



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

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

Comstock-Skipp, J.K.

Citation

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

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3483626>

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

Chapter 3

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

This chapter scrutinizes the circumstances of production and physical transfer of a Firdausian *Shāhnāma* copy located in the Topkapı Palace Library registered as H.1488, resting mere meters from where it was given over 400 years ago. It was completed in Bukhara in 1564 when the city had long been the de facto capital of the Abū'l-Khairids. We are privileged to have preserved documentation explaining how the lavish manuscript journeyed westwards thirty years later, clutched by the Bukharan ambassador Adtāsh Bahādur. He was led to the Alay Köşkü (parade pavilion) on Alemdar Caddesi on the edge of the Gülhane gardens in Istanbul on Wednesday, 4 January 1594 (12 Rabī' II 1002).³⁸⁶ There the Bukharan noble presented the work on behalf of the Abū'l-Khairid leader 'Abdullāh Khan to officials acting in the Ottoman Sultan Murad III's stead. The giving and receiving of books is part of a long tradition of *pīshkash*—gift exchange—across the Turco-Persianate sphere, and out of all the manuscripts examined in the chapters of this present study, 'Abdullāh Khan's *Shāhnāma* offers the most concrete proof of Ottoman and Abū'l-Khairid diplomatic and artistic exchange.

Through artistic and political lenses, I will focus on the two dates significant to the manuscript: when it was completed in 1564, and the moment when it was later presented to the Ottomans in early 1594. Examining politics and painting at the poles of this thirty-year period, I will provide insight into the courtly Abū'l-Khairid arts of the book and the role of manuscripts in their diplomacy. My discussion will first enumerate 'Abdullāh's political reforms and unification strategies in the domestic arena, as well as his transregional relations with the Ottomans. Next, I will contextualize 'Abdullāh Khan's *Shāhnāma* with regard to other mid-century manuscripts from his kitābkhāna in Bukhara. By taking a multi-pronged approach, I shall compare that volume with other illustrated ruler-*nāma* and Firdausian *Shāhnāma* works in the style of 'Abdullāh Muşavvir completed in the mid-1550s through the 1570s. I will also incorporate unillustrated biographical chronicles extolling 'Abdullāh Khan's deeds and leadership. The third and final section examines the historical and political circumstances surrounding the presentation of 'Abdullāh Khan's *Shāhnāma* to the Ottomans against the broader backdrop of manuscript production and gifting as part of his diplomacy.

³⁸⁶ William Samuel Peachy, "A Year in Selānikī's History: 1593-4" (PhD diss., Indiana University, 1984), 334.

I. Khan made Shah: ‘Abdullāh’s political and cultural motivations to produce a

Firdausian *Shāhnāma*

Both R.D. McChesney and Martin Dickson have outlined the changing political dynamics in the Abū’l-Khairid khanate across the sixteenth century. Dickson adumbrates the Uzbeks’ continuation of Turco-Mongol traditions at the dynasty’s start, practices that markedly differed from the Safavids who ruled in accordance with “a European theoretical concept of kingship...[with a] clear locus of power in a specific individual with succession automatically passing down from father to son.”³⁸⁷ In contrast, within the Abū’l-Khairid realm the “locus of power devolved upon the entire ruling Dynastic House rather than an individual.”³⁸⁸ The early Abū’l-Khairid political system initiated by Muḥammad Shībānī Khan was essentially a confederation of independent city-states with Bukhara, Balkh, Tashkent, and Samarqand being the larger power centers governed by hereditary chiefs, who were originally uncles and nephews to Shībānī. Following the death of Shībānī, the great khan in Samarqand would typically be the oldest dynastic member. Dickson distinguishes the different concept of rulership in the Safavid and Abū’l-Khairid realms by describing how Shah Ṭahmāsp “headed” his dynasty while the designated great khan “represented” his.³⁸⁹ However, according to Dickson, the Abū’l-Khairid administration converted from this shared power structure around 1550, at which point it shifted “into a sub-variety of the ‘Irano-Islamic’ model for dynastic succession.”³⁹⁰

I.i. The lead-up to 1557

In §III to the prior chapter, I mentioned surviving epistolary documentation between the Ottomans and Abū’l-Khairids that sheds light on their relationship. Continuing this investigation of these sources, further material elucidates circumstances prior to ‘Abdullāh’s rise to power in 1557, and the ensuing domestic and foreign political relations that he inherited from the preceding appanage heads (consult App. 3). Until then, power was shared and distributed across the appanages, with Samarqand serving as the political center of the great khan (even if this power was only symbolic), while the cultural and military head presided in Bukhara.

