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

Comstock-Skipp, J.K.

Chapter 2

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

I.i. ʿUbaidullāh's Bukhara pre-1529

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

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

---

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

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

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

I.i.a. Artistic exodus from Herat

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

[230] Ashrafi, *Bekhzad*, 236.

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

Sulṭān ʿAlī al-Mashhadī

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

[240] BL Or. 12956.

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

Kamāl al-Dīn Bihzād

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

---

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

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

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

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

Shaikhzāda

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

Mīr ʿAlī Ḥusainī al-Haravī

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Maḥmūd Muẕahhib

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

I.i.b. Motivations for migration

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

II.i.a. Textual component

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

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

---

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

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

[276] Ibid., 626.

[277] Ibid., 611-12.

[278] Ibid., 621.

[279] Altıer, "Semerkand Sarayı," 12.

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

II.i.b. Visual component

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

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

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

---

[280] Ibid., 16.

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

[289] Altıer, "Semerkand Sarayı," 15.

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

II.ii.a. Illustrative program

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

II.ii.b. Timurid prototypes

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

---

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

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

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

[304] Ibid., 108.

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

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

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

II.ii.c. Provenance

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

---

[314] Rührdanz, "Truncated Shahnamas."

[315] Ibid., 118.

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

III.ii. *Tīmūr-nāma* (TSMK H.1594)

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

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

---

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

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

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

III.ii.a. Illustrative program

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

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

---

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

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

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

[330] Gruber, "The Gulbenkian *Bahāristān.*"

[331] The manuscript was in the collection of Eustache de Lorey, who probably acquired it in Iran.

started in his lifetime and finished for his successor Yār Muḥammad (1550–54), the next appanage leader of Bukhara. He, like ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, was never made great khan so could direct his attention to and enjoy productions from the manuscript workshops of Bukhara. Whereas the Gulbenkian *Bahāristān* was made under the supervision of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz's kitābdār Sulṭān Mīrak, the Minneapolis version was written out by the third kitābdār of the Bukharan workshops Mīr Ḥusain al-Ḥusainī, a pupil of Mīr ʿAlī.[332] Maḥmūd Muẕahhib also signed some illustrations in the Minneapolis copy. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz may not have officially commissioned a *Ẓafarnāma/Tīmūr-nāma* copy, but the same iconography used to accompany such a text found its way into other works of poetry.

H.1594's illustrations have stylistic and compositional links to other Abū'l-Khairid manuscripts from earlier phases of production and contemporaneous works produced in the 1540s and early 1550s. F.63r to H.1594 (fig. 42) is a hasty redeployment of f.84r from a copy of ʿAṭṭār's *Manṭiq al-ṭair* (fig. 43) that is speculated to have been completed in the 1520s/early 1530s by Herati artists newly arriving in Abū'l-Khairid appanages.[333] H.1594 shares visual components to a royal copy of Jāmī's *Tuḥfat al-aḥrār* in the Gulbenkian collection (MCG LA 184) scribed by Mīr Ḥusain al-Ḥusainī in 1554 which incidentally has the same binding as H.1594. In f.97b to H.1594, a seated man in the pose of a prisoner with crossed wrists enveloped in long sleeves is led by a standing figure carrying a staff who wears a two-toned garment. One side of the hem is tucked into the sash around his waist and a sword dangles at his side. The same duo appears before Yūsuf who holds a mirror (f.29v) in the Gulbenkian *Tuḥfat al-aḥrār* as they do in another loose folio from a manuscript that contains the poetry of Khwājū Kirmānī in the Gulbenkian attributed to Bukhara, 1540–50 (fig. 44).[334] This Khwājū painting is in the same caliber of execution as H.1594, and a group of four men on the right side of its composition are the direct counterparts of three men standing on the right side of H.1594's f.34v (fig. 39) and suggest the same workshop.

Other figures in H.1594 correspond to those in later courtly manuscripts made for Naurūz Aḥmad (also called Barāq) Khān ruling in Samarqand, a contemporary of Yār Muḥammad. Naurūz

---

[332] The signature is in his usual marking place in compositions, reverently on the steps of the throne for the depicted ruler to tread upon on his ascent and descent. The listing of kitābdār heads of the Bukharan workshops is in Akimushkin, "Biblioteka Shibanidov," 330-32.

[333] The provenance to an ʿAṭṭār volume (BL Add. 7735) has yet to be confirmed, but Muhammad Isa Waley's contribution "'The Speech of the Birds': an illustrated Persian manuscript" to the British Library's Asian and African Studies Blog proposes an Uzbek origin <https://blogs.bl.uk/asian-and-african/2013/11/the-speech-of-the-birds.html>. In observing visual parallels to Abū'l-Khairid manuscripts TSMK R.958 (for ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz), NMAA F.1932.5 (dated 1523), IOL 1317 (in a little-figure style), NLR Dorn 559 (dated 1521, for Kīldī Muḥammad), MMA 40.39.1 (ca. 1510), I concur with Waley's attribution.

[334] The Khwājū Kirmānī folio appears as an entry and illustration in Basil Gray, *Oriental Islamic Art: Collection of the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation* (Museu Nacional de Arte Antiga: Lisbon, 1963), no. 131.

Aḥmad, the brother of Kīldī Muḥammad Sulṭān, had originally headed the Tashkent appanage between 1533–51 before being made great khan in 1551 (lasting until 1556).[335] It can be speculated that Naurūz Aḥmad's interest in books was through exposure to his brother's patronage in the 1520s-early 30s. Shortly before his death while he presided over the broader Abū'l-Khairid state, Naurūz Aḥmad hosted the Ottoman admiral of the Seyidi (Sidi) Ali Reis while he passed through Samarqand in June 1556, and letters are preserved between Naurūz Aḥmad and Sultan Süleyman.[336] Could the H.1594 manuscript, lingering for ten or fifteen years after its completion, have been gifted to the Ottoman guest, who later passed it along to his Ottoman lords?

