coincides with ʿUbaidullāh's reign which has caused scholars to classify the work as an Uzbek production, or to attribute it to ʿUbaidullāh's patronage.[319] But the text is the only Abū'l-Khairid component of the manuscript's manufacture. It is written out in very slanted and thin nasta'liq using a trimmed reed that accentuates the thicker lines of the dragged pen. It is not certain who the named Maḥmūd was or what other works he copied, but given that he was active in Bukhara in the 1530s we might associate him with one of the scribes named in Mustafa ʿÂli's later account of significant artisans and those whom they trained.

ʿÂli names a few Maḥmūds who were pupils of Mīr ʿAlī, but they either have different named fathers (Maḥmūd b. Isḥāq al-Shahhābī will be mentioned in Chapter 3 §III.i.b) or they came from centers at a distance from Balkh (such as Turbat, Nishapur, Siyavushan, Herat, Sabzivar). Our Maḥmūd the son of Muḥammad could refer to the following individual working in Bukhara under the tutelage of the scribal master Mīr ʿAlī. ʿÂli names a certain Sulṭān Maḥmūd of Bukhara who was "well versed in beautiful writing, …a talented [calligrapher] and a lover of talent, whose hand was better at [the art of] illumination than at writing."[320] Maḥmūd was (and remains) a common name and Bukhara a densely populated place, but it is significant that Mustafa ʿÂli was aware of such a figure in the Ottoman realm which is precisely where H.1514 ended up during the time ʿÂli was writing in the late sixteenth century.

---

[318] Manuscript production in Balkh is not well-documented and although a few scribes are named as hailing from or living in this center, it seems the manuscripts on which they contributed were completed in the larger sites of Bukhara or Herat. As examples, I can point to the scribes Maḥmūd b. Muḥammad al-Balkhī (TSMK H.1514); Shaikh Kamāl b. ʿAbd al-Khāliq al-Balkhī (TSMK M.10); 'Alā al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Haravī (NMAA S1986.213); and Muḥammad Balkhī, a scribe reported by M. Bayānī as serving the Uzbeks [*Ahvāl va āsār-i khūshnivīsān* vol. 1 (Tehran: Intishārāt-i 'Ilmī, 1363 [1984]), 662, no. 924].

[319] İnal erroneously categorizes H.1514 as an example of ornate Uzbek production in "Bir Özbek Şehnamesi." Elsewhere, she groups H.1514, R.1544, H.1487, and H.105 (sic, 1503) as having illustrations in a similar style she typifies as "late-days of the Bukhara school" [*Türk Minyatür Sanati: Baslangicindan Osmanlilara kadar* (Ankara: Atatürk Cultural Center, 1995), 173]. Zeki Velidi Togan amusingly —but without substantiation—suggests the ruler seated in the frontispiece on ff.1b-2a is ʿUbaidullāh Khan himself [*On the Miniatures in Istanbul Libraries* (Publications of the Faculty of Letters of the University of Istanbul N. 1034, Publications of the Department of General Turkish History N. 2, 1963), 24].

[320] Mustafa ʿÂli, *Epic Deeds*, 240.

To Rührdanz, H.1514 is the very copy that initiated the production of interpolated and truncated Firdausian *Shāhnāma* texts.[321] Filiz Çağman and Zeren Tanındı theorize that the general idea of preparing a shortened form of Firdausī's text was "first introduced in Sistan during the Uzbek period, …related to Sistan's demand to write legendary histories."[322] The heroes and battles from the legendary sections lauded in the truncated versions reflect popular retellings circulating amongst the masses in eastern Iran and in Transoxiana. H.1514 and the other truncated *Shāhnāma* copies reflect this oral tradition which would be refashioned and gain more popularity later in the sixteenth century.[323] I do not claim, as Rührdanz does, that the genre of truncated Persian verse copies emerged from Bukhara or Abū'l-Khairid centers in the 1530s. I refute this because the works do not take a set order, so one copy cannot be credited as a prototype.

Although the group she examined follows a similar format concluding with events from the life of Alexander, there are multiple arrangements of stories in the truncated copies. The order of the stories in H.1514 is different from the set format that would be taken up in some other truncated copies (TSMK mss. H.1492, H.1502, H.1503, H.1512; MMA mss. 13.228.11, 13.228.14). These later copies located in Istanbul and New York are divided into four labeled parts: *Shāhnāma* (corresponding to much of Firdausī's first/mythical section), *Khusrau-nāma* (covering the reign of Kai Khusrau from the second/legendary section), *Bahman-nāma* (an interpolation not found in most Firdausian copies), and *Iskandar-nāma* (an abridgment of Firdausī's historical section). H.1514, in contrast, opens with the *Garshāsp-nāma* (an interpolation), skips over Firdausī's account of the mythical origins of the world to give the *Sām-nāma* and *Barzū-nāma* that emphasize the life of Rustam, and closes with the *Bahman-nāma* that is found in other truncated copies.[324] H.1514 has no Firdausian *Iskandar-nāma* or any other inclusions from Firdausī's historical section. Although it is textually related to truncated copies, the order of H.1514's assortment and arrangement of Firdausian *Shāhnāma* stories is unique.

---

[321] Karin Rührdanz, "The Transformed *Shāhnāma*: Romanticized Heroic Legends versus History," *10th International Congress of Turkish Art: Arc Turc-Turkish Art,* ed. Francois Deroche (Geneva, Switzerland, 1995), 599-606.

[322] Filiz Çağman and Zeren Tanındı, "Firdevsi'nin Şâhnamesi'nde Geleneğin Değişimi," *TUBA / Journal of Turkish Studies* 32, no. 1 (2008): 154 (translated from Turkish). The Uzbek occupation of Sistan they imply is unclear but seems to correspond to 1524-28; a second period would last from 1578-98. Information on Sistan and epic cycles is in Saghi Gazerani, *The Sistani Cycle of Epics and Iran's National History: On the Margins of Historiography* (Leiden: Brill, 2016).

[323] Gabrielle van den Berg has published several studies on the oral background and afterlife of Firdausī's epic; her article "Rustam's Grandson in Central Asia: The Sistan Cycle Epics and the *Shahnama* Tradition," in *Shahnama Studies III*, 94-107.

[324] Rührdanz, "Truncated Shahnamas," 132, ftn. 36.

III.ii. *Tīmūr-nāma* (TSMK H.1594)

Unlike the truncated *Shāhnāma* H.1514 with textual and visual programs divided across Uzbek and Ottoman centers, there are several whole manuscripts of Persian poetry completely of Abū'l-Khairid manufacture that are located in the Topkapı. This makes it easier to ascertain their process of production, although the circumstances and date of their dispatch remain elusive. A subset of these seem to have come from the library of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, and they could have been gifted in his lifetime or by the Abū'l-Khairid heads of state who succeeded him (App. 4, nos. 9, 19, 27, 28). Not all of them carry dedicatory inscriptions, but based on the prestige of their calligraphers and fine craftsmanship it is assumed they had royal owners. A *Tīmūr-nāma* of Hātifī (H.1594) scribed in 1541 cannot be definitively attributed to ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz's patronage, but is connected to other works created for him.

At the time of its creation, H.1594 attests to Abū'l-Khairid interest in other ruler-*nāma*s and dynasties than their own. Their connections to the Timurids were often fraught, viewing them as illegitimate rulers of Transoxiana, yet I have mentioned how Shībānī himself and other appanage heads had intermarried into the Chaghataid bloodline and appropriated artistic and cultural forms of the Timurid courts (Introduction §II.i.a). Following ʿUbaidullāh's final victory over Bābur's troops in May 1526, the Timurids were eliminated as a third rival to Khurasan leaving only the Safavids to reckon with. The colophon to H.1594 states it was written out in 1541, names the scribe Maḥmūd b. Niẓām al-Haravī, and lists the place of production as *fākhira-yi Bukhārā* (the splendor [that is] Bukhara).[325] This makes H.1594 the earliest textual transmission of a work devoted to Tīmūr in the Abū'l-Khairid realm that I have come across, other versions by Hātifī and Yazdī illustrated in later decades will be analyzed in the remaining chapters of my study.[326] A copy of Hātifī's *Tīmūr-nāma* in the Walters Art Museum has illumination characteristic of late-fifteenth through early-sixteenth century manuscripts, and its illustrations are in an uncertain style but have Herati elements from the same period through the

---

[325] Togan's entry in *On the Miniatures in Istanbul Libraries* for H.1594 is full of errors and best ignored. The scribe to H.1594 might have served ʿUbaidullāh. An entry in Bayānī for Maḥmūd b. Niẓām (no. 1331, p. 890) states this individual scribed a *Khamsa* of Niẓāmī, but catalogue records instead turn up a *Khamsa* of Jāmī (KMSM no. 3097) dated 14 *Shawwāl* 937/May 1531. Another scribed work which may be by the same copyist has a colophon naming Maḥmūd al-Haravī in a Jāmī *Subḥat al-abrār* in the collection of D.G. Kalekian (mentioned in Akimushkin, "Biblioteka Shibanidov").

[326] Some materials of uncertain provenance exist that bear mentioning: a section (40 folios) of Hātifī's *Tīmūr-nāma* appeared in a Sam Fogg auction (entry 33 in Black and Saidi, *Islamic manuscripts*, 92-93). The author gives a dubious provenance to Bukhara 1510 and claims "already in the 16th century the manuscript was in Ottoman possession" based on a round seal impression and interlinear and marginal glosses in Ottoman Turkish. Not having examined this manuscript, I can only analyze the reproduced folio of Tīmūr's enthronement in Balkh. The seated ruler is akin to depictions of Sultan Ḥusain Mīrzā in a black fur-lined, tall white cap in copies of Sultan Ḥusain's own *Dīvān* (TSMK E.H.1636, f.1b); the structure in which Tīmūr sits in the Sam Fogg folio is akin to f.2b in another *Dīvān* copy (BNF Sup Pers 993). These *Dīvān*s have colophons with dates corresponding to Bāiqarā's reign in the 1480s-90s, but the illustrations have yet to have their provenance confirmed. Lâle Uluç's research on this is forthcoming. Consult Filiz Çağman, "The Miniatures of the Divan-i Hüseyni and the Influence of their Style," ed. G. Fehér, *Fifth International Congress of Turkish Art* (Budapest, 1978), 231-57.

1520s.[327] Without a secure Abū'l-Khairid attribution I must leave this copy aside, but it does help substantiate my claim that only when the Timurids were no longer a political or dynastic threat in Transoxiana following 1526 was there Abū'l-Khairid interest in the rival dynasty.

III.ii.a. Illustrative program

H.1594 shares the same size and embossed binding motifs as other courtly Abū'l-Khairid manuscripts in the Topkapı (mss. H.1091, R.958, R.895). The embossed covers have flying cranes swirling amidst clouds above peaceful animals in a landscape, enclosed in a border flanked by cartouches with *vāq vāq* motifs (small faces of humans and beasts derived from a mythical tree encountered by Alexander). I attribute these elements to Bukhara. Although lavish on the outside, the lesser quality of H.1594's inside illustrations (figs. 39, 42) contrasts other magnificent copies produced for ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz. One fine example is a copy of Jāmī's *Bahāristān* dedicated to ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz dated 1548 in the Gulbenkian collection (MCG LA 169). In it is an illustration of a bent-legged ruler dressed in green seated in front of a yurt (fig. 40).[328] It follows the iconography of Tīmūr holding audience in Balkh on the occasion of his accession as established in the Garrett *Ẓafarnāma* (fig. 16).[329] Bihzād's Tīmūr in the Garrett manuscript takes the visage of Sultan Ḥusain, and one scholar similarly suggests the seated ruler in front of a yurt in the Gulbenkian *Bahāristān* depicts ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz himself.[330]

Another Abū'l-Khairid illustration that renders a Tīmūr-like figure in a non-*Tīmūr-nāma* text is in another Jāmī *Bahāristān* copy today located in Minneapolis from 1551 (fig. 41).[331] This manuscript's date of transmission postdates ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz's reign by one year, and could have been

---

[327] This copy of Hātifī's *Tīmūr-nāma* (WAM W.648) scribed by Pīr (Mīr?) ʿAlī al-Jāmī has illustrations that are very Herati and an inner binding of 19th-century silk *atlas* (ikat) fabric. Its *sarlauh* (f.1b) with interconnected lobed roundels is akin to illuminations in other manuscripts made for Bāiqarā and early Abū'l-Khairid productions from Herat and Samarqand. It has been examined by Charles Melville, "On Some Manuscripts of Hatifi's *Timurnama*," in *Exploring Written Artefacts: Objects, Methods, and Concepts*, vol. II, eds. Jörg B. Quenzer and Michael Friedrich (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021), 1125-1126. Melville notes other *Tīmūr-nāma* written out by the same scribe from the 1530s, and suggests the Walters copy was produced in Herat or Transoxiana in the first half of the sixteenth century.

[328] Jāmī's *Bahāristān* text imitates Saʿdī's *Gulistān* but is of a biography genre. One should be aware that the provenance to the Gulbenkian *Bahāristān* is problematic for several reasons. There are Bihzād "signatures" adorning painted architectural features that look to be painted after his death, and the colophon appears forged, giving a spurious date of 903/1498 and has a false dedication to Sultan Ḥusain. It states it was made in Bukhara, by or under the supervision of Sulṭān Mīrak for ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz. The manuscript arrived in India in 1556, six years after ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz had died. Christiane Gruber proposes that "someone at the Shaybanid book atelier added Bihzād's signature to increase its value as a diplomatic gift to a Mughal monarch" by ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz's successor Yār Muḥammad ["The Gulbenkian *Bahāristān*: 'Abd al-'Aziz & the Bihzādian Tradition in 16th-Century Bukhara" published in Persian in the conference proceedings of: *Namayeshgah-i Bayn al-Malal Kemal al-Din Behzad/ International Congress on Master Kemal al-Din Behzad* (Tehran: Farhangestan-i Honar, 2005)].

[329] Natif reports the manuscript arrived in Akbar's court by the nobleman Mīr Jamāl al-Dīn Ḥusain Injū (a native of Shiraz). The Garrett manuscript must have been a prototype for the Bukharan artists before the object continued on to Akbar and Jahāngīr's libraries sometime prior to 1572 ("The Zafarnama [Book of Conquest] of Sultan Husayn Mirza," 213).

[330] Gruber, "The Gulbenkian *Bahāristān.*"

[331] The manuscript was in the collection of Eustache de Lorey, who probably acquired it in Iran.

started in his lifetime and finished for his successor Yār Muḥammad (1550–54), the next appanage leader of Bukhara. He, like ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, was never made great khan so could direct his attention to and enjoy productions from the manuscript workshops of Bukhara. Whereas the Gulbenkian *Bahāristān* was made under the supervision of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz's kitābdār Sulṭān Mīrak, the Minneapolis version was written out by the third kitābdār of the Bukharan workshops Mīr Ḥusain al-Ḥusainī, a pupil of Mīr ʿAlī.[332] Maḥmūd Muẕahhib also signed some illustrations in the Minneapolis copy. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz may not have officially commissioned a *Ẓafarnāma/Tīmūr-nāma* copy, but the same iconography used to accompany such a text found its way into other works of poetry.

H.1594's illustrations have stylistic and compositional links to other Abū'l-Khairid manuscripts from earlier phases of production and contemporaneous works produced in the 1540s and early 1550s. F.63r to H.1594 (fig. 42) is a hasty redeployment of f.84r from a copy of ʿAṭṭār's *Manṭiq al-ṭair* (fig. 43) that is speculated to have been completed in the 1520s/early 1530s by Herati artists newly arriving in Abū'l-Khairid appanages.[333] H.1594 shares visual components to a royal copy of Jāmī's *Tuḥfat al-aḥrār* in the Gulbenkian collection (MCG LA 184) scribed by Mīr Ḥusain al-Ḥusainī in 1554 which incidentally has the same binding as H.1594. In f.97b to H.1594, a seated man in the pose of a prisoner with crossed wrists enveloped in long sleeves is led by a standing figure carrying a staff who wears a two-toned garment. One side of the hem is tucked into the sash around his waist and a sword dangles at his side. The same duo appears before Yūsuf who holds a mirror (f.29v) in the Gulbenkian *Tuḥfat al-aḥrār* as they do in another loose folio from a manuscript that contains the poetry of Khwājū Kirmānī in the Gulbenkian attributed to Bukhara, 1540–50 (fig. 44).[334] This Khwājū painting is in the same caliber of execution as H.1594, and a group of four men on the right side of its composition are the direct counterparts of three men standing on the right side of H.1594's f.34v (fig. 39) and suggest the same workshop.

Other figures in H.1594 correspond to those in later courtly manuscripts made for Naurūz Aḥmad (also called Barāq) Khān ruling in Samarqand, a contemporary of Yār Muḥammad. Naurūz

---

[332] The signature is in his usual marking place in compositions, reverently on the steps of the throne for the depicted ruler to tread upon on his ascent and descent. The listing of kitābdār heads of the Bukharan workshops is in Akimushkin, "Biblioteka Shibanidov," 330-32.

[333] The provenance to an ʿAṭṭār volume (BL Add. 7735) has yet to be confirmed, but Muhammad Isa Waley's contribution "'The Speech of the Birds': an illustrated Persian manuscript" to the British Library's Asian and African Studies Blog proposes an Uzbek origin <https://blogs.bl.uk/asian-and-african/2013/11/the-speech-of-the-birds.html>. In observing visual parallels to Abū'l-Khairid manuscripts TSMK R.958 (for ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz), NMAA F.1932.5 (dated 1523), IOL 1317 (in a little-figure style), NLR Dorn 559 (dated 1521, for Kīldī Muḥammad), MMA 40.39.1 (ca. 1510), I concur with Waley's attribution.

[334] The Khwājū Kirmānī folio appears as an entry and illustration in Basil Gray, *Oriental Islamic Art: Collection of the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation* (Museu Nacional de Arte Antiga: Lisbon, 1963), no. 131.

Aḥmad, the brother of Kīldī Muḥammad Sulṭān, had originally headed the Tashkent appanage between 1533–51 before being made great khan in 1551 (lasting until 1556).[335] It can be speculated that Naurūz Aḥmad's interest in books was through exposure to his brother's patronage in the 1520s-early 30s. Shortly before his death while he presided over the broader Abū'l-Khairid state, Naurūz Aḥmad hosted the Ottoman admiral of the Seyidi (Sidi) Ali Reis while he passed through Samarqand in June 1556, and letters are preserved between Naurūz Aḥmad and Sultan Süleyman.[336] Could the H.1594 manuscript, lingering for ten or fifteen years after its completion, have been gifted to the Ottoman guest, who later passed it along to his Ottoman lords?

A figural specimen in H.1594 that appears in better-drafted manuscripts is the portly bearded man leaning on a staff. The prototype likely originated from Bihzād in the previous century. In the H.1594 counterpart (fig. 39), the rotund gentleman dons robes in red and spearmint green; in a *Tuḥfat al-aḥrār* of Jāmī for Naurūz Aḥmad with illustrations bearing the signature of Maḥmūd Muẕahhib, he is in olive green and poppy (fig. 45). These comparisons at the level of individual figures and full compositions make it is obvious that the quality of execution in H.1594's illustrations is not equivalent to contemporary works for Yār Muḥammad and Naurūz Aḥmad, and the closest counterpart to H.1594 is the Gulbenkian Khwājū folio (fig. 44). H.1594 was an early and rough attempt to complete Hātifī's *Tīmūr-nāma,* easily passed along as a gift to the Ottomans. A later version of an Abū'l-Khairid *Tīmūr-nāma*, to be examined next, would have more value and remained in Transoxiana longer, with pictorial elements that would factor into the later manuscripts for ʿAbdullāh Khan (the subject of Chapter 3).

III.ii.b. Darvīsh Muḥammad's *Tīmūr-nāma* (HAM 1957.140)

A finer copy of Hātifī's *Tīmūr-nāma* with a colophon dated 1551 in the Harvard Art Museum names Naurūz Aḥmad's son Darvīsh Muḥammad in a painted epigraphic panel.[337] Its four illustrations encompassing battle scenes (fig. 46) and an enthronement (fig. 47) are very close to the contemporary Minneapolis and Gulbenkian *Bahāristān* manuscripts (figs. 41 and 42). This iconography in Darvīsh Muḥammad's *Tīmūr-nāma* follows compositional and figural types of Maḥmūd Muẕahhib and is the precursor to the formulae associated with the style of ʿAbdullāh Muṣavvir (to be featured in Chapter 3).

---

[335] Naurūz Aḥmad had constructed a madrasa and mosque complex in Tashkent. Although an earthquake of 1868 did some damage, the site is preserved at Hast Imom up the hill from Chor Su.

[336] The account is in "Medieval Sourcebook: Sidi Ali Reis (16th Century CE): Mirat ul Memalik (The Mirror of Countries), 1557 CE," in the Internet History Sourcebooks Project by ed. Charles F. Horne, *The Sacred Books and Early Literature of the East* (New York: Parke, Austin, & Lipscomb, 1917), Vol. VI: Medieval Arabia, pp. 329-95. Available online: <https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/source/16csidi1.asp>

[337] The epigraphy reads: *fī ayyām Sulṭān Muẓaffar al-Dīn Muḥammad Darvīsh Bahādur*, which implies Darvīsh Khān b. Naurūz Aḥmad.

It is significant that a text devoted to Tīmūr's life would be produced so early in Naurūz Aḥmad's reign in Samarqand, and he might have commissioned it with the intention to give to his son who would preside over the Tashkent appanage between 1556 and 1578. Naurūz Aḥmad might have presumed Darvīsh Muḥammad would be his heir in Samarqand but ʿAbdullāh Khan intervened which affected the art and politics in the third quarter of the Abū'l-Khairid dynasty.

III.ii.c. A *kitābkhāna* in Samarqand or a secondary Bukharan workshop?

From Darvīsh Muḥammad's *Tīmūr-nāma*, it can be deduced that a main Bukharan kitābkhāna—functioning since the late 1520s or early 1530s—later came to fulfill the royal demands of the appanage heads wherever these khans were based; in other words, elite manuscripts in Bukhara were "made to order." But the lesser quality *Tīmūr-nāma* H.1594 also suggests an alternate workshop could have been operating in Bukhara in the 1540s where it produced less-refined illustrations to manuscripts, compensating quantity over quality. H.1594 copied imagery from finer manuscripts produced a decade or two earlier; as was noted, so too does the voluminously-illustrated *Tārīkh-i Abū'l-Khair Khānī* reuse whole paintings adorning Kīldī Muḥammad's own commissioned works.

I have left open the question about Samarqand as a site of manufacture for courtly commissions in this period. I am not fully content to attribute works to a kitābkhāna that is not distinctly identified in colophons and the broader historical record, although further research may clarify this. Different styles and methods of production can coexist at the same site, just as the same style can be used in different centers. It cannot be overemphasized that the mobility of materials, artists, and styles are a given in Turco-Persianate book arts, consistently crossing dynastic, geographic, and chronological lines. There remains the possibility that the artisans responsible for the Abū'l-Khairid dynastic chronicles in the mid sixteenth century did not venture far, easily commuting between Samarqand and Bukhara. Or perhaps they operated in a workshop in Bukhara outside of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz's personal kitābkhāna, but adjacent to it, as the fine Maḥmūd Muẕahhib-mannered illustration of Chinggis Khan in the *Nuṣratnāma* suggests connections to the courtly workshop but the majority of illustrations are in a coarser execution. Thus within Bukhara, a workshop offering quality production practices in paintings and bindings could intersect with an adjacent site offering speed of completion and a greater amount of illustrations per manuscript.

III.iii. *Shībānī-nāma* (ÖNB cod. mixt. 188)

I provided an overview in Chapter 1 §II.iii of historical chronicle production in the Ottoman realm during the first half of the sixteenth century. Here we will examine mid-century Ottoman ruler-*nāma* works that have subject matter explicitly related to the Abū'l-Khairids, and focus on the Turkic-verse *Shībānī-nāma* currently located in the Austrian National Library. Although other unillustrated versions in Persian by Bannāʾī exist, the Vienna manuscript is the only copy of Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ's text that chronicles the life and heroics of Muḥammad Shībānī Khan.[338] Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ finished writing his *Shībānī-nāma* and included events up to the capture of Urgench in 1505.[339] The Vienna manuscript has a colophon dated Jumāda I 916/ August-September 1510, implying the text was copied five years after Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ wrote the work but a mere two-three months before Shībānī Khan's skull was separated from his body and used as a drinking cup by Shah Ismāʿil.[340] The name of the scribe is recorded as Qāsim. Although common, a calligrapher named Mīrzā Qāsim is named in a Safavid source which reports he was killed in Herat when Safavids and Abū'l-Khairids battled for control of the city in 1526.[341]

The *Shībānī-nāma* manuscript has received the most thorough analysis in but one article by Dorothea Duda, the cataloguer of Turkish materials in the Austrian National Library.[342] She accurately locates the production of its visuals to Istanbul. Other shorter references written before hers spuriously included the object in overviews of book arts produced in Bukhara based on the subject of its text.[343] None of those authors separated its textual component from its visual, nor did they dwell on the details of the object's production at the eastern and western poles of the Persianate realm, or explore the

---

[338] Schimmel remarks that it is written in a Khivan dialect ("Some Notes on the Cultural Activity of the First Uzbek Rulers," 155), but Duda (repeating Vambéry's claim) states it is in Chaghatai (*Islamische Handschriften I: Persische Handschriften*, 92).

[339] Altıer, "Şiban Han dönemi (1500-1510) Özbek kitap sanatı," 7.

[340] Death date of late November or 10 December in L. Fekete, *Einführung in die Persische Palaeographie: 101 Persische Dokumente* (Budapest: Akademiai Kiado, 1977), 303.

[341] Mahfuz ul-Haq, "Persian Painters, Illuminators, Calligraphists etc. in the 16th Century, A. D.," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* 28 (1938): 139-49.

[342] Dorothea Duda, "The Illustrated Shaybaniname in Vienna Österreichische Nationalbibliothek Cod. Mixt. 188," in *Tenth International congress of Turkish Art* (Geneva: Fondation Max van Berchem, 1999), 261-72.

[343] As examples of this mistake, Blair and Bloom write: "crude paintings [added in Bukhara] following Persian styles of the late 16th century were added c. 1600" to the *Shībānī-nāma* manuscript ("Central Asia" subsection to "Illustration" in *Grove Encyclopedia*, 249). Ashrafi-Aini erroneously asserts, "miniatures from the *Shaybānīnāma* of Muhammad Sālih copied in 916/1510, in the Vienna National Library, help us to obtain more reliable information on the art of this period. …[T]he miniatures…[date] between 1510 and 1520" ("The School of Bukhara to c. 1550," 260). They indeed add to our understanding of the period's art, albeit in the Ottoman realm and not Transoxiana.

relationship between Istanbul and Bukhara. Hence my pursuit of these very topics to uncover the ramifications of the object's joint manufacture.

To Duda the text to the Vienna manuscript is "written in bold calligraphic taʿliq of presumable Ottoman type"[344] with two columns of eleven lines, but this is also true for the first officially commissioned Abū'l-Khairid manuscript, the *Fatḥnāma*. Although there could have been later trimming, both the *Shībānī-nāma* and the *Fatḥnāma* have similar page dimensions (*Fatḥnāma*: 21x14 cm, *Shībānī-nāma*: 24x16.5 cm) which suggest similar production circumstances (location, time period) for their textual productions, that is to say between 1507–10, in Transoxiana (Herat or Samarqand). I agree with Altıer who states the scribing and illuminating of the *Shībānī-nāma*'s *sarlauh* and *ʿunvān* designs with interlocking lobed shapes are indebted to Timurid traditions in Herat, and produced in an early Abū'l-Khairid workshop. Duda however posits the entire work was a copy of a now lost original, fully produced in Istanbul derived from Herat-Tabriz traditions.[345] Supporting this latter view, Esin Atıl lists Persian and Turkish classics that were abundantly reproduced by Ottoman court artists between 1520–74, and cites a Turkic *Şeybanname* title but does not give the author's name or any other information.[346] My analysis however takes as an established fact that the manuscript's text and heading illumination was produced in Transoxiana, then the physical object migrated westwards to reach the Istanbul nakkaşhane at an uncertain date. Political and artistic exchanges between Ottomans and Uzbeks are not fully known in the first half of the sixteenth century but can be gleaned from the materiality of this very manuscript.

The *Shībānī-nāma* has a note in German written in black ink that calls attention to some erasing and recopying in the original manuscript (f.118b). This writing was added in the nineteenth century by Armin Vámbéry—the Hungarian scholar, traveller, linguist, Ottoman secretary, British spy, and Bram Stoker's consultant in the writing of Dracula—who produced a critical edition of the work in 1885.[347] In perhaps the 1820s the manuscript reached the court library of Vienna, having most likely been taken

---

[344] Duda, "The Illustrated Shaybaniname," 261.

[345] Altıer, "Şiban Han dönemi (1500-1510) Özbek kitap sanatı," 7. Duda notes the similarity to other works painted in Istanbul taken from the Herat-Tabriz tradition ("The Illustrated Shaybaniname," 267).

[346] Esin Atıl, ed., *Turkish Art* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1980), 165.

[347] The original text and its translation into German are found in Vambéry, *Die Scheïbaniade.*

from Istanbul by an Austrian diplomat serving the Habsburg administration.[348] A blurred and partially legible ex libris (f.1a) in black ink mixed with gold dust seems to give the name of a *sarʿaskar* (commander in chief; general) of the Girāy Khans of Crimea suggesting ownership in the mid-eighteenth century.[349] Beside it are the faint remnants of an Ottoman *tughra.* Although badly rubbed, these lines and loops match the seal of Sultan Süleyman's son and intended heir Şehzade Mehmet (b. 1522–November 1543) which affixes a provenance of 1530 through the early 1540s to the illustrations.[350] It seems the Ottoman sultan became interested in activities over in Transoxiana and wanted an illustrated manuscript to enjoy reading with his son about new allies in the region who could help defeat the Safavids in Iran.

III.iii.a. Abū'l-Khairids in Ottoman chronicles between 1500–1520

As was stated in Chapter 1, early Ottoman universal histories of the fifteenth century had a scope of subject matter spanning the creation of the world, tales of the prophets, and multiple regional dynasties and a style indebted to Firdausī. Some of these works forged connections between the Seljuqs in Central Asia with the early Ottomans through the common ancestor Oghuz Khan.[351] Later works were less wide ranging, versifying the history of the House of Osman in isolation. Enthronement scenes are clearly derived from traditions in Turco-Persianate arts of the book, and overtly appropriate *Shāhnāma* iconography. This is evident in a scene of Bayezid I holding court painted circa 1460 (decades after his reign) in Ahmedi's universal history, the *Iskender-nâme*.[352] A copy of Malik Āhī's *Bayezid-nāma* penned in 1486 had illustrations added in 1495 which included portraits of Sultan Bayezid II seated with his viziers.[353]

I mentioned Idrīs-i Bitlīsī's *Hasht bihisht* panegyric from 1506 in Chapter 1 in which the Ottomans are presented as the more "cultured" brother designated as "Roman" and with the Central Asian sibling bearing the title "Turk" and "Turanian."[354] However, this opinion seems to have promptly

---

[348] ÖNB cod. A.F. 129 containing Saʿdī's *Būstān* and *Gulistān* was presented by the Austrian Internuntius in Istanbul to the Imperial Library in Vienna in 1758 (Duda, *Islamische Handschriften* 3). Perhaps the *Shībānī-nāma* left Istanbul at this same time and by these same means.

[349] Duda, *Islamische Handschriften,* 90.

[350] My gratitude to Ali Seslikaya for this *tughra* identification and sharing with me the entry in Suha Umur, *Osmanlı Padişah Tuğraları* (Istanbul: Cem yayinevi, 1980).

[351] Anooshahr, *Turkestan and the Rise of Eurasian Empires*, 33.

[352] Biblioteca Nazionala Marciana (Venice), Cod. Or. XC (57) Edirne ff.240v-241r.

[353] TSMK H.1123, f.30v.

[354] Anooshahr, *Turkestan and the Rise of Eurasian Empires*, 32-35.

changed around 1507. After being forced out of Transoxiana by the troops of Shībānī Khan, the last Timurid ruler of Herat Badīʿ al-Zamān Mīrzā (son of Sultan Ḥusain Bāiqarā) took refuge first with the Safavids in Tabriz then went to Istanbul under the protection of the Ottomans in 1514. An illustration showing Badīʿ al-Zamān presenting a Firdausian *Shāhnāma* copy as a gift to Sultan Selim I appears in the *Selim-nâma* composed by Shukrī Bitlīsī from circa 1525-30 (fig. 48).[355] This *Selim-nâma* manuscript (and most likely the very *Shāhnāma* copy rendered within it) was presented to Sultan Süleyman a few years after his accession.[356] The Ottoman hosts were happy to receive the exiled Timurid prince but their curiosity was surely piqued by the strength of the new power in Central Asia who had evicted him, and who might be able to engage the common Safavid enemy by raiding Iran's eastern border while the Ottomans concurrently battled on the western flank.

Shībānī Khan himself is first explicitly mentioned in the *Selim-nâma* chapter within Kemalpaşazâde's dynastic chronicle *Tavārīkh-i āl-i ʿUṯmān* finished in 1512. Kemalpaşazâde introduces Shībānī as a Mongol descendant of Chinggis, and mentions that he was captured and tortured to death when Ismāʿīl defeated Shībānī's Tatar troops.[357] With phrasing denigrating the Safavids, Shībānī is rendered sympathetically in the mind of the Ottoman readers of the text. Sultan Süleyman inherited these *Selim-nâma* versions by Shukrī Bitlīsī and Kemalpaşazâde and would have browsed through the pages to read about the exploits of his ancestors, their allies, and their enemies. Thus, Ottoman vanity towards Central Asia at the onset of the sixteenth century seems to have subsided by the time Süleyman took control in 1520.

III.iii.b. *Shāhnāma* and ruler-*nāma* production under Süleyman

Süleyman was famously enamored of Turco-Persianate cultural forms within his long reign (1520–66). Midway through his reign in 1545, a post for the official court historian writing in Persian was created and was referred to as the *Şehnâmeci*.[358] An important specimen of *Şehnâmeci* production

---

[355] Tanındı suspects it was the manuscript completed in 1493 for Sulṭān ʿAlī Mīrzā, the Turkman ruler of Gilan, dubbed the "Turkmen" or "Big Head" *Shāhnāma* on account of its figures' exaggerated proportions ("The Illustration of the *Shahnama* and the Art of the Book in Ottoman Turkey," 144). Charles Melville's analysis on this *Shāhnāma* does not confirm this ["The 'Big Head' *Shāhnāma* in Istanbul and Elsewhere: Some Codicological and Iconographical Observations," in *The Arts of Iran in Istanbul and Anatolia*, eds. Olga Davidson and Shreve Simpson (Boston, MA: Ilex Foundation, 2018), 113-49].

[356] TSMK H.1597-98, illustrated circa 1525 following the death of its author. Tanındı suspects that it was Sultan ʿAlī Mīrzā's (big head) *Shāhnāma* ("The Illustration of the *Shahnama* and the Art of the Book in Ottoman Turkey," 144).

[357] Passage translated by Uğur, *The Reign of Sultan Selim I in the Light of the Selim-Name Literature*, 228.

[358] Yıldız explains that the *Şehnâmeci* tradition would become further developed and increasingly Ottomanized with texts predominantly written in Turkish in the latter half of the sixteenth century and into the seventeenth ("Ottoman Historical Writing in Persian," 469). Any discussion of illustrated Ottoman histories must of course take into account Fetvaci, *Picturing History at the Ottoman Court*.

is ʿĀrifī's (d. 1561) five-part *Tārīkh-i āl-i ʿUsmān* (written, illustrated, and bound in 1558) which includes the renowned last section, the *Süleyman-nâma* (TSMK H.1517) covering events from Süleyman's reign up to 1555. Süleyman himself reviewed the some 30,000 verses of his biography written in Persian using the *masnavī* genre and employing the *mutaqārib* meter of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma*.[359]

It is notable that in the context of such Ottoman ruler-*nāma* production at the time ʿĀrifī was composing the work, Turkic-language versions of Firdausī's epic were being copied and illustrated in the court during the 1540s and 1550s which must have provided an additional stimulus for the creation of a similar epic covering Süleyman's own rule and events in it.[360] Ottoman manuscript productions of Firdausī's original Persian text and commissioned Turkic-language translations as they connect to select Abū'l-Khairid manuscripts will be further explored in Chapter 4. But I will here preliminarily highlight some main points: there seem to be no Persian-language copies of Firdausī's text that were illustrated in the workshops of the Sublime Porte. Instead in the imperial capital during the mid sixteenth century, we find *Şehnâme-i türkî* (Turkic translations of Firdausī's text). Persian Firdausian versions produced in the Ottoman sphere are associated with truncated copies attributed to late-sixteenth century Baghdad which we examined above (§III.i), and will further analyze in Chapter 3 §III.ii.b. Against this backdrop of illustrated histories and translated *Shāhnāma* productions in the Ottoman realm in the mid sixteenth century, we can now add an Ottoman interest in completing a ruler-*nāma* about another dynasty. Whereas artists of Iranian origin who had formerly served in Safavid workshops are attested to in several period sources, there is "no record known of a painter associated with Bukhara working in the reign of Süleyman I," and so it must be concluded that Ottoman interest in the Abū'l-Khairid dynasty came from within the court.[361]

Duda theorizes the *Shībānī-nāma*'s "modest" illustrations are derivations of the grander *Süleyman-nâma* project given commonalities in color usage and composition layout. Duda dates the *Shībānī-nāma* after the *Süleyman-nâma*, proposing an "Istanbul origin in the late 16th or early 17th century."[362] To her, "one member of the same department" worked on both the *Süleyman-nâma* and

---

[359] Esin Atıl, *Süleymanname: The Illustrated History of Süleyman the Magnificent* (Washington, D.C.: The National Gallery of Art, 1986), 35.

[360] Ibid., 64.

[361] G.M. Meredith-Owens, "A Sixteenth-century Illustrated Turkish Manuscript at Manchester," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 48, no. 2, (1966): 373.

[362] Duda, "The Illustrated Shaybaniname," 267.

Shībānī-nāma, and the paintings were carried out by less-talented pupils of the courtly masters who had originally painted in the 1550s. These apprentices might have "later started to work in a smaller workshop which may or may not have been connected with the royal court" who had completed the work for the Ottoman sultan then turned their attention to compositions related to another dynasty.[363] This late attribution is not substantiated however by the visual and historical record; relations between Uzbeks and Ottomans had soured by the early 1590s, and the Abū'l-Khairid dynasty itself weakened and fell in 1598 making a text devoted to its first ruler an unlikely project at the onset of a new power in the region (the Tūqāy-Timurids—to be treated in Chapter 5). Artistic styles in the Ottoman workshops had also shifted by the late sixteenth century. An earlier stage of Ottoman painting indebted to Herat traditions characterized by drooping mustaches lasted between 1520–60.[364] The *Shībānī-nāma* is a specimen of this phase rather than the other style that followed that was brought about by artists native to Anatolia incorporating local features into their illustrations, such as Ottoman courtly garb.

Corresponding to the date of Şehzade Mehmet's death, my pre-1543 provenance to the illustrations to the *Shībānī-nāma* chronologically follows those in the *Selim-nâma* attributed to Shukrī circa 1525-30 (fig. 48), but comes before the completion of the illustrated *Süleyman-nâma* from the 1550s.[365] This means that the *Shībānī-nāma* was illustrated around the same time as the *Şehnâmeci* position first became popularized in the Ottoman court. In this same decade—1540–50— we also see courtly illustrated copies of Şerif Âmidî's Turkic translation of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma*. In one (H.1520, circa 1545) the courtiers of Kayūmarṯ wear close-fitting leopard caps akin to that on Shībānī's head in the *Shībānī-nāma* (fig. 51).[366] In refining Duda's provenance I argue that the artists of the *Shībānī-nāma* hailed from or were trained by the artists of the *Selim-nâma* of Shukrī. In turn, after filling in the *Shībānī-nāma*'s blank spaces, it was actually the arrangement of these very figures and compositions that aided the painters of the *Süleyman-nâma* in the following decade. Ayşin Yoltar has also demonstrated how painters in the Ottoman realm refurbished unfinished manuscripts to showcase their efforts in hopes of then being hired for grander projects, such as to complete a biography of the sultan

---

[363] Ibid., 263.

[364] Atıl describes this style in *Süleymanname*, 43-44, and also in a longer explanation in *Turkish Art*, 164.

[365] Altıer has also attempted to refine the *Shībānī-nāma*'s provenance and suggests its illustrations were carried out between 1540-1550, before the *Süleyman-nâma* project.

[366] Illustration of Kayūmarṯ and courtiers (H.1520, f.8a) reproduced in Serpil Bağcı, et al., *Osmanlı Resim Sanatı* (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2006), 94, fig. 55.

and his ancestors.[367] As we shall see in Chapters 4 and 5, previously scribed texts were a means to practice compositions and styles that would then be used to complete more important ruler-*nāma* commissions of various courts in the Turco-Persianate world, and the *Shībānī-nāma* is a further example of this.

III.iii.c. Illustrative program to the *Shībānī-nāma* situated in courtly Ottoman manuscript production

Duda found several visual features in the *Shībānī-nāma* comparable to those in the *Süleyman-nâma* of 1558. Note the compositions of the paintings "Reception of the Iranian ambassador in Amasya" in the *Süleyman-nâma* (fig. 49) and the *Shībānī-nāma*'s rendering of Shībānī Khan celebrating his victory over Andijan in a garden setting (fig. 50), particularly the *sāya-bān* (tented covering) above the seated rulers and their short-sleeved kaftans over colorful robes. In the *Shībānī-nāma*, Shībānī Khan on horseback in the top left corner defeats Bābur at Sarpul (fig. 51); in the *Süleyman-nâma* (fig. 52) we see the death of the rebel leader Kalender in a composition with a similar high horizon, multiple riders, attention to flora and vegetation, some swirling clouds, and mustachioed profiles of the figures. Soldiers climb trees during a storm en route to Vienna in the *Süleyman-nâma* (f.266a). Similar sinuous branches, blossoming plants, cypress trees on the horizon appear in Shībānī Khan's victory celebration in Tashkent (f.150a). There are further visual parallels: Süleyman and Shībānī sit on hexagonal thrones under umbrella-like sun shades in the folios with Süleyman inspecting prisoners after the Ottoman siege of Vienna (fig. 53), and Shībānī sitting in the garden of his summer residence near Samarqand (f.54). Shībānī is self-referentially receiving a book (perhaps the very *Shībānī-nāma* text) offered by the poet Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ dressed in yellow. The slight S-shaped sway of the standing figure in the *Shībānī-nāma*, standing on the left side in cobalt and rose robes, mirrors the pair in the *Süleyman-nâma* on the right wearing white turbans.

I have found overt stylistic parallels between the *Shībānī-nāma* and a Niẓāmī *Khamsa* in the Topkapı collection (TSMK H.764) which has been attributed to the Ottoman sphere in the 1530s through 1540s.[368] This *Khamsa* too carries the insignia of Süleyman's son Şehzade Mehmet. Its scribe —ʿAbd al-Ghaffār b. ʿAbd al-Vāḥid b. Kamāl al-Dīn ʿAbdullāh al-Quraishī—has a name suggesting

---

[367] Yoltar, "The Role of Illustrated Manuscripts in Ottoman Luxury Book Production: 1413-1520," 529.

[368] A 1540s provenance is given by Amy Landau, "From Poet to Painter: Allegory and Metaphor in a Seventeenth-Century Persian Painting by Muḥammad Zaman, Master of Farangī-Sāzī," *Muqarnas* 28 (2011): 126, ftn. 34. Reproductions of illustrations to H.764 dated to the 1530s and provenance information to it are in Ivan Stchoukine, *Les Peintures des Manuscrits de la 'Khamseh' de Niẓāmī au Topkapı Saray Muzesi d'Istanbul*, 145-47.

family origins in the Arabian peninsula, a region the Ottomans took from the Mamluks in 1517. Smaller details and broader compositions within the *Shībānī-nāma* and the *Khamsa* are uncanny in their similarity and prove they are from a common workshop. The *Shībānī-nāma* contains nine miniatures with two spaces left blank while the *Khamsa* is more prolific with twelve miniatures in its illustrative program. In both manuscripts, little figures interact on high horizons dotted with foliated clusters beneath gold skies. Nearly the same composition is used to render an enthronement scene in a garden with attendants, musicians, flowers, and wine ewers in the *Khamsa* (fig. 55) as in a folio from the *Shībānī-nāma* of the poet Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ presenting his manuscript to Shībānī Khan seated atop a gold throne with black filigree detailing (fig. 54). Mustachioed profiles common to Ottoman arts of the book grimace in both works. Reticulated patterning on a stepped structure in the *Khamsa* (f.316b) appears in the *Shībānī-nāma* (f.23b). A similar domed pavilion extends into the upper margins on the *Khamsa* (fig. 56) as it does in the *Shībānī-nāma* (fig. 57). Symmetric doors set inside an arced spandrel have a central partition with two knockers in the *Khamsa* (f.201b) and the *Shībānī-nāma*'s ff.44a, 111a, 162b. The most convincing detail proving these two manuscripts are by the same artist or of the same workshop are the identical jewel-encrusted gold ewers in the *Khamsa* (figs. 56, 57) and the enthroned Shībānī Khan (fig. 54).

III.iii.d. Books from the east brought to the west

As a further specimen of the artistic style shared by the *Khamsa* and *Shībānī-nāma* manuscripts, recall the Firdausian *Shāhnāma* R.1549 with Transoxianan origins in the late-Timurid and early Abū'l-Khairid period in the previous chapter (§III.iii). Alongside its illustrations in the little-figure style (figs. 5, 7), I mentioned others present which reflect Tabrizi trends carried out in an Ottoman nakkaşhane (fig. 8). This second style is detectable through the double chins on figures, ground dotted with grass tufts and large hollyhock clusters, and usage of gold on filigreed thrones and clothing ornamentation. I will conclude this section and chapter by examining documentary evidence that sheds light on the relationship between the Sublime Porte and Shībānī Khan's descendants in Central Asia, and which might explain the transfer of these manuscripts at this time.

III.iii.e. Proposed rationale for the production of the *Shībānī-nāma*

This final section sifts through the archives, bringing up key letters written between heads of state and information on the manuscript's past ownership. Although I have not yet found anything explicitly stated, these details offer a rationale for the production of this *Shībānī-nāma.* In tandem with

other illustrated manuscripts of biographic and epic content that appear to have played a role in Abū'l-Khairid–Ottoman diplomacy in the sixteenth century, period epistolary documentation between Ottoman sultans and Uzbek khans is a means to confirm political interactions in the early-modern period. I have found sources in the British Library and Ottoman Archives and have relied heavily on the publications and translations of documents by Toru Horikawa, Jean-Louis Bacqué-Grammont, Audrey Burton, Burt Fragner, L. Fekete and their analysis on them (see App. 3: Correspondence between Ottoman and Abū'l-Khairid rulers, ca. 1500–1598).

Epistolary relations began during the reigns of Shībānī and Bayezid II who were both worried about the expansion of the nascent state of Shah Ismāʿīl, but there were no formal connections linking the khan and sultan.[369] Following Shībānī's death, ʿUbaidullāh's decades in power (1514–40) were marked by more correspondence between him and the sultans Selim and Süleyman. Bacqué-Grammont has examined an intelligence report written in Ottoman Turki sent to the Sublime Porte concerning the distribution of appanages and with an assessment of the military forces of the Abū'l-Khairid khanate under Abū Saʿīd b. Kūchkūnchī (r. 1530–1533).[370] The document declares that during his reign, "from the *yeşilbaş* came an ambassador" who resided in Anatolia while Süleyman was engaged in the Ottomans' "Two Iraqs" campaign against Shah Ṭahmāsp.[371] Other letters exchanged between dynastic leaders have been translated and analyzed by Bacqué-Grammont who remarks, "the main topics discussed are reciprocal wishes for little change[.] …Another constant is the expression of the need for concerted action. As we know, this military action could not be coordinated," especially at the most favorable moment between 1534–35 when the Safavids were being hedged in by Ottomans gaining Tabriz and Baghdad, and the Abū'l-Khairids were conducting another siege of Herat.[372]

All this is to confirm that by the time Süleyman assumed the throne in 1520 a strong alliance had been formed with the Abū'l-Khairids which lasted his entire reign. The Safavid dynasty was the common enemy to the Abū'l-Khairids and Ottomans, and across the sixteenth century there was mutual interest in military collaboration between Iran's neighbors but the Ottomans remained the dominant power compared to the Abū'l-Khairids. Audrey Burton sums up the relationship as derived from a commonality of confession, Central Asian origin (which, as was noted, picked up after 1507), and

---

[369] Horikawa, "The Shaybanid Dynasty and the Ottoman Empire," 53.

[370] Bacqué-Grammont, "Les événements d'Asie centrale en 1510 d'après un document ottoman," 207.

[371] Bacqué-Grammont, "Une liste ottomane de princes et d'apanages Abu'l-Khairides," 425.

[372] Translated from the French. Bacqué-Grammont, "Ubaydu-llah han de Boukhara et Soliman le Magnifique," 487.

communication (Persian and Turki). The Abū'l-Khairids were keen to maintain healthy relations with the Ottomans controlling access to the Muslim pilgrimage sites. Burton writes, "The distance separating the countries made it difficult to co-ordinate their attacks [with a lag of one year in correspondence], although each side made good use of the other's campaigns against Iran in order to conquer large slices of Iranian territory. Except in the [1590s], when the Uzbegs planned to conquer parts of Iran situated within reach of Turkey, relations were and remained friendly, and the unequal partnership flourished, bringing benefits to both sides."[373]

News of the revived splendor of ʿUbaidullāh's Bukhara reached Istanbul and aroused Ottoman interest in the city that had finally flourished after the Mongol devastation three centuries ago. ʿUbaidullāh's reputation continued to resonate in the Ottoman sphere long after his death, and his portrait fills a roundel in the *Jamʿ-i tārīkh* (Collection of History), an illustrated genealogical manuscript produced in Baghdad, 1606–07.[374] Dūghlāt reports that ʿUbaidullāh personally wrote out the words of the Qur'an, implying two copies in his *naskh* calligraphic specialty, and sent them to the noble cities of Mecca and Medina.[375] This dispatch of Qur'anic manuscripts came at an unknown date, sometime after Ottoman victory over the Mamluks in 1517 but before ʿUbaidullāh's death in 1540, and is proof of Abū'l-Khairid contact with the Ottomans who were now administering the important pilgrimage sites. Beside these religious works, the personal poetry compilations of Shībānī and ʿUbaidullāh themselves at some point found their way into the Topkapı collection by way of cultural or diplomatic exchange, and I suspect the manuscripts arrived during the first half of the sixteenth century.[376]

Who would have wanted a ruler-*nāma* about a non-Ottoman dynasty to be produced in the Ottoman court? Esin Atıl suggests that flipping through illustrated histories of the Ottoman "dynasty and its rulers was… a tradition in which the best talents of the empire were employed. …[They were]

---

[373] Audrey Burton, "Relations between the Khanate of Bukhara and Ottoman Turkey, 1558-1702," *International Journal of Turkish Studies* 5 (1990-91): 103.

[374] ME 8457, f.17b. I am grateful to Melis Taner for bringing this image to my attention. Uzbeks are not included in other illustrated genealogies of the *Silsilename* genre, which include serial portraits produced between 1579 and 1595, and longer universal histories covering the reign of Murad III.

[375] Soucek, *A History of Inner Asia*, 155.

[376] The Topkapı holds Shībānī Khan's *Dīvān* that he himself might have written out in Turkic verse (TSMK A.2436) which is dated 1507-08. The collection also holds a copy of the *Dīvān* of ʿUbaidī also in Turki (TSMK 2381), although a version of this work with better provenance signed by the scribe Sulṭān ʿAlī is in the British Library (BL Add. 7907).

produced for private use, for the enjoyment of the members of the dynasty."[377] Christine Woodhead has further clarified that most Ottoman ruler-*nāma* "exist in unique copies only, that they are generally in excellent condition, and that there are virtually no references to them in the works of other Ottoman historians, [which] suggests that they were not read at all by contemporaries… [but this] misses the point that the essential target audience was not a public or a popular one, but the sultan, his entourage and his advisers."[378] The Ottoman rulers took an interest in other dynasties, especially if they were Muslim and of Turkic heritage, and the idea to illustrate a text on the Abū'l-Khairid dynastic founder's biography that had been previously deposited would have appealed to the ruling Ottoman monarch for personal pleasure, or with the intention to gift it back to ʿUbaidullāh's successors in a gesture of goodwill.[379]

ʿUbaidullāh and Süleyman had corresponded throughout the 1520s and 30s and the letters that survive today might be but a few of many. The volume is alluded to by records from the Safavid chancellery that makes fun of Ottoman-Uzbek correspondence after the Safavid victory over the Abū'l-Khairids in the Battle of Jām in 1529. Safavid secretaries cast Uzbek emissaries as coming from the embassy of Bilqis to the court of Solomon, juxtaposing an emasculated ʿUbaidullāh Khan with the Queen of Sheba, and Sultan Süleyman with King Solomon in their parody.[380] A final letter written in Persian by ʿUbaidullāh's son ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz dated 1541 arrived in Istanbul to notify Süleyman of the great khan's death a year and a half earlier.[381] Sultan Süleyman could have come up with the idea to complete the *Shībānī-nāma* project perhaps as a result of losing his ally ʿUbaidullāh Khan; I might even venture it was a project to honor the illustrious uncle of his departed "friend."

---

[377] Atıl, *Süleymanname*, 44.

[378] Christine Woodhead, "Reading Ottoman 'Şehnames': Official Historiography in the Late Sixteenth Century," *Studia Islamica* 104/105 (2007): 70.

[379] Prof. Woodhead in private correspondence has directed my attention to later Ottoman manuscripts with subject matter on other dynasties made in the time of Murad III: Seyfi Çelebi's history of eastern kingdoms and the *Tarih-i hind-i garbi* indicates Ottoman interest in the wider contemporary world. She writes, "There is less obvious evidence for Suleyman but absence of evidence is not evidence of absence."

[380] Reported in Mitchell, *The Practice of Politics in Safavid Iran*, 64.

[381] Letter dated March 1541/Ẕū al-hijja 947 (BOA doc. TSMA E. 5489).

IV. Conclusion

The book arts presented in this chapter demonstrate a need to alter ways of thinking that expect illustrated manuscripts to be "entities planned in advance and meticulously executed as uniform, complete objects."[382] Unity of style does not seem to have been a component of aesthetic judgment in the Turco-Persianate world during the early-modern period. Stylistic conformity need not be equated with coherence; manuscripts could lack the former but still possess the latter. What is more, several of the manuscripts presented in this chapter confirm a predilection for completing an already-transcribed text no matter what its origins. It could be due to economy or to emphasize a connection and affinity to the original center and/or era beginning the project.

Despite insufficient information about their physical transfer and date of dispatch, it is incontrovertible that multiple manuscripts written out in Transoxiana—some with paintings added in that region—were sent to the Ottomans and finished under their auspices. The *Shībānī-nāma*, like *Shāhnāma* R.1549, entered the Ottoman realm and empty picture boxes were filled in during Süleyman's reign. Akin to the truncated *Shāhnāma* H.1514 written by Maḥmūd b. Muḥammad al-Balkhī in 1535 but later illustrated in Ottoman Baghdad, a *Kulliyāt* of Navāʾī dated 1536 (TIEM 1946) names a Mīr ʿAlī Bukhārāʾī as the copyist and has illustrations indebted to Tabrizi elements that have been attributed to an Ottoman school operating in the 1550s.[383] Similarly, a *Dīvān* of ʿAlī-Shīr Navāʾī in the Topkapı (R.806) has a colophon naming the scribe Muḥammad b. Dūst Muḥammad Samarqandī and a 1534 date of completion. However, it has Ottoman illustrations from this same decade (1530s). It does not seem to be the case that scribes and artisans of Transoxianan origin and/or heritage were employed in the nakkaşhane of Istanbul. It is more feasible that the textual components to these manuscripts were scribed in Transoxiana and the objects made their way to Ottoman parts during the decades of Süleyman's reign where they were illustrated and finished.

Whatever was the exact process of their completion, fully within Transoxiana or written out there and completed in the Ottoman realm, the main manuscripts presented here are specimens of manuscript amalgamation corresponding to what the scholar of Mughal painted arts John Seyller terms "eclectic manuscripts." To Seyller, such manuscripts occur "in the aggregate, and not the level of an

---

[382] Natif, "The SOAS *Anvār-i Suhaylī*," 354.

[383] The manuscript carries an inscription to ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz in a white *shamsa*. It seems the text was a courtly project completed in Bukhara and the illustrations were added to the blank page spaces in Istanbul; at present I am unable to assert whether this project was officially coordinated.

individual artist."[384] Inherent in the *Nuṣratnāma*, the truncated *Shāhnāma* manuscript H.1514, *Tīmūr-nāma* H.1594, and *Shībānī-nāma*, these manuscripts' processes of completion are collective and cumulative. What is notable is how the concept of uniformity associated with a single textual and pictorial site is not privileged. As a case in point, the most celebrated *Shāhnāma* manuscript of all, Ṭahmāsp's *Shāhnāma-yi shāhī,* is itself an eclectic manuscript: its illustrations attest to stylistic variety by multiple masters, over a span of ten years, and carried out in two centers.[385]

---

[384] Seyller, "Overpainting in the Cleveland *Ṭūṭīnāma*," 294.

[385] By scrutinizing the movements of Bihzād and the artists of the Herat kitābkhāna, Bahari suggests the Ṭahmāsp *Shāhnāma* was begun in Herat (under the orders of Ismāʿīl I) until the siege of the city by the Abū'l-Khairid Uzbeks in 1527-28. At this point the artists could have gone to Tabriz and continued their projects there ("Timurid to Safavid Transition," 159).

Chapter 3

From the Khan to the Sultan: the Abū'l-Khairid *Shāhnāma* in the Topkapı (H.1488) and manuscript production under ʿAbdullāh b. Iskandar Khan

This chapter scrutinizes the circumstances of production and physical transfer of a Firdausian *Shāhnāma* copy located in the Topkapı Palace Library registered as H.1488, resting mere meters from where it was given over 400 years ago. It was completed in Bukhara in 1564 when the city had long been the de facto capital of the Abū'l-Khairids. We are privileged to have preserved documentation explaining how the lavish manuscript journeyed westwards thirty years later, clutched by the Bukharan ambassador Adtāsh Bahādur. He was led to the Alay Köşkü (parade pavilion) on Alemdar Caddesi on the edge of the Gülhane gardens in Istanbul on Wednesday, 4 January 1594 (12 Rabīʿ II 1002).[386] There the Bukharan noble presented the work on behalf of the Abū'l-Khairid leader ʿAbdullāh Khan to officials acting in the Ottoman Sultan Murad III's stead. The giving and receiving of books is part of a long tradition of *pīshkash*—gift exchange—across theTurco-Persianate sphere, and out of all the manuscripts examined in the chapters of this present study, ʿAbdullāh Khan's *Shāhnāma* offers the most concrete proof of Ottoman and Abū'l-Khairid diplomatic and artistic exchange.

Through artistic and political lenses, I will focus on the two dates significant to the manuscript: when it was completed in 1564, and the moment when it was later presented to the Ottomans in early 1594. Examining politics and painting at the poles of this thirty-year period, I will provide insight into the courtly Abū'l-Khairid arts of the book and the role of manuscripts in their diplomacy. My discussion will first enumerate ʿAbdullāh's political reforms and unification strategies in the domestic arena, as well as his transregional relations with the Ottomans. Next, I will contextualize ʿAbdullāh Khan's *Shāhnāma* with regard to other mid-century manuscripts from his kitābkhāna in Bukhara. By taking a multi-pronged approach, I shall compare that volume with other illustrated ruler-*nāma* and Firdausian *Shāhnāma* works in the style of ʿAbdullāh Muṣavvir completed in the mid-1550s through the 1570s. I will also incorporate unillustrated biographical chronicles extolling ʿAbdullāh Khan's deeds and leadership. The third and final section examines the historical and political circumstances surrounding the presentation of ʿAbdullāh Khan's *Shāhnāma* to the Ottomans against the broader backdrop of manuscript production and gifting as part of his diplomacy.

---

[386] William Samuel Peachy, "A Year in Selânikî's History: 1593-4" (PhD diss., Indiana University, 1984), 334.

I. Khan made Shah: ʿAbdullāh's political and cultural motivations to produce a Firdausian *Shāhnāma*

Both R.D. McChesney and Martin Dickson have outlined the changing political dynamics in the Abū'l-Khairid khanate across the sixteenth century. Dickson adumbrates the Uzbeks' continuation of Turco-Mongol traditions at the dynasty's start, practices that markedly differed from the Safavids who ruled in accordance with "a European theoretical concept of kingship...[with a] clear locus of power in a specific individual with succession automatically passing down from father to son."[387] In contrast, within the Abū'l-Khairid realm the "locus of power devolved upon the entire ruling Dynastic House rather than an individual."[388] The early Abū'l-Khairid political system initiated by Muḥammad Shībānī Khan was essentially a confederation of independent city-states with Bukhara, Balkh, Tashkent, and Samarqand being the larger power centers governed by hereditary chiefs, who were originally uncles and nephews to Shībānī. Following the death of Shībānī, the great khan in Samarqand would typically be the oldest dynastic member. Dickson distinguishes the different concept of rulership in the Safavid and Abū'l-Khairid realms by describing how Shah Ṭahmāsp "headed" his dynasty while the designated great khan "represented" his.[389] However, according to Dickson, the Abū'l-Khairid administration converted from this shared power structure around 1550, at which point it shifted "into a sub-variety of the 'Irano-Islamic' model for dynastic succession."[390]

I.i. The lead-up to 1557

In §III to the prior chapter, I mentioned surviving epistolary documentation between the Ottomans and Abū'l-Khairids that sheds light on their relationship. Continuing this investigation of these sources, further material elucidates circumstances prior to ʿAbdullāh's rise to power in 1557, and the ensuing domestic and foreign political relations that he inherited from the preceding appanage heads (consult App. 3). Until then, power was shared and distributed across the appanages, with Samarqand serving as the political center of the great khan (even if this power was only symbolic), while the cultural and military head presided in Bukhara.

---

[387] McChesney, "CENTRAL ASIA VI. In the 16th-18th Centuries."

[388] Dickson, "Shah Tahmasp and the Uzbeks," 25.

[389] Martin Dickson, "Uzbek Dynastic Theory in the Sixteenth Century," *Trudy XXV-ogo Mezhdunardnogo Kongressa Vosto-kovedov* (Moscow: Proceedings of the 25th International Congress of Orientalists, 1963): 210.

[390] Dickson, "Shah Tahmasp and the Uzbeks," 27.

By 1550, exchanges between Bukhara and the Sublime Porte increased to such an extent that diplomatic dispatches went beyond written words. Sultan Süleyman I proclaimed not only friendship to ʿAbd al-Laṭīf but also offered military aid. After a Bukharan embassy visited Constantinople in 1551, an entry from Süleyman's diary relates that the Ottomans promised three hundred janissaries and cannons (*tūp va żarb-zanān*) all worthy of the generalship of the sultan himself in 1554.[391] It is not known whether book arts also traveled at this time alongside the soldiers, ambassadors, and weapons. Based on Ottoman records requesting safe passage for these personnel and goods from the shores of the eastern Black Sea to the lower Volga, across the Caspian Sea, through Khwarazm, and into Abū'l-Khairid lands, we know this northern route avoiding Safavid territory was the road taken. Moreover, despite being longer, this safer travel route proved more popular at that time. Janissaries were still found in Khwarazm in 1555.[392]

The war aid arrived after ʿAbd al-Laṭīf's death and was delivered to his successor Naurūz Aḥmad (encountered in Chapter 2), who became well-known in Istanbul through the exchange of several embassies with Süleyman I. The Ottomans' offer of military assistance stipulated that it primarily provide domestic security but could also be used to conduct a protracted campaign against the Safavids.[393] In carrying out the former, there was unleashed a violent era of inter-appanage warfare lasting throughout the next three decades.

I.ii. Enter: ʿAbdullāh b. Iskandar Khan

The human tendencies of ambition, competition, and rivalry are in part to blame for the later shift to Abū'l-Khairid centralization; another factor is the direction of attention inwards on domestic issues when external struggles against Safavids, Kazakhs, and Khwarazmians were at a lull. Previously, in the first half of the sixteenth century with frequent Abū'l-Khairid skirmishes in Safavid-controlled Khurasan, the main Abū'l-Khairid appanages had their own relatively independent lines which offered internal stability. The Shahbudaqids (descendants of Abū al-Khair's oldest son Shāh Budāq—Shībānī's father) administered Bukhara; the Kuchkunjids (after Shībānī's uncle Kūchkūnchī, mentioned in Chapter 1) presided over Samarqand; the Janibegids (eponymously descended through one of Abū al-

---

[391] Reported in Hammer-Purgstall, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches*, 353–54.

[392] This route provided safe passage from Edirne to Kefe, through Or and Azaq (Azov) in Crimea, and is discussed in Alexandre Bennigsen and Chantal Lemercier-Quelquejay, "La Grande Horde Nogay et le problème des communications entre l'empire Ottoman et l'Asie Centrale en 1552-1556," *Turcica: Revue d'Études Turques* 8, no. 2 (1976): 225–27.

[393] The Ottomans sent arquebuses, transported by a *chāvūsh* named Nasūh, which arrived in Bukhara in mid-June 1552. The document with this information is preserved (TSMK K.888, f.237v), and has been reproduced and translated in Bennigsen and Lemercier-Quelquejay, "La Grande Horde Nogay," 225–27.

Khair's grandsons) were in control of Balkh; and the Suyunjuqids (after Shībānī's other uncle Suyūnch, also mentioned in Chapter 1) governed Tashkent. These arrangements held until the deaths of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz in Bukhara in 1550 and ʿAbd al-Laṭīf in Samarqand in 1552, at which point Abū'l-Khairid offenses against the Safavid qizilbāsh in Khurasan stalled despite Ottoman pleas.[394]

With the steadily growing power and prestige of Bukhara, ʿAbdullāh arrived there in 1557 with the intention to head the broader Abū'l-Khairid state from this base. This then triggered a power struggle between 1557–82 in which Bukhara was polarized between the two most powerful Janibegids, ʿAbdullāh and Yār Muḥammad's son Khusrau.[395] The other heads of Balkh, Samarqand, and Tashkent along with their progeny became allies and enemies of these two competitors. By 1561 ʿAbdullāh was the dominant player in an alliance with the Suyunjuqids of Tashkent led by Darvīsh Muḥammad (son of Naurūz Aḥmad; encountered in Chapter 2 §III.b) to control Bukhara, and with deference bestowed the title of great khan upon his father Iskandar in Samarqand. Despite this seemingly respectful act of filial devotion, ʿAbdullāh was the de facto Abū'l-Khairid head. He was the unquestioned leader and policy-maker who installed other Janibegid relatives to govern the other appanages. His patronage of the Bukharan kitābkhāna testifies to the wealth amassed in that center during the late 1550s through the 1560s.[396]

II. Manuscript production in ʿAbdullāh Khan's Bukharan *kitābkhāna,* late-1550s through late-1570s

The previous chapter examined manuscripts produced by the Bukhara kitābkhāna in the 1530s through 1550s. In this third phase of Abū'l-Khairid manuscript production centralized under ʿAbdullāh's command, the kitābkhāna there continued to make courtly works. It had employed key staff—some identified in Chapter 2 §I who were still alive and working—and produced some illustrated titles for ʿAbdullāh that had never before been commissioned at the courtly level in the Abū'l-Khairid domain. Consult App. 5: Manuscripts produced for ʿAbdullāh Khan and his courtiers ca. 1550s–1570s in the workshop of ʿAbdullāh Muṣavvir, kitābdār of Bukhara.

---

[394] Fekete, *Einführung in die Persische Palaeographie*, 425–31, no. 74.

[395] Information on the inter-clan warfare and ʿAbdullāh Khan's ascent is found in Lee, *Qazaqliq*, 118; McChesney, "CENTRAL ASIA VI. In the 16th-18th Centuries"; McChesney, "Historiography in Central Asia since the 16th Century," in *A History of Persian Literature*, 512, 515; McChesney, "The Chinggisid restoration in Central Asia: 1500-1785," 294-302.

[396] McChesney, "Islamic culture and the Chinggisid restoration," 252.

II.i. Personnel

Following Sulṭān Mīrak's tenure as kitābdār (chief librarian) who oversaw projects for ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz throughout the 1540s (the subject of Chapter 2 §I.ii), an individual named Maulānā ʿAbdullāh al-Munshī succeeded him. That, or this ʿAbdullāh at some point shared those duties with the calligrapher and student of Mīr ʿAlī, Ḥusain Ḥusainī (nicknamed Kulangī), before the latter assumed the official title of being the third kitābdār of the Bukharan workshop.[397]

Maulānā ʿAbdullāh al-Munshī is possibly the same person as ʿAbdullāh Muṣavvir, whose epithet denotes he was a painter.[398] The latter is accepted to have died in around 1575. ʿAbdullāh Muṣavvir signed illustrations in manuscripts and collaborated with the illuminator Maḥmūd Muẕahhib and Kulangī for Yār Muḥammad (d. 1554) and Naurūz Aḥmad (d. 1556). The biography of ʿAbdullāh the artist is opaque, but he is mentioned by Mustafa ʿÂli as being a native of Khurasan and Shaikhzāda's pupil.[399] Shaikhzāda himself had been the pupil of Bihzād, which demonstrates a chain of artistic transmission that sums up Abū'l-Khairid manuscript traditions across the decades very nicely, comprising Timurid, Safavid, and local Abū'l-Khairid models in varying concentrations.