³⁸⁷ McChesney, “CENTRAL ASIA VI. In the 16th-18th Centuries.”

³⁸⁸ Dickson, “Shah Tahmasp and the Uzbeks,” 25.

³⁸⁹ Martin Dickson, “Uzbek Dynastic Theory in the Sixteenth Century,” *Trudy XXV-ogo Mezhdunarдного Kongressa Vosto-kovedov* (Moscow: Proceedings of the 25th International Congress of Orientalists, 1963): 210.

³⁹⁰ Dickson, “Shah Tahmasp and the Uzbeks,” 27.

By 1550, exchanges between Bukhara and the Sublime Porte increased to such an extent that diplomatic dispatches went beyond written words. Sultan Süleyman I proclaimed not only friendship to ‘Abd al-Laṭīf but also offered military aid. After a Bukharan embassy visited Constantinople in 1551, an entry from Süleyman’s diary relates that the Ottomans promised three hundred janissaries and cannons (*tūp va zarb-zanān*) all worthy of the generalship of the sultan himself in 1554.³⁹¹ It is not known whether book arts also traveled at this time alongside the soldiers, ambassadors, and weapons. Based on Ottoman records requesting safe passage for these personnel and goods from the shores of the eastern Black Sea to the lower Volga, across the Caspian Sea, through Khwarazm, and into Abū’l-Khairid lands, we know this northern route avoiding Safavid territory was the road taken. Moreover, despite being longer, this safer travel route proved more popular at that time. Janissaries were still found in Khwarazm in 1555.³⁹²

The war aid arrived after ‘Abd al-Laṭīf’s death and was delivered to his successor Naurūz Aḥmad (encountered in Chapter 2), who became well-known in Istanbul through the exchange of several embassies with Süleyman I. The Ottomans’ offer of military assistance stipulated that it primarily provide domestic security but could also be used to conduct a protracted campaign against the Safavids.³⁹³ In carrying out the former, there was unleashed a violent era of inter-appanage warfare lasting throughout the next three decades.

I.ii. Enter: ‘Abdullāh b. Iskandar Khan

The human tendencies of ambition, competition, and rivalry are in part to blame for the later shift to Abū’l-Khairid centralization; another factor is the direction of attention inwards on domestic issues when external struggles against Safavids, Kazakhs, and Khwarazmians were at a lull. Previously, in the first half of the sixteenth century with frequent Abū’l-Khairid skirmishes in Safavid-controlled Khurasan, the main Abū’l-Khairid appanages had their own relatively independent lines which offered internal stability. The Shahbudaqids (descendants of Abū al-Khair’s oldest son Shāh Budāq—Shībānī’s father) administered Bukhara; the Kuchkunjids (after Shībānī’s uncle Kūchkūnchī, mentioned in Chapter 1) presided over Samarqand; the Janibegids (eponymously descended through one of Abū al-

³⁹¹ Reported in Hammer-Purgstall, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches*, 353–54.

³⁹² This route provided safe passage from Edirne to Kefe, through Or and Azaq (Azov) in Crimea, and is discussed in Alexandre Bennigsen and Chantal Lemercier-Quelquejay, “La Grande Horde Nogay et le problème des communications entre l’empire Ottoman et l’Asie Centrale en 1552-1556,” *Turcica: Revue d’Études Turques* 8, no. 2 (1976): 225–27.

³⁹³ The Ottomans sent arquebuses, transported by a *chāvūsh* named Nasūh, which arrived in Bukhara in mid-June 1552. The document with this information is preserved (TSMK K.888, f.237v), and has been reproduced and translated in Bennigsen and Lemercier-Quelquejay, “La Grande Horde Nogay,” 225–27.

