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

Comstock-Skipp, J.K.

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 'Abbas 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 Esmāʿil: 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 Shi'ite.[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 Sīghnāq.

[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 ["Tavārīkh-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 Fażl-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] Binbaṣ, *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-aṣār* 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 *Fatḥnāma* 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" ("Hatifi's *Tīmūrnameh* and Qāsimī's *Shāhnāmeh-yi Ismāʿil,*" 7).

[145] Allworth discusses the deployment of the epithet to Timur's and Shībānī'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 ("Şiban 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 *Zafarnama* [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 *Maṣnavī,* 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 Qurʾan 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 Muzaffar 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.