After Sulṭān Mīrak, I argue that ʿAbdullāh the painter next served as kitābdār for the Abū'l-Khairid patrons Yār Muḥammad and Naurūz Aḥmad in Bukhara. In the previous chapter, I noted how illustrations in the Harvard *Ẓafarnāma* completed in 1551 for Darvīsh Muḥammad followed Maḥmūd Muẕahhib's conventions and how a young ʿAbdullāh likely also contributed to the project. The overall uniformity of illustrated courtly Bukharan manuscripts of the late 1550s through the 1570s supports ʿAbdullāh's role as kitābdār at that time. The conspicuous cessation of his style after his death in circa 1575 indicates his instructing other painters and overseeing their productions had ended.[400]

Prior scholars have identified ʿAbdullāh's style in illustrated manuscripts of the 1550s through the 1570s based upon certain specific characteristics. M.M. Ashrafi notes how men are depicted wearing turbans wrapped around an elongated *kulāh* (cap).[401] To Abolala Soudavar, the "stiff, short-

---

[397] Akimushkin,"Biblioteka Shibanidov," 330.

[398] ʿAbdullāh the artist's early career is overviewed in Ashrafi, *Bekhzad*, 175.

[399] Mustafa ʿÂli, *Epic Deeds of Artists*, 265. Secondary literature on ʿAbdullāh the artist is contained in Priscilla Soucek's entry, "ʿAbdallāh Bokarī," *Encyclopædia Iranica.*

[400] Date of death posited by Laurence Binyon, J.V.S. Wilkinson, and Basil Gray, *Persian Miniature Painting* (London: Oxford University Press, 1933), 107. Also noted by Norah Titley, *Persian Miniature Painting and its Influence on the Arts of Turkey and India* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1984), 89.

[401] Ashrafi, *Bekhzad*, 179.

legged figures and bland faces with thick, short eyebrows, is typical of the colorful but uninspired production of ʻAbdollāh's atelier in Bokhara."[402] Oleg Akimushkin et al. credit ʿAbdullāh with "a local style of painting repeating stocky, rounded figures with heavy jaws and small mouths and unrefined brushwork [who inhabit] a schematic composition and a simple, unfinished landscape."[403]

Expanding upon the above, I identify the preponderance of figures with heads rendered in a three-quarter view, which contain Picasso-like outer eyes that extend beyond the outline of the face, to be characteristic of ʿAbdullāh's style. Turban wrappings worn by royalty and nobility are rendered with multiple, small pleats outlined in thin gold lines that encircle the central, colorful ribbed *kulāh*. Such "ʿAbdullahian" figures recline and battle across the pages of multiple manuscripts produced for ʿAbdullāh Khan.

II.ii. Illustrated works

Productions by ʿAbdullāh Khan's kitābkhāna staff during the 1560s comprise the third period of Abū'l-Khairid illustration. While elite manuscripts were completed in Bukhara across the 1530s–70s, it is only in this third period in the third quarter of the century that we discern distinct features and traits that are quintessential to the so-called "Bukhara school." Prior to ʿAbdullāh Khan's rise, in the previous chapter I posited how artisans of varying abilities in Bukhara completed commissions for appanage heads when requested in the second period of Abū'l-Khairid book arts. However, "with his policy of centralisation and permanent warfaring ʿAbdullāh II had stripped other members of his house of the resources to patronise book art effectively."[404] He was now the dominant client to serve.

Scholars have noted a stylistic divergence in the miniatures produced earlier in Bukhara during my delineated second phase spanning the 1530s through the mid-1550s: one style is connected with the activities of Herat artists and their students working within older Timurid frameworks. An example is a copy of Saʿdī's *Gulistān* from 1547 (MBF Pers. 30).[405] Also present at the end of this second period is a second style bearing the features of a new and distinctive direction of painting that would become associated with ʿAbdullāh the artist in the third period, which will be presently examined. A *Būstān* of Saʿdī written in 1542 with an illustration dated 1549 reflects this conceptual and pictorial move away

---

[402] Soudavar, *Art of the Persian Courts*, 212-13.

[403] Akimushkin, et al., "The Shaybanids (Bukhara, 1500–98) and the Janids (Astarkhanids) (Bukhara, 1599–1753)," 582.

[404] Rührdanz, "The revival of Central Asian painting in the early 17th century," 385-86.

[405] Illustrations are reproduced in Pugachenkova and Galerkina, *Miniatiury srednei azii*, 122-25.

from Herat, and a visual shift from the second through the third periods. It contains the earliest work attributed to ʿAbdullāh Muṣavvir and was made for ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz (MCG 177).

In the third phase, the Bukhara school really comes into its own with manuscripts produced for Yār Muḥammad, Naurūz Aḥmad, and ʿAbdullāh Khan. The final quarter of the sixteenth century corresponding to the fourth period is marked by a decline in Abū'l-Khairid manuscript productions in terms of aesthetics and quantity; this will be covered in Chapters 4 and 5. In this period, ʿAbdullāh Khan's focus was directed towards architectural projects and territorial expansion. He gave away copies of his own commissioned manuscripts that had been produced earlier, and also those of his predecessors that had come into his possession, to the heads of other dynasties. But while ʿAbdullāh Khan's interest in manuscripts still held, courtly Abū'l-Khairid book arts in ʿAbdullāh's Muṣavvir's signature style point to a productive and prolific partnership between khan and artist across the 1560s.

It is revelatory to compare works of poetry produced in the Bukharan workshops during the reigns of the two greatest patrons of Abū'l-Khairid manuscript arts, ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz (App. 4) and ʿAbdullāh Khan (App. 5). They were prolific in part due to the duration of their time in power. As was enumerated, ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz ordered the completion of manuscripts that were previously scribed in the late-Timurid period, which functioned to fashion him as the equal of Sultan Ḥusain Mīrzā Bāiqarā. Few of these older, pictureless texts were in circulation by the time ʿAbdullāh assumed power, but some early Abū'l-Khairid productions scribed by Sulṭān Muḥammad Nūr spanning 1515–39 (TSMK R.895; NMAA S.1986.52; AHT no. 78; DMA K.1.2014.1167) had illustrations added in the 1560s. Both ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz and ʿAbdullāh Khan were interested in Jāmī titles above all, with individual copies of some stories (*Yūsuf u Zulaikhā*, *Tuḥfat al-aḥrār*, *Ṣubḥat al-abrār*, *Silsilat al-ẕahab*) bound as separate volumes. This is in contrast to the few copies of Niẓāmī works that are contained together in *Khamsa* form. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz seems to have preferred Saʿdī's *Būstān* over the *Gulistān*, but these works were commissioned in equal amounts during ʿAbdullāh's reign and were intended for the ruler and his courtiers. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz perpetuated Timurid traditions and had collections of Navāʾī's poetry produced, but the courtly workshop of the kitābdār ʿAbdullāh eschewed Turkic poetry completely and expanded its Persian repertoire to include titles by Kāshifī, Hātifī, Ḥāfiẓ, Qāsimī, ʿĀrifī, Hilālī, Dihlavī, and of central importance to this present study, Firdausī.

II.iii. Illustrated ruler-*nāma* productions in mid-sixteenth century Transoxiana

The absence of a Firdausian *Shāhnāma* for the bibliophile ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz does not prove that no copy was ever made for him; however, an assumption that one never was can be derived from existing materials. With few surviving Transoxianan manuscripts and detached folios from the sixteenth century with Firdausian *Shāhnāma* content, the evidence is indeed sparse. We previously examined the truncated copy completed in Bukhara in 1535 (TSMK H.1514, Ch. 2 §III.i). The next dated volume from the broader region is dedicated by the calligrapher Hamdamī to his patron Īsh Muḥammad Sultan in 1556-57 in Khiva (ARB 1811).[406] I will explain in Chapter 5 the afterlife and completion of this Khivan *Shāhnāma* after ʿAbdullāh's death 1598, but here I will focus on its textual component created in the period we are scrutinizing.

II.iii.a. Firdausian *Shāhnāma* copies

Khivan *Shāhnāma*

At the time the Khivan *Shāhnāma* was written out, the ʿArabshāhid dynasty— a Shībānid branch and rival to the Abū'l-Khairid line— had established Khiva as their administrative center in Khwarazm. ʿArabshāhid manuscript production in Khwarazm has been barely researched by Anglophone scholars and the topic is currently beyond my expertise. However, some contemporaneous sixteenth-century productions from the workshops in Khwarazm and its personnel contribute to our understanding of the Khivan *Shāhnāma*'s scribal production. The Turcologist Zeki Velidi Togan mentions one calligrapher and painter from Khwarazm named ʿAbd al-Raḥīm who contributed calligraphic specimens of Turkic poems that ended up in the Dūst Muḥammad album assembled in 1544 (TSMK H.2154) for the Safavid prince Bahrām Mīrzā (d. 1549).[407] An unillustrated mid-sixteenth century *Chingīz-nāma*, or *Tārīkh-i Dūst Sulṭān* in Turki by Ūtamīsh Ḥājjī chronicles the Jūchid ulus that formed after the death of Chinggis Khan in 1227.[408] It is one of several histories composed by Jūchid descendants and is a particularly valuable resource on the Golden Horde and its chieftain Tūqtamīsh (1342–1406). Ūtamīsh Ḥājjī consulted Mongolian texts and eyewitness accounts held in

---

[406] The scribe Hamdamī is mentioned in Hamidreza Ghelichkhani, *Kātibān-i Shāhnāmah* [The scribes of *Shahnameh*], (Tehran: Kitāb Ārāyī-i Īrānī, 1396 [2017]), introduction (unpaginated).

[407] Togan, "On the Miniatures in Istanbul Libraries," 117a.

[408] Utemish-khadzhi and Takushi Kawaguchi and Hiroyuki Nagamine, trans., "*Čingīz-nāma*: Introduction, Annotated Translation, Transcription and Critical Text," in *Studia Culturae Islamicae* 94 (Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa 2008). ARB 1552/6 is another copy of the text.

other Jūchid-administered centers.[409] He might have accessed Abū'l-Khairid archives in Samarqand, since this locale held records referenced by the *Tārīkh-i Abū'l-Khair Khānī* and *Nuṣratnāma* previously discussed in Chapter 2. This suggests a potential fraternal community of scholars coming together to access sources and documents, much like today.

From these admittedly few examples, it seems the Khwarazmian workshops fostered textual transcriptions but could not support visual programs. Like the Abū'l-Khairids, their ʿArabshāhid rivals appreciated both Turkic and Persian texts, but their manuscript production—and the local market for books—was limited. At the time Hamdamī was writing out the Khivan *Shāhnāma*, accounts of period travelers in the mid-sixteenth century attest that "urban life and handicrafts do not seem to have been greatly developed in Khwarazm. The English merchant Anthony Jenkinson, who visited the capital Urgench in 1558, was far from impressed. …Only the resources obtained from military spoils in Khurasan and Astarabad, and also in Bukharan territory, sustained the [Shibanid] aristocracy of Khwarazm."[410] It was therefore impossible that there were artistic resources to sustain the Khivan *Shāhnāma*'s extensive visual program with two fully illuminated frontispieces in the opening pages of the manuscript and spaces for 115 illustrations. It remained an unadorned codex until the onset of the seventeenth century.

The colophon to the Khivan *Shāhnāma* is in rhymed Persian and written on a slant. It reads: "This chronicle that Hamdamī penned with the aid of the most knowledgeable sages [was finished] in Khiva with the efforts of Īsh Muḥammad Sultan in 964 [1556-57]."[411] The Ottoman admiral Seyidi Ali Reis, hosted by Naurūz Aḥmad in June 1556 (a visit mentioned in Chapter 2 §III.ii.a), continued his journey from Samarqand to Khiva that September, and refers to an individual named Esh (Īsh) Muḥammad who was the younger brother of the ʿArabshāhid ruler Dost (Dūst) Muḥammad Khān (r. 1556–58).[412] Ali Reis writes that he and his party's members divided their own firearms, prior to their departure, between Dūst Muḥammad and Īsh Muḥammad in order to smoothly pass through enemy

---

[409] Lee, *Qazaqliq*, xxxiv-xxxv.

[410] M. Annanepesov, "The Khanate of Khiva (Khwarazm)," in *History of Civilizations of Central Asia*, 67.

[411] Colophon reads: *Īn nāma ki Hamdamī namūdash arqām / az ʻaun-i ʻināyat-i ʻalīm-i ʻalām / dar Khīva ba-sa'i-yi Īsh Muḥammad Sulṭān / dar nuhṣad u shaṣt u chār gardīd tamām.*

[412] Information on Dost Muhammad and Esh Sultan in Henry Hoyle Howorth, *History of the Mongols, from the 9th to the 19th Century*, Part 2, issue 2 (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1880), 885-86.

Safavid territory unarmed on their way back to the Sublime Porte.[413] These Ottomans unknowingly fueled a domestic dispute between the two brothers, with Dūst Muḥammad of "a mild and peaceable disposition, while his brother Ish, who was a dissolute person, was exceedingly passionate."[414] It is understandable that the younger Khivan regent would have sought a personal copy of Firdausī's work as a means to legitimize his claims to rulership; the favoritism shown to the mythical Īraj might have resonated with the ambitious Īsh Muḥammad. Then again, and similar to ʿAbdullāh Khan over in Bukhara with his own commissioned copy, the title's actual contents chronicling kings and battles between Iran and Turan could have been less important than possession of the object as a whole to assert the majesty and mastery of the patron.

By 1558, both ʿArabshāhid regents were dead. Īsh Muḥammad had demanded that Urganj should be handed over to him, and not be retained by the Khwarazmian leader of the Urganj appanage Ḥājjī Muḥammad (Ḥajjim) Khan (d. 1603) while Dūst Khan ruled in Khiva.[415] After a few months in 1558, Ḥajjim Khan secured allies and had the brothers Dūst and Īsh killed. He was proclaimed the khan of Khiva and overall Khwarazm, and exiled Īsh Muḥammad's sons to Bukhara, where they died.[416] Although we do not know exact days and months, it is fair to assert that the writing out to the Khivan *Shāhnāma* took place in between the Ottoman admiral's visit (1556) and the death of its patron (1558).

Might Īsh Muḥammad's sons have brought with them their father's unfinished *Shāhnāma* manuscript to Bukhara? I believe this to be more feasible than the theory of Mukaddima Ashrafi that the Khivan *Shāhnāma* was transported decades later from Khwarazm to Bukhara as spoils of war following ʿAbdullāh Khan's successful campaign in 1593.[417] According to her, one of ʿAbdullāh's generals may have taken it when Khwarazm was brought under Abū'l-Khairid control, causing Ḥajjim Khan to flee to the Safavids to seek refuge (to be covered in the upcoming §III.ii.c).[418] I acknowledge that this is a possibility, but visual material in the Khivan *Shāhnāma* and in ʿAbdullāh's personal copy

---

[413] "Medieval Sourcebook: Sidi Ali Reis (16th Century CE)."

[414] Howorth, *History of the Mongols*, 885.

[415] Information on Ḥajjim Khan is in Annanepesov, "Relations between the Khanates and with Other Powers," 66.

[416] Historical overview derived from Howorth, *History of the Mongols*, 885-86.

[417] M. Ashrafi, "K voprosu o vremeni sozdania miniatiur Mukhammada Murada Samarkandi k 'Shakh-Name' 1556 g," in *Mittelalterliche Malerei im Orient,* ed. Karin Rührdanz (Halle: Martin Luther Universität, 1981), 16.

[418] After his exile in the Safavid realm he returned to Khwarazm in 1600 (Annanepesov, "Relations between the Khanates and with Other Powers," 66).

supports the Khivan manuscript's earlier arrival into Bukhara. Thus, I claim that the Khivan *Shāhnāma* was carried off by Īsh Muḥammad's sons in the late 1550s, and some illumination was added to the unadorned codex in Bukhara shortly thereafter.

ʿAbdullāh Khan's *Shāhnāma*

ʿAbdullāh Khan's *Shāhnāma* of 1564 (TSMK H.1488) is the only known courtly Abū'l-Khairid production of this work. The timing of its patronage comes in the midst of the leader domestically solidifying hegemony. It appears that the Khivan *Shāhnāma* motivated some components to ʿAbdullāh Khan's *Shāhnāma* copy. For one, the two manuscripts share similar physical dimensions, format, and page layout. ʿAbdullāh's courtly *Shāhnāma* measures 33x22 cm, while the Khivan *Shāhnāma* is 32x23 cm. Furthermore, the frontispieces of the two volumes (ff.8r-9v in the Khivan *Shāhnāma*, as it has two) clearly derive from Herati illumination practices (figs. 58–59) deployed across Abū'l-Khairid arts of the book. This illumination to the Khivan *Shāhnāma* may have been an initial, unfinished experiment prior to the completion of ʿAbdullāh Khan's personal Firdausian copy.

In the colophon to ʿAbdullāh Khan's *Shāhnāma*, the scribe Muḥammad Bāqī states that he completed it in the workshop of Abū al-Ghāzī ʿAbdullāh Bahādur Khān (ʿAbdullāh Khan's full title) in early Muḥarram 972 AH (August 1564), "in the splendid city of Bukhara." The same calligrapher signed written specimens dated between 1557–60 in a Safavid album taken from Ardabil now held in Saint Petersburg (NLR Dorn 147, ff.5v, 19r), which attests that he had some clout and there was reason to collect his work.[419] Mustafa ʿÂli describes a "Bāqī Muḥammad of Bukhara" as a scribe skilled in six scripts, who was a "famous master of those with praiseworthy pens and elegant penmanship."[420] Mustafa ʿÂli includes Bāqī Muḥammad in a list of scribes who found success in Rum, the Levant, and Tabriz. This is supported by one of the scribe's above-mentioned album pages written out in Damascus several years before ʿAbdullāh Khan's *Shāhnāma* project.

The gilt binding of leather impressed with a panel stamp onto thick paper board on ʿAbdullāh's courtly *Shāhnāma* (fig. 60) is nearly identical to the cover of another royal Bukharan manuscript of Niẓāmī's *Makhzan al-asrār*, completed under the direction of Sulṭān Mīrak for ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz in 1545 (BNF Sup Pers 985). The perimeters of the boards in both bindings are embossed with cartouches filled

---

[419] Bāqī is mentioned in Akimushkin, "Biblioteka Shibanidov," 333. Specimens of his calligraphy are reproduced in O.V. Vasilyeva and O.M. Yastrebova, *Arts of the Book in the 15th-17th-Century Mawarannahr: From the Collection of the National Library of Russia, Saint Petersburg, Russia,* (Tashkent: Zamon Press, 2019), 65.

[420] Mustafa ʿÂli, *Epic Deeds*, 199 and 459 (entry no. 58). The same author denotes the six scripts as *thuluth, naskh, taʿlīq, rayḥānī, muḥaqqaq,* and *riqāʿ* (35).

with imaginary figures such as Chinese-inspired qilin interspersed with fox heads. In the center, a dragon with squat tail assaults a deer and hisses at a confrontational simurgh above. At the top, spiraling clouds ascend like smoke, while a monkey rides a bear at lower left beside rabbits and foxes congregating amidst a landscape dotted with oversized flowers. Given that some elements are in reverse and the shapes of animals and clouds have subtle differences in size, different tools and patterns were used to imprint the motifs into the leather, but ʿAbdullāh Khan seems to be asserting himself and his patronage to be on par with that of his bibliophile predecessor ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz.

The colophon, binding, and several illustrated folios repeat the name of the patron ʿAbdullāh Khan. Thirty-one illustrations follow ʿAbdullāh Muṣavvir's characteristic style; however, twenty-nine other blank spaces interspersed throughout the manuscript indicate that it was never fully finished. To Barbara Schmitz, the work is significant and "contains the largest cycle of illustrations known in a royal Bukhara manuscript."[421] Those illustrations present in ʿAbdullāh Khan's *Shāhnāma* emphasize Rustam in terms of quantity of depictions. Bahrām Gūr comes second and there are several paintings of his exploits. To date, Güner İnal published the only comprehensive analysis of the volume nearly half a century ago.[422] She also compared its illustrations with those in another *Shāhnāma* completed in Tabriz in 1522 (TSMK H.1485).[423] İnal suggests the latter copy was produced for the Safavid shah Ismāʿīl I prior to the more elaborate *Shāhnāma* commission that would come to be known as the *Shāhnāma* of Shah Ṭahmāsp. İnal compares the composition of the death of Dara (f.382r) in the Ismāʿīl copy to its Abū'l-Khairid counterpart (f.428r), and identifies the former as a significant "model for some later illustrations of the same story" produced in the workshops of Bukhara and Shiraz.[424] İnal proposes that imagery created in Tabriz circa 1522 transferred to Bukhara in 1564 by means of another Safavid *Shāhnāma* copy "from the same family [as] H.1485" taken during one of the Abū'l-Khairid occupations of Herat in 1535. She notes, "later when the Uzbeck ruler wanted to have a *Shahnameh* to be designed for himself, the illustrator deliberately took a miniature of this manuscript as a model for his scene."[425]

---

[421] Schmitz, "BUKHARA vi. Bukharan School of Miniature Painting."

[422] İnal, "Bir Özbek Şehnamesi."

[423] Güner İnal, "Şah İsmail devrinden bir Şehname ve sonraki etkileri" (Eng. summary "A Manuscript of the Shahnameh from the Period of Shah Ismāʿīl and its Influences on later Shahnameh Illustrations"), *Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı / Journal of Art History* 5 (1973): 497-545.

[424] Ibid., 541. The Shiraz copy mentioned is from 1539 scribed by Murshīd al-Shīrāzī, and was in the Kraus collection at the time İnal's article was written (1973).

[425] Ibid., 544.

Other iconographic features in ʿAbdullāh Khan's *Shāhnāma* appear in other manuscripts closer to it in terms of place and time, found in other manuscripts produced in the Bukhara kitābkhāna. "Rustam defeating the white div" (fig. 61) might be a later version of the same scene painted on silk attributed to mid-sixteenth century Bukhara in the Keir collection (fig. 62).[426] Both render a similarly garbed Rustam in green with a tiger-skin tunic trimmed in white fur, and a cobalt blue quiver of arrows at his waist. Rustam's facial features in the Keir painting recall the portrait of Chinggis Khan I attributed to Maḥmūd Muẕahhib in the *Nuṣratnāma* discussed previously (fig. 32).[427] A young Rustam lassoing the colt Rakhsh in H.1488 (fig. 63) is derived from depictions of Dārā and the herdsmen that originated in a *Būstān* of Saʿdī illustrated by Bihzād in 1488 (fig. 64). This composition was subsequently emulated multiple times for Abū'l-Khairid patrons.[428] *Shāhnāma* battle scenes with frontally-facing drummers in the top left corners in ʿAbdullāh's Khān's *Shāhnāma* (fig. 65; also in ff.83r, 290v) parallel depictive schemes in Darvīsh Muḥammad's *Tīmūr-nāma* examined in Chapter 2 §III.ii.b (fig. 46).

The ambitious *Shāhnāma* production of 1564 was the only copy made for an Abū'l-Khairid elite. Karin Rührdanz identifies two detached folios from a common manuscript (ROM 970.268.1 and 2) as "a faint echo" of another *Shāhnāma* intended for ʿAbdullāh that indicate "there must have been one other illustrated manuscript made about the same time."[429] Further dispersed folios with the same dimensions, short-legged figures, and square-jawed horses are also evidently from this same manuscript. Several pages were formerly in the Keir Collection and are now held in the Dallas Museum of Art (fig. 66 is one example), one folio is in the possession of Lady Humayun Renwick, and other pages were auctioned in recent years.[430] Although Rührdanz describes them as a "modest offshoot of 'Abd-Allah's commission," they stylistically resemble Bukharan productions of the 1570s through the

---

[426] The Keir folio is reproduced in B.W. Robinson, et al., *Islamic Painting and the Arts of the Book: The Keir Collection* (London: Faber and Faber, 1976), entry III.227.

[427] Rustam's helmet and visage in the Keir folio also resemble a folio of Tīmūr and his troops defeating Qipchaqs in a *Tīmūr-nāma* of Hātifī of an uncertain provenance, although it is quite Herati in style (WAM W.648, f.75v).

[428] Compare the herds of horses in the following copies of *Būstān* manuscripts: RAS 251, f.20b (ca. 1530s); HAM 1979.20.19 (ca. 1542); FMC PD.202-1948 (ca. 1550s); MMA 11.134.2 (ca. 1523); MKG 2164 (ca. 1562); Christie's London auction 7 October 2013, lot 175. A similar scene in a *Shāhnāma* sold at a Christie's London auction 16 October 2001, lot 76 was attributed to Khurasan; however, Schmitz attributes it to 1586–97 ("Miniature Painting in Harāt, 1570-1640," ms. LII).

[429] Rührdanz, "The Samarqand Shahnamas," 214.

[430] Some of the Keir Collection folios (labelled III.337–41; now DMA K.1.2014.154.A-B; and K.1.2014.750) are reproduced in Robinson et al., *Arts of the Book: The Keir Collection*, 197–98; Lady Humayun Renwick's folio was discovered on the Cambridge Shahnama Project website (<http://shahnama.caret.cam.ac.uk/new/jnama/card/ceillustration:-1999101622>); pages auctioned in London were sold at Christie's (22 April 2016, lot 312); Sotheby's (15 July 1970, lots 293 through 295); Sotheby's (8 October 2014, lot 74).

1590s when ʿAbdullāh Khan's patronage of illustrated manuscripts declined. Manuscripts completed in Bukhara during this period were for regional courtly, religious, and military elites.[431] Others featuring subjects appealing to markets further afield in India shall be examined in the final chapters.

II.iii.b. *Tīmūr-nāma* manuscripts

Tīmūr-nāma versions were also produced during the reign of ʿAbdullāh Khan. Compared to his singular aforementioned Firdausian *Shāhnāma* H.1488 above, the quantity of illustrated biographies of Tīmūr's feats is remarkable. Five manuscripts survive either as complete copies or dispersed folios. Although some scribes employed in the Bukhara kitābkhāna wrote them out, none in this *Tīmūr-nāma* group is explicitly dedicated to a specific ruler. Therefore, they were likely produced for courtiers and military elites. After ʿAbdullāh's patronage of illustrated manuscripts waned in the 1570s, the noble Jūibārid family subsequently sponsored Bukharan production and members of it were also the intended recipients of manuscripts, to be examined in the final chapters 4 and 5.

Despite having incomplete or missing colophons, the illustrations look to have been executed at the same time as, or after the completion of, ʿAbdullāh Khan's *Shāhnāma* from 1564. What might be the earliest, now just a detached folio in the Harvard Art Museum (fig. 67), is the only specimen derived from Yazdī's *Ẓafarnāma* in our group. It depicts Tīmūr's troops hunting, elements of which are echoed in the Abū'l-Khairid *Shāhnāma*, which suggest they were produced concurrently. Beside obvious figural and sartorial parallels, the arc of the horizon depicted on the Harvard folio and in ʿAbdullāh Khan's *Shāhnāma* (fig. 65) is punctuated with hatch marks in black ink. Lobed trees and shrubs in both works feature prominent protruding twigs painted against golden hillsides.

According to the colophon of a *Tīmūr-nāma* of Hātifī in the Beruni Institute (ARB 2102), the scribe ʿAlī Riżā al-Kātib completed it in 1568.[432] If one trusts only the colophon, one would assume its three illustrated diptychs post-date paintings in ʿAbdullāh Khan's *Shāhnāma*. However, the illustrations in the Beruni *Tīmūr-nāma* are adhered to the pages and might be a rare case in which the illustrations predate the text. They could have been produced around the same time as H.1488 was illustrated, were briefly retained, and then pasted. For example, Tīmūr's troops laying siege to a fortress in Khurasan (fig. 68) recall soldiers in H.1488 scaling the walls of Kai Khusrau's castle as defensive archers take

---

[431] Assadullah Souren Melikian-Chirvani offers a case study of a royal manuscript made in the royal Bukharan atelier during ʿAbdullāh's reign but not for him ["The Anthology of a Sufi Prince from Bukhara," in *Persian Painting from the Mongols to the Qajars*, ed. Robert Hillenbrand (London: IB Tauris), 151–85].

[432] The manuscript is published in Madraimov, et al., *Oriental Miniatures*, 161–63. The scribe ʿAlī Riżā copied several other manuscripts between 1564 and 1581 for ʿAbdullāh Khan and nobles.

aim in the upper portion (fig. 69). In the Beruni *Tīmūr-nāma*'s siege scene, a soldier in red on the left plunges his dagger into the chest of a fallen warrior, taking the same pose as Rustam killing Suhrāb in H.1488 (fig. 70). The same light pink ground punctuated by red, blue, and green rocks depicted in the Beruni *Tīmūr-nāma*'s scene of Tīmūr surveying his troops beneath an umbrella (fig. 71) is also found on the battlefield scenes in H.1488.[433] Tīmūr's soldiers sport helmets topped with colorful flags and small black tufts and one wields a lance with a black feathered puff.[434] One of the troops even dons a tiger skin tunic akin to the character Rustam. Similar features of headwear and tasseled horse armor appear in H.1488.[435]

The frontispiece to the Beruni *Tīmūr-nāma* (fig. 72), however, betrays a subtle pictorial shift from the precise style of ʿAbdullāh the kitābdār. Despite the visual parallels enumerated above to the 1564 *Shāhnāma* of ʿAbdullāh Khan, the paintings in the *Tīmūr-nāma* are closer to the 1568 date of transcription. Francis Richard observes that at that time, Mīr ʿAlī's student Mīr Ḥusain Ḥusainī Kulangī the calligrapher—whose career was previously recounted in Chapter 2— was appointed kitābdār. He may have shared duties with his colleague ʿAbdullāh the painter prior to the latter's death in 1575.[436] After this point the Bukhara kitābkhāna weakened, but was not altogether closed.

Yet another *Tīmūr-nāma* of Hātifī in the British Library (BL Add. 22703) has a similar frontispiece to the Beruni copy. It was divided in half, with one folio pasted at the beginning and the other at the end of the manuscript. Putting them together (fig. 73), we see a ruler presiding over an outdoor gathering. His attendant grasps the handle of a wine ewer resting on a low table set with three other vessels, features also found in the Beruni version. On the left side of the original diptych in the BL manuscript, there are musicians and inebriated guests swooning in front of a gate bearing the same checkered pattern as in the Beruni copy of the text. Golden hills looming behind blossoming pink and white trees are also found in both versions. These illustrative schemes belie a post-1568 provenance. The BL *Tīmūr-nāma* even contains distinct details in the rendering of tiles and clouds present in

---

[433] Reproductions of these illustrations to H.1488 with this pink ground cluttered by rocks are in İnal, "Bir Özbek Şehnamesi," figs. 11, 12, and 14.

[434] Similar headwear—tufted helmets—and golden diadems found in Bukharan manuscripts from the late 1590s appear in the *Tārīkh-i Chingīz Khān* (SPBGU OB 950), attesting to overpainting carried out in Bukhara onto this earlier Timurid work. See Melville, "Genealogy and exemplary rulership."

[435] Note the caparisons and armor reproduced in İnal, "Bir Özbek Şehnamesi," figs. 3 and 5.

[436] It is my own proposition that ʿAbdullāh the painter and Kulangī the scribe worked for a period of time as a kitābdār team. Francis Richard suggests Kulangī was officially kitābdār much earlier than the usual 1568 date, and has kindly shared with me his forthcoming text "Illustrated Manuscripts from Mawarannahr in French Collections."

Bukharan manuscripts with colophons dated to 1575.[437] The two *Tīmūr-nāma* manuscripts are executed in a style that persisted into the early years of the following century, to be further examined in Chapter 5.

The BL *Tīmūr-nāma* is an incomplete excerpt of Hātifī's original text and lacks a colophon. However, its illuminated margins bear pasted flanking medallions cut from colorful papers that resemble borders attributed to ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz's workshop. The volume's dimensions (28.6 x 17.8 cm) conform to others that he commissioned; however, the production of manuscripts with similar dimensions, sprayed stenciled borders, and colored paper appliqués persisted in Bukhara into the 1570s.[438] It is thus unknown when the text was written, but it could have been completed anytime between the 1540s–1570s. Besides the divided frontispiece, the other illustrations to the BL manuscript reflect later trends in India and Transoxiana after the Abū'l-Khairid downfall and will be treated in Chapter 5.

There exists another undated and damaged copy of Hātifī's *Tīmūr-nāma* in the Royal Asiatic Society (RAS 305A).[439] Two badly abraded illustrations in it (figs. 74-75) evoke fighters and horses painted under the supervision of the kitābdār ʿAbdullāh in the Bukharan workshop. A warrior in a blend of tiger and leopard skin with red shield on the far right of the first illustration (fig. 74) has the long face and sad eyes of figures associated with Maḥmūd Muẕahhib, but stylistically the overall composition can be dated to the 1560s. In the second illustration, a rider astride a square-shaped horse with blue caparison in the upper portion of fig. 75 is the mirror image of a similar rider atop a horse with an orange and gold caparison trimmed in silver near the bottom section of a later *Tīmūr-nāma* to be discussed in the final chapter (fig. 147). Most of the BL manuscript's illustrations were produced three decades later and reflect interactions with the arts of northern India; I shall examine its illustrative program and also relationships between Transoxiana and India in the concluding chapter. But I can here assert that although more *Tīmūr-nāma* copies were produced in the last four decades of ʿAbdullāh Khan's rule than the *Shāhnāma*, the single Abū'l-Khairid copy had many more illustrations in this one volume than all the other *Tīmūr-nāma* combined.

---

[437] Compare a manuscript illustration to a manuscript of *Raużat al-aḥbāb* by Jamāl al-Ḥusainī (ARB 2134, f.168v) reproduced in Madraimov, et al., *Oriental Miniatures*, 176.

[438] For example, Kulangī completed a *Tuḥfat al-aḥrār* of Jāmī with similar margins (NLR Dorn 425).

[439] RAS 305A has an enigmatic provenance: it was presented by Col. Francis Younghusband, the British Army officer and explorer who bought it in Yarkand while on a mission to Chinese Turkestan in the 1880s/90s. The final pages have Turkic poetic passages and several references to somebody named ʿUmar Khān. Under ʿAbdullāh Khan, Abū'l-Khairid dominion stretched up to Khutan and Kashghar in the east; the manuscript seems to have stayed within the region of its original production.

I will close this discussion by considering a final detached folio that is connected to the Bukharan *Tīmūr-nāma* corpus. Now held in the Grassi Museum of Applied Arts (fig. 76), its rendered floor tiling, figural types, and decorated fabrics resemble other works supervised by Kulangī between the 1570s and 1590s.[440] Paired hills on the horizon have anthropomorphic forms that are akin to composite figures popular in Khurasan in this period.[441] An inscription at the top identifies the illustration as depicting *amīr Tīmūr ṣāḥib qirān,* but this is admittedly but a tenuous linkage to the *Tīmūr-nāma*. While the seated ruler on a platform with bent leg comports with depictions of the dynastic founder, Philipp Walter Schulz notes the painting's similarities to an illustration from a *Gulistān* of Saʿdī (BL Or. 5302, f.25v).[442] Schulz attributes the latter scene to the painter Shaikhm who originally trained in Bukhara but later migrated to India where he served in Akbar's kitābkhāna. Kulangī states in the colophon of this Saʿdī manuscript that he completed writing it in 1567, a year before the scribe ʿAlī Riżā completed the Beruni *Tīmūr-nāma* (ARB 2102).[443] Their chronological proximity suggests simultaneous coordination between the two texts.

These different threads— multiple *Tīmūr-nāma* texts, Bukhara-trained artists and scribes, connections to Akbar's courtly workshop in late-sixteenth century India—contribute to our understanding of the period and its arts. It seems that Bukharan artisans, likely alarmed by dwindling royal patronage in the 1560s, prepared *Tīmūr-nāma*s that stylistically appealed to the Mughal market. Whereas some copies were produced for local clients and may have remained in Transoxiana (such as ARB 2102, and perhaps the original manuscript containing HAM no. 1965.477), others completed in Bukhara appear to have been taken to the subcontinent where they either served as models there (RAS 305A, GMAA no. B.11.5r), or local Transoxianan artists picked up skills in India and applied them once back in their local region (BL Add. 22703—to be discussed more in Chapter 5). With regard to the purpose and appeal of these Bukharan *Tīmūr-nāma* in India, what could be more attractive than a

---

[440] Comparable work of Kulangī's supervision is a *Duvalrānī u Khiżr Khān* of Dihlavī (NLR PNS 276) scribed by Mīr Ṣāliḥ b. Mīr Ṭāhir al-Bukhārī in 1598.

[441] See Francis Richard, "Composite figures in the *Hadiqat al-haqiqa wa Shari'at al-ṭariqa* of Sana'i," in *Ferdowsi, the Mongols and the History of Iran: Art, Literature and Culture from Early Islam to Qajar Persia. Studies in Honour of Charles Melville*, eds. Robert Hillenbrand, A.C.S. Peacock, and Firuza Abdullaeva (London: IB Tauris, 2013), 341–57.

[442] Schulz, *Die persisch-islamische Miniaturmalerei*, pl. 75.

[443] Kulangī in this *Gulistān* copied in 1567 goes by Mīr ʿAlī Ḥusainī. Six paintings commissioned at Akbar's request are ascribed to the artist Shaikhm who had trained in Bukhara. Seven more paintings were added in a courtly Mughal style, probably between 1605 and 1609.

laudatory chronicle of the Chaghataid son-in-law prepared in the Mughals' ancestral homeland?[444] As for their attractiveness to Abū'l-Khairid elites within Transoxiana, the stories provided excitement but also brought to mind the latest heroics and territorial conquests of the leader ʿAbdullāh Khan.[445]

II.iv. Unillustrated ruler-*nāma*: biographies of ʿAbdullāh Khan

In contrast to the above, the Mughals would not appreciate an unillustrated, laudatory chronicle of the Jūchid challenger and then-current Abū'l-Khairid ruler ʿAbdullāh Khan. Intended to remain in Transoxiana, ʿAbdullāh commissioned several chronicles of his reign. Whereas his earlier patronage of illustrated Persian poetry served to rival ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, his patronage of personal biographies emulates those completed for Muḥammad Shībānī Khan. Both Bregel and McChesney have thoroughly reviewed this "flurry of writing about the past, centered in particular on the most powerful political figure of the latter half of the century, Abd-Allâh Khân."[446] My investigation does not attempt to expand upon their scholarship, but shall instead focus on two surviving texts that have connections to Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* and the *Tīmūr-nāma* versions of Hātifī and Yazdī.

McChesney highlights three major Persian works commissioned by or gifted to ʿAbdullāh: Ḥāfiẓ-i Tanīsh ibn Mīr Muḥammad Bukhārī's *ʿAbdullāh-nāma* (also called *Sharafnāma-yi shāhī*), and two versified *Ẓafarnāma* by Badr al-Dīn Kashmīrī and Ḥāfiẓ Muqīm Bustānkhānī; however, the latter does not survive. Alas, whether due to ʿAbdullāh's disinterest in manuscripts later in the century, domestic political tensions, or the reallocation of funds for massive public building projects instead of manuscripts, a pictorial scheme was never planned. One can only wonder how two works discussed below, the 1589 *ʿAbdullāh-nāma* by by Ḥāfiẓ Tanīsh and Kashmīrī's *Ẓafarnāma* of 1593, would have been illustrated.[447]

II.iv.a. *ʿAbdullāh-nāma* of Ḥāfiẓ Tanīsh

According to Bregel, Ḥāfiẓ Tanīsh's *ʿAbdullāh-nāma / Sharafnāma-yi shāhī* was the longest and most detailed historical work written under the Abū'l-Khairids.[448] Commissioned by ʿAbdullāh's

---

[444] Melville reaches the same conclusion ("On Some Manuscripts of Hatifi's *Timurnama*").

[445] Galerkina asserts as much when she writes: "In Abdallah's time the chronicles telling of the Timurid campaigns…were once again re-written. In this way historical parallels were created, which emphasized the greatness of Abdallah and his father Iskandar Khan" (*Mawarannahr Book Painting*, 15).

[446] McChesney, "Historiography in Central Asia since the 16th Century," 508; Bregel, "HISTORIOGRAPHY xii. CENTRAL ASIA."

[447] McChesney dates Kashmīrī's *Ẓafarnāma* to 1598 in "The Conquest of Herat 1587-88: Sources for the Study of Safavid/qizilbāsh – Shībānid/Uzbak Relations," in *Etudes Safavides* 39, ed. Jean Calmard (Paris and Tehran: Bibliothèque Iranienne, 1993): 71.

[448] Bregel, "HISTORIOGRAPHY xii. CENTRAL ASIA." Several copies survive: ARB D.88; ARB mss. 2207, 1415, 5363, 9262; Central Bukhara Library, former Barthold collection no. 17; BL Or. 3497, BL IO 574; IU F.1338-1339; CWH 778/II.

closest confidante Qul Bābā Kūkaltāsh (to reappear in Chapter 4), Tanīsh wrote it between 1584 and 1589 to commemorate the recapture of Herat from the Safavids. It covers the life of ʿAbdullāh from his birth to events in 1589. By this period, ʿAbdullāh had headed Bukhara since 1557, and the broader khanate since 1582 as great khan. Bukhara had unofficially been the seat of whoever was the most powerful Abū'l-Khairid appanage leader since ʿUbaidallāh, but with ʿAbdullāh it displaced Samarqand as the Abū'l-Khairid capital.[449] ʿAbdullāh's elimination of rival claimants to the Chinggisid mantle—even having his own brother assassinated—resulted in internal strife, beginning with his siege of Samarqand in 1569, and he waged a civil war until 1578.[450] The following year, with the aid of the elite Jūibārid family who led the Naqshbandi Sufi order, ʿAbdullāh finally defeated his former ally-cum-rival Darvīsh Muḥammad the Suyunjuqid and with his father Iskandar took control of Samarqand.[451] ʿAbdullāh then steadily consolidated his power and in June 1582 was proclaimed supreme khan after an enthronement ceremony held near Istaravshan (present-day Tajikistan).[452] Even before he was officially declared great khan, the Ottoman sultan Murad III had invited him to celebrate the circumcision of his son, Şehzade Mehmet, held that same month in Istanbul. Unable to attend in person, he sent an ambassador in his stead.

McChesney has summarized the *ʿAbdullāh-nāma.* It is written in rhymed Persian prose, "periodically punctuated by appropriate verse (perhaps as much as twenty percent of the text) and Qor'anic quotations."[453] It specifically promotes the Janibegid family of the Abū'l-Khairid Shībānids as the legitimate Chinggisid dynastic line, and celebrates the lives of Khwāja Saʿd al-Dīn, the son of the Naqshbandi Sufi leader Khwāja Muḥammad-Islām Juibārī. The main attention is given to Khwāja Saʿd al-Dīn's disciple and supporter ʿAbdullāh. Tanīsh attributes ʿAbdullāh's political success to the Jūibārid-led Naqshbandi religious authority supporting him.

Tanīsh's motivations for composing the *ʿAbdullāh-nāma* were twofold: firstly, he wanted to commemorate ʿAbdullāh's new status as great khan. Secondly, he clearly conceived it to emphasize the

---

[449] Several scholars have repeated the mistaken claim of Bukhara being a capital too early. Robinson credits ʿAbd al-Laṭīf in 1540 with making Bukhara (*A Descriptive Catalogue of the Persian Paintings in the Bodleian Library*, 126); others perpetuate the claim that ʿUbaidullāh declared Bukhara the capital (Mukminova and Mukhtarov, "The Khanate (Emirate) of Bukhara," 41).

[450] ʿAbdullāh's brother ʿIbādullāh was assassinated 16 August 1586. Reported in McChesney, "Historiography in Central Asia since the 16th Century," 520.

[451] Events of 1569 are recounted in Ibid., 515. The context of 1578 is described in Dickson, "Shah Tahmasp and the Uzbeks," 27.

[452] The exact location of the ritual was in Nafrandi, near Ura Teppa (Tiube). Information on the act is in McChesney, "Zamzam water on a white felt carpet."

[453] McChesney, "Historiography in Central Asia since the 16th Century," 511.

recapture of Herat from the Safavids in 1588, as evinced by the last episode in all the surviving copies. The *ʿAbdullāh-nāma* celebrates the ruler's victories over his appanage rivals, his unification of the khanate, and the territories wrested from the Safavids. Much as the successful siege of Samarqand from the Timurids in 1500 inspired chronicles of Shībānī's reign, the 1588 conquest of Khurasan elicited similar productions. So, these motivations parallel those that inspired the composition of the *Fatḥnāma* and *Nuṣratnāma* manuscripts at the onset of the sixteenth century.

The contents of the *ʿAbdullāh-nāma* parallels *Tārīkh-i Abū'l-Khair Khānī* and *Nuṣratnāma* in that they insert ʿAbdullāh into the line of Mongol forefathers, recalling Kūhistānī's portrayal of Abū al-Khair with an explicit Mongol pedigree. Historical and biographical accounts at the beginning of the Abū'l-Khairid dynasty incorporated Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ's *Shībānī-nāma* biography of Shībānī Khan, and the older texts of Rashīd al-Dīn's *Jāmiʿ al-tawārīkh* and Yazdī's *Ẓafarnāma.* Tanīsh expanded on these but referenced Bannāʾī's Persian chronicle of Shībānī's life as opposed to Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ's. In an introductory section on ʿAbdullāh's Chinggisid genealogy, Tanīsh regularly quotes passages from these earlier chronicles as well as Mīrkhwhānd's *Raużat al-ṣafā*.

II.iv.b. *Ẓafarnāma* of Kashmīrī

Kashmīrī is credited by his contemporary Muṭribī Samarqandī (whom we will encounter again in Chapter 5 §V.iii.c) with having written a response to Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* in his four-part versified general history: the *Rasūl-nāma*.[454] Within it is included a biographical account of ʿAbdullāh's life, and its final fourth section is titled *Ẓafarnāma*. The author intended to present it to ʿAbdullāh as a gift but the khan died just before he could receive it in 1598.[455] While Tanīsh lived all of his life in Bukhara, Kashmīrī, who had been born in India where he was informed by Timurid-influenced chronicles of the early Mughal dynasty, left for Bukhara in 1553. In Transoxiana he joined the Jūibārid Naqshbandi shaikhs, and much as Tanīsh, Kashmīrī's panegyrics praise ʿAbdullāh and acknowledge his Jūibārid support.

---

[454] Analyzed by Devin DeWeese, "The Problem of the *Siraj al-salihin*: Notes on two hagiographies by Badr al-Din Kashmiri," in *Writing and Culture in Central Asia and the Turko-Iranian World, 10th-19th Centuries,* eds. Francis Richard and Maria Szuppe (Paris: Association pour l'avancement des études iraniennes, 2009), 49-51. DeWeese examines the larger corpus of Kashmīrī's work modeled on Niẓāmī's *Makhzan al-asrār*, ʿAṭṭār's *Manṭiq al-ṭair*, Saʿdī's *Būstān*, and other poetry specimens by Dihlavī, Jāmī, and Hātifī.

[455] Abdulgani Mirzoev and Aleksandr Boldyrev, *Katalog vostochnykh rukopisei Akademii nauk Tadzhikskoi SSR* [A catalogue of oriental manuscripts of the Academy of Sciences of the Tajiks SSR], vol. I (Stalinabad [Dushanbe]: 1960), 75, no. 61.

Lola Dodkhudoeva has examined a manuscript of Kashmīrī held in Tajikistan (CWH 779).[456] She describes the first section, the *Ṣafī-nāma*, as a history of the prophets from Adam to Jesus including several sovereigns of Iran from the Pishdadian, Kayanid, Arsacid (Parthian), and Sasanian dynasties. It is thus indebted to a tradition instigated by Firdausī that was also utilized by Kūhistānī in his *Tārīkh-i Abū'l-Khair Khānī*. The second part, titled *Iskandar-nāma*, provides information about the legendary Alexander, the favored hero of Islamic civilization. The third part, the *Muṣṭafā-nāma*, embraces the entire history of Islam from the Prophet Muḥammad up until Muḥammad Shībānī Khan. The fourth and final part of this grandiose work entitled *Ẓafarnāma* focuses on the reign of ʿAbdullāh Khan. In it Kashmīrī alludes to both a *Shāhnāma* character and Sasanian ruler by referring to ʿAbdullāh as "the second Ardashīr," a historical figure also included in *TAKK*.[457]

Besides Firdausī, Kashmīrī's stand-alone *Ẓafarnāma* consciously emulates biographies of Tīmūr. In addition, Kashmīrī explicitly states in his preface that he intended to imitate Niẓāmī's *Iskandar-nāma* as well.[458] The work covers ʿAbdullāh's birth, his conquest of Samarqand from his appanage rivals, capture of Badakhshan and Kulab from the Mughals, march to Khurasan and seizure of Herat, Mashhad, and Marv from the Safavids, and ends with the conquest of ʿArabshāhid Khwarazm in 1593. Dodkhudoeva interprets these conquests as expressions of ʿAbdullāh's irrepressible desire to expand his dominions territorially, but also to prove the religious superiority of the Hanafi Sunni school to which he and the Naqshbandis based in Bukhara adhered.[459]

The accounts of Ḥāfiẓ Tanīsh and Kashmīrī not only fashion ʿAbdullāh Khan as Shībānī's equal on paper. ʿAbdullāh was personally determined to portray himself as a "second" Shībānī who enlarged the Abū'l-Khairid state to its original extent established by his predecessor, encompassing Khurasan and Khwarazm. Under ʿAbdullāh, the Abū'l-Khairids reached the height of their power and the empire witnessed its greatest territorial expansion. Between 1588–1598, Herat flourished economically and culturally under his hegemony with his sponsorship of public architecture as well as irrigation projects that increased agricultural production.[460] McChesney contrasts ʿAbdullāh's reputation in Transoxiana

---

[456] Dodkhudoeva, "K voprosu ob instrumentakh formirovaniia imperskoi ideologii," 53. Another version is held in London, catalogued as *Rauẓat al-ṣalāṭīn* (BL Or. 14244).

[457] DeWeese, "The Problem of the *Siraj al-salihin,*" 66.

[458] Dodkhudoeva, "K voprosu ob instrumentakh formirovaniia imperskoi ideologii," 65.

[459] Ibid., 64.

[460] For details on the Abū'l-Khairids' hold on Herat lasting a decade, consult Burton, "The Fall of Herat"; McChesney, "The Conquest of Herat."

as a builder to Chinggis Khan's infamy as a destroyer.[461] Due to the strength of its urban infrastructure constructed at this time, Bukhara would remain the capital of Transoxianan rulers until the late nineteenth-century Russian conquest.[462]

The domestic turmoil engendered by ʿAbdullāh's pursuit of power prior to 1582 was not an environment conducive for a kitābkhāna to produce illustrated manuscripts. Periods of political strain negatively impacted artistic output, whereas stable times fostered it. ʿAbdullāh's patronage of the workshops never recovered in part because it took all of his effort to maintain his greatly enlarged empire. For example, his troops had seized Khurasan in 1588 only to loosen their grip on the region in the campaign to take Khwarazm in 1592. By 1593 the Abū'l-Khairids had obtained Khwarazm but at the expense of Khurasan, necessitating its recapture.[463] During these events, manuscripts previously completed in the Bukharan kitābkhāna would go on to have greater utility beyond Abū'l-Khairid domains, as explained below.

III. Gift-giving (*pīshkash*) and the politics of presenting manuscripts

Presentations of manuscripts as diplomatic gifts by Abū'l-Khairid envoys were not only a prevailing custom amongTurco-Persianate political elites of the so-called "gunpowder empires" but also a well-established practice throughout the broader Muslim world. In a major exhibition highlighting such exchanges, Linda Komaroff explains how gift-giving creates an obligatory system of presenting and receiving that does not conform to universal rules.[464]

In theTurco-Persianate world the word for these exchanges is *pīshkash*, and it has played various roles in Islamic courtly cultures during the last 1400 years. Ann Lambton has explained nuanced interpretations of the Persian term as a tribute, tax, bribe, or gift.[465] It demarcates the status of the giver and recipient within the dynamics of political power, and comes with obligations to give,

---

[461] McChesney, "Islamic culture and the Chinggisid restoration," 253. Scott Levi compares ʿAbdullāh II to his contemporaries Akbar and ʿAbbās in his appreciating transregional commerce and constructing "hundred of bridges, caravansarais, and securing critical trade routes contributing to an upsurge in regional commerce" in "India, Russia and the Eighteenth-Century Transformation of the Central Asian Caravan Trade," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 42, no. 4 (1999): 529.

[462] Yuri Bregel, "Abdallah Khān B. Eskandar," *Encyclopædia Iranica.*

[463] Burton, "Relations between the Khanate of Bukhara and Ottoman Turkey," 91.

[464] Linda Komaroff, ed., *Gifts of the Sultan* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2011), 20.

[465] Ann Lambton, "Pīshkash: Present or Tribute?" *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 57, no. 1 (1994): 145.

accept, or reciprocate.[466] Hedda Reindl-Kiel's examinations of Ottoman gift exchanges articulate political and social dimensions "which precisely made the status of the present's receiver visible and tangible. Thus, gifts established not only real values but also what we might call symbolic capital in kind."[467] When dealing with manuscripts, this symbolic worth, however, was lost after it was accessioned by the library or treasury, but it could be revived when given to another person.[468] In Sinem Arcak's examinations of Ottoman-Safavid gift-giving, she similarly interprets the objects as indicators of "economic, symbolic and artistic values" and the circumstances of their distribution as "a courtly performance" involving spectators, recipients, and bestowers. She notes how for the Ottomans, "there was the expectation to not only reciprocate, but to return the favor through the giving of a comparable or even more valuable object or sum of money worth twice the value of the original given item."[469] Thus, the gift functions as a financial transaction, and an immediate second gift can eradicate the indebtedness created by the first. This secondary exchange provides a way for a ruler to express his superiority while still accepting the original gifted item.

III.i. Abū'l-Khairid manuscript diplomacy

As the above scholarship attests, these Ottoman and Safavid pīshkash transfers provide insight into how these powers' dispatch and receipt of illustrated manuscripts and can inform similar Abū'l-Khairid exchanges with other dynastic heads. Lâle Uluç's findings on the Ottoman predilection for illustrated Firdausian *Shāhnāma*s also influences my study.[470] I shall overlook the earlier period of Abū'l-Khairid diplomacy and pīshkash to focus on manuscripts that were likely transferred during the reign of ʿAbdullāh Khan (consult the three subsets to App. 6: Abū'l-Khairid manuscripts gifted in the 16th century). This is due to a paucity of sources concerning transfers of book objects between courts in the first half of the sixteenth century; the second half is better documented.

---

[466] Ashley Mayeri Burns condenses these theories of Marcel Mauss in her paper "The Gift of Diplomacy: Case Studies in Safavid Gifting, 1567—1583" (MA thesis, School of Oriental and African Studies, 2015), 7.

[467] Hedda Reindl-Kiel, "East is East and West is West, and Sometimes the Twain Did Meet: Diplomatic Gift Exchange in the Ottoman Empire," in *Frontiers of Ottoman Studies: State, Province, and the West,* Vol. 2, eds. Colin Imber and Keiko Kiyotaki (London: IB Tauris, 2005), 114.

[468] Ibid., 115, 116.

[469] Sinem Arcak, "Gifts in Motion: Ottoman-Safavid Cultural Exchange, 1501-1618" (PhD diss., University of Minnesota, 2012), 21–23.

[470] In particular: Lâle Uluç, "Ottoman Book Collectors and Illustrated Sixteenth Century Shiraz Manuscripts," *Revue des mondes musulmans et de la Méditerranée* 87-88 (September 1999): 85-107; "Selling to the Court: Late-Sixteenth-Century Manuscript Production in Shiraz," *Muqarnas* 17 (2000): 73-96; "A Persian Epic, Perhaps for the Ottoman Sultan," *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 29 (1994): 67–68.

ʿAbdullāh's victories over all the appanages and control of the Bukhara kitābkhāna made him the main patron in the late-1550s throughout the 1560s, and the illustrated manuscripts that had been previously assembled in Bukhara for ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, Naurūz Aḥmad, and Yār Muḥammad were available to him. Later in his rule however, he gifted some of his own commissioned copies—and perhaps those originally owned by his predecessors—to foreign powers. I have identified three manuscripts given by the Abū'l-Khairids to the Safavids, (App. 6a), twenty-eight volumes likely presented to the Mughals (App. 6b), and twenty-eight others that were sent to the Ottomans (App. 6c). Regrettably, many either lack records regarding their transfer or there are limited seals and notes that might better indicate previous ownership, and these impede thorough analysis on them. Fortunately, there is sufficient documentation regarding ʿAbdullāh's gift of his *Shāhnāma* to Sultan Murad III in 1594 to permit a case study of Abū'l-Khairid pīshkash. By analyzing the complex, intertwined Ottoman—Abū'l-Khairid political and artistic relationships surrounding the volume, I shall articulate both the intended impact that the Abū'l-Khairids desired in giving it, and the actual outcome after the Ottomans accepted it.

III.i.a. Safavids (Appendix 6a)

As the main enemies of the Abū'l-Khairids, it is not surprising that few manuscripts found their way from courtly Abū'l-Khairid workshops into the hands of the Safavids. Nevertheless, at least three manuscripts produced under Transoxianan patronage were presented to Safavid royalty and remained in Iran for a few centuries. Those that did must have been gifted to Shah ʿAbbās I in Isfahan after the death of ʿAbdullāh Khan when the two polities were on peaceful terms. Afterwards, their new owner commissioned his kitābkhāna artists to conduct further amendments. Based on added illustrations, seal impressions, and inscriptions, we can point to two that were then regifted by the Safavids to the Mughals (App. 6a, no. 2) and Ottomans (App. 6a, no. 3).

III.i.b. Mughals (Appendix 6b)

A more systematic review of the extensive holdings of Abū'l-Khairid manuscripts in Mughal libraries numbering twenty-eight volumes will be given in Chapter 5 §V.i. Some of those given on ʿAbdullāh's behalf by emissaries were intended to cement alliances against the Safavids, while others were directly taken by artists originating from Transoxiana to India. Paratextual elements in some of these volumes await analysis that could shed light on their accession. Many of the works lack such

explicit documentation but bear features that merit their inclusion, such as Mughal overpainting that proves the objects spent time in India.

III.i.c. Ottomans (Appendix 6c)

Out of all the dynastic powers, Abū'l-Khairid gifts of manuscripts and albums to the Ottomans were the most numerous, with some delivered by Bukharan ambassadors to the Sublime Porte while others could have been given to Ottoman ambassadors in Bukhara to then transport back to Istanbul.[471] This discussion shall primarily focus on those illustrated manuscripts known to have been gifted by ʿAbdullāh Khan in his lifetime that are still preserved today in the Topkapı Palace Library. We have already examined some Abū'l-Khairid manuscripts that appear to have arrived earlier, prior to ʿAbdullāh Khan's leadership, such as the *Tīmūr-nāma* of Hātifī (TSMK H.1594), discussed in Chapter 2 §III.ii. There are also a few copies of Firdausian *Shāhnāma* that traveled from east to west, between Transoxiana and Constantinople. One of these is the *Shāhnāma* in the big-figure style (TSMK H.1509) that was examined in Chapter 1 §III.ii; another copy (TSMK R.1549) with some little-figure illustrations was finished in the Ottoman realm circa 1530s through 1540s (covered in Chapter 1§III.iii and Chapter 2 §III.iii.d). The text to the truncated *Shāhnāma* (TSMK H.1514) was written in Bukhara in 1535 but found its way into the royal Ottoman collection decades later (discussed in Chapter 2 §III.i).

Some of the manuscripts originally gifted by Abū'l-Khairid rulers to their Ottoman counterparts were subsequently acquired by other collections and remain today outside of Istanbul, and these shall also necessarily be considered (App. 6c, nos. 25–28). In circa 1900, the Swedish diplomat and dealer F.R. Martin acquired objects from the Ottoman collection. Scholars have since noted Martin's infamy in "returning to his villa in Florence with important paintings and manuscripts removed surreptitiously or with the tacit approval of unscrupulous librarians from the libraries of Istanbul."[472] This explains how some illustrated manuscripts of Bukharan manufacture known to have been gifted to the Ottomans left the Sublime Porte.

---

[471] Burton references Abū al-Ghāzi's *Shajara-yi Turk* reporting an Ottoman envoy named Sala Shah was "loaded with gifts" in Bukhara upon his return to Istanbul at some point in 1589, although he was reported to have been robbed in Khwarazm ("Relations between the Khanate of Bukhara and Ottoman Turkey," 89-90).

[472] Glenn D. Lowry and Susan Nemazee, *A Jeweler's Eye: Islamic Arts of the Book from the Vever Collection* (Washington, D.C.: Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, 1988), 31, ftn. 44. For further information on manuscript materials coming into F.R. Martin's possession under suspicious circumstances, consult Stuart Cary Welch, "Private Collectors and Islamic Arts of the Book," in *Treasures of Islam*, ed. Toby Falk (Bristol: Artline Editions, 1985), 26.

There are other unillustrated texts that have remained in the Topkapı collection, such as original copies of ʿUbaidullāh's and Shībānī's *Dīvān* compositions of personal poetry, and it is quite feasible that these too were gifted.[473] It is easy to believe that these precious volumes of the premier Abū'l-Khairid dynastic leaders would have been presented to Ottoman rulers in a display of fraternity and literary pretension. Since they only contain illuminated headings and have no other visual schema, they are not included in the list but are important examples of Uzbek-Ottoman exchanges of manuscripts.

III.ii. Dispatches of Firdausian *Shāhnāma* to the Ottomans

When exchanged at the courtly level, manuscripts gifted to the Ottomans did not come for free; they accompanied letters asking for political favors, or were proffered after the conclusion of peace and trade agreements. Having been produced in 1564, here we will focus on the afterlife of ʿAbdullāh Khan's *Shāhnāma* when it was gifted to Sultan Murad III in 1594 and the politics surrounding its transfer. Although Karin Rührdanz claims that ʿAbdullāh's *Shāhnāma* "was specially made with the intention of being presented at Istanbul by an embassy negotiating Ottoman help against the Safavids," the work does not seem to have been created with the aim of passing it along. Firstly: it had been in ʿAbdullāh's collection for three decades and remained there despite other earlier occasions to part with it. Secondly, characterizing ʿAbdullāh's exchange of the manuscript as an act of subservience and supplication glosses over important circumstances surrounding its transfer.[474] ʿAbdullāh's gift was actually intended to convey his status equivalent to its intended recipient while concurrently securing political favor. His selection of that particular title implies his knowledge of a prevailing Ottoman predilection for illustrated *Shāhnāma*s. By extension, it also reflects his awareness of Firdausian *Shāhnāma*s given by other dynastic leaders to the Sublime Porte.

III.ii.a. Courtly Firdausian *Shāhnāma* copies gifted before 1575

The earliest documented Firdausian *Shāhnāma* manuscript exchange between Transoxiana and the Ottomans occurred when the last Timurid ruler of Herat, Bāiqarā's son and brief successor Badīʿ al-Zamān (d. 1514), presented a copy to Sultan Selim I (r. 1512–20) when he sought refuge in Istanbul in 1514.[475] Over ensuing decades, the Ottomans were avid collectors of Firdausī's work and the Safavid

---

[473] I allude to the undated *Dīvān* (in Turki) of ʿUbaidullāh (TSMK A.2381), and the *Dīvān* (also in Turki) of Shībānī (TSMK A.2436) scribed by Sulṭān ʿAlī in 1507.

[474] Rührdanz, "The Samarqand Shahnamas," 214.

[475] A contemporary account of this exchange is noted in Uğur, *The Reign of Sultan Selim I in the Light of the Selim-name Literature*, 269, and it is illustrated in a *Selim-nâma* of Bitlīsī (H.1597–98), completed in ca. 1525. See Tanındı, "The Illustration of the *Shahnama* and the Art of the Book in Ottoman Turkey," 144.

workshops were prolific in producing copies of the title, with some designated as sites to satiate this desire (such as Shiraz).[476]

In 1567, Shah Ṭahmāsp dispatched Shāh Qulī Khān Ustajlū as his ambassador to the enthronement ceremony of Selim II's new reign in Edirne. There Shāh Qulī presented the shah's own lavish Firdausian *Shāhnāma* on 16 February 1568.[477] Commenced in 1522, during Ismāʿīl's reign, the manuscript encased in a jewel and pearl-encrusted binding was later completed for his successor Ṭahmāsp in 1537.[478] It was the most lavish rendition of the *Shāhnāma* that the Safavids or any other dynasty ever produced. Its presentation to the Ottomans by the Safavid ambassador, shown deeply bowing in a very subservient posture, is featured in an illustration within Selim's biographical ruler-*nāma,* the *Shāhnāma-yi Salīm Khān* by Sayyid Luqmān.[479]

Rather than simply signifying Ṭahmāsp's full allegiance and devotion to the Ottoman ruler, the bestowal of this opulent gift served critical cultural and political aims on both sides. The Safavids and Ottomans individually viewed themselves as the sole possessors of cultural and artistic superiority. The Safavids, who saw themselves as the prevailing arbiters of refinement and cultural production in theTurco-Persianate world, knew the impact that the object would have. The Ṭahmāsp *Shāhnāma* — truly the pinnacle of Safavid manuscripts with its rich and compelling illustrative pictorial scheme— would later inspire Ottoman artists to reproduce some of its compositions.[480] Ünver Rüstem notes how Ṭahmāsp's gift stimulated production of truncated and illustrated *Shāhnāma*s in the Ottoman Empire, as discussed in Chapter 2.[481]

Arcak explains that the presentation of lavish manuscripts manifested power relations and was a tool in Safavid diplomacy to obtain concessions in political and military negotiations with the more

---

[476] Consult Uluç, "Ottoman Book Collectors and Illustrated Sixteenth Century Shiraz Manuscripts."

[477] This event is recounted in Tanındı, "Additions to Illustrated Manuscripts in Ottoman Workshops," 147.

[478] Zarinebaf-Shahr describes the manuscript's manufacture in "Cross-Cultural Contacts in Eurasia," 538. Stuart Cary Welch claimed it was originally commissioned in 1522 by Shah Ismāʿīl for the nine-year-old Ṭahmāsp, who that year returned to the capital Tabriz from Herat [*A King's Book of Kings: The Shāh-Nameh of Shah Tahmasp* (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1972), 16].

[479] TSMK A.3595, ff.53b–54a, completed in Istanbul, ca. 1571–81. Extensively reproduced.

[480] Illustrations of "The Iranian Qaran slays the Turanian Barman" (Ṭahmāsp *Shāhnāma* f.102v) and "The Iranian army with Rustam and Barzu fighting the Turanian (Transoxianan) army" (*Shāhnāma* HDA br. A. 1, f.323b), both completed in 1573 in Baghdad, feature noticeable parallels. The Ṭahmāsp folio "Combat of Rustam and Shangul" (f.279v) could have been the model for "Rustam lifts Pilsam off his horse on a spear" in a *Şehnâme-i Türkî* verse translation by Şerif Âmidî, ca. 1616-20, Istanbul (NYPL Spencer Turk. 1, f.199v). All illustrations to the Ṭahmāsp *Shāhnāma* are reproduced in Sheila R. Canby, *The* Shahnama *of Shah Tahmasp: the Persian Book of Kings* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2004).

[481] Ünver Rüstem, "The Afterlife of a Royal Gift: The Ottoman Inserts of the *Shāhnāma-i Shāhī*," *Muqarnas* 29 (2012): 247.

powerful Ottomans.[482] Safavid artistic prowess could also convey political mastery. What is more, Ṭahmāsp may have gifted his valuable manuscripts as a result of his second Edict of Sincere Repentance in 1556. He decreed new standards of public morality and piety, denounced the arts and disbanded his kitābkhāna. Ṭahmāsp's acts of gifting thereby may have also served as a conscious display of the shah's newfound ascetic humility—and Shiʿite spiritual superiority—to the Sunni Ottomans as a form of religious power play that elevated the position of the giver over the receiver. However, Christine Woodhead has analyzed the Ottoman response in acquiring precious works of Safavid make as diplomatic gifts, such as Ṭahmāsp's *Shāhnāma*, which reinforced Ottoman notions of their own superiority in being given such a valuable object. Both the Ottomans and the Safavids in their own way each thought they were the stronger party.[483]

III.ii.b. Truncated *Shāhnāma*s TSMK mss. H.1503 and H.1514–illustrative programs

As was mentioned in Chapter 2 §III.i, based on their textual and visual contents, truncated *Shāhnāma* versions lack much or all of the historical component to Firdausī's original text and were mostly the product of Ottoman workshops and would have been attractive to Abū'l-Khairid and Ottoman readers. Focusing on the two truncated specimens written by scribes working in or from Bukhara (TSMK mss. H.1503 and H.1514), I can track the manuscripts' movements through analyzing their illustrations. Written in Bukhara in 1535, H.1514 was later carried west and was taken in and finished by artists connected to a workshop presumed to be in Baghdad when it was under Ottoman rule in the late sixteenth century. H.1503 could have been produced entirely in this workshop at the same time as the illustrations to H.1514 were added. Together, the manuscripts serve as a cautionary tale in using colophon information to attribute a single provenance to a work. Like so many of the objects mentioned in the chapters to this research, H.1503 and H.1514 are specimens of amalgamated manuscript manufacture. I will examine them individually then will comment on their cumulative illustrations executed in styles shared between them.

H.1514: illustrative program

The stylistically uniform imagery within H.1514 rendered in a bold style (figs. 77-78, 103) yields a different chronology and provenance than the text that accompanies it. Analysis of the illustrative program—foreign to Abū'l-Khairid workshops—helps to chronicle the trajectory the

---

[482] Arcak, "Gifts in Motion," 19.

[483] Woodhead, "Reading Ottoman 'Şehnames'," 74.

manuscript took following its exit from the Abū'l-Khairid domain after it was written out in 1535. Through comparisons to other Ottoman materials in a similar style such as paintings within albums, I theorize that the text to H.1514 ended up in the Ottoman realm where illustrations were added sometime between the 1570s through 1580s. An Ottoman album folio depicting Rustam seated on a rock (TSMK H.2145, f.30v) features similar leg armor as Garshāsp smiting an orange div in H.1514 (fig. 77).[484] The Garshāsp composition is obviously painted after the text was written since the rocks and tree extend over the original rulings in the upper portion. A letter dated January 1572 indicates an envoy of the ruler of Tashkent (Darvīsh Khān being in power at this time) carried out a pilgrimage upon the completion of the members' ambassadorial duties. The document explains financial exchanges linking Ottoman centers. A cash sum originally paid by the ambassadors was to be refunded by Ottoman treasury administrators in Baghdad. The coins initially bestowed by the Tashkent envoy in Basra were to be taken from there and sent to the *beylerbey* (provincial governor) of Damascus, who was ordered to return the customs fee to them there upon their return from Mecca and guarantee their safety so that they would not be attacked while transiting in the Ottoman realm.[485] There is no mention of a manuscript exchange, but the meeting of Uzbek and Ottoman officials and the linkage of geographical centers at this time provide an appropriate backdrop for H.1514 to have transited from east to west in the custody of Uzbek noblemen engaged in diplomacy and pilgrimage. They might have traded the manuscript text for goods and services in lieu of heavier (and riskier) hard currency transported across long distances.