Khair's grandsons) were in control of Balkh; and the Suyunjuqids (after Shībānī's other uncle Suyūnch, also mentioned in Chapter 1) governed Tashkent. These arrangements held until the deaths of 'Abd al-'Azīz in Bukhara in 1550 and 'Abd al-Laṭīf in Samarqand in 1552, at which point Abū'l-Khairid offenses against the Safavid qizilbāsh in Khurasan stalled despite Ottoman pleas.³⁹⁴

With the steadily growing power and prestige of Bukhara, 'Abdullāh arrived there in 1557 with the intention to head the broader Abū'l-Khairid state from this base. This then triggered a power struggle between 1557–82 in which Bukhara was polarized between the two most powerful Janibegids, 'Abdullāh and Yār Muḥammad's son Khusrau.³⁹⁵ The other heads of Balkh, Samarqand, and Tashkent along with their progeny became allies and enemies of these two competitors. By 1561 'Abdullāh was the dominant player in an alliance with the Suyunjuqids of Tashkent led by Darvīsh Muḥammad (son of Naurūz Aḥmad; encountered in Chapter 2 §III.b) to control Bukhara, and with deference bestowed the title of great khan upon his father Iskandar in Samarqand. Despite this seemingly respectful act of filial devotion, 'Abdullāh was the de facto Abū'l-Khairid head. He was the unquestioned leader and policy-maker who installed other Janibegid relatives to govern the other appanages. His patronage of the Bukharan kitābkhāna testifies to the wealth amassed in that center during the late 1550s through the 1560s.³⁹⁶

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

The previous chapter examined manuscripts produced by the Bukhara kitābkhāna in the 1530s through 1550s. In this third phase of Abū'l-Khairid manuscript production centralized under 'Abdullāh's command, the kitābkhāna there continued to make courtly works. It had employed key staff—some identified in Chapter 2 §I who were still alive and working—and produced some illustrated titles for 'Abdullāh that had never before been commissioned at the courtly level in the Abū'l-Khairid domain. Consult App. 5: Manuscripts produced for 'Abdullāh Khan and his courtiers ca. 1550s–1570s in the workshop of 'Abdullāh Muṣavvir, kitābdār of Bukhara.

³⁹⁴ Fekete, *Einführung in die Persische Palaeographie*, 425–31, no. 74.

³⁹⁵ Information on the inter-clan warfare and 'Abdullāh Khan's ascent is found in Lee, *Qazaqliq*, 118; McChesney, "CENTRAL ASIA VI. In the 16th-18th Centuries"; McChesney, "Historiography in Central Asia since the 16th Century," in *A History of Persian Literature*, 512, 515; McChesney, "The Chinggisid restoration in Central Asia: 1500-1785," 294-302.

³⁹⁶ McChesney, "Islamic culture and the Chinggisid restoration," 252.

II.i. Personnel

Following Sulṭān Mīrak's tenure as kitābdār (chief librarian) who oversaw projects for 'Abd al-'Azīz throughout the 1540s (the subject of Chapter 2 §I.ii), an individual named Maulānā 'Abdullāh al-Munshī succeeded him. That, or this 'Abdullāh at some point shared those duties with the calligrapher and student of Mīr 'Alī, Ḥusain Ḥusainī (nicknamed Kulangī), before the latter assumed the official title of being the third kitābdār of the Bukharan workshop.³⁹⁷

Maulānā 'Abdullāh al-Munshī is possibly the same person as 'Abdullāh Muṣavvir, whose epithet denotes he was a painter.³⁹⁸ The latter is accepted to have died in around 1575. 'Abdullāh Muṣavvir signed illustrations in manuscripts and collaborated with the illuminator Maḥmūd Muṣahhib and Kulangī for Yār Muḥammad (d. 1554) and Naurūz Aḥmad (d. 1556). The biography of 'Abdullāh the artist is opaque, but he is mentioned by Mustafa 'Āli as being a native of Khurasan and Shaikhzāda's pupil.³⁹⁹ Shaikhzāda himself had been the pupil of Bihzād, which demonstrates a chain of artistic transmission that sums up Abū'l-Khairid manuscript traditions across the decades very nicely, comprising Timurid, Safavid, and local Abū'l-Khairid models in varying concentrations.