A figural specimen in H.1594 that appears in better-drafted manuscripts is the portly bearded man leaning on a staff. The prototype likely originated from Bihzād in the previous century. In the H.1594 counterpart (fig. 39), the rotund gentleman dons robes in red and spearmint green; in a *Tuḥfat al-aḥrār* of Jāmī for Naurūz Aḥmad with illustrations bearing the signature of Maḥmūd Muẕahhib, he is in olive green and poppy (fig. 45). These comparisons at the level of individual figures and full compositions make it is obvious that the quality of execution in H.1594's illustrations is not equivalent to contemporary works for Yār Muḥammad and Naurūz Aḥmad, and the closest counterpart to H.1594 is the Gulbenkian Khwājū folio (fig. 44). H.1594 was an early and rough attempt to complete Hātifī's *Tīmūr-nāma,* easily passed along as a gift to the Ottomans. A later version of an Abū'l-Khairid *Tīmūr-nāma*, to be examined next, would have more value and remained in Transoxiana longer, with pictorial elements that would factor into the later manuscripts for ʿAbdullāh Khan (the subject of Chapter 3).

III.ii.b. Darvīsh Muḥammad's *Tīmūr-nāma* (HAM 1957.140)

A finer copy of Hātifī's *Tīmūr-nāma* with a colophon dated 1551 in the Harvard Art Museum names Naurūz Aḥmad's son Darvīsh Muḥammad in a painted epigraphic panel.[337] Its four illustrations encompassing battle scenes (fig. 46) and an enthronement (fig. 47) are very close to the contemporary Minneapolis and Gulbenkian *Bahāristān* manuscripts (figs. 41 and 42). This iconography in Darvīsh Muḥammad's *Tīmūr-nāma* follows compositional and figural types of Maḥmūd Muẕahhib and is the precursor to the formulae associated with the style of ʿAbdullāh Muṣavvir (to be featured in Chapter 3).

---

[335] Naurūz Aḥmad had constructed a madrasa and mosque complex in Tashkent. Although an earthquake of 1868 did some damage, the site is preserved at Hast Imom up the hill from Chor Su.

[336] The account is in "Medieval Sourcebook: Sidi Ali Reis (16th Century CE): Mirat ul Memalik (The Mirror of Countries), 1557 CE," in the Internet History Sourcebooks Project by ed. Charles F. Horne, *The Sacred Books and Early Literature of the East* (New York: Parke, Austin, & Lipscomb, 1917), Vol. VI: Medieval Arabia, pp. 329-95. Available online: <https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/source/16csidi1.asp>

[337] The epigraphy reads: *fī ayyām Sulṭān Muẓaffar al-Dīn Muḥammad Darvīsh Bahādur*, which implies Darvīsh Khān b. Naurūz Aḥmad.

It is significant that a text devoted to Tīmūr's life would be produced so early in Naurūz Aḥmad's reign in Samarqand, and he might have commissioned it with the intention to give to his son who would preside over the Tashkent appanage between 1556 and 1578. Naurūz Aḥmad might have presumed Darvīsh Muḥammad would be his heir in Samarqand but ʿAbdullāh Khan intervened which affected the art and politics in the third quarter of the Abū'l-Khairid dynasty.

III.ii.c. A *kitābkhāna* in Samarqand or a secondary Bukharan workshop?

From Darvīsh Muḥammad's *Tīmūr-nāma*, it can be deduced that a main Bukharan kitābkhāna—functioning since the late 1520s or early 1530s—later came to fulfill the royal demands of the appanage heads wherever these khans were based; in other words, elite manuscripts in Bukhara were "made to order." But the lesser quality *Tīmūr-nāma* H.1594 also suggests an alternate workshop could have been operating in Bukhara in the 1540s where it produced less-refined illustrations to manuscripts, compensating quantity over quality. H.1594 copied imagery from finer manuscripts produced a decade or two earlier; as was noted, so too does the voluminously-illustrated *Tārīkh-i Abū'l-Khair Khānī* reuse whole paintings adorning Kīldī Muḥammad's own commissioned works.

I have left open the question about Samarqand as a site of manufacture for courtly commissions in this period. I am not fully content to attribute works to a kitābkhāna that is not distinctly identified in colophons and the broader historical record, although further research may clarify this. Different styles and methods of production can coexist at the same site, just as the same style can be used in different centers. It cannot be overemphasized that the mobility of materials, artists, and styles are a given in Turco-Persianate book arts, consistently crossing dynastic, geographic, and chronological lines. There remains the possibility that the artisans responsible for the Abū'l-Khairid dynastic chronicles in the mid sixteenth century did not venture far, easily commuting between Samarqand and Bukhara. Or perhaps they operated in a workshop in Bukhara outside of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz's personal kitābkhāna, but adjacent to it, as the fine Maḥmūd Muẕahhib-mannered illustration of Chinggis Khan in the *Nuṣratnāma* suggests connections to the courtly workshop but the majority of illustrations are in a coarser execution. Thus within Bukhara, a workshop offering quality production practices in paintings and bindings could intersect with an adjacent site offering speed of completion and a greater amount of illustrations per manuscript.