Truncated *Shāhnāma* versions visually comparable to H.1514 have been associated with commercial productions assembled in Baghdad later in the sixteenth century at the time the Tashkent delegation passed through the eastern Ottoman lands. The compositions and figures to some illustrated scenes are reused across the group of truncated *Shāhnāma* productions examined by Rührdanz which have stylistic parallels to illustrations in *Qiṣaṣ al-anbiyā'* manuscripts.[486] With the exception of H.1514, none of the manuscripts with illustrations in this style mention a locale in their colophons, but

---

[484] The div closely follows that depicted in an often reproduced dispersed folio to a *Fālnāma* (LM no. MAO 894) with Imam Riżā saving the sea peoples, ca. 1550-1565. TSMK H.2145, f.30v is reproduced as pl. XXVIIa in Ivan Stchoukine, *La Peinture Turque d'après les manuscrits illustrés IIme partie de Murad IV a Mustafā III, 1623-1773* (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1971).

[485] BOA no. DVNSMHM.d.16/657 (979 Ş 19).

[486] Rührdanz, "The Transformed *Shāhnāma*," 601. For an extensive analysis of this style and suggested Baghdad center, consult Rachel Milstein, et al., *Stories of the Prophets: Illustrated Manuscripts of* Qiṣaṣ al-Anbiyā' (Costa Mesa, California: Mazda Publishers, 1999).

Rührdanz has given the group an Ottoman provenance that she locates in Istanbul.[487] Other scholars have (arguably more convincingly) situated their manufacture in Baghdad, but the location cannot definitively be determined at this present state of research.[488] Ottoman-controlled workshops in Baghdad began operating in 1573 but decreased their production at the close of the sixteenth century as a result of political instability and wars between Ottomans and Safavids.[489]

Baghdad manuscripts were predominantly commercial enterprises. Workshops there produced illustrated texts for court and military elites. Some copies of Persian poetry originating there found their way to India where they were retouched by local artists.[490] Others were later owned by the Emir of Bukhara and subsequently gifted to Tsar Nicholas II in the late nineteenth century, while several remained in the Ottoman realm and were accessioned by the Topkapı collection.[491] H.1514 has some identical compositions and figures as another truncated *Shāhnāma* copy in the Topkapı (TSMK R.1544) that is dated 1576 which follows the standard four-part division discussed in Chapter 2, containing sections labelled *Shāhnāma*, *Khusrau-nāma*, *Bahman-nāma*, *Iskandar-nāma*.[492] Both H.1514 and R.1544 are lavish: every illustration in R.1544 is awash in gold or has gilded accents, and H.1514 is endowed with two diptychs at the beginning and end of the manuscript each with illuminated margins. The double-page frontispiece in H.1514 (fig. 78) is similar to that in R.1544 (fig. 79), and in both there are two figures beside a horse on the left side wearing kalpak headwear (red and yellow in

---

[487] Arguing against an Istanbul provenance for the truncated *Shāhnāma*s and any other Persian-language Firdausian *Shāhnāma* copies, Uluç has asserted in publications that the Ottoman capital at the end of the sixteenth century was only producing Persian-language historical chronicles (ruler-*nāma*) and Turkic translations of Firdausian *Shāhnāma*s. This will be taken up in §IV in this present chapter, and Ch. 4 §I.

[488] Rührdanz posits an Istanbul attribution in "Truncated Shahnamas," 129. Read also her contributions in Kwiatkowski, *The Eckstein Shahnama* for her theory on the influence of Iranian styles (derived from Isfahan and Qazvin) or artists from these locales working on illustrations in Ottoman workshops. Her analysis comes from her earlier collaborative work with Milstein, et al., *Stories of the Prophets*. The Baghdad school has been used as a stylistic designation to refer to a single group of non-royal illustrated manuscripts copied and illustrated between 1565–85 by artists from different backgrounds (Tabriz, Qazvin, Shiraz, Khurasan, and Ottoman workshops) gathered together in one place (Baghdad). Their coherence as a group is questioned, but stylistic diffusion and the formation of mixed styles after 1576 increases perhaps as a result of the Ottomans annexing Tabriz and disrupting workshops. On the Istanbul versus Baghdad debate, Melis Taner gives an overview in "'Caught in a Whirlwind:' Painting in Baghdad in the Late Sixteenth-Early Seventeenth Centuries" (PhD diss., Harvard University, 2016), 21-22.

[489] Taner connects the workshop's collapse with the death of the Baghdad governor and patron Hasan Paşa, rekindled warfare between Ottomans and Safavids in 1603, and instability in Baghdad with local uprisings and the campaigns of Shah ʿAbbās ("Caught in a Whirlwind," 254).

[490] The truncated *Shāhnāma* in All Souls' College, Oxford—Codrington Library 288—was later purchased in Muradabad by a member of the British East India Company. Provenance in Robinson, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Persian Paintings in the Bodleian Library*, 185.

[491] Two Niẓāmī manuscripts that are examples of the Bukhara-to-Muscovy gift exchange are RIOS mss. PNS 272 (*Khamsa* dated 1579), PNS 84 (*Iskandar-nāma* dated 1571). See ftn. 644.

[492] Information on TSMK R.1544 in Lâle Uluç, "Vezir-i Azam Sinan Paşa'dan Gelen Kitabdır—Sene 999," in *Günsel Renda'ya Armağan (Essays in Honor of Günsel Renda)*, eds. Zeynep Yasa Yaman and Serpil Bağcı (Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Hastaneleri Basımevi, 2011), 245–53.

H.1514, and black and white in R.1544). The figures have unique wispy beards that might distinguish them as heralding from Transoxiana. R.1544 was gifted by Sinan Paşa (the grand vizier to five sultans) to Mehmet III in 1590, five years before Mehmet would ascend the Ottoman throne. R.1544 was created as a commercial manuscript with illustrations derived from a set repertoire used for truncated *Shāhnāma* copies, but from these commercial origins it became royal through the act of gifting it to the future Ottoman sovereign. H.1514 has no identifiable seals or markers to pinpoint past owners or dates of transmission, but like R.1544 its current location in the Topkapı Palace asserts its dispatch into the royal collection.

H.1503: textual production

Like H.1514, the entire manuscript H.1503 in the Topkapı has also been catalogued as "Bukharan" or "Shībānid" because of its colophon, however the information undergirding this classification is not explicit. H.1503's colophon follows a similar format as H.1514 and reads: "the book was finished under the auspices of the most munificent king by the hand of the humblest worshipper the illuminator Muḥammad the Bukharan [*al-bukhārā'ī*] / forgive his sins."[493] Mustafa ʿÂli mentions several Muḥammads of Bukharan origin who were trained by Mīr ʿAlī but they have longer names (e.g., Muḥammad Maʿṣūm Ḥusainī, or Muḥammad Nāṣir). Other Muḥammads are listed with a first name and a nisba naming Mashhad and Herat. The Bukharan nisba in H.1503 suggests Abū'l-Khairid scribal origins but no production site or year are listed, and so it cannot be confirmed that the manuscript had any connection to Transoxiana beyond the site where the scribe might have originally trained. A nisba suggests the named individual's background but does not assert definitive personal origins, and it by no means implies the person remained in the center from which he or his family hailed. The Bukharan moniker could designate an artisan of Transoxianan origin working as part of a team far from this center; indeed another truncated *Shāhnāma* (MMA 13.228.11) has a colophon naming "Shāh Muḥammad, the Sabzivārī scribe" with the date 1584, but its illustrations do not come from Sabzivar, in Khurasan. As we shall see, the illustrations to H.1503 could demonstrate that the birthplace of the scribe is not the place of the manuscript's ultimate assemblage.

H.1503 is a large volume measuring 47.5x32.5cm and is written out in 4 columns with 21 rows. These specifics are common to another truncated *Shāhnāma* copy (MMA 13.228.14). These

---

[493] The colophons to H.1514 and H.1503 have very similar formats. Some work on colophon formulae has been done by Ramazan Şeşen, "Esquisse d'un histoire du développement des colophons dans les manuscrits musulmans," in eds. François Déroche and Francis Richard, *Scribes Et Manuscrits Du Moyen-Orient* (Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France, 1997), 189-221.

measurements also apply to other *Shāhnāma* manuscripts in the Topkapı with illustrations and illuminations stylistically attributed to Baghdad, Isfahan, and Qazvin in the last quarter of the sixteenth century.[494] H.1503 was the personal copy of Davud Paşa (d. post-1596), the Ottoman governor of Ganja, Van, and Shirvan who was a general on the eastern front in battles with the Safavids.[495] He brought this *Shāhnāma* along with the other truncated copies H.1502 and H.1512 to the Topkapı Palace at some point between 1594–1604. In the next section we will examine the types of illustrations to these *Shāhnāma* works that are posited to have been produced for the Ottoman market, and the manuscripts' migration and the cadre of artists originally trained in far-flung workshops coming together to complete them.

H.1503: illustrative program

H.1503 has illustrations done in two styles, those in the same bold style (fig. 80) we saw in H.1514 that are akin to the *Qiṣaṣ al-anbiyāʾ* manuscripts from Baghdad, and a more lyric style.[496] The second manner of painting (fig. 81) is associated with the work of artists trained in Safavid workshops located in Qazvin and later Isfahan who replicated the works of Shah ʿAbbās I's court painter and kitābdār Ṣādiqī Beg (d. 1610).[497] It is not likely that there were two sites of illustration to complete the visual components of this manuscript in the two styles. Artists originally trained in two different workshops might have feasibly come together in one site, posited to be Baghdad. The artists there used the same paints since the color saturation and pigments are the same in all the illustrations to H.1503. This raises the valid point that different pictorial modes can and did coexist within a center and workshop; we are dealing with handmade creations and mobile bodies after all. Later, or while Muḥammad the Bukharan wrote the text to H.1503, illustrations in the "bold" and "lyric" styles filled the picture boxes he had left empty. I interpret these as the work of two artists from different backgrounds working at the same time and in the same place where Muḥammad copied the text. The manuscript would have been completed by 1600 for it to have come into the possession of Davud Paşa.

---

[494] TSMK mss. H.1512: 48.7 x 32.5cm; H.1502: 48 x 31.2cm; H.1503: 47.3 x 31.5cm; H.1492: 36.7 x 24.5cm (an outlier but possibly trimmed); Eckstein ms.: 46 x 33.5cm.

[495] Schmidt, "The Reception of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* Among the Ottomans," 125.

[496] Some reproductions are in Güner İnal, "Topkapı Sarayi Muzesindeki Bazi Şah Abbas Dönemi Sehname'lerinin Minyatürleri," *Hacettepe Beseri Bilimler Dergisi* 10, no. 3 (Haziran 1980): fig. 21 (lyric), figs. 22-24 (bold).

[497] I have also discovered this same "lyric" style in another *Shāhnāma* manuscript (MMA 13.228.14) that has an identical binding and dimensions as H.1503. The style parallels illustrations found in the following manuscripts: a *Shāhnāma* (LG O.117); and *Qiṣaṣ al-anbiyāʾ* scribed by Isḥāq b. Ibrāhīm al-Nīshāpūrī illustrated by Ṣādiqī Beg or Riżā, circa 1595 (BNF Sup Pers 1313).

H.1503 has been linked to a group of truncated *Shāhnāma* manuscripts examined by İnal.[498] What I refer to as the "lyric style" of illustration, she suggests it is an early example of the Isfahan style arising in the late sixteenth or early seventeenth century. İnal theorizes one workshop produced the truncated *Shāhnāma* manuscripts in the Topkapı: H.1492 (dated 1597), H.1502, H.1512, and H.1503. To this group I can add MMA mss. 13.228.11 (by the Sabzivārī scribe, dated 1584) and 13.228.14 (dated 1588).[499] Many are bound in nearly identical embossed gold covers which may or may not be contemporary to the textual and illustrative programs.[500] Çağman and Tanındı have since attributed İnal's manuscript group to artisans who roamed between Khurasan (Herat and its environs in Sabzivar, Bakharz, etc., to be covered in Chapter 4 §III.iv), Isfahan, Tabriz, and Baghdad. Çağman and Tanındı do not state it, but pecuniary needs might have spurred the itinerancy of the artisans formerly employed in the Safavid domain as Shah Ṭahmāsp's patronage declined in the 1550s. Our present focus on H.1503 adds to Çağman and Tanındı's grouping of illustrated *Shāhnāma* copies that have abridged text and image cycles ending with the death of Alexander in Babylon.[501] The cited scholars presented an eclectic working environment that brought together talent originally from multiple centers to make these works. With H.1503, we can now add a scribe of Bukharan origin to this cosmopolitan roster in the second half of the sixteenth century.

Details within the truncated *Shāhnāma* copies display how the workshop staff was mindful not to fan the flames of sectarianism, and painted characters in generic flat turbans and military banners with Allāh written on them as well as Muḥammad and ʿAlī so as to appeal to a broader base of buyers. Waning Abū'l-Khairid patronage later in the sixteenth century precipitated scribes to relocate to other centers; upsets in eastern Iran and in Abū'l-Khairid territory later in the sixteenth century and the artistic fallout will be covered in Chapter 4. Shāh Muḥammad the Sabzivārī scribe of MMA 13.228.11, and the copyist of H.1503 Muḥammad the Bukharan might have ventured west to the Ottoman realm following the dissolution of courtly workshops in Bukhara in the 1570s. Baghdad was on a pilgrimage

---

[498] İnal, "Şah Abbas Dönemi Sehname'lerinin Minyatürleri," 12-51.

[499] The truncated *Shāhnāma* MMA 13.228.11 has uniform illustrations executed in a style associated with developments in late-sixteenth century Isfahan, with some overpainting applied in India. It has similar breaklines to H.1503 which result in many of the same scenes illustrated in these two copies. MMA 13.228.14 is in the same two styles as H.1503. Illustrations to many of these manuscripts have been reproduced in the following articles: Zeren Tanandı, "Sultanlar, Şairler ve İmgeler: Şehnâme-i Firdevsi'nin Mukaddimesinin Resimleri," *U.Ü. Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, Yıl 9, Sayı 15 (2008/2): 267-96; İnal, "Şah Abbas Dönemi Şehnamelerinin Minyatürleri."

[500] *Shāhnāma* 13.228.11 is the outlier in having lacquer covers painted in an archaizing style that is of Qajar provenance.

[501] Çağman and Tanındı, "Firdevsi'nin Şâhnamesi'nde Geleneğin Değişimi," 156.

and diplomatic route linking Transoxiana to Anatolia and H.1514 might have also changed hands there, having been written out in Bukhara by Maḥmūd of Balkh half a century before. I mentioned above the delegation sent from Tashkent combining their political duties with a pilgrimage to the Hijaz, riding with members who could have carried manuscripts with them.

Whereas scholars have analyzed manuscript productions from Baghdad and truncated *Shāhnāma* versions through the lens of Safavid and Ottoman exchanges, the *Shāhnāma* manuscripts H.1514 and H.1503 are specimens of Abū'l-Khairid and Ottoman interchange but not at the courtly level.[502] Manuscripts H.1514 and H.1503 are evidence that copyists living in Abū'l-Khairid centers along with whole, unillustrated texts were transferred to courtly and commercial workshops likely under Ottoman administration in the sixteenth century, where artists there filled in the illustrations on site.

III.ii.c. Courtly Firdausian *Shāhnāma* copies gifted after 1575

In the last quarter of the sixteenth century, Safavid representatives continued to present lavishly prepared Firdausian *Shāhnāma* manuscripts as gifts to Ottoman royals and nobles. This was in spite of, and even enhanced by, the Safavid-Ottoman wars taking place between 1578–1590.[503] In 1576, Ṭahmāsp sent another embassy led by Tūqmāq Khān and gifted illuminated manuscripts including a *Shāhnāma* copy to celebrate Sultan Murad III's succession; however, curiously, no Bukharan ambassadors seem to have attended that same event.[504] This festival in Istanbul in 1576 is depicted in the first volume of the Ottoman ruler-*nāma*, the *Shāhan-shāhnāma* dated 1581.[505]

Later in 1582, Shah Khudābanda (r. 1578–87) sent the Safavid ambassador Ibrāhīm Khān to the eight-week circumcision festival of the sultan's son Mehmet which began in June. This time Mustafa Âli reported that the Safavid emissary "presented gifts both to the Sultan and the young heir [which included] a gilded Qurʾān, manuscripts of the *Shāhnāma* and a *Khamsa* of Niẓāmi, both decorated by

---

[502] Baghdad as a center of manuscript production has been most recently examined by Taner, "Caught in a Whirlwind."

[503] Asserted by Filiz Çağman and Zeren Tanındı, "Remarks on Some Manuscripts from the Topkapı Palace Treasury in the Context of Ottoman-Safavid Relations," *Muqarnas* 13 (1996): 132–48.

[504] According to Burton, little is known about the first embassy sent by ʿAbdullāh Khan ("Relations between the Khanate of Bukhara and Ottoman Turkey," 87). It was led by ʿAlī Bahādur Hajjī who probably left Bukhara in 1574–75, then returned to Bukhara in 1576–77 bearing a letter from the new Ottoman Sultan Murad III praising ʿAlī's eloquence committing to fight the Safavids together. The next Uzbek ambassador (so far unidentified) would visit Istanbul in June 1582 for the circumcision of Murad's son Mehmet.

[505] IUL F.1404, ff.41v-42r.

famous Persian artists."[506] Invited but unable to attend, ʿAbdullāh Khan dispatched seven *deste* (Ottoman measurement of ten-twelve units) of sable furs, sixty-three musk grains, two decorated amulets to guard against plague, a Qurʾān, and a *Shāh u gadā* manuscript of Hilālī with miniatures.[507] In May 1582, a month before acquiring these goods sent by "the Khan of the Uzbeks" (as articulated by the Ottoman chronicler in attendance) ʿAbdullāh, the Ottoman grand vizier Osman Paşa received orders about the dispatch of weapons and soldiers to the Uzbek ambassador when his entourage arrived at Demirkapı.[508] In the early-modern era—much as today— we see diplomacy paired with international arms deals. Rifles and janissaries were dispatched using a northern route over the Black Sea through the Crimea, avoiding Safavid territory to reach Bukhara.[509]

The importance of the 1582 pīshkash displays from the foreign delegations is recorded textually and visually in the second volume of the *Shāhan-shāhnāma* in which queues of figures process through the Gate of Felicity in the Topkapı Palace bearing these manuscripts and gifts.[510] *Shāhnāma* manuscripts continued to be given by the Safavids to the Ottomans through the 1590s.[511] However, after both Safavid and Abū'l-Khairid ambassadors were present and observed each others' offerings in 1582, the subsequent exchange in 1594 suggests rival displays of gift-giving by the Safavid and Abū'l-Khairid emissaries to the Ottoman court.

ʿAbdullāh must have heard reports of what the Safavids presented to Murad III at the 1582 circumcision festival, and perhaps sought to curry favor with the Ottoman sultan by offering the only royal *Shāhnāma* manuscript that he had produced when the next opportunity arose. Fortunately, Ottoman historian Selânikî (Mustafa Efendi, ca. 1545–1600) chronicles the visit of the Uzbek envoy

---

[506] Mustafa Âli lists the gifts the Safavid *īlchī* (ambassador) Ibrāhīm Khān brought, and adds that he was "infamous for his gaudy, second-rate writing" (*Epic Deeds*, 124).

[507] The gifts listed in the original roster in the Topkapı archives (D.9614, f.9a) are described by Hedda Reindl-Kiel, "Power and Submission: Gifting at Royal Circumcision Festivals in the Ottoman Empire (16th–18th centuries)," *Turcica: Revue d'Études Turques* 41 (2009): 53, ftn. 96. The gifted Qurʾān manuscript may have been a copy originally produced for ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz in 1545 (App. 6c, no. 26). The Hilālī manuscript may have been transcribed in 1539 by Sulṭān Muḥammad Nūr but then later illustrated in 1565 (App. 6b, no. 14).

[508] Letter dated 2 Jumādā I 990 (25 May 1582). BOA no. DVNSMHM.d 47/337.

[509] Information on 16th-century passages frequented by ambassadors, pilgrims, and merchants is in Horikawa, "The Shaybanid Dynasty and the Ottoman Empire," 65-67; and Levi, "Transformation of the Central Asian Caravan Trade."

[510] TSMK B.200, ff.36v–37r, dated between 1592–97.

[511] Soudavar describes Safavid *Shāhnāma* copies sent in 1584 to Sultan Murad III (*Art of the Persian Courts*, 66). Uluç observes how Ḥaidar Mīrzā, Shah ʿAbbās I's six-year-old nephew and hostage sent following a Safavid-Ottoman peace treaty, arrived in Istanbul 15 January 1590 and may have presented a *Shāhnāma* (H.1475) to Ferhad Paşa or Murad III. Uluç explains how Ottoman elites acquired Shirazi *Shāhnāma* manuscripts, purchased and as gifts, which they in turn presented to the sultan, such as those presented by Safavid emissary Ẕū'l-Fiqār Khān in 1595 ["A Persian Epic, Perhaps for the Ottoman Sultan," 67–68]. Zarinebaf-Shahr documents a long list of manuscripts gifted by the embassy headed by Mahdī Qulī Khān to Murad III on 19 January 1590 ("Cross-Cultural Contacts in Eurasia," 539). Komaroff notes gifts of poetical works and a Qurʾān said to be penned by the hand of ʿAlī himself (*Gifts of the Sultan*, 19).

Adtāsh Bahādur, from his arrival to the Sublime Porte in Istanbul on 4 January 1594 until his departure six weeks later.[512] He recounts how the ambassador "tendered gifts and presents" including pelts, readymade fur garments, and five yak tails to be hung around the necks of horses, all of which historian Audrey Burton argues were "no doubt intended to show that ʿAbdullāh had healthy trade links with Muscovy and Siberia."[513] In addition, Adtāsh Bahādur also presented two Qurʾān manuscripts (or one in two volumes), a *Khamsa* of Niẓāmī, and of course the *Shāhnāma* manuscript under discussion.[514] In comparison to the gifts presented earlier at the 1582 circumcision ceremony, by 1594 the Uzbeks offered objects of greater value. Perhaps the gift of both *Khamsa* and *Shāhnāma* volumes that year reflects the Safavid ambassador Ibrāhīm Khān's offerings in 1592 which acknowledged Ottoman appetites for Persian poetry by Firdausī and Niẓāmī.

What is more, as opposed to 1582, by 1594 ʿAbdullāh Khan's status had steadily risen after consolidating his power over the Abū'l-Khairid appanages to become its great khan in 1582. He no longer had to share power with Samarqand; it was centralized solely in Bukhara. ʿAbdullāh dispatched the ambassador Adtāsh Bahādur to Istanbul immediately following his conquest of Khwarazm. Along with the pīshkash gifts, Adtāsh carried a letter written in Turki and addressed "from the Ruler of the Vilayet of Samarkand and Bukhara, the Uzbek Tatar His Excellency 'Abdu'llah Khan."[515] ʿAbdullāh's choice of title flaunts his unification of Samarqand and Bukhara to his Ottoman recipient.

Before then, ʿAbdullāh undertook campaigns against the Khwarazmians, the Kazakhs, the Tajiks, the Turkomans, Mughals, and Safavids with the aim of recapturing the full extent of territory briefly ruled by his ancestor Muḥammad Shībānī Khan.[516] This was the justification for ʿAbdullāh's attack on Iran to secure control over the Khurasan province in 1588, the core subject of Chapter 4 to

---

[512] Audrey Burton names Ushāh Bahādur as ʿAbdullāh's emissary [*The Bukharans: A Dynastic, Diplomatic and Commercial History 1550–1702* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997), 78]. Peachy translates and analyzes events taking place in the Sublime Porte between January 1593 through early May 1594 ("A Year in Selânikî's History"). T.I. Sultanov also recounts the ambassadorial visit ["Sredneaziatskaia i vostochnoturkestanskaia pozdnesrednevekovaia rukopisnaia kniga," in *Rukopisnaya kniga v kul'ture narodov vostoka* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Nauka, 1987): 478–503].

[513] Burton, *The Bukharans*, 78. Zdzislaw Zygulski Jr. explains the significance of furs to the Ottomans: "Some parts of Anatolia and of Rumelia, with a cold winter climate, justified the use of furs, but in the court fashion of Istanbul furs signified simply the highest rank and wealth. Particularly in demand were the sable, squirrel, and black fox needed for the lining and edging of hilats (ceremonial caftans) and mantles of brocade" [*Ottoman Art in the Service of the Empire* (New York: New York University Press, 1992), 118–21].

[514] This manuscript is speculated to be either TSMK R.863 or MMA 13.228.7 (App. 6c, nos. 3, 25).

[515] Translated in sections XCVI: "The Arrival of an Envoy with a Letter from the Tatar Uzbek Khan 'Abdu'llāh and the Welcome Accorded Him"; XCVIII: "The Arrival at the Sublime [Porte] of the Envoy of the Khan of the Tatar Uzbeks"; CVIII: "The Kissing of the Hand of Leave by the Envoy of the Khan of the Uzbeks and his Departure" in Peachy, "A Year in Selânikî's History."

[516] Annanepesov, "Relations between the Khanates and with other Powers," 84.

come. ʿAbdullāh's military aims to restore the original Abū'l-Khairid borders caused great alarm and frantically-formed alliances in the neighboring regions of Safavid Iran, the Mughals in South Asia, and the Kazakhs based in the Central Eurasian Steppe. The Russian Tsar Feodor of Muscovy (r. 1584–98) also appealed to ally with a Kazakh coalition to help Iran against ʿAbdullāh of Bukhara.[517] Despite a one-year lag in correspondence given the technology of the times, the Ottomans and Uzbeks attempted to coordinate attacks on the eastern and western flanks of the Safavid empire to keep the Iranians engaged and their military power distracted and divided. This strategy seems to have been in the forefront of ʿAbdullāh's mind at the height of his military power in the 1590s.

Burton describes how by 1589, friendly relations between the Sublime Porte and Bukhara had actually weakened. Murad III "consider[ed the] Uzbeks rulers of a petty state, anxious to curb schemes for expansion which seemed excessive and inconsistent with [their] insignificant status."[518] She notes that was in comparison to earlier in the century, when the Ottomans were the predominant power in the region and "relations were and remained friendly, and [an] unequal partnership flourished, bringing benefits to both sides."[519] By 1594, the relationship between khan and sultan had become complicated when the Uzbeks were poised to conquer parts of Iran near Turkey. Murad III sent no congratulations on ʿAbdullāh's success in Khurasan in 1588, only an acknowledgement of the takeover of Herat.[520] Burton recounts:

> ʿAbdullāh must have resented the Sultan's strongly expressed disapproval of further Bukharan expansion in Khurasan. …This, surely, was an intolerable attempt to curtail his freedom of action and…it was clear that their earlier friendship had not survived the news of ʿAbdullāh's victories. All traces of Ottoman goodwill for the khanate had in fact disappeared … with apprehension in Istanbul, for it was thought that ʿAbdullāh might follow such a conquest with an attack on Iran proper, after which he would become Turkey's dangerous and unwelcome neighbour. […I]n August 1592, [Murad III] went so far as to promise that he would support the Shah against 'Osbeck Tatares.'[521]

Burton's observations illuminate the context of Ottoman political machinations when the Abū'l-Khairids presented their *Shāhnāma*: the Ottomans would secretly aid the Safavids over the Uzbeks!

---

[517] Burton, "The Fall of Herat," 119.

[518] Burton, "Relations between the Khanate of Bukhara and Ottoman Turkey," 88.

[519] Ibid., 103.

[520] Burton, *The Bukharans*, 73.

[521] Ibid., 74.

When ʿAbdullāh Khan acted through Adtāsh to present his *Shāhnāma* to Murad III in 1594, it was in the midst of the Abū'l-Khairid occupation of Khurasan and recent victory over the neighboring Khwarazmian ruler Ḥajjim Khan. After the Khivan khan's defeat by ʿAbdullāh, when an "innumerable Tatar army… poured like a raging flood upon the Khan of the Vilayet of Khwarazm," the vanquished ruler took refuge with the Safavid shah ʿAbbās I in Qazvin.[522] ʿAbdullāh's letter circuitously asked his assumed allies, the Ottomans, to plead with the Safavids to expel Ḥajjim Khan out of Iran and into the hands of the Abū'l-Khairids so he could obtain vengeance and secure his control over Khwarazm. However, the Ottoman ruler replied that "now is not the time" to vex the Safavid shah into giving up the Khwarazmian refugee.[523] A few years prior in 1590, the Ottomans sought peace with the Safavids and concluded a treaty in which the Ottoman Empire kept most of its gains. Ḥaidar Mīrzā, the nephew of Shah ʿAbbās, was held hostage in the Ottoman court to ensure peace would hold, so long as he lived. What is more, since 1593 the Ottoman Empire pursued a new and costly war against the Habsburgs with an ongoing campaign in Serbia, so they could not endure further political entanglements.

Nearing the end of this excursus, a contemporary account of the Ottoman–Abū'l-Khairid relationship by a seemingly impartial witness provides final insight into the historical dynamics of this period. Anthony Sherley (1565–1635), Elizabeth I's envoy to Shah ʿAbbās I between 1598–1601, presents the Uzbeks as "uncouth frontiersmen who do the bidding of the Ottomans 'whose religion they professe.'"[524] Despite his criticisms, he accurately portrays the power dynamic between Iran's neighbors to the west and the east as an alliance of convenience couched in confessional terms. However, the Ottomans were still the authoritative power and wished to preserve it. In 1594, ʿAbdullāh wanted to pursue a simultaneous strategy against Iran more than Murad III was willing. In 1590 following a war lasting twelve years, the Ferhad Paşa Treaty was agreed between the Safavids and the Ottomans. In it, the Safavids ceded territories long held by Iranian authorities to the Ottomans: Georgia, parts of Armenia and Azerbaijan, Baghdad, and swathes of Mesopotamia. The Ottomans

---

[522] Peachy, "A Year in Selânikî's History," 339.

[523] Ibid., 358.

[524] Sherley would write these words while reflecting on his travels from years earlier. Quoted in K. Şahin and J. Schleck, "Courtly Connections: Anthony Sherley's *Relation of his trauels* (1613) in a Global Context," *Renaissance Quarterly* 69, no. 1 (2016): 106. Other accounts of non-Muslim ambassadors on perceptions of Bukhara or Uzbeks are mentioned in Allworth, *The Modern Uzbeks*, 85; Scott C. Levi and Ron Sela, eds., "Anthony Jenkinson: an English Merchant in Central Asia," in *Islamic Central Asia: An Anthology of Historical Sources* (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2010), 215-21; Foltz, *Mughal India and Central Asia*, 42-44; Rudi Matthee quoting the French visitor Jean Chardin to the late-seventeenth century Safavid court claims Iranians looked down upon the Russians and the Uzbeks in the same way as "filthy, uncultured, and obtuse" ["Facing a Rude and Barbarous Neighbor," in *Iran Facing Others: Identity Boundaries in a Historical Perspective,* eds. Abbas Amanat and Farzin Vejdani (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2012), 103].

sought to uphold this peace agreement and retain the annexed lands in the years that followed. Therefore, keeping their word to the Safavids in 1594 was more important than the Ottomans' rapport with the Abū'l-Khairids at the time.

Edward Allworth's chapter on diplomacy in Central Asia is relevant to this present study on pīshkash practices in or by inhabitants of Transoxiana. Diplomacy "was a metaphor for sovereignty in Central Asia [raising] the problem of parity. …Central Asian rulers who participated in diplomatic exchanges aspired to recognition and permanence in their sovereign roles and wanted to impress the rulers they dealt with."[525] Seen in this light, ʿAbdullāh Khan's presentation of his *Shāhnāma* is an expression of power, patronage, and opulent gift-giving—not tribute— to a receiving head of state whom he viewed as his equal.

By parting with his *Shāhnāma*, ʿAbdullāh Khan selected an unusual offering. Manuscripts presented as diplomatic gifts were typically completed first. However, while its text was complete, the volume remained only half-illustrated which contrasts all the other complete and distinguished works presented by ambassadors to the Ottoman palace.[526] It is as though the empty picture boxes beg for the Ottoman sultan to commission his nakkaşhane to complete the grand designs initiated by the Uzbeks. To me, it serves as a metaphor for ʿAbdullāh's aims at territorial conquest and his desires for Uzbek-Ottoman collaboration to dominate Safavid Iran, by *infilling* the expanse separating their empires. But much like the state of the manuscript today, Ottoman interaction is only attested to by its absence and Abū'l-Khairid efforts remained one-sided, and incomplete.

IV. Conclusion

The Firdausian *Shāhnāma* is a multi-layered phenomenon. Factors such as its reproduction and gifting are statements of legitimacy and rulership in the period currently under study, and less so are they markers of identity. When the manuscript H.1488 was produced in 1564, ʿAbdullāh Khan aspired to rule a unified Transoxiana and broader Khurasan. Both Abū'l-Khairid and Safavid polities ultimately succeeded in restructuring their systems of governance later in the sixteenth century. Upon ascending the throne in 1588, political consolidation under Shah ʿAbbās I curtailed qizilbāsh administrative and

[525] Allworth, *The Modern Uzbeks*, 79.

[526] Tanındı, "Additions to Illustrated Manuscripts in Ottoman Workshops," 157.

military power and unified it under his direct control, as opposed to decentralized Mongol governance.[527] Safavid reliance on Mongol models ruptured when ʿAbbās extricated himself from the qizilbāsh grip and moved the capital from Qazvin to Isfahan in 1598. Significantly, however, ʿAbdullāh Khan's own centralizing policies and final defeat of the last blood rival in 1579 predate these Safavid reforms. If we define dynastic centralization as the establishment of an imperial capital, stimulation of trade to fund the state, patronage of shrines and religious architecture to support ideology, and curtailing the power of male relatives through imprisonment or death, then the Perso-Islamicate shift from Turco-Mongol customs actually took place in Transoxiana before it did in Iran.[528]

By 1578, ʿAbdullāh had launched a line of succession intending to pass authority to his son who was installed in Balkh as heir-apparent. In June 1582 ʿAbdullāh ascended the white felt carpet and assumed the title of great khan to administer his newly unified domain. Parting with illustrated works of poetry from his own collection was a diplomatic tool wielded as a regional leader operating in a new role as a singular monarch lording over his domain.

---

[527] Sussan Babaie, et al., *Slaves of the Shah: New Elites of Safavid Iran* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2004), 13.

[528] These distinguishing features of dynastic centralization in Turco-Persianate domains are listed in Liesbeth Geevers, "Safavid Cousins on the Verge of Extinction: Dynastic Centralization in Central Asia and the Bahrāmī Collateral Line (1517-1593)," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 58 (2015): 293-326.

Chapter 4

Turk amongst Tajiks: the Turkic *Shāhnāma* translation located in Tajikistan (CWH 1032) and manuscript production during the Abū'l-Khairid annexation of Khurasan (1588–1598)

Having examined Persian-language *Shāhnāma* manuscripts (both Firdausian and truncated versions) written and/or illustrated in centers controlled by the Abū'l-Khairids, along with historiographies written in Persian and Turki that place the Abū'l-Khairids in their genealogical and regional context, I will now discuss another type of Abū'l-Khairid *Shāhnāma* and one manuscript in particular. Our specimen is a Turkic verse translation of Firdausī's text, and it is unvowelled and ruled in four columns with thirty-one lines per page rubricated in Persian-language headings. This isolated Turkic *Shāhnāma* copy is housed in the Center of Written Heritage at the National Academy of Sciences of Tajikistan.[529] Its opening pages have notations in rhymed Turkic, Arabic, and Persian written in different hands. A line states that it is volume one. This is confirmed by the final story which covers the accession of Luhrāsp and marks a common division of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* into two parts.

This manuscript of mixed pedigree is a translation composed by the poet Ḥusain b. Ḥasan (Şerif) Âmidî (d. 1514) which was popular in Ottoman circles. According to Serpil Bağcı, "a group of Ottoman illustrated manuscripts of Şerif's *Şehnâme-i Türki* was probably produced all at once" implying the texts to various manuscripts were written out in the 1540s with illustrations added in subsequent decades.[530] However, the few scholars who have catalogued or cursorily analyzed what I am referring to as the Tajikistan *Shāhnāma* have classified its Turkic text as classical Qipchaq and attributed its few unfinished paintings to Khurasan in the 1570s.[531] In this chapter I will amend both this characterization of the text, and also the decade of its added illustrations to instead posit that these

---

[529] CWH 1032. Catalogue entry in Mirzoev and Boldyrev, *Katalog Vostochnykh Rukopiseĭ Akademii Nauk Tadzhikskoĭ SSR III*, 52-53, no. 831.

[530] Bağcı, "From translated word to translated image," 166.

[531] Shāh Mansūr Khājāev defers to Kazakh scholar Atgīn Kamīsboev in his article on the manuscript: "Shāhnāma: mashhūrtarīn aṡar dar miyān-i aqvām-e turkī zabān-i minṭaqa," *Bunyād-e Firdausī-ye Tūs* [Isfand 16, 1394 (March 6, 2016)], <http://bonyadferdowsitous.ir/> accessed 17 February 2017. Larisa Dodkhudoeva notes its unfinished state and suggests it is useful as a means to study the mechanics of book-making and illustration [*Katalog khudozhestvenno oformlennykh vostochnykh rukopiseī akademii nauk tadzhikskoi SSR* (Dushanbe: Donish, 1986), entry 57, p. 58]. She dates it to the 1570s (16). Other entries on the manuscript are found in Abuseitova and Dodkhudoeva, *History of Kazakhstan in Eastern miniatures*, 130; Dodkhudoeva, *The Arts of the Book in Central Asia and India*, 79-80.

were added sometime during the mid-1580s through the 1590s. I will provide textual and visual comparisons along with historical facts to argue that the components of its production span centers administered by Ottomans and Abū'l-Khairids.

As an object with text and imagery at the interface of eastern and western Turco-Persianate zones, it is not easily assigned a provenance. In support of my claim that it would have appealed to a resident in the Abū'l-Khairid realm, I will connect the manuscript to other written and oral Turkic translations of Firdausī's work that were initiated during the first few decades of Abū'l-Khairid control over different appanages. I will then compare other Turkic Âmidî versions produced in the Ottoman Empire, as well as other works of poetry with relatable visual programs, so as to better understand the Tajikistan manuscript's assemblage. Doing this will add to existing research on manuscript production in the second half of sixteenth-century Khurasan when it was impacted by battles between the Safavids and Abū'l-Khairids. It will also bring to light the contributions of artists and scribes immigrating there from Bukhara after ʿAbdullāh Khan's patronage ceased. The discussion closes with a detailed page-by-page analysis of the illuminations and seven illustrations in the Tajikistan manuscript, and connects them to other book arts and sites of production. The object truly encapsulates the mobility of the era in miniature.

I. Turkic translations of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* in the Ottoman empire

Overall, the majority of Firdausian and truncated *Shāhnāma* copies that survive from the sixteenth century are written in Persian and were produced in centers that are located today in Iran. The Ottomans had a lengthy history of involvement with Firdausī's *Shahnama* in both Persian and Turki, even greater than the Safavids in terms of timespan, due to their comparative dynastic longevity. Lâle Uluç has examined the role that the *Shāhnāma* played in Ottoman society, and asserts that Persian-language copies produced in the Ottoman capital Istanbul were very rare, or even nonexistent.[532] Persian versions produced in the Empire are held to be the truncated copies attributed to late-sixteenth century Baghdad which we examined in Chapters 2 and 3. There have been studies of Firdausian *Shāhnāma* versions in Turki that were produced in the courtly workshops of Istanbul, and scholars have

[532] Lâle Uluç's publications examine this absence of Persian-language *Shāhnāma* copies: "A Persian Epic, Perhaps for the Ottoman Sultan," 66; "The *Shahnama* of Firdausi as an Illustrated Text," in *The Treasures of the Aga Khan Museum – Arts of the Book and Calligraphy*, exhibition catalogue, eds. Margaret S. Graves and Benoît Junod (Istanbul: Sabancı University and Sakıp Sabancı Museum, 2010), 264; "The *Shahnama* in the Lands of Rum." Some fragments cut and pasted on board however depict scenes from the *Shāhnāma* and have passages in Persian. They appear to be from Istanbul circa 1530–50 and merit further study (LACMA nos. M.73.5.428, M.73.5.429, M.73.5.430, M.73.5.586). Other Persian *Shāhnāma* manuscripts (TSMK mss. H.1499 and H.1510) are posited to have been illustrated in Istanbul in the 1530s by artists originally trained in Tabriz (Atıl, *Turkish Art*, 166).

detected how the illustrators of these works erected a division between themselves, and the text which they did not consider to be of their own heritage.[533] However, with time the imagery and ideas associated with Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* would become assimilated as Ottoman artists transformed and at times built on the epic cycles, garbing the heroes and villains in the latest Ottoman fashions.[534]

In the sixteenth century, language was not a marker of group affiliation and identity. The heads of the Ottoman, Safavid, and Abū'l-Khairid states would have been comfortably bilingual in Persian and Turki across the century; refer to Appendix 3 (Correspondence between Ottoman and Abū'l-Khairid rulers, ca. 1500–1598) proving Ottoman and Abū'l-Khairid usage of both languages in official missives. However as was mentioned above, Uluç notes linguistic shifts taking place in Istanbul: during the reign of Murad III (1574–95), the Ottoman sultan commissioned copies of the *Shāhnāma* of Firdausī written out in Turki, but at the same time was "having the history of his own ancestors [in the form of ruler-*nāma*] written in Persian."[535] This is indicative of the later linguistic rigidity taking shape in the Ottoman and Safavid spheres to favor Turki and Persian respectively. Under the command of Murad III, the *ʿulamaʾ* forbade teaching Persian in madrasas, and the Ottoman nakkaşhane produced more works in Turki.[536] In contrast, little Turkic poetry was copied and illustrated in Safavid Iran during the sixteenth century. Despite the Azeri (read: Turkic) origins of the dynasty's founders, Safavid *Shāhnāma*s maintained the Persian of Firdausī's original text.

I.i. Prose translations

The earliest Turkic translation of Firdausī's work was in prose by an anonymous writer commissioned by Sultan Murad II (r. 1421–44, 1446–51) who was based in the Ottoman capital Edirne at this time.[537] It was mentioned above (Chapter 1, §II.iv.c) that the late-fifteenth century Ottoman chronicler Uzun Firdevsî carried out a Turkic-language *Shāhnāma* of Firdausī, seemingly in prose, before writing in 1472 a text on the history of the world. Several illustrated Turkic-language versions lack complete colophons, and it is uncertain if they are Uzun Firdevsî's version or comprise different

---

[533] Güner İnal, "The Ottoman Interpretation of Firdausi's Shahname," *Ars Turcica: Akten des VI. internationalen Kongresses für türkische Kunst, München vom 3. bis 7. September 1979* (Munich: Editio Maris, 1987): 559–60.

[534] Tülay Artan, "A Book of Kings Produced and Presented as a Treatise on Hunting," *Muqarnas* 25 (2008): 322.

[535] Uluç, "A Persian Epic, Perhaps for the Ottoman Sultan," 66.

[536] In response to this, Milstein et al. note Sufi *tekke*s in the Ottoman realm took it upon themselves to teach Persian literature and language (*Stories of the Prophets,* 101).

[537] Information on early Ottoman manuscripts produced in Edirne between 1451–1520 is in Atıl, *Turkish Art,* 154.

ones.[538] Dates of production are based on stylistic analysis of their illustrations, and most have a provenance during the second-half of the sixteenth century.

I.ii. Verse translations

Firdausī's epic spawned two renditions translated into Turkic verse, both exclusively copied in the Ottoman domain with the exception of an early prototype from the Mamluk dynasty.

I.ii.a. Şerif Âmidî version

The first Turkic verse translation of Firdausī's poetry was commissioned by the Mamluk Qānṣūh al-Ghūrī (r. 1501–16) who selected Şerif Âmidî to compose it. Âmidî completed the task between 1501–11 and presented his two-volume manuscript to the court in Cairo shortly after its completion.[539] Within Mamluk territories at this time, elites had original Persian and Arabic works of poetry translated into Turki.[540] The original composition of Âmidî's work—which states the circumstances of its translation, production, and patronage in its colophon—is held in the Topkapı collection (TSMK H.1519). It was carried off by the Ottoman victor Selim I (r. 1512–20) after he defeated the Mamluks and captured Cairo in 1517.[541] Later Ottoman scribes and artists employed this very manuscript as a prototype, copying its voweled text and illustrations. Its iconography and compositions inspired Ottoman productions of other *Shāhnāma* copies of Âmidî's translation during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.[542] According to Tülün Değirmenci, artists working in

---

[538] Illustrated prose works in the Topkapı Library are: H.1116 (circa 1540 or second-half of the sixteenth century); H.1518 (circa 1580); B.284 (circa second-half of the sixteenth century). Other copies are in the New York Public Library: Binney 17 (circa 1580, perhaps commissioned by Sultan Murad III); Istanbul University Library T.6131-33 (circa 1773-74 with illustrations pasted in). These are enumerated by Tülün Değirmenci, " 'Legitimising' a Young Sultan: Illustrated Copies of Medhî's 'Shāhnāma-ı Türkî' in European Collections," in *Thirteenth International Congress of Turkish Art*, eds. Géza Fehér and Ibolya Gerelyes (Budapest: Hungarian National Museum, 2009), 157-72; Nurhan Atasoy and Filiz Çağman, *Turkish Miniature Painting* (Istanbul: R.C.D. Cultural Institute, 1974).

[539] Biographical information on Şerif Âmidî is in Barbara Flemming's publications: "Literary Activities in Mamluk Halls and Barracks," in *Studies in Memory of Gaston Wiet,* ed. Myriam Rosen-Ayalon (Jerusalem: Institute of Asian and African Studies, 1977), 249-60; "Şerīf, Sultan Ġavrī and the 'Persians,'" in *Essays on Turkish Literature and History* (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 47-59.

[540] Ira M. Lapidus summarizes: "after the middle of the fifteenth century, epic histories, including the history of Alexander the Great and the *Shāhnāma*, were produced in Turkish translation. These works assert royal prerogative, the grandeur of monarchy, and the identification of Mamluk rulers with Turkish princes throughout the Middle East. …Persian and Arabic manuscripts were translated into the language of the Mamluk elite" until the end of Mamluk rule ["Mamluk Patronage and the Arts in Egypt: Concluding Remarks," *Muqarnas* 2 (1984): 176].

[541] For a transcription of the complete text derived from the original Mamluk manuscript (TSMK H.1519), consult Ananiasz Zajaczkowski, *La Version en Turc du Sah-nâme de l'Égypte Mamelouk* (Warsaw: Panstwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1965). For further details on the illustrations to H.1519 consult Bağcı, "From Translated Word to Translated Image." The particulars of this manuscript are described and with some illustrations reproduced in Esin Atıl, *Renaissance of Islam: Art of the Mamluks* (Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1981), 264-65; Nurhan Atasoy, "Un manuscrit Mamlūk illustré du Šāhnāma," *Revue des Études Islamiques* (1969): 151-58, pls. I-XVI; Esin Atıl, "Mamluk Painting in the Late Fifteenth Century," *Muqarnas* 2 (1984): 159-71.

[542] As an example of H.1519 being used in the production of others, a long inscription on f.591v in another Turkic *Shāhnāma* (NYPL Spencer Turk 1) describes how the grand vizier and imperial son-in-law Ḥāfiẓ Pasha borrowed a manuscript of the Ottoman Turkish translation of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* that had been made for Sultan Qānṣūh al-Ghūrī by Şerif Âmidî Efendi, and persuaded the famous calligrapher Dervish Abdi Efendi to copy it for him in Istanbul between 1616 and 1620. Information derived from Artan, "A Book of Kings," 299-330.

Ottoman ateliers adopted the "canonised iconography" from Iranian traditions but made it fit Ottoman tastes.[543] As far as I know, Âmidî's text was recopied only in the court workshops of Istanbul, and the Tajikistan *Shāhnāma* is one of these versions.

I.ii.b. Madḥī version

Another Turkic verse translation with shorter-lived appeal was composed by the poet Madḥī (fl. late-16th c.–early-17th c.) after the enthronement of the Ottoman sultan Osman II (r. 1618–22).[544] Madḥī's interpolation is not a word-for-word translation of Firdausī. He included the main stories but also added others such as the creation tale of Adam and Eve, the *Barzū-nāma*, and finishes with a panegyric to the ruling leader Osman II and an excoriation of his brother Mustafa I who briefly sat on the throne.[545] However, this version never migrated to Khurasan or Transoxiana so more on this text will not be provided in this present study. Şerif Âmidî's edition ultimately dominated Turkic *Shāhnāma* productions and given that it is the text to the Tajikistan manuscript, it is on this we will focus.

II. Turkic translations of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* in the Abū'l-Khairid appanages

Here I will characterize the role of Turkic versions of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* in the Abū'l-Khairid state. In order to analyze the Turkic text of the Tajikistan *Shāhnāma,* I have compared a sample passage relaying Faraidūn's distribution of his empire to his sons across versions of rhymed Turkic *Shāhnāma* copies in the British Library (BL mss. Or. 1126, Or. 7204), Topkapı (TSMK mss. H.1520, H.1522), and Süleymaniye Library (SL ms. Damat Ibrahim Paşa 0983M). As they are all verbatim, they must all be copies of Âmidî's translation. It is not likely that this Turkic translation of Firdausī's text would have been copied under the Abū'l-Khairids, since nearly all poetic works are written out in nasta'liq; the Tajikistan manuscript is in a plainer script that resembles the other Şerif Âmidî copies. What is more, although I acknowledged the importance of Kūchkūnchī's court in Samarqand between 1514–30 as a site of Turkic literary translation and production (Chapter 1 §§I and II.iv.c), Persian-language works of literature dominated manuscript production later in the century. As for the Safavids, *Shāhnāma* copies produced within Iran were always in Persian. Like the Abū'l-Khairids, ʿArabshāhids in Khwarazm

---

[543] Değirmenci, "'Legitimising' a Young Sultan," 159.

[544] Madḥī and his works have been researched by Tülün Değirmenci, "A Storyteller's Shahnama: Meddâh Medhî and His Şehnâme-i Türkî," in *Shahnama Studies III: The Reception of the* Shahnama, eds. Gabrielle van den Berg and Charles Melville (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 199–215. Firuza Abdullaeva connects Madḥī's works to other *Shāhnāma* copies written in Turkic prose in "A Turkish Prose Version of Firdawsi's Shāh-nāma in the Manuscript Collection of the St. Petersburg State University Library," *Manuscript Orientalia: International Journal for Oriental Manuscript Research* 3, no. 2 (June 1997): 50-55.

[545] See Değirmenci, "Illustrated Copies of Medhî's Shahnama."

appreciated both Turkic and Persian texts, but as was noted in the previous chapter, their manuscript production—and the local market for books—was limited. The copying of Turkic *Shāhnāma* translations must therefore be the domain of workshops serving the Ottomans. How and why the Tajikistan manuscript left Anatolia to reach Khurasan where illustrations were added, then arrived in its present location in Central Asia is impossible to be definitively ascertained, but the work would have been well received in Transoxiana.

Turkic *Shāhnāma* translations undertaken in the early Abū'l-Khairid appanages elucidate the appeal of the *Shāhnāma* in the Abū'l-Khairid realm. In the early years of the sixteenth century, at the same time that Âmidî was translating his version in Cairo, I mentioned previously that Shībānī Khan was asking his court poets to translate the *Shāhnāma* into Turki. Was Shībānī inspired by *Shāhnāma* stories received orally or in the form of the late-Timurid manuscripts (in the big-figure and little-figure styles) we have previously examined in Chapter 1? He could not have heard or read any parts of Âmidî's version while he was alive, for his stuffed head was reported by the last Mamluk chronicler Ibn Iyās to have been personally delivered by a Safavid emissary to the very court of Sultan Qānṣūh al-Ghūrī in June 1511, just three months after Âmidî's manuscript was presented to this ruler in Cairo.[546]

In Chapter 1 §V.i, I cited the Safavid prince Sām Mīrzā's claim that Muḥammad Shībānī commissioned Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* into Turki. If Shībānī gave the initial request, the project might have been completed after he died in 1510, being read aloud at the Tashkent court of Shībānī's uncle Suyūnch Khwāja Khan (d. 1525).[547] Suyūnch's successor—and Shībānī's first cousin—the more renowned Kīldī Muḥammad Sultan (r. 1525–32) had interests in Turkic translations of classic Persian works, which included Firdausī's *Shāhnāma*.[548] We do not know if this task was fully completed beyond a few lines which incidentally, when read aloud, were "indescribably awful" to Vāṣifī who was in attendance.[549]

---

[546] TSMK H.1519 is dated 2 Ẕū al-Hijja 916 (March 2, 1511). The head "of a person of the Tartar kings" arrived in the court of Sultan Qānṣūh al-Ghūrī "in a nice box" in June 1511. Analysis of this gift exchange is given by Rabie, "Political Relations between the Safavids of Persia and the Mamluks of Egypt and Syria," 75-81.

[547] Subtelny reports on Suyūnch Khwāja's receptivity to Turkic translations of Persian literature in "Art and Politics in Early 16th Century Central Asia," 145.

[548] Information in DeWeese, "Chaghatay literature in the early sixteenth century." He also examines Turkic literary production and patronage under Kūchkūnchī (r. 1512–31) in Samarqand, whose court unfortunately lacked a written *Shāhnāma* translation.

[549] Vāṣifī's reaction is described by Subtelny, "Poetic Circle at the Court of the Timurid Sultan Ḥusain Baiqara," 172-73; idem, "Art and Politics in Early 16th century Central Asia," 145. On the quality of the recitation and Shībānī's Turkish translation see Schimmel, "Some Notes on the Cultural Activity of the First Uzbek Rulers," 152. Özgüdenli and Köprülü are doubtful about the "Chaghatai" translation's completion [Özgüdenli, "Sah-nāma Translations i: into Turkish"; Köprülü, "Çagatay edebiyati," 309].

Although unusual, a Turkic translation of the *Shāhnāma* could have been welcomed by a literate Abū'l-Khairid elite. It is my argument that the Tajikistan manuscript, which is the only extant copy of Âmidî's version in Transoxiana so far discovered, was written out in the Ottoman realm but was later transported eastwards. It is unknown whether it had an intended recipient, but it is more likely that it did not have a predetermined owner at the time the object left Ottoman lands. However, after its import a visual program and some illumination was started but never completed.

III. Historical context in Khurasan between 1560–1600

Based on comparisons to similar features and forms in other manuscripts, it is likely that the illustrations to the Tajikistan *Shāhnāma* were carried out in Khurasan while the region was under Abū'l-Khairid control between 1588–98. Its imagery was made in the context of military successes, territorial expansion, urban planning, and centralized administration in the Abū'l-Khairid realm. While Maria Subtelny suggests a correlation between political decline and a surge of cultural activity in the case of the Timurids, the inverse was true for the Abū'l-Khairids. Political gains under ʿAbdullāh marked a decline in manuscript production. In contradistinction to the late Timurids who had shifted their focus from the battlefield to the arts, the Abū'l-Khairids in the final decades of the sixteenth century had reached their political height but few political leaders were concerned to harness the creativity of their new subjects or continue patronizing the Bukharan workshops.

Khurasan has long been renowned as a locale of artistic production. Despite years of conflicts between Safavids and Abū'l-Khairids to control it across the sixteenth century, Khurasan was hardly affected by shifts in military control.[550] Similarly, artisans in Khurasan were "little affected by the constant warring of the Uzbek and Safavid overlords."[551] During the decade when it came into Abū'l-Khairid hands and was politically and artistically isolated from the Safavid capital Qazvin, the region maintained a level of autonomy and manuscripts produced there were technically better than contemporary specimens from Transoxiana.[552] As Rührdanz states, "Khorasan had always been

---

[550] Information on Khurasan in Christine Nölle-Karimi, "Khurasan and its Limits: Changing Concepts of Territory from Pre-Modern to Modern Times," in *Iran und iranisch geprägte Kulturen: Studien zum 65. Geburtstag von Bert G. Fragner,* eds. Markus Ritter, Ralph Kauz, and Birgitt Hoffmann, *Beiträge zur Iranistik* 27 (Wiesbaden, 2008), 12-13. She discusses the importance of trade in the region, with the Safavids safeguarding commerce and facilitating trade routes from brigandage at the start of the dynasty even in the midst of military altercations with Abū'l-Khairid rulers.

[551] Schmitz, "Miniature Painting in Harāt, 1570-1640," 246.

[552] Compare the simpler *Majālis al-ʿushshāq* manuscript (UML Islamic 270 Pers, dated 1597), and Dihlavī and Jāmī excerpts from Bukhara dated 1598-1603 (NLR PNS 276).

synonymous with superior artistry, and if [its] painters did not come to Bukhara, the Bukharans had to go to the painters."[553]

III.i. Political and economic significance of Khurasan

Hostilities between Safavids and Abū'l-Khairids in Khurasan operated under a façade of Sunni versus Shiʻite antipathy, but the scholars Dickson and McChesney have convincingly claimed that this religious dimension masked efforts to secure political and economic mastery.[554] Although located at the periphery of power centers based in Qazvin and Bukhara, Khurasan had never been of marginal significance.[555] Beside housing significant political and cultural sites in Herat and a center of pilgrimage in Mashhad, the domain was strategically located and offered rich economic and agricultural benefits to the governing power. It contained excellent farmland and irrigation to support food reserves and materials necessary for silk production.[556] Its steppe and mountain foothills were ideal for winter and summer pasturage to sustain grazing herds and flocks.[557] Trade routes shifted from an east-west axis to a north-south course later in the sixteenth century, and Khurasan's important centers continued to hold significance in this new trade configuration as it had earlier.[558]

Prior to the Uzbek takeover of Khurasan which lasted from 1588–98, the Abū'l-Khairids seized Herat for nine months in 1574 which caused chaos in the Safavid zone.[559] Iran further suffered after the death of Ṭahmāsp in 1576 which resulted in a power struggle; Ismāʻīl II (r. 1576–77) emerged victorious. Within the capital Qazvin and outside, the reign of the succeeding Safavid shah Khudābanda (r. 1578–87) was plagued by civil war.[560] This allowed the Abū'l-Khairids to attack Iran in 1578, but they were repulsed by the governor of Mashhad.[561] The Ottomans were quick to take

---

[553] Rührdanz, "The Arts of The Book in Central Asia," 108.

[554] Dickson, "Shah Tahmasp and the Uzbeks," 45-46; McChesney, "Barrier of heterodoxy."

[555] B.F. Manz, *The Rise and Rule of Tamerlane* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 21. D. Blow repeats the saying that Khurasan is the oyster-shell of the world, Herat its pearl [*Shah Abbas: the Ruthless King who Became an Iranian Legend* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2009)], 16.

[556] Subtelny, "Poetic Circle at the Court of the Timurid Sultan Ḥusain Baiqara," 6.

[557] Manz, *The Rise and Rule of Tamerlane,* 21-22.

[558] Dickson, "Shah Tahmasp and the Uzbeks," 24, ftn 1.

[559] Burton, "The Fall of Herat."

[560] For more on the qizilbāsh civil war involving earlier competition among the Ustājlū, Shāmlū, Rūmlū, and Takkalū in 1526, read the distillation in Andrew Newman, *Safavid Iran: Rebirth of a Persian Empire* (London: IB Tauris, 2009), 27-30.

[561] Annanepesov, "Relations between the Khanates and with other Powers," 83.

advantage of this general disarray in Iran and engaged the Safavids in battle between 1578 through 1590. This war on Iran's western front only ended when the new shah ʿAbbās I ascended the throne (r. 1588–1629) and promptly made peace with the Ottomans because the Uzbeks were on his tail in the east.

Taking advantage of these issues plaguing the Safavids in the post-Ṭahmāsp era and playing off of qizilbāsh rivalries, ʿAbdullāh Khan and his generals waged a war to take Khurasan in 1587 that resulted in a great victory for the Abū'l-Khairids. The chronicler Ḥāfiẓ Tanīsh (encountered in Chapter 3 §II.iv.a) was present during the ten-month siege of Herat, and witnessed the city's fall on 2 April 1588. Mashhad followed in November 1589, then Nishapur, Sabzivar, and Isfarain in quick succession.[562] These would be held for nearly a decade. At one point Uzbek tribesmen penetrated hundreds of miles into Safavid territory reaching Yazd in 1596.[563]

III.ii. Incoming artistic talent from Safavid Qazvin

In the late sixteenth century, political upheavals in Khurasan might explain how stoic—but still in need of work—artists and scribes from different backgrounds came together in the region to produce manuscripts to sell elsewhere.[564] In Iran, artistic migration began in earnest after Shah Ṭahmāsp disbanded his courtly workshop and signed his aforementioned Edict of Sincere Repentance in 1556, whereby he dismissed painters who had worked in the royal kitābkhāna in Qazvin.[565] Artists formerly employed in the Safavid capital sought opportunities elsewhere, some journeying to Khurasan, Astarabad, Gilan, Herat, and onwards to India.[566] Artists and calligraphers relocating to these other

---

[562] These military campaigns are discussed in McChesney's publications: "The Conquest of Herat," 69-107; "Islamic culture and the Chinggisid restoration," 296-97. For an overview of events taking place in the final decade of Abū'l-Khairid rule in Khurasan, read Schmitz, "Miniature Painting in Harāt," 13-19. The capture of Mashhad is recounted in Burton, "The Fall of Herat," 121.

[563] Rudi Matthee, "Relations Between the Center and the Periphery in Safavid Iran: The Western Borderlands v. the Eastern Frontier Zone," *Historian* (2015): 440.

[564] This same argument is used in another commercial center and site of dynastic struggles —Baghdad— by Milstein et al., *Stories of the Prophets*, 55.

[565] Art historians note the decline in manuscript production with Shah Ṭahmāsp's renunciation of the arts and heightened religiosity in 1556. Artists were allowed to leave the courtly workshops to cater to other patrons as well as the masses, producing complete manuscripts or less expensive loose pages to sell to a new class made wealthy from trade. Necipoğlu states a first repentance of forbidden acts was decreed earlier in the 1530s resulting in the dismissal of artists ("Word and Image: Ottoman Sultans in Comparative Perspective," 23, ftn. 7). The ailing eyesight of shahs Tahmasp and Khudābanda could also be a reason why these rulers lacked interest in manuscripts. Soudavar has written on their "hereditary ophthalmic deficiency" ("Between the Safavids and the Mughals," 51-52).

[566] Robinson notes the connections between Qazvin and Khurasan in his section on the Khurasan style in *Persian Miniature Painting from Collections in the British Isles*, 110. Soudavar has written on the waves of artistic migration from the Safavid realm to the Mughal in "Between the Safavids and the Mughals," noting in particular the artist Farrukh Beg who worked in Khurasan circa 1565–75 and later joined the courtly workshops of Akbar.

sites assisted in producing commercial copies and continued to serve royal patrons, such as Ibrāhīm Mīrzā's Mashhad-based workshop which produced fine manuscripts in the 1550s and 1560s.[567]

III.iii. Incoming talent from Abū'l-Khairid Bukhara

While these Safavid artists ventured east, artisans formerly working for the Abū'l-Khairids also migrated south and west to convene in India and Khurasan as a result of the decline of manuscript arts in Transoxiana. The death of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz in 1550 precipitated the first exodus of artists leaving Bukhara for better employment opportunities.[568] More migrated in the 1570s due to a loss of patronage. The last three decades of the sixteenth century, during the height of Abū'l-Khairid political power, have been judged to be artistically insignificant and inferior.[569] Rather than using value judgments to denigrate the works, it is far more illuminating to examine why productions tapered off in Transoxiana in the 1570s and flourished in Khurasan.

It can be surmised that during this time, ʿAbdullāh Khan had a heightened interest in consolidating the state and erecting architecture at the (literal) expense of book productions. Bregel notes how ʿAbdullāh was credited with "various buildings, both religious and secular, as well as irrigation works…[as well] as domed market arcades and a number of madrasas in Bokhara. ʿAbdullāh Khan's centralizing policy favored the development of trade, as did his improvement of roads, building of caravansaries and water cisterns."[570] After securing a victory in the region north of the Syr Darya in the Ulu Tag heights of the central Qazaq steppe, ʿAbdullāh ordered a mosque to be built on the same site where Timur had erected an inscription.[571] More a man of brick than of books, ʿAbdullāh oversaw projects in Tashkent, such as the Kūkaltāsh madrasa (constructed in 1569), the tomb of Abū Bakr Qaffāl al-Shāshī (1561), and the Imām Ismāʿīl al-Bukhārī complex (1560s). In Bukhara, ʿAbdullāh expanded commercial districts in the center between 1562–87; endowed a madrasa in his name (1587–90); renovated the *mazār* (tomb) sites of Ismāʿīl Sāmānī, Bahāʾ al-Dīn Naqshbandī, and Chashma-yi Ayyūb; and between 1560–63 expanded the Chār Bakr necropolis complex out of gratitude to the

---

[567] Consult Simpson and Farhad, *Sultan Ibrahim Mirza's* Haft Awrang.

[568] Karin Rührdanz, "The revival of Central Asian painting in the early 17th century," in *Proceedings of the Third European Conference of Iranian Studies*, ed. Charles Melville (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1999), 386.

[569] Ibid., 385.

[570] Bregel, "Abdallah Khān b. Eskandar."

[571] Ibid. This inscription is known as Tīmūr's Stone, or the Karsakpay Inscription, and is located in the Hermitage Museum in St Petersburg (inv. no. AFP-5906).

Jūibārid shaikhs who had supported his rise to power.[572] ʿAbdullāh built right up until the end, and the last Abū'l-Khairid structure was a *khānaqāh* in Faizabad finished the same year as his death (1598).

Artisans who remained in Bukhara found other patrons among the military elites and Naqshbandi and Jūibārid religious leaders.[573] Many painters were hired to work on a single manuscript, to assemble unfinished copies, or to illustrate manuscripts captured on ʿAbdullāh Khan's war marches. These manuscripts evince a rush to complete these tasks, and with time there is a palpable sense of "a general lessening of funds allotted to the needs of art."[574] After the Uzbeks secured control of Herat and the broader region between 1586–98, illustrated texts made in Khurasan were exported back into Bukhara as a means to fulfill the limited market there, and also to India, where some manuscripts were reassembled and assimilated into local productions.[575] This will be covered more in the next chapter.

III.iv. Convergence in Khurasan

B.W. Robinson first identified the Khurasan style of manuscript illustration practiced between 1561–1606 which he described in collection catalogues and articles from 1958 through late in his career.[576] Barbara Schmitz further refined his analysis on the region's manuscript productions in her dissertation from 1981, and in subsequent publications aided by other scholars' interest in productions made there.[577] She found evidence that it was a commercial industry radiating around Herat and

---

572 For ʿAbdullāh's building patronage see Edgar Knobloch, *Monuments of Central Asia: A Guide to the Archaeology, Art and Architecture of Turkestan* (London: IB Tauris, 2001); Mustafa Tupev, "All the King's Men: Architectural Patronage in Bukharan Madrasa Buildings from the 1560s," in *Beiträge zur Islamischen Kunst und Archäologie* 5, ed. M. Ritter, et al. (Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 2015), 28-56; G. A. Pugachenkova and E.V. Rtveladze, "BUKHARA v. Archeology and Monuments," in *Encyclopædia Iranica*; B. Brentjes, "Islamic Art and Architecture in Central Asia," *Journal of Central Asia* 16, nos. 1-2 (July and December 1993): 54-58; R.D. McChesney, "Economic and Social Aspects of the Public Architecture of Bukhara in the 1560's and 1570's," *Islamic Art* II (1987): 217-42. McChesney draws intriguing parallels between the cultural and commercial facilities in Bukhara's *chārsūq* (*chorsu*) development and the contemporary Maidān-i Shāh complex in Isfahan (234-35).

573 These are usually evidenced by inscriptions reading "*fī ayyām (al-daulat) ʿAbdullāh Khan*" [in the days of (the polity of) ʿAbdullāh Khan], implying the manuscript projects were carried out during his rule and were not specifically commissioned by him but were requested by military and religious elites instead. For materials with this detail, consult App. 5, nos. 12, 13, 18, 57. An illustrated *Ḥāl-nāma* manuscript of ʿĀrifī dated 1598 was made for the Jūibārid noble ʿAbdī Khwāja Saʿd b. Khwāja Muḥammad Islām (NLR PNS 285).

574 Pugachenkova and Galerkina, *Miniatiury srednei azii*, 46-47.

575 Porter, "Remarques sur la peinture à Boukhara."

576 Consult B.W. Robinson's many works on the subject "Muhammadī and the Khurasan Style," *Iran* 30 (1992): 17-30; his "Provincial Style" section in *Persian Miniature Painting from Collections in the British Isles*; the entry on "The Khurasan Style" in *Persian Paintings in the John Rylands Library: A Descriptive Catalogue* (London: Sotheby Parke Bernet, 1980); the Khurasan listing under the "Safavid Period" division in *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Persian Paintings in the Bodleian Library*, 151-52. The cut-off date of 1606 is based on a Saʿdī *Būstān* manuscript dated 1606 copied by Shah Qāsim (MKG 399). Khurasan's contributions to artistic productions are also in Mustafa ʿÂli, *Epic Deeds of Artists*, passim.

577 Schmitz, "Miniature Painting in Harāt"; and "The Beginning of the Khurasānī School of Painting at Herat," *Artibus Asiae* 67, no. 1 (2007): 75–93. Workshop practices in Bakharz and Sabzivar have been examined by Porter ("Remarques sur la peinture"). Uluç gives some information on manuscript production in Tun, Tabas, and Sabzivar in "Selling to the Court."

employing local scribes and other copyists from Mashhad and smaller towns in Sabzivar, Malan, Tun, Bakharz, and Raza.[578]

III.iv.a. Muḥammadī

Robinson credits the artist Muḥammadī (fl. 1527–84) with developing and training other painters in the Khurasan style of painting in Herat between ca. 1565 and 1590.[579] He might have been the son of the royal Safavid painter Sulṭān Muḥammad who worked on Ṭahmāsp's own commissioned manuscripts.[580] From its inception, the style featured elements associated with Qazvin and Mashhad as a result of the disbanding of the Safavid courtly workshops and dispersal of talent that had been situated in the former site to the latter.[581] Robinson characterizes Muḥammadī's style and the Khurasan school of painting as "smooth, competent, and uncomplicated… [in which] background details of vegetation and architecture are as simple as possible, and the colour-scheme is often dominated by pale blue, mauve, or light olive green, which are the favourite colours for the ground."[582] Schmitz describes the Khurasan style's usage of a "spare technique" coalescing around 1570 with large-scale figures and elaborate details of dress. Women are infrequent in the illustrations, and typical painted subjects are battle scenes and male assemblies.[583] This is observed in the Tajikistan *Shāhnāma*.