After Sulṭān Mīrak, I argue that 'Abdullāh the painter next served as kitābdār for the Abū'l-Khairid patrons Yār Muḥammad and Naurūz Aḥmad in Bukhara. In the previous chapter, I noted how illustrations in the Harvard *Ẓafarnāma* completed in 1551 for Darvīsh Muḥammad followed Maḥmūd Muṣahhib's conventions and how a young 'Abdullāh likely also contributed to the project. The overall uniformity of illustrated courtly Bukharan manuscripts of the late 1550s through the 1570s supports 'Abdullāh's role as kitābdār at that time. The conspicuous cessation of his style after his death in circa 1575 indicates his instructing other painters and overseeing their productions had ended.⁴⁰⁰

Prior scholars have identified 'Abdullāh's style in illustrated manuscripts of the 1550s through the 1570s based upon certain specific characteristics. M.M. Ashrafī notes how men are depicted wearing turbans wrapped around an elongated *kulāh* (cap).⁴⁰¹ To Abolala Soudavar, the “stiff, short-

³⁹⁷ Akimushkin, “Biblioteka Shibanidov,” 330.

³⁹⁸ 'Abdullāh the artist's early career is overviewed in Ashrafī, *Bekhzad*, 175.

³⁹⁹ Mustafa 'Āli, *Epic Deeds of Artists*, 265. Secondary literature on 'Abdullāh the artist is contained in Priscilla Soucek's entry, “'Abdallāh Bokarī,” *Encyclopædia Iranica*.

⁴⁰⁰ Date of death posited by Laurence Binyon, J.V.S. Wilkinson, and Basil Gray, *Persian Miniature Painting* (London: Oxford University Press, 1933), 107. Also noted by Norah Titley, *Persian Miniature Painting and its Influence on the Arts of Turkey and India* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1984), 89.

⁴⁰¹ Ashrafī, *Bekhzad*, 179.

legged figures and bland faces with thick, short eyebrows, is typical of the colorful but uninspired production of ‘Abdullāh’s atelier in Bokhara.”⁴⁰² Oleg Akimushkin et al. credit ‘Abdullāh with “a local style of painting repeating stocky, rounded figures with heavy jaws and small mouths and unrefined brushwork [who inhabit] a schematic composition and a simple, unfinished landscape.”⁴⁰³

Expanding upon the above, I identify the preponderance of figures with heads rendered in a three-quarter view, which contain Picasso-like outer eyes that extend beyond the outline of the face, to be characteristic of ‘Abdullāh’s style. Turban wrappings worn by royalty and nobility are rendered with multiple, small pleats outlined in thin gold lines that encircle the central, colorful ribbed *kulāh*. Such “‘Abdullahian” figures recline and battle across the pages of multiple manuscripts produced for ‘Abdullāh Khan.

II.ii. Illustrated works

Productions by ‘Abdullāh Khan’s kitābkhāna staff during the 1560s comprise the third period of Abū’l-Khairid illustration. While elite manuscripts were completed in Bukhara across the 1530s–70s, it is only in this third period in the third quarter of the century that we discern distinct features and traits that are quintessential to the so-called “Bukhara school.” Prior to ‘Abdullāh Khan’s rise, in the previous chapter I posited how artisans of varying abilities in Bukhara completed commissions for appanage heads when requested in the second period of Abū’l-Khairid book arts. However, “with his policy of centralisation and permanent warfaring ‘Abdullāh II had stripped other members of his house of the resources to patronise book art effectively.”⁴⁰⁴ He was now the dominant client to serve.

Scholars have noted a stylistic divergence in the miniatures produced earlier in Bukhara during my delineated second phase spanning the 1530s through the mid-1550s: one style is connected with the activities of Herat artists and their students working within older Timurid frameworks. An example is a copy of Sa‘dī’s *Gulistān* from 1547 (MBF Pers. 30).⁴⁰⁵ Also present at the end of this second period is a second style bearing the features of a new and distinctive direction of painting that would become associated with ‘Abdullāh the artist in the third period, which will be presently examined. A *Būstān* of Sa‘dī written in 1542 with an illustration dated 1549 reflects this conceptual and pictorial move away

⁴⁰² Soudavar, *Art of the Persian Courts*, 212-13.

⁴⁰³ Akimushkin, et al., “The Shaybanids (Bukhara, 1500–98) and the Janids (Astarkhanids) (Bukhara, 1599–1753),” 582.