III.iii. *Shībānī-nāma* (ÖNB cod. mixt. 188)

I provided an overview in Chapter 1 §II.iii of historical chronicle production in the Ottoman realm during the first half of the sixteenth century. Here we will examine mid-century Ottoman ruler-*nāma* works that have subject matter explicitly related to the Abū'l-Khairids, and focus on the Turkic-verse *Shībānī-nāma* currently located in the Austrian National Library. Although other unillustrated versions in Persian by Bannāʾī exist, the Vienna manuscript is the only copy of Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ's text that chronicles the life and heroics of Muḥammad Shībānī Khan.[338] Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ finished writing his *Shībānī-nāma* and included events up to the capture of Urgench in 1505.[339] The Vienna manuscript has a colophon dated Jumāda I 916/ August-September 1510, implying the text was copied five years after Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ wrote the work but a mere two-three months before Shībānī Khan's skull was separated from his body and used as a drinking cup by Shah Ismāʿil.[340] The name of the scribe is recorded as Qāsim. Although common, a calligrapher named Mīrzā Qāsim is named in a Safavid source which reports he was killed in Herat when Safavids and Abū'l-Khairids battled for control of the city in 1526.[341]

The *Shībānī-nāma* manuscript has received the most thorough analysis in but one article by Dorothea Duda, the cataloguer of Turkish materials in the Austrian National Library.[342] She accurately locates the production of its visuals to Istanbul. Other shorter references written before hers spuriously included the object in overviews of book arts produced in Bukhara based on the subject of its text.[343] None of those authors separated its textual component from its visual, nor did they dwell on the details of the object's production at the eastern and western poles of the Persianate realm, or explore the

---

[338] Schimmel remarks that it is written in a Khivan dialect ("Some Notes on the Cultural Activity of the First Uzbek Rulers," 155), but Duda (repeating Vambéry's claim) states it is in Chaghatai (*Islamische Handschriften I: Persische Handschriften*, 92).

[339] Altıer, "Şiban Han dönemi (1500-1510) Özbek kitap sanatı," 7.

[340] Death date of late November or 10 December in L. Fekete, *Einführung in die Persische Palaeographie: 101 Persische Dokumente* (Budapest: Akademiai Kiado, 1977), 303.

[341] Mahfuz ul-Haq, "Persian Painters, Illuminators, Calligraphists etc. in the 16th Century, A. D.," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* 28 (1938): 139-49.

[342] Dorothea Duda, "The Illustrated Shaybaniname in Vienna Österreichische Nationalbibliothek Cod. Mixt. 188," in *Tenth International congress of Turkish Art* (Geneva: Fondation Max van Berchem, 1999), 261-72.

[343] As examples of this mistake, Blair and Bloom write: "crude paintings [added in Bukhara] following Persian styles of the late 16th century were added c. 1600" to the *Shībānī-nāma* manuscript ("Central Asia" subsection to "Illustration" in *Grove Encyclopedia*, 249). Ashrafi-Aini erroneously asserts, "miniatures from the *Shaybānīnāma* of Muhammad Sālih copied in 916/1510, in the Vienna National Library, help us to obtain more reliable information on the art of this period. …[T]he miniatures…[date] between 1510 and 1520" ("The School of Bukhara to c. 1550," 260). They indeed add to our understanding of the period's art, albeit in the Ottoman realm and not Transoxiana.

relationship between Istanbul and Bukhara. Hence my pursuit of these very topics to uncover the ramifications of the object's joint manufacture.

To Duda the text to the Vienna manuscript is "written in bold calligraphic taʿliq of presumable Ottoman type"[344] with two columns of eleven lines, but this is also true for the first officially commissioned Abū'l-Khairid manuscript, the *Fatḥnāma*. Although there could have been later trimming, both the *Shībānī-nāma* and the *Fatḥnāma* have similar page dimensions (*Fatḥnāma*: 21x14 cm, *Shībānī-nāma*: 24x16.5 cm) which suggest similar production circumstances (location, time period) for their textual productions, that is to say between 1507–10, in Transoxiana (Herat or Samarqand). I agree with Altıer who states the scribing and illuminating of the *Shībānī-nāma*'s *sarlauh* and *ʿunvān* designs with interlocking lobed shapes are indebted to Timurid traditions in Herat, and produced in an early Abū'l-Khairid workshop. Duda however posits the entire work was a copy of a now lost original, fully produced in Istanbul derived from Herat-Tabriz traditions.[345] Supporting this latter view, Esin Atıl lists Persian and Turkish classics that were abundantly reproduced by Ottoman court artists between 1520–74, and cites a Turkic *Şeybanname* title but does not give the author's name or any other information.[346] My analysis however takes as an established fact that the manuscript's text and heading illumination was produced in Transoxiana, then the physical object migrated westwards to reach the Istanbul nakkaşhane at an uncertain date. Political and artistic exchanges between Ottomans and Uzbeks are not fully known in the first half of the sixteenth century but can be gleaned from the materiality of this very manuscript.

The *Shībānī-nāma* has a note in German written in black ink that calls attention to some erasing and recopying in the original manuscript (f.118b). This writing was added in the nineteenth century by Armin Vámbéry—the Hungarian scholar, traveller, linguist, Ottoman secretary, British spy, and Bram Stoker's consultant in the writing of Dracula—who produced a critical edition of the work in 1885.[347] In perhaps the 1820s the manuscript reached the court library of Vienna, having most likely been taken

---

[344] Duda, "The Illustrated Shaybaniname," 261.

[345] Altıer, "Şiban Han dönemi (1500-1510) Özbek kitap sanatı," 7. Duda notes the similarity to other works painted in Istanbul taken from the Herat-Tabriz tradition ("The Illustrated Shaybaniname," 267).

[346] Esin Atıl, ed., *Turkish Art* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1980), 165.

[347] The original text and its translation into German are found in Vambéry, *Die Scheïbaniade.*

from Istanbul by an Austrian diplomat serving the Habsburg administration.[348] A blurred and partially legible ex libris (f.1a) in black ink mixed with gold dust seems to give the name of a *sarʿaskar* (commander in chief; general) of the Girāy Khans of Crimea suggesting ownership in the mid-eighteenth century.[349] Beside it are the faint remnants of an Ottoman *tughra.* Although badly rubbed, these lines and loops match the seal of Sultan Süleyman's son and intended heir Şehzade Mehmet (b. 1522–November 1543) which affixes a provenance of 1530 through the early 1540s to the illustrations.[350] It seems the Ottoman sultan became interested in activities over in Transoxiana and wanted an illustrated manuscript to enjoy reading with his son about new allies in the region who could help defeat the Safavids in Iran.