---

[578] Tun is the historic name of the modern city Taban in southern Khurasan. The present-day village of Ustayi below Bakharz near Taibad is historical Malan and is on a historic road to Herat. Robert Skelton provides a case study of a manuscript associated with Bakharz ["An Illustrated manuscript from Bakharz," in *The Memorial Volume of the Vth International Congress of Iranian Art & Archaeology 11-18 April 1968* (Teheran: Ministry of Culture and Arts, 1972), 198-204]. Titley explains the continuation of the Qazvin style in Khurasan and states, "the province of Bakharz between Herat and Nishapur, in the east of Khurasan, provided patrons in the 1560s and '70s while Herat itself became yet again a noted centre at the end of the 16th century and during the first two decades of the 17th." She also quotes the Safavid chronicler Qāẓī Aḥmad's scorn of Khurasan scribes, deriding their uninspired productions (*Persian Miniature Painting and its Influence on the Arts of Turkey and India*, 109-10). Marianna Shreve Simpson has investigated Raza and found a village near Birjand. Earlier scholarship read the locale as "Zarrah," but there were no variations on "Zari" in the atlases, maps, or gazetteers she consulted ("Codicology in the Service of Chronology: The Case of Some Safavid Manuscripts," in *Les Manuscrits Du Moyen-Orient*, 135, ftn. 10). In my personal travels and conversations in Khurasan, the present-day city of Mashhad Rīza (meaning small Mashhad) below Bakharz adjacent to Ustayi could be the present-day location of historic Raza.

[579] B.W. Robinson, "An Amir Khusraw Khamsa of 1581," *Iran: Journal of the British Institute of Persian Studies* 35 (1997): 40.

[580] Robinson suggests Muḥammadī was born out of a *ṣīgha* (temporary marriage) with a local Herati girl ("Muhammadī and the Khurasan Style," 18). Abolala Soudavar disagrees; his rebuttal is in "The Age of Muhammadī," *Muqarnas* 17 (2000): 53. Robinson's biography of Muḥammadī states he was a native of Herat who quite possibly never left that city, and by 1581 he would have been at the height of his career. Mustafa ʿÂli's entry on Muḥammadī Beg reads: "the son and talented pupil of Sulṭān Muhammad distinguished worldwide for his varnished book-binding designs and miniature paintings [of *majālis* scenes]" (Mustafa ʿÂli, *Epic Deeds*, 265-66). According to Qāẓī Aḥmad, Muḥammadī Beg died in Qazvin.

[581] Robinson suggests a *Laylī u Majnūn* manuscript by Hilālī (JRL Pers 907) dated 1561 and scribed by Muḥammad al-Kātib of Raza is an "interesting and early example of the Khurasan style" (*Persian Paintings in the John Rylands Library*, 270). Karin Rührdanz however attributes the start of the Khurasan school to a manuscript in the Topkapı (H.1233) of Niẓām al-Dīn Astarābādī's *Āṯār al-muẓaffar* with a colophon dated 1568 scribed by Muḥyī al-Kātib al-Haravī ["The illustrated manuscripts of Athar al-Muzaffar: a history of the Prophet," in *Persian Painting from the Mongols to the Qajars: Studies in Honour of Basil W. Robinson*, ed. Robert Hillenbrand (London: I.B. Tauris, 2001), 206].

[582] B.W. Robinson, "Persian Painting," *Persia: History and Heritage*, ed. John Boyle (London: 1978), 84.

[583] Schmitz, "Miniature Painting in Harāt," 113-14.

Schmitz classifies two major styles, delineated as Herat and Mashhad strains, present in Khurasan on the cusp of the Uzbek invasion in 1586. The first is "based on the traditional development of painting in Herat [which was] almost surely practiced only in this city by the 1580's."[584] Schmitz typifies the second elusive "Late Mashhad Style" as resembling manuscripts illustrated between 1556–65 when artists congregated in Mashhad under the patronage of the Safavid governor Ibrāhīm Mīrzā (d. 1577). There they composed "small figures, slim proportions, [and a] new type of wide turban."[585] After the death of their Safavid patron, artists—including Muḥammadī—continued working in Khurasan even as the administration changed from Safavid to Abū'l-Khairid control.

III.iv.b. Abū'l-Khairid patrons of book arts in Khurasan

With the Abū'l-Khairid conquest of Khurasan in 1588 by ʿAbdullāh and his generals, many of the artisans there chose to remain and serve the new Abū'l-Khairid governors overseeing the larger cities. With ʿAbdullāh's patronage vanishing in the 1570s, the region along with Mughal centers became attractive places of employment for Abū'l-Khairid artisans formerly working in Transoxiana. During this fourth period of Abū'l-Khairid arts of the book, Khurasan would have been appealing to these scribes and artists when it came under Uzbek control, and the political situation was favorable for Bukhara-trained artisans to join the local workshops in and around Herat.

The most powerful and respected Abū'l-Khairid representative after ʿAbdullāh Khan was Qul Bābā Kūkaltāsh (d. 1598), "the Bukharan Maecenas": leading administrator of ʿAbdullāh's regime and his right-hand man.[586] He was the patron of the chronicler Ḥāfiẓ Tanīsh who produced the *ʿAbdullāh-nāma* we examined previously. He had been given the epithet *kūkaltāsh*, meaning foster- or milk-brother, due to his close companionship to ʿAbdullāh Khan since childhood. Qul Bābā was the son of Yār Muḥammad who had served as head of the Bukhara appanage in the mid century.[587] Like his father, McChesney affirms that "Qul Bābā was a man who loved literature and compiled a large library

---

[584] Ibid., 125.

[585] Ibid., 124-26. See Simpson and Farhad's masterful and thorough case study of the patronage of a single manuscript in *Sultan Ibrahim Mirza's* Haft Awrang.

[586] Biography in McChesney, "Historiography in Central Asia since the 16th Century," 521; idem, "The Conquest of Herat," 85.

[587] Born in Samarqand, Qul Bābā was made governor of Samarqand in spring 1578 after ʿAbdullāh's successful unification of the appanages (McChesney, "Islamic culture and the Chinggisid restoration," 254). Regarding Qul Bābā's architectural patronage in Herat, his relationship to ʿAbdullāh Khan, and military and civil duties during his 12-year governance of Herat, see McChesney, "Economic and Social Aspects," 232; idem, "CENTRAL ASIA VI. In the 16th-18th Centuries"; Haider, *Central Asia in the Sixteenth Century*, 302, ftn. 12.

which he donated to his madrasa in Bukhara [erected in 1568]. He hosted literary assemblies and took the pen name 'Muhibbi'."[588] Testifying to his tolerance, Qul Bābā maintained "close and harmonious relations with Shi'i intellectuals in Herat during the decade of his governorship" and there made repairs to the tomb of ʿAlī-Shīr Navāʾī.[589]

Although he is known to have endowed 650 books to his eponymous madrasa on the north side of Lab-i Ḥauż in Bukhara, Schmitz states Qul Bābā might not have patronized illustrated epic and poetic texts at all.[590] It is unlikely that his commissioned works would have all been unillustrated, and Soudavar claims a copy of the *Gulistān* of Saʿdī in the Bruschettini collection (circa 1590) is of his commission.[591] One of its illustrations (fig. 82) depicts a colorful gathering with figures seated on a light blue ground composed of hexagonal forms radiating from six-pointed stars. A circular fountain with swimming birds is on the lower left. Attendants bring platters and offer a napkin, and the individual in green offering a wine cup reappears in the Tajikistan manuscript soon to be examined (fig. 94). They serve a nobleman dressed in red who kneels inside a rectangular pavilion with animal figures painted on the white wall above him. An autumnal *chinār* (plane) tree arises on the right side of the composition. A boy stands in front of its trunk and looks over a low fence, making eye contact with a privileged guest irritated by this intruder. A figure in profile walks out a taller gate and approaches the prying young man, threatening to chase him away.

Other illustrations from different manuscripts have similar layouts and compositions as the folio from the Bruschettini *Gulistān*, and reflect the quality of book arts in Herat during the period of Qul Bābā's governance. A *Dīvān* of Ḥāfiẓ copied by Sulṭān Ḥusain b. Qāsim al-Tūnī between 1581–86 (TSMK H.986) for the Safavid governor of Tun, Sulṭān Sulaimān, was produced right before the Abū'l-

---

[588] McChesney, "Islamic culture and the Chinggisid restoration," 255. Incidentally, Muḥibbī was the pen name of the Ottoman sultan Süleyman as well. Excerpts from Qul Bābā's *dīvān* of poetry are in Muṭribī Samarqandī, *Nuskha-yi zībā-yi Jahāngīrī*, ed. Isma'il Bik Januf and Sayyid 'Ali Mujani (Qum: Kitabkhana-yi Buzurg-i Hazrat Ayat Allah al-'Uzma Mar'ashi, 1377/1998), 139-42. I am grateful to R.D. McChesney for sharing with me this primary source.

[589] These examples of Qul Bābā's benevolence are in Soudavar's publications: *Reassessing Early Safavid Art and History*, 77; idem, *Art of the Persian Courts*, 217-19. They are also delineated in McChesney, "The Conquest of Herat," 84, 86.

[590] This numeric figure is quoted in Stacy Liechti, "Books, Book Endowments, and Communities of Knowledge in the Bukharan Khanate" (PhD diss., New York University, 2008), 44. Schmitz's claim about Qul Bābā's lack of patronage is in "Miniature Painting in Harāt," 20-21. An anachronistic (perhaps forged) attribution to the patronage of Qul Bābā is written on the painting of an ascetic (TMoCA inv. 633), discussed in Marianna Shreve Simpson, "Mostly Modern Miniatures: Classical Persian Painting in the Early Twentieth Century," *Muqarnas* 25 (2008): 383, fig. 28.

[591] Originally auctioned at Hotel George V, 30 October 1975, lot 479. An illustration is reproduced in Soudavar, "The Age of Muhammadī," 67, and is also discussed in idem, *Reassessing Early Safavid Art and History*, 77. Soudavar titles the illustration "Qul Bābā sending a gift to ʿAbd al-Muʾmīn," and confidently attributes it to Muḥammadī during the Uzbek occupation of Herat in the late sixteenth century. Schmitz is less presumptuous and titles the work: "Feasting and Divertisements [sic]" and dates it circa 1590 ("Miniature Painting in Harāt," pl. 285, LVIII).

Khairid siege. A folio depicts a musical gathering of dervishes on a geometrically-patterned ground with rows of quatrefoil tiling (fig. 83). One dances ecstatically and his unwound turban falls to the ground. A figure standing in the bottom-right wears a long-sleeved robe akin to figures in the *Tīmūr-nāma* H.1594 and the Gulbenkian folio with the poetry of Khwājū Kirmānī (figs. 39 and 44) which we examined in Chapter 2. Above this party is a rectangular pavilion with a variety of repeated floral and hexagonal forms, and a window opens out to a garden behind two men conversing over a platter of pomegranates. A white tympanum has paintings of bears climbing trees on its surface. A low fence extends on the right side of the illustration and separates the architectural section from the natural garden setting with a cliff arising in the background. A young gardener tills the soil.

Another loose folio with a similar layout as these two mentioned so far is from a *Haft aurang* of Jāmī (fig. 84). It renders a slim-waisted king whose twin appears in the Tajikistan manuscript to be analyzed below (fig. 94) seated on a hexagonal throne in a garden pavilion. The architectural structure has a window featuring the natural landscape and purple cliffs beyond, and the pavilion's white arch depicts peaceful animals grazing and sitting. Enclosed by a low red fence, the pale turquoise ground has busy tile-work with interlocking quatrefoils and octagons, and thin canals funnel water into a circular pool around which courtiers sit and interact. The kneeling duo on the right reappears in the Tajikistan manuscript (fig. 94). The lowest part of the scene renders a *chāvūsh* (footman) in a poppy-red tunic leading a white horse.[592] He is offered a red flower by a figure in a slouched hat with a feather. The folio is undated but the museum's mistaken attribution of "Qazvin—1560" belies Khurasan's indebtedness to incoming Qazvini talent. Thanks to existing studies nuancing Khurasan manuscript arts and through comparisons to the other examples under scrutiny here, a more appropriate provenance can now be affixed to the work: Herat, circa 1580s–1590s.

A final example is an illustration in another *Dīvān* of Ḥāfiẓ copied in 1593 by Quṭb al-Dīn (fig. 85), a scribe associated with Tun who wrote out a *Shāhnāma* dated 1580 to be discussed below. No patron is mentioned in the *Dīvān* but it could have been made for an Abū'l-Khairid elite in Khurasan. Its illustrated scene takes place entirely indoors with the main pavilion positioned off-center. In the H-shaped blue wall paintings on a white surface, two foxes interact amidst flowers and trees. The overall composition has geometric patterning identical to those in the Bruschettini *Gulistān* folio, such as the

---

[592] "*Chāvūsh*" examples are mentioned by Robinson in "An Amir Khusraw Khamsa of 1581," 38, 39. Another term is *shāṭir,* whose role and attire have been discussed by Rakhimova, *K istorii kostiuma narodov Uzbekistana*, 37. The figure is called *peyk* in Ottoman sources and is described by Zeynep Tarım Ertuğ, "The Depiction of Ceremonies in Ottoman Miniatures: Historical Record of a Matter of Protocol?," *Muqarnas* 27 (2010): 262.

stars and hexagons on the floor and wainscoting. Slim-waisted figures with tubular knees wear slouching gray caps, and standing attendants in wrapped turbans positioned facing to the left, are rendered in the same style across the two manuscripts. The *Dīvān*'s standing attendant carrying a gold, covered platter wears sage green and an unusual shorter tunic over this garment; this detail will be of interest in the coming section on the Tajikistan manuscript's illustrations.

Could all of these compositions have been partly derived from Abū'l-Khairid conventions? We have seen mid-century frontispieces and illustrations from Bukhara which frequently depict symmetric pavilions and garden settings (figs. 72, 73). They often have cupolas or domes extending into the upper margin.[593] The off-center rectangular pavilions of the Herati compositions from the 1580s and 1590s could be the contribution of artisans trained in Bukhara adding their talents to workshops in Herat. These illustrations combine the twin currents in earlier Khurasani painting: the elongated, "late-Mashhad" style evolving from Ibrāhīm Mīrzā's atelier, and the style based on Muḥammadī's conventions in Herat. Schmitz states that painters in Herat in the 1580s derived inspiration from both these Herati and Mashhadi sources to illustrate manuscripts destined for the Indian market and specifically, later in the decade, the new Uzbek overlords.

Whether or not Qul Bābā was among them, there were other Abū'l-Khairid generals commissioning illustrated manuscripts in Khurasan while he governed Herat. A *Maṯnavī* of Rūmī, scribed by Muḥyī al-Kātib al-Haravī and his son ʿImād al-Dīn, is dated 1594–97 and was prepared for ʿAbdullāh Khan's son ʿAbd al-Muʾmīn in Balkh.[594] ʿAbdullāh's nephew Dīn Muḥammad Sulṭān (d. 1598) was awarded governorship of Khargird and Bakharz for his participation in the conquest of Herat in 1588.[595] Dīn Muḥammad played a role in the founding of the following Tūqāy-Tīmūrid dynasty in Transoxiana, which will be covered in Chapter 5. He was the patron of several manuscripts, including a

---

[593] Compare the *Sabʿa sayyāra* (BLO Elliott 318, f.47a) from 1553 for Muḥammad Yār. Reproduced in Porter, "Remarques sur la peinture." Porter discusses repeated Bukharan architectural decoration depicted in manuscripts that contain a symmetric *ayvān* supported by columns.

[594] AMA, no. unknown. Francis Richard has inspected the manuscript and I am grateful that he brought it to my attention. Mentioned by Schmitz, "The Beginning of the Khurasānī School," 80, ftn. 27. She notes it has border stenciling and composite figures typical of manuscripts produced in Khurasan and Bukhara.

[595] Dīn Muḥammad was the son of ʿAbdullāh's (whole or half) sister Maʿṣūma and Jānī Beg, and brother to the later Tūqāy-Tīmūrid dynasts Bāqī Muḥammad and Valī Muḥammad (featured in Ch. 5). Information on Dīn Muḥammad in: R.D. McChesney, "CENTRAL ASIA VI. In the 16th-18th Centuries"; Schmitz, "Miniature Painting in Harāt," 55, 68; Schmitz, *Islamic Manuscripts in the New York Public Library*, 59. See ftn. 652. For a diagram of these parallel branches traced through paternal relationships, see Thomas Welsford, *Four Types of Loyalty in Early Modern Central Asia: the Tūqāy-Timūrid Takeover of Greater Mā Warā al-Nahr, 1598-1605* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 54-60.

Jāmī *Haft aurang* dated 1593.[596] Further attesting to Dīn Muḥammad's patronage, three separate illustrated colophons to a *Silsilat al-ẕahab* manuscript exist that are dated between autumn 1592 and spring 1593. These are copied by Shāh Qāsim in what Schmitz posits was his scribal debut.[597] When the illustrations render mountains, they "show the light-coloured or white pustule formations round the edges—a trade-mark of Khurasanian painting from the 1590s onwards" described by Robinson.[598] To Soudavar, the earliest of these illustrated colophons (fig. 86) displays these features as well as those associated with the Bukhara workshops, and he indicates "the oval faces with pointed chins" to demonstrate his latter claim.[599] Shāh Qāsim would go on to be a prolific scribe who wrote out texts of Persian poetry between 1591 and 1630, staying in Herat to serve the later Safavid governors after the reconquest in 1600.[600] In a display of further fluid dynastic allegiance, he transferred to Transoxiana after 1626 to be employed by the ruling Tūqāy-Tīmūrids.[601]

III.iv.c. Firdausian *Shāhnāma* copies from Khurasan

While collating manuscripts completed in Khurasan between 1560–1600, Robinson noted the preponderance of Jāmī titles and surprisingly few Firdausī or Niẓāmī texts. He surmised that these last two titles would have been "too purely Persian [sic-Iranian?] in their subject matter and appeal" since the manuscripts' intended destinations were in India and Transoxiana.[602] Jāmī's oeuvre, after all, was most frequently read by Abū'l-Khairid elites based on the quantity of manuscripts. Among all the Persian-language poetic texts illustrated in Khurasan during the late sixteenth century is a Firdausian

---

[596] MKG, ms. no. unknown. Manuscript mentioned by Schmitz, "Miniature Painting in Harāt," 324. A colophon to its *Salāmān u Absāl* section states it was copied by Muḥammad Amīn.

[597] These three dated and dispersed colophons signed by Shāh Qāsim do not appear to have been written out in the story's order. The earliest is dated September 1592 (AHT entry 83 mistakenly dated 1591, reproduced in Soudavar, *Art of the Persian Courts,* 217-19). The next is dated winter 1592-93 and was formerly in the Rothschild collection but was sold by the Colnaghi firm [reproduced in Yael Rice, "The Emperor's Eye and the Painter's Brush: the Rise of the Mughal Court Artist, c. 1546-1627," (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2011), fig. 1.48]. The third colophon ending with the *Iʿtiqādnāma* is dated April 1593 (Rice, "The Emperor's Eye," fig. 1.49). Soudavar attributes them to Qul Bābā's patronage and names Muḥammadī as the painter of the last two colophons. However, by the 1590s the artist would have probably been deceased.

[598] Robinson, "An Amir Khusraw Khamsa of 1581," 40.

[599] Soudavar, *Art of the Persian Courts,* 219.

[600] Details on the life of Shāh Qāsim are given by Schmitz who notes some of the scribe's manuscript colophons state they were executed in a private workshop, while others say they were made in the courtly Herat workshop ("Miniature Painting in Harāt," 52-56, 62). Shāh Qāsim would go on to work in the library Ḥasan Khān Shāmlū after the Safavids reclaimed Herat, writing out a *Tīmūr-nāma* of Hātifī in 1619 for this patron (CBL Per. 264). The scribe signed 47 works over a 40-year period.

[601] Schmitz, "Miniature Painting in Harāt," 52.

[602] Robinson, "Muḥammadī and the Khurasan Style," 27.

Shāhnāma attributed to Muḥammadī circa 1575–80 (CBL Pers. 295, figs. 87-88).[603] A later *Shāhnāma* produced for the new Safavid governor of Herat, Ḥusain Khān Shāmlū, is dated 1600 after the Safavids routed the Abū'l-Khairids, and recalls the Muḥammadī *Shāhnāma* manuscript.[604] Robinson attributes a dispersed folio in an album illustrating Gushtāsp slaying a rhinoceros to Khurasan in the 1570s (JRL Indian Drawings 18, f.32a).[605] This could indicate an additional *Shāhnāma* version was produced but it has not fully survived. Francis Richard has suggested a Khurasan provenance to another complete Firdausian *Shāhnāma* (BNF Supp. Pers. 1122), but it requires further investigation.[606] A *Shāhnāma* in fine condition formerly in the Kraus collection was auctioned at Sotheby's and has a colophon dated 1572, and the lot description states the eclectic illustrations come from the traditions of Khurasan, Qazvin, Isfahan, and Bukhara.[607] Schmitz mentions other copies made during the Uzbek occupation of Herat, such as one belonging to Shāh Beg b. Mīrzā Atālīq (a patron so far unidentified) that was illustrated in Khurasan at the end of the sixteenth century.[608] Atālīq's *Shāhnāma* contains illustrations that parallel those in another auctioned Firdausian *Shāhnāma* that has since been dispersed. It was written out in 1580 by Quṭb al-Dīn b. Ḥasan al-Tūnī whose nisba bolsters a Khurasani origin for the manuscript.[609] Its visual elements associated with Mashhad, Herat, and Qazvin further support this attribution. Taken together, these book arts made in the final three decades of the century suggest that Persian-language *Shāhnāma* productions in Khurasan were greater than what Robinson calculated.

Several differences distinguish these enumerated Persian-language *Shāhnāma* materials fully produced in Khurasan from our Tajikistan *Shāhnāma*. Most obvious is language, as our case study is a

---

[603] Entry no. 173 in Robinson, *Persian Miniature Painting from Collections in the British Isles*, 111; listed as manuscript K27 in Robinson, "Muḥammadī and the Khurāsān Style," 27.

[604] Information on the Shāmlū manuscript (located in Niavaran Palace—Imperial Iranian Collection, Tehran) is provided in ʿAbd al-Majīd Ḥusainī Rād, "Pazhūhishī barāyi muʿarifi-yi Shāhnāma muṣavvir-i no yāfta az daura-yi Ṣafavī (Shāhnāma-yi Shāmlū)," *Nashriya Hunarhā-yi Zībā u Hunarhā-yi Tajassumī* 18, no. 4 (Winter 1392 [2013-14]): 43-54. Listed as ms. XXXII in Schmitz, "Miniature Painting in Harāt," 329-34.

[605] Entry no. 804 in Robinson, *Persian Paintings in the John Rylands Library*, 274, pl. XIII. The folio is stylistically similar to the *Āṯār al-muẓaffar* (TSMK H.1233) that Rührdanz attributes to the start of the Khurasan School.

[606] Francis Richard, "Un manuscrit malaisé à dater et à localiser, Supplément persan 1122 de la Bibliothèque nationale," *Études orientales* 11-12 (1991): 90-103.

[607] Sotheby's, 28 April 2004, lot 25. Having been unable to inspect the manuscript, it is unclear to me whether the text is truncated or not, but the listed illustrations cease after Bahrām Gūr slays the dragon which suggests the historical section has been abridged.

[608] Schmitz briefly mentions the manuscript and attributes it to Herat during the Abū'l-Khairid occupation circa 1590 on the basis of the rendered turbans ("Miniature Painting in Harāt," 131-32). The manuscript sold at Christie's, 16 October 2001, lot 76. It is erroneously attributed to circa 1570. Rührdanz places its manufacture closer to 1600 ("The Samarqand Shahnamas in the Context of Dynastic Change," 227).

[609] Two folios most recently sold at Christie's, 28 October 2020, lots 30 and 31. Provenance information is in Schmitz, "Miniature Painting in Harāt," 123. The scribe penned the *Dīvān* of Ḥāfiẓ mentioned above (BLO Elliott 163).

Turkic translation of Şerif Âmidî's. The text-image relationship is also unique in the Tajikistan manuscript through the presence of smaller boxes intended for illustrations that are enveloped by text. In contrast, manuscripts completely designed in Khurasan often feature full-page illustrations segmenting the textual narrative. Therefore, the Tajikistan *Shāhnāma*'s inset depictions indicate the manuscript was written out and arranged outside of Khurasan; Istanbul is the location advanced in our present examination.

IV. The visual program to the Tajikistan *Shāhnāma*

Lacking both a detailed colophon and finished illustrative program, the full provenance of the Tajikistan *Shāhnāma* is doomed to ambiguity, but through a close examination of its text and imagery I can reconstruct how it might have come into being. Since all other copies of Âmidî's work are attributed to late-Mamluk and Ottoman workshops, it is probable the layout of the Tajikistan manuscript was conceived in Istanbul if not another Ottoman center. The text then ultimately travelled to present-day Tajikistan for reasons and by means we do not—and may never—know. Other problematic manuscripts with questionable provenances currently housed in archives today located in neighboring Uzbekistan are thought to have been produced in the region where they remained. However, one cannot attribute a manuscript's origins based on its present-day location, although Lisa Golombek remarks that an ongoing and current presence in Central Asia is "a good indication that [a manuscript of questionable provenance] was illustrated in the eastern Islamic world."[610] If we acknowledge this observation, then the Tajikistan manuscript did not venture far to end up in the Center of Written Heritage at the National Academy of Sciences in Dushanbe where it continues to sit on a shelf.

The illustrative program to the Tajikistan *Shāhnāma* includes figures and compositions that originate predominantly in Herat. These comport with other materials produced there between the 1580s through the 1590s. However, it also contains elements from courtly Ottoman book arts and those from the Abū'l-Khairid appanages that were produced earlier. In lieu of harder evidence I must rely on my eyes, and illustrated comparanda cause me to believe artists with different backgrounds converged in Khurasan and there contributed their skills. The stylistic uniformity of the Tajikistan manuscript's

---

[610] Lisa Golombek, "Early Illustrated Manuscripts of Kāshifī's *Akhlāq-i Muḥsinī*," *Iranian Studies* 36, no. 4 (December 2003): 631.

outlined figures makes it likely that designs and patterns from far-flung workshops also transferred to Khurasan for a single artist there to consult.

Farhad Mehran's analysis of break-lines (the verses closest to the image that dictate the scene to depict) in *Shāhnāma* illustrations demonstrate how a visual program is always predetermined and situated within specific moments of the narrative.[611] In the case of the Tajikistan *Shāhnāma*, there is no indication of coordination between calligrapher and painter. The artist who sketched the images was fulfilling a program plotted out earlier and far away. In comparing break-lines across surviving Şerif Âmidî copies, I have detected a standard format in three that repeat the same image cycles and captions: BL Or. 7204, the Tajikistan *Shāhnāma*, and TSMK H.1522. These support my claim that multiple copies of the text were transcribed and most were painted in the Ottoman domain, but the Tajikistan manuscript was taken elsewhere to be illustrated.

Despite its unfinished state with sketched red outlines in the Tajikistan *Shāhnāma,* figural and compositional comparisons to illustrations in other manuscripts from Khurasan on the cusp of Abū'l-Khairid conquest inform my analysis. Let us review the frontispiece and seven unfinished illustrations in the Tajikistan *Shāhnāma* in sequential order as they appear in the manuscript, and conclude with some musings on the intentionality and purpose in creating it.

IV.i. Illuminated frontispiece (ff.1r-2v)

A beautiful frontispiece, incongruous to the rest of the codex in its relative completeness, opens the manuscript (fig. 89). Badly abraded in the lower sections and with the right side containing empty spaces intended to contain images, the illumination is in dazzling lapis with gold thumb-spaces in the right and left margins. Alternating gold, black, and turquoise palmettes with coral-colored accents and minute white filigree lines are evocative of a tradition associated with Timurid Herat that was maintained in Abū'l-Khairid workshops. The illumination is similar to the frontispiece in the Persian-language *Shāhnāma* transcribed by Hamdamī in Khiva examined in Chapter 3 (fig. 58).

IV.ii. The court of Kayūmarṯ (f.7r)

Kayūmarṯ, the first king credited with asserting order over all of creation, is represented in the first illustration to the Tajikistan *Shāhnāma* (fig. 90). His name, inscribed above in a sloppy hand, labels his epithet: "the first king." The scene is one of the most commonly encountered, but here the iconography departs from typical depictions that render Kayūmarṯ and his retinue wearing animal

---

[611] Farhad Mehran, "Break-line Verse: Link between Text and Image in the 'First Small Shāhnāma,' " in *Shāhnāma Studies I*, ed. Charles Melville (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 2006), 151-70.

skins, for the figures wear tunics and headwear common in the sixteenth century. An indecipherable phrase below the seated ruler could read *palang p*[*ā*]*dishāh* (leopard ruler), perhaps to instruct an artist how to fill in the outlined clothing.

This partly-completed illustration is the only folio that permits an examination of the busy patterning of pastel-colored surfaces in the manuscript. One can compare it to other illustrations from Khurasan, Qazvin, Shiraz, and Bukhara from the second half of the sixteenth century that also brim with colorful details and ornamented surfaces. Star, cross, square-shaped, and hexagonal geometric designs form the panels and floors in the illustrations we examined above from 1580s–1590s Khurasan (figs. 82-85). Cruciform and eight-pointed star panels with central dots in the lavender section on the Tajikistan folio appear in two other Turkic *Shāhnāma* copies. One is the Âmidî version TSMK H.1522 circa 1544–60 (fig. 91).[612] The other is a loose folio with Turkic prose depicting Faraidūn attacking Żaḥḥāk (HAM no. 1985.230, fig. 92).[613] Rows of teal squares in the Tajikistan illustration also recall wall ornamentation in the royal Ottoman manuscript *Siyar al-nabī* completed for sultan Murad III in 1594.[614] A close study of regional patterns and forms and colors that were in vogue in specific centers has yet to be written, but those present in the Tajikistan illustration suggest a transference of designs across workshops via sketches and materials moving through Ottoman, Safavid, and Abū'l-Khairid demarcated borders.

IV.iii. Żaḥḥāk's vizier announces Faraidūn's arrival (f.14r)

This illustration (fig. 93) also departs from traditional *Shāhnāma* iconography presenting a regal Żaḥḥāk holding court who typically listens to a *maubad* (priest) interpreting his dreams. Here the maubad sits on a diagonal carpet below the ruler. The Tajikistan *Shāhnāma* illustration displays a macabre—and rarely depicted—element of the story: servants prepare the brains of two human victims to feed to two evil snakes that sprout from the demon king's shoulders. Cowering on the right side against an unevenly applied purple ground is a bearded *kalpak*-capped attendant. This man is the

---

[612] The design repeats on f.97b ("Accession of Kay Kāvūs") and f.465a ("Accession of Bahrām Gūr." Reproduced in Serpil Bağcı,"An Iranian epic and an Ottoman painter: Nakkaş Osman's 'new' visual interpretation of the *Shâhnâmah*," in *Arts, Women and Scholars: Studies in Ottoman Society and Culture. Festschrift Hans Georg Majer,* eds. Sabine Prätor and Christoph K. Neumann (Istanbul: Simurg, 2002, Vol. 2), 421-50.

[613] Edwin Binney III suggests the folio formerly in his collection parallels the earliest volumes of a later Turkic verse translation by Madḥī produced in Istanbul in the 1620s, but this seems too late a provenance for the loose illustration [*Turkish Treasures from the Collection of Edwin Binney, 3rd*, exh. cat. (Oregon: Portland Art Museum, 1979), 66-67].

[614] Compare the illustration "Dream of the Byzantine Emperor" (TSMK H.1221, f.86b) reproduced in Carol Garrett Fisher, "A Reconstruction of the Pictorial Cycle of the 'Siyar-i Nabi' of Murad III," *Ars Orientalis* 14 (1984): 75-94, fig. 5.

reverse of a figure standing in a painting from the *Fatḥnāma-i khānī* (fig. 15). The figure in the Tajikistan *Shāhnāma* wears a thicker sash that is more the vogue of the late sixteenth century.

IV.iv. Faraidūn enthroned (f.21v)

In the third illustration (fig. 94), Faraidūn sits on a *takht* (platform) with a kerchief of sovereignty in his right hand and left leg bent. Washes of gold are applied to the sky as well as to certain details of dress and props. Similar figure types are found in other folios produced in the workshops of Khurasan circa 1570–81, such as the illustration to a Jāmī manuscript dated 1576 (fig. 95). To the left of Faraidūn's in the Tajikistan manuscript a figure kneels performing the *kāsa-gīrī*, or ritual offering of a cup to the ruler that is derived from Mongol custom. This same attendant dressed in green offers a small cup in the Bruschettini *Gulistān* illustration (fig. 82).

The two studious boys seated to Faraidūn's right in the Tajikistan manuscript are stock types that circulated as single-page album compositions. One version is attributed to Shaikh Muḥammad who was active in the Mashhad atelier of Ibrāhīm Mīrzā and broader Khurasan between 1540 and 1580.[615] In the Tajikistan composition, they are garbed in collared tunics and squat turbans; perhaps they are Faraidūn's older sons who gossip and plot as they jealously look upon their younger brother sycophantically serving their father.[616] Two similarly-posed boys wearing poppy-red and forest-green tunics sit within the aforementioned separated *Haft aurang* painting in LACMA (fig. 84) and were probably depicted closer to the time and place of production of the Tajikistan *Shāhnāma.*

IV.v. The death of Īraj (f.29r)

The fourth illustration (fig. 96) portrays the violent struggle of Faraidūn's sons and bears overt connections to contemporary illustrations produced in Khurasan.[617] Names in faded letters designate each figure, and a crown sketched at Īraj's feet, now faded, is labeled *tāj*. The scene is common in *Shāhnāma* iconography. Usually, Īraj's throat is slit or his head is bashed with a stool within a tent as overturned platters of fruits and spilled ewers add to the chaotic atmosphere. Instead, the victim here grips a dagger and grabs Salm's throat; he's not surrendering easily. The sparse use of gold emphasizes the hilts and handles of the weaponry.

---

[615] Reproduced in Arménag Sakisian, *La Miniature Persane du XIIe au XVIIe Siècle* (Paris: Les Éditions G. Van Oest, 1929), fig. 122. Shaikh Muḥammad was famous for naturalism and portraiture and credited with instigating the role of facial specificity in Persian arts (Soudavar, *Art of the Persian Courts*, 217).

[616] The role of performing *kāsa-gīrī* was for princes and nobles, not servants and attendants.

[617] Reproduced in Abuseitova and Dodkhudoeva, *History of Kazakhstan in Eastern miniatures*, 206.

The sketch of the brothers killing Īraj in the Tajikistan manuscript most closely parallels a scene depicting a pious man attacked by a drunkard within a *Muntakhab-i Būstān* (Selections from the *Būstān*) of Saʿdī copied by Muḥammad Qāsim b. Shādīshāh in Herat in 1527 (fig. 97).[618] Soudavar attributes the illustrations to this *Būstān*—added later—to Mīrzā ʿAlī working in Mashhad or Sabzivar circa 1565, and ventures they were commissioned by Ibrāhīm Mīrzā. Robinson, however, suggests the illustrations are of a later date, and I would attribute them closer to 1580 as well.[619] Without providing specific details and comparisons to other works, Dodkhudoeva observes that the Tajikistan manuscript's illustrations display features of royal paintings associated with the kitābkhāna of Ibrāhīm Mīrzā and Mashhad influences, as well as compositions done by Muḥammadī.[620] In the *Būstān* illustration as in the Tajikistan *Shāhnāma*'s "Death of Īraj," a man is roughly held by two opponents while a pair of distraught onlookers on the right side of each illustration hold fingers to their lips in dismay. (Why they do not intervene is a question that must remain unanswered.)

IV.vi. Tūr's attempt to ambush Manūchihr (f.35r)

The fifth illustration (fig. 98) is a powerful depiction of combat on the right side while Tūr sits on a platform in front of his tent on the other, his evil grimace delineated as a childish scrawl. A soldier casts a mistrustful glance at his cruel commander as he sets out amidst the carnage of dismembered limbs cleaved by sword blows to wage war against Manūchihr's army. With severed heads piled at his feet, Tūr's pose is the same as the ruler in the LACMA *Haft aurang* illustration (fig. 84). The same seated ruler and frenzy of clustered fighters are similar to illustrations from a *Tīmūr-nāma* of Hātifī dated 1582 that Schmitz attributes to Muḥammadī while he worked in Herat (figs. 99–100).[621] This is the only copy of the text with a Khurasan provenance. In the left section of fig. 99 in the *Tīmūr-nāma* as in the folio from the Tajikistan *Shāhnāma* here discussed, rulers with daggers in their belts sit in front of yurts with fabric draped over the smokestack openings. The right section of a siege scene in the

---

[618] Soudavar muses the scribe was an early *nastaʿlīq* master and that the four Mashhad-style paintings (which he attributes to Mīrzā ʿAlī) were 1565 additions (*Art of the Persian Courts*, 173-75). The manuscript later made its way to the royal Mughal libraries of Jahāngīr, Shāh Jahān, and Aurangzīb based on seals and marginal inscriptions. It was valued at 100 rupees (Seyller, "Inspection and Valuation," 274).

[619] Robinson disputes the date of the illustrations, saying Soudavar's attribution "may be on the early side" ("An Amir Khusraw Khamsa of 1581," 41, ftn. 22). Compare them to a *Gulistān* of Saʿdī (DAI LNS 46 MS) as a further bolstering of a 1580 provenance. Reproduced in Adel T. Adamova and Manijeh Bayani, *Persian Painting: the Arts of the Book and Portraiture. Dar al-Athar al-Islamiyyah: The Al-Sabah Collection, Kuwait* (New York: Thames & Hudson, 2015), 443.

[620] Dodkhudoeva, *The Arts of the Book in Central Asia and India*, 80.

[621] Originally sold at Sotheby's in London, 21 April 1980, lot 199. Description of the manuscript is in Schmitz, "Miniature Painting in Harāt," 127-28, 396-97. It has more recently been auctioned at Christie's, 31 March 2022, lot 4.

Tīmūr-nāma (fig. 100) parallels a similar composition in Muḥammadī's *Shāhnāma* (fig. 88). A jumbled unit of soldiers raise their swords and shields in the *Tīmūr-nāma* and Tajikistan illustration. The armor worn by the mass of soldiers in the *Tīmūr-nāma* echoes that worn by troops in the Tajikistan manuscript. They wear spiked *zānū band* (poleyns; knee guards), flat-footed ankle boots with flaps at the heel, and pronged arm coverings that would make a simple elbowing quite a lethal jab.[622]

IV.vii. Manūchihr slays Salm (f.38r)

In the penultimate illustration to the Tajikistan *Shāhnāma* (fig. 101), Īraj's grandson Manūchihr avenges the murder of his grandfather by slaying Salm. The impact of the blow splits Salm's shield in half and topples his crown. This version of the scene repeats a common pictorial trope that presents the ferocity of battles by showing a victor cleaving a rival in half from head to waist.[623] Although this gruesome act is very common inTurco-Persianate manuscripts, the humorous pouncing horse nipping at the haunches of the opponent's mount is not. However, two illustrations with this detail appear in the *Qiṣaṣ al-anbiyā'* style associated with Ottoman Baghdad. A similarly cleft victim atop a horse bitten by the steed of another rider appears in a battle scene from Niẓāmī's *Iskandar-nāma* in a *Khamsa* dated 1579–80 that can be attributed to this site (fig. 102).[624] The other illustration is from the truncated *Shāhnāma* written out in Bukhara in 1535 (TSMK H.1514, fig. 103) discussed in Chapter 3 §III.ii.b. The illustration to H.1514 shows Rustam skewering an opponent and lifting him from the saddle with the pink-speckled Rakhsh nipping the rump of the riderless horse in front of him.[625] Collectively, these textual and visual components of these manuscripts are derived from the eastern- and western-most areas of theTurco-Persianate cultural sphere, encompassing Baghdad and Bukhara.

---

[622] This same armor and footwear also appear in the Ottoman *Shajāʿat-nāma* (IUL T.6043) worn by two battling warriors in the lower right section of f.124. Reproduced in Âsafî Dal Mehmed Çelebi and Abdülkadir Özcan, *Şecâ'atnâme: Özdemiroğlu Osman Paşa'nın Şark Seferleri (1578-1585)* (Istanbul: Çamlıca Basım Yayın, 2007).

[623] I am grateful to Barry Wood for bringing this vivid detail to my attention. The period description of this act is "like a ripe cucumber" (*chun khiyār*) and is repeated in various chronicles, among them popular retellings of the exploits of the Safavid shah Ismāʿīl. Wood has translated many of these works, among them *The Adventures of Shāh Esmāʿil: A Seventeenth-Century Persian Popular Romance* (Leiden, Brill: 2019). An illustration to the third volume of the Safavid historiography *Ḥabīb al-siyār* by Khwāndamīr dated 1579 (f.335a) showing Shah Ismāʿīl defeating Muḥammad Shībānī Khan is reproduced in Glenn Lowry, et al., *An Annotated and Illustrated Checklist of the Vever Collection* (Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution), 184.

[624] Several illustrations to the Niẓāmī manuscript (NLR PNS 272) and Firdausī work (TSMK H.1514) share iconographic and stylistic elements. Milstein, et al., in their *Stories of the Prophets* further distinguish the style as T-1 in *Qiṣaṣ al-anbiyā'* productions. If this shared style is not from Baghdad then they claim it comes from a locality of western Persianate origin. Illustrations from PNS 272 (including its frontispiece that is nearly identical to truncated *Shāhnāma* TSMK H.1505) appear in N.V. Diakonova and L.G. Giuzal'ian, *Sredneaziatskie Miniatiury XVI-XVII vv.* Series: *Vostochnaya Miniatiura i Kalligrafia v Lenindradskikh Sobraniakh* (Moscow: Nauka, 1964), pl. 29. I have not yet examined the manuscript and its colophon but I suspect the scribe is of Bukharan origin and the illustrations are from Baghdad. PNS 272 along with PNS 84 (*Iskandar-nāma* dated 1571) were once owned by the Emir of Bukhara, and later given to Tsar Nicholas in 1913.

[625] Here there seems to be a misinterpretation of the section of the story where Rustam lifts Afrāsiyāb from the saddle within the chapter "Kay Kāvūs fights the King of Hamāvarān."

IV.viii. Zāl and Rūdāba (f.49r)

The final illustration in the Tajikistan *Shāhnāma* (fig. 104) is the only one that bears overt parallels to Turkic-language *Shāhnāma* copies produced in the court nakkaşhane in Istanbul. In the painting, Zāl ascends Rūdāba's hair in a Rapunzel-like love story. A *chāvūsh* (groom) appears in a pointed cap and sporran-like pouch tending to his lord's horse, and he is similar to the figure in the lower section of the *Haft aurang* folio. This Tajikistan *Shāhnāma* composition is remarkably similar to the Âmidî *Shāhnāma* in the British Library attributed to 1560–80 Istanbul (Or. 7204, fig. 105). Although both of these Âmidî versions have nearly identical layouts, the heavily-outlined eyes and sartorial elements of the figures in the British Library *Shāhnāma* are obviously of Ottoman creation. Rūdāba is attired as an Ottoman noblewoman reaching down from her balcony wearing a golden crown.[626] Zāl is garbed in the animal skins and helmet associated with Rustam, and the phallic feathers of his helmet recall other headwear produced in the Istanbul nakkaşhane during the late sixteenth century.[627] Although uncolored and lacking the gold accents of the previous six unfinished illustrations, a Qur'anic verse scribbled beneath Rūdāba above the doorway reads: "*Yā mufattiḥ al-abwāb*" (O opener of doors), a feature found in depictions of architecture in Timurid, Safavid, and Abū'l-Khairid painting, and already mentioned in the context of the *Fatḥnāma* (Ch. 1, §IV.i).

A differently-arranged portrayal of Zāl climbing Rūdāba's hair appears in another earlier Âmidî *Shāhnāma* from the Ottoman workshops circa 1545 (TSMK H.1520, fig. 106). As noted by Zeren Tanındı, it has marked parallels to a scene of "Abdürrahman Gazi Climbing the Fortress of Aydos" in the fourth volume (called *Osmân-nâme*) of the Ottoman dynastic chronicle, the *Shāhnāma-yi Āl-i Osman* by Arifi (d. 1562) dated 1558 (fig. 107).[628] The illustration renders a Byzantine princess helping an Ottoman soldier climb up the walls and open the castle door to let in the other troops who would conquer Constantinople. In Tanındı's analysis, the Âmidî *Shāhnāma* copy H.1520 done on inferior paper could have been an iconographic experiment filled in by illustrators who would later prepare the illustration to the *Osmân-nâme* manuscript. This indicates that the Ottoman head of the court workshop may have stipulated that illustrators of ruler-*nāma* materials must have previously illustrated a

---

[626] Rūdāba's crown parallels illustrations in Topkapı H.1522 circa 1560, particularly the folios rendering Iskandar enthroned (f.369b) and Bahrām Gūr hunting accompanied by Āzāda (f.449b).

[627] For similar distinctive plumed helmets see G.M. Meredith-Owens, *Turkish Miniatures* (London, British Museum: 1963), pl. 47; dispersed leaves from the *Siyar-i nabī* of Darīr produced in Turkey for Murad III, 1594-95 (DAI LNS 205 MS; BM 1985,0513,0.1); the *Şehname-i Selim Han* of Seyyid Lokman (TSMK A.3595, scribed 1581) with folios reproduced in Uluç, *Turkman Governors, Shiraz Artisans and Ottoman Collectors: Sixteenth Century Shiraz Manuscripts* (Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası, 2016), 494-95.

[628] Tanındı, "The Illustration of the *Shahnama* and the Art of the Book in Ottoman Turkey," 148.

Shāhnāma either with the text of Firdausī's original Persian or Âmidî's Turkic version. Tanındı states outright that the illustrations in the other Âmidî *Shāhnāma* (BL Or. 7204) also support this claim.[629] Applying her analysis, the Tajikistan *Shāhnāma* executed on rough unburnished paper could have been intended as an incomplete mock-up that somehow escaped the Ottoman nakkaşhane. Abuseitova and Dodkhudoeva have also suggested as much for the Tajikistan *Shāhnāma*. They write: "it did not matter for the copyist and artist in which language manuscripts were copied. They quite often used ready samples for illustrations for one text, more often from Persian painting, only slightly amending graphical models. …The plots chosen for illustrating [the Tajikistan *Shāhnāma*] belong to the most conventional Persian book painting."[630] Although all the illustrations in the Tajikistan manuscript are the product of a kitābkhāna in Khurasan at the crossroads of Safavid and Abū'l-Khairid skirmishes late in the sixteenth century, details of patterning and composition indicate an Ottoman presence in the illustrative program as well. It cannot be proven that an artist trained in Ottoman workshops traveled eastward carrying the manuscript or clutched preparatory images destined for Tajikistan, but the presence of shared compositional and decorative elements across Istanbul and Khurasan confirms a visual linkage spanning these sites.

V. Conclusion

Despite its coarse and unfinished state, thorough textual and illustrative analysis of the Tajikistan *Shāhnāma* brings to light the journey of its manufacture spanning the Mamluk and Ottoman Empires, and Khurasan at the nexus of Abū'l-Khairid and Safavid control. A majority of images in the Tajikistan *Shāhnāma* accompany the Faraidūn story, dwelling on the lead-up to the murder of Īraj. But it would be irresponsible to overemphasize the significance of these illustrations found early in the manuscript. One cannot claim that this part of the text, detailing the origin of tensions between Iran and Turan, was more important than all the other stories to whoever was the artist. In manuscripts where the text either predates the illustrations or was transcribed elsewhere, the scene selection does not necessarily reflect the artist's decision-making. Evidence and theory support my claim that the Tajikistan *Shāhnāma* illustrations were sketched out and added later onto a manuscript from the Ottoman realm whose calligraphy was finished perhaps decades earlier. In the presented case study, the

---

[629] Ibid., 149.

[630] Abuseitova and Dodkhudoeva, *History of Kazakhstan in Eastern miniatures*, 130.

draftsman responsible for the visual material proceeded systematically through the finished text but then inexplicably stopped and left the manuscript incomplete.

Although it might have originally been intended as a model for Ottoman scribes and artists to consult for a grander project, such as a biography of the sultan and his ancestors, the Tajikistan *Shāhnāma* was deemed worthy of retention. The language of this sample text was unimportant; only the placement of images in relation to text concerned the draftsman. Copying this first volume obviously took time, effort, and resources which endowed it with value. But who then transported it over a geographic expanse and why will never be fully ascertained. Perhaps it was an impecunious artisan affected by the turbulent politics later that century. Maybe he lacked royal commissions so was forced to itinerantly sojourn through the Turco-Persianate ecumene in search of work. He might have ultimately settled in Khurasan while the Safavids and Abū'l-Khairids feuded for control, creating manuscripts on demand or for export. There, he could have shared patterning and compositional ideas with local artists and others converging in Herat.

The Tajikistan manuscript was originally thought to have been illustrated in Khurasan during the 1570s. However, manuscripts associated with this region are too often attributed to this decade, much like the lack of nuance used to label all book arts of sixteenth-century Transoxiana as Bukharan specimens. My more refined provenance of 1580s through the 1590s, based on comparisons to contemporaneous samples, demands a re-contextualization of the imagery and brings it under the Abū'l-Khairid fold. The intended owner of the Tajikistan manuscript—if it was intended to be finished—could have been a wealthy member of the Abū'l-Khairid military elite judging from the gratuitous violence depicted in the illustrations, although one wonders who could have actually read the text. Regarding this issue of literacy, Abuseitova and Dodkhudoeva confirm that the heroes in the Persian and Turkic copies of the *Shāhnāma* epic "had enough popularity among writers and readers of ruling classes and broad masses of Turkic states in Northern Khoresm, Kipchak steppes of Central Asia, [and the] Golden Horde for many centuries. Demand for manuscripts was rather high in these regions, and representatives of various clans could be their customers."[631]

In the fractured yet fusing domains of eastern Iran and Transoxiana in the late sixteenth century, artisans gathered in villages around Herat and in broader Khurasan where they offered their talents derived from elsewhere. Scribes were hired to execute oft-repeated works of poetry, or they brought

---

[631] Abuseitova and Dodkhudoeva, *History of Kazakhstan in Eastern miniatures*, 133. Dodkhudoeva states the same concept in the Russian text to *The Arts of the Book in Central Asia and India*, 79.

previously-copied texts with them if they journeyed from afar. Painters contributed figures and compositions that had been learned and practiced in different centers such as Qazvin, Mashhad, Istanbul, Baghdad, and Bukhara. Artists illustrated both Persian and Turkic texts in order to suit the aesthetic and linguistic whims of prospective buyers. Although fragmentary and lacking firm data elucidating its creation and transfer, the Tajikistan *Shāhnāma* exemplifies this paradigm through similarities to other illustrated manuscripts.

The lyric and romantic nature of these comparative contemporaneous materials challenged my methodology employing formal analysis and extrapolation. Few soldiers march through the illustrated pages of Saʿdī, Jāmī, and Ḥāfiẓ poetry that I used to analyze the Tajikistan *Shāhnāma*'s militaristic and violent scenes. But through small details, such as the pointed flat boots visible on Faraidūn, Żaḥḥāk, and Tūr as they recline on their thrones with one or both knees bent, I discerned how an artist with similar training could have rendered similar details visible in the Ḥāfiẓ folio and *Silsilat al-ẕahab* colophon as in the Tajikistan manuscript.

Chapter 5

New century, new dynasty: artists and *Shāhnāma* manuscripts during the Abū'l-Khairid—Tūqāy-Tīmūrid transition in Transoxiana and exchanges with India (1598–1620)

Previously in Chapters 3 and 4, connections between the Ottomans and Abū'l-Khairids were manifested via manuscript transfers, be they ʿAbdullāh's Persian-language *Shāhnāma* to Murad III, or the Turkic-language *Shāhnāma* theorized to have been scribed in Istanbul and reworked in Khurasan. In the third and fourth periods of Abū'l-Khairid manuscript production, the artisans ʿAbdullāh Khan had formerly employed dispersed and sought commissions from the local Abū'l-Khairid military and religious aristocracy. Others ventured abroad to find their fortune in Mughal dynasty (1526–1857) domains and further south. This final chapter covers the fifth period, in which artisans formerly associated with Abū'l-Khairid workshops found employment with the new Tūqāy-Tīmūrid dynasty emerging in Transoxiana (1598–1740; Map 3: The Tūqāy-Tīmūrid domain, ca. 1605). They also trained in Indo-Persian workshops in India following ʿAbdullāh's death in 1598, which marks the end of Abū'l-Khairid power.

The prior shift that occurred, during which Abū'l-Khairids toppled Timurid dynasts circa 1500, indicates an external regime change. In this scenario, a Jūchid line replaced a Chaghataid to restore a perceived Chinggisid legitimacy. Later in circa 1600 when power transferred from Abū'l-Khairid to Tūqāy-Tīmūrid control, it essentially constituted an internal restructuring of political authority because both were Jūchid lines.[632] During these two eras at the start and end of the sixteenth century, artisans

---

[632] Known by various names, the preferred "Tūqāy-Tīmūrid" label for this group emphasizes their descent from Chinggis Khan's other grandson Tūqāy Tīmūr (brother to Shībān) who was given the lands that would become the Golden Horde. The other dynastic designation "Astrakhanid" refers to the group's geographic connections to Astrakhan on the Caspian Sea. A Chinggisid prince from Astrakhan, Yār Muḥammad, fled the Russian invasion in 1556. ʿAbdullāh Khan's father Iskandar welcomed him, and allowed him to marry ʿAbdullāh's own sister Maʿṣūma. The "Jānid" appellation used for the Tūqāy-Tīmūrids refers to Jānī Muḥammad, the attributed first ruler after the fall of Abū'l-Khairid rule. Jānī Muḥammad, the son of Yār Muḥammad Khān, should not be confused with the 1550s Abū'l-Khairid leader of the same name. Janid and Astrakhanid dynastic classifications assume a clear-cut chronological and dynastic shift. However, given the power struggles and decentralized rulership at the time, the situation was more complex and opaque. Jānī Muḥammad administered Samarqand while his son Bāqī Muḥammad made Bukhara his operational base while doing away with the Abū'l-Khairid dynasts there. Information derived from Audrey Burton, "Imam Quli and Iran," in *Proceedings of the Third European Conference of Iranian Studies held in Cambridge, 11th to 15th September 1995.* Part 2: Mediaeval and Modern Persian Studies, ed. Charles Melville (Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 1999), 289; Idem, "Who were the First Ashtarkhānid Rulers of Bukhara?" *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 51, no. 3 (1988): 482-88; R.D. McChesney, "The 'Reforms' of Bāqī Muḥammad Khān," *Central Asiatic Journal* 24, no. 1/2 (1980): 69-84. For information on the twists and turns of the interregnum between summer 1598–spring 1599, consult McChesney, "CENTRAL ASIA VI. In the 16th-18th Centuries."

working in them produced *Shāhnāma* manuscripts for local Jūchids in Transoxiana, and also Chaghataid clientele who had migrated south to India.

Map 3: The Tūqāy-Tīmūrid domain, ca. 1605. Taken from Thomas Welsford, *Four Types of Loyalty in Early Modern Central Asia: the Tūqāy-Timūrid Takeover of Greater Mā Warā al-Nahr, 1598-1605* (Leiden, 2013), 304.

I. Ottomans in decline, Mughals on the rise

While we previously reviewed manuscripts that revealed Ottoman connections, Istanbul and Baghdad do not figure in this present chapter. Although a powerful authority in the mid-sixteenth century, the Sublime Porte had started to precipitously weaken in the final quarter. As a result, artistic exchanges with Abū'l-Khairids petered out while the Mughals' patronage superseded the Ottomans in attracting artisans and merchants from Transoxiana and Iran. In just two decades, Ottoman currency devalued to such an extent that the *akçe* (the main silver coinage) in the 1580s was worth half of what it was in the 1560s.[633]

[633] Baki Tezcan, "The Ottoman Monetary Crisis of 1585 Revisited," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 52, no. 3 (2009): 460-504.

The currency in Transoxiana had become similarly debased, weighing less than half a Mughal rupee in the sixteenth century and becoming increasingly worthless after the death of ʿAbdullāh Khan.[634] Mustafa ʿÂli himself witnessed both the Ottoman empire's political weakening (which he attributed to ignorance and corruption), and the concomitant decline in royal artistic patronage. ʿÂli hyperbolically "demanded that all palace artists be killed" as they pandered to the sultans' appeals to decorum and pretense rather than actual erudition and refinement.[635] ʿÂli "specifically calls miniature painters 'a bunch of disgraceful, ill-fortuned wretches… inhabiting the corners of coffee houses and wine taverns[. …Their] revenues should immediately be cut off'."[636] Facing shrinking financial resources at the court, in the late sixteenth century Ottoman artisans turned to lesser, independent patrons and collectors in the noble classes: viziers, pashas, governors, finance ministers, chancellors and provincial land grant holders (*timar*).[637] Similarly, Abū'l-Khairid artisans also turned to patrons outside the central court during the same period.

The Ottoman decline and weakened state of the late Abū'l-Khairid and early Tūqāy-Tīmūrid dynasties correspond to the ascent of the Mughals and Deccan Sultanates in India. Some artisans who formerly worked for the Abū'l-Khairids in Bukhara and Khurasan went to India where they received training. They then later returned to a Transoxiana ruled by the Tūqāy-Tīmūrid dynasty that administered a smaller region than that formerly held by the Abū'l-Khairids. For this reason, we see a shift in artistic styles in Uzbek painting that assimilate Indo-Persianate forms. After discussing fin-de-siècle geo-political affairs in Transoxiana and the dynastic shift from Abū'l-Khairid to Tūqāy-Tīmūrid administration, I will address a group of commercial Firdausian *Shāhnāma* manuscripts copied in Samarqand meant for purchase. Created in the early years of the new Tūqāy-Tīmūrid dynasty, Karin Rührdanz and Maria Szuppe both previously examined them.[638] Another unpublished copy held in the Abu Rayhan Biruni Institute of Tashkent also relates to this group.

Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* manuscripts fall into two categories: a prolific shorter period of commercial production between 1600–05, and a longer decade in circa 1610–20 which saw fewer copies produced, but of higher aesthetic standards. After asserting their talents, some of the original

---

[634] Foltz, *Mughal India and Central Asia*, 21.

[635] Mustafa ʿÂli, *Epic Deeds of Artists*, 111.

[636] Ibid., 103, ftn. 56.

[637] Ibid., 92.

[638] Rührdanz, "The Samarqand Shahnamas"; Szuppe, "Family and Professional Circle of Two Samarkand Calligraphers."

artists in the earlier period later went on to produce the more lavish manuscripts for courtly and religious elites. The career of the particularly active and well-known artist Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī appears well-documented due to his signatures appearing on works. He filled in all the empty picture spaces to the Firdausian *Shāhnāma* that was scribed earlier in Khiva in 1556 reviewed in Chapter 4. Here, we analyze the illustrations of this manuscript that he added to it, and delve into his training in northern India that I argue coincided with the death of the Mughal emperor Akbar and the accession of Jahāngīr in 1605.

Alongside these bound *Shāhnāma* texts, I will analyze isolated folios held in the British and Fitzwilliam Museums, and the Los Angeles County Museum of Art. I will examine select illustrations to the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* manuscripts and attend to the ways in which artists interacted with earlier compositions and figures from the royal Abū'l-Khairid kitābkhāna in Bukhara, and other illustrative models from the Khurasan workshops. I will conclude both the chapter and dissertation as a whole with a topic worth exploring in more detail: the migration of artisans and manuscripts between Transoxiana and India. The Mughals avidly received ruler-*nāma* copies enumerating Chinggisid, Timurid, and Abū'l-Khairid dynastic lines. Personnel and materials transferred from domains overseen by the Tūqāy-Tīmūrids to the Mughals; the manuscript arts on both sides benefited from this exchange.

II. Historical background on the Jūchid split and its impact on manuscript production

In the last chapter, we encountered Abū'l-Khairid governors tasked with controlling parts of Khurasan that had come under the command of ʿAbdullāh Khan. Some of these local administrators, like Dīn Muḥammad, availed themselves of the workshops in and around Herat to commission illustrated manuscripts (the subject of Chapter 4). Qul Bābā, ʿAbdullāh's second in command, had fought alongside ʿAbdullāh Khan's son ʿAbd al-Muʾmīn in the Abū'l-Khairid victory in the third Khurasan war in 1588. Whereas Qul Bābā received Herat, ʿAbd al-Muʾmīn surely felt snubbed when he was ordered back to Balkh to lead that smaller appanage. He assumed he was entitled to a position of power based on his birthright, even if others surpassed his military and administrative prowess.

With ʿAbdullāh Khan's death in February 1598, ʿAbd al-Muʾmīn seized Bukhara and assuaged his jealousy by killing Qul Bābā.[639] ʿAbd al-Muʾmīn in turn was assassinated just four months after his

[639] Qul Bābā's demise recounted by multiple period chroniclers is recorded in Rosemary Stanfield-Johnson, "*Yuzbashi-ye Kurd Bacheh* and 'Abd al-Mu'min Khan the Uzbek: A Tale of Revenge in the Dastan of Husayn-e Kurd," in *Muraqqa'e Sharqi*, eds. Soussie Kerman-Rastegar and Anna Vanzan (Dogana: AIEP Editore S.r.l., 2007), 168-70. Muṭribī Samarqandī's account is in *Nuskhah-yi zībā-yi Jahāngīrī*, 126.

rule began.[640] Between the autumn of 1598 until summer of 1599, Qazaqs occupied Samarqand before Dīn Muḥammad's brother Bāqī Muḥammad liberated the city and was rewarded with its governorship.[641] Bāqī Muḥammad actually supported the Abū'l-Khairids and had no desire for insurrection. Samarqand at this point operated as an alternative princely court by the inchoate Tūqāy-Tīmūrids to compete with Bukhara, which was the site of ongoing inter-Jūchid clashes. In contrast, Dīn Muḥammad proclaimed an independent khanate in Khurasan and Sistan and promised vassalage to Shah ʿAbbās I in exchange for Safavid aid, but he later changed his mind and as a result was killed in Herat by attacking Safavid armies.[642] The Safavids thus reabsorbed Khurasan into their fold. Prior to his death, Dīn Muḥammad appointed his father Jānī Muḥammad governor of Samarqand, which officially precipitated the Tūqāy-Tīmūrid dynastic line in 1599.[643] Bāqī Muḥammad received critical military support from the Ottoman sultan Mehmet III in his domestic struggle against his brother Valī Muḥammad for control of Samarqand.[644] This weaponry also aided Bāqī Muḥammad and the Uzbek general Rustam Muḥammad Khan to successfully repel a Safavid attempt to take Balkh in 1602. This event further consolidated Tūqāy-Tīmūrid power.[645]

Upon Jānī Muḥammad's death in Samarqand in 1603, Imām Qulī Khan, son of Dīn Muḥammad, assumed control. Then, after ousting his uncle Valī Muḥammad in 1611, he ascended the Bukharan throne. Imām Qulī ruled Samarqand between 1603–11 while Valī Muḥammad administered Bukhara during the same period. Significantly, after his expulsion in 1611, Valī Muḥammad visited Shah ʿAbbās I at the recently-established Safavid capital at Isfahan, where he is depicted in the courtly

---

640 ʿAbdullāh died on 8 February 1598 (2 Rajab 1006); ʿAbd al-Muʾmīn on 30 June 1598. These troubled months are enumerated by Burton, *The Bukharans*, 95; and idem, "First Ashtarkhanid Rulers." Thomas Welsford has made the disarray of concurrent dynastic dissolution and consolidation in late-sixteenth to early-seventeenth century Transoxiana orderly and comprehensible in *Four Types of Loyalty*.

641 The Qazaqs remained in Tashkent until 1606. Listed in "Table 28: The Appanage 'khans'" in McChesney, "CENTRAL ASIA VI. In the 16th-18th centuries."

642 Foltz, *Mughal India and Central Asia,* 19. Some chronicles say the khanate was to be for himself and his grandfather Yār Muḥammad Khān (Burton, "First Ashtarkhanid Rulers," 483). Details on Shāh ʿAbbās's acts in Mashhad immediately following his victory over the Uzbeks are in Sheila Canby, *Shah ʿAbbas: the Remaking of Iran* (British Museum Press, London, 2009), 191-95.

643 Welsford describes Dīn Muḥammad's political life (*Four Types of Loyalty*, 54-60).

644 Burton reports that in the confused period following ʿAbdullāh's death, players were busy establishing power and infighting; no embassies were sent to Istanbul or vice versa until Bāqī Muḥammad Khān restored relations with Mehmet III (d. 1603). Recalling the coalition between Süleyman and Naurūz Aḥmad half a century earlier, Mehmet sent 20 guns and 200 arquebuses to Bukhara for use against the forces of Iran backed by Muscovites and Qazaqs (Burton, "Relations between the Khanate of Bukhara and Ottoman Turkey," 94-95).

645 Shah ʿAbbās I's ill-fated campaign against the Tūqāy-Tīmūrids at Balkh in 1602 to expand Safavid prestige is covered by Sheila Blair, "The Ardabil Carpets in Context," in *Society and Culture in the Early Modern Middle East: Studies on Iran in the Early Safavid Period*, ed. Andrew J. Newman (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 132.

wall paintings of the Chihil Sutūn Palace.[646] With Safavid support, Valī Muḥammad sought to retake Bukhara but died in 1612; Imām Qulī Khan would not budge. For the next three decades, Samarqand would fade in importance while the sons of Dīn Muḥammad— Imām Qulī Khan in Bukhara and Naẕr Muḥammad in Balkh— presided over a bipartite Uzbek state, with Bukhara as its predominant center.[647]

Quite truly caught between the twilight of the Abū'l-Khairid sixteenth century and the dawn of the Tūqāy-Tīmūrid seventeenth century, documentation dated 31 December 1599 (13 Jumādā II 1008) speaks of the devastation wrought in Transoxiana and Khurasan. The upheaval resulted from wars directed inward during the consolidation of Tūqāy-Tīmūrid power, and outwardly in battles with the troops of Shah ʿAbbās.[648] Akin to the shift from the Timurid to the Abū'l-Khairid dynasties a century earlier, the instability and lack of royal commissions prompted artisans to move again. Previously, they appear to have selected Samarqand and Herat. However, this time they would ultimately gravitate towards Samarqand and northern India as stable sites for artistic creation. This late-sixteenth to early-seventeenth century dispersal of artistic talent coincided with the end of Abū'l-Khairid control over Transoxiana with Bukhara as its centralized capital. The early Firdausian *Shāhnāma* manuscripts produced in Samarqand, discussed next, emerge from this political context.

III. Firdausian *Shāhnāma* manuscript completion in Samarqand ca. 1600–05

In this final body chapter, as in the first, we explore *Shāhnāma* production at a fin de siècle during an interim period between one dynasty's fall and the onset of another. To make ends meet, artisans privately collaborated with each other to create multiple copies of a small number of titles that they could sell to any prospective client. Firdausian *Shāhnāma* manuscripts appeared during significant moments of dynastic change, much like a century prior. We shall examine some of the nuances of these dynastic displacements and the concomitant surge in Firdausian *Shāhnāma* productions below.

Maria Szuppe and Audrey Burton both note that historical chronicles do not document the first decade or so of Tūqāy-Tīmūrid power very well. However, we can glean information from courtly

---

[646] This period of "Dinid" competition (the sons of Dīn Muḥammad) with the "Valid" heirs of Valī Muḥammad is explained in Schwarz, "Safavids and Ozbeks," 361; also in Sussan Babaie, "Shah ʿAbbas II, the Conquest of Qandahar, the Chihil Sutun, and Its Wall Paintings," *Muqarnas* 11 (1994): 127.

[647] Foltz, *Mughal India and Central Asia,* 19.

[648] The report is written by a Mehmet b. Yusuf el-Hüseyin to the Iranian shah about people in cities located in Samarqand, Herat, Balkh, Bukhara, Tashkent, Khurasan, and Sirgan who ran away to Turkestan due to the wars between khans and sultans (BOA doc. TSMA E 750.9 f).

commissioned historiographies, and also from other popular titles and poetic works. Rührdanz examined a Firdausian *Shāhnāma* group from this period numbering seven codices.[649] Six feature surprisingly specific colophons listing both the day and year of production spanning 1600 through 1604, and an undated one is linked to them by its illustrations. Remarkably, some of them even name the street in Samarqand as their site of production.[650] The illustrative cycle of the Khivan *Shāhnāma* written out in 1556 (ARB 1811) relates to this set. Half a century after its ink dried, the artist Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī illustrated the empty spaces and signed his name upon five folios. Such rare documentation of an artist in this period and region afford us invaluable insight. Records attest to his travels in India which I will argue left a mark on his later painting style. We will first consider the earlier Abū'l-Khairid techniques practiced in Khurasan and Bukhara before discussing how Indian painting affected early Tūqāy-Tīmūrid arts of the book in §V.iii.b below.

All these manuscripts betray artisanal migrations during the dynastic change in Transoxiana. Abū'l-Khairid scribes and artists in Bukhara and Khurasan who had worked during the final quarter of the sixteenth century promptly congregated in Samarqand with the establishment of Tūqāy-Tīmūrid rulership. While Jānī Muḥammad (r. 1599–1603) and Imām Qulī (r. 1603–11) oversaw the city, these artisans produced copies of Firdausī's text anew or filled in existing codices. However, they did not make them for those rulers, who did not concern themselves with manuscript patronage.[651] Our discussion of Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* manuscripts divides itself between prolific commercial manuscript production in 1600–05, and a later period that saw fewer copies made, but with a higher aesthetic standard that reflects increased contacts with the Indian subcontinent. Some of those Samarqandi artists later followed Imām Qulī to Bukhara in 1612, and produced more lavish manuscripts for military, religious, and political elites in the center.