⁴⁰⁴ Rührdanz, “The revival of Central Asian painting in the early 17th century,” 385-86.

⁴⁰⁵ Illustrations are reproduced in Pugachenkova and Galerkina, *Miniatiury srednei azii*, 122-25.

from Herat, and a visual shift from the second through the third periods. It contains the earliest work attributed to ‘Abdullāh Muṣavvir and was made for ‘Abd al-‘Azīz (MCG 177).

In the third phase, the Bukhara school really comes into its own with manuscripts produced for Yār Muḥammad, Naurūz Aḥmad, and ‘Abdullāh Khan. The final quarter of the sixteenth century corresponding to the fourth period is marked by a decline in Abū’l-Khairid manuscript productions in terms of aesthetics and quantity; this will be covered in Chapters 4 and 5. In this period, ‘Abdullāh Khan’s focus was directed towards architectural projects and territorial expansion. He gave away copies of his own commissioned manuscripts that had been produced earlier, and also those of his predecessors that had come into his possession, to the heads of other dynasties. But while ‘Abdullāh Khan’s interest in manuscripts still held, courtly Abū’l-Khairid book arts in ‘Abdullāh’s Muṣavvir’s signature style point to a productive and prolific partnership between khan and artist across the 1560s.

It is revelatory to compare works of poetry produced in the Bukharan workshops during the reigns of the two greatest patrons of Abū’l-Khairid manuscript arts, ‘Abd al-‘Azīz (App. 4) and ‘Abdullāh Khan (App. 5). They were prolific in part due to the duration of their time in power. As was enumerated, ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ordered the completion of manuscripts that were previously scribed in the late-Timurid period, which functioned to fashion him as the equal of Sultan Ḥusain Mīrzā Bāīqarā. Few of these older, pictureless texts were in circulation by the time ‘Abdullāh assumed power, but some early Abū’l-Khairid productions scribed by Sulṭān Muḥammad Nūr spanning 1515–39 (TSMK R.895; NMAA S.1986.52; AHT no. 78; DMA K.1.2014.1167) had illustrations added in the 1560s. Both ‘Abd al-‘Azīz and ‘Abdullāh Khan were interested in Jāmī titles above all, with individual copies of some stories (*Yūsuf u Zulaikhā*, *Tuḥfat al-aḥrār*, *Ṣubḥat al-abrār*, *Silsilat al-zahab*) bound as separate volumes. This is in contrast to the few copies of Niẓāmī works that are contained together in *Khamṣa* form. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz seems to have preferred Sa’dī’s *Būstān* over the *Gulistān*, but these works were commissioned in equal amounts during ‘Abdullāh’s reign and were intended for the ruler and his courtiers. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz perpetuated Timurid traditions and had collections of Navā’ī’s poetry produced, but the courtly workshop of the kitābdār ‘Abdullāh eschewed Turkic poetry completely and expanded its Persian repertoire to include titles by Kāshifī, Hātifī, Ḥāfiẓ, Qāsimī, ‘Ārifī, Hilālī, Dihlavī, and of central importance to this present study, Firdausī.

II.iii. Illustrated ruler-*nāma* productions in mid-sixteenth century Transoxiana

The absence of a Firdausian *Shāhnāma* for the bibliophile ‘Abd al-‘Azīz does not prove that no copy was ever made for him; however, an assumption that one never was can be derived from existing materials. With few surviving Transoxianan manuscripts and detached folios from the sixteenth century with Firdausian *Shāhnāma* content, the evidence is indeed sparse. We previously examined the truncated copy completed in Bukhara in 1535 (TSMK H.1514, Ch. 2 §III.i). The next dated volume from the broader region is dedicated by the calligrapher Hamdamī to his patron Īsh Muḥammad Sultan in 1556-57 in Khiva (ARB 1811).⁴⁰⁶ I will explain in Chapter 5 the afterlife and completion of this Khivan *Shāhnāma* after ‘Abdullāh’s death 1598, but here I will focus on its textual component created in the period we are scrutinizing.