III.iii.a. Abū'l-Khairids in Ottoman chronicles between 1500–1520

As was stated in Chapter 1, early Ottoman universal histories of the fifteenth century had a scope of subject matter spanning the creation of the world, tales of the prophets, and multiple regional dynasties and a style indebted to Firdausī. Some of these works forged connections between the Seljuqs in Central Asia with the early Ottomans through the common ancestor Oghuz Khan.[351] Later works were less wide ranging, versifying the history of the House of Osman in isolation. Enthronement scenes are clearly derived from traditions in Turco-Persianate arts of the book, and overtly appropriate *Shāhnāma* iconography. This is evident in a scene of Bayezid I holding court painted circa 1460 (decades after his reign) in Ahmedi's universal history, the *Iskender-nâme*.[352] A copy of Malik Āhī's *Bayezid-nāma* penned in 1486 had illustrations added in 1495 which included portraits of Sultan Bayezid II seated with his viziers.[353]

I mentioned Idrīs-i Bitlīsī's *Hasht bihisht* panegyric from 1506 in Chapter 1 in which the Ottomans are presented as the more "cultured" brother designated as "Roman" and with the Central Asian sibling bearing the title "Turk" and "Turanian."[354] However, this opinion seems to have promptly

---

[348] ÖNB cod. A.F. 129 containing Saʿdī's *Būstān* and *Gulistān* was presented by the Austrian Internuntius in Istanbul to the Imperial Library in Vienna in 1758 (Duda, *Islamische Handschriften* 3). Perhaps the *Shībānī-nāma* left Istanbul at this same time and by these same means.

[349] Duda, *Islamische Handschriften,* 90.

[350] My gratitude to Ali Seslikaya for this *tughra* identification and sharing with me the entry in Suha Umur, *Osmanlı Padişah Tuğraları* (Istanbul: Cem yayinevi, 1980).

[351] Anooshahr, *Turkestan and the Rise of Eurasian Empires*, 33.

[352] Biblioteca Nazionala Marciana (Venice), Cod. Or. XC (57) Edirne ff.240v-241r.

[353] TSMK H.1123, f.30v.

[354] Anooshahr, *Turkestan and the Rise of Eurasian Empires*, 32-35.

changed around 1507. After being forced out of Transoxiana by the troops of Shībānī Khan, the last Timurid ruler of Herat Badīʿ al-Zamān Mīrzā (son of Sultan Ḥusain Bāiqarā) took refuge first with the Safavids in Tabriz then went to Istanbul under the protection of the Ottomans in 1514. An illustration showing Badīʿ al-Zamān presenting a Firdausian *Shāhnāma* copy as a gift to Sultan Selim I appears in the *Selim-nâma* composed by Shukrī Bitlīsī from circa 1525-30 (fig. 48).[355] This *Selim-nâma* manuscript (and most likely the very *Shāhnāma* copy rendered within it) was presented to Sultan Süleyman a few years after his accession.[356] The Ottoman hosts were happy to receive the exiled Timurid prince but their curiosity was surely piqued by the strength of the new power in Central Asia who had evicted him, and who might be able to engage the common Safavid enemy by raiding Iran's eastern border while the Ottomans concurrently battled on the western flank.

Shībānī Khan himself is first explicitly mentioned in the *Selim-nâma* chapter within Kemalpaşazâde's dynastic chronicle *Tavārīkh-i āl-i ʿUṣmān* finished in 1512. Kemalpaşazâde introduces Shībānī as a Mongol descendant of Chinggis, and mentions that he was captured and tortured to death when Ismāʿīl defeated Shībānī's Tatar troops.[357] With phrasing denigrating the Safavids, Shībānī is rendered sympathetically in the mind of the Ottoman readers of the text. Sultan Süleyman inherited these *Selim-nâma* versions by Shukrī Bitlīsī and Kemalpaşazâde and would have browsed through the pages to read about the exploits of his ancestors, their allies, and their enemies. Thus, Ottoman vanity towards Central Asia at the onset of the sixteenth century seems to have subsided by the time Süleyman took control in 1520.

III.iii.b. *Shāhnāma* and ruler-*nāma* production under Süleyman

Süleyman was famously enamored of Turco-Persianate cultural forms within his long reign (1520–66). Midway through his reign in 1545, a post for the official court historian writing in Persian was created and was referred to as the *Şehnâmeci*.[358] An important specimen of *Şehnâmeci* production

---

[355] Tanındı suspects it was the manuscript completed in 1493 for Sulṭān ʿAlī Mīrzā, the Turkman ruler of Gilan, dubbed the "Turkmen" or "Big Head" *Shāhnāma* on account of its figures' exaggerated proportions ("The Illustration of the *Shahnama* and the Art of the Book in Ottoman Turkey," 144). Charles Melville's analysis on this *Shāhnāma* does not confirm this ["The 'Big Head' *Shāhnāma* in Istanbul and Elsewhere: Some Codicological and Iconographical Observations," in *The Arts of Iran in Istanbul and Anatolia*, eds. Olga Davidson and Shreve Simpson (Boston, MA: Ilex Foundation, 2018), 113-49].

[356] TSMK H.1597-98, illustrated circa 1525 following the death of its author. Tanındı suspects that it was Sultan ʿAlī Mīrzā's (big head) *Shāhnāma* ("The Illustration of the *Shahnama* and the Art of the Book in Ottoman Turkey," 144).

[357] Passage translated by Uğur, *The Reign of Sultan Selim I in the Light of the Selim-Name Literature*, 228.