III.i. Scribal practices in Samarqand

The turbulent politics commencing in 1598 and the resulting decline in royal patronage prompted legions of itinerant artists to join commercial workshops across Khurasan, India, and also

---

[649] Rührdanz, "Samarqand Shahnamas in the Context of Dynastic Change."

[650] The series, in chronological order of scribal completion, includes: BL IO Islamic 301 (Shaʿbān 1008/February 1600); PUL O-16/7249 (Rabīʿ I 1009/October 1600); PFL 59G (Ṣafar 1009/September 1601); PUL O-15/7248 (1010/1601-02); NLR PNS 90 (1011/1602-03); AIIT Pers. 2.01 BD (Ẕū al-qaʿda 1012/April 1604); BL Or. 14403 (incomplete and lacking a colophon but stylistically related to the others; ca. 1600-04). Beside year and scribe, the colophons to many of these include the street names of the calligraphers as though to advertise the location of the commercial workshop producing them, and are discussed in: Szuppe, "Family and Professional Circle of Two Samarkand Calligraphers," 326-27; Rührdanz, "Revival of Central Asian painting in the early 17th century," 387-88, ftn. 9; idem, "Samarqand Shahnamas in the Context of Dynastic Change," 225.

[651] Rührdanz, "Samarqand Shahnamas in the Context of Dynastic Change," 228-29.

under new Tūqāy-Tīmūrid governance in Transoxiana.[652] The Samarqand *Shāhnāma* manuscript group reflects a commercial enterprise with staff coordinating work on every component. Some had received more training and produced finer quality compositions, others were more active and produced a larger quantity of illustrations with lesser refinement. Some illustrations in the group copy compositions across versions. Other paintings appear indebted to earlier Abū'l-Khairid workshops in Bukhara and Khurasan.

Akin to the truncated *Shāhnāma* redactions in the *Qiṣaṣ al-anbiyāʾ* style attributed to Baghdad that we have returned to in Chapters 2 and 3, Rührdanz's examination of the seven Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* manuscripts reveals how they also emphasize fantastic adventures of legendary heroes over Firdausī's final historical section.[653] Szuppe further analyzed five of them copied by the scribes Ādīna-yi Bukhārī and Mīr Māh b. Mīr ʿArab.[654] Thanks to her, the oeuvre of the scribe Ādīna-yi Bukhārī furnishes valuable insight into the collaborative nature of early seventeenth-century manuscript production in Samarqand. The (presumed) Bukhara native Mīr Māh flourished in Samarqand between 1595–1605 where he fully copied three *Shāhnāma* works: BL IO Islamic 301 (February 1600); PUL O-16/7249 (October 1600); and AIIT Pers 2.01 (April 1604). In the midst of these, he completed half of the text in PUL O-15/7248 (1601). Ādīna signed other manuscripts that include Muḥyī al-Dīn Lārī's *Futūḥ al-ḥaramain* (CWH 684, dated 1595), and the anonymous *Tafṣīr-i taẕkirat al-anbiyā' wa'l-umām* (BL IO 319, dated 1604). Szuppe acknowledges that more could be discovered.

Szuppe provides some interesting "statistical suppositions" based on the specificity of the colophon dates above. She calculates the average speed of each Ādīna-scribed *Shāhnāma* copy to be around fourteen and fifteen months given that he "produced three and a half copies of the *Shāhnāma* during a period of over four years, 1600-04."[655] Szuppe also determines other professional practices of scribes in early seventeenth-century Samarqand (and their capacity to work on concurrent projects). She notes their "semi-serial production process" in transcribing other works, or second copies of the same while in the midst of one assignment.

---

[652] Schmitz, "Miniature Painting in Harāt," 131.

[653] Rührdanz distinguishes NLR PNS 90 as the only manuscript of the Samarqandi group more akin to truncated manuscript production in that it has a double-page frontispiece painting and 'modern' text model comprising the Baysunghuri preface and parts of the *Garshaspnama* ("Samarqand Shahnamas in the Context of Dynastic Change," 218).

[654] Szuppe includes the helpful table "Chronological list of *Šāhnāma*s copied by Ādīna Buḫarī and by Mīr Māh b. Mīr ʿArab" with this information ("Family and Professional Circle of Two Samarkand Calligraphers," 325).

[655] Ibid., 333-34, 342.

Ādīna-yi Bukhārī may not have been famous, but he was prolific. The scholar of calligraphic and codicological materials Hamidreza Ghelichkhani explicitly names Ādīna-yi Bukhārī among the most productive of the *Shāhnāma* copyists with his four transcriptions of the work. Questioning why other great scribal masters with more clout than Ādīna did not copy the *Shāhnāma*, Ghelichkhani suggests: "famous calligraphers preferred [titles] which needed less time to be finished in order to create more works at the same time."[656]

III.ii. Illustrative programs to the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* manuscripts

Whereas a small number of copyists completed the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* manuscripts, the great artistic variety present in their illustrative schemes indicates that many different artists contributed to the overall project.[657] Rührdanz suggests that all of the contributors probably did not physically interact in a single kitābkhāna setting. More likely, the illustrations "reflect a meeting on the level of models" referring to painters with limited experience and/or reliant upon available designs to reproduce various scenes or recombine figures in the compositions.[658] While I cannot cover the full stylistic diversity in all the illustrations in this study, I will focus on examples that reflect past visual formulae from Khurasan and Bukhara.

III.ii.a. Elements from late-16th century Khurasan

The Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* copies contain figures and forms associated with the Herat and Mashhad branches of production in Khurasan. One such volume written out by Ādīna-yi Bukhārī (AIIT Pers 2.01 BD) exemplifies artistic transfer from Khurasan to Samarqand within this manuscript group.[659] Rührdanz's brief entry on this AIIT manuscript remarks on its "27 illustrations by an inexperienced hand …[showing] some impact of late 16th-century Qazvin and Herat work."[660] However, we can refine her description by making nuanced comparisons.

Stylistically, the AIIT *Shāhnāma* appears closer to illustrations made in Mashhad that are identifiable by colorfully-garbed individuals with slender necks. The previous chapter explained how in

---

656 Ghelichkhani, *The scribes of Shahnameh*, introduction (unpaginated).

657 Rührdanz, "Samarqand Shahnamas in the Context of Dynastic Change," 224.

658 Ibid., 225.

659 Preliminary research on it has been done by Maria Szuppe, "A preliminary account of the Persian Manuscripts in the collection of the late Sir Harold Bailey," *Iran* 35 (1997): 118-19.

660 Rührdanz, "Samarqand Shahnamas in the Context of Dynastic Change," 218. The comparative example she gives is a loose album folio (BL IOL J.26.6) that has been misattributed to Bukhara at the end of the sixteenth century, instead interpreted as containing elements from Herat (evident in the autumnal *chinār* tree with magpies perched in the branches and rock renderings). The IOL composition and figures appear to be contemporary to paintings in a *Būstān* of Saʿdī (CBL Pers. 297, f.22a) from a later 1616 Tūqāy-Tīmūrid workshop.

the late sixteenth century, this style geographically and chronologically crossed both the Oxus and half a century, as Safavid and Abū'l-Khairid spheres converged in the intermediary realm of Khurasan. Thus, the AIIT *Shāhnāma*'s illustrations attributed to the early Tūqāy-Tīmūrid period did not evolve directly from Mashhad, but via artists in Khurasan, or their models from circa 1580 to 1600. The bound work of excerpts from the *Būstān* of Saʿdī in the Soudavar collection (AHT no. 66, fig. 97) examined in Chapter 4 shares some visual elements with the Tajikistan Turkic-language *Shāhnāma*, as well as the AIIT *Shāhnāma*. The AIIT *Shāhnāma* illustration with Rūdāba atop a pink tower handing her hair to Zāl so that he may climb up it (fig. 108) appears as a feminized version of an outdoor gathering in the earlier "late-Mashhad" volume of the Soudavar *Būstān* (fig. 109). Note the crouching attendants dressed in red holding candles in the AIIT manuscript, and in the *Būstān* there is a long-necked wine decanter; in both manuscripts, we also observe a seated figure with knees splayed open. The fuzzy gray cap and *ghabghab*—double chin—on Zāl in the *Shāhnāma* also appear on the servant proffering a white vessel in the *Būstān* folio.

The Khivan *Shāhnāma* illustrated by Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī serves as visual proof of the artist's training in Khurasan in the 1580s and 1590s that underpins his enigmatic personal style.[661] Muḥammad Murād completed all 115 illustrations, sometimes rendered two on a page, with images that face each other in a series of continual painted narratives. In five of these, he signs his name with and without the Samarqandī nisba. Due to the manuscript's colophon giving the date and location of its textual component as Khiva, 1556 (covered in Chapter 3 §II.iii.a), many initially concluded he illustrated it at that time, but subsequent scholarship confirms that he added the manuscript's extensive visual elements half a century later.[662] As was mentioned, the manuscript contains two fully illuminated, double-page frontispieces based on Herati traditions (ff.1r-2v, 8r-9v). I previously claimed one of these illuminations (fig. 58) was added once the manuscript arrived in ʿAbdullāh Khan's courtly Bukharan kitābkhāna in the late-1550s. Through comparison to the coarser frontispiece adorning the AIIT copy (fig. 110), it becomes obvious that they are not of the same workshop or time period.

---

[661] E.M. Ismailova and Sh. M. Musaev pinpoint visual elements from Khurasan in "Miniatiury Mukhammeda Murada Samarkandi k Khivinskomu spisku "Shakh-name" (k voprosu o novatorstve khudozhestvennogo stilia)," *O'zbekistonda Ijtimoiy Fanlar* vol. 12 (1983): 42. Rührdanz also notes elements from Khurasan in Muḥammad Murād's practice and suggests he even trained in one of the workshops there ("Die Entwicklung der mittelasiatischen Buchmalerei," 118).

[662] Descriptions of the illustrations are in Madraimov, et al., *Oriental Miniatures*, 141–60. For in-depth analysis of the corrected visual program, read Ashrafi, "K voprosu o vremeni sozdania miniatiur"; O.I. Galerkina, "Zur Charakteristik der Miniaturenmalerei Mawarannahrs im 16. Jahrhundert," *Ars Turcica: Akten des VI. internationalen Kongresses für türkische Kunst, München vom 3. bis 7. September 1979* (Munich, Editio Maris, 1987): 522-31.

Much occurred during the intervening years between the text's completion and the addition of Muḥammad Murād's illustrations, presumably in Samarqand. While Rührdanz dates the paintings to the first decade of the seventeenth century, Mukaddima Ashrafi argues for their completion between 1604 through 1616.[663] After comparing the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma*s located in London (BL IO 301), Saint Petersburg (NLR PNS 90), and Cambridge (AIIT 2.01), I argue the illustrations date to the beginning of the seventeenth century. The paintings' similarities to Khurasan manuscripts in the late sixteenth century, and contemporary Samarqand *Shāhnāma* copies from the early seventeenth prompt this revision. A nuanced pre-1605 attribution seems fitting and is derived from other visual traces and clues left by the artist.

Previously working in Abū'l-Khairid–administered Khurasan, Muḥammad Murād might have learned the "spare techniques" of the style popularized by the master Muḥammadī in Herat. Comparing painted folios from Muḥammadī's *Shāhnāma* (CBL Pers. 295, figs. 87-88), we see how Muḥammad Murād adopts compositional devices. The lovers Bīzhan and Manīzha seated beneath an enclosed arch in Muḥammad Murād's composition (fig. 112) derive from Muḥammadī's work circa 1580 (fig. 87). Note the standing female figures with swaying bodies glancing over their shoulders on the left in Muḥammadī's composition, and those in Muḥammad Murād's rendition of Tahmīna approaching Rustam's bed chamber (fig. 112). Muḥammad Murād's female spectators witnessing Faraidūn defeating Żaḥḥāk (fig. 113) also appear similar to those distributing wine in the AIIT *Shāhnāma* (fig. 108); I mentioned earlier how they manifest Mashhadi qualities. Muḥammadī and Muḥammad Murād depict women in their *Shāhnāma* copies sporting elegant black aigrettes rising from their headwear, and their warriors wear the same armor: compare Muḥammadī's climbing soldier in a poppy-red tunic with circular breastplate and black boots (fig. 88), and Muḥammad Murād's version in yellow in fig. 114.[664]

With the onset of tumult in Khurasan upon ʿAbdullāh Khan's death in 1598, the Safavid armies under Shah ʿAbbās I retook the province. Abū'l-Khairid control waned and the Tūqāy-Tīmūrids' power waxed, and it is at this time that I posit that Muḥammad Murād ventured from Khurasan back to his

---

[663] Ashrafi, "K voprosu o vremeni sozdania miniatiur," 16.

[664] Rührdanz also indicates his appropriation of forms from Khurasan ("Revival of Central Asian painting in the early 17th century," 390).

presumed hometown.[665] Samarqand was the site of increased production of commercial copies of the *Shāhnāma* to sell to the regional elites of the new dynasty and elsewhere. The Tūqāy-Tīmūrids came into possession of unfinished volumes left in the courtly workshops of Bukhara and took these to their base in Samarqand in a move that politically and culturally undermined Abū'l-Khairid authority. Many artisans subsequently sought to make a living and appeal to potential Tūqāy-Tīmūrid patronage through these various *Shāhnāma* productions in Samarqand between 1600–04.

Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī illustrated the Khivan manuscript in the context I have presented.[666] Perhaps motivated less by money, he might have filled in the blank areas to display his innovative artistic skills to secure employment in the new Tūqāy-Tīmūrid region. He completed the illustrations prior to departing for India, a period which we shall discuss in §V.iii.b.

III.ii.b. Elements from Bukhara

Rührdanz did not deem the illustrations to the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* group to be of the finest caliber, and suggested they were instead derivative versions of visual models originally produced in late-century commercial workshops within Khurasan.[667] This is partly true, but Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* compositional schema also reflect vestiges derived from the highest levels of the courtly Abū'l-Khairid workshops in Bukhara. Several manuscripts of ʿAbdullāh's patronage in the 1560s and others produced for nobles have striking floor patterning and wall paneling with hexagons and six-pointed stars. A courtly Bukharan innovation, this tessellation repeats in four Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* copies: BL IO Islamic 301 (fig. 115); BL Or. 14403 (figs. 116, 121); NLR PNS 90 (figs. 122, 127); and in the loose, lavish *Shāhnāma* folios to be discussed below.

Limited to just one courtly *Shāhnāma* copy from Bukhara as a source of inspiration, some of the Samarqandi manuscripts emulate elements from this volume in ʿAbdullāh Khan's collection that he gifted to Sultan Murad III (TSMK H.1488, the subject of Chapter 3). Although it does not directly copy an illustration in ʿAbdullāh's *Shāhnāma*, the undated Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* in the British Library (ms. Or. 14403) confirms that exchanges of Abū'l-Khairid models from the courtly kitābkhāna in 1560s

---

[665] Foltz cites the Mughal chronicle *Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī* that states the artist was either from Marv or Herat (Foltz, *Mughal India and Central Asia,* 81, ftn. 57). Whether Samarqand, Marv, or Herat, Muḥammad Murād clearly lived in a center under Abū'l-Khairid control as a cognitive adult.

[666] Haider speculates that Khwarazmian ruler Īsh Muḥammad invited the artist to illustrate it in Khiva appears, but does not adequately support her assertion in *Central Asia in the Sixteenth Century*, 354.

[667] Rührdanz, "Samarqand Shahnamas in the Context of Dynastic Change," 225.

Bukhara reached Samarqand in the early 1600s. Rustam rescuing Bīzhan from a strangely-shaped pit resembling a test tube appears in ʿAbdullāh's 1564 rendition (fig. 117) as it does in the British Library manuscript (fig. 118).[668] A perusal of the scene in the *Cambridge Shahnama Project* database only turns up these two distinctive versions of the pit iconography, which intimates their linkage.[669]

Sartorial selection to render characters in the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* manuscripts could also come from designs in H.1488. Soldiers in the AIIT and NLR Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* copies wear helmets with black tufts emerging from pointed tops, akin to those in H.1488 (figs. 61, 65) and the late-century Bukharan *Tīmūr-nāma* copies explored in Chapter 3 §II.iii.b, figs. 46, 71). Warriors in one of the Punjab University Library's Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* manuscripts (PUL O-15/7248, fig. 140) sport a different version with additional pointed feathers emerging above the black puffs.[670] This form of headwear is linked not to H.1488, but to the since-dispersed *Shāhnāma* I attributed to Bukhara, post-1570 (Chapter 3 §II.iii.b, fig. 66). Civilian dress also connects certain manuscripts. Rustam as a youth smiting the white elephant wears a similar tunic tucked into his belt as he bludgeons the animal in both H.1488 (f.73r) and PUL O-16/7249. In this same PUL manuscript, Rustam hoists Afrāsiyāb by the belt as do other characters in H.1488 (ff.90r and 69v). I must concede that the mentioned scenes are popular in *Shāhnāma* iconography and so these comparisons to H.1488 may seem superficial. However, a full composition lifted from H.1488 and recopied in the AIIT Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* best points to the circulation of visual material from ʿAbdullāh's *Shāhnāma* after it had left Transoxiana.

The illustration of Siyāmak being attacked by the div Khazarvān in the AIIT *Shāhnāma* (fig. 119) is directly taken from the same scene in ʿAbdullāh Khan's courtly volume (fig. 120). In both settings, swathes of color appear layered over one another. A strip of green grass demarcates the foreground, above it pink hills take up the middle ground topped by golden hills in the background, while the uppermost section features a strip of blue sky. The placement of the main characters mirror each other in the two copies. The frantic horse in the center of the compositions has exactly the same hoof positioning and contorted body in both versions; so too, does the large central div who claws the clambering Siyāmak below. We observe both princes' pointed, turned-out boots and outstretched arms

---

[668] The iconography in the folio from H.1488 is appropriated from versions of Yūsuf freed from the well found in contemporaneous copies of Jāmī's *Yūsuf u Zulaikhā.* Compare MMA 67.266.7.8v; NYPL Spencer Pers. 64; CWH 1872; DC 53.1980; BL Or. 4389; AHT no. 80.

[669] Accessed 14 May 2020.

[670] Both plumed helmet types are found in later Tūqāy-Tīmūrid manuscripts, such as a Niẓāmī *Khamsa* (NLR PNS 66) dated 1648, and a Firdausian *Shāhnāma* from 1664 (ARB 3463).

braced on the grass in both copies. Two divs and one horseman gather on opposite sides in the AIIT *Shāhnāma*, whereas ʿAbdullāh's copy has five figures in each group on either side of its composition.

This shared illustration provides insight into the ways visual material transited from Abū'l-Khairid Bukhara to the new Samarqand workshops once regional administration shifted to Tūqāy-Tīmūrid.[671] Given that the Abū'l-Khairid *Shāhnāma* manuscript was presented to the Ottomans in January 1594 and therefore must have left Bukhara by the middle of 1593, it can be assumed that there existed sketches and studies of its individual compositions which continued to circulate amongst artists and workshops in the Uzbek sphere spanning both Bukhara and Samarqand. Although the actual materials have not physically survived, these drawings and models for courtly productions were retained and factored into commercial productions decades later.

The Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* copies directly borrow from other Bukharan manuscripts produced across the last quarter of the sixteenth century, following ʿAbdullāh's disinterest in manuscripts. They evince how figural and compositional elements, and painters themselves traveled the short distance from Bukhara to Samarqand following the Abū'l-Khairid dissolution. Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* copies BL IO Islamic 301, NLR PNS 90, and BL Or. 14403 contain figures and forms associated with the declining Bukharan workshops. Shāpūr enthroned in BL Or. 14403 (fig. 121) with pink floor patterning and attendants sitting beneath an enthroned monarch appears plucked from a late-century Abū'l-Khairid Bukharan frontispiece. NLR PNS 90 and BL IO Islamic 301 manuscripts have double-page illustrations with courtly scenes that are related to the *Tīmūr-nāma* frontispieces examined in Chapter 3 (figs. 72-73). The NLR copy (fig. 122) features a proper opening frontispiece, but the BL version (fig. 121) places it in a common mid-manuscript break showing Kai Khusrau handing over kingship to Luhrāsp.

III.ii.c. Connections to later materials in different media in Samarqand

Above, I have pointed out the reverberations of past Abū'l-Khairid visual formulae in the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* group. The manuscripts in turn contain figures and compositions that would factor into pictorial cycles of later materials in Samarqand. Lest we think the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* versions only derive or echo forms and styles produced before them, this group also possesses generative qualities later emulated elsewhere.

---

[671] This story of Siyāmak appears to have held significance to the Abū'l-Khairids. Pouya reports that the *Tārīkh-i Abū'l-Khair Khānī* extensively narrates the story from Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* in "Intertextual analysis of the History of Abū'l-Khair," 622.

As a sole example of a motif crossing media, the AIIT *Shāhnāma* contains a small detail that appears on tile-work in Samarqand. In the illustration of Jamshīd enthroned and held aloft by divs (fig. 123), an anthropomorphic sun (not unlike the *khānum khurshīd* design in present-day Iran) peers over the horizon similar to the mosaic faces smiling above the backs of tigers in the Shīrdār Madrasa on the Rīgistān plaza (fig. 124). The ovular heads have slanted eyes, arched eyebrows, wide noses, small dimpled mouths, and symmetric tendrils of hair on the sides of their faces. The tiled version has *khāl* (beauty marks) on the cheeks, whereas the AIIT counterpart on paper has a forehead marking. Ruling on behalf of Imām Qulī, the governor of Samarqand Yalangtūsh Bahādur Alchīn (1578–1656) built the architectural monument between 1619–36, and the mosaics with powerful heraldic symbolism link to him.[672] Any connection between Yalangtūsh and possible ownership of the AIIT *Shāhnāma* is purely speculative, as Yalangtūsh would have been young in 1604 when the AIIT *Shāhnāma* was created. But as both a military commander and religious elite of the Dihbīdī clan of the Naqshbandi order (as well as one of the wealthiest men in Transoxiana at the time), Yalangtūsh would be an ideal owner of such manuscript copies.[673] The books continued to circulate after their completion, and illustrated details could have impacted both their original readers and different art mediums in Samarqand.

IV. An additional Firdausian *Shāhnāma* manuscript from Samarqand: Cherniaev's *Shāhnāma* ca. 1605–10 (ARB 872)

To the existing studies on the early seventeenth-century Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* group by Rührdanz and Szuppe, I here add an unpublished *Shāhnāma* manuscript located in Tashkent (ARB 872).[674] It bears a Russian inscription in pencil on the opening page (f.1v) that states it was gifted to General Mikhail Grigorievich Cherniaev (1828–98) in Tashkent in 1865. Having fist stormed Shymkent in September 1864, during the reign of Tsar Alexander II and together with Konstantin von

---

[672] Yalangtūsh Bī Alchīn's biography is provided in McChesney, "Islamic culture and the Chinggisid restoration," 259-60; Foltz, *Mughal India and Central Asia,* 59, ftn. 47. His name, meaning "bare-chested," was an honorific given to him on account of his heroism in battle. The symbolism of the Shīrdār madrasa's decoration scheme, with its lion and sun symbol also in Tīmūr's coat of arms, is in Brentjes, "Islamic Art and Architecture in Central Asia," 56; Sulhiniso Rahmatullaeva, "Samarqand's Rigestān and its Architectural Meanings," *Journal of Persianate Studies* 3 (2010): 180; Samie, "The Shibanid Question," 154-59.

[673] Jasmin Badr and Mustafa Tupev mention Yalangtūsh's wealth in "The Khoja Zainuddin Mosque in Bukhara," *Muqarnas* 29 (2012): 238. Yalangtūsh's Sufi background is in McChesney, "The Chinggisid restoration in Central Asia: 1500-1785," 290.

[674] A ninth copy might have existed based on two dispersed folios: one in the Netherlands (NMVW RV-2103-4) depicting Qubād slain by Bārmān, and the other with Tūr slain by Manūchihr formerly in the Keir Collection (DMA K.1.2014.751). Robinson attributes the latter to Bukhara, early 17th century, and its visuals are connected to the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* copies depicting a battle between Iranians and Turanians in St. Petersburg (NLR PNS 90, f. 296v), and London (BL IO Islamic 301, 169b). Note the rearing horses with sinuous necks on the right sides of the compositions.

Kaufman and Mikhail Skobelev, Cherniaev led the Russian conquest of Central Asia and took Tashkent the same year the book was presented to him. The tsar later appointed Cherniaev the Governor General of Turkestan between 1882–84. His *Shāhnāma* is a complete Persian text and has a final section covering the reign of the last Sasanian king Yazdigird, implying it contains Firdausī's historical section and is not truncated. Multiple blank spaces were reserved for illustrations that were never carried out. It is not a lavish copy, and has but one incomplete illustration (fig. 125) located halfway through the text, and no descriptive information in the colophon placed at the end of the first section. With similar dimensions (24x36 cm) and rulings (4 by 25) as the other Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* copies, it could have been written out between 1600–05 alongside them and was among the last to have had an illustration added in Transoxiana.[675] Or, if postdating 1605, it could have been drafted in Bukhara when the site became a center of manuscript production under Valī Muḥammad after a brief period of production in Samarqand.[676] The artist responsible for the Cherniaev illustration, whom I tentatively attribute to the artist Muḥammad Sharīf (to be further discussed in §V.iii.a), appears to have created more paintings later in Bukhara. These were produced after 1612 and were perhaps intended for Valī Muḥammad's successor Imām Qulī Khan, whose long reign (1612–42) provided political stability in Transoxiana not seen since the reign of ʿAbdullāh Khan.

Cherniaev's *Shāhnāma* is at once linked to the earlier Samarqandi specimens, and also to a later lavish *Shāhnāma* created in circa 1610–15 with three illustrations to it since dispersed across various museum collections: LACMA's "Żaḥḥāk enthroned with the two daughters of Jamshid" (fig. 128), the Fitzwilliam Museum's "Ruler seated in a pavilion surrounded by courtiers and attendants, one of whom is leading in a Christian priest" (Fig. 129), and the British Museum's painting "The execution of Afrāsiyāb in front of Garsīvāz" (fig. 130).[677] In crafting a trajectory of early Tūqāy-Tīmūrid manuscript painting utilizing existing Abū'l-Khairid talent, I approach the Cherniaev *Shāhnāma*'s single illustration at a temporal and geographical nexus. Stylistically located between Transoxiana and India,

---

[675] One wonders if these measurements and rulings were not a standardized format since a majority of *Shāhnāma* mss. from several locations and time periods have these characteristics as well.

[676] The other manuscripts that can be attributed to this same workshop in Bukhara are: *Majālis al-ʿushshāq* (ARB 3476 ca. 1606), *Mihr u mushtarī* (KBOPL 148 ca. 1609), *Būstān* (MMA 13.228.23 ca. 1610), *Yūsuf u Zulaikhā* of Durbek (ARB 1433 ca. 1615), *Būstān* (CBP Pers. 297 ca. 1616).

[677] I group these three pages and interpret them as being from a singular copy. Rührdanz instead speculates the three folios are evidence of two high-quality *Shāhnāma* manuscripts for (or during the reign of) Valī Muḥammad. She groups the FMC and BM folios together, stating they are "obviously from the same manuscript" ("Samarqand Shahnamas in the Context of Dynastic Change," 226, ftn. 37). I include the stylistically-dissimilar LACMA folio due to a contemporaneous *Būstān* attributed to Bukhara, 1616 (CBP Pers. 297) also having illustrations in similar styles assembled together in one work.

it stands chronologically between the early Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* copies from 1600–05 and the three dispersed pages of the lavish Bukharan *Shāhnāma* probably produced in circa 1610–15.

I cannot confirm that Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī contributed to the Cherniaev and lavish *Shāhnāma* visual materials. However, based on stylistic analysis and comparanda to other works on paper, I argue that he and his colleagues (all with the name Muḥammad) played important roles in Tūqāy-Tīmūrid manuscript production. After closely analyzing the Cherniaev illustration and its connections to earlier materials, I relate it to the three detached folios of the dispersed courtly *Shāhnāma* to embark upon a discussion encompassing artistic exchanges between Transoxiana and India that I cover in more depth in the final sections V and VI.

IV.i. Connections to the earlier Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* group (pre–1605)

Elements in the Cherniaev *Shāhnāma*'s single unfinished illustration appear in the Samarqandi copies. Its image comes at the end of the first section and depicts Luhrāsp enthroned on a single full page lacking text. In the upper section, the outline of a dome extends into the margin. Beneath it is a pavilion with an unfinished multi-lobed *īvān* opening. Ladies look out of small windows from the levels of a two-tiered structure on the left. On the right side, an attendant in a yellow robe with chocolate-brown outer tunic stands beneath a leafless tree, and a sketched goose flaps its wings overhead. The large central ruler rendered in a very Mughal profile (to be investigated below) is seated under a lobed arch. His upward handlebar mustache may have been added later along with the other scribbles that mar the manuscript's pages. He wears a tight-fitting turban in the Indian style and holds a white *piyāla* (unstemmed cup), now faded. In front of him there are preparations for a feast: a *shashlīk* griller wearing a rubbed pea-green robe prepares a duck roasting on a skewer; an *āshpaz* (cook) wields a spoon and gestures towards two men who dance holding ewers of a libation that is the presumable source of their merriment. Young boys horse around in the bottom right corner beside an oversize potted plant with ribbing around the neck and halfway down the vessel's belly. From it emerges large five-petaled flowers.

We can compare details here to other Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* illustrations: the most obvious parallels are to one of the Punjab copies also depicting Luhrāsp enthroned (PUL O-16/7249, fig. 126), which features figures similar to the same scene in BL IO Islamic 301. The PUL illustration carries additional features in its lower section that are closer to the Cherniaev image, with cooks, a portly man with a staff, and men carrying a cauldron. In an illustration to another scene depicting Garshāsp

seeking to wed the daughter of the Qaisar in Rum in NLR PNS 90 (fig. 127), women wearing outer garments opened to their navel peer down at the courtly spectacle. The same multi-lobed *īvān* composition dominates the opening in the center that remains unfinished in the Cherniaev drawing. Comparing both these sets of voyeurs to those in BL 301 who oversee the coronation of Luhrāsp (fig. 115), we get the impression that an older painter perpetuating Abū'l-Khairid formulae illustrated BL 301 earlier, or its visual elements came from late sixteenth-century Khurasan.

The figures in the PNS 90 and Cherniaev copies reflect emerging sartorial changes in Transoxiana as a result of increasing contacts with India. These changes in female fashion are most overt in the loose LACMA folio featuring Żaḥḥāk with his concubines (fig. 128). Likely derived from a lavish *Shāhnāma* since dispersed for which two other paintings were produced (figs. 129-130), the Cherniaev illustration could have been the model for the more refined LACMA work. A single artist (could it be Muḥammad Sharīf?) may have carried out both works using the Cherniaev *Shāhnāma* as a template. He may have also relied upon earlier compositional formulae from other Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* versions.[678] I already noted this common practice for the completion of manuscripts in previous chapters, and explained how the unfinished Tajikistan *Shāhnāma* illustrations appear to have been added as visual studies in advance of a more formal, intricate version intended for the court. Whoever was responsible for the Cherniaev and LACMA works, they seem intimately familiar with artistic currents in India, or had perhaps even visited there themselves.

IV.ii. Connections to later Bukharan *Shāhnāma* materials (ca. 1610–15) and increasing contacts with India

Tracking plunging necklines in the tailoring of women's robes and fashions current in India points to geographical linkages in arts of the book in Transoxiana during the first quarter of the seventeenth century. Earlier, when women appear in Bukharan manuscripts during the first half of the sixteenth century, they wear conservative high-necked robes (figs. 19, 28, 45). Later, circa 1580 in Khurasan, women in Muḥammadī's *Shāhnāma* wear garments with longer frontal slits down their chests (fig. 87). The underclothing showing through is a thin line beneath their necks. By the time the AIIT and Muḥammad Murād's *Shāhnāma* illustrations were painted around 1600, the cut in the fabric now extends to the abdomen with differently-colored material showing through. In a page within BL Or. 14403, could that be a naked bellybutton spied between the fastenings of the woman in red and

[678] This is visible in the pointed palmettes around the edges of Żaḥḥāk's throne that are sketched upside-down beneath Luhrāsp in the Cherniaev illustration.

green hastily dressing in the corner to gawk at the spectacle outside (fig. 131)? Are those flesh-tones painted between the narrow robe openings donned by women assembled outside Rūdāba's tower in the AIIT illustration (fig. 108)? The female figures in all these depictions appear modestly flat-chested, but such conservative morals dissipate around 1605, which coincides with my attribution for the Cherniaev illustration. The painter of a woman wearing fuchsia and red robes in the upper left rectangle is depicted with delineated underbreasts, while the LACMA folio detached from the lavish *Shāhnāma* (fig. 128) features more volume in its depiction of the female form.

In a move towards greater eroticism, the perky breasts on Żaḥḥāk's yellow-clad consort in the LACMA folio truly "point" to the migration of artists and manuscripts between Transoxiana and India. Bare chests on women feature in manuscript painting in Transoxiana by the mid-1600s, evident in a *Khamsa* of Niẓāmī with illustrations added in the 1650s (NLR PNS 66).[679] Stylized, hemispherical breasts prominently feature in several Mughal female depictions, such as women in a courtyard recoiling at Faraidūn assaulting Żaḥḥāk from Jahāngīr's personal *Shāhnāma* copy made in 1610 (fig. 132).[680] A *Shāhnāma* containing figures wearing Humāyūn's distinctive style of headdress contains multiple women naturalistically portrayed; in it, white-haired Zāl fondles Rūdāba in their court (fig. 133).[681] Outside the Mughal realm, shapely women also fill the composition of a folio attributed to Bijapur in the Deccan ca. 1600–10 (fig. 134). Two men in this same illustration wear black Europeanized headwear, one seated in the foreground and another small figure in the background.

As a hallmark of painted arts from the Indian subcontinent in this period, this hat features in a contemporary folio from Transoxiana in the Fitzwilliam Museum that is detached from the dispersed lavish *Shāhnāma* (fig. 129). Once part of a manuscript, a compiler later mounted it in an album now held in the Fitzwilliam Museum. Catholic iconography observed in Mughal albums and manuscript paintings from the period resulted from well-attested exchanges made by visiting Jesuit priests and Portuguese emissaries to Akbar's court.[682] These black hats are in a few illustrations within the *Akbar-nāma* produced in 1604 (BL Or. 12988). In one, a sea scene depicts the Portuguese governor of the

---

[679] Reproduced in Vasilyeva and Yastrebova, *Arts of the Book in the 15th-17th-Century Mawarannahr*, figs. 9.30, 9.40.

[680] LACMA M.78.9.5. We can see similar features in a scene of two women dancing from a Mughal *Ẓafarnāma* of Yazdī for an unnamed patron (BL Or. 1052, f.50v).

[681] BKBM ms. no. unknown.

[682] Ebba Koch, "The Influence of the Jesuit Missions," in *Mughal Art and Imperial Ideology: Collected Essays* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2001), 1-11. Rice has compiled related publications on the reception and adaptation of Catholic art at the Mughal court during the late sixteenth into the early seventeenth centuries authored by Milo Beach and Gauvin Bailey ("The Emperor's Eye and the Painter's Brush," ftn. 246).

Indies, Nuno da Cunha, and his Jesuit soldiers directing a naval operation against the army of Sulṭān Bahādur (fig. 135).[683] The Fitzwilliam *Shāhnāma* folio appears to have been painted following the aforementioned works from the Indian Deccan and Mughal courts. It depicts a ruler seated under a pavilion surrounded by courtiers and attendants, one of whom leads a Christian priest wearing a black hat and voluminous white robes. While it lacks lines of descriptive poetry and the reverse cannot be viewed due to its album mounting, I infer that this Fitzwilliam painting comes from the historical section of Firdausī's final chapters. It depicts a scene taking place during the reign of Khusrau Parvīz in which a Christian emissary of the Roman Qaisar arrives at his court. The conspicuous foreigner in black hat would be a fifth-century Nestorian figure, according to Firdausī's chronology. But in curious contrast to other attendees, the character wears headwear associated with Jesuits in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century India. Therefore the Fitzwilliam painting by an artist presumably working in Bukhara circa 1615 essentializes Christians through distinctly Jesuit attire that demarcates their membership in a non-Muslim faith group.

In their depictions of seated rulers, the lavish LACMA folio of Żaḥḥāk—inferred to be from the same manuscript as the Fitzwilliam folio—as in the Cherniaev illustration depart from *Shāhnāma* iconographic conventions. They incorporate features associated with arts of the book in India, such as, notably, the profile rendering of Luhrāsp in the Cherniaev *Shāhnāma*. In comparison, sixteenth-century Ottoman, Safavid, and Abū'l-Khairid illustrated manuscripts almost exclusively render enthroned monarchs in three-quarter view.[684] Art historians highlight various aesthetic and political reasons for this shift, concluding that Jahāngīr promoted the full profile to visually differentiate himself from his father Akbar.[685] Prior to his accession to the throne in 1605 while still known as Prince Salīm, Jahāngīr appears in profile in a painting from 1601 (fig. 136).[686] In this portrait he wears a robe with ribboned fastenings dangling on his right side; the Cherniaev sketch of Luhrāsp also includes some uncolored

---

[683] Reproduced in Jeremiah P. Losty, *Indian Book Painting* (London: The British Library, 1986), 19, fig. 12.

[684] Jeremiah Losty, "From three-quarter to full profile in Indian painting: revolutions in art and taste," in *Das Bildnis in der Kunst des Orients*, ed. J.M. zur Capellen et al. (Wiesbaden, 1989), 153-60. Ebba Koch has also examined how naturalistic profiles in Mughal manuscript arts signified class distinction and hierarchical divisions between the ruling emperor and lower classes. Rebels were "shown in the freest views and most drastic realism, in what could be described as a three-dimensional degradation" ["Jahāngīr as Publius Scipio Maior: The Commensurability of Mughal Political Portraiture," in *Portraiture in South Asia since the Mughals: Art, Representation and History*, ed. Crispin Branfoot (London: I.B. Tauris, 2018), 77]. Only the portraits of Badr al-Dīn Lūʾlūʾ depicting him centrally facing the viewer come to mind as specimens of royal portraiture rendered head-on.

[685] Advanced by Jeremiah P. Losty, *The Art of the Book in India* (London: The British Library, 1982), 84.

[686] The folio in the "Allahabad Album" (RIOS Album E-14, f.3a) is signed by Manuhar and Manṣūr 1600-01. My gratitude to Mehreen Chida-Razvi for bringing this work to my attention.

fastenings on his left.[687] Both Jahāngīr/Salīm and Luhrāsp wear close-fitting turbans associated with Indian wrapping styles. As in the sixteenth century, the seventeenth century was still an era in which headwear was an important indicator of identity. Tightly-wound turbans and figures of people originating from India feature in manuscripts from Khurasan and Transoxiana from the 1570s onwards. The Cherniaev *Shāhnāma* is unusual, however, in garbing a major ruler in such attire.

Equally surprising, Żaḥḥāk's toes in the LACMA folio distract the viewer accustomed to enthroned *Shāhnāma* rulers in Ottoman, Safavid, and Abū'l-Khairid illustrated manuscripts that never show their bare feet visible. Sovereigns either wear boots or they sit cross-legged with their robes spread taught over their covered laps. In the Prince Salīm/Jahāngīr album portrait however, the monarch-to-be reveals his entire bare foot, as do other royal figures in the *Ḥamza-nāma*, *Akbar-nāma*, and *Bābur-nāma* copies made for Akbar. Żaḥḥāk's two crossed feet also show tight-fitting trousers gathered at the ankle similar to Jahāngīr's. We also observe this same feature in a painting of a seated amir attributed to Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī working in his mature style (post-1615).[688] Other Indian elements—associated with painting in Kashmir and the Deccan, among other locales—in the painting of Żaḥḥāk include the subject's toes and a big bolster placed behind the sitter. We see these same two details in the Princeton Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* dated 1600 (PFL 59G, fig. 137). Rührdanz links some of the illustrations in that volume to an anonymous artist influenced by Indian models of a sub-imperial level. According to her, that painter would go on to illustrate later Tūqāy-Tīmūrid manuscripts, such as the *Ẓafarnāma* of 1628 to be discussed in the final section (VI.iii).[689]

Both the barefooted Żaḥḥāk in the LACMA folio and square-jawed Luhrāsp sketched in "Mughal" profile within the Cherniaev illustration must be by an artist familiar with Jahāngīr's artistic preferences. These features indicate that imported paintings and manuscripts from India served as models that inspired artists working in the Tūqāy-Tīmūrid sphere. That, or those individuals traveled to

---

[687] My gratitude to Jake Benson for pointing out this Mughal sartorial marker, and the Deccani custom to wear fastenings tied on both sides.

[688] Although misattributing it to Shaikh Muḥammad, 1564, Stuart C. Welch, Sheila R. Canby, and Nora Titley reproduce the painting and comment that the "turban exudes the energy of a Neapolitan wedding cake. The organic wriggle of the sleeves is almost intestinal" (*Wonders of the Age: Masterpieces of Early Safavid, 1501-1576* (London: Fogg Art Museum, 1979), 205.

[689] Rührdanz examines and dates the illustrations to PFL 59G (purchased in August 1907 for £30 in Istanbul) to the second or third decade of the 17th century in "Revival of Central Asian painting in the early 17th century," 398-400; idem, "The Arts of The Book in Central Asia." Its figures with pursed red lips and black boots with pointed heels and toes carrying illuminated designs on them are also in the album NLR Dorn 489, f.21. It is attributed to Muḥammad Nādir Samarqandī working in Kashmir, 1650. Reproduced in Vasilyeva and Yastrebova, *Arts of the Book in the 15th-17th-Century Mawarannahr*, 80.

the subcontinent, gained experience in workshops there, then returned to Bukhara and Samarqand fueled by their encounters, to be treated in the upcoming §V.iii.

V. The appeal of India

As previously noted in Chapter 4, Abū'l-Khairid artisans left Transoxiana during periods of political tension. Recall the civil unrest across the appanages when ʿAbdullāh arrived in Bukhara in 1557 with the intention to rule it, and the domestic disarray between 1569–79 while ʿAbdullāh secured control of Samarqand. In the 1570s, Khurasan offered secure employment to artisans facing dwindling prospects in Bukhara. Manuscripts produced there during the last quarter of the sixteenth century contain figures wearing Indian clothing. Robinson suggests artists added these to appeal to the manuscripts' intended Indian customers.[690] He contends that Khurasani artists did not copy Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* in earnest due to the non-royal Indian markets that they targeted lacking interest in such imports. Until around 1600, Khurasani manuscripts naively rendered Indian fashions, as few artists seem to have actually directly visited the region prior to this time or directly interacted with individuals originating from this region. This changed at the end of the Abū'l-Khairid period and the onset of the early Tūqāy-Tīmūrid dynasty.

V.i. Manuscripts used in courtly exchanges between Transoxiana and India

While late sixteenth-century Khurasani manuscripts attest to book commerce between Transoxiana and India, courts in the two spheres also exchanged them as gifts. See App. 6b for Abū'l-Khairid manuscripts presumed to have been gifted to the Mughals; nos. 1-12 could have been destined for Akbar himself. John Seyller examined and traced the trajectory of numerous Transoxianan manuscripts as attested by ownership seals and notations by Mughal administrators, and sometimes the rulers themselves.[691] Most of the volumes conspicuously display undated overpainted imagery and full illustrations added in the Mughal kitābkhāna. Like the works gifted to the Safavids after the death of ʿAbdullāh Khan in 1598, most of the manuscripts that were produced for ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz were later acquired by Jahāngīr (r. 1605–27) then inherited by his son and successor Shāh Jahān (1628–58).

A few of the manuscripts produced in Transoxiana but deposited into Mughal libraries bear inscriptions containing information about their transfer. Political events and territorial skirmishes also

---

[690] Robinson, "Muḥammadī and the Khurasan Style," 27.

[691] Seyller, "The Inspection and Valuation of Manuscripts in the Imperial Mughal Library."

assist in determining when the manuscripts transited. Due to unsettled Uzbek-Mughal frontier zones and border skirmishes in the 1560s, it seems unlikely that manuscripts would have been exchanged during this decade. Several embassies circulated between the courts of ʿAbdullāh Khan and Akbar beginning in 1572 through 1596 that facilitated the objects' transfer.[692] Not always successful, these were gifted to solicit friendship and thereby preempt the threat of a Mughal invasion.

Even in the midst of their own armies battling one another, ambassadors from Bukhara and Agra passed through and within each other's domains. Although often unlisted in court registers, manuscripts surely count among the items brought by these diplomats. By 1573, ʿAbdullāh retook Balkh from its Mughal occupiers, and he then sent a delegation in 1577 before prying Badakhshan and Kulab from Mughal control in 1584.[693] In 1585, ʿAbdullāh sent an embassy to Akbar's court with his own court poet (*malik al-shuʿarāʾ*) ʿAbduraḥmān Mushfiqī (1538–88) to recite laudatory *qaṣīda*s to the Mughal emperor.[694] A particular embassy of ʿAbdullāh's headed by the ambassador Mīr Quraish arrived at Akbar's court wishing to secure a joint campaign in Khurasan against the Safavids in summer 1586.[695] Akbar reciprocated with a delegation that arrived in Bukhara in 1587. The two powers then upheld an official alliance between 1588–90 when Safavid armies attempted to infiltrate their domains.[696] By 1593, despite mutual skepticism, good relations further eased movements across the two states' Hindu Kush border.[697]

Barbara Brend speculates the *Nuṣratnāma* (examined in Chapter 2) came into the Mughal library prompting Akbar's workshops to imitate it in crafting the *Bāburnāma* of 1590.[698] A copy of the

---

[692] Exchanges of envoys between Bukhara and Agra took place in 1577, 1578, and 1586, among others. Mansura Haider explores some of these in "Relations of ʿAbdullāh Khan Uzbeg with Akbar," *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique* 23, nos. 3-4 (Juillet-Décembre 1982): 313-31; She reports ʿAbdullāh's first embassy to the court of Akbar arrived in 1572. The primary account of this exchange is in Ḥāfiẓ Tanīsh's *ʿAbdullāh-nāma/ Sharafnāma shāhī*, covered in McChesney, "Historiography in Central Asia since the 16th Century," 513-14. Manuscript diplomacy is briefly covered in Adamova and Bayani, *Persian Painting: the Arts of the Book and Portraiture*, 435-36.

[693] Haider, "Relations of ʿAbdullāh Khan Uzbeg with Akbar," 317.

[694] Mushfiqī had already gone to India prior to this mission. Details on the poet are in Jan Rypka, *History of Iranian Literature* (Netherlands: Springer, 1968), 503; and A.A. Semenov, "K voprosu o kul'turno-politicheskikh sviaziakh Astarkhanidov Bukhary (XVII v.) s'Velikimi Mogolami' Indii," in *Izobrannye sochnineniia pod obshchei redaktsiei akademika R. Masova* (Dushanbe, 2013), 198.

[695] Mīr Quraish's mission in India is recounted in McChesney, "The Conquest of Herat," 82, ftn. 40.

[696] Haider, "Relations of ʿAbdullāh Khan Uzbeg with Akbar," 324-25.

[697] Historical information on diplomatic visits between Transoxiana and India is in Losty, *Art of the Book in India*, 86, ftn. 55; Burton, "Relations between the Khanate of Bukhara and Ottoman Turkey," 77; McChesney, "Historiography in Central Asia since the 16th Century," 521-22. Mughal and Abū'l-Khairid ambassadorial exchanges around 1585 are also mentioned by B. Spuler, "Central Asia from the Sixteen Century to the Russian Conquests," in *The Cambridge History of Islam* vol. 1A, eds. P.M. Holt, Ann K.S. Lambton, Bernard Lewis (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 471; and McChesney, "The Conquest of Herat," 82.

[698] Brend, "Sixteenth-Century Manuscript from Transoxiana," 114.

Jāmiʿ al-tawārīkh (RRK P.1820) with a few illustrations that are similar to the *Nuṣratnāma*'s (but perhaps later emulations by Mughal artists) may have also been gifted at this time.[699] Borrowing certain compositions, Brend notes equivalent depictions of assaults on fortresses with troops storming drawbridges in the *Nuṣratnāma* as in the *Bāburnāma*.[700] We know that ʿAbdullāh offered manuscripts from his collection— those of his own patronage and objects he inherited from preceding Abū'l-Khairid appanage leaders—to other heads of state in the form of pīshkash. He might have given the *Nuṣratnāma* to Akbar in the 1580s. Bestowing this particular title, a Jūchid dynastic chronicle, would proclaim their shared Chinggisid origins and function to solidify goodwill between them. However, the move could have also carried a backhanded assertion of Abū'l-Khairid superiority, since the text and illustration scheme included the defeat of Akbar's ancestor Bābur and the fall of Chaghataid power in Transoxiana. Either way, perhaps Mughal artists in the taṣvīrkhāna drew inspiration from the Abū'l-Khairid dynastic chronicle as well as original Timurid manuscripts to visualize comparable siege and enthronement scenes in the newly translated Mughal chronicles of Bābur's life. The Mughals particularly valued Abū'l-Khairid artisans from Bukhara and Khurasan, along with these practitioners' compositional models and ruler-*nāma* manuscripts. Based on manuscripts produced for him, Akbar appears to have desired his own dynasty's written and illustrated works to feature similar visual and textual content as the *Nuṣratnāma*. Whether the *Nuṣratnāma* manuscript was directly consulted cannot be proven. However, it is feasible that some artisans and materials from Transoxiana helped to fashion Mughal illustrated histories alongside staff and objects already operating in the courtly Mughal taṣvīrkhāna.

V.ii. Artisans traveling between Transoxiana and India during ʿAbdullāh's lifetime

Beside illustrated works, individuals also circulated back and forth.[701] A special quarter in Bukhara housed a large colony of non-Muslim, Hindu merchants who had resided there and in other parts of the region since the 1550s, if not earlier.[702] Along with Muslim Multani merchants from

---

[699] Rice, "Mughal Interventions."

[700] Ibid., 112-13.

[701] Titley suggests manuscripts with origins in Transoxiana, rather than artists, "found their way to Mandu in central India," and also says artists from Bukhara took manuscripts with them to India in the mid sixteenth century (*Persian Miniature Painting and its Influence on the Arts of Turkey and India*, 76).

[702] Semenov, "K voprosu o kul'turno-politicheskikh sviaziakh," 199. Economic exchanges (significantly the horse trade) between Central Asia and India are covered in Alam, "Trade, State Policy and Regional Change," 209.

today's northern Pakistan, they boosted Samarqand's economy during this period.[703] According to Mansura Haidar, "large-scale migrations [of Abū'l-Khairid subjects] to other places are recorded in the sources, which indicate a state of internal instability. Skilled artisans and workers migrated to India and other regions. It was no wonder then that Abdullah complained of the acute lack of efficient people, like Qul Baba, in his empire."[704] Since ʿAbdullāh ruled Khurasan at the height of these migrations from the eastern flank of the Turco-Persianate world to the southeastern, he seemingly grumbles about the exodus of talent to India, a particularly attractive and lucrative site for artists in the final two decades of the sixteenth century.

Although he refers to military and political elites serving in Abū'l-Khairid administration relocating to India, Foltz's reasons why these individuals sought Mughal service applies to artisans as well. They did so to not only escape local unrest, but they were also attracted by the lure of India's proverbial riches and the Mughals' reputation for generosity. Despite being a greater distance away than Khurasan, regular caravans plied seven different routes through the Hindu Kush to India, and these artisans and their creations could easily journey from Bukhara, Samarqand, and Balkh to Agra or Delhi.[705] The third kitābdār of the Bukharan workshop since 1568, Mīr Ḥusain Ḥusainī Kulangī (encountered in Chapter 3) left for India with or without ʿAbdullāh Khan's agreement to do so. Kulangī himself worked on Akbar's *Ḥamza-nāma* in the 1570s, a heroic epic about Prophet Muḥammad's uncle.[706] Kulangī did not remain in India, and also copied manuscripts while on his pilgrimage to Mecca. He returned to Bukhara and there completed his last known signed work which is a copy of Jāmī's *Yūsuf u Zulaikhā* dated 1585.[707] Kulangī exemplifies how serving multiple dynastic heads in this period did not result in stigmatization or accusations of disloyalty. We might also consider that ʿAbdullāh Khan may have sent not only painted manuscripts, but also their very manufacturers as well.

---

[703] Muzaffar Alam, "Trade, State Policy and Regional Change: Aspects of Mughal-Uzbek Commercial Relations, c. 1550-1750," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 37, no. 3 (1994): 205, 211. Alam also notes the British emissary Anthony Jenkinson encountered merchants from north India, Multan, and Bengal in Bukhara in 1558.

[704] Haider, *Central Asia in the Sixteenth Century*, 299. Foltz lists specific migrations in 1557 and 1567 that coincide with the civil war in which ʿAbdullāh Khan killed off his rivals to unite the state (*Mughal India and Central Asia,* 73–74). These would be optimal periods for artists to migrate to India.

[705] Foltz cites *Āʾīn-i Akbarī* for this figure (*Mughal India and Central Asia,* 7).

[706] Several scholars have dealt with the provenance to the *Ḥamza-nāma* manuscript: Faridany-Akhavan, "Dating the Hamzanama"; Seyller, "A Dated *Ḥamzanāma* Illustration," 501-05.

[707] KMSM ms. no. unknown. Referenced by Szuppe, "Family and Professional Circle of Two Samarkand Calligraphers," ftn. 60.

V.iii. Artisans traveling between Transoxiana and India in the early Tūqāy-Tīmūrid period

Objects and individuals circulated between Transoxiana and northern India in the Abū'l-Khairid period, and continued to do so in earnest during the Tūqāy-Tīmūrid.[708] Following ʿAbdullāh's death, the Uzbeks threatened the Safavids more than the Mughals. An amenable Uzbek-Mughal relationship developed under the Tūqāy-Tīmūrids which facilitated exchanges between various social groups. Based on the rendering of manuscript illustrations, Burchard Brentjes claims Indian painters worked in Bukhara in the first few years of the 1600s, but we know that Samarqand was the predominant artistic center at the time.[709] He contends these non-native artists contributed to illustrations in a *Majālis al-ʿushshāq* manuscript dated 1606 (ARB 3476, figs. 138-139). Brentjes asserts that these individuals utilized prototypes not found in Mughal workshops, "but in Kashmiri and Deccan styles." Rather than solely identifying these illustrations as works by Indian artists in Uzbek workshops, Uzbek artists could have also traveled to India where they gained experience in and outside of Mughal-controlled territories.[710] These artists could have then introduced subcontinental methods, forms, figures, and fashions to Transoxiana upon their return.

V.iii.a. The Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* group and political and artistic exchanges with India

Whether Central Asian and Khurasani artists played a role in the production of *Shāhnāma* manuscripts in India merits further examination.[711] However, here I emphasize how the manuscripts in the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* group squarely connect to Abū'l-Khairid vestiges, and contain new sources of inspiration from India. For this reason, I will examine how entire manuscripts and select illustrations within the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* group demonstrate these interactions. Much as in the LACMA folio of Żaḥḥāk and the Cherniaev *Shāhnāma* illustration, the *Shāhnāma* of PFL 59G (fig. 137) depicts sartorial and physical forms that reflect a hybrid illustrative program based upon Indian—namely

---

[708] Larisa Dodkhudoeva points to sources asserting "the co-operation of different artistic schools, for example of Bukhara and Delhi" ("Persian Miniature Painting: Collection of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tajikistan," 80).

[709] Brentjes, "Islamic Art and Architecture in Central Asia," 69.

[710] Some scholars assert that Bukhara-trained artists worked in Golconda before 1600. Douglas Barrett mentions a copy of *Shīrīn u Khusrau* by Hātifī dated 1568 written by a scribe named Yūsuf perhaps for Ibrāhīm Quṭb Shāh (KBOPL no. 499) ["Some unpublished Deccan miniatures," *Lalit Kalā* 7 (1960): 10]. However, Laura Weinstein is suspicious of this manuscript's Golconda provenance in "Variations on a Persian Theme: Adaptation and Innovation in Early Manuscripts from Golconda," (PhD diss., Columbia University, 2011), 58-61.

[711] Some *Shāhnāma* manuscripts needing further research could shed light on this matter, among them BL Add. 5600 (commissioned by Jahāngīr to present to a noble, dated 1616); BL Or. 11842; SB Or. f.172; BKBM (shelfmark unknown); SDMA nos. 1990.300, 1990.322, 1990.331, 1990.332, 1990.340, 1990.437. Any attributions to Central Asian artisans in these manuscripts would be premature at this time. For studies on the reception of primarily non-imperial Firdausī *Shāhnāmas* in India see Alka Patel, "The *Shahnama* in India," in *Epic Tales from Ancient India* (San Diego, CA: The San Diego Museum of Art, 2016), 142-53; Laura Weinstein, "Illustration as Localization: A Dispersed Bijapuri Manuscript of the Shahnama," in *Shahnama Studies III*, 347-72; John Seyller, *Workshop and Patron in Mughal India: The Freer Rāmāyana and Other Illustrated Manuscripts of ʿAbd al-Raḥīm* (Switzerland: Artibus Asiae, 1999), 32-33, 263-73.

Kashmiri— models. Those artists may have spent time in India, then replicated any techniques they learned there after returning to Tūqāy-Tīmūrid domains.

Some other manuscripts in the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* group indicate Indian workshops contributed to their manufacture. Two distinct styles of illustrations in PUL O-15/7248 demonstrate this. One mode, demonstrated in fig. 140, depicts battling troops rendered in garments and landscapes in a manner completely foreign to Uzbek workshops. Rustam kneeling in profile before his slain victim suggests a hand fully trained in a non-courtly Indian workshop. Its differing style indicates that this painting and the others stylistically related to it were added sometime after the manuscript left Transoxiana. A Samarqandi artisan could have transported the unfinished manuscript to India and completed it there with new colleagues, or perhaps gave it away unfinished, or sold the incomplete object. Either way, non-visual elements in the manuscript might have appealed to an Indian audience. Mīr Māh b. Mīr ʿArab (fl. 1592–1613), nephew to ʿAbdullāh Khan's kitābdār Kulangī (the workshop overseer who went to India in the 1570s referenced above), copied the volume in 1601.[712] Mughal royals and nobles in India valued objects associated with the lost Timurid heartlands of Transoxiana, and particularly Samarqand. For this reason, it seems unsurprising that PUL 15/7248 would transit to India and be finished there and remain in Punjab.

The illustrations to PUL O-15/7248 in the second style (exemplified by fig. 141) are contemporary to the textual component, and are locally produced in Samarqand. I tentatively attribute these to Muḥammad Sharīf, a colleague of Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī, or one working in a similar style. It appears that both Muḥammads originally worked in Abū'l-Khairid Khurasan based on the formal properties of their work. Muḥammad Sharīf's signed extant materials render visages with wide noses, thick eyebrows, and outlined eyes that resemble figures populating some of the other Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* versions. Although they are unsigned, his figures inhabit some paintings within BL Or. 14403 (figs. 116, 121), the Cherniaev *Shāhnāma*, and the three loose folios from the dispersed lavish copy (figs. 128–130). Muḥammad Murād completed and signed the margins of a double-page album painting for which Muḥammad Sharīf rendered the larger central figures, now divided between Washington DC and Paris (fig. 142).[713] Muḥammad Sharīf's facial types with wide noses and thick

---

[712] Szuppe analyzes such scribal familial networks in "Family and Professional Circle of Two Samarkand Calligraphers."

[713] Now divided between "Seated Princess," NMAA S1986.304; and "Man Reading," LM OA 7109. Muḥammad Murād's marginal figures bear striking similarities to decorative borders in a manuscript completed for Akbar and Jahāngīr, reproduced in J.P. Losty, "The 'Bute Hafiz' and the Development of Border Decoration in the Manuscript Studio of the Mughals," *The Burlington Magazine* 127, no. 993 (Dec. 1985): 855-71.

apostrophe-shaped eyebrows appear in the *Majālis al-ʿushshāq* manuscript from 1606 (figs. 138-139), and a *Ẓafarnāma* copy to be discussed next (BL Add. 22703, figs. 146-149). As noted in Chapter 3 regarding stock figures associated with ʿAbdullāh Muṣavvir from the 1550s and 1560s, I cannot definitively attribute all items with formal similarities to Muḥammad Sharīf. However, he and his colleagues would have worked outside any particular Tūqāy-Tīmūrid royal kitābkhāna between 1600–20 since no documented site exists. These artists could travel between Transoxiana and India and transport manuscripts along with their own skills, and offer both to any workshops that hired them.

Muḥammad Sharīf collaborated with Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī and Muḥammad Darvīsh (more a poet and calligrapher) to produce elaborate paintings during the early reign of Imām Qulī Khan in Bukhara (post-1611), albeit nothing expressly commissioned by this ruler.[714] A portrait painter named Muḥammad Nādir is reported to have accompanied Muḥammad Murād and Muḥammad Sharīf on a trip to India, where these three men worked together.[715] Rührdanz credits Muḥammads Murād and Sharīf with bringing about "a new Central Asian style" personally shaped by their creativity and previous experiences in the commercial workshops of Khurasan.[716] While I hesitate to assign authorship to the unfinished Cherniaev *Shāhnāma* and the three lavish detached folios, their common features and shared forms suggest the work of several artists collaborating at the same time and place, likely Samarqand between the years 1600–15.

V.iii.b. Case study: Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī

In consulting period sources, several scholars assert Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī criss-crossed dynastic and geographic lines demarcating Central from South Asia, while others appear unconvinced that he ever left Transoxiana.[717] Even if he did, whether he worked during ʿAbdullāh Khan's lifetime or afterwards, and at what level—courtly or sub-imperial— remains unanswered. Russian-language scholarship states that ʿAbdullāh Khan himself sent Muḥammad Murād to Akbar, but this claim cannot be verified.[718] Whatever the intentions of his travel, if Muḥammad Murād did not

---

[714] Rührdanz states there are no manuscripts attributed to Imām Qulī's patronage ("Revival of Central Asian painting in the early 17th century," 400-02).

[715] Information on the Muḥammads is in Y. Porter, "le kitâbkhâna de 'Abd al'Aziz Khân (1645-1680) et le mécénat de la peinture à Boukhara," *Cahiers d'Asie centrale* 7 (1999); and Schmitz, "BUKHARA vi. Bukharan School of Miniature Painting."

[716] Rührdanz, "Samarqand Shahnamas in the Context of Dynastic Change," 225; idem, "Arts of the Book in Central Asia," 108.

[717] Robert Skelton voices his skepticism in "Relations between Mughal and Central Asian painting in the seventeenth century," in *Indian Art & Connoisseurship, Essays in Honour of Douglas Barrett,* ed. J. Guy (Chidambaram Ahmedabad, India: Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts in association with Mapin Pub., 1995), 282.

[718] Semenov, "K voprosu o kul'turno-politicheskikh sviaziakh," 197.

leave for India in the 1590s he could have done so early in the 1600s. Various sources place him in courtly and commercial Mughal centers in Kashmir, Lahore, Allahabad, Delhi, and Agra, as well as the Deccan Sultanates of Bijapur and Golconda.[719] According to Galina Pugachenkova and Olimpiada Galerkina, Muḥammad Murād and his colleague Muḥammad Nādir ventured to India and worked in Delhi between 1590 through the mid-seventeenth century; however, we cannot corroborate this long duration.[720] Pugachenkova later revised her analysis to express a degree of skepticism. In her subsequent collaboration with Abdumajid Madraimov, they posited that Muḥammad Murād arrived at Akbar's court—Agra, if post-1599—before the emperor's death in 1605.[721] Foltz cites I.G. Nizamutdinov who "pushes his arrival in India up to the 1620s, thereby leading one to conclude that Muḥammad Murād may have returned to Central Asia in Akbar's time and come again to India during Jahāngīr's."[722] However, Muḥammad Murād's signed materials do not support this trajectory, and visual analysis instead tacitly suggests another chronology.

Setting aside textual accounts, I derive information on the painter's peregrinations through his known extant works. In this way we can track Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī's various residencies theorized to have started in Abū'l-Khairid Khurasan during the 1580s–1590s. He then proceeded to Tūqāy-Tīmūrid Samarqand in the first few years of the 1600s, illustrating the unfinished Khivan *Shāhnāma* manuscript in an individual style inflected by Khurasani models which implies he had not secured imperial patronage.[723] Since we do not observe Indian sartorial and stylistic forms and figures in that *Shāhnāma*, it seems he ventured to India afterwards. One drawing signed by the artist (fig. 143) depicts a man wearing a robe with four-pointed hem along the bottom edge (*chakdār jāma*), male attire popular during Akbar's rulership.[724] This suggests that he probably arrived in the Mughal realm before

---

[719] Kashmir and Delhi are posited in G.A. Pugachenkova and A.A. Madraimov, "Miniatiura Mukhammada Murada Samarkandi iz fonda Instituta Vostokovedenia AN UzSSR," *O'zbekistonda Ijtimoiy Fanlar* vol. 2 (1984): 47. Weinstein cites the work of Mark Zebrowski who asserts that paintings during the early Quṭb Shāhī dynasty in the Deccan were done by "Turco-Iranian émigrés - the greatest number coming from Bukhara, Bakharz (in Khorasan) and Shiraz" ("Variations on a Persian Theme," 50-51).

[720] Pugachenkova and Galerkina, *Miniatiury srednei azii*, 49. Brentjes confirms Muḥammad Murād accompanied him ("Islamic Art and Architecture in Central Asia," 69).

[721] Pugachenkova and Madraimov, "Miniatiura Mukhammada Murada Samarkandi," 47.

[722] Foltz, *Mughal India and Central Asia*, 81, ftn. 58.

[723] Referring to other contemporary "Bukhara artists", Titley suggests they "were more likely to be employed by lesser patrons than the emperor, as Akbar did not care for the romanticised [flat] style" associated with ʿAbdullāh Khan's workshop (*Persian Miniature Painting and its Influence on the Arts of Turkey and India*, 208). The assumption that Akbar instead preferred naturalism is not fully accurate since his patronage extended to both modes of representation.

[724] The illustration is the subject of Pugachenkova and Madraimov, "Miniatiura Mukhammada Murada Samarkandi," 49. Pugachenkova notes its reverse contains calligraphy signed by Mīr ʿAlī in "Manuscript Miniatures from the Oriental Studies Institute of the Uzbek SSR Academy of Sciences," *Bulletin of the Asia Institute, New Series* 4 (1990): 144. I am grateful to Jake Benson for identifying the garment.

or during the tradeoff between Akbar and Jahāngīr's reigns in 1605. The lack of visual devices derived from India in his *Shāhnāma* indicates Muḥammad Murād did not step foot in India prior to illustrating it. In the few illustrations to his *Shāhnāma* that are Indo-Persianate in their style and subject matter, Muḥammad Murād's acquaintance with Indian materials seems to be based on what was available to him in Transoxiana, and does not reflect a deep connection at the time of his painting. Had he gone there in the 1590s as has been posited by other scholars, how could that rich artistic context and experiences therein not impact his *Shāhnāma* work only to reappear decades later, post-1610?

If we accept that Muḥammad Murād illustrated the Khivan manuscript prior to departing for India, then he likely arrived shortly before Akbar's death in 1605. He might have joined the legions of artists employed in the imperial taṣvīrkhāna with access to its library collections and remained there into Jahāngīr's reign. Muḥammad Murād seems to have picked up skills and painting devices in either Mughal-controlled north India or the Deccan Sultanate —or both— that he would incorporate into his later Tūqāy-Tīmūrid Bukharan oeuvre of the second decade of the seventeenth century.

Impacted by his various experiences, Muḥammad Murād illustrated manuscripts and embellished marginal decorations with various figures in his "mature style," evidenced by the divided frontispiece (fig. 142). His portrayal of a Mughal emissary received by a Tūqāy-Tīmūrid khan in a *chīnī-khāna* (fig. 144) further reflects cross-dynastic political and artistic exchanges in this period by its very subject matter.[725] Pinpointing moments of stylistic transition in an artist's practice often proves difficult. However, a stint in India aptly explains Muḥammad Murād's conspicuous stylistic shift evident in his earlier additions to the Khivan *Shāhnāma* manuscript versus later illustrations incorporating his work that postdate 1615. Among the latter material is an illustration from a *Būstān* manuscript (CBL Pers. 297, fig. 145) with dark-skinned devotees in loincloths kneeling before a carved deity. The standing figure on the left with blue sash, white trousers, and red shoes wears the four-pointed garment as in the loose painting (fig. 143) mentioned above.

V.iii.c. Tūqāy-Tīmūrid dynastic chronicles and connections to India

As mentioned in Chapter 3, the historian Badr al-Dīn Kashmīrī left India forty years before he wrote his unillustrated *Ẓafarnāma* in circa 1593 extolling ʿAbdullāh's victories as the second Shībānī Khan. Concurrently, Muṭribī al-Aṣamm Samarqandī (b. 1559) commenced composition of the earliest unillustrated Tūqāy-Tīmūrid dynastic chronicle *Taẕkirat al-shuʿarāʾ* that he modified from a Persian

[725] The painting in CSMVS (formerly Prince of Wales Museum of Bombay), shelfmark unknown, is reproduced in Skelton, "Relations between Mughal and Central Asian painting," 290.

text in the final years of ʿAbdullāh Khan's life.[726] Muṭribī finished it in 1604, around the time Valī Muḥammad Khān ascended the Bukharan throne, but we cannot be certain whether the monarch accepted or acknowledged the work.[727]

Muṭribī later augmented his anthology with further information on poets in Balkh and Bukhara in order to appeal to Emperor Jahāngīr.[728] It apparently worked; Muṭribī arrived in India in 1626— just a year before Jahāngīr's death— and enjoyed a short stay in Lahore at the Mughal court. To Jahāngīr, Muṭribī encapsulated the wisdom of native Transoxianan thinkers and poets maintained from the Timurid age. During the few months of Muṭribī's visit, his host called upon him to verify the likenesses of ʿAbdullāh Khan and ʿAbd al-Muʾmīn that artists prepared for the Mughal emperor.[729] Jahāngīr scolded Muṭribī when he expressed disdain for ʿAbdullāh Khan's own composed poetry, perhaps in part because Jahāngīr's father Akbar often held amicable relations with his neighbor who occupied the ancestral Mughal lands.