II.iii.a. Firdausian *Shāhnāma* copies

Khivan *Shāhnāma*

At the time the Khivan *Shāhnāma* was written out, the ‘Arabshāhid dynasty— a Shībānīd branch and rival to the Abū’l-Khairīd line— had established Khiva as their administrative center in Khwarazm. ‘Arabshāhid manuscript production in Khwarazm has been barely researched by Anglophone scholars and the topic is currently beyond my expertise. However, some contemporaneous sixteenth-century productions from the workshops in Khwarazm and its personnel contribute to our understanding of the Khivan *Shāhnāma*’s scribal production. The Turcologist Zeki Velidi Togan mentions one calligrapher and painter from Khwarazm named ‘Abd al-Raḥīm who contributed calligraphic specimens of Turkic poems that ended up in the Dūst Muḥammad album assembled in 1544 (TSMK H.2154) for the Safavid prince Bahrām Mīrzā (d. 1549).⁴⁰⁷ An unillustrated mid-sixteenth century *Chingīz-nāma*, or *Tārīkh-i Dūst Sulṭān* in Turki by Ūtamīsh Ḥājī chronicles the Jūchid ulus that formed after the death of Chinggis Khan in 1227.⁴⁰⁸ It is one of several histories composed by Jūchid descendants and is a particularly valuable resource on the Golden Horde and its chieftain Tūqtamīsh (1342–1406). Ūtamīsh Ḥājī consulted Mongolian texts and eyewitness accounts held in

⁴⁰⁶ The scribe Hamdamī is mentioned in Hamidreza Ghelichkhani, *Kātibān-i Shāhnāmāh* [The scribes of *Shahnameh*], (Tehran: Kitāb Ārāyī-i Īrānī, 1396 [2017]), introduction (unpaginated).

⁴⁰⁷ Togan, “On the Miniatures in Istanbul Libraries,” 117a.

⁴⁰⁸ Utemish-khadzhi and Takushi Kawaguchi and Hiroyuki Nagamine, trans., “*Chingīz-nāma*: Introduction, Annotated Translation, Transcription and Critical Text,” in *Studia Culturae Islamicae* 94 (Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa 2008). ARB 1552/6 is another copy of the text.

other Jūchid-administered centers.⁴⁰⁹ He might have accessed Abū'l-Khairid archives in Samarqand, since this locale held records referenced by the *Tārīkh-i Abū'l-Khair Khānī* and *Nuṣratnāma* previously discussed in Chapter 2. This suggests a potential fraternal community of scholars coming together to access sources and documents, much like today.

From these admittedly few examples, it seems the Khwarazmian workshops fostered textual transcriptions but could not support visual programs. Like the Abū'l-Khairids, their 'Arabshāhid rivals appreciated both Turkic and Persian texts, but their manuscript production—and the local market for books—was limited. At the time Hamdamī was writing out the Khivan *Shāhnāma*, accounts of period travelers in the mid-sixteenth century attest that “urban life and handicrafts do not seem to have been greatly developed in Khwarazm. The English merchant Anthony Jenkinson, who visited the capital Urgench in 1558, was far from impressed. ...Only the resources obtained from military spoils in Khurasan and Astarabad, and also in Bukharan territory, sustained the [Shibanid] aristocracy of Khwarazm.”⁴¹⁰ It was therefore impossible that there were artistic resources to sustain the Khivan *Shāhnāma*'s extensive visual program with two fully illuminated frontispieces in the opening pages of the manuscript and spaces for 115 illustrations. It remained an unadorned codex until the onset of the seventeenth century.

The colophon to the Khivan *Shāhnāma* is in rhymed Persian and written on a slant. It reads: “This chronicle that Hamdamī penned with the aid of the most knowledgeable sages [was finished] in Khiva with the efforts of Īsh Muḥammad Sultan in 964 [1556-57].”⁴¹¹ The Ottoman admiral Seyidi Ali Reis, hosted by Naurūz Aḥmad in June 1556 (a visit mentioned in Chapter 2 §III.ii.a), continued his journey from Samarqand to Khiva that September, and refers to an individual named Esh (Īsh) Muḥammad who was the younger brother of the 'Arabshāhid ruler Dost (Dūst) Muḥammad Khān (r. 1556–58).⁴¹² Ali Reis writes that he and his party's members divided their own firearms, prior to their departure, between Dūst Muḥammad and Īsh Muḥammad in order to smoothly pass through enemy

⁴⁰⁹ Lee, *