[358] Yıldız explains that the *Şehnâmeci* tradition would become further developed and increasingly Ottomanized with texts predominantly written in Turkish in the latter half of the sixteenth century and into the seventeenth ("Ottoman Historical Writing in Persian," 469). Any discussion of illustrated Ottoman histories must of course take into account Fetvaci, *Picturing History at the Ottoman Court*.

is ʿĀrifī's (d. 1561) five-part *Tārīkh-i āl-i ʿUṣmān* (written, illustrated, and bound in 1558) which includes the renowned last section, the *Süleyman-nâma* (TSMK H.1517) covering events from Süleyman's reign up to 1555. Süleyman himself reviewed the some 30,000 verses of his biography written in Persian using the *maṣnavī* genre and employing the *mutaqārib* meter of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma*.[359]

It is notable that in the context of such Ottoman ruler-*nāma* production at the time ʿĀrifī was composing the work, Turkic-language versions of Firdausī's epic were being copied and illustrated in the court during the 1540s and 1550s which must have provided an additional stimulus for the creation of a similar epic covering Süleyman's own rule and events in it.[360] Ottoman manuscript productions of Firdausī's original Persian text and commissioned Turkic-language translations as they connect to select Abū'l-Khairid manuscripts will be further explored in Chapter 4. But I will here preliminarily highlight some main points: there seem to be no Persian-language copies of Firdausī's text that were illustrated in the workshops of the Sublime Porte. Instead in the imperial capital during the mid sixteenth century, we find *Şehnâme-i türkî* (Turkic translations of Firdausī's text). Persian Firdausian versions produced in the Ottoman sphere are associated with truncated copies attributed to late-sixteenth century Baghdad which we examined above (§III.i), and will further analyze in Chapter 3 §III.ii.b. Against this backdrop of illustrated histories and translated *Shāhnāma* productions in the Ottoman realm in the mid sixteenth century, we can now add an Ottoman interest in completing a ruler-*nāma* about another dynasty. Whereas artists of Iranian origin who had formerly served in Safavid workshops are attested to in several period sources, there is "no record known of a painter associated with Bukhara working in the reign of Süleyman I," and so it must be concluded that Ottoman interest in the Abū'l-Khairid dynasty came from within the court.[361]

Duda theorizes the *Shībānī-nāma*'s "modest" illustrations are derivations of the grander *Süleyman-nâma* project given commonalities in color usage and composition layout. Duda dates the *Shībānī-nāma* after the *Süleyman-nâma*, proposing an "Istanbul origin in the late 16th or early 17th century."[362] To her, "one member of the same department" worked on both the *Süleyman-nâma* and

---

[359] Esin Atıl, *Süleymanname: The Illustrated History of Süleyman the Magnificent* (Washington, D.C.: The National Gallery of Art, 1986), 35.

[360] Ibid., 64.

[361] G.M. Meredith-Owens, "A Sixteenth-century Illustrated Turkish Manuscript at Manchester," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 48, no. 2, (1966): 373.

[362] Duda, "The Illustrated Shaybaniname," 267.

Shībānī-nāma, and the paintings were carried out by less-talented pupils of the courtly masters who had originally painted in the 1550s. These apprentices might have "later started to work in a smaller workshop which may or may not have been connected with the royal court" who had completed the work for the Ottoman sultan then turned their attention to compositions related to another dynasty.[363] This late attribution is not substantiated however by the visual and historical record; relations between Uzbeks and Ottomans had soured by the early 1590s, and the Abū'l-Khairid dynasty itself weakened and fell in 1598 making a text devoted to its first ruler an unlikely project at the onset of a new power in the region (the Tūqāy-Timurids—to be treated in Chapter 5). Artistic styles in the Ottoman workshops had also shifted by the late sixteenth century. An earlier stage of Ottoman painting indebted to Herat traditions characterized by drooping mustaches lasted between 1520–60.[364] The *Shībānī-nāma* is a specimen of this phase rather than the other style that followed that was brought about by artists native to Anatolia incorporating local features into their illustrations, such as Ottoman courtly garb.

Corresponding to the date of Şehzade Mehmet's death, my pre-1543 provenance to the illustrations to the *Shībānī-nāma* chronologically follows those in the *Selim-nâma* attributed to Shukrī circa 1525-30 (fig. 48), but comes before the completion of the illustrated *Süleyman-nâma* from the 1550s.[365] This means that the *Shībānī-nāma* was illustrated around the same time as the *Şehnâmeci* position first became popularized in the Ottoman court. In this same decade—1540–50— we also see courtly illustrated copies of Şerif Âmidî's Turkic translation of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma*. In one (H.1520, circa 1545) the courtiers of Kayūmarṯ wear close-fitting leopard caps akin to that on Shībānī's head in the *Shībānī-nāma* (fig. 51).[366] In refining Duda's provenance I argue that the artists of the *Shībānī-nāma* hailed from or were trained by the artists of the *Selim-nâma* of Shukrī. In turn, after filling in the *Shībānī-nāma*'s blank spaces, it was actually the arrangement of these very figures and compositions that aided the painters of the *Süleyman-nâma* in the following decade. Ayşin Yoltar has also demonstrated how painters in the Ottoman realm refurbished unfinished manuscripts to showcase their efforts in hopes of then being hired for grander projects, such as to complete a biography of the sultan

---

[363] Ibid., 263.

[364] Atıl describes this style in *Süleymanname*, 43-44, and also in a longer explanation in *Turkish Art*, 164.

[365] Altıer has also attempted to refine the *Shībānī-nāma*'s provenance and suggests its illustrations were carried out between 1540-1550, before the *Süleyman-nâma* project.

[366] Illustration of Kayūmarṯ and courtiers (H.1520, f.8a) reproduced in Serpil Bağcı, et al., *Osmanlı Resim Sanatı* (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2006), 94, fig. 55.

and his ancestors.[367] As we shall see in Chapters 4 and 5, previously scribed texts were a means to practice compositions and styles that would then be used to complete more important ruler-*nāma* commissions of various courts in the Turco-Persianate world, and the *Shībānī-nāma* is a further example of this.