Since the bones of the Mughals' Timurid ancestors remained in Samarqand's Gūr-i Amīr mausoleum, the current Chaghataids in India expressly identified with their hereditary links to that site and the broader region of Transoxiana once governed by their ancestors.[730] This sentiment extended to manuscripts, and they held copies of ruler-*nāma*—such as *Ẓafarnāma/Tīmūr-nāma* versions of Abū'l-Khairid manufacture and *Jāmiʿ al-tawārīkh* copies— with nostalgic esteem.

VI. Tūqāy-Tīmūrid *Tīmūr-nāma* copies

Having examined early Tūqāy-Tīmūrid Firdausian *Shāhnāma*s and selected artists traveling between Transoxiana and the subcontinent, this final section dwells on other versions of Tūqāy-Tīmūrid ruler-*nāma* and their processes of completion incorporating hybrid forms derived from Transoxiana and India. As noted in Chapters 1 and 2, the Abū'l-Khairids recorded and illustrated the histories of their Muslim and Mongol forefathers at the onset of the dynasty, and also documented the

---

[726] ARB 2253.

[727] This skepticism is expressed by McChesney, "Historiography in Central Asia since the 16th Century," 521. Foltz claims Muṭribī enjoyed the patronage of Valī Muḥammad ["Two Seventeenth-Century Central Asian Travellers to Mughal India," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 6, no. 3 (November 1996), 368; since revived and republished as a chapter in his book *Mughal India and Central Asia,* 109].

[728] Muṭribī's stay in India is recounted in Foltz, *Mughal India and Central Asia,* 109-16.

[729] Although it is impossible to determine if it is the exact drawing which Muṭribī was asked to verify, I suspect the attributed portrait of ʿAbdullāh Khan slicing melons (BM 1948,1211,0.10) is of Mughal manufacture and is not an Abū'l-Khairid production.

[730] McChesney, "Historiography in Central Asia since the 16th Century," 515.

accounts of living appanage rulers. This textual tradition continued under the Tūqāy-Tīmūrids, but without accompanying illustrations. Instead, the heroics of Tīmūr continued to hold appeal.

VI.i. *Tīmūr-nāma* of Hātifī (BL Add. 22703)

Depictions of Tīmūr's acts migrated from Abū'l-Khairid Transoxiana to India during Akbar's reign. This illustrated material also made a return journey and reappeared in later Tūqāy-Tīmūrid copies of the *Tīmūr-nāma*. In Chapter 3, I analyzed a frontispiece cut apart and mounted on the opening and closing pages of a probable mid-1570s Bukharan *Tīmūr-nāma* of Hātifī in the British Library (ms. Add. 22703, fig. 73). The manuscript has only attracted limited attention amongst historians of book arts produced in India and Transoxiana. Basil Robinson describes the manuscript's battle scenes as "prototypes of the crowded melees beloved by Akbar's court painters who illustrated the celebrated *Akbar-nāma* in the Victoria and Albert Museum."[731] He attributes the full manuscript to Bukhara, circa 1560, and claims the Mughals inspired the Abū'l-Khairids. Rührdanz similarly notes Mughal influence in the five main illustrations (excluding the divided frontispiece), but attributes them to products of Central Asian manuscript painting from the second decade of the seventeenth century.[732] Larisa Dodkhudoeva cites other scholars who identify Muḥammad Sharīf as among the painters in Samarqand responsible for illustrating scenes within the BL *Tīmūr-nāma* that are "filled with dynamism and rage."[733] After reviewing these arguments and the object, I confirm components of these observations through comparisons to figures and compositions from the early Tūqāy-Tīmūrid workshops. Most of my comparisons to the BL *Tīmūr-nāma* come from the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* dated 1600 (BL Or. 14403), and the *Majālis al-ʿushshāq* manuscript dated 1606 (figs. 138-39).

Clarifying the provenance to the BL *Tīmūr-nāma* manuscript, I claim it was originally an unfinished copy scribed during the reign of ʿAbdullāh Khan in the 1560s or 1570s but was finished in later decades. Its divided frontispiece (fig. 73) could be contemporary to the text or was derived from another manuscript and pasted in. The remaining illustrations (figs. 146-149) were added sometime between 1605–15 in Transoxiana. They thus postdate the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* group and are contemporary to the dispersed three lavish *Shāhnāma* folios, and other Tūqāy-Tīmūrid manuscripts associated with Jūibārid—as opposed to royal— patronage in Bukhara (such as the 1606 *Majālis al-*

---

[731] Robinson, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Persian Paintings in the Bodleian Library*, 127.

[732] Rührdanz, "Revival of Central Asian painting in the early 17th century," 398.

[733] Dodkhudoeva, *The Arts of the Book in Central Asia and India*, 73.

ʿushshāq).[734] I contend that the illustrators of all these works had earlier Abū'l-Khairid training obtained in Khurasan during the 1590s where they worked alongside Safavid artists from Qazvin. The BL *Tīmūr-nāma'*s full-page paintings indicate those painters also borrowed Bukharan Abū'l-Khairid figural and sartorial details. The painters themselves likely worked on the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* group, but later improved their quality of execution, perhaps during stints in India. As the above scholars suggested, their exposure to Akbar's numerous ruler-*nāma* projects might have inspired the crowded and tumultuous battle scenes in the *Tīmūr-nāma*. The architectural forms in the upper corner of the illustration depicting Tīmūr atop a yellow war elephant (fig. 146) evinces this familiarity with Indian painting and architecture. Similar white domes and ribbed structures also appear in the *Majālis al-ʿushshāq* folio (fig. 138). Figures in Indian turbans and garb are also common to both manuscripts.

Other details in the BL *Tīmūr-nāma* further substantiate its being an Uzbek production spanning several dynasties. A rider atop a square-shaped horse from within it (fig. 147) mentioned in Chapter 3 appears similar to another in a late-1560s Bukharan Hātifī *Tīmūr-nāma* (RAS 305A, fig. 75). Pavilions with colorful patterning and red fencing appear in a disturbing illustration of soldiers committing atrocities on a city's inhabitants within the BL *Tīmūr-nāma* (fig. 148). These forms derive from Bukharan manuscripts associated with ʿAbdullāh Khan's patronage. This underscores how Tūqāy-Tīmūrid artists had themselves painted earlier Abū'l-Khairid manuscripts, or they were familiar with their models.

Other figures and compositions in the BL *Tīmūr-nāma* are better-drafted than those in the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* group completed a decade earlier. Smiting warriors with raised swords and arched, nearly-connected eyebrows frequent BL Or. 14403 and the BL *Tīmūr-nāma*. One of Tīmūr's troops in a poppy-red tunic in the latter manuscript wears Abū'l-Khairid armor and a helmet topped by a black tuft who battles a div poised to throw a severed head at him (fig. 149). The style of rendering seems particularly Qazvini, also akin to an illustration from Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī's Khivan *Shāhnāma* depicting Manūchihr's shot arrow in poppy-colored robes shooting an arrow at Tūr (fig. 150). A bare-chested figure strapped to a stretcher in the upper section of the aforementioned upsetting BL *Tīmūr-nāma* folio (fig. 148) seems like a victim about to be waterboarded. His pose and turned-out

---

[734] Contemporary Jūibārid patronage includes manuscripts dedicated to Shaikh Khwāja ʿAbd al-Raḥīm in Bukhara: Durbek's *Yūsuf u Zulaikhā* ca. 1615 (ARB 1433); and Bāiqarā's *Majālis al-ʿushshāq* ca. 1606 (ARB 3476). A section of Yazdī's *Ẓafarnāma* scribed in 1617 by a scribe named Muḥammad included in a Miscellany (BL IOL 3448) might be related, but I have not yet examined the manuscript. Robinson states its 14 illustrations are inserted from other manuscripts produced from Shiraz ca. 1515-20 (Safavid) and 1470 (Turkman), and Bukhara (date unspecified) (*Persian Paintings in the India Office Library*, 79, 153). It is an unusual example in which the colophon postdates the visual components. The fact that the manuscript was in India before it came into British hands is telling, and might be relevant to Transoxiana—India exchanges.

feet derive from an earlier, unusual image in BL Or. 14403 illustrating the great battle between Kai Khusrau and Afrāsiyāb (fig. 151). In it, men gather around a corpse to wash dirt and blood off the body of a fallen Iranian soldier before wrapping him in a shroud.[735] Another detail on the lower right side of the same violent scene in the BL *Tīmūr-nāma* depicts two distraught women dressed in purple and orange with long white headscarves. An old woman crouched in blue scolds an attacking soldier in gold armor and feathered turban.[736] These three women repeat depictions of female spectators wearing similar attire in contemporaneous manuscripts: the dispersed lavish *Shāhnāma* folio of Żaḥḥāk and his consorts (fig. 132), the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* copies in Saint Petersburg (NLR PNS 90, fig. 127) and the Cherniaev illustration (fig. 125).

Both the older Yazdī *Ẓafarnāma* manuscript illustrated by Bihzād for Sultan Ḥusain Mīrzā Bāiqarā, and the BL *Tīmūr-nāma* by Hātifī convey dramatic full-page scenes of Tīmūr and his troops lowered in baskets to attack the inhabitants of Nerges in Georgia (figs. 14 and 149 respectively). However, their compositional differences may be due to the fact that by the time the painters illustrated the BL *Tīmūr-nāma,* the Mughals had acquired Bāiqarā's *Ẓafarnāma* as a gift, so artists in Transoxiana could not consult it. The BL *Tīmūr-nāma* illustration instead features details that mirror elements in the AIIT Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* folio, "Aulad leading Rustam to the White Div's cave" (fig. 152). The AIIT illustration is a comparatively simpler composition, with some nearly identical figures rendered in reverse as they appear in the BL *Tīmūr-nāma* folio. One div in the AIIT *Shāhnāma* grips a boulder above his head that corresponds to the female figure in blue and red standing on the right in the *Tīmūr-nāma* version. Her sagging breasts and the indecency of her lifted leg and exposed genitals equates her with witches and sorceresses in *Shāhnāma* iconography. Her male compatriots appear similarly half-nude with phalluses dangling out of loincloths; such a detail is common in portrayals of divs in Turco-Persianate book illustrations.[737] Rendering the Georgian enemies dwelling in caves carved into cliffs with the impropriety and barbarity of witches and divs dehumanizes the depicted enemy.

---

[735] Gratitude goes to Mohsen Qassemi for assisting me in determining the story of the depicted scene. He notes that the surrounding text differs from canonical versions of the *Shāhnāma* by substituting Islamic references to Firdausī's Zoroastrian original phrasing; a mosque is mentioned as opposed to a fire temple.

[736] This older female figure also appears several times in a copy of Durbek's *Yūsuf u Zulaikhā*, ca. 1615, Bukhara (ARB 1433).

[737] Axel Langer has commented on "*divs*, the demons of the *Shahnama*, whose circumcised penises quite often peep out from beneath their loincloths. Unlike Persia's romantic heroes, who are motivated only by higher sentiments, *divs* are depicted as purely sexual creatures" ["European Influences on Seventeenth-Century Persian Painting: Of handsome Europeans, naked ladies, and Parisian timepieces," in *The Fascination of Persia: Persian-European Dialogue in Seventeenth-Century Art & and Contemporary Art of Teheran* (Zürich: Scheidegger & Spiess, 2013), 180].

The abundant Indian elements in the BL *Tīmūr-nāma*—figural, sartorial, architectural— seems intended to appeal to a subcontinental (perhaps royal) recipient. The manuscript has multiple layers of value: as an original Bukharan manuscript with text and marginal stenciling and illumination perhaps from ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz's workshop, with later interventions by artists connected to ʿAbdullāh Khan's patronage, then finished by the finest contemporary manuscript artists in Transoxiana. Such an eminent volume would befit an emperor. However, whether the manuscript spent any time in India cannot yet be surmised although it could have been taken from there to then reside in its current London home.

VI.ii. *Ẓafarnāma* of Yazdī from 1628 (ARB 4472)

On account of compositional and figural formulae in Abū'l-Khairid manuscripts common to those derived from Yazdī's *Ẓafarnāma* completed for Sultan Ḥusain Bāiqarā in the late-Timurid period, I argued in Chapter 1 that only after Muḥammad Shībānī Khan had taken Herat in 1507 could the manuscript have come into Abū'l-Khairid hands. Sometime later at a date yet to be confirmed, Bāiqarā's precious manuscript ventured into the imperial Mughal library. Mika Natif states that it was "brought from Central Asia to Akbar's court in India by the nobleman Mir Jamal al-Din Husayn Inju (a native of Shiraz)."[738] Knowing it would delight Akbar, the intended recipient, Mīr Jamāl bestowed it at some point before 1572. Passed down to Akbar's successors, notes in Jahāngīr's own hand attribute its illustrations to Bihzād. In the *Akbar-nāma* chronicling Akbar's own life, the author Abū'l Fażl ʿAllāmī (1551–1602) uses Yazdī's account of Tīmūr's horoscope to apply to Akbar in order to reinforce the legitimacy of the latter's reign. The marginal notes and seals of Jahāngīr, Shāh Jahān, and Aurangzīb prove these royals avidly read Bāiqarā's personal *Ẓafarnāma*, but the absence of traces left by Akbar himself implies that he might have never seen it in his lifetime.[739] This suggests that it was his successor Jahāngīr who received it as a gift during his rule between 1605 and 1627 by a presumably Tūqāy-Tīmūrid emissary. It is not likely, however, that the above-mentioned poet Muṭribī would have been the one to do so when he stayed with Jahāngīr in 1626.

The majority of older Abū'l-Khairid productions of Tīmūr's life took the form of Hātifī's *Tīmūr-nāma*. However, it is significant that Tūqāy-Tīmūrid artisans completed one illustrated copy of

---

[738] Natif, "The *Zafarnama* [Book of Conquest] of Sultan Husayn Mīrzā," 213. Regarding the object's removal from India, the object is thought to have been taken to Iran by Nādir Shāh although there is no evidence of this. There is a Qajar seal in it, and the work transited from Iran to German collections before making a trans-Atlantic voyage to ultimately reach the Johns Hopkins University Library.

[739] Foltz, *Mughal India and Central Asia,* 24. The first Mughal production of Yazdī's title is a copy dated 1600 (BL Or. 1052) made in the atelier of the governor of Ahmedabad, Mīrzā ʿAzīz Koka (Losty, *Art of the Book in India*, 122).

Yazdī's *Ẓafarnāma* (ARB 4472, figs. 153–156) in 1628.[740] Finished within the second decade of Imām Qulī Khan's reign in Bukhara, they may not have necessarily produced it for him, but for one of his governors. Yazdī's popularity among the Mughals may have inspired the commission of this *Ẓafarnāma* by whoever was the Tūqāy-Tīmūrid patron.

Abū'l-Khairid visual formulae influence the 1628 *Ẓafarnāma*. In one of its illustrations, Tūqtamīsh Khan cowers below Tīmūr who arrives on horseback holding the reins and brandishing a sword (fig. 153) in a pose recalling Muḥammad Shībānī in his armor in the *Fatḥnāma* (fig. 12, right side). In another painting within the *Ẓafarnāma*, Tīmūr dressed in green sits with left knee bent while he celebrates his victory over Tūqtamīsh Khan (fig. 154). This stance iconographically derives from Timurid and Abū'l-Khairid manuscript traditions, such as the enthronement scenes discussed in Chapter 2 §III.i.b: the MIA *Bahāristān* (fig. 41) and Hātifī *Ẓafarnāma* copies from 1541 and 1551 (figs. 39 and 47 respectively). The 1628 Tūqāy-Tīmūrid rendition of Tīmūr banqueting might be a visual nod to Bāiqarā's *Ẓafarnāma* that had left Transoxiana.

The 1628 *Ẓafarnāma* contains features associated with Indian painting practices then-unusual in Uzbek book arts. In a scene completely foreign to Abū'l-Khairid painting and derived from romantic traditions further south, Tīmūr lays entwined in the hennaed feet and hands of his beloved Dilshād while a wrinkled old woman peers in profile on the left (f.152b, fig. 155).[741] Dilshād and Tīmūr embrace beneath a canopy with black detailing that parallels the carpeting of Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī's illustrations in the Khivan *Shāhnāma*. The iconography of Gulnār sleeping with Ardashīr in the *Shāhnāma* undeniably demonstrates the longevity of eroticism in Turco-Persianate book arts. However, the merging of the kissing lovers in the 1628 *Ẓafarnāma* into one entity marks an iconographic shift, closer and comparable to the couples painted by Chagall across several continents and centuries.

---

[740] The 1628 *Ẓafarnāma* is a lavish work on paper with silk fibers and has stories that other copies do not, according to N.G. Mallitskii, "Protokoly i soobscheniia chlenov Turkestanskogo kruzhka liubitelei arxeologii," G.IV (1899): 71-180. A.A. Semenov provides a page-by-page description of the *Ẓafarnāma* manuscript's illustrations and gives its provenance. It was purchased by the Uzbek Academy of Sciences in 1939 from a private individual. Prior to this it was in the collection of an old Tashkent judge, Qāżī Sayyid Muhyiddīn Khwāja, and was displayed in a Paris exposition (1900?). Reproductions of several illustrations to the 1628 *Ẓafarnāma* appear in Semenov, "Miniatiury Samarkandskoi Rukopisi Nachala XVII v. 'Zafar-noma' Sharafuddina Ezdi," *Majmūai Maqolaho bakhshida ba San'ati Khalqi Tojik; Asarho* vol. XLII (Academy of Sciences Tajikistan SSR, 1956): 3-16; and E.A. Poliakova and Z.I. Rakhimova, *Miniatiura i literatura vostoka [L'art de la miniature et la littérature de l'orient]* (Tashkent: Gafour Gouliame, 1987).

[741] Reproduced in G.A. Pugachenkova, *Miniatures of Central Asia* (Tashkent: Editorial Office of Encyclopaedias, 1994), 36-37. The composition is evocative of the earlier work "Khusrau wooing Shirin" in a *Khamsa* of Niẓāmī produced the same year as the Timurid ruler Shāh Rukh died (TSMK H.786, ca. 1447) (reproduced in Robinson, "Book-Painting in Transoxiana during the Timurid Period," 73, fig. 1).

Other Indian-inspired figures in the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* group also appear in the 1628 *Ẓafarnāma*. Parallels to some of the illustrations in the Princeton *Shāhnāma* (PFL 59G) already examined indicate production by the same workshop in 1620s Samarqand. One figure in the *Ẓafarnāma* scene depicting Tīmūr's attack on the Sīstānīs (fig. 156) awkwardly tumbles from his horse with boot upright in the air. This faller appears again in the manuscript as a victim in Tīmūr's army during their battle against the Golden Horde (f.275a).[742] He again stumbles in the rendering of Bārmān's victory over Qubād in the Princeton *Shāhnāma* version (fig. 157); here, the back of Qubād's head is a simplistic diamond. The 1628 *Ẓafarnāma*'s faller is rendered with more successful movement and perspective, and beneath him is the same white horse with red tail as Qubād's mount in the other manuscript. The simpler Princeton *Shāhnāma* composition and figures might therefore predate or be contemporary to the complex 1628 *Ẓafarnāma.*

VII. Conclusion

Throughout transitions from Timurid to Abū'l-Khairid, and Abū'l-Khairid to Tūqāy-Tīmūrid control of Central Asia, copies of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* were again produced and peddled. Gauging the market for early seventeenth-century *Shāhnāma* manuscripts in Samarqand proves difficult. Who were their intended owners? Rührdanz suggests painters adapted *Shāhnāma* imagery for clientele who favored oral and popular retellings of the fantastic and heroic stories over the historical section of the work. These individuals may have formed their tastes for such titles during the Uzbek occupation of Khurasan in the last quarter of the sixteenth century. During that time, Rührdanz states Abū'l-Khairid governors and bureaucrats grew more acquainted with the sophisticated book culture in the regions they administered. *Shāhnāma* manuscript production continued into the following century past the dynastic decline.[743] According to McChesney, Uzbek religious and political elites —shaikhs and amirs — maintained their status, serving both dynasties with equal loyalty.[744] Thus, their purchasing power stayed constant. As a case in point, the influential Jūibārid-led Naqshbandi order sought out local

---

[742] Formal analysis of the Tūqtamīsh illustration is in G.A. Pugachenkova and L. I. Rempel', *Vydaiushchiesia pamiatniki izobrazitel'nogo iskusstva uzbekistana* (Tashkent, 1961), 107-08.

[743] Rührdanz, "Samarqand Shahnamas in the Context of Dynastic Change," 227.

[744] McChesney declares, "there are many instances of amirs and amirid families who served both the Shibanid and then Tuqay-Timurid dynasties with equal loyalty" ["The Amirs of Muslim Central Asia in the XVIIth Century," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* XXVI, no. 1 (1983): 58].

Uzbek scribes and artists regardless of their skills from the 1590s into the 1620s to produce desired titles.[745]

Domestic productions of Firdausian *Shāhnāma* copies were available in India for non-royal consumption by lesser artists familiar with the traditions of imperial workshops. However, the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* copies could compete by having a prestigious connection to Transoxiana by merit of their origin. Some of the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* volumes catered to customers in India, both those locally born there, and also Iranian and Central Asian immigrants in the subcontinent who admired classical Persian literature and poetry. Natif writes: "In the eyes of Muslims in India during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Bukhara was particularly esteemed as a center of religious learning, supported by powerful Naqshbandi shaykhs. …Bukharan-style illustrations…should be seen as both the expression and the continuation of the Bukharan intellectual legacy in Mughal India" and outside in the other parts not under Mughal jurisdiction.[746] Despite the abundance of local talent, these patrons/purchasers in India admired Transoxianan artisans in particular. The Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* manuscript group—here broadened by adding onto Rührdanz's original grouping in including the Cherniaev specimen, the Khivan manuscript finished by Muḥammad Murād, and the lavish copy evidenced by three loose folios (despite their Bukharan attribution)—sheds light on artistic and political exchanges between Transoxiana and Hindustan heretofore unconsidered.

I conclude with the Cherniaev manuscript and its afterlife. Although a humble offering, the fact that Cherniaev, a Russian general, was presented with this Firdausian *Shāhnāma* after his conquest of Turkestan demonstrates the timeless and symbolic power of illustrated manuscripts as gifts to royals and nobles. In the intervening centuries between its presumed completion in Samarqand in the early 1600s to its presentation in 1860s Tashkent, the gesture of giving a *Shāhnāma* as pīshkash maintained such courtly traditions. It is a pity Cherniaev did not further the project and commission artists to illustrate the empty voids and enrich its illumination scheme. Had the object's exchange taken place

---

[745] Jūibārids, manuscript patronage, and political connections across Transoxiana and India converge in ways that have not yet been fully explored. The Jūibārid ʿAbdī Khwāja Ṣaʿd (1580–1607) had patronized Bukharan manuscripts in the 1590s when their quality was at their lowest. ʿAbdī Khwāja had supported Bāqī Muḥammad Khān to seize the throne in Bukhara in 1601 but was expelled to India that same year. The Jūibārid shaikh Khwāja ʿAbd al-Raḥīm (son of ʿAbdī Khwāja Ṣaʿd) was Imām Qulī's ambassador to Jahāngīr in 1626, and he also patronized manuscripts produced in Bukhara up to his death in India in 1628. These details on Jūibārid patronage and connections to India are in Rührdanz, "Revival of Central Asian painting in the early 17th century," 398; Vasilyeva and Yastrebova, *Arts of the Book in the 15th-17th-Century Mawarannahr*, 224; Foltz, *Mughal India and Central Asia,* 53.

[746] Natif, "The SOAS *Anvār-i Suhaylī,*" 355.

centuries earlier, he just might have followed the lead of early-modern patrons and painters to refurbish older works and bring them to completion.

Conclusion

I. Scions of Turan

Scion: a descendant, particularly of a distinguished family. The heir to the throne. A bud or shoot, especially one destined for grafting or rooting.

Definitions of scion carry notions of maintaining tradition and perpetuating a legacy, along with the concepts of regeneration and recombination. In terms of manuscript arts, all the contemporary Turco-Persianate dynasties dominating the sixteenth century—the Abū'l-Khairids, Ottomans, Safavids, and Mughals—revered and reinterpreted the earlier Timurid decorative repertoire and historiographic tradition that had created standards of high culture.[747] Only the Mughals could claim full and direct Timurid continuity and sovereignty through Chaghataid descent. Lacking a Timurid connection through blood or land, Ottoman and Safavid rulers compensated by proclaiming the mantle of Timurid legitimacy in their right to rule and by appropriating its visual and literary culture.[748] The Ottomans fashioned their own identity by braiding Timurid components with those from the Byzantine and Roman empires. The Safavids viewed themselves as a continuation of the Āq Quyūnlū Turkmans, the Timurids' rivals, and were keen to expand their own territorial holdings and reclaim the full extent of lands once under Timurid rule.[749] The Abū'l-Khairids meanwhile positioned themselves as inheritors of the Timurid heartland in Transoxiana and dynastic restorers of Chinggis Khan's original aims. These Jūchid Abū'l-Khairids also endeavored to be custodians of the Timurid legacy through Chaghataid intermarriage. All of the eastern Islamicate empires were shaped by a similar admixture of Turkic, Persian, Mongol, and Islamic elements. What set the Abū'l-Khairids apart was their recombination of these so as to forge an identity derived from Timurid blood, land, culture, and politics.

Those chronicling the above dynasties in the sixteenth century narrated the past by imitating earlier texts as models, in particular Firdausī's successive rulers in the *Shāhnāma,* and Yazdī's individual-centric biography of Tīmūr in the *Ẓafarnāma.* Although these sources were significant to the

---

[747] For a discussion of Timurid "cosmopolitan cultural unity," read Gülru Necipoğlu, "From International Timurid to Ottoman: A Change of Taste in Sixteenth-Century Ceramic Tiles," *Muqarnas* 7 (1990): 158.

[748] Consult the publications of Sholeh A. Quinn.

[749] The Safavids' co-opting Turkman administrative forms and supplanting the Āq Quyūnlū dynasty are noted by Bashir, "Shah Ismail and the Qizilbash: Cannibalism in the Religious History of Early Safavid Iran," 246; Wood, "*Shāhnāma-i Ismāʿīl* [dissertation]," 111.

dynasties in varying proportions, the *Shāhnāma* has become the weightiest and most contested text to stake identity claims in modern times. This is however a product of the colonial age. During a few conferences I have been asked why the Abū'l-Khairids would be interested in producing a copy of the "Iranian" epic given their status as "Turks." Implied in this remark are some tacit assumptions: 1) Firdausī's text belongs to Iran; 2) the Abū'l-Khairids identified themselves as Turks and saw themselves mirrored in Firdausī's literary Turanians; and 3) the paucity of Firdausian *Shāhnāma* manuscripts produced in Transoxiana can be attributed to Abū'l-Khairid governance modeled on communal Mongol customs, as opposed to centralized authority associated with Iranian kingship. I will treat these in order.

Regarding the first conjecture that the *Shāhnāma* is Iran's right: in our age of nationalism and linguistic rigidity, it is vital to detach our contemporary interpretations of the *Shāhnāma* so that they do not color our perception of its status in eras prior to ours.[750] Hamid Dabashi's recent study on Firdausī's text paired with nationalism is relevant. He writes:

> Before its European reception, the Shahnameh was primarily a dynastic object—a text principally (but never exclusively) used and abused as an apparatus of legitimacy for one triumphant dynasty or another. …[By the 1800s] the state of Shahnameh studies in Ferdowsi's own homeland was limited to very small learned cliques. But the eventual awareness of its European acceptance combined with the nascent ethnic nationalism suddenly catapulted the aging text into the political limelight.[751]

So, the *Shāhnāma* came to "belong" to Iran only in the mid nineteenth century; in the sixteenth the work was not the prerogative of one region or dynasty, and was known and appreciated by Abū'l-Khairid, Ottoman, Safavid, and Mughal elites and subjects. We as post-moderns ought not to assume the early-moderns shared our ethos to fix identities and borders based on ethnic and linguistic groupings. If today we are content with hardened delineations, those in the sixteenth century operated in a world with softer demarcations, and less stringent border patrols.

Apropos the second supposition that the Abū'l-Khairids empathized with Turkic speakers and Turanians: this is impossible to gauge from period sources, although a perusal of Appendix 3: Correspondence between Ottoman and Abū'l-Khairid rulers, ca. 1500–1598 reveals comfort in both Persian and Turki. There is no need to identify "who is who" in Firdausī's work based on language, and a patron need not identify with one side when reading the text. Related to this, the third surmise on the

---

[750] My gratitude goes to Christine Nölle-Karimi who made this important observation and others at the European Conference of Iranian Studies (ECIS 9) in 2019 at Freie University. Amanat touches on this concept in "Divided Patrimony."

[751] Hamid Dabashi, *Persophilia: Persian Culture on the Global Scene* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2015), 153-54.

scarcity of Firdausī's version in Abū'l-Khairid manuscript production has been asserted on political grounds. This interpretation, however, assumes Abū'l-Khairid governance and reliance on Mongol systems remained constant across the century they were in power. Rührdanz avoids arguing on linguistic and ethnic lines, and instead suggests "that it was the specific system of power sharing in the Shaibanid realm and its ideological impact that suppressed interest in the Shahnama [due to] the absence of the idea of centralised rule executed by a divinely ordained king."[752] This "power sharing" is true during the decades prior to ʿAbdullāh Khan's mid-century unification of the Uzbek state, but not afterwards. ʿAbdullāh Khan's own centralizing policies predated similar Safavid reforms; the political shift to unified leadership, characterized in older scholarship as an Irano-Islamic model as opposed to Turco-Mongol, actually took place in Transoxiana before it did in Iran.[753]

II. Abū'l-Khairid *Shāhnāma* copies

The first of its kind, this study has constituted a specific corpus of manuscripts linked by epic subject matter that expands what can be defined under the rubric of Abū'l-Khairid *Shāhnāma* copies. It has done so through several case studies, some already having been the subject of published research in prior decades, but with new materials here introduced for the first time or with provenances so closely analyzed that their interpretation is renewed by the level of nuance presented. The grouped manuscripts have included, and looked beyond, Firdausian versions to ruler-*nāma* compendia of the various figures and dynasties inhabiting Transoxiana and its environs in different centuries. The study also treated Turkic translations that might have appealed to those with limited Persian language skills, and truncated versions that emphasized popular episodes of particular heroes. I have made *Shāhnāma* the umbrella term, as opposed to ruler-*nāma*, due to the primacy of Firdausī and his impact (explicit or tacit) on the discussed works.

The acts themselves of presenting and producing a Firdausian *Shāhnāma* manuscript were opulent royal displays, and expressed power and patronage. Copies manufactured to the highest standards would be deemed appropriate as diplomatic gifts between perceived equals. Acquiring non-royal, commercial copies for personal collections also conferred erudition and status on the owner. The

---

[752] Rührdanz, "The Samarqand Shahnamas," 213.

[753] Dickson, "Shah Tahmasp and the Uzbeks," 27.

choice of title neither represents the promotion of a national epic defined as such, or a uniquely Iranian code of rulership. One cannot speak on behalf of the original Abū'l-Khairids holding court, but to me, their lack of Firdausian *Shāhnāma* copies is less out of umbrage over the poet's pro-Iranian stance, and more a deference to the first Abū'l-Khairid dynastic leader Shībānī Khan's original disdain for the title. Or, perhaps, their lack of interest was itself a continuation of Sultan Ḥusain Mīrzā Bāiqarā's own neglect of the work in late-Timurid Herat. Whatever the case may be, throughout their century in power the Abū'l-Khairids did indeed engage with Firdausī's *Shāhnāma*, albeit indirectly.

At the onset of the Abū'l-Khairid dynasty, inheriting Timurid talent as well as whole manuscripts helped legitimize Abū'l-Khairid rule in the region. This functioned in the following ways: using the same artisans as the previous dynasty provided continuity and made the Abū'l-Khairids appear as the Timurids' natural inheritors. Although Shībānī Khan achieved great military victories, he did not celebrate his gains through patronizing a Firdausian *Shāhnāma.* Yet he still acknowledged that cultural and artistic prestige are intrinsic to political power, as equal to it, if not more. Firdausī's model was instrumental in Shībānī's commissioning his own parallel ruler-*nāma*, the *Fatḥnāma-yi khānī.* Its text and illustrations conflate his own heroics with those of Tīmūr. In analyzing its visual program, I claimed that the work employed artists who had previously worked on Firdausian *Shāhnāma* copies from the late Timurid period. By selecting compositions, figures, and subject matter that would function to equate him with the heroes and escapades of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma*, Shībānī Khan's ruler-*nāma* was a substitute and perceived improvement to it.

Later in the 1530s, despite insufficient information about their physical transfer and date of dispatch, two truncated *Shāhnāma* manuscripts written out in Transoxiana were sent to the Ottomans and finished under their auspices at the end of the century. These and other mid-century Abū'l-Khairid ruler-*nāma* reflect collective and cumulative processes of completion that challenge underlying assumptions about single-studio, single-style, and single-event processes. Notably, an eponymous *Shībānī-nāma* chronicling the life of the first Abū'l-Khairid leader carries Ottoman illustrations dating to the 1530s through the early 1540s. The object and contemporaneous epistolary documentation between the Ottoman sultan Süleyman and the ruling Abū'l-Khairid leader ʿUbaidullāh shed light on why the manuscript was finished, and the political situation between the Sublime Porte and Bukhara. The *Shībānī-nāma* and other ruler-*nāma* manuscripts illustrated in the 1540s—*Tavārīkh-i guzīda-yi*

nuṣratnāma and *Tārīkh-i Abū'l-Khair Khānī*—elevate the Abū'l-Khairid forefather Abū al-Khair Khan over the Timurids. While the *Shībānī-nāma* is akin to the older *Fatḥnāma* in terms of a single subject, the *Nuṣratnāma* and *Tārīkh-i Abū'l-Khair Khānī* connect the dynasty to its Chinggisid origins. Earlier Abū'l-Khairid ruler-*nāma* conflated Shībānī with Tīmūr to justify political control. Some later ruler-*nāma* versions extend further back to compare Shībānī's successor Kūchkūnchī to Ghāzān, one of the earlier Chinggisid converts to Islam, as a means to broadcast the dynasty's religious legitimacy.

Despite the small number of courtly Firdausian *Shāhnāma* manufactured by Abū'l-Khairid kitābkhāna staff, it was commonly accepted across the Turco-Persianate sphere that possessing and exchanging Firdausian *Shāhnāma* copies were attributes of authority and kingship. To Robinson, the commissioning of the particular title signalized a monarch's accession, although the longest-reigning Abū'l-Khairid overseer ʿAbdullāh Khan had his own *Shāhnāma* manuscript (TSMK H.1488) produced within seven years of having taken Bukhara.[754] The same Bukhara workshop fulfilling this and numerous other requests in the second half of the sixteenth century churned out more *Tīmūr-nāma* copies of Hātifī than of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma.* These ruler-*nāma* of the Timurid founder were arguably intended to graft ʿAbdullāh Khan's victories in Transoxiana and broader Khurasan onto those of Tīmūr in prior centuries. Some of these commercial *Tīmūr-nāma* were intended for readers in Transoxiana, while others were destined for markets in India.

ʿAbdullāh used manuscripts from his personal collection in diplomacy, parting with the above *Shāhnāma* thirty years after its creation by giving it to the Ottomans in 1594. The object became a tool to declare his new role as a singular monarch lording over his domain to Sultan Murad III. However, entries by Ottoman authorities attendant during the receipt of this *Shāhnāma* explain the shifted political axis at odds with the camaraderie expressed earlier in the century. Alongside the dispatch of ʿAbdullāh's courtly Firdausian *Shāhnāma*, a Turkic-language translation by Âmidî located in Tajikistan reflects a multi-locational process of production and collaboration spanning east and west. Posited to have been written out in the Ottoman realm in the middle of the century, I refined the provenance of its fragmentary illustrations to Khurasan in the 1580s through the 1590s when the Abū'l-Khairids had annexed a large area of eastern Iranian territory.

If correct, then the Tajikistan manuscript would have been worked on when alliances shifted, borders were contested, and distinct regional identities were established. The manuscript may have

---

[754] B.W. Robinson, "Ismāʿīl II's Copy of the Shāhnāma," *Iran* 14 (1976): 5.

been a test project to appeal to the new Abū'l-Khairid administrators in Khurasan. It is of particular significance that the object circulated across political and cultural boundaries. With similar fluidity, artisans in Khurasan came under, and were released from, different dynastic oversight. We find ourselves again faced with the conundrum over how appropriate it is to label the artist of the Tajikistan manuscript "Abū'l-Khairid," for this individual could have previously produced manuscripts for Safavid authorities prior to 1588, then catered to Abū'l-Khairid patronage for a decade, before again securing employment working on Safavid commissions at the start of the seventeenth century all the while remaining in Herat.

Throughout dynastic transitions from Timurid to Abū'l-Khairid at the turn of the fifteenth through sixteenth centuries, and Abū'l-Khairid to Tūqāy-Tīmūrid between the sixteenth through the seventeenth, copies of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* were peddled to non-courtly elites. In times of tumult, artisans relied on older compositional and conceptual designs and held onto these after stability within political and cultural hubs was restored. These Tūqāy-Tīmūrid Firdausian *Shāhnāma* copies were made in Samarqand to sell to buyers in Transoxiana during this juncture, and further afield in India. The Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* manuscript group has already been examined, but I have broadened and added onto this work by including the following: a specimen later given to an Imperial Russian general after victory over Tashkent, another Firdausian copy written out in Khiva, and a lavish copy evidenced by three loose folios which I have furthered existing analysis on its production and provenance. These gathered objects articulate how Abū'l-Khairid artisans both persisted in their practice and subsisted after the fall of the dynasty. Through these Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* materials and contemporaneous ruler-*nāma* versions of Tīmūr's life, we observe how some Abū'l-Khairid artisans originally working in Khurasan in the 1590s left for India. Or, they trained others who would journey southwards to contribute their talents to polities in the subcontinent. In turn, these individuals and others imported new visual models from workshops in India back to Transoxiana, manifesting the transition of Abū'l-Khairid arts of the book becoming Tūqāy-Tīmūrid.

III. Abū'l-Khairid inheritors

As an historian, the past frequently coalesces with the present, and I here ruminate from this trans-temporal vantage point. Appropriating cultural forms from select dynasties to secure political

legitimacy continues in Uzbekistan today. Whereas the Abū'l-Khairids looked to the Mongols, the Soviets wrote off the Abū'l-Khairids as nomadic, feudal, and backwards. This disregard trivialized preceding administrators once in control of the lands now forming the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic in the 1920s. The Bolshevik message downplayed positive Abū'l-Khairid contributions to the region. For seventy years, the Timurids and Abū'l-Khairids alike were suppressed subjects of study and repressed figures of national pride. Post-Soviet Uzbekistan has retaliated by elevating the former dynasty with Tīmūr's statue replacing Lenin's in the streets and squares. The former president Islam Karimov (d. 2016) peppered his political speeches with allusions and references to Tīmūr that mirrored his own achievements.[755]

Dramatized historical events and figures in serials aired on television, as well as literary works of fiction and textbooks used in Uzbek classrooms, still glorify Tīmūr and his progeny. These denigrate the Abū'l-Khairids for bringing the splendid dynasty to an end. Around Tashkent today, there continues to be a conspicuous "absence in the public memory of the first Uzbek rulers of the territory, the [Abū'l-Khairid] Khans."[756] However, I detect a change in the winds wafting from Bukhara as local students and scholars turn their attention to this overlooked dynasty; the cast iron bodies of Abū al-Khair, Muḥammad Shībānī, and ʿAbdullāh Khan may yet adorn public spaces in the appanages of old.

---

[755] L. Adams, *The Spectacular State: Culture and National Identity in Uzbekistan* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2010), 5.

[756] Ibid., 39.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Table of takeovers

Compiled with information derived from the publications of M. Annanepesov, Jean-Louis Bacqué-Grammont, Alexandre Bennigsen, Yuri Bregel, Audrey Burton, Martin Dickson, Chantal Lemercier-Quelquejay, Joo-Yup Lee, R.D. McChesney, Charles Melville, Andrew Newman, Maria Eva Subtelny, Maria Szuppe, Thomas Welsford.

Time period	Ruling power in the east: Herat/Khurasan	Ruling power in the west: Tabriz/Baghdad	Contributing factors to and outcomes of conflicts
1501–1505	Timurid (Herat) Abū'l-Khairid (Samarqand)	Safavid	1500–1501: Bābur's second short-term rule in Samarqand 1500-01 (first rule May 1497-98); defeated by Abū'l-Khairids under Shībānī Khan 1501: Shah Ismāʿīl I begins reign in Tabriz 1503: Safavids take Iraq-i 'Ajam (Fars and Isfahan) from Aq Qoyunlu Turkmans 1505: Shībānī Khan's victory over Khwarazm (lost to Safavids in 1510)
1506–1510	Abū'l-Khairid	Safavid	1506: Death of Timurid ruler Sultan Ḥusain Mīrzā Bāiqarā in Herat 1507: Shībānī Khan's victory over Herat 1507–1510: 1st Abū'l-Khairid occupation of Herat 1510: Shah Ismāʿīl I defeats Shībānī Khan at Marv; Safavid conquest of Herat
1511–1515	Safavid Abū'l-Khairid (1513)	Safavid	1511–1512: Bābur's third short-term rule in Samarqand 1512: Battle of Ghijduvan (Abū'l-Khairid victory over Bābur); proto-Mughals flee to Kabul 1513: Brief Abū'l-Khairid occupation of Herat before Safavids reclaim 1514: Battle of Chaldiran (Ottoman victory over Safavids)
1516–1520	Safavid	Safavid	1516–1526: Bābur controls Balkh 1516–1517: Ottoman victory over Mamluks in Egypt and Syria; Ottomans acquire pilgrimage sites 1517: Ottoman victory over Spanish Algiers 1520: Sultan Süleyman I begins reign
1521–1525	Safavid	Safavid	April–May 1521: minor 12-day Herat siege by Abū'l-Khairids May 1524: death of Shah Ismāʿīl I June 1524: Shah Ṭahmāsp begins reign

1526–1530	Abū'l-Khairid (1529-1530) Safavid	Safavid	1524-28: Abū'l-Khairids control Sistan May 1526: First Battle of Panipat; beginning of Mughal Empire in India with Timurids eliminated as third rival to Khurasan 1526–1534: Safavid court intrigue, qizilbash civil war 1526–1528: Abū'l-Khairids attack Herat 1528: Battle of Jam (Safavids and Abū'l-Khairids clash in Herat) 1528: Abū'l-Khairids and Mughals battle over Balkh and Badakhshan 1529–1530: Abū'l-Khairids occupy Herat (29 October 1529–August 1530)
1531–1535	Abū'l-Khairid (1531-1533 raids) Safavid	Ottoman-Safavid War (1532–1555)	1530–1534: Battle of Bitlis between Safavids and Ottomans (ends in Ottoman victory) 1531–1533: Uzbek campaigns into eastern edge of the Caspian Sea (Bastam and Damghan), advancing as far as Rayy 1532: Abū'l-Khairids attack Herat
1536–1540	Abū'l-Khairid (1535-1537) Safavid	Ottoman-Safavid War (1532–1555)	1535–1537: Abū'l-Khairids attack Herat 1535: Ottoman victory over Safavids in the "Two Iraqs" 1538–1539: Abū'l-Khairids under ʿUbaidullāh take over Khwarazm 1540: ʿAbd al-Laṭif Khan reigns as great khan in Samarqand (until 1551) 1540: Death of ʿUbaidullāh, accession of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz to head Bukhara appanage. Cessation of Abū'l-Khairid threats to Safavids (until 1580s)
1541–1545	Safavid	Ottoman-Safavid War (1532–1555)	1540–1550:ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz rules Bukhara appanage
1546–1550	Abū'l-Khairid	Ottoman-Safavid War (1532–1555)	1548: Abū'l-Khairid raids in Khurasan 1550: ʿAbd al-Laṭif Khan attempts to take Herat
1551–1555	Safavid	Ottoman-Safavid War (1532–1555)	1550: Bukhara appanage struggle between Yār Muḥammad and Pīr Muḥammad 1551–1556: Naurūz Aḥmad reigns as great khan in Samarqand 1555: Treaty of Amasya between Safavids and Ottomans; Ottomans retain Baghdad 1555: Safavid capital shift from Tabriz to Qazvin
1556–1560	Abū'l-Khairid	Ottoman (Baghdad)	1557: Abū'l-Khairid capital consolidation in Bukhara under ʿAbdullāh b. Iskandar Khan; start of civil unrest in Transoxiana

1561–1565	Safavid	Ottoman (Baghdad)	1561: ʿAbdullāh Khan makes father Iskandar great khan of Samarqand 1563–1565: Abū'l-Khairid attempts to seize Mashhad (unsuccessful) mid-1560s: Akbar thwarts challenges to his rule by fellow Timurid claimants and Uzbeks
1566–1570	Safavid	Ottoman (Baghdad)	1566: Death of Sultan Süleyman I; accession of Selim II 1567: ʿAbdullāh Khan attempts to take Herat; besieges Turbat held by future Shah Muḥammad Khudābanda
1571–1575	Abū'l-Khairid	Ottoman (Baghdad)	1573: ʿAbdullāh Khan takes Balkh 1574: Abū'l-Khairids seize Herat for 9 months 1575: Abū'l-Khairids attempt siege of Khiva (Khwarazm)
1576–1580	Safavid	Ottoman-Safavid War (1578–1590)	1576: Shah Ṭahmāsp dies; accession of Ismāʿīl II. Ottomans annex Tabriz 1577: Death of Ismāʿīl II 1578: Accession of Shah Muḥammad Khudābanda. Safavid-Ottoman war launched 1578: Abū'l-Khairid attack launched in Khurasan, repulsed by governor of Mashhad
1581–1585	Safavid	Ottoman-Safavid War (1578–1590)	1583: Death of Iskandar Khan; ʿAbdullāh becomes great khan from new capital Bukhara 1584: Abū'l-Khairids take Badakhshan and Kulab from Mughals 1585: Mughal capital shift from Fatehpur Sikri to Lahore 1585–1603: Tabriz under Ottoman rule
1586–1590	Abū'l-Khairid (1588–1598)	Ottoman-Safavid War (1578–1590)	1588: Shah ʿAbbās I overthrows Muḥammad Khudābanda and begins reign in October 1588–1598: Khurasan controlled by the Abū'l-Khairids after Herat taken in April 1588, Mashhad in November 1589, followed by Nishapur, Sabzivar, and Isfarain 1590: Treaty of Ferhat Paşa; Shah ʿAbbās relinquishes Tabriz and Baghdad
1591–1595	Abū'l-Khairid (1588–1598)	Ottoman	1593–1598: ʿAbdullāh Khan occupies Khwarazm
1596–1600	Abū'l-Khairid (1588–1598) Safavid (1599 onwards)	Ottoman	1598: Safavid capital shift from Qazvin to Isfahan 1598: ʿAbdullāh dies in February; Shah ʿAbbās takes Khurasan 1599: Rise of Tūqāy-Tīmūrids in Samarqand

Appendix 2: Periodization of Abū'l-Khairid arts of the book

Periods 1–4 cover the extent of the Abū'l-Khairid dynasty; Period 5 encompasses the transition to the Tūqāy-Tīmūrid dynasty.

Period	Dates	Notable patrons	Notable artisans	Centers
1	1500–1529	Muḥammad Shībānī, Kīldī-Muḥammad, Kūchkūnchī, Suyūnch Khwāja	Bihzād	Samarqand, Herat, Tashkent, Balkh
2	1530–1555	ʿUbaidullāh, ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, ʿAbd al-Laṭīf, Muḥammad Yar, Naurūz Aḥmad (Barāq)	Maḥmūd Muẕahhib, Shaikhzāda, Mīr ʿAlī, Maḥmūd b. Isḥāq al-Shahābī	Bukhara, Samarqand
3	1556–1575	ʿAbdullāh Khan	ʿAbdullāh Muṣavvir	Bukhara, Balkh
4	1576–1598	ʿAbdullāh Khan, Dīn Muḥammad Sulṭān (military commander), ʿAbdī Khwāja Ṣaʿd (religious leader)	Muḥammadī	Bukhara, Herat, Balkh
5	1599–1628	Valī Muḥammad Khan	Muḥammad Murād, Muḥammad Darvīsh, Muḥammad Sharīf	Samarqand, Bukhara

Appendix 3: Correspondence between Ottoman and Abū'l-Khairid rulers. ca. 1500–1598

Compiled with information derived from the publications of Jean-Louis Bacqué-Grammont, Alexandre Bennigsen, Martin Dickson, Chantal Lemercier-Quelquejay, Audrey Burton, L. Fekete, Bert G. Fragner, H.F. Hofman, and Toru Horikawa. Supplemented with other documents in the Ottoman Imperial Archives.

Languages:
P=Persian, T=Turki.
Dates:
CE Year.Month.Day(s) followed by AH Year.Month.Day(s) in parentheses.
M=*Muḥarram*, S=*Ṣafar*, RA=*Rabīʿ al-avval*, R=*Rabīʿ al-ākhir*, JA=*Jumādā al-ūlā*, J=*Jumādā al-ākhira*, B=*Rajab*, Sh=*Shaʿbān*, N=*Ramażān*, L=*Shavvāl*, ZA=*Ẕū al-qaʿda*, Z=*Ẕū al-ḥijja*.
Locations:
BL Or 3482=*Majmaʿ al-inshāʾ* by Abū'l Qāsim Ḥaidar Iwaghlī (P).
BL IO 3497=*Sharafnāma-yi shāhī* by Ḥāfiẓ Tanīsh (P).
BL Or 6478=*Taẕkīra-yi Muqīm Khānī* by Muḥammad Yūsuf Munshī Khān (P).
BOA=Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi (Ottoman Imperial Archives), Istanbul (P&T).
FB=*Majmūʿa-yi munshaʾāt-i salāṭīn* by Feridun Beg (P&T).
MM=*Mirat ul-memâlik* by Sidi Ali Reis, 1557 (T).
TS=*Tarih-i Selânikî* by Selânikî (T).

Letter location and accession number	Date written	Language (when known)	From	To	Contents (when known)
BOA: TSMA 11404	1513.7.9 (919.JA.5)	P	ʿUbaidullāh	Muḥammad Tīmūr (unidentified)	ʿUbaidullāh discusses siege of Herat
FB	1514.3.18-27 (920.M)	P	Selim I	ʿUbaidullāh	ʿUbaidullāh acknowledges receipt of firepower from Selim I used in the Battle of Ghijduvan to fight the Timurids under Babur
FB	1514.7.12-21 (920.J)	P	ʿUbaidullāh	Selim I	
FB	1514	T	Selim I	Suyūnch	Ottoman proclamation of victory in Chaldiran
FB	1514 or 1515	P	Suyūnch	Selim I	Suyūnch's response
FB	1515.9.1-9 (921.B)	T	Selim I	ʿUbaidullāh	Selim I reports on his conquests in Diyarbakir and Kurdistan
BOA: TSMA E.8358	1518.1-1519.1 (ca. 924)	P	Jānībeg Sulṭān	Selim I	ʿUbaidullāh's congratulations on the conquest of Egypt
BOA: TSMA E.5441 (also 745/25)	1533.8.1 (940.M.10)	P	ʿUbaidullāh	Süleyman	ʿUbaidullāh reports to the Sulṭān about a campaign between April–May 1532 in which the Safavids were routed from Herat, and congratulates Süleyman on his victory over Shāh Ismāʿīl's son Bahrām Mīrza, governor of Khurasan, in August 1533
FB	—	T	Süleyman	Uzbek Sulṭān (unidentified)	
TSMA.E.6515	—	T	Süleyman	ʿUbaidullāh	
BOA: TSMA.E.750.85	1535.2.5 (941.Sh.1)	P&T	ʿUbaidullāh	Süleyman	ʿUbaidullāh opens with a poem from Dihlavī to express sorrow to his Ottoman counterpart
TSMA.E.5905	1535.2.15 (941.Sh.11)	T	ʿUbaidullāh	Süleyman	
BOA: TSMA.E.12284	1535.3.1 (941.Sh.25)	T	ʿUbaidullāh	Süleyman	
BOA: TSMA.E.5489	1541.2.27–3.28 (947.ZA)	P	ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz	Süleyman	Death announcement of ʿUbaidullāh
BOA: TSMA.E.9661	ca. 1550	T	Naurūz Aḥmad (Barāq) Khan	Süleyman	
FB	1550.5.30 (957.JA.13)	T	Süleyman	ʿAbd al-Laṭīf	
?	1551–55				Exchanges of embassies (east to west) and weapons (west to east) between Naurūz Aḥmad Khan and Süleyman. Süleyman asks Naurūz Aḥmad Khan to march against Iran

BOA: TSMA K.888, f.160	1552.4 (959.JA)	T			Letter by the Ottoman authorities to allow safe passage concerning the return to Central Asia of the ambassadors of the rulers of Bukhara, Samarkand and Urganch
BOA: TSMA K.888, f.237v	1552.5 (959.J)	T			Letter by the Ottoman authorities to allow safe passage of Naurūz Aḥmad Khan's ambassador, arquebuses, cannons, janissaries, and horses from Edirne through the Crimea to reach Samarqand
BOA: TSMA.E.9696	1554.7 (961.N)	P	Naurūz Aḥmad Khan	Süleyman	Naurūz Aḥmad informs the addressee that he will soon resume the war against the Safavids after it stalled following the death of ʿAbd al-Laṭīf Khan
MM	1556–57				Ottoman admiral Sidi Ali Reis en route between India and Istanbul visits court of Naurūz Aḥmad
FB	1556.2 (963.R)	P	Naurūz Aḥmad Khan	Süleyman	
FB	1556.5.1 (963.J.20)	P	Naurūz Aḥmad Khan	Süleyman	
FB	–	P	Naurūz Aḥmad Khan	Süleyman	
BOA: TSMA.E.9696	1557.4–5 (964.B)	P	Süleyman	Naurūz Aḥmad Khan	Süleyman answers Naurūz Aḥmad, expressing his hope to have a special friendship with ʿAbdullāh, but cannot give or accept help for the sake of peace with the Safavids
?	ca. 1559–61				Pīr Muḥammad offers to march on Iran; Ottoman help fails to materialize
?	1559.9 (967.Z)	T	Süleyman	Pīr Muḥammad	
FB	1561.9.2–10 (968.Z)	T	Süleyman	Pīr Muḥammad	
BOA: M.21–465	1573.3.25 (980.ZA.21)	T	Selim II	ʿAbdullāh Khan	
FB	1576–77 (984–85)	T	Murad III	ʿAbdullāh Khan	ʿAbdullāh's first representative sent to the Ottomans, ambassador ʿAlī Bahādur Ḥajjī, carries letter from the new sultan Murad III expressing determination to fight Iran.
FB	pre–1585	—	Murad III	ʿAbdullāh Khan	Ottoman ambassador Muṣṭafā Chāvūsh representing Murad III sent to Khanate; message carried not found.

BL Or 3482, ff.114b-115a	1585.7 (993.B)	T	ʿAbdullāh Khan	Murad III	ʿAbdullāh's letter to Murad III inquires into the possibility of a joint Ottoman-Uzbek attack on Iran.
HT, f.243b	1587.8.3 (995.Sh.28)	—	ʿAbdullāh Khan	Murad III	ʿAbdullāh writes from Herat to the sultan again proposing a joint attack on Iran. Missive given to Ottoman envoy Sala Shāh who departs the khanate with gifts and arrives in Istanbul in 1590; Abū'l-Khairid victory already secured over Khurasan.
BL Or 6478, ff. 236b-240a	1589.9.30 (977.ZA.20)	P	ʿAbd al-Muʾmīn	Murad III	ʿAbd al-Muʾmīn writes following the siege of Mashhad on 30 September 1589, boasts of ʿAbdullāh's military victories and political power. Claims the Mashhad shrine and Tahmasp's tomb were desecrated. Speaks of sending troops to Tabriz.
?	ca. 1591				ʿAbdullāh sends two ambassadors to Istanbul in 1591 with details of his successes in Khurasan.
FB	ca. Aug. 1591–March 1592	—	Murad III	ʿAbdullāh Khan	Murād writes to ʿAbdullāh referring to the latter's recent capture of Herat, intention to take Bastam and Damghan, and advance on Qazvin. Voices dissatisfaction with further Abū'l-Khairid expansion. Explains the Ottomans' commitment to peace with Iran after Shah ʿAbbās presents Ḥaidar Mīrza as a hostage.
TS	1594.1.11 (1002.RA.)	T	ʿAbdullāh Khan	Murad III	ʿAbdullāh proclaims his military victories and asks the Ottomans to request of the Safavids to extradite the Khwarazmian ruler Ḥajjim Khan from Qazvin to Khwarazm.
TS	1594	—	Murad III	ʿAbdullāh Khan	Letter expresses Ottoman refusal to extradite Ḥajjim Khan or wage war with Safavids carried by Bukharan ambassador Adtāsh Khan.
FB	1594–97	—	ʿAbdullāh Khan	Mehmet III	Letter asks for pilgrims' protection while making the hajj in Ottoman lands carried by Khwāja Isḥāq.
FB	Feb. 1598	—	ʿAbdullāh Khan	Mehmet III	ʿAbdullāh's congratulations on Ottoman victories against Austria and on Mehmet III's accession in 1595 carried by ambassador.

FB	late 1597–early 1598	—	Mehmet III	ʿAbdullāh Khan	Letter on behalf of Mehmet written by Khadim Hasan Pasha (Ottoman grand vizier October 1597–April 1598) expresses joy over Abū'l-Khairid victories against the Khwarazmians to liberate Caspian shores. Carried by Uzbek envoy Tardī ʿAlī after his embassy visit to Istanbul.
FB	post–April 1598	—	Mehmet III	ʿAbdullāh Khan	Letter on behalf of Mehmet written by Gerash Pasha (Ottoman grand vizier April-December 1598) confirms ʿAbdullāh's request for protections granted to Bukharan pilgrims. Asks ʿAbdullāh to lift a blockade in Khwarazm to benefit pilgrimage and trade.

Appendix 4: Manuscripts produced for ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz and his courtiers ca. 1530s–1550s in the workshop of Sulṭān Mīrak, *kitābdār* of Bukhara

Listed by the date of their illustrative program in Bukhara.

Number	Title	Author	Scribal information	Illustration information	Accession number
1	*Būstān*	Saʿdī	Mīr ʿAlī al-Ḥusainī al-Kātib as-Sulṭānī	Shaikhzāda, 1531	Cartier collection
2	Qurʾān	—	Shaikh Kamāl b. ʿAbd al-Khāliq al-Balkhī	1532	TSMK no. 10
3	*Kulliyāt*	Navāʾī	Mīr ʿAlī Bukhārāʾī	1536	TIEM 1946
4	*Yūsuf u Zulaikhā*	Jāmī	ʿAīshī al-Kātib and Mīr ʿAlī al-Sulṭānī, 1537	1537, later additions in 1557	FM 24-1948
5	*Tuḥfat al-aḥrār*	Jāmī	Sulṭān ʿAlī al-Mashhadī, 1499	Maḥmūd Muẕahhib, Shaikhzāda, 1538	BNF Sup. Pers. 1416
6	Qurʾān	—	1538	—	Khalili Collection QUR 114
7	*Haft manẓar*	Hātifī	Mīr ʿAlī, 1529	Sulṭān Mīrak, 1538	NMAA F.1956.14
8	*Yūsuf u Zulaikhā*	Jāmī	Sulṭān ʿAlī al-Mashhadī, 1492	Sulṭān Mīrak ca. 1540s	Kevorkian Collection CXXXV
9	Album	Miscellaneous	Sulṭān ʿAlī al-Mashhadī, Muḥammad b. Sulṭān Muḥammad Nūr, Shaikh Burānī, Khaṭāʾī	Maḥmūd Muẕahhib, ca. 1540s	TSMK H.2159
10	*Ṣubḥat al-abrār*	Jāmī	Maḥmūd al-Haravī	ca. 1540s	Kelekian Collection
11	*Khamsa*	Navāʾī	Sulṭān ʿAlī al-Mashhadī, 1492	1540	WCRL 1/8 (RCIN 1005032)
12	*Maṭlaʿ al-anvār*	Dihlavī	Mīr ʿAlī, 1540	Sulṭān Mīrak, 1540	KBOPL 129
13	*Sharḥ-i Dīvān-i ʿAlī*	Jāmī	Sulṭān Maḥmūd al-Ṣāfī b. Sulṭān Muḥammad, 1518	ca. 1540	RIOS S-1532
14	*Būstān*	Saʿdī	Mīr ʿAlī al-Ḥusainī, 1531	1540	Cartier Collection
15	*Ṣubḥat al-abrār*	Jāmī	Khwāja Maḥmūd b. Isḥāq al-Shahhābī Siyāvūshānī, 1535	ca. 1540	Sotheby's sale 21 April 1980, lot 186
16	*Tīmūr-nāma*	Hātifī	Scribed by Maḥmūd b. Niẓām al-Haravī in 1541.	ca. 1541	TSMK H.1594
17	*Būstān*	Saʿdī	Mīr ʿAlī al-Ḥusainī, 1531	1542	HAM 1979.2

18	4 *maṯnavī* (lacks *Yūsuf u Zulaikhā*)	Jāmī	Mīr Ḥusain al-Kātib al-Khāqānī al-Ḥusainī (Kulangī), Muḥammad ʿAlī b. Maḥmūd al-Munajjim al-Khāqānī at Bukhara, Khwāja Jān b. Sulṭān Aḥmad Siyāvūshānī at Bukhara, 1543	1543	CBL 213
19	Anthology	Qāsim Anvār, Kamāl Ismāʿīl, Ḥāfiẓ, Āsafī, Bannāʾī, Hilālī	(Muḥammad) ʿAlī b. Maḥmūd al-Munajjim al-Haqqānī al-Kātib; Mīr Ḥusain al-Ḥusainī, 1545	1545	TSMK R.958
20	*Makhzan al-asrār*	Niẓāmī	Mīr ʿAlī Haravī, 1538	Sulṭān Mīrak, 1545	BNF Sup Pers 985
21	Qurʾān of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz	—	Muḥammad Ḥusain b. Muḥyī al-Haravī, 1545	1545	DMA K.1.2014.1172
22	*Tuḥfat al-aḥrār*	Jāmī	Mīr ʿAlī al-Ḥusainī (II), 1547	1547	CBL 215
23	*Bahāristān*	Jāmī	Sulṭān ʿAlī al-Mashhadī, 1547	Sulṭān Mīrak, ca. 1547	MCG LA 169
24	*Gulistān*	Saʿdī	Sulṭān ʿAlī al-Mashhadī, 1500	Sulṭān Mīrak, 1547	MBF 30
25	*Raużat al-muḥibbīn*	Jauziya	Mīr ʿAlī (II), 1548	Sulṭān Mīrak, 1548	SJM A. Nm. 1611
26	*Būstān*	Saʿdī	Mīr ʿAlī al-Haravī, 1542	1549	MCG L.A. 177
27	*Haft aurang*	Jāmī	Posited ca. 1540s	illustration added ca. 1560s	TSMK H.1091
28	Anthology	—	Scribed by Kulangī and Muḥammad ʿAlī al-Kātib circa 1545-50.		TSMK R.1964
29	*Bahāristān*	Jāmī	Mīr Ḥusain Ḥusainī Kulangī, 1551	1551	MIA 52.13

Appendix 5: Manuscripts produced for ʿAbdullāh Khan and his courtiers ca. 1550s–1570s in the workshop of ʿAbdullāh Muṣavvir, *kitābdār* of Bukhara

Listed by title.

Number	Title	Author	Scribal information	Illustration information	Patron	Accession number
1	Anthology (with *Dīvān* of Jāmī, *Būstān* of Saʿdī)	Jāmī, Saʿdī	1563	1563	ʿAbdullāh	Kevorkian Collection
2	Anthology	Niʿmatullāh	ʿAlī Riżā al-Kātib, 1564	1564	Niʿmatullāh Khalifa	Hotel Drouot sale 3 December 2012
3	Anthology (*Bayāż*)		Mīr Ḥusain al-Ḥusainī (Kulangī), 1575	1575	ʿAbdullāh	Hotel Drouot sale 17 June 2019, lot 306
4	Anthology		1579	1579	unspecified	JRL Pers. MS 45
5	*Anvār-i suḥailī*	Kāshifī	ʿAlī Riżā al-Kātib, 1564	1564	unspecified	LACMA M.73.5.517
6	*Bahāristān*	Jāmī	ʿAlī Riżā al-Kātib, 1575	1575	unspecified	AMA 93/23/1146
7	*Dīvān*	Shāhī (Qāsim)	ʿAlī Riżā al-Kātib (attributed), 1563	1563	ʿAbdullāh	NYPL Spencer, Pers. 52
8	*Dīvān*	Ḥāfiẓ	1568	1568	unspecified	Khalili Collection 719
9	*Dīvān*	Ḥāfiẓ	Muhammad Ḥusain al-Ḥusainī (Kulangī), 1570	1570	unspecified	Khalili Collection 778
10	*Dīvān*	Qāsim	Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ Bukhārī, 1579	1579	unspecified	JRL Pers. MS 43
11	*Duval Rānī u Khiżr Khān*	Dihlavī	1568	1568	unspecified	NMI 997
12	*Būstān* and *Gulistān* (dispersed)	Saʿdī	1560	1560	ʿAbdullāh or courtier	CAI 1998.171, 172; Christie's sale 10 October 2013, lot 15; 25 April 2013, lots 26 & 27; BL IO J.28.8; BM 1948,1009.0.57; WCMA 91.15.56, lot 60 from a Sotheby's auction 3-8 October 2014; Marteau Collection (as of 1912) now in an unknown location
13	*Būstān*	Saʿdī	Mīr ʿAlī Haravī (II), 1562	1562	ʿAbdullāh's vizier Amīr Tursun	Christie's sale 7 October 2008, lot 175 (formerly MKG 2164)

14	*Būstān*	Saʿdī	Muḥammad Qāsim al-Haravī, 1524	1565	unspecified	CBL Per 129
15	*Būstān*	Saʿdī	Sulṭān Bayazīd b. Mīr Niẓām, 1566	1566	unspecified	Kevorkian Collection
16	*Muntakhab-i Būstān*	Saʿdī	Mīr Ḥusain al-Ḥusainī (Kulangī), 1575	1575	unspecified	NLR PNS 269
17	*Gūī u chaugān, Hālnāma*	ʿArifī	1560	1560	unspecified	JRL Pers. MS 31
18	*Gulistān*	Saʿdī	1560	1560	Courtier of ʿAbdullāh	Christie's sale 4 October 2012, lot 13
19	*Gulistān*	Saʿdī	Mīr ʿAlī al-Ḥusainī (Kulangī), 1564 or 1567	1564 and 1608	unspecified	BL Or. 5302
20	*Gulistān*	Saʿdī	Mīr ʿAlī Haravī (II), 1566	1566	Khwāja Kamāl al-Din Ḥusain b. Khwāja Mīr Vazīr	NLR PNS 110
21	*Gulistān*	Saʿdī	Mīr ʿAlī Haravī (II), 1567	1567	unspecified	BL Or. 9302
22	*Khamsa*	Niẓāmī	Sulṭān Muḥammad Nūr, 1514	1560	unspecified	AHT 78
23	*Khamsa*	Niẓāmī	1564	1564	unspecified	VMM Inv. 219
24	*Khulaṣat al-Khamsa*	Niẓāmī	Muḥammad Ḥusainī al-Ḥusainī (Kulangī), 1565	1565	unspecified	RAS 363
25	*Laylī u Majnūn*	Hātifī	1558	1558	unspecified	LM MAO 713
26	*Shāh u gadā*	Hilālī	Sulṭān Muḥammad Nūr, 1539	1565	unspecified	DMA K.1.2014.1167
27	*Shāhnāma*	Firdausī	Bāqī Muḥammad, 1564	1564	ʿAbdullāh	TSMK H.1488
28	*Silsilat al-ẕahab* and *Makhzan al-asrār*	Jāmī	Sulṭān Muḥammad Nūr, 1519	ca. 1560s	ʿAbdullāh	TSMK R.895
29	*Ṣubḥat al-abrār*	Jāmī	…-al-Haravī, 156…	ca. 1560s	unspecified	IM 5028.1.79
30	*Ṣubḥat al-abrār*	Jāmī	Maḥmūd b. Isḥāq al-Shahhābī al-Haravī, 1564	1564	ʿAbdullāh	DAI LNS 16 MS
31	*Ṣubḥat al-abrār*	Jāmī	Maḥmūd b. Isḥāq al-Shahhābī, 1565	1565	unspecified	BLO Ouseley Add. 23

32	*Ṣubḥat al-abrār*	Jāmī	Isḥāq Muḥammad b. Isḥāq Gunābādī, 1567	1567	unspecified	Sotheby's sale 21 April 1980, 196
33	*Tīmūr-nāma*	Hātifī	1560	1560	unspecified	BL 7780
34	*Tuḥfat al-aḥrār*	Jāmī	Bābā Mīrak al-Kātib al-Tāshkandī, 1558	1558	unspecified	NMAA S.1986.40
35	*Tuḥfat al-aḥrār*	Jāmī	Sulṭān Muḥammad Nūr, 1515	ca. 1560	unspecified	NMAA S.1986.52
36	*Tuḥfat al-aḥrār*	Jāmī	Mīr Ḥusain al-Ḥusainī (Kulangī), 1560s	1560s	ʿAbdullāh (no inscription)	NLR Dorn 425
37	*Tuḥfat al-aḥrār*	Jāmī	Maḥmūd b. Isḥāq al-Shahhābī, 1563	1563	ʿAbdullāh	AKM MS 17
38	*Tuḥfat al-aḥrār*	Jāmī	ʿAlī Riżā al-Kātib, 1568	1568	unspecified	TSMK R.897
39	*Tuḥfat al-aḥrār*	Jāmī	Mīr Ḥusain al-Ḥusainī (Kulangī), 1560s-70s	1560s/70s	unspecified	NLR Dorn 425
40	*Tuḥfat al-aḥrār*	Jāmī	Mīr Ḥusain al-Ḥusainī (Kulangī), 1572	1572	unspecified	IM 5032.1.79
41	*Yūsuf u Zulaikhā*	Jāmī	Maḥmūd b. Isḥāq al-Shahhābī, 1557	1557	ʿAbdullāh	MIK I.1986.105
42	*Yūsuf u Zulaikhā* (dispersed)	Jāmī		1560s	ʿAbdullāh or courtier	SAM 47.17; DC 53.1980, 54.1980; MFAL E.563b & c; MMA 67.266.7-8b; RRK IV-5; BL IOL J.28.19 & 20
43	*Yūsuf u Zulaikhā*	Jāmī	ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Bukhārī, 1563	1563	Niʿmatullāh Khalifa	Sotheby's sale 21 April 1980, lot 194
44	*Yūsuf u Zulaikhā*	Jāmī	Maḥmūd b. Isḥāq al-Shahhābī, 1564	1564	ʿAbdullāh	LACMA M.73.5.440-444
45	*Yūsuf u Zulaikhā*	Jāmī	ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Bukhārī, 1564	1564	ʿAbdullāh	Sotheby's sale 18 October 1995, lot 58
46	*Yūsuf u Zulaikhā*	Jāmī	Maḥmūd b. Isḥāq al-Shahhābī, 1565	1565	ʿAbdullāh	AHT 80
47	*Yūsuf u Zulaikhā*	Jāmī	Sulṭān Bayazīd b. Mīr Niẓām, 1566	1566	unspecified	Colnaghi Collection

48	*Yūsuf u Zulaikhā*	Jāmī	Sulṭān Bayazīd b. Mīr Niẓām, 1544	1566	unspecified	AHT 81
49	*Yūsuf u Zulaikhā*	Jāmī	1568	1568	unspecified	BL Or. 4389
50	*Yūsuf u Zulaikhā*	Jāmī	ʿAbdullāh Shīrāzī, pre-1555	1570s	Kāmrān b. Bābur (intended patron or later recipient)	NYPL Pers. 64
51	*Yūsuf u Zulaikhā*	Jāmī	Mīr ʿAlī al-Ḥusainī (Kulangī), 1570	1570	unspecified	Christie's sale 18 October 1994, lot 72
52	*Yūsuf u Zulaikhā*	Jāmī	1570	1570	unspecified	MBF 509
53	*Yūsuf u Zulaikhā*	Jāmī	ʿAlī Riżā al-Kātib, 1572	1572	unspecified	IM OS 5032.1.79
54	*Yūsuf u Zulaikhā*	Jāmī	ʿAlī Riżā al-Kātib, 1573	1573	unspecified	Sotheby's sale 19 October 1994, lot 107
55	*Yūsuf u Zulaikhā*	Jāmī	ʿAlī Riżā al-Kātib, 1581	1581	unspecified	Sotheby's sale 22 April 1980, lot 306
56	*Ẓafarnāma*	Hātifī	ʿAlī Riżā al-Kātib, 1568	1568	unspecified	ARB 2102
57	Folio from unidentified manuscript	—	—	—	ʿAbdullāh or courtier	MMA 20.120.262

Appendix 6: Abū'l-Khairid manuscripts gifted in the 16th century

Arranged by possible date of dispatch.

6a: To the Safavids

Number	Title	Author	Original production information	Information on acquisition by the Safavids (when known)	Accession number	Notes
1	*Tuḥfat al-aḥrār*	Jāmī	Scribed by Mīr Ḥusain al-Ḥusainī (Kulangī), 1560s.	Seal on f.1r and a record about the transfer of the book attest that Shah ʿAbbās I endowed the volume together with other literary works to Shaikh Ṣāfī's mausoleum in Ardabil, in 1608.	NLR Dorn 425	Reproduced in Vasilyeva and Yastrebova, *Arts of the Book in the 15th-17th-Century Mawarannahr*, 188-203. This gifting of a Jāmī manuscript to the Safavids might have carried a subtle statement: Shāh Ṭahmāsp abhorred Jāmī (Dickson, "Shāh Ṭahmāsp and the Uzbeks," 190). The volume was later gifted by the Qajars to the Russians in 1829.
2	Anthology	*Būstān* of Saʿdī and *Dīvān* of Qāsimī	Scribed by Kulangī for a courtier of Naurūz Aḥmad between 1552-56 with illustrations from this period.	Offered to Shah ʿAbbās I as *pīshkash.*	BNF Sup Pers 257	The manuscript entered the Mughal imperial library and continued to the Ottoman realm after 1653 (Richard, *Splendeurs persanes: Manuscrits du XIIe au XVIIe siècle,*148).
3	*Makhzan al-asrār*	Niẓāmī	Scribed by Mīr ʿAlī in 1538 with illustrations added in 1545 and produced for ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz.	Sent to the Safavids where a double-page frontispiece was added in Isfahan between 1610-20.	BNF Sup Pers 985	The manuscript continued onwards into the library of Shāh Jahān where further Mughal retouching was added, then was taken by Nādir Shāh as booty where it remained in the royal Qajar collections, then was later gifted to the Russians and sold in Paris (Richard, "Un Makhzan al-Asrar de Niẓāmī").

6b: To the Mughals

Ms. no.	Title	Author	Original production information	Information on acquisition by the Mughals (when known)	Accession number	Notes
1	*Gulistān*	Saʿdī	Scribed by Kulangī between 1564-67.	Illustrated by Shaikhm in Akbar's *kitābkhāna* in the late-sixteenth/early seventeenth century.	BL Or. 5302	Manuscript's trajectory is evinced by artistic interventions from the reign of Fatḥ ʿAlī Shāh (r. 1797-1834), including a painted lacquer binding depicting a foreign retinue wearing military uniforms from the period of George III (r. 1760–1820).
2	*Tavārīkh-i guzīda-yi nuṣrat-nāma*	anonymous	Illustrated in Transoxiana circa late-1530s through 1550s.	Possibly gifted to the Mughals pre-1590. Might contain a seal of Shāh Jahān.	BL Or. 3222	Brend, "A Sixteenth-Century Manuscript from Transoxiana."
3	*Tuḥfat al-aḥrār*	Jāmī	Scribed by Mīr ʿAlī in 1509, assembled between 1544–47 under Sulṭān Mīrak for ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz.	Presented to Akbar in 1556. It was then in the possession of Akbar's son Sulṭān Murād Mīrzā (1570–99), and passed into Akbar and Jahāngīr's ownership.	CBL Per 215	Akimushkin, et al., "The Shībānīds (Bukhara, 1500–98) and the Janids (Astarkhanids)," 581.
4	*Tuḥfat al-aḥrār*	Jāmī	Scribed by Kulangī and illustrated for a courtier of Yār Muḥammad in 1554.	In the possession of Akbar's son Sulṭān Murād Mīrzā (1570–99).	MCG LA 184	Natif, "The SOAS *Anvār-i Suhaylī,*" 347.
5	*Būstān*	Saʿdī	Scribed by Mīr ʿAlī in 1531 and illustrated in 1540 for ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz.	In the possession of Akbar's son Sulṭān Murād Mīrzā (1570–99).	Cartier Collection	After the manuscript was transferred to Akbar's library it continued into the possessions of Jahāngīr and Shāh Jahān (Balafrej, *The Making of the Artist in Late Timurid Painting*, 222).
6	*Khamsa*	Niẓāmī	Scribed by Mīr Muḥammad in 1557.	Illustrations added in India circa 1572.	BL IOL 384	Natif, "The SOAS *Anvār-i Suhaylī*, 347.
7	*Yūsuf u Zulaikhā*	Jāmī	Scribed by Maḥmūd b. Isḥāq al-Shahhābī al-Haravī in 1557 and illustrated for ʿAbdullāh Khan.	Gifted to the Mughals during the last quarter of the sixteenth or the first decade of the seventeenth century.	MIK I.1986.105	Kröger, "On Maḥmūd B. Isḥāq al-Shihabi's Manuscript of 'Yūsuf va Zulaykhā'."
8	*Yūsuf u Zulaikhā*	Jāmī	Scribed by ʿAbdullāh Shīrāzī, pre-1555. With illustrations circa 1570.	Gifted to Kāmrān b. Bābur.	NYPL Pers. 64	Sharma, "Approaching Jāmī through Visual Culture," 46.

Ms. no.	Title	Author	Original production information	Information on acquisition by the Mughals (when known)	Accession number	Notes
9	*Ṣubḥat al-abrār*	Jāmī	Scribed by Maḥmūd b. Isḥāq al-Shahhābī al-Haravī in 1564 (although the colophon has been tampered with) and illustrated for ʿAbdullāh Khan.	Gifted to Akbar at some point between 1577–96 or in 1601.	DAI LNS 16 MS	Adamova and Bayani, *Persian Painting: The Arts of the Book and Portraiture*, 423.
10	*Bahāristān*	Jāmī	Scribed by Sulṭān ʿAlī in 1547, assembled by Sulṭān Mīrak for ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz.	Inspected by Akbar in 1566.	MCG LA 169	Gruber, "The Gulbenkian *Bahāristān*," unpaginated.
11	Qurʾān	—	Scribed in Samarqand.	Gifted by ʿAbdullāh to Akbar in 1593.	NMI 54.29/1	Seyller, "Inspection and Valuation," 345.
12	*Yūsuf u Zulaikhā*	Jāmī	Scribed by Mīr Ṣāliḥ al-Kātib in February 1599.	Date of transfer to India unknown but later acquired by Tīpū Sulṭān.	BL IO Islamic 737	
13	*Shāh u gadā*	Hilālī	Scribed and illustrated in 1540 for a courtier of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz.	Bears Mughal overpainting. Date of accession by the Mughal library unknown.	MLM M.531	Tanındı suggests a Bukharan copy of *Shāh u gadā* by Hilālī was a diplomatic gift to the Mughals ("Safevī, Özbek ve Osmanlı İlişkisinin Kitap Sanatına Yansıması," 580).
14	*Shāh u gadā*	Hilālī	Scribed by Sulṭān Muḥammad Nūr in 1539, refurbished and illustrated in 1565.	Unknown when accessioned by the Mughal library.	DMA K.1.2014.1167	The manuscript continued onwards into the library of Shāh Jahān where further Mughal retouching was added, then was taken by Nādir Shāh as booty where it remained in the royal Qajar collections, then was later gifted to the Russians and sold in Paris (Richard, "Un Makhzan al-Asrar de Niẓāmī").
15	*Shāh u gadā*	Hilālī	Circa 1565.	Unknown whether accessioned by the Mughal library.	Hotel Druout auction, Paris, 16 November 1992, lot 293	
16	*Tuḥfat al-aḥrār*	Jāmī	Scribed by Sulṭān Muḥammad Nūr in 1515 and illustrated in the 1560s.	Later inspected by the Mughal royal library in 1658.	NMAA S1986.52.1	Seyller, "Inspection and Valuation," 250.
17	*Būstān*	Saʿdī	Scribed by Kulangī under the authority of ʿAbdullāh al-Munshī and illustrated in 1553.	Signed by Jahāngīr in 1605.	MKG Inv. 2197	Seyller, "Inspection and Valuation," 338.

Ms. no.	Title	Author	Original production information	Information on acquisition by the Mughals (when known)	Accession number	Notes
18	Anthology	—	Scribed by Mīrzā Muḥammad al-Kātib and illustrated circa 1550.		BNF Supp Pers 802	French Indian Company employee Pierre de Brueys purchased the volume in India in 1801 (Richard, "Illustrated Manuscripts from Mawarannahr in French Collections," forthcoming).
19	*Haft manẓar*	Hātifī	Scribed by Mīr ʿAlī in 1529, assembled by Sulṭān Mīrak in 1537 for ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz.	Includes a note by Shāh Jahān dated 1628.	NMAA 1956.14	Seyller, "Inspection and Valuation," 286.
20	*Dīvān*	Hilālī	Scribed by Mīr ʿAlī in 1531.	In the possession of Shāh Jahān.	KCL Pote 186	The manuscript is the subject of Firuza Melville, "Hilali and Mir ʿAli."
21	*Būstān*	Saʿdī	Scribed by Mīr ʿAlī in 1542, illustrated in 1549 for ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz.		MCG L.A. 177	Seyller, "Inspection and Valuation," 303.
22	*Bahāristān*	Jāmī	Scribed by Kulangī and illustrated in 1551.		MIA 52.13	
23	*Raużat al-muḥibbīn*	Jauziya	Scribed by Mīr ʿAlī and assembled by Sulṭān Mīrak for ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz in 1548.	Contains notes by Jahāngīr, Shāh Jahān.	SJM 4372, or A. Nm. 1611	Seyller, "Inspection and Valuation," 339.
24	*Dīvān*	Jāmī	Scribed by Mīr ʿAlī in 1515, illustrated in 1560.	Contains a note by Shāh Jahān's librarian Daulat.	NYPL M&A Pers. 1	Seyller, "Inspection and Valuation," 248, ftn. 15.
25	*Majālis al-ʿushshāq*	Bāiqarā/ Gazurgāhī	Scribed by Mīr Ṣāliḥ in 1606, illustrated by Muḥammad Samarqandī in Samarqand.	Contains seals of Shāh Jahān.	ARB 3476	
26	*Būstān*	Saʿdī	Scribed by Sulṭān Muḥammad Nūr in Samarqand in 1530.		RAS 251	
27	*Yūsuf u Zulaikhā*	Jāmī	ʿAīshī al-Kātib and Mīr ʿAlī al-Sulṭānī, 1537	1537, later additions in 1557	FM 24-1948	Sharma, "Approaching Jāmī through Visual Culture," 46.
28	*Gulistān*	Saʿdī	Scribed by Mīr ʿAlī Haravī (II), 1566 for Khwāja Kamāl al-Din Ḥusain b. Khwāja Mīr Vazīr	Contains seals of Jahāngīr up to Aurangzib, later Nādir Shāh. Later in the hands of the Russian envoy to Iran I.O. Simonich.	NLR PNS 110	Provenance mentioned in O.V. Vasilyeva and O.M. Yastrebova, *Arts of the Book in the 15th-17th-Century Mawarannahr,* 72.

6c: To the Ottomans

Ms. no.	Title	Author	Production information	Information on acquisition by the Ottomans (when known)	Accession number	Notes
1	Qurʾān	—	Scribed by Shaikh Kamāl b. ʿAbd al-Khāliq al-Balkhī in 1532 for ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz.	Likely transmitted to the Ottoman library in 1582.	TSMK M.10	
2	*Iẓhār al-muẕmar-i kabīr*	?	Scribed and illustrated in 1542.		TSMK B.148	Mentioned by Akimushkin, "Biblioteka Shībānīdov v Bukhare," 340.
3	*Khamsa*	Niẓāmī	Scribed in 1501 and illustrated in the "little figure" style.	Possibly accessioned by the royal Ottoman library in 1594.	TSMK R.863	Stchoukine suggests the manuscript was offered to Sultan Murad III in 1594 by ʿAbdullāh's ambassador in *Les Peintures des Manuscrits de la 'Khamseh' de Niẓāmī*, 125.
4	*Khamsa*	Jāmī	Scribed by Sulṭān ʿAlī al-Mashhadī in 1506, unknown date of illustrations.		TSMK R.888	Simpson and Farhad, *Sultan Ibrahim Mirza's* Haft Awrang, 371.
5	*Silsilat al-ẕahhab*	Jāmī	Scribed by Sulṭān Muḥammad Nūr in 1519, illustrated circa 1565-70.		TSMK R.895	
6	*Tuḥfat al-aḥrār*	Jāmī	Scribed by ʿAlī Riẕā and illustrated in 1568.		TSMK R.897	Carries an inscription stating it was offered by the ambassador of Bukhara but without a date. Likely transmitted to the royal Ottoman library in 1582 at the circumcision festival for Murād's son Mehmed in 1582 (Stchoukine, *Les Peintures des Manuscrits de la 'Khamseh' de Niẓāmī*, 125).
7	*Būstān*	Saʿdī	Scribed by ʿAlī al-Kātib and illustrated in 1583.		TSMK R.931	İnal, "Bir Özbek Şehnamesi," 319.
8	*Būstān*	Saʿdī	Scribed and purportedly illustrated in 1583.		TSMK R.936	Based on the scribal date I suspect it is of Khurasani manufacture. Mentioned in İnal, "Bir Özbek Şehnamesi," 318-19.
9	*Gulistān*	Saʿdī	Scribed and illustrated in 1583.		TSMK R.938	İnal, "Bir Özbek Şehnamesi," 320.
10	Anthology	Qāsim Anvār, Kamāl Ismāʿīl, Ḥāfiẓ, Āsafī, Bannāʾī, Hilālī	Scribed by Muḥammad ʿAlī b. Maḥmūd al-Munajjim al-Haqqānī and Kulangī between 1544-1549 for ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz.		TSMK R.958	Tanındı, "Safevī, Özbek ve Osmanlı İlişkisinin Kitap Sanatına Yansıması," ftn. 15.

Ms. no.	Title	Author	Production information	Information on acquisition by the Ottomans (when known)	Accession number	Notes
11	*Haft aurang*	Jāmī	Circa 1560s.		TSMK H.1091	
12	*Shāhnāma*	Firdausī	Scribed by Muḥammad al-Bāqī in 1564 for ʿAbdullāh Khan.	Transmitted to the Ottoman library in 1594.	TSMK H.1488	İnal, "Bir Özbek Şehnamesi."
13	*Shāhnāma* (truncated version)	Firdausī	Scribed by Muḥammad al-Bukhārā'ī, undated. Perhaps written and illustrated in Baghdad in the last quarter of the sixteenth century.	Deposited by the Ottoman governor Davud Paşa (d. post-1596) in the Topkapı Palace at some point between 1594–1604.	TSMK H.1503	Schmidt, "The Reception of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* Among the Ottomans," 125.
14	*Shāhnāma*	Firdausī	Circa 1480–1510.		TSMK H.1509	İnal, "Topkapı Müzesindeki Hazine 1509."
15	*Shāhnāma* (truncated version)	Firdausī	Scribed by Maḥmūd b. Muḥammad al-Balkhī in Bukhara in 1535.	Likely illustrated in Baghdad in the last quarter of the sixteenth century.	TSMK H.1514	
16	*Shāhnāma*	Firdausī	Possibly scribed in Herat circa 1500 with illustrations begun there.	Finished in the Ottoman realm circa 1530s/1540s. Date of accession by the Ottoman library unknown, post-Chaldiran (1514) possible. Contains later ownership seals of Sultan Selim II (r. 1566–74) and Osman III (r. 1754–57).	TSMK R.1549	
17	*Tīmūr-nāma*	Hātifī	Scribed by Maḥmūd b. Niẓām al-Haravī in 1540.		TSMK H.1594	
18	Anthology	—	Scribed by Kulangī and Muḥammad ʿAlī al-Kātib circa 1545-50.		TSMK R.1964	Also labelled *Majmūʿa-yi aṣār*. Information on the scribe in Szuppe, "The Family and Professional Circle of Two Samarkand Calligraphers," ftn. 59.
19	Album of Bahrām Mīrzā	—	With calligraphic specimens by the Abū'l-Khairid leaders ʿUbaidullāh, ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, Naurūz Aḥmad		TSMK H.2154	Togan, *On the Miniatures in Istanbul Libraries,* 18.
20	Album of ʿUbaidullāh	—	Compiled ca. 1530.		TSMK H.2155	Togan, *On the Miniatures in Istanbul Libraries,* 20.
21	Album	—	Bukharan or Khurasan provenance, ca. 1580s.		TSMK H.2169	Mahir, "Album H. 2169 in the Topkapı Palace Museum Library."
22	Album of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz	—	Compiled ca. 1540.		TSMK H.2159	Togan, *On the Miniatures in Istanbul Libraries,* 20.

Ms. no.	Title	Author	Production information	Information on acquisition by the Ottomans (when known)	Accession number	Notes
23	Album of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz	—	Originally compiled circa 1540, repaired in Khurasan and/or Isfahan circa 1580-1600.	Brought to Istanbul after 1597.	TSMK E.H. 2841	Tanındı, "Safevī, Özbek ve Osmanlı İlişkisinin Kitap Sanatına Yansıması."
24	*Duval Rānī u Khiżr Khān*	Dihlavī	—		IUL F.1340	Illustrations appear to be ca. 1500s Samarqand/ Herat, or ca. 1520s, Tashkent.
25	*Khamsa*	Niẓāmī	Scribed by Sulṭān Muḥammad Nūr and illustrated by Shaikhzāda in 1524 in Herat.	Possibly accessioned by the royal Ottoman library in 1594.	MMA 13.228.7	İnal identifies the manuscript as the copy gifted to the Ottomans in 1594. The binding is akin to those made for the Safavid prince Sām Mīrzā (d. 1566). ʿUbaidullāh may have taken the manuscript to Bukhara before it was gifted to the Ottomans. Seal impressions attest to both Safavid and Qajar ownership (including a son of Fatḥ ʿAlī Shāh in 1844). In circa 1900, F. R. Martin acquired the volume from an Ottoman collection.
26	Qurʾān of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz	—	Scribed by Muḥammad Ḥusain b. Muḥyī al-Haravī in 1545.	Likely transmitted to the Ottoman library.	DMA K.1.2014.1172	
27	*Dīvān*	Qāsimī	Scribed by Sulṭān ʿAlī al-Mashhadī in 1514, illustrated circa 1535.		BNF Sup Pers 1960	Gilt panel-stamped binding akin to TSMK R.863. The manuscript was owned by Hajji Ahmed Bostancı in 1786, before coming into F.R. Martin's possession (Welch, "Private Collectors and Islamic Arts of the Book," 26).
28	*Lisān al-ṭair*	Navāʾī	Scribed and illustrated in 1553 for Yār Muḥammad.		BNF Sup Turc 996	According to Richard's investigation, a Frenchman obtained the manuscript from the Ottomans ("Illustrated Manuscripts from Mawarannahr in French Collections," unpaginated).

Figures

Figure 1. Sām recognizes his son. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. LACMA M.73.5.409.

Figure 2. Bahrām Gūr slaying a dragon. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. DMA 1.2014.128.A-B.

Figure 3. Bahrām Gūr slaying a dragon. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. KMM ms. 5986, f.691b.

Figure 4. Shah Shāpūr consulting advisors. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. MAH no. 1971-107/431.

Figure 5. Bahrām Gūr slaying a dragon. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. TSMK ms. R.1549, f.379b.

Figure 6. Gushtāsp slaying a dragon. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. BL ms. Or. 13859, f.208r. Reproduced in Norah M. Titley, "A Shahnama from Transoxiana," *British Library Journal* 7, no. 2 (1981): fig. 5.

Figure 7. Rustam pulls Bizhan from the pit. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. TSMK ms. R.1549, f.185b.

Figure 8. Rustam seated with Kai Khusrau. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. TSMK ms. R.1549, f.229b.

Figure 9. Shīrīn visits Farhād at Bisūtūn. Niẓāmī, *Khamsa*, 1501. TSMK ms. R.863, f.66v. Reproduced in Ivan Stchoukine, *Les Peintures des Manuscrits de la 'Khamseh' de Nizami au Topkapi Saray Muzesi d'Istanbul* (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1977), fig. LV.

Figure 10. The poet Shādī presents a book to Shībānī Khan. Shādī, *Fatḥnāma*, undated. ARB ms. 5369, f.19r. Image taken by Semiha Altıer.

Figure 11. Tīmūr's troops attack the city of Khiva (Urganj). Yazdī, *Ẓafarnāma*, scribed in 1467, illustrated ca. 1480-1506. JHUL ms. Garrett 3, ff.115r-116v.

Figure 12. Shībānī lays siege to Samarqand. Shādī, *Fatḥnāma*, undated. ARB ms. 5369, ff.213r-214v. Reproduced in Galina A. Pugachenkova, *Miniatures of Central Asia* (Tashkent: Editorial Office of Encyclopaedias, 1994), 19-20.

Figure 13. Shībānī's troops attack Tatkand. Shādī, *Fatḥnāma*, undated. ARB ms. 5369, ff.206r-207v. Image taken by Semiha Altıer.

Figure 14. Tīmūr surveys the remains of the defeated Qipchaq army in the town of Nerges in Georgia. Yazdī, *Ẓafarnāma*, scribed in 1467, illustrated ca. 1480-1506. JHUL ms. Garrett 3, f.283v.

Figure 15. Shībānī Khan sits in front of a yurt with his lover. Shādī, *Fatḥnāma*, undated. ARB ms. 5369, f.54r. Galina A. Pugachenkova, *Miniatures of Central Asia* (Tashkent: Editorial Office of Encyclopaedias, 1994), 23.

Figure 16. Tīmūr's accession scene in Balkh. Yazdī, *Ẓafarnāma*, scribed in 1467, illustrated ca. 1480-1506. JHUL ms. Garrett 3, f.83r.



Figure 17. The invention of the game of chess in Iran. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. TSMK ms. H.1509, f.305r. Reproduced in Güner İnal, “Topkapı Müzesindeki hazine 1509 numaralı Şehnamenin minyatürleri = Shahname hazine no. 1509.” *Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı / Journal of Art History* 3 (1969-70): fig. 15.

Figure 18. Isfandiyār slaying a dragon. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. TSMK ms. H.1509, f.213a. Reproduced in Serpil Bağcı, “Old Images for New Texts and Contexts: Wandering Images in Islamic Book Painting,” *Muqarnas* 21 (2004): fig. 3.

Figure 19. Māh-i Dil receives a letter from Shībānī. Shādī, *Fatḥnāma*, undated. ARB ms. 5369, f.44r. Reproduced in El'mira Ismailova, et al. *Sharq Miniatiurasi Ŭzbekiston Ssr Fanlar Akademiiasi Abu Raĭhon Beruniĭ Nomidagi Sharqshunoslik Instituti: Vostochnaia Miniatiura V Sobranii Instituta Vostokovedeniia Imeni Abu Raĭkhon Beruni Akademii Nauk UzSSR* [Oriental Miniatures of Abu Raihon Beruni Institute of Orientology of the Uzssr Academy of Sciences] (Tashkent: Ghafur Ghulom Nomidagi Adabiyot va San'at nashriyoti, 1980), fig. 19.

Figure 20. Bahrām Chūbīna in female attire. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. TSMK ms. H.1509, f.368b. Reproduced in B.W. Robinson, "Two Illustrated Manuscripts in the Malek Library, Tehran," in *Content and Context of Visual Arts in the Islamic World* (Philadelphia, 1988), 94-97, fig. 12.

Figure 21. Bizhan brought before Afrāsiyāb. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1451, Yazd. TIEM ms. 1945, f.187v.

Figure 22. Bahrām Gūr marries Ārzū, the daughter of Mahiyār the jeweler. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1451, Yazd. TIEM ms. 1945, f.391v.

Figure 23. Sultan Maḥmūd Bahādur brings Muḥammad Mazīd to Shībānī Khan. Shādī, *Fatḥnāma*, undated. ARB ms. 5369, f.146r. Image taken by Semiha Altıer.

Figure 24. Battle between the armies of Iran and Turan. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1451, Yazd. TIEM ms. 1945, f.232v.



Figure 25. Detail: The Chinese Khaqan and his son Farhād enthroned. Navāʾī, *Kulliyāt,* dated 1521. NLR ms. Dorn 559, f.79r. Reproduced in Olga Vasilyeva, et al. *The Works of Alishir Navai in Fine Books of the 15th-16th Centuries from the collection of the National Library of Russia, Saint Petersburg, Russia* (Tashkent: Zamon Press, 2017), fig. 4.13.

Figure 26. Bahrām Gūr talks to the artist Mānī, who offers him Dilārām's portrait. Navāʾī, *Kulliyāt*, dated 1521, Tashkent. NLR ms. Dorn 559, f.184r. Reproduced in Olga Vasilyeva, et al. *The Works of Alishir Navai in Fine Books of the 15th-16th Centuries from the collection of the National Library of Russia, Saint Petersburg, Russia* (Tashkent: Zamon Press, 2017), fig. 4.25.

Figure 27. Detail: Shaikh Suhrawardī invites the calligrapher Yāqūt to sit next to him. Navāʾī, *Kulliyāt,* dated 1521. NLR ms. Dorn 559, f.49v. Reproduced in Olga Vasilyeva, et al. *The Works of Alishir Navai in Fine Books of the 15th-16th Centuries from the collection of the National Library of Russia, Saint Petersburg, Russia* (Tashkent: Zamon Press, 2017), fig. 4.8.

Figure 28. Shāpūr II. Kūhistānī, *Tārīkh-i Abū'l-Khair Khānī*, dated 1543. ARB ms. 9989, f.76v. Reproduced in Edvard Rtveladze, ed., *The Oriental Miniature: Historical Figures* (Tashkent: Zamon Press, 2021), 204.

Figure 29. Ghazan Khan beneath his tent in Urjan giving a feast for his nobles. Kūhistānī, *Tārīkh-i Abū'l-Khair Khānī*, dated 1543. ARB ms. 9989, f.173r.

Figure 30. Enthronement of Abū al-Khair. Kūhistānī, *Tārīkh-i Abū'l-Khair Khānī*, dated 1543. ARB ms. 9989, f.213v.

Figure 31. Abū al-Khair after destroying the troops of Samarqand. Kūhistānī, *Tārīkh-i Abū'l-Khair Khānī*, dated 1543. ARB ms. 9989, f.224v. Reproduced A. Madraimov, E. Ismailova, and Sh. Musaev, *Oriental miniatures. The Collection of the Beruni Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Volume I: 14th-17th centuries* (Tashkent: Media Land, 2001), 101.

Figure 32. Chinggis Khan sitting with his sons. *Tavārīkh-i guzīda-yi nuṣratnāma,* ca. 1540-62. BL ms. Or. 3222, f.43b.

Figure 33. Ūgtāy Khan and his retinue. *Tavārīkh-i guzīda-yi nuṣratnāma,* ca. 1540-62. BL ms. Or. 3222, f.50v.

Figure 34. Tribute paid to a Chinggisid prince in 638 AH (1241). Rashīd al-Dīn, *Jāmīʿ al-tawārīkh*, ca. 1430. BNF ms. Sup Pers 1113, f.137r.

Figure 35. Abū al-Khair and his followers. *Tavārīkh-i guzīda-yi nuṣratnāma,* ca. 1540-62. BL ms. Or. 3222, f.118v.

Figure 36. Shībānī's assault on Samarqand. *Tavārīkh-i guzīda-yi nuṣratnāma*, ca. 1540-62. BL ms. Or. 3222, f.130v.

Figure 37. The death of Chinggis Khan. Rashīd al-Dīn, *Jāmiʿ al-tawārīkh*, ca. 1430. BNF ms. Sup Pers 1113, f.14r.

Figure 38. Entertainment in a garden. Anthology, ca. 1545-50. TSMK ms. R.1964, f.107a.

Figure 39. Tīmūr enthroned. Hātifī, *Tīmūr-nāma*, dated 1541. TSMK ms. H.1594, f.34v.

Figure 40. Enthronement scene. Jāmī, *Bahāristān,* dated 1548. MCG ms. LA 169, ff.12v-13r. Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, Lisbon – Calouste Gulbenkian Museum. Photo: Catarina Gomes Ferreira.

Figure 41. Enthronement scene. Jāmī, *Bahāristān*, dated 1551. MIA ms. 52.13.

Figure 42. Battle scene. Hātifī, *Tīmūr-nāma*, dated 1541. TSMK ms. H.1594, f.63r.

Figure 43. Hunting scene. ʿAṭṭār, *Manṭiq al-ṭair,* undated. BL ms. Add. 7735, f.84r.

Figure 44. Folio with the poetry of Khwājū Kirmānī, undated. In Basil Gray, *Oriental Islamic Art: Collection of the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation* (Museu Nacional de Arte Antiga: Lisbon, 1963), illus. 131.

Figure 45. Folio painted by Maḥmūd Muẕahhib. Jāmī, *Tuḥfat al-aḥrār*, ca. 1551–56. NMAA ms. S.1986.46, f.2.

Figure 46. Battle scene. Hātifī, *Tīmūr-nāma*, dated 1551. HAM 1957.140, f.83r.

Figure 47. Enthronement scene: Tīmūr holding court in a garden. Hātifī, *Tīmūr-nāma*, dated 1551. HAM 1957.140, f.34v-35r.

Figure 48. Badīʿ al-Zamān conversing with Sultan Selim I. Shukrī Bitlīsī, *Selim-nâma*, ca. 1525-30. TSMK ms. H.1597-98, f.140r.

Figure 49. Reception of the Iranian ambassador in Amasya. ʿĀrifī, *Süleyman-nâma*, dated 1558. TSMK ms. H.1517, f.600a.

Figure 50. Shībānī Khān celebrating his victory over Andijan in a garden setting. Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ, *Shībānī-nāma*, dated 1510, illustrated ca. 1535-43. ÖNB cod. mixt. 188, f.166b.

Figure 51. Shībānī Khan defeats Bābur at Sarpul. Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ, *Shībānī-nāma*, dated 1510, illustrated ca. 1535-43. ÖNB cod. mixt. 188, f.47b.

Figure 52. Death of the rebel leader Kalender. ʿĀrifī, *Süleyman-nâma*, dated 1558. TSMK ms. H.1517, f.248a.

Figure 53. Süleyman inspecting prisoners after the Ottoman siege of Vienna. ʿĀrifī, *Süleyman-nâma*, dated 1558. TSMK ms. H.1517, f.297a.

Figure 54. Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ presenting his manuscript to Shībānī Khan in the garden of his summer residence near Samarqand. Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ, *Shībānī-nāma*, dated 1510, illustrated ca. 1535-43. ÖNB cod. mixt. 188, f.188b.

Figure 55. Outdoor entertainments. Niẓāmī, *Khamsa*, ca. 1530-45. TSMK ms. H.764, f.53a.

Figure 56. Bahrām Gūr in the black pavilion. Niẓāmī, *Khamsa*, ca. 1530-45. TSMK ms. H.764, f.189a.

Figure 57. The defeat of the town of Karakul. Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ, *Shībānī-nāma*, dated 1510, illustrated ca. 1535-43. ÖNB cod. mixt. 188, f.38b.



Figure 58. Illuminated frontispiece. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1556. ARB ms. 1811, ff.8r-9v. Paintings attributed to Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī. Reproduced in G.A. Pugachenkova and L.I. Rempel', *Vydaiushchiesia Pamiatniki Izobrazitel'nogo Iskusstva Uzbekistana* (Tashkent, 1961), fig. 92.

Figure 59. Illuminated frontispiece. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1564. TSMK ms. H.1488, ff.1b-2a. Reproduced in Birinci Baskı, *Şahname Yazmalarından Seçme Minyatürler* (Istanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları kitapları, 1971).

Figure 60. Binding impressed with panel stamp. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1564. TSMK ms. H.1488.

Figure 61. Rustam defeats the white div. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1564. TSMK ms. H.1488, f.94a. Reproduced in Birinci Baskı, *Şahname Yazmalarından Seçme Minyatürler* (Istanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları kitapları, 1971).

Figure 62. Rustam defeats the white div. Illustration on silk, undated. Present location unknown. Reproduced in B.W. Robinson, et al., *Islamic Painting and the Arts of the Book: The Keir Collection* (London: Faber and Faber, 1976), entry III.227.

Figure 63. Young Rustam lassoing the colt Rakhsh. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1564. TSMK ms. H.1488, f.66r. Reproduced in Birinci Baskı, *Şahname Yazmalarından Seçme Minyatürler* (Istanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları kitapları, 1971).

Figure 64. Dārā and the herdsmen. Saʿdī, *Būstān*, dated 1488. DAKM ms. Adab Farisi 22, f.10a.



Figure 65. Manūchihr in battle. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1564. TSMK ms. H.1488, f.41r.

Figure 66. Battle scene from dispersed manuscript. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. DMA K.1.2014.750.

Figure 67. Detached folio. Yazdī, *Ẓafarnāma*, undated. HAM no. 1965.477.

Figure 68. Tīmūr's troops lay siege to a fortress in Khurasan. Hātifī, *Tīmūr-nāma*, dated 1568. ARB ms. 2102, f.45v. Reproduced in Olimpiada Galerkina, *Mawarannahr Book Painting* (Leningrad: Aurora Art Publishers, 1980), 95.

Figure 69. Attack on Kai Khusrau's castle. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1564. TSMK ms. H.1488, f.297r.

Figure 70. Rustam kills Suhrāb. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1564. TSMK ms. H.1488, f.116v.

Figure 71. Tīmūr surveying his troops beneath an umbrella. Hātifī, *Tīmūr-nāma*, dated 1568. ARB ms. 2102, f.69v.

Figure 72. Illustrated frontispiece. Hātifī, *Tīmūr-nāma*, dated 1568. ARB ms. 2102, ff.105r-106v. Reproduced in Olimpiada Galerkina, *Mawarannahr Book Painting* (Leningrad: Aurora Art Publishers, 1980), 96-97.

Figure 73. Reconstituted illustrated frontispiece. Hātifī, *Tīmūr-nāma*, undated. BL ms. Add. 22703, ff.1r (right), 87v (left).

Figure 74. Battle scene 1. Hātifī, *Tīmūr-nāma*, undated. RAS ms. Persian 305A, f.70r.

Figure 75. Battle scene 2. Hātifī, *Tīmūr-nāma*, undated. RAS ms. Persian 305A, f.76v.

Figure 76. Loose folio inscribed *amīr Tīmūr ṣāḥib qirān*, undated. GMAA no. B.11.5r. Reproduced in Philipp Walter Schulz, *Die persisch-islamische Miniaturmalerei* (Leipzig: Verlag von Karl W. Hiersemann, 1914), pl. 75.

Figure 77. Garshāsp smiting a div. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1535, illustrated ca. 1580s. TSMK ms. H.1514, f.46v.

Figure 78. Illustrated frontispiece. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1535, illustrated ca. 1580s. TSMK ms. H.1514, ff.1r-2v.

Figure 79. Illustrated frontispiece. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. TSMK ms. R.1544, ff.1r-2v.

Figure 80. Bahrām, son of Gūdarz, defeated by the Turanian army. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. TSMK ms. H.1503, f.181a.

Figure 81. Zāl and Rustam visit Kai Khusrau. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. TSMK ms. H.1503, f.162r.

Figure 82. Ruler (Qul Bābā?) at a feast. Saʿdī, *Gulistān*, undated. Bruschettini collection. Reproduced in Abolala Soudavar, "The Age of Muhammadī," *Muqarnas* 17 (2000): fig. 26.

Figure 83. Gathering of dervishes. Ḥāfiẓ, *Dīvān*, dated 1581–86. TSMK ms. H.986, f.21b. Reproduced in Abolala Soudavar, "The Age of Muhammadī," *Muqarnas* 17 (2000), fig. 18.

Figure 84. Loose folio. Jāmī, *Haft aurang*, undated. LACMA no. M.73.5.577.

Figure 85. Gathering in a pavilion. Ḥāfiẓ, *Dīvān*, dated 1593. BLO ms. Elliott 163, f.55b.



Figure 86. Illustrated colophon. Jāmī, *Silsilat al-ẕahab*, dated 1592. AHT no. 83. Reproduced in Abolala Soudavar, *Art of the Persian Courts: Selections from the Art and History Trust Collection* (New York: Rizzoli, 1992), pl. 83.

Figure 87. Rūdāba and Zāl seated in a pavilion. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. CBL ms. Pers. 295, f.76v.

Figure 88. Siege scene. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. CBL ms. Pers. 295, f.232v.

Figure 89. Illuminated frontispiece. Şerif Âmidî, Turkic *Shāhnāma* translation, undated. CWH ms. 1032, ff.1r-2v.

Figure 90. The court of Kayūmarṣ. Şerif Âmidî, Turkic *Shāhnāma* translation, undated. CWH ms. 1032, f.7r.

Figure 91. The accession of Iskandar. Şerif Âmidî, Turkic *Shāhnāma* translation, undated. TSMK H.1522, f.369v.

Figure 92. Faraidūn attacks Żaḥḥāk. Turkic *Shāhnāma* translation in prose, undated. HAM no. 1985.230.

Figure 93. Żaḥḥāk's vizier announces Faraidūn's arrival. Şerif Âmidî, Turkic *Shāhnāma* translation, undated. CWH ms. 1032, f.14r.



Figure 94. Faraidūn enthroned. Şerif Âmidî, Turkic *Shāhnāma* translation, undated. CWH ms. 1032, f.21v.

Figure 95. Outdoor entertainment scene. Jāmī, *Dīvān*, dated 1576. BL ms. IOL P&A 48, f.71a. Reproduced in B.W. Robinson, *Persian Paintings in the India Office Library: A Descriptive Catalogue* (London: Sotheby Parke Bernet, 1976), fig. 217.

Figure 96. The death of Īraj. Şerif Âmidî, Turkic *Shāhnāma* translation, undated. CWH ms. 1032, f.29r.

Figure 97. Pious man attacked by a drunkard. Saʿdī, *Muntakhab-i Būstān*, dated 1527. AHT no. 66, f.11v. Reproduced in Abolala Soudavar, *Art of the Persian Courts: Selections from the Art and History Trust Collection* (New York: Rizzoli, 1992), fig. 66b.

Figure 98. Tūr’s attempt to ambush Manūchihr. Şerif Âmidî, Turkic *Shāhnāma* translation, undated. CWH ms. 1032, f.35r.

Figure 99. Sultan Maḥmūd captures the Qaisar of Rum and brings him to Tīmūr. Hātifī, *Tīmūr-nāma*, dated 1582. Private collection, f.155v.

Figure 100. Tīmūr's forces storm the walls of Damascus. Hātifī, *Tīmūr-nāma*, dated 1582. Private collection, f.138v.

Figure 101. Manūchihr slays Salm. Şerif Âmidî, Turkic *Shāhnāma* translation, undated. CWH ms. 1032, f.38r.

Figure 102. Battle scene from *Iskandarnāma* section. Niẓāmī, *Khamsa,* dated 1579–80. NLR ms. PNS 272, f.234b. Reproduced in N.V. Diakonova and L.G. Giuzal'ian, *Sredneaziatskie Miniatiury XVI-XVII vv.* Series: *Vostochnaya Miniatiura i Kalligrafia v Lenindradskikh Sobraniakh* (Moscow: Nauka, 1964), pl. 29.

Figure 103. Rustam lifts Afrāsiyāb. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1535. TSMK ms. H.1514, f.172r.

Figure 104. Zāl climbs Rūdāba's hair. Şerif Âmidî, Turkic *Shāhnāma* translation, undated. CWH ms. 1032, f.49r.

Figure 105. Zāl climbs Rūdāba's hair. Şerif Âmidî, Turkic *Shāhnāma* translation, undated. BL ms. Or. 7204, f.55b. Photograph taken by Michael Erdman.

Figure 106. Zāl climbs Rūdāba's hair. Şerif Âmidî, Turkic *Shāhnāma* translation, undated. TSMK ms. H.1520, f.48a. Reproduced in Serpil Bağcı, et al., *Osmanlı Resim Sanatı* (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2006), 95.

Figure 107. Abdürrahman Gazi climbs the fortress of Aydos. Arifi, *Shāhnāma-yi Āl-i ʿUs̱man*, vol. IV (*Osmanname*), dated 1558. Private collection, f.70b. Reproduced in Esin Atıl, *The Age of Sultan Süleyman the Magnificent* (Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1987), fig. 31.

Figure 108. Zāl climbs Rūdāba's hair. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, 1604. AIIT ms. 2.01 BD, f.37v.

Figure 109. Outdoor gathering. Saʿdī, *Muntakhab-i Būstān*, dated 1527. AHT no. 66, f.2v. Reproduced in Abolala Soudavar, *Art of the Persian Courts: Selections from the Art and History Trust Collection* (New York: Rizzoli, 1992), fig. 66a.

Figure 110. Frontispiece. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, 1604. AIIT ms. 2.01 BD, ff.1r-2v.

Figure 111. Bīzhan comes to Manīzha's tent. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1556. Painting attributed to Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī. ARB ms. 1811, f.191v. Reproduced in M. Ashrafi, *Persian-Tajik Poetry in XIV-XVII Centuries Miniatures* (Stalinabad [Dushanbe]: Academy of Sciences, 1974), 101.

Figure 112. Tahmīna approaches Rustam's bed chamber. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1556. Paintings attributed to Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī. ARB ms. 1811, f.84v. Reproduced in M. Ashrafi, *Persian-Tajik Poetry in XIV-XVII Centuries Miniatures* (Stalinabad [Dushanbe]: Academy of Sciences, 1974), 100.



Figure 113. Faraidūn defeats Żaḥḥāk. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1556. Paintings attributed to Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī. ARB ms. 1811, f.21r. Reproduced in M. Ashrafi, *Persian-Tajik Poetry in XIV-XVII Centuries Miniatures* (Stalinabad [Dushanbe]: Academy of Sciences, 1974), 95.

Figure 114. Rustam rescues Bīzhan from the pit. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1556. Paintings attributed to Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī. ARB ms. 1811, f.204v.

Figure 115. Luhrāsp enthroned. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, 1600. BL ms. IO Islamic 301, ff.185b-186a.

Figure 116. Shīrīn weeps at the grave of Khusrau. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. BL ms. Or. 14403, f.534v.

Figure 117. Rustam rescuing Bijan from the pit. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1564. TSMK ms. H.1488, f.247. Reproduced in Güner İnal, *Türk Minyatür Sanati: Baslangicindan Osmanlilara kadar* (Ankara: Atatürk Cultural Center, 1995), fig. 112.

Figure 118. Rustam rescues Bīzhan from the pit. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. BL ms. Or. 14403, f.153v.

Figure 119. Siyāmak attacked by the div Khazarvān. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, 1604. AIIT ms. 2.01 BD, f.10r.

Figure 120. Siyāmak attacked by the div Khazarvān. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1564. TSMK ms. H.1488, f.18b.

Figure 121. Shāpūr enthroned. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. BL ms. Or. 14403, f.367v. Reproduced in Karin Rührdanz, "The Samarqand Shahnamas in the Context of Dynastic Change," in *Shahnama Studies II: The Reception of Firdausi's* Shahnama, ed. Charles Melville and Gabrielle van den Berg, pp. 213-233. (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 223, fig. 8.

Figure 122. Frontispiece. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, 1602. NLR ms. PNS 90, ff.1r-2v. Reproduced in O.V. Vasilyeva and O.M. Yastrebova, *Arts of the Book in the 15th-17th-Century Mawarannahr: From the Collection of the National Library of Russia, Saint Petersburg, Russia* (Tashkent: Zamon Press, 2019), 240-41.

Figure 123. Jamshīd carried by divs. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, 1604. AIIT ms. 2.01 BD, f.12r.

Figure 124. Mosaic spandrels to the Shīrdār madrasa on Rīgistān square, Samarqand. Built between 1619–36.

Figure 125. Luhrāsp enthroned. Manuscript belonging to General Cherniaev. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. ARB ms. 872, f.219r.

Figure 126. Luhrāsp enthroned. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, 1600. PUL ms. O-16/7249.

Figure 127. Garshāsp seeks to wed the daughter of the Qaisar in Rum. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, 1602. NLR ms. PNS 90, f.61r.

Figure 128. Żaḥḥāk enthroned with the daughters of Jamshid. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated illustration. LACMA M.83.27.2.

Figure 129. Ruler seated in a pavilion surrounded by courtiers and attendants, one of whom is leading in a Christian priest. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated illustration. FMC PD.144-1948.

Figure 130. The execution of Afrāsiyāb in front of Garsīvāz. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated illustration. BM 1948,1009,0.55.



Figure 131. The trial of Siyāvush. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. BL ms. Or. 14403, f.267v.

Figure 132. Faraidūn assaults Żaḥḥāk. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, 1610. LACMA M.78.9.5.

Figure 133. Rūdāba and Zāl. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, BKBM ms., shelfmark unknown.

Figure 134. Painting attributed to Bijapur in the Deccan, ca. 1600–10. V&A IM.14&A-1913.

Figure 135. The death of Sultan Bahādur of Gujarat. Abū'l-Faẓl, *Akbar-nāma*, 1602. BL Or. 12988, f.66a.

Figure 136. Portrait of Prince Salīm, dated 1600. RIOS Album E-14, f.3a.

Figure 137. Faraidūn assaults Żaḥḥāk. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, 1601. PFL ms. 59G.

Figure 138. Amīr Khusrau Dihlavī and Ḥasan Najm al-Dīn before ʿAlā al-Dīn Fīrūz Shāh. Bāiqarā, *Majālis al-ʿushshāq*, dated 1606. ARB ms. 3476, f.72b.

Figure 139. Tīmūr wins a victory over Amīr Sayyid ʿAlī Hamadānī in an argument. Bāiqarā, *Majālis al-ʿushshāq*, dated 1606. ARB ms. 3476, f.75a.

Figure 140. Rustam kneels over his victim. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. PUL ms. O-15/7248.

Figure 141. Rustam rescues Bīzhan from the pit. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. PUL ms. O-15/7248.

Figure 142. Reconstituted illustrated frontispiece. Left: “Man Reading,” LM OA 7109. Right: “Seated Princess,” NMAA S1986.304.

Figure 143. Man in *chakdār jāma.* Signed by Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī, undated. Reverse contains lines written by Mīr ʿAlī Haravī. ARB no. 30v.

Figure 144. A Tūqāy-Tīmūrid khan receives a Mughal emissary in a *chīnī-khāna.* CSMVS, shelfmark unknown. Reproduced in Robert Skelton, "Relations between Mughal and Central Asian painting in the seventeenth century," in *Indian Art & Connoisseurship, Essays in Honour of Douglas Barrett,* ed. J. Guy (Chidambaram Ahmedabad, India: Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts in association with Mapin Pub., 1995), 290.



Figure 145. Saʿdī visits the temple of Somnath, painted by Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī. Saʿdī, *Būstān*, 1615. CBL ms. Pers. 297, f.159b.



Figure 146. Tīmūr's campaign in India. Hātifī, *Tīmūr-nāma*, undated. BL ms. Add. 22703, f.65v.

Figure 147. Battle scene. Hātifī, *Tīmūr-nāma*, undated. BL ms. Add. 22703, f.21r.

Figure 148. Soldiers committing atrocities on a city's inhabitants. Hātifī, *Tīmūr-nāma*, undated. BL ms. Add. 22703, f.2r.

Figure 149. Tīmūr's troops lowered in baskets to attack the inhabitants of Nerges in Georgia. Hātifī, *Tīmūr-nāma*, undated. BL ms. Add. 22703, f.55v.

Figure 150. Manūchihr defeats Tūr. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, dated 1556. Painting attributed to Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī. ARB ms. 1811, f.31v.

Figure 151. Fallen warrior in the battle between Kai Khusrau and Afrāsiyāb. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, undated. BL ms. Or. 14403, f.319r.

Figure 152. Aulad leads Rustam to the White Div's cave. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, 1604. AIIT ms. 2.01 BD, f.62v.

Figure 153. Tīmūr before the captive Tūqtamīsh Khan. Yazdī, *Ẓafarnāma*, 1628. ARB ms. 4472, f.219r. Reproduced in G.A. Pugachenkova and O. Galerkina, *Miniatiury Sredneĭ Azii/Miniatures of Central Asia in Selected Examples from Soviet and Foreign Collections* (Moscow: Izobrazitel′noe iskusstvo, 1979), 172-73.

Figure 154. Tīmūr celebrates his victory over Tūqtamīsh Khan. Yazdī, *Ẓafarnāma*, 1628. ARB ms. 4472, f.288a.

Figure 155. Tīmūr lies with Dilshād. Yazdī, *Ẓafarnāma*, 1628. ARB ms. 4472, f.152b. Reproduced in G.A. Pugachenkova, *Miniatures of Central Asia* (Tashkent: Editorial Office of Encyclopaedias, 1994), 36-37.



Figure 156. Tīmūr's attack on the Sīstānīs. Yazdī, *Ẓafarnāma*, 1628. ARB ms. 4472, f.170a.

Figure 157. Bārmān's victory over Qubād. Firdausī, *Shāhnāma*, 1601. PFL ms. 59G, f.51v.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Abu'l Fazl. *The Akbar Nama of Abu'l Fazl: History of the Reign of Akbar including an Account of his Predecessors composed 1590-96,* volumes 1-2. Translated by H. Beveridge. Lahore, 1902.

Adams, Laura. *The Spectacular State: Culture and National Identity in Uzbekistan.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2010.

'Âli, Mustafa. *Mustafa 'Âli's Epic Deeds of Artists: A Critical Edition of the Earliest Ottoman Text about the Calligraphers and Painters of the Islamic World.* Edited and translated by Esra Akın-Kıvanç. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Âsafî Dal Mehmed Çelebi. *Şecâ'atnâme: Özdemiroğlu Osman Paşa'nın Şark Seferleri (1578-1585).* Compiled by Abdülkadir Özcan. Istanbul: Çamlıca Basım Yayın, 2007.

Bābur. *The Baburnama.* Translated by Wheeler M. Thackston. London: Folio Society, 2013.

Bannā'ī. *Die Scheïbaniade: ein Özbegisches Hedlengedicht in 76 Gesängen von Prinz Mohammed Salih aus Charezm*. Translated by Hermann Vambéry. Vienna: 1885.

Fekete, L., trans. *Einführung in die Persische Palaeographie: 101 Persische Dokumente.* Budapest: Akademiai Kiado, 1977.

Ḥaidar Mīrzā. *Tārīkh-i Rashīdī: a History of the Kings of Moghulistan.* Vol. 1 (Persian), vol. 2 (English). Translated by Wheeler M. Thackston. Cambridge: Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, Harvard University, 1996. , vol. 1 pp. 233-34 (Persian), vol. 2 pp. 182 (English).

Levi, Scott C. and Ron Sela, eds. and trans. *Islamic Central Asia: An Anthology of Historical Sources.* Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2010.

Muṭribī Samarqandī. *Nuskha-yi zībā-yi Jahāngīrī.* Edited by Isma'il Bik Januf and Sayyid 'Ali Mujaini. Qum: Kitabkhana-yi Buzurg-i Hazrat Ayat Allah al-'Uzma Mar'ashi, 1377 [1998].

Qāżī Aḥmad. *Calligraphers and Painters: A Treatise by Qadi Ahmad, son of Mir Munshi (circa A.H. 1015/1606).* Translated by Vladimir Minorsky. Freer Gallery of Art Occasional Papers, 1959.

Sidi Ali Reis. "Medieval Sourcebook: Sidi Ali Reis (16th Century CE): Mirat ul Memalik (The Mirror of Countries), 1557 CE." In the Internet History Sourcebooks Project, Vol. VI: Medieval Arabia. Edited by Charles F. Horne, 329-395. *The Sacred Books and Early Literature of the East.* New York: Parke, Austin, & Lipscomb, 1917. Available online: https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/source/16csidi1.asp (accessed on 29 March 2021).

Utemish-khadzhi. "*Čingīz-nāma*: Introduction, Annotated Translation, Transcription and Critical Text." In *Studia Culturae Islamicae* 94. Translated by Takushi Kawaguchi and Hiroyuki Nagamine. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa 2008.

Secondary sources

Abdullaeva, F.I. "A Turkish Prose Version of Firdawsi's Shāh-nāma in the Manuscript Collection of the St. Petersburg State University Library." *Manuscript Orientalia: International Journal for Oriental Manuscript Research* 3, no. 2 (June 1997): 50-55.

Abuseitova, M. Kh., and L.N. Dod͡khudoeva. *Qazaqstan tarikhy shyghys miniati͡uralarynda = Istori͡ia Kazakhstana v vostochnykh miniati͡urakh = History of Kazakhstan in Eastern miniatures.* Almaty: Daĭk-Press, 2010.

Abuseitova, M.Kh, and J.G. Baranova. *Pis'mennye Istočniki Po Istorii I Kul'ture Kazachstana I Central'noi Azii v xii-xvii vv: (biobibliografičeskie Obzory)* = Written Sources on History and Culture of Kazakhstan and Central Asia in XII-XVII Centuries: Bio-Bibliographical Surveys. Almaty: Daĭk-Press, 2001.

Adamova, Adel T., and Manijeh Bayani. *Persian Painting: the Arts of the Book and Portraiture. Dar al-Athar al-Islamiyyah: The Al-Sabah Collection, Kuwait.* New York: Thames & Hudson, 2015.

Adamova, Adel T. "The Shāhnāmah in Il-Khanid Times." In *Proceedings of the Eighth European Conference of Iranian Studies, 14-19 September 2015*, ed. Olga M. Yastrebova, 7-30. Saint Petersburg: State Hermitage Publishers, 2020.

'Ādil, Parvīz. "*Shībānī-nāme.*" *Kitāb-i Māh-i Tārīkh u Jughrāfiyā* (Tīr, Murdād, u Shahrīvar 1383 [summer 2004]): 186-190.

Adle, Chahryar, and Irfan Habib, eds. *History of Civilizations of Central Asia*: Vol. V. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 2003.

Akimushkin, O. "Biblioteka Shibanidov v Bukhare XVI veka." In *Bamberger Zentralasienstudien. Konferenzakten ESCAS IV Bamberg 8.-12. Oktober 1991,* edited by Ingeborg Baldauf and Michael Friederich, 325-341. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 1994.

Akimushkin, O., et al. "The Shaybanids (Bukhara, 1500–98) and the Janids (Ashtarkhanids) (Bukhara, 1599–1753)." In *History of Civilizations of Central Asia*: *Vol. 5: Development in contrast: from the sixteenth to the mid-nineteenth century,* edited by Chahryar Adle, et al., 580-84. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 2003.

Akramov, A.M. "Tavārikh-i Gūzide, Nusrat-nāme, kak istochnik po istorii Uzbekistana XV-nachala XVI veka." *O'zbekistonda ijtimoiy fanlar* 8 (1963): 54-59.

Alam, Muzaffar. "Trade, State Policy and Regional Change: Aspects of Mughal-Uzbek Commercial Relations, c. 1550-1750." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, 37, no. 3 (1994): 202-227.

Alexander, Jonathan. *Medieval Illuminators and Their Methods of Work.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.

Allaeva, Nigora. "The Shajara-ye Turk as an Important Source on the History of Relations between Khiva and Its Neighbors." *Journal of Persianate Studies* 7 (2014): 55-87.

Allen, W.E.D. *Problems of Turkish Power in the Sixteenth Century.* Central Asian Research Centre, London: 1963.

Allouche, Adel. *The Origins and Development of the Ottoman-Safavid Conflict (906-962/1500-1555).* Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 1983.

Allworth, Edward A. *The Modern Uzbeks: from the Fourteenth Century to the Present.* California: Hoover Institution Press, 1990.

Altıer, Semiha. "Şiban Han dönemi (1500-1510) Özbek kitap sanatı." PhD diss., Hacettepe University, 2014.

Altıer, Semiha. "Semerkand Sarayı'ndan Tarihe Bir Bakış: Mes'ud Bin Usman Kuhistânî'nin Tarih-i Ebu'l Hayr Han'ındaki Minyatürler." *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2013 Bahar (18): 7-24.

Altıer, Semiha. "Özbek Hanlığı'nın (1500-1599) Bilinen İlk Resimli Tarih Kitabı: Fetihnâme ve Öne Çıkardığı Temalar." *Mimar Sinan Güzel Sanatlar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, no. 1 (Spring 2010): 11-23.

Amanat, Abbas. "Divided Patrimony: Iranian Self-Image in the Story of Faridun." In *Shahnama Studies I,* 49-70. Edited by Charles Melville. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 2006.

Amitai, R. *The Mongols in the Islamic Lands: Studies in the History of the Ilkhanate.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.

And, Metin. *Ottoman Figurative Arts 1: Miniature*. Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2017.

And, Metin. *Turkish Miniature Painting*. Ankara: Dost yayinlari, 1987.

Annanepesov, M. "Relations between the Khanates and with Other Powers." In *History of Civilizations of Central Asia, Vol. 5: Development in contrast: from the sixteenth to the mid-nineteenth century.* Edited by Chahryar Adle and Irfan Habib, 83-89. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 2003.

Annanepesov, M. "The Khanate of Khiva (Khwarazm)." In *History of Civilizations of Central Asia, Vol. 5: Development in contrast: from the sixteenth to the mid-nineteenth century.* Edited by Chahryar Adle and Irfan Habib, 65-68. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 2003.

Anooshahr, Ali. *Turkestan and the Rise of Eurasian Empires: A Study of Politics and Invented Traditions.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.

Arcak, Sinem. "Gifts in Motion: Ottoman-Safavid Cultural Exchange, 1501-1618." PhD diss., University of Minnesota, 2012.

Arjomand, Said Amir. "From the Editor: Defining Persianate Studies." *Journal of Persianate Studies* 1, no. 1 (2008): 1-4.

Artan, Tülay. "A Book of Kings Produced and Presented as a Treatise on Hunting." *Muqarnas* 25 (2008): 299-330.

Ashrafi, M M. *Persian-Tajik Poetry in XIV-XVII Centuries Miniatures*. Stalinabad [Dushanbe]: Academy of Sciences, 1974.

Ashrafi, Mukaddima. “The School of Bukhara to c. 1550.” In *The Arts of the Book in Central Asia.* Edited by B. Gray, 249-272. Colorado: Shambhala UNESCO, 1979.

Ashrafi, M. M. “K Voprosu o vremeni sozdania miniatiur Mukhammada Murada Samarkandi k ‘Shakh-Name’ 1556 g.” In *Mittelalterliche Malerei im Orient.* Edited by Karin Rührdanz, 11-20. Halle: Martin Luther Universität, 1981.

Ashrafi, M.M. *Bekhzad i razvitiya bukharskoy shkoly miniatyury XVI v.* [Bihzad and the development of the Bukhara school of miniatures in the 16th century]. Dushanbe: Donish, 1987.

Ashrafi, Mukaddima. *The Tajik Miniature: Bukhara School XVI-XVII-th Centuries*. Dushanbe, Tajikistan: A. Donisha, 2011.

Atasoy, Nurhan, and Filiz Çagman. *Turkish Miniature Painting*. Istanbul: R.C.D. Cultural Institute, 1974.

Atasoy, Nurhan. “Un manuscrit mamluk illustré de Sahnama.” *Revue des etudes islamiques* 37 (1969): 151-158.

Atasoy, Nurhan, and Filiz Çağman. *Turkish Miniature Painting.* Istanbul: R.C.D. Cultural Institute, 1974.

Atıl, Esin, ed. “The Art of the Book.” In *Turkish Art*, 139-238. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1980.

Atıl, Esin. *Renaissance of Islam: Art of the Mamluks.* Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1981.

Atıl, Esin. “Mamluk Painting in the Late Fifteenth Century.” *Muqarnas* 2 (1984): 159-171.

Atıl, Esin. *Süleymanname: The Illustrated History of Süleyman the Magnificent.* Washington, D.C. and New York: The National Gallery of Art and Harry N. Abrams Inc., 1986.

Atıl, Esin. *The Age of Sultan Süleyman the Magnificent.* Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1987.

Babadjanov, Baxtiyor, et al. *Schaibanidische Grabinschriften -Shaybanid Tombstones*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 1997.

Babaie, Sussan. “Shah ʿAbbas II, the Conquest of Qandahar, the Chihil Sutun, and Its Wall Paintings." *Muqarnas* 11 (1994): 125-142.

Babaie, Sussan, et al. *Slaves of the Shah: New Elites of Safavid Iran.* London: I.B. Tauris, 2004.
Babayan, Kathryn. *Mystics, Monarchs, and Messiahs: Cultural Landscapes of Early Modern Iran.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Bacqué-Grammont, John-Louis. “Une liste ottomane de princes et d'apanages Abu’l-Khayrides." *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique* 11, no. 3 (July-September 1970): 423-453.

Bacqué-Grammont, John-Louis. “Les événements d'Asie centrale en 1510 d'après un document ottoman." *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique* 12, nos. 1-2 (January-June 1971): 189-207.

Bacqué-Grammont, Jean-Louis. “Ubaydu-llah han de Boukhara et Soliman le Magnifique. Sur quelques pièces de correspondance.” In *Soliman le Magnifique et son temps. Actes du colloque de Paris, Galeries Nationales du Grand Palais, 7-10 mars 1990, Études turco-safavids, XVII.* Edited by G. Veinstein,

485-504. Paris: École du Louvre, École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, La Documentation Française, 1992.

Bacqué-Grammont, Jean-Louis. “Lettres diplomatiques des Ottomans avec l’Inde moghole, la Transoxiane et l’Iran. Estimation des sources disponibles.” In *La Correspondance Entre Souverains, Princes Et Cités-États: Approches Croisées Entre L'orient Musulman, L'occident Latin Et Byzance (xiiie-Début Xvie Siècle*). Edited by Denise Aigle, and Stéphane Péquignot, 195-229. Turnhout: Brepols, 2013.

Badr, Jasmin, and Mustafa Tupev. “The Khoja Zainuddin Mosque in Bukhara.” *Muqarnas* 29 (2012): 213-243.

Bağcı, Serpil. “From translated word to translated image: The illustrated Şehnâme-i Türki copies.” *Muqarnas* 17 (2000): 162-176.

Bağcı, Serpil. “An Iranian epic and an Ottoman painter: Nakkaş Osman’s ‘new’ visual interpretation of the *Shâhnâmah.*” In *Arts, Women and Scholars: Studies in Ottoman Society and Culture. Festschrift Hans Georg Majer,* Vol. 2. Edited by Sabine Prätor and Christoph K. Neumann, 421-450. Istanbul: Simurg, 2002.

Bağcı, Serpil. “Old Images for New Texts and Contexts: Wandering Images in Islamic Book Painting.” *Muqarnas* 21 (2004): 21-32.

Bağcı, Serpil, et al. *Osmanlı Resim Sanatı.* Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2006.

Bahari, E. “The Sixteenth Century School of Bukhara Painting and the Arts of the Book.” In *Society and Culture in the Early Modern Middle East: Studies on Iran in the Safavid Period.* Edited by Andrew J. Newman, 251-264. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Bahari, E. “The Timurid to Safavid Transition in Persian Painting. Artists in Limbo: New Evidence.” *Iran* 52, no. 1 (2014): 157-204.

Bahari, Ebadollah. *Bihzad: Master of Persian Painting*. London: I.B. Tauris and Co., 1996.

Baipakov, K.M., and B.E. Kumekov. “The Kazakhs.” In *History of Civilizations of Central Asia, Vol. 5: Development in contrast: from the sixteenth to the mid-nineteenth century.* Edited by Chahryar Adle and Irfan Habib, 99-109. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 2003.

Bajraktarević, Sulejman. “Ottenfelsova orijentalistička zbirka u Zagrebačkom državnom arhivu.” In *Zbornik historijskog instituta jugoslavenske akademije,* 77-84 (German summary 120-121). Zagreb, 1959.

Balafrej, Lamia. *The Making of the Artist in Late Timurid Painting.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2019.

Baldauf, I. “Some thoughts on the making of the Uzbek nation.” *Cahiers du monde russe* 32, no. 1 (1991): 79-96.

Barrett, Douglas. “Some unpublished Deccan miniatures." *Lalit Kalā* 7 (1960): 9-13.

Barrucand, Marianne. “Considerations sur les Miniatures Sefevides de la Bibliotheque Nationale.” In *Etudes Safavides*, *Institut Français de Recherche en Iran.* Edited by Jean Calmard, 17-30. Paris-Tehran, IFRI: 1993.

Barry, Michael. *Figurative Art in Medieval Islam and the Riddle of Bihzad of Herat (1465-1535)*. Paris: Flammarion, 2004.

Barthold, W. “Bukhara.” *The Encyclopedia of Islam*, 1293-1296. London and Leiden: Brill, 1960.

Bashir, Shahzad. “Shah Isma’il and the Qizilbash: Cannibalism in the Religious History of Early Safavid Iran.” *History of Religions* 45, no. 3 (February 2006): 234-256.

Bashir, Shahzad. *The Market in Poetry in the Persian World.* Cambridge University Press: 2021. Online edition.

Baskı, Birinci. *Şahname Yazmalarından Seçme Minyatürler.* Ankara: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları kitapları, 1971.

Bayani, Mahdi. *Ahvāl va āsār-i khūshnivīsān.* Tehran: Intishārāt-i ‘Ilmī, 1363 [1984].

Bennigsen, Alexandre, and Chantal Lemercier-Quelquejay. “La Grande Horde Nogay et le problème des communications entre l’empire Ottoman et l’Asie Centrale en 1552-1556.” *Turcica: Revue d’Études Turques* 8, no. 2 (1976): 203-236.

Berg, Gabrielle van den. “Rustam’s Grandson in Central Asia: The Sistan Cycle Epics and the *Shahnama* Tradition.” In *Shahnama Studies III: The Reception of the Shahnama.* Edited by Gabrielle van den Berg and Charles Melville, 94-107. Leiden: Brill, 2018.

Bernardini, Michele. “HĀTEFI, ʿABD-ALLĀH.” *Encyclopædia Iranica*, available online at https://iranicaonline.org/articles/hatefi (accessed on 18 February 2020).

Bernardini, Michele. “Hatifī’s *Tīmūrnameh* and Qāsimī's *Shāhnāmeh-yi Ismāʿil*: Considerations for a double Critical Edition.” In *Society and Culture in the Early Modern Middle East: Studies on Iran in the Safavid Period.* Edited by A.J. Newman, 3–18. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Binbaş, Evrim. *Intellectual Networks in Timurid Iran: Sharaf Al-Dīn 'Alī Yazdī and the Islamicate Republic of Letters.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

Binney III, Edwin. *Turkish Treasures from the Collection of Edwin Binney, 3rd*, exhibition catalogue. Oregon: Portland Art Museum, 1979.

Binyon, J.V.S. Wilkinson and Basil Gray. *Persian Miniature Painting.* London: Oxford University Press, 1933.

Biçer, Bekir. “Firdevsî-i Rûmî ve Tarihçiliği.” *Selçuk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi* no. 18 (2005): 245-261.

Black, Crofton, and Nabil Saidi. *Islamic manuscripts,* Catalogue 22. London: Sam Fogg Rare Books and Manuscripts, 2000.

Blair, Sheila S., and Jonathan M. Bloom, eds. “Architecture and the Arts in Uzbekistan under the Uzbeks.” In *The Art and Architecture of Islam, 1250-1800,* 199-211. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.

Blair, Sheila. “The Ardabil Carpets in Context.” In *Society and Culture in the Early Modern Middle East: Studies on Iran in the Early Safavid Period.* Edited by Andrew J. Newman, 125-144. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Blair, Sheila, and Jonathan Bloom, eds. *Grove Encyclopedia of Islamic Art and Architecture.* 3 volumes. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Blochet, Edgar. *Musulman Painting: XII-XVII Century.* London: Mathuen & Co., 1929.