III.iii.c. Illustrative program to the *Shībānī-nāma* situated in courtly Ottoman manuscript production

Duda found several visual features in the *Shībānī-nāma* comparable to those in the *Süleyman-nâma* of 1558. Note the compositions of the paintings "Reception of the Iranian ambassador in Amasya" in the *Süleyman-nâma* (fig. 49) and the *Shībānī-nāma*'s rendering of Shībānī Khan celebrating his victory over Andijan in a garden setting (fig. 50), particularly the *sāya-bān* (tented covering) above the seated rulers and their short-sleeved kaftans over colorful robes. In the *Shībānī-nāma*, Shībānī Khan on horseback in the top left corner defeats Bābur at Sarpul (fig. 51); in the *Süleyman-nâma* (fig. 52) we see the death of the rebel leader Kalender in a composition with a similar high horizon, multiple riders, attention to flora and vegetation, some swirling clouds, and mustachioed profiles of the figures. Soldiers climb trees during a storm en route to Vienna in the *Süleyman-nâma* (f.266a). Similar sinuous branches, blossoming plants, cypress trees on the horizon appear in Shībānī Khan's victory celebration in Tashkent (f.150a). There are further visual parallels: Süleyman and Shībānī sit on hexagonal thrones under umbrella-like sun shades in the folios with Süleyman inspecting prisoners after the Ottoman siege of Vienna (fig. 53), and Shībānī sitting in the garden of his summer residence near Samarqand (f.54). Shībānī is self-referentially receiving a book (perhaps the very *Shībānī-nāma* text) offered by the poet Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ dressed in yellow. The slight S-shaped sway of the standing figure in the *Shībānī-nāma*, standing on the left side in cobalt and rose robes, mirrors the pair in the *Süleyman-nâma* on the right wearing white turbans.

I have found overt stylistic parallels between the *Shībānī-nāma* and a Niẓāmī *Khamsa* in the Topkapı collection (TSMK H.764) which has been attributed to the Ottoman sphere in the 1530s through 1540s.[368] This *Khamsa* too carries the insignia of Süleyman's son Şehzade Mehmet. Its scribe —ʿAbd al-Ghaffār b. ʿAbd al-Vāḥid b. Kamāl al-Dīn ʿAbdullāh al-Quraishī—has a name suggesting

---

[367] Yoltar, "The Role of Illustrated Manuscripts in Ottoman Luxury Book Production: 1413-1520," 529.

[368] A 1540s provenance is given by Amy Landau, "From Poet to Painter: Allegory and Metaphor in a Seventeenth-Century Persian Painting by Muḥammad Zaman, Master of Farangī-Sāzī," *Muqarnas* 28 (2011): 126, ftn. 34. Reproductions of illustrations to H.764 dated to the 1530s and provenance information to it are in Ivan Stchoukine, *Les Peintures des Manuscrits de la 'Khamseh' de Niẓāmī au Topkapı Saray Muzesi d'Istanbul*, 145-47.

family origins in the Arabian peninsula, a region the Ottomans took from the Mamluks in 1517. Smaller details and broader compositions within the *Shībānī-nāma* and the *Khamsa* are uncanny in their similarity and prove they are from a common workshop. The *Shībānī-nāma* contains nine miniatures with two spaces left blank while the *Khamsa* is more prolific with twelve miniatures in its illustrative program. In both manuscripts, little figures interact on high horizons dotted with foliated clusters beneath gold skies. Nearly the same composition is used to render an enthronement scene in a garden with attendants, musicians, flowers, and wine ewers in the *Khamsa* (fig. 55) as in a folio from the *Shībānī-nāma* of the poet Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ presenting his manuscript to Shībānī Khan seated atop a gold throne with black filigree detailing (fig. 54). Mustachioed profiles common to Ottoman arts of the book grimace in both works. Reticulated patterning on a stepped structure in the *Khamsa* (f.316b) appears in the *Shībānī-nāma* (f.23b). A similar domed pavilion extends into the upper margins on the *Khamsa* (fig. 56) as it does in the *Shībānī-nāma* (fig. 57). Symmetric doors set inside an arced spandrel have a central partition with two knockers in the *Khamsa* (f.201b) and the *Shībānī-nāma*'s ff.44a, 111a, 162b. The most convincing detail proving these two manuscripts are by the same artist or of the same workshop are the identical jewel-encrusted gold ewers in the *Khamsa* (figs. 56, 57) and the enthroned Shībānī Khan (fig. 54).

III.iii.d. Books from the east brought to the west

As a further specimen of the artistic style shared by the *Khamsa* and *Shībānī-nāma* manuscripts, recall the Firdausian *Shāhnāma* R.1549 with Transoxianan origins in the late-Timurid and early Abū'l-Khairid period in the previous chapter (§III.iii). Alongside its illustrations in the little-figure style (figs. 5, 7), I mentioned others present which reflect Tabrizi trends carried out in an Ottoman nakkaşhane (fig. 8). This second style is detectable through the double chins on figures, ground dotted with grass tufts and large hollyhock clusters, and usage of gold on filigreed thrones and clothing ornamentation. I will conclude this section and chapter by examining documentary evidence that sheds light on the relationship between the Sublime Porte and Shībānī Khan's descendants in Central Asia, and which might explain the transfer of these manuscripts at this time.

III.iii.e. Proposed rationale for the production of the *Shībānī-nāma*

This final section sifts through the archives, bringing up key letters written between heads of state and information on the manuscript's past ownership. Although I have not yet found anything explicitly stated, these details offer a rationale for the production of this *Shībānī-nāma.* In tandem with

other illustrated manuscripts of biographic and epic content that appear to have played a role in Abū'l-Khairid–Ottoman diplomacy in the sixteenth century, period epistolary documentation between Ottoman sultans and Uzbek khans is a means to confirm political interactions in the early-modern period. I have found sources in the British Library and Ottoman Archives and have relied heavily on the publications and translations of documents by Toru Horikawa, Jean-Louis Bacqué-Grammont, Audrey Burton, Burt Fragner, L. Fekete and their analysis on them (see App. 3: Correspondence between Ottoman and Abū'l-Khairid rulers, ca. 1500–1598).

Epistolary relations began during the reigns of Shībānī and Bayezid II who were both worried about the expansion of the nascent state of Shah Ismāʿīl, but there were no formal connections linking the khan and sultan.[369] Following Shībānī's death, ʿUbaidullāh's decades in power (1514–40) were marked by more correspondence between him and the sultans Selim and Süleyman. Bacqué-Grammont has examined an intelligence report written in Ottoman Turki sent to the Sublime Porte concerning the distribution of appanages and with an assessment of the military forces of the Abū'l-Khairid khanate under Abū Saʿīd b. Kūchkūnchī (r. 1530–1533).[370] The document declares that during his reign, "from the *yeşilbaş* came an ambassador" who resided in Anatolia while Süleyman was engaged in the Ottomans' "Two Iraqs" campaign against Shah Ṭahmāsp.[371] Other letters exchanged between dynastic leaders have been translated and analyzed by Bacqué-Grammont who remarks, "the main topics discussed are reciprocal wishes for little change[.] …Another constant is the expression of the need for concerted action. As we know, this military action could not be coordinated," especially at the most favorable moment between 1534–35 when the Safavids were being hedged in by Ottomans gaining Tabriz and Baghdad, and the Abū'l-Khairids were conducting another siege of Herat.[372]

All this is to confirm that by the time Süleyman assumed the throne in 1520 a strong alliance had been formed with the Abū'l-Khairids which lasted his entire reign. The Safavid dynasty was the common enemy to the Abū'l-Khairids and Ottomans, and across the sixteenth century there was mutual interest in military collaboration between Iran's neighbors but the Ottomans remained the dominant power compared to the Abū'l-Khairids. Audrey Burton sums up the relationship as derived from a commonality of confession, Central Asian origin (which, as was noted, picked up after 1507), and

---

[369] Horikawa, "The Shaybanid Dynasty and the Ottoman Empire," 53.

[370] Bacqué-Grammont, "Les événements d'Asie centrale en 1510 d'après un document ottoman," 207.

[371] Bacqué-Grammont, "Une liste ottomane de princes et d'apanages Abu'l-Khairides," 425.

[372] Translated from the French. Bacqué-Grammont, "Ubaydu-llah han de Boukhara et Soliman le Magnifique," 487.

communication (Persian and Turki). The Abū'l-Khairids were keen to maintain healthy relations with the Ottomans controlling access to the Muslim pilgrimage sites. Burton writes, "The distance separating the countries made it difficult to co-ordinate their attacks [with a lag of one year in correspondence], although each side made good use of the other's campaigns against Iran in order to conquer large slices of Iranian territory. Except in the [1590s], when the Uzbegs planned to conquer parts of Iran situated within reach of Turkey, relations were and remained friendly, and the unequal partnership flourished, bringing benefits to both sides."[373]

News of the revived splendor of ʿUbaidullāh's Bukhara reached Istanbul and aroused Ottoman interest in the city that had finally flourished after the Mongol devastation three centuries ago. ʿUbaidullāh's reputation continued to resonate in the Ottoman sphere long after his death, and his portrait fills a roundel in the *Jamʿ-i tārīkh* (Collection of History), an illustrated genealogical manuscript produced in Baghdad, 1606–07.[374] Dūghlāt reports that ʿUbaidullāh personally wrote out the words of the Qur'an, implying two copies in his *naskh* calligraphic specialty, and sent them to the noble cities of Mecca and Medina.[375] This dispatch of Qur'anic manuscripts came at an unknown date, sometime after Ottoman victory over the Mamluks in 1517 but before ʿUbaidullāh's death in 1540, and is proof of Abū'l-Khairid contact with the Ottomans who were now administering the important pilgrimage sites. Beside these religious works, the personal poetry compilations of Shībānī and ʿUbaidullāh themselves at some point found their way into the Topkapı collection by way of cultural or diplomatic exchange, and I suspect the manuscripts arrived during the first half of the sixteenth century.[376]

Who would have wanted a ruler-*nāma* about a non-Ottoman dynasty to be produced in the Ottoman court? Esin Atıl suggests that flipping through illustrated histories of the Ottoman "dynasty and its rulers was… a tradition in which the best talents of the empire were employed. …[They were]

---

[373] Audrey Burton, "Relations between the Khanate of Bukhara and Ottoman Turkey, 1558-1702," *International Journal of Turkish Studies* 5 (1990-91): 103.

[374] ME 8457, f.17b. I am grateful to Melis Taner for bringing this image to my attention. Uzbeks are not included in other illustrated genealogies of the *Silsilename* genre, which include serial portraits produced between 1579 and 1595, and longer universal histories covering the reign of Murad III.

[375] Soucek, *A History of Inner Asia*, 155.

[376] The Topkapı holds Shībānī Khan's *Dīvān* that he himself might have written out in Turkic verse (TSMK A.2436) which is dated 1507-08. The collection also holds a copy of the *Dīvān* of ʿUbaidī also in Turki (TSMK 2381), although a version of this work with better provenance signed by the scribe Sulṭān ʿAlī is in the British Library (BL Add. 7907).

produced for private use, for the enjoyment of the members of the dynasty."[377] Christine Woodhead has further clarified that most Ottoman ruler-*nāma* "exist in unique copies only, that they are generally in excellent condition, and that there are virtually no references to them in the works of other Ottoman historians, [which] suggests that they were not read at all by contemporaries… [but this] misses the point that the essential target audience was not a public or a popular one, but the sultan, his entourage and his advisers."[378] The Ottoman rulers took an interest in other dynasties, especially if they were Muslim and of Turkic heritage, and the idea to illustrate a text on the Abū'l-Khairid dynastic founder's biography that had been previously deposited would have appealed to the ruling Ottoman monarch for personal pleasure, or with the intention to gift it back to ʿUbaidullāh's successors in a gesture of goodwill.[379]

ʿUbaidullāh and Süleyman had corresponded throughout the 1520s and 30s and the letters that survive today might be but a few of many. The volume is alluded to by records from the Safavid chancellery that makes fun of Ottoman-Uzbek correspondence after the Safavid victory over the Abū'l-Khairids in the Battle of Jām in 1529. Safavid secretaries cast Uzbek emissaries as coming from the embassy of Bilqis to the court of Solomon, juxtaposing an emasculated ʿUbaidullāh Khan with the Queen of Sheba, and Sultan Süleyman with King Solomon in their parody.[380] A final letter written in Persian by ʿUbaidullāh's son ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz dated 1541 arrived in Istanbul to notify Süleyman of the great khan's death a year and a half earlier.[381] Sultan Süleyman could have come up with the idea to complete the *Shībānī-nāma* project perhaps as a result of losing his ally ʿUbaidullāh Khan; I might even venture it was a project to honor the illustrious uncle of his departed "friend."

---

[377] Atıl, *Süleymanname*, 44.

[378] Christine Woodhead, "Reading Ottoman 'Şehnames': Official Historiography in the Late Sixteenth Century," *Studia Islamica* 104/105 (2007): 70.

[379] Prof. Woodhead in private correspondence has directed my attention to later Ottoman manuscripts with subject matter on other dynasties made in the time of Murad III: Seyfi Çelebi's history of eastern kingdoms and the *Tarih-i hind-i garbi* indicates Ottoman interest in the wider contemporary world. She writes, "There is less obvious evidence for Suleyman but absence of evidence is not evidence of absence."

[380] Reported in Mitchell, *The Practice of Politics in Safavid Iran*, 64.

[381] Letter dated March 1541/Ẕū al-hijja 947 (BOA doc. TSMA E. 5489).

IV. Conclusion

The book arts presented in this chapter demonstrate a need to alter ways of thinking that expect illustrated manuscripts to be "entities planned in advance and meticulously executed as uniform, complete objects."[382] Unity of style does not seem to have been a component of aesthetic judgment in the Turco-Persianate world during the early-modern period. Stylistic conformity need not be equated with coherence; manuscripts could lack the former but still possess the latter. What is more, several of the manuscripts presented in this chapter confirm a predilection for completing an already-transcribed text no matter what its origins. It could be due to economy or to emphasize a connection and affinity to the original center and/or era beginning the project.

Despite insufficient information about their physical transfer and date of dispatch, it is incontrovertible that multiple manuscripts written out in Transoxiana—some with paintings added in that region—were sent to the Ottomans and finished under their auspices. The *Shībānī-nāma*, like *Shāhnāma* R.1549, entered the Ottoman realm and empty picture boxes were filled in during Süleyman's reign. Akin to the truncated *Shāhnāma* H.1514 written by Maḥmūd b. Muḥammad al-Balkhī in 1535 but later illustrated in Ottoman Baghdad, a *Kulliyāt* of Navāʾī dated 1536 (TIEM 1946) names a Mīr ʿAlī Bukhārāʾī as the copyist and has illustrations indebted to Tabrizi elements that have been attributed to an Ottoman school operating in the 1550s.[383] Similarly, a *Dīvān* of ʿAlī-Shīr Navāʾī in the Topkapı (R.806) has a colophon naming the scribe Muḥammad b. Dūst Muḥammad Samarqandī and a 1534 date of completion. However, it has Ottoman illustrations from this same decade (1530s). It does not seem to be the case that scribes and artisans of Transoxianan origin and/or heritage were employed in the nakkaşhane of Istanbul. It is more feasible that the textual components to these manuscripts were scribed in Transoxiana and the objects made their way to Ottoman parts during the decades of Süleyman's reign where they were illustrated and finished.

Whatever was the exact process of their completion, fully within Transoxiana or written out there and completed in the Ottoman realm, the main manuscripts presented here are specimens of manuscript amalgamation corresponding to what the scholar of Mughal painted arts John Seyller terms "eclectic manuscripts." To Seyller, such manuscripts occur "in the aggregate, and not the level of an

---

[382] Natif, "The SOAS *Anvār-i Suhaylī*," 354.

[383] The manuscript carries an inscription to ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz in a white *shamsa*. It seems the text was a courtly project completed in Bukhara and the illustrations were added to the blank page spaces in Istanbul; at present I am unable to assert whether this project was officially coordinated.

individual artist."[384] Inherent in the *Nuṣratnāma*, the truncated *Shāhnāma* manuscript H.1514, *Tīmūr-nāma* H.1594, and *Shībānī-nāma*, these manuscripts' processes of completion are collective and cumulative. What is notable is how the concept of uniformity associated with a single textual and pictorial site is not privileged. As a case in point, the most celebrated *Shāhnāma* manuscript of all, Ṭahmāsp's *Shāhnāma-yi shāhī,* is itself an eclectic manuscript: its illustrations attest to stylistic variety by multiple masters, over a span of ten years, and carried out in two centers.[385]

[384] Seyller, "Overpainting in the Cleveland *Ṭūṭīnāma*," 294.

[385] By scrutinizing the movements of Bihzād and the artists of the Herat kitābkhāna, Bahari suggests the Ṭahmāsp *Shāhnāma* was begun in Herat (under the orders of Ismāʿīl I) until the siege of the city by the Abū'l-Khairid Uzbeks in 1527-28. At this point the artists could have gone to Tabriz and continued their projects there ("Timurid to Safavid Transition," 159).