Blochet, Edgar. *Les enluminures des manuscrits orientaux: turcs, arabes, persans de la bibliotheque nationale*. Paris: Editions de la Gazette des beaux-arts, 1926.

Blow, David. *Shah Abbas: the Ruthless King who Became an Iranian Legend.* London: I.B. Tauris, 2009.

Bodrogligeti, A.J.E. "Muhammed Shaybânî's «Bahru'l- Hudâ»: An Early Sixteenth Century Didactic Qasida in Chagatay." *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 54 (1982): 1-56.

Bodrogligeti, Andras J. E. "TURKIC-IRANIAN CONTACTS ii. CHAGHATAY." *Encyclopædia Iranica*, online edition, available at https://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/turkic-iranian-contacts-ii-chaghatay (accessed 2 August 2021).

Bregel, Yuri. "Ch. 12: Uzbeks, Qazaqs and Turkmens." In *The Cambridge History of Inner Asia: The Chinggisid Age.* Edited by N. Di Cosmo, A. Frank, and P. Golden, 221-236. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Bregel, Yuri. *An Historical Atlas of Central Asia.* Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Bregel, Yuri. "Abu'l-Khayrids." *Encyclopædia Iranica*, online edition, available at http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/bukhara-iv (accessed on 18 February 2015).

Bregel, Yuri. "Abdallah Khan b. Eskandar." *Encyclopædia Iranica*, online edition, available at http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/abdallah-khan-b-eskandar-saybanid-ruler-of-transoxania-d-1598 (accessed on 17 January 2015).

Bregel, Yuri. "BUKHARA iv. Khanate of Bukhara and Khorasan." *Encyclopædia Iranica*, online edition, available at http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/bukhara-iv (accessed on 18 February 2015).

Bregel, Yuri. "HISTORIOGRAPHY xii. CENTRAL ASIA." *Encyclopædia Iranica*, online edition, available at https://iranicaonline.org/articles/historiography-xii (accessed on 18 February 2015).

Brend, Barbara. "Elements from Painting of the Eastern Islamic Area in Early Ottoman Manuscripts of the Khamseh of Amir Khusrau Dihlavi." In *Proceedings of the 9th International Congress of Turkish Art.* Vol. 3, 423-448. Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 1991.

Brend, Barbara. "A Sixteenth-Century Manuscript from Transoxiana: Evidence for a Continuing Tradition in Illustration." *Muqarnas* 11 (1994): 103-116.

Brend, Barbara. "A Kingly Posture: The Iconography of Sultan Husayn Bayqara." In *The Iconography of Islamic Art: Studies in Honour of Robert Hillenbrand.* Edited by Bernard O'Kane, 81-92. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005.

Brend, Barbara, and Charles Melville, eds. *Epic of the Persian Kings: The Shahnameh of Ferdowsi.* London: I.B. Tauris, 2011.

Brend, Barbara. *Perspectives on Persian Painting: Illustrations to Amir Khusrau's* Khamsah. London: Routledge, 2016.

Brentjes, Burchard. "Islamic Art and Architecture in Central Asia." *Journal of Central Asia* 16, nos. 1-2 (July and December 1993).

Burns, Ashley Mayeri. "The Gift of Diplomacy: Case Studies in Safavid Gifting, 1567—1583." MA thesis, School of Oriental and African Studies, 2015.

Burton, Audrey. *The Bukharans: A Dynastic, Diplomatic and Commercial History 1550–1702.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997.

Burton, Audrey. “The Fall of Herat to the Uzbegs in 1588." *Iran* 26 (1988): 119-123.

Burton, Audrey. “Who were the First Ashtarkhānid Rulers of Bukhara?” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 51, no. 3 (1988): 482-488.

Burton, Audrey. “Relations between the Khanate of Bukhara and Ottoman Turkey, 1558-1702.” *International Journal of Turkish Studies* 5 (1990-91): 83-103.

Burton, Audrey. “Bukharan Trade: 1558-1718.” *Papers on Inner Asia* 23, Indiana University. Indiana, 1993.

Burton, Audrey. “Commercial and military routes between Bukhara and India.” *Cahiers d’Asie centrale* [online] 1/2 (1996).

Burton, Audrey. “Descendants et successeurs de Timour: la rivalité territoriale entre les régimes ouzbek, safavide et moghol." *Cahiers d'Asie centrale* [online] 3/4 (1997).

Burton, Audrey. “Merchants and Bukharan Traders, 1558-1920.” *Cahiers d’Asie centrale* [online] 5/6 (1998).

Burton, Audrey. “Imam Quli and Iran.” In *Proceedings of the Third European Conference of Iranian Studies held in Cambridge, 11th to 15th September 1995.* Part 2: Mediaeval and Modern Persian Studies. Edited by Charles Melville, 287-308. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 1999.

Çağman, Filiz. “The Miniatures of the Divan-i Hüseyni and the Influence of their Style.” In *Fifth International Congress of Turkish Art.* Edited by G. Fehér, 231-257. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1978.

Çağman, Filiz, and Zeren Tanındı. “Remarks on Some Manuscripts from the Topkapı Palace Treasury in the Context of Ottoman-Safavid Relations.” *Muqarnas* 13 (1996): 132–148.

Çağman, Filiz, and Zeren Tanındı. “Firdevsi'nin Şâhnamesi'nde Geleneğin Değişimi." *TUBA / Journal of Turkish Studies* 32, no. 1 (2008): 143-167.

Canby, Sheila. *The* Shahnama *of Shah Tahmasp: the Persian Book of Kings.* New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2004.

Canby, Sheila. *Shah ʿAbbas: the Remaking of Iran.* British Museum Press, London, 2009.

Chagnon, Michael. “The Illustrated Manuscript Tradition in Iran, 1040s/1630s-1070s/1660s: Patronage, Production, and Poetics in the Age of the ʿFresh Style’. ” PhD diss., New York University, 2015.

Chann, Naindeep Singh. “Lord of the Auspicious Conjunction: Origins of the *Sāhib-Qirān.*” *Iran and the Caucasus* 13 (1999): 93-110.

Çınar, Gülay Karadağ. “II. Abdullah Han Özelinde Şeybanî Hanlığında Şehzadelik Kurumu.” *Turkish Studies: International Periodical For the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic* 10, no. 5 (Spring 2015): 183-200.

Csirkés, Ferenc. “ ‘Chaghatay Oration, Ottoman Eloquence, Qizilbash Rhetoric’: Turkic Literature in Safavid Persia.” PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2016.

Dabashi, Hamid. *Persophilia: Persian Culture on the Global Scene.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2015.

Dahmardeh, Barat. "The Shaybanid Uzbeks, Moghuls and Safavids in Eastern Iran." In *Iran and the World in the Safavid Age*. Edited by Willem Floor and Edmund Herzig, 131-148. London: I.B. Tauris, 2012.

Dale, Stephen F. "Ch. 11: The later Timurids c. 1450-1526." In *The Cambridge History of Inner Asia: The Chinggisid Age.* Edited by N. Di Cosmo, A. Frank, and P. Golden, 199-201. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Dale, Stephen F. "Ch. 12: Indo-Persian Historiography." In *A History of Persian Literature (Book 10): Persian Historiography.* Edited by Charles Melville, 565-610. London: I.B. Tauris, 2012.

Değirmenci, Tülün. " 'Legitimising' a Young Sultan: Illustrated Copies of Medhî's 'Shāhnāma-ı Türkî' in European Collections." In *Thirteenth International Congress of Turkish Art.* Edited by Géza Fehér and Ibolya Gerelyes, 157-172. Budapest: Hungarian National Museum, 2009.

Değirmenci, Tülün. "A Storyteller's Shahnama: Meddâh Medhî and His Şehnâme-i Türkî." In *Shahnama Studies III.* Edited by Gabrielle van den Berg and Charles Melville, 199-215. Leiden: Brill, 2018.

Déroche, François, ed. *Les Manuscrits Du Moyen-Orient: Essais De Codicologie Et De Paleographie: Actes Du Colloque D'istanbul.* Istanbul: Institut Français d'Etudes Anatoliennes d'Istanbul et Bibliotheque Nationale, 1989.

Deweese, Devin. "A note on manuscripts of the *Zubdat al-athār*, a Chaghatay Turkic History from sixteenth-century Mawarannahr." *Manuscripts of the Middle East* 6 (1992): 96-100.

Deweese, Devin. "The Problem of the *Siraj al-salihin*: Notes on two hagiographies by Badr al-Din Kashmiri." In *Écrit et culture en Asie centrale et dans le monde turco-iranien Xe-XIXe siècles = Writing and culture in central Asia and the Turko-Iranian world 10th-19th centuries.* Edited by Francis Richard and Maria Szuppe, 43-92. Paris: Association pour l'avancement des études iraniennes, 2009.

Deweese, Devin. "A Sixteenth-Century Interpretation of the Islamization of the Mongols Attributed to Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī." *Mawlana Rumi Review* 5, no. 1 (2014): 88-105.

Deweese, Devin. "Chaghatay literature in the early sixteenth century: notes on Turkic translations from the Uzbek courts of Mawarannahr." In *Turkish Language, Literature, and History: Travelers' tales, sultans, and scholars since the eighth century.* Edited by Bill Hickman and Gary Leiser, 99-117. London: Routledge, 2017.

Deweese, Devin. "Ch. 7: Islamization in the Mongol Empire." In *The Cambridge History of Inner Asia: The Chinggisid Age.* Edited by N. Di Cosmo, A. Frank, and P. Golden, 120-134. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Diakonova, N.V., and L.G. Giuzal'ian. *Sredneaziatskie Miniatiury XVI-XVII vv.* Series: *Vostochnaya Miniatiura i Kalligrafia v Lenindradskikh Sobraniakh.* Moscow: Nauka, 1964.

Dickson, Martin. "Shah Tahmasp and the Uzbeks: The Duel for Khurāsān with 'Ubayd Khan 930-946/ 1524-1540." PhD diss., Princeton University, 1958.

Dickson, Martin. "Uzbek Dynastic Theory in the Sixteenth Century." *Trudy XXV-ogo Mezhdunardnogo Kongressa Vosto-kovedov,* 208-216. Moscow: Proceedings of the 25th International Congress of Orientalists, 1963.

Dodhudoeva, Larisa, and Lola Dodhudoeva. “Manuscrits orientaux du Tadjikistan : la collection Semenov.” *Cahiers de l’Asie Centrale* [online] 7 (1999).

Dodkhudoeva, Larisa. *Katalog khudozhestvenno oformlennykh vostochnykh rukopiseī akademii nauk tadzhikskoi SSR.* Dushanbe: Donish, 1986.

Dodkhudoeva, Larisa. *The Arts of the Book in Central Asia and India: XVI-XIX Centuries.* Dushanbe: Collection of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tajikistan, 2000.

Dodkhudoeva, Lola N. “K voprosu ob instrumentakh formirovaniia imperskoi ideologii v period pravleniia shibanidov.” In *SrednevekovyĬ vostok: problemy istoriografii i istochnikovedeniia. Pamiaati Geroiaa Sovetskogo Soiuza akademika Z.M. Buniiatova*, 51-71. Baku: Ilm, 2015.

Dodkhudoeva, Larisa. “Persian Miniature Painting: Collection of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tajikistan.” In P*roceedings of the Eighth European Conference of Iranian Studies, vol. II: Studies on Iran and the Persianate World after Islam.* Edited by Olga M. Yastrebova, xx. Saint Petersburg: The State Hermitage Publishers, 2020.

Duda, Dorothea. *Islamische Handschriften I: Persische Handschriften.* Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1983.

Duda, Dorothea. “The Illustrated Shaybaniname in Vienna Österreichische National Bibliothek Cod. Mixt. 188.” In *Tenth International Congress of Turkish Art.* Edited by François Déroche, Antoinette Harri, and Allison Ohta, 261-272. Geneva: Fondation Max van Berchem, 1999.

Dunbar, Robert W. “Zayn al-Dīn Mahmūd Vāsifī and the Transformation of Early Sixteenth Century Islamic Central Asia.” PhD diss., Indiana University, 2015.

Ebaid, Shebl. “Muhammad Shaybani Khan’s Coffin: New Light on the Monument.” *Iran* 50 (2012): 103-108.

Erkinov, Aftandil. “The Poetry of Nomads and Shaybānī Rulers in the Process of Transition to a Settled Society.” In *Central Asia on Display: Proceedings of the VII. Conference of the European Society for Central Asian Studies*. Edited by Gabriele Rasuly-Paleczek and Julia Katschnig, 145-150. Vienna: LIT Verlag, 2004.

Erkinov, Aftandil. “Persian-Chaghatay Bilingualism in the Intellectual Circles of Central Asia during the 15th-18th Centuries.” *International Journal of Central Asian Studies* 12 (2008): 57-82.

Ertuğ, Zeynep Tarım. “The Depiction of Ceremonies in Ottoman Miniatures: Historical Record of a Matter of Protocol?” *Muqarnas* 27 (2010): 251-275.

Faridany-Akhavan, Zahra. “Dating the Hamzanama: A Re-examination.” *Marg: A Magazine of the Arts* (March 2015): 22-33.

Fetvacı, Emine. *Picturing History at the Ottoman Court*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013.

Fisher, Carol Garrett. “A Reconstruction of the Pictorial Cycle of the ‘Siyar-i Nabi’ of Murad III.” *Ars Orientalis* 14 (1984): 75-94.

Flemming, Barbara. “Literary Activities in Mamluk Halls and Barracks.” In *Studies in Memory of Gaston Wiet.* Edited by Myriam Rosen-Ayalon, 249-260. Jerusalem: Institute of Asian and African Studies, 1977.

Flemming, Barbara. "Şerīf, Sultan Ġavrī and the 'Persians'." In *Essays on Turkish Literature and History*, 47-59. Leiden: Brill, 2018.

Foltz, Richard C. "Two Seventeenth-Century Central Asian Travellers to Mughal India." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 6, no. 3 (November 1996): 367-377.

Foltz, Richard C. *Mughal India and Central Asia.* Karachi and New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Fragner, Bert G. *Repertorium Persischer Herrscherurkunden: Publizierte Orig.-Urkunden (bis 1848*). Freiburg im Breisgau: Schwarz, 1980.

Fragner, Bert. "The Safavid Empire and the Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Political and Strategic Balance of Power within the World System." In *Iran and the World in the Safavid Age.* Edited by Willem Floor and Edmund Herzig, 17-29. London, New York: I.B. Tauris, 2012.

Frank, Allen J. "The western steppe: Volga-Ural region, Siberia and the Crimea." In *The Cambridge History of Inner Asia: The Chinggisid Age.* Edited by Nicola di Cosmo, Allen J. Frank, Peter B. Golden, 250-253. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Galerkina, Olimpiada. *Rukopis' sochinenii Navoi 1521-1522 gg. iz sobraniya GPB im Saltuikova-Shchedrina v Leningrade: k voprosu o sredneaziatskoi shkole miniatyur [A manuscript of the works of 'Alī Shīr Navā'ī written in the years 1521-22, in the collection of the Leningrad Public Library: a study of the central Asian school of miniature painting]*. Stalinabad [Dushanbe]: Academy of Sciences, 1956.

Galerkina, Olimpiada. *Mawarannahr Book Painting.* Leningrad: Aurora Art Publishers, 1980.

Galerkina, Olimpiada. "Zur Charakteristik der Miniaturenmalerei Mawarannahrs im 16. Jahrhundert." In *Ars Turcica: Akten des VI. internationalen Kongresses für türkische Kunst, München vom 3. bis 7. September 1979.* Edited by Klaus Kreiser, 522-531. Munich, Editio Maris, 1987.

Gazerani, Saghi. *The Sistani Cycle of Epics and Iran's National History: On the Margins of Historiography.* Leiden: Brill, 2016.

Geevers, Liesbeth. "Safavid Cousins on the Verge of Extinction: Dynastic Centralization in Central Asia and the Bahrāmī Collateral Line (1517-1593)." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 58 (2015): 293-326.

Ghelichkhani, Hamidreza. *Kātibān-i Shāhnāmah* [The scribes of *Shahnameh*]. Tehran: Kitāb Ārāyī-i Īrānī, 1396 [2017].

Golden, Peter. *Central Asia in World History.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Golombek, Lisa. "Early Illustrated Manuscripts of Kāshifī's *Akhlāq-i Muḥsinī*." *Iranian Studies* 36, no. 4 (December 2003): 615-643.

Gray, Basil. *Oriental Islamic Art: Collection of the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation.* Museu Nacional de Arte Antiga: Lisbon, 1963.

Green, Nile. *The Persianate World: The Frontiers of a Eurasian Lingua Franca.* California: University of California Press, 2019.

Gronke, Monika. “The Persian Court between Palace and Tent: From Tīmūr to ‘Abbas I.” In Timurid *Art and Culture: Iran and Central Asia in the Fifteenth Century.* Edited by Lisa Golombek and Maria Subtelny, 19-22. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

Grube, Ernst. *The Classical Style in Islamic Painting: The early school of Herat and its impact on Islamic painting of the later 15th, the 16th and 17th centuries.* Venice: Edizioni Oriens, 1968.

Gruber, Christiane. “The Gulbenkian *Bahāristān*: ‘Abd al-‘Aziz & the Bihzādian Tradition in 16th-Century Bukhara.” In *Namayeshgah-i Bayn al-Malal Kemal al-Din Behzad/ International Congress on Master Kemal al-Din Behzad.* Tehran: Farhangestan-i Honar, 2005.

Haider, Mansura. “Relations of ʿAbdallāh Khan Uzbeg with Akbar.” *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique* 23, nos. 3-4 (Juillet-Décembre 1982): 313-331.

Haider, Mansura. *Central Asia in the Sixteenth Century.* Delhi: Manohar Publishers, 2002.

Hammer-Purgstall, Joseph. *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches: Grossentheils aus bisher unbenützen Handschriften und Archiven.* Pesth [Budapest]: C.A. Hartleben, 1840.

ul-Haq, Mahfuz. “Persian Painters, Illuminators, Calligraphists etc. in the 16th Century, A.D.” *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* 28 (1938): 139-149.

Hayashi, Norihito. “The Turkman Commercial Style of Painting: Origins and Developments Reconsidered.” *Orient* 47 (2012): 169-189.

Hillenbrand, Robert. “The Iconography of the *Shāh-nāmah-yi Shāhī.*” In *Safavid Persia: The History and Politics of an Islamic Society.* Edited by Charles Melville, 53-78. London: I.B. Tauris, 1996.

Hitchins, Keith. “WĀṢEFI, ZAYN-AL-DIN MAḤMŪD.” *Encyclopædia Iranica*, online edition, available at https://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/wasefi (accessed on 11 November 2018).

Hofman, H.F. *Turkish Literature: Bio-Bibliographical Survey.* Vols. 1-6. Utrecht: The Library of the University of Utrecht, 1969.

Horikawa, Toru. “The Shaybanid Dynasty and the Ottoman Empire: The Changing of Routes between the Two States according to Archives in Istanbul [in Japanese].” *Bulletin of the Society for Western and Southern Asiatic Studies, Kyoto University* no. 34 (March 1991): 43-75.

Howorth, Henry Hoyle. *History of the Mongols, from the 9th to the 19th Century*, Part 2, issue 2. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1880.

İnal, Güner. ”Topkapı Müzesindeki Hazine 1509 No. LU Şehname'nin Minyatürleri." *Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı / Journal of Art History* 3 (1970): 197-220.

İnal, Güner. “Şah İsmail devrinden bir Şehname ve sonraki etkileri” (Eng. summary: “A Manuscript of the Shahnameh from the Period of Shah Ismāʿīl and its Influences on later Shahnameh Illustrations”). *Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı / Journal of Art History* 5 (1973): 497-545.

İnal, Güner. “Topkapı Sarayı Koleksiyonundaki Sultani Bir Özbek Şehnamesi ve Özbek Resim Sanatı İçindeki yeri” (Eng. summary: “A royal Uzbek Shahnameh in the Topkapı Palace Museum and Its Significance for Uzbek Painting”). *Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı / Journal of Art History* 6 (1974-75): 303-332.

İnal, Güner. “Topkapı Sarayi Muzesindeki Bazi Şah Abbas Dönemi Sehname’lerinin Minyatürleri." *Hacettepe Beseri Bilimler Dergisi* 10, no. 3 (Haziran 1980): 12-51.

İnal, Güner. “The Ottoman Interpretation of Firdausi’s Shahname.” *Ars Turcica: Akten des VI. internationalen Kongresses für türkische Kunst, München vom 3. bis 7. September 1979.* Edited by Klaus Kreiser, 554-562. Munich: Editio Maris, 1987.

İnal, Güner. *Türk Minyatür Sanati: Baslangicindan Osmanlilara kadar.* Ankara: Atatürk Cultural Center, 1995.

Ismailova, E.M., and Sh. M. Musaev. “Miniatiury Mukhammeda Murada Samarkandi k Khivinskomu spisku “Shakh-name” (k voprosu o novatorstve khudozhestvennogo stilia).” *O'zbekistonda Ijtimoiy Fanlar* vol. 12 (1983): 35-42.

Jafarian, Rasool. “The Political Relations of Shah Ismāʿīl I with the Mamluk Government (1501-16/907-22).” In *Iran and the World in the Safavid Age.* Edited by Willem Floor and Edmund Herzig, 31-47. London: I.B. Tauris, 2012.

Khājāev, Shāh Mansūr. “Shāhnāma: mashhūrtarīn asar dar miyān-i aqvām-e turkī zabān-i minṭaqa.” *Bunyād-e Firdausī-ye Tūs* [Isfand 16, 1394 (March 6, 2016)]. Available at http://bonyadferdowsitous.ir/ (accessed on 17 February 2017).

Kılıç, N. “Change in Political Culture: The Rise of Sheybani Khan.” *Cahiers de l’Asie Centrale* [online] 3/4 (1997).

Kılıç, Remzi. “Osmanlı-Özbek siyasi ilişkileri (1530-1555).” *Türk Kültürü* 37 (1999): 523-534.

Kirakosyan, Hasmik, and Ani Sargsyan. “Persian-Turkish Bilingual Dictionaries and Sufism Transmission in the Ottoman Empire (15-16th centuries).” Paper presented at the Ninth European Conference of Iranian Studies, Berlin, September 9-13, 2019.

Knobloch, Edgar. *Monuments of Central Asia: A Guide to the Archaeology, Art and Architecture of Turkestan.* London: IB Tauris, 2001.

Koch, Ebba. “The Influence of the Jesuit Missions.” In *Mughal Art and Imperial Ideology: Collected Essays*, 1-11. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Koch, Ebba. “Jahāngīr as Publius Scipio Maior: The Commensurability of Mughal Political Portraiture.” In *Portraiture in South Asia since the Mughals: Art, Representation and History.* Edited by Crispin Branfoot, 73-97. London: I.B. Tauris, 2018.

Komaroff, Linda, ed. *Gifts of the Sultan.* New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2011.

Köprülü, M. Fuad. “Çagatay edebiyati.” In *İslâm ansiklopedisi* 3, part 24, 309. Istanbul, 1945.

Kowalski, Tadeusz. “The Turks in the *Shāh-nāma.*” In *The Turks in the Early Islamic World.* Edited by C. Edmund Bosworth, 121–143. Aldershot, 2007.

Kröger, Jens. “On Maḥmūd B. Ishaq al-Shihabi's Manuscript of ‘Yūsuf va Zulaykhā’ of 964 (1557).” *Muqarnas* 21 (2004): 239-253.

Kwiatkowski, Will. *The Eckstein Shahnama: an Ottoman Book of Kings.* London: Sam Fogg, 2005.

Lambton, “Pīshkash: Present or Tribute?” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 57, no. 1 (1994): 145-158.

Landau, Amy. “From Poet to Painter: Allegory and Metaphor in a Seventeenth-Century Persian Painting by Muḥammad Zaman, Master of Farangī-Sāzī.” *Muqarnas* 28 (2011): 101-132.

Langer, Axel, ed. “European Influences on Seventeenth-Century Persian Painting: Of handsome Europeans, naked ladies, and Parisian timepieces.” In *The Fascination of Persia: Persian-European Dialogue in Seventeenth-Century Art & and Contemporary Art of Teheran*, 170-237. Zürich: Scheidegger & Spiess, 2013.

Lapidus, Ira. “Mamluk Patronage and the Arts in Egypt: Concluding Remarks.” *Muqarnas* 2 (1984): 173-181.

Lee, Joo-Yup. *The ‘Ancient Supremacy:’ Bukhara, Afghanistan and the Battle for Balkh, 1731-1901.* New York: E.J. Brill, 1996.

Lee, Joo-Yup. *Qazaqliq, or Ambitious Brigandage, and the Formation of the Qazaqs: State and Identity in Post-Mongol Central Eurasia.* Leiden: Brill, 2016.

Levi, Scott. “India, Russia and the Eighteenth-Century Transformation of the Central Asian Caravan Trade." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 42, no. 4 (1999): 519-548.

Liechti, Stacy. “Books, Book Endowments, and Communities of Knowledge in the Bukharan Khanate.” PhD diss., New York University, 2008.

Losty, Jeremiah. *The Art of the Book in India.* London: The British Library, 1982.

Losty, Jeremiah. “The 'Bute Hafiz' and the Development of Border Decoration in the Manuscript Studio of the Mughals.” *The Burlington Magazine* 127, no. 993 (Dec. 1985): 855-871.

Losty, Jeremiah. *Indian Book Painting.* London: The British Library, 1986.

Losty, Jeremiah. “From three-quarter to full profile in Indian painting: revolutions in art and taste.” In *Das Bildnis in der Kunst des Orients.* Edited by J.M. zur Capellen, et al., 153-160. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz, 1989.

Lowry, Glenn D., and Susan Nemazee. *A Jeweler’s Eye: Islamic Arts of the Book from the Vever Collection.* Washington, D.C.: Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, 1988.

Lowry, Glenn D., et al. *An Annotated and Illustrated Checklist of the Vever Collection.* Washington, D.C.: Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, 1988.

Madraimov, A., Sh. Musaev, and E. Ismailova. *Oriental Miniatures: The Collection of the Beruni Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan: Volume 1, 14th-17th Centuries.* Tashkent: The Beruni Institute of Oriental Studies, 2001.

Mahir, Banu. “Album H. 2169 in the Topkapı Palace Museum Library.” In *Thirteenth International Congress of Turkish Art*. Edited by Géza Dávid and Ibolya Gerelyes, 465–477. Budapest: Hungarian National Museum, 2009.

Makariou, Sophie.“Eustache de Lorey (XXe siècle) historien d’art.” In *Dictionnaire des orientalistes de langue française.* Edited by François Pouillon, 365-366. Paris: IISMM, 2008.

Mallitskii, N.G. “Protokoly i soobscheniia chlenov Turkestanskogo kruzhka liubitelei arxeologii." G.IV (1899): 71-180.

Manz, Beatrice Forbes. *The Rise and Rule of Tamerlane.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Marzolph, Ulrich. "The Persian national epic in between tradition and ideology." In *The Kalevala and the World's Traditional Epics.* Edited by Lauri Honko, 276-293. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society, 2002.

Maslyuzhenko, D.N. "Sibirskaia vetv' dinastii shibanidov v issledovanii Sh. Mardzhani [The Siberian Branch of the Shibanid Dynasty in Sh. Marjani's Studies]." *Zolotoordynskoe obozrenie/ Golden Horde Review* 7, no. 3 (2019): 485–496.

Matthee, Rudi. "Facing a Rude and Barbarous Neighbor." In *Iran Facing Others: Identity Boundaries in a Historical Perspective.* Edited by Abbas Amanat and Farzin Vejdani, 101-126. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2012.

Matthee, Rudi. "The Safavid Economy as Part of the World Economy." In *Iran and the World in the Safavid Age*. Edited by Willem Floor and Edmund Herzig, 31-47. London, New York: I.B. Tauris, 2012.

Matthee, Rudi. "Relations Between the Center and the Periphery in Safavid Iran: The Western Borderlands v. the Eastern Frontier Zone." *Historian* (2015): 431-463.

McChesney, R.D. "The 'Reforms' of Bāqī Muḥammad Khan." *Central Asiatic Journal* 24, no. 1/2 (1980): 69-84.

McChesney, R.D. "The Amirs of Muslim Central Asia in the XVIIth Century." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* XXVI, no. 1 (1983): 33-70.

McChesney, R.D. "Economic and Social Aspects of the Public Architecture of Bukhara in the 1560's and 1570's." *Islamic Art* II (1987): 217-42.

McChesney, R.D. "The Conquest of Herat 1587-88: Sources for the Study of Safavid/qizilbāsh – Shībānid/Uzbak Relations." In *Etudes Safavides* 39. Edited by Jean Calmard, 69-107. Paris and Tehran: Bibliothèque Iranienne, 1993.

McChesney, R.D. " 'Barrier of heterodoxy?' Rethinking the Ties Between Iran and Central Asia in the 17th Century." In *Safavid Persia: The History and Politics of an Islamic Society.* Edited by Charles Melville, 231-267. London: I.B. Tauris, 1996.

McChesney, R.D. "Zamzam water on a white felt carpet: adapting Mongol ways in Muslim Central Asia, 1550-1650." In *Religion, Customary Law, and Nomadic Technology.* Edited by Michael Gervers and Wayne Schlepp, 63-80. Toronto: Joint Centre for Asia Pacific Studies, 2000.

McChesney, R.D. "The Central Asia Hajj-Pilgrimage in the time of the Early Modern Empires." In *Safavid Iran and Her Neighbors.* Edited by Michel Mazzaoui, 129-156. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2003.

McChesney, R.D. "Ch. 15: The Chinggisid restoration in Central Asia: 1500-1785." In *The Cambridge History of Inner Asia: The Chinggisid Age.* Edited by N. Di Cosmo, A. Frank, and P. Golden, 277-302. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

McChesney, R.D. "Islamic culture and the Chinggisid restoration: Central Asia in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries." In *The New Cambridge History of Islam. Vol. 3: The Eastern Islamic World Eleventh to Eighteenth Centuries.* Edited by David O. Morgan and Anthony Reid, 239-265. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

McChesney, R.D. “Ch. 10: Historiography in Central Asia since the 16th Century.” In *A History of Persian Literature (Book 10): Persian Historiography.* Edited by Charles Melville, 503-531. London: Tauris, 2012.

McChesney, R.D. “CENTRAL ASIA VI. In the 16th-18th Centuries.” *Encyclopædia Iranica*, online edition, available at http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/central-asia-vi (accessed on 15 January 2015).

McChesney, R.D. “Earning a Living: Promoting Islamic Culture in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.” In *Afghanistan’s Islam: From Conversion to the Taliban*. Edited by Nile Green, 89-104. California: University of California Press, 2017.

Mehran, Farhad. “Break-line Verse: Link between Text and Image in the ‘First Small Shahnama.’” In *Shahnama Studies I*. Edited by Charles Melville, 151-170. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 2006.

Melikian-Chirvani, Assadullah Souren. “The Anthology of a Sufi Prince from Bukhara.” In *Persian Painting from the Mongols to the Qajars.* Edited by Robert Hillenbrand, 151–185. London: IB Tauris, 2001.

Melville, Charles. “Genealogy and exemplary rulership in the Tarikh-i Chingiz Khan.” In *Living Islamic History: Studies in Honour of Professor Carole Hillenbrand.* Edited by Yasir Suleiman, 129-50. Edinburgh: University Press, 2010.

Melville, Charles. “ ‘Ali Yazdī and the *Shāhnāme.*” In *International* Shāhnāme *Conference: The Second Millennium (Conference Volume).* Edited by Forogh Hashabeiky, 117-133. Sweden: Uppsala University Library, 2014.

Melville, Charles. “Perceptions of History in Persian Chronicles of the Sixteenth–Seventeenth Centuries.” Paper presented at LUCIS Annual Conference 2016: Memory and commemoration in Islamic Central Asia: past and present perspectives. Leiden University, 23-25 November 2016.

Melville, Charles. “The ‘Big Head’ *Shāhnāma* in Istanbul and Elsewhere: Some Codicological and Iconographical Observations.” In *The Arts of Iran in Istanbul and Anatolia.* Edited by Olga Davidson and Shreve Simpson, 113-49. Boston, MA: Ilex Foundation, 2018.

Melville, Charles. “The Illustration of History in Persian Manuscripts.” *Iran* vol. 56, no. 1 (2018): 47-63.

Melville, Charles. “The Shaibanids between Tīmūr and Chinggis Khan: Visual Dilemmas." LUCIS Lecture. Leiden University, 7 May 2019.

Melville, Charles. “On Some Manuscripts of Hatifi’s *Timurnama*.” In *Exploring Written Artefacts: Objects, Methods, and Concepts*, vol. II. Edited by Jörg B. Quenzer and Michael Friedrich, 1123-43. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021.

Melville, Firuza. “Hilali and Mir ‘Ali: Sunnis among the Shi‘is, or Shi‘is among the Sunnis between the Shaybanids, Safavids and the Mughals.” *Iran* 59, no. 2 (2021): 245-262.

Meredith-Owens, G.M. *Turkish Miniatures.* London, British Museum: 1963.

Meredith-Owens, G.M. “A Sixteenth-century Illustrated Turkish Manuscript at Manchester." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 48, no. 2, (1966): 372-380.

Metropolitan Museum of Art. “Central and North Asia, 1400–1600 A.D.” *Heilbrunn Timeline of Art History* (2000). Accessed 3 October 2019. <http://www.metmuseum.org/toah/ht/?period=08&region=nc>

Milstein, Rachel, et al. *Stories of the Prophets: Illustrated Manuscripts of* Qiṣaṣ al-Anbiyāʾ. Costa Mesa, California: Mazda Publishers, 1999.

Minorsky, V. “The Poetry of Shah Ismail I." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 10, no. 4 (1942): 1006a-1053a.

Mirzoev, Abdulgani, and Aleksandr Boldyrev. *Katalog vostochnykh rukopisei Akademii nauk Tadzhikskoi SSR* [A catalogue of oriental manuscripts of the Academy of Sciences of the Tajiks SSR], 6 volumes. Stalinabad [Dushanbe]: Academy of Sciences, 1960.

Mitchell, Colin P. *The Practice of Politics in Safavid Iran: Power, Religion and Rhetoric.* London: IB Tauris 2012.

Mukminova, R.G., and A. Mukhtarov. “The Khanate (Emirate) of Bukhara.” In *History of Civilizations of Central Asia, Vol. 5: Development in contrast: from the sixteenth to the mid-nineteenth century.* Edited by Chahryar Adle and Irfan Habib, 34-46. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 2003.

Natif, Mika. “The *Zafarnama* [Book of Conquest] of Sultan Husayn Mīrzā.” In *Insights and Interpretations.* Edited by Colum Hourihane, 211-228. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2002.

Natif, Mika. “The SOAS *Anvār-i Suhaylī*: The Journey of a ‘Reincarnated’ Manuscript.” *Muqarnas* 25 (2008): 331-358.

Necipoğlu, Gülru. “From International Timurid to Ottoman: A Change of Taste in Sixteenth-Century Ceramic Tiles.” *Muqarnas* 7 (1990): 136-170.

Necipoğlu, Gülru. “Word and Image: Ottoman Sultans in Comparative Perspective.” In *The Sultan’s Portrait: Picturing the House of Osman.* Edited by Selmin Kangal, 22-61. Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası, 2000.

Newman, Andrew J. *Safavid Iran: Rebirth of a Persian Empire.* London: IB Tauris, 2009.

Nölle-Karimi, Christine. “Khurasan and its Limits: Changing Concepts of Territory from Pre-Modern to Modern Times.” In *Iran und iranisch geprägte Kulturen: Studien zum 65. Geburtstag von Bert G. Fragner.* Edited by Markus Ritter, Ralph Kauz, and Birgitt Hoffmann, 9-19. Wiesbaden: Beiträge zur Iranistik 27, 2008.

O’Kane, Bernard. “Reconciliation or estrangement? Colophon and paintings in the TİEM Ẓafarnāma and some other controversial manuscripts.” *Muqarnas* 26 (2009): 205-227.

Özgüdenli, Osman G. “Sah-nama Translations i: into Turkish.” *Encyclopædia Iranica*, online edition, available at http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/sah-nama-iv-illustrations (accessed on 16 January 2015).

Papas, Alexandre, Thomas Welsford, and Thierry Zarcone, eds. *Central Asian Pilgrims: Hajj Routes and Pious Visits between Central Asia and the Hijaz.* Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 2012.

Patel, Alka. “The *Shahnama* in India.” In *Epic Tales from Ancient India.* Edited by Marika Sardar, 142-153. San Diego, CA: The San Diego Museum of Art, 2016.

Peachy, William Samuel. “A Year in Selânikî’s History: 1593-4.” PhD diss., Indiana University, 1984.

Pickett, James. “The Persianate Sphere during the Age of Empires: Islamic Scholars and Networks of Exchange in Central Asia, 1747-1917.” PhD diss., Princeton University, 2015.

Poliakova, E.A. and Z.I. Rakhimova. *Miniatiura i literatura vostoka [L’art de la miniature et la littérature de l’orient].* Tashkent: Gafour Gouliame, 1987.

Porter, Yves. “Remarques sur la peinture à Boukhara au XVIe siècle.” *Cahiers d’Asie centrale* [online] 5/6 (1998).

Porter, Yves. “Le kitâbkhâna de 'Abd al'Aziz Khân (1645-1680) et le mécénat de la peinture à Boukhara.” *Cahiers d'Asie centrale* [online] 7 (1999).

Pouya, Ali Rezaei. “Intertextual analysis of the History of Abū’l-Khair: an overview of the text and a case study of the Pishdadian section based on Gérard Genette's transcript” [in Persian]. *Proceedings of the Fourth Conference on Literary Textual Research* vol. 4 (Āzar 1396 [November-December 2018]), 601-634.

Pugachenkova, Galina A. “Miniatiury ‘Fatkh-name’—khroniki pobed Sheiani-khana iz sobrania instituta po izuchenniiu bostochnykh rukopisei Akademiii Nauk UzSSR.” *Trudy: Sredneaziatskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta. Arkheologia Srednei Azii* 11, no. 3 (1950): 121-136.

Pugachenkova, Galina A., and L. I. Rempel’. *Vydaiushchiesia pamiatniki izobrazitel’nogo iskusstva uzbekistana.* Tashkent, 1958.

Pugachenkova, Galina A., and O. Galerkina. *Miniatiury Sredneĭ Azii [Miniatures of Central Asia in Selected Examples from Soviet and Foreign Collections].* Moscow: Izobrazitel′noe iskusstvo, 1979.

Pugachenkova, G. A., and L. I. Rempel. *Ocherki iskusstva srednei Asii [Essays on the Art of Central Asia].* Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1982.

Pugachenkova, Galina A., and A.A. Madraimov, “Miniatiura Mukhammada Murada Samarkandi iz fonda Instituta Vostokovedenia AN UzSSR." *O'zbekistonda Ijtimoiy Fanlar* vol. 2 (1984): 47-50.

Pugachenkova, Galina A. “Manuscript Miniatures from the Oriental Studies Institute of the Uzbek SSR Academy of Sciences.” *Bulletin of the Asia Institute, New Series*, vol. 4 (1990): 139-148.

Pugachenkova, Galina A. *Miniatures of Central Asia.* Tashkent: Editorial Office of Encyclopaedias, 1994.

Pugachenkova, Galina A., and E.V. Rtveladze. “BUKHARA v. Archeology and Monuments.” *Encyclopædia Iranica*, online edition, available at https://iranicaonline.org/articles/bukhara-v (accessed on 16 January 2015).

Quinn, Sholeh. “Notes on Timurid Legitimacy in Three Safavid Chronicles.” *Iranian Studies* 31, No. 2 (Spring 1998): 149-158.

Quinn, Sholeh. “Reading Safavid and Mughal chronicles: kingly virtues and early modern Persianate historiography.” In *Ferdowsi, the Mongols and the history of Iran: art, literature and culture from early Islam to Qajar Persia: studies in honour of Charles Melville.* Edited by Robert Hillenbrand, A.C.S. Peacock, F.I. Abdullaeva, and Linda Komaroff, 149-158. London: I.B. Tauris, 2013.

Quinn, Sholeh. *Persian Historiography Across Empires: The Ottomans, Safavids, and Mughals.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2021.

Rabie, Hassanein. “Political Relations between the Safavids of Persia and the Mamluks of Egypt and Syria in the Early Sixteenth Century." *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 15 (1978): 75-81.

Rād, ʿAbd al-Majīd Ḥusainī. “Pazhūhishī barāyi muʿarifi-yi Shāhnāma muṣavvir-i no yāfta az daura-yi Ṣafavī (Shāhnāma-yi Shāmlū)." *Nashriya Hunarhā-yi Zībā u Hunarhā-yi Tajassumī* 18, no. 4 (Winter 1392 [2013-14]): 43-54.

Rahmatullaeva, Sulhiniso. “Samarqand’s Rigestān and its Architectural Meanings." *Journal of Persianate Studies* 3 (2010): 156-191.

Rakhimova, Zukhra Ibragimova. *K istorii kost͡iuma n̲arodov Uzbekistana: kost͡ium Bukhary i Samarkanda XVI -- XVII vekov; po dannym srednevekovoĭ miniatiurnoĭ zhivopisi.* Tashkent: Izdatel′stvo zhurnala “San'at", 2005.

Rakhimova, Zukhra, Mavliuda Abbasova-Yusupova, Gulabza Qarshieva. *Movarounnahr Miniatiura San’atini O’rganish Aspektlari [Aspects of Studying the Miniature of Mavarannakhr: Collective Monograph].* Tashkent: Muxr Press, 2020.

Randhawa, M.S. “Rare Bukhara Manuscript: ‘Raudat-ul-Muhibbin.” *Arts: The Islamic World* 1, no. 1 (Winter 1982/83): 7-10.

Reindl-Kiel, Hedda. “East is East and West is West, and Sometimes the Twain Did Meet: Diplomatic Gift Exchange in the Ottoman Empire.” In *Frontiers of Ottoman Studies: State, Province, and the West,* Vol. 2, eds. Colin Imber and Keiko Kiyotaki (London: IB Tauris, 2005), 113-123.

Reindl-Kiel, Hedda. “Power and Submission: Gifting at Royal Circumcision Festivals in the Ottoman Empire (16th–18th centuries)." *Turcica: Revue d’Études Turques* 41 (2009): 37-88.

Rice, Yael. “The Emperor’s Eye and the Painter’s Brush: the Rise of the Mughal Court Artist, c. 1546-1627.” PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2011.

Rice, Yael. “Mughal Interventions in the Rampur ‘Jāmīʿ al-Tavārīkh.’ *Ars Orientalis* 42 (2012): 150-164.

Richard, Francis. “Un manuscrit malaisé à dater et à localiser, Supplément persan 1122 de la Bibliothèque nationale.” *Études orientales* 11-12 (1991): 90-103.

Richard, Francis, and Maria Szuppe, eds. *Écrit et culture en asie centrale et dans le monde Turco-Iranien, Xe-XIXe siècles [Writing and Culture in Central Asia and the Turko-Iranian World, 10th-19th Centuries].* Paris: Association pour l’Avancement des Études Iraniennes, 2009.

Richard, Francis. “Composite figures in the *Hadiqat al-haqiqa wa Shari’at al-ṭariqa* of Sana’i.” In *Ferdowsi, the Mongols and the History of Iran: Art, Literature and Culture from Early Islam to Qajar Persia. Studies in Honour of Charles Melville.* Edited by Robert Hillenbrand, A.C.S. Peacock, and Firuza Abdullaeva, 341–357. London: IB Tauris, 2013.

Richard, Francis. “Un Makhzan al-Asrar de Niẓāmī de la Bibliothèque Nationale de France ayant Appartenu a Mikhaïl Simonitsch Fils de l'Ambassadeur de Russie a Teheran.” *Manuscripta Orientalia* 22, no. 1 (December 2016): 56-68.

Rieu, Charles. *Catalogue of the Turkish Manuscripts in the British Museum.* London: British Museum, 1888.

Robinson, B.W. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Persian Paintings in the Bodleian Library.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.

Robinson, B.W. *Persian Miniature Painting from Collections in the British Isles.* London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1967.

Robinson, B.W., et al. *Islamic Painting and the Arts of the Book: The Keir Collection.* London: Faber and Faber, 1976.

Robinson, B.W. "Ismāʿīl II's Copy of the Shāhnāma." *Iran* 14 (1976): 1-8.

Robinson, B.W. *Persian Paintings in the India Office Library: A Descriptive Catalogue.* London: Sotheby Parke Bernet, 1976.

Robinson, B.W. "Persian Painting." In *Persia: History and Heritage.* Edited by John Boyle, 77-89. London and New York: Routledge, 1978.

Robinson, B.W. *Persian Paintings in the John Rylands Library: A Descriptive Catalogue.* London: Sotheby Parke Bernet, 1980.

Robinson, B.W. "Two Illustrated Manuscripts in the Malek Library, Tehran*." In Content and Context of Visual Arts in the Islamic World: papers from a colloquium in memory of Richard Ettinghausen…New York…1980.* Edited by Priscilla Soucek, 91-103. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1988.

Robinson, B.W. "Book-Painting in Transoxiana during the Timurid Period." *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 5 (1991): 71-82.

Robinson, B.W. *Fifteenth-century Persian Painting: Problems and Issues.* New York: New York University Press, 1991.

Robinson, B.W. "Muhammadī and the Khurasan Style." *Iran* 30 (1992): 17-30.

Robinson, B.W. "An Amir Khusraw Khamsa of 1581." *Iran: Journal of the British Institute of Persian Studies* 35 (1997): 35-42.

Roxburgh, David. "The Study of Painting and the Arts of the Book." *Muqarnas* 17 (2000): 1-16.

Roxburgh, David J. "Kamal al-Din Bihzad and Authorship in Persianate Painting." *Muqarnas* 17 (2000): 119-146.

Rtveladze, Edvard, ed. *The Oriental Miniature: Historical Figures.* Tashkent: Zamon Press, 2021.

Rührdanz, Karin. "The Transformed *Shāhnāma*: Romanticized Heroic Legends versus History." In *10th International Congress of Turkish Art: Arc Turc-Turkish Art.* Edited by François Déroche, Antoinette Harri, and Allison Ohta, 599-606. Geneva: Fondation Max Van Berchem, 1995.

Rührdanz, Karin. "About a Group of Truncated *Shāhnāma*s: A Case Study in the Commercial Production of Illustrated Manuscripts in the Second Part of the Sixteenth Century." *Muqarnas* 14 (1997): 118–34.

Rührdanz, Karin. "The Arts of The Book in Central Asia." In *Uzbekistan Heirs to the Silk Road.* Edited by J. Kalter and M. Pavalio, 101-119. London & New York: Thames and Hudson, 1997.

Rührdanz, Karin. “Die Entwicklung der mittelasiatischen Buchmalerei vom. 15. bis zum 17. Jahrhundert.” In *Eothen: Jahreshefte der Gesellschaft der Freunde Islamischer Kunst und Kultur* (1998): 109-122.

Rührdanz, Karin. “The revival of Central Asian painting in the early 17th century.” In *Proceedings of the Third European Conference of Iranian Studies held in Cambridge, 11th to 15th September 1995.* Part 2: Mediaeval and Modern Persian Studies. Edited by Charles Melville, 385-405. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 1999.

Rührdanz, Karin.“The illustrated manuscripts of Athar al-Muzaffar: a history of the Prophet.” In *Persian Painting from the Mongols to the Qajars: Studies in Honour of Basil W. Robinson.* Edited by Robert Hillenbrand, 201-216. London: I.B. Tauris, 2001.

Rührdanz, Karin. “The Samarqand Shahnamas in the Context of Dynastic Change.” In *Shahnama Studies II.* Edited by Charles Melville and Gabrielle van den Berg, 213-33. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Rührdanz, Karin. “A History of Miniature Painting Between the 1540s and 1560s in Central Asia.” Bahari Lecture presented at SOAS, London. March 11, 2020.

Rüstem, Ünver. “The Afterlife of a Royal Gift: The Ottoman Inserts of the *Shāhnāma-i Shāhī*." *Muqarnas* 29 (2012): 245-337.

Rypka, Jan. *History of Iranian Literature.* Netherlands: Springer, 1968.

Ṣafā, Zabīḥ-Allāh. *Ḥamāsa-sarāyī dar Īrān.* Tehran, 1344/1965.

Şahin, K. and J. Schleck. “Courtly Connections: Anthony Sherley’s *Relation of his trauels* (1613) in a Global Context.” *Renaissance Quarterly* 69, no. 1 (2016): 80-115.

Sakisian, Arménag. *La Miniature Persane du XIIe au XVIIe Siècle.* Paris: Les Éditions G. Van Oest, 1929.

Samie, August. “The Shibanid Question: Reassessing 16th Century Eurasian History in Post-Soviet Uzbekistan.” PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2020.

Satyal, Amita. “The Mughal Empire, Overland Trade, and Merchants of Northern India, 1526-1707.” PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley, 2008.

Schimmel, Annemarie. “Some Notes on the Cultural Activity of the First Uzbek Rulers.” *Journal of the Pakistan Historical Society* 8, no. 4 (1960): 149-166.

Schmidt, Jan. “The Reception of Firdausi’s *Shahnama* Among the Ottomans.” In *Shāhnāma Studies II.* Edited by Charles Melville and Gabrielle van den Berg, 121-140. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Schmitz, Barbara. “Miniature Painting in Harāt, 1570-1640.” PhD diss., New York University, 1981.

Schmitz, Barbara. “BUKHARA vi. Bukharan School of Miniature Painting." *Encyclopædia Iranica*, online edition, available at https://iranicaonline.org/articles/bukhara-vi (accessed on 16 January 2015).

Schmitz, Barbara. *Islamic Manuscripts in the New York Public Library.* New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Schmitz, Barbara, and Ziyaud-Din A. Desai. *Mughal and Persian Paintings and Illustrated Manuscripts in the Raza Library, Rampur.* New Delhi: Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts, 2006.

Schmitz, Barbara. “The Beginning of the Khurasānī School of Painting at Herat.” *Artibus Asiae* 67, no. 1 (2007): 75–93.

Schulz, Ph. Walter. *Die persisch-islamische Miniaturmalerei.* Leipzig: Verlag von Karl W. Hiersemann, 1914.

Schwarz, Florian. “Safavids and Ozbeks.” In *Safavid Persia in the Age of Empires: The Idea of Iran*. Edited by Charles Melville, 357–374. London: I.B.Tauris, 2021.

Semenov, A.A. “Miniatiury Samarkandskoi Rukopisi Nachala XVII v. ‘Zafar-noma’ Sharafuddina Ezdi.” *Majmuai Maqolaho bakhshida ba San’ati Khalqi Tojik; Asarho* vol. XLII (Academy of Sciences Tajikistan SSR, 1956): 3-16.

Semenov, A.A. “K voprosu o kul’turno-politicheskikh sviaziakh Astarkhanidov Bukhary (XVII v.) s‘Velikimi Mogolami’ Indii.” In *Izobrannye sochnineniia pod obshchei redaktsiei akademika R. Masova.* Dushanbe, 2013.

Şeşen, Ramazan. “Esquisse d’un histoire du développement des colophons dans les manuscrits musulmans.” In *Scribes Et Manuscrits Du Moyen-Orient.* Edited by François Déroche and Francis Richard, 189-221. Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France, 1997.

Seyller, John. “Overpainting in the Cleveland *Ṭūṭīnāma*." *Artibus Asiae* 52, no. 3/4 (1992): 283-318.

Seyller, John. “Recycled Images: Overpainting in Early Mughal Art.” *Humayun’s Garden Party: Princes of the House of Timur and Early Mughal Painting.* Edited by Sheila Canby, 49-80. Bombay: Marg Publications, 1994.

Seyller, John. “The Inspection and Valuation of Manuscripts in the Imperial Mughal Library.” *Artibus Asiae* 57, no. 3/4 (1997): 243–349.

Seyller, John. *Workshop and Patron in Mughal India: The Freer Rāmāyana and Other Illustrated Manuscripts of ‘Abd al-Raḥīm.* Switzerland: Artibus Asiae, 1999.

Shah, Imtiyaz. *Inside the History of Central Asian Khanates (18th-19th Centuries)*. New Delhi: Dilpreet Publishing House, 2016.

Sharma, Sunil. “Approaching Jāmī through Visual Culture: The Popularization of Yūsuf-Zulaykhā in Persianate Societies.” In *The Reception of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī’s Works in the Islamicate World, ca. 9th/ 15th-14th/20th Century.* Edited by Thibaut d’Hubert and Alexandre Papas, 42-62. Leiden: Brill, 2019.

Shenkar, Michael. “The Epic of *Farāmarz* in the Panjikent Paintings.” *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 24 (2010): 67-86.

Simpson, Marianna Shreve. “The Illustration of an Epic: the Earliest Shahnama Manuscripts.” PhD diss., Harvard University, 1978.

Simpson, Marianna Shreve. “Codicology in the Service of Chronology: The Case of Some Safavid Manuscripts.” In *Les Manuscrits Du Moyen-Orient: Essais De Codicologie Et De Paleographie: Actes Du Colloque D'istanbul (Istanbul, 26-29 Mai 1986).* Edited by François Déroche, 133-139. Istanbul: Institut Français d'Etudes Anatoliennes d'Istanbul et Bibliotheque Nationale, 1989.

Simpson, Marianna Shreve, and Massumeh Farhad. *Sultan Ibrahim Mirza's* “Haft Awrang”: *A Princely Manuscript from Sixteenth-Century Iran.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.

Simpson, Marianna Shreve. “Mostly Modern Miniatures: Classical Persian Painting in the Early Twentieth Century." *Muqarnas* 25 (2008): 359-395.

Simpson, Marianna Shreve. “Sah-Nama iv: Illustrations.” *Encyclopædia Iranica*, online edition, available at http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/sah-nama-iv-illustrations (accessed on 1 October 2014).

Sims, Eleanor. “Turks and Illustrated Historical Texts.” In *Fifth International Congress of Turkish Art.* Edited by G. Fehér, 747-772. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1978.

Sims, Eleanor. “The Illustrated Manuscripts of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* Commissioned by Princes of the Houses of Tīmūr." *Ars Orientalis* 22 (1993): 43-68.

Skelton, Robert. “An Illustrated manuscript from Bakharz.” In *The Memorial Volume of the Vth International Congress of Iranian Art & Archaeology 11-18 April 1968.* Edited by Muḥammad Yūsuf Kiyānī, and A. Tajvidi, 198-204. Teheran: Ministry of Culture and Arts, 1972.

Skelton, Robert. “Relations between Mughal and Central Asian painting in the seventeenth century.” In *Indian Art & Connoisseurship, Essays in Honour of Douglas Barrett.* Edited by J. Guy. 276-293. Chidambaram Ahmedabad, India: Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts in association with Mapin Pub., 1995.

Smith, Grace Martin. “The Özbek Tekkes of Istanbul." *Der Islam* 57, no. 1 (1980): 130-139.

Soucek, Priscilla P., and Filiz Çağman. “A Royal Manuscript and Its Transformation: The Life History of A Book.” In *The Book in the Islamic World: The Written Word and Communication in the Middle East.* Edited by George N. Atiyeh, 179-208. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995.

Soucek, Priscilla P. “ʿAbdallāh Bokarī.” *Encyclopædia Iranica*, available online at http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/abdallah-bokari-a-painter-active-in-bokhara-during-the-middle-decades-of-the-16th-century (accessed on 3 May 2015).

Soucek, Svat. *A History of Inner Asia.* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Soudavar, Abolala. *Art of the Persian Courts: Selections from the Art and History Trust Collection.* New York: Rizzoli, 1992.

Soudavar, Abolala. “Between the Safavids and the Mughals: Art and Artists in Transition." *Iran* 37 (1999): 49-66.

Soudavar, Abolala. “The Age of Muhammadī." *Muqarnas* 17 (2000): 53-72.

Soudavar, Abolala. “Section VI. Shaykhzadeh vs. Mahmud-e Mozahheb.” In *Reassessing Early Safavid Art and History: Thirty-Five Years after Dickson & Welch 1981.* Houston: Abolala Soudavar, 2016.

Spuler, B. “Central Asia from the Sixteen Century to the Russian Conquests.” In *The Cambridge History of Islam* vol. 1A. Edited by P.M. Holt, Ann K.S. Lambton, Bernard Lewis, 468-494. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Stanfield-Johnson, Rosemary. “*Yuzbashi-ye Kurd Bacheh* and ‘Abd al-Mu’min Khan the Uzbek: A Tale of Revenge in the Dastan of Husayn-e Kurd.” In *Muraqqa’e Sharqi.* Edited by Soussie Kerman-Rastegar and Anna Vanzan, 167-181. Dogana: AIEP Editore S.r.l., 2007.

Stchoukine, Ivan. *La Peinture Turque d'après les manuscrits illustrés IIme partie de Murad IV a Mustafā III, 1623-1773.* Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1971.

Stchoukine, Ivan. *Les Peintures des Manuscrits de la 'Khamseh' de Nizami au Topkapi Saray Muzesi d'Istanbul.* Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1977.

Storey, C.A., and Yu. E. Bregel, eds. "Istoria Srednei Azii: (I) Bukhara." In *Persidskaya literatura: Bio-bibliograficheskiĭ obzor* II, 1116-61. Moscow: Izdatel′stvo Nauka, 1975.

Subtelny, Maria. "The Poetic Circle at the Court of the Timurid Sultan Ḥusain Baiqara and its Political Significance." PhD diss., Harvard University, 1979.

Subtelny, Maria. "Art and Politics in Early 16th Century Central Asia." *Central Asia Journal* 27, nos. 1-2 (1983): 121-148.

Subtelny, Maria. "Bābur's Rival Relations: A Study of Kinship and Conflict in 15th-16th Century Central Asia." *Der Islam* 66, no. 1 (1989): 102-118.

Subtelny, Maria. "The Symbiosis of Turk and Tajik." In *Central Asia in Historical Perspective.* Edited by B. Manz, 45-61. London: Routledge, 1994.

Subtelny, Maria. "The Making of *Bukhara-yi Sharif*: Scholars and Libraries in Medieval Bukhara (The Library of Khwaja Muhammad Parsa)." In *Studies on Central Asian History in Honor of Yuri Bregel.* Edited by Devin DeWeese, 79-111. Bloomington, Ind.: Research Institute for Inner Asian Studies, 2001.

Sultanov, T.I. "Sredneaziatskaia i vostochnoturkestanskaia pozdnesrednevekovaia rukopisnaia kniga." In *Rukopisnaya kniga v kul'ture narodov vostoka* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Nauka, 1987): 478–503.

Sultanov, T., and V. Goreglyad. Review of *Toruko-isuramu jidai chuo Ajia bunka no sōgōteki kenkyū (A Synthetical Study on Central Asian culture the Turco-Islamic Period). Manuscripta Orientalia* 3, no. 4 (December 1997): 67-68.

Sultonov, U. "Toshkent mulki Shaiboniilar davrida: Suyunchkhozhakhon khonadoni boshqaruvi haqida airim mulohazalar (XVI asr)." *Uzbekiston Respublikasi Fanlar Akademiiasi Abu Raihon Berunii Nomidagi Sharqshunoslik Instituti* 17 (2014): 7-14.

Sümer, Mustafa. "Bir Õzbek Nakkaşı Mahmut Müzehhip ve Yayınlanmamış Yeni Minyatürleri." In *Bedrettin Cömert'e Armağan.* Edited by Õzel Sayi, 471-480. Hacettepe University Press, Ankara, 1980.

Szuppe, Maria. "A preliminary account of the Persian Manuscripts in the collection of the late Sir Harold Bailey." *Iran* 35 (1997): 93-101.

Szuppe, Maria. "Lettrés, patrons, libraires. L'apport des recueils biographiques sur le rôle du livre en Asie centrale aux XVI et XVII siècles." *Cahiers d'Asie centrale* [online] 7 (1999).

Szuppe, Maria. "Looking Across the Frontier: a Shaybānid (Non-)View of the Early Safavid State." In *Iran und iranisch geprägte Kulturen. Studien zum 65. Geburtstag von Bert G. Fragner.* Edited by Markus Ritter, Ralph Kauz, Birgitt Hoffmann, 94-105. Wiesbaden, Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 2008.

Szuppe, Maria. "The Family and Professional Circle of Two Samarkand Calligraphers of Persian Belles-Lettres Around the Year 1600 (ca. 1010 AH)." *Eurasian Studies* 15 (2017): 320-349.

Taner, Melis. "'Caught in a Whirlwind:' Painting in Baghdad in the Late Sixteenth-Early Seventeenth Centuries." PhD diss., Harvard University, 2016.

Tanındı, Zeren. "Additions to Illustrated Manuscripts in Ottoman Workshops." *Muqarnas* 17 (2000): 147-161.

Tanındı, Zeren. "Sultanlar, Şairler ve İmgeler: Şehnâme-i Firdevsi'nin Mukaddimesinin Resimleri." *U.Ü. Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, Yıl 9, Sayı 15 (2008): 267-296.

Tanındı, Zeren. "The Illustration of the *Shahnama* and the Art of the Book in Ottoman Turkey." In *Shahnama Studies II: The Reception of Firdausi's* Shahnama. Edited by Charles Melville & Gabrielle van den Berg 141-158. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Tanındı, Zeren. "Safevī, Özbek ve Osmanlı İlişkisinin Kitap Sanatına Yansıması: Bir saray albümü ve Şeyhzâde Nakkaş." In *Filiz Çağman'a Armağan.* Edited by Lâle Uluç, 579-590. Istanbul: Lale Yayıncılık, 2018.

Tanındı, Zeren. "Arts of the Book: the Illustrated and Illuminated Manuscripts Listed in ʿAtufi's Inventory." In *Treasures of Knowledge An Inventory of the Ottoman Palace Library (1502/3–1503/4).* Edited by G. Necipoğlu, C. Kafadar, and C.H. Fleischer, 213–239. Leiden, Brill: 2019.

Tanman, M. Baha. "Özbekler tekkesi." *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi* available online at https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/ozbekler-tekkesi--kadirga (accessed on 3 August 2020).

Tezcan, Baki. "The Ottoman Monetary Crisis of 1585 Revisited." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 52, no. 3 (2009): 460-504.

Titley, Norah. "A Shāhnāma from Transoxiana." *British Library Journal* 7, no. 2 (1981): 158-171.

Titley, Norah. *Persian Miniature Painting and its Influence on the Arts of Turkey and India.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 1984.

Togan, Zeki Velidi. *On the Miniatures in Istanbul Libraries.* Publications of the Faculty of Letters of the University of Istanbul N. 1034, Publications of the Department of General Turkish History N. 2, 1963.

Tupev, Mustafa. "All the King's Men: Architectural Patronage in Bukharan Madrasa Buildings from the 1560s." In *Beiträge zur Islamischen Kunst und Archäologie* 5. Edited by M. Ritter, et al., 28-56. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 2015.

Uğur, Ahmet. *The Reign of Sultan Selim I in the Light of the Selim-name Literature.* Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 1984.

Uluç, Lâle. "A Persian Epic, Perhaps for the Ottoman Sultan." *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 29 (1994): 57-69.

Uluç, Lâle. "Ottoman Book Collectors and Illustrated Sixteenth Century Shiraz Manuscripts." *Revue des mondes musulmans et de la Méditerranée* 87-88 (September 1999): 85-107.

Uluç, Lâle. "Selling to the Court: Late-Sixteenth-Century Manuscript Production in Shiraz." *Muqarnas* 17 (2000): 73-96.

Uluç, Lâle. "The *Shahnama* of Firdausi as an Illustrated Text." In *The Treasures of the Aga Khan Museum – Arts of the Book and Calligraphy*, exhibition catalogue. Edited by Margaret S. Graves and Benoît Junod, 256-269. Istanbul: Sabancı University and Sakıp Sabancı Museum, 2010.

Uluç, Lâle. “Vezir-i Azam Sinan Paşa’dan Gelen Kitabdır—Sene 999.” In *Günsel Renda’ya Armağan (Essays in Honor of Günsel Renda).* Edited by Zeynep Yasa Yaman and Serpil Bağcı, 245–253. Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Hastaneleri Basımevi, 2011.

Uluç, Lâle. “The *Shāhnāma* in the Lands of Rum.” In *Shāhnāma Studies II.* Edited by Charles Melville and Gabrielle van den Berg, 159-80. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Uluç, Lâle. *Turkman Governors, Shiraz Artisans and Ottoman Collectors: Sixteenth Century Shiraz Manuscripts.* Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası, 2016.

Umur, Suha. *Osmanlı Padişah Tuğraları.* Istanbul: Cem yayinevi, 1980.

Vasilyeva, Olga, et al. *The Works of Alishir Navai in Fine Books of the 15th-16th Centuries from the collection of the National Library of Russia, Saint Petersburg, Russia.* Tashkent: Zamon Press, 2017.

Vasilyeva, Olga V., and Oxana Vodneva. *Kist i Kalam: 200 let kollektsiam Instituta Vostochnykh Rukopisei: Katalog Vystavki.* Saint Petersburg: Gosudarstvennyi Ermitazh, 2018.

Vasilyeva, O.V., and O.M. Yastrebova. *Arts of the Book in the 15th-17th-Century Mawarannahr: From the Collection of the National Library of Russia, Saint Petersburg, Russia.* Tashkent: Zamon Press, 2019.

Waley, Muhammad Isa. “‘The Speech of the Birds’: an illustrated Persian manuscript.” British Library’s Asian and African Studies Blog available at https://blogs.bl.uk/asian-and-african/2013/11/the-speech-of-the-birds.html (accessed on 5 March 2021).

Weinstein, Laura. “Variations on a Persian Theme: Adaptation and Innovation in Early Manuscripts from Golconda." PhD diss., Columbia University, 2011.

Weinstein, Laura. “Illustration as Localization: A Dispersed Bijapuri Manuscript of the Shahnama.” In *Shahnama Studies III.* Edited by Gabrielle van den Berg and Charles Melville, 347-372. Leiden: Brill, 2018.

Welch, Anthony. *Artists for the Shah: Late Sixteenth Century Painting at the Imperial Court of Iran*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976.

Welch, Stuart C., Sheila R. Canby, and Nora Titley. *Wonders of the Age: Masterpieces of Early Safavid, 1501-1576.* London: Fogg Art Museum, 1979.

Welch, Stuart Cary. “Private Collectors and Islamic Arts of the Book.” In *Treasures of Islam.* Edited by Toby Falk, 25-31. Bristol: Artline Editions, 1985.

Welch, Stuart Cary. *A King's Book of Kings: The Shāh-Nameh of Shah Tahmasp.* New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1972.

Welsford, Thomas. *Four Types of Loyalty in Early Modern Central Asia: the Tūqāy-Timūrid Takeover of Greater Mā Warā al-Nahr, 1598-1605.* Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Wood, Barry. “Shāhnāma-i Ismāʿīl: Art and cultural memory in sixteenth-century Iran.” PhD diss., Harvard University, 2002.

Wood, Barry, ed. and trans. *The Adventures of Shāh Esmā’il: a Seventeenth-century Persian Popular Romance.* Leiden: Brill, 2019.

Woodhead, Christine. “An Experiment in Official Historiography: The Post of Sehnameci in the Ottoman Empire, c. 1555-1605.” *Wiener Zeitschrift fur die Kunde des Morgenlandes 15* (1983): 157-218.

Woodhead, Christine. “Reading Ottoman ‘Şehnames’: Official Historiography in the Late Sixteenth Century." *Studia Islamica* 104/105 (2007): 67-80.

Woods, John E. “The Rise of Timurid Historiography.” *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 46, no. 2 (April 1987): 81-108.

Yıldız, Sara Nur. “Ch. 9: Ottoman Historical Writing in Persian, 1400-1600.” In *A History of Persian Literature (Book 10): Persian Historiography.* Edited by Charles Melville, 436-502. London: Tauris, 2012.

Yoltar, Ayşin. “The Role of Illustrated Manuscripts in Ottoman Luxury Book Production: 1413-1520.” PhD diss., New York University, 2002.

Zajaczkowski, Ananiasz. *La Version en Turc du Sah-nâme de l’Égypte Mamelouk.* Warsaw: Panstwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1965.

Zarinebaf-Shahr, Fariba. “Cross-Cultural Contacts in Eurasia: Persianate Art in Ottoman Istanbul.” In *History and Historiography of Post-Mongol Central Asia and the Middle East: Studies in Honor of John E. Woods.* Edited by Judith Pfeiffer and Shohleh A. Quinn, 535-540. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2006.

Zygulski Jr., Zdzislaw. *Ottoman Art in the Service of the Empire.* New York: New York University Press, 1992.

Curriculum Vitae

Jaimee K. Comstock-Skipp was born in California, USA to a British (Cockney) father and an American (San Franciscan) mother. She holds a BA with Highest Honors (2009) from the University of California, Berkeley in Near Eastern Studies with a specialty in Islamic civilizations, and the Arabic and Persian languages. With a Student Merit Fellowship, she obtained a first MA (2012) from the Williams College Graduate Program in the History of Art (USA), and a second MA (2015) from The Courtauld Institute of Art in London (UK) with tuition and fees covered. There she studied Mongol through Safavid book arts predominantly from Iran. During summers in between coursework and outside of enrolled studies, she took intensive Persian-language programs (Farsi and Tajiki) in Tajikistan, and herself administered them while employed by American Councils for International Education. As a Fulbright US Student Award recipient based in Dushanbe, Tajikistan (2015–2016), she investigated Tajik cultural and artistic history and heritage with regard to manuscript and wall paintings that portray subject matter from the *Shāhnāma* epic.

While an external PhD candidate in the Leiden Institute for Area Studies between 2017–2022, she was resident in the Netherlands on a Juynboll Foundation grant to prepare for a PhD-track (2017), and a 2018 Grantee of the RCMC/FEL Junior Fellowship at the Nationaal Museum van Wereldculturen based in Leiden. She mostly lived in Istanbul and was supported by the following funding bodies: Orient Institut Istanbul PhD Research Grant Fellowship, Barakat Trust Graduate Student Grant, Netherlands Institute in Turkey Residency Fellowship, Iran Heritage Foundation, and the Leiden University Fund. Fieldwork in Uzbekistan was completed while on Erasmus+ Fellowships (2020, 2022) at the Al-Beruni Institute for Oriental Studies, and Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies. Upon the completion of her PhD, she will be a visiting fellow at the Oxford Nizami Ganjavi Centre between 2022—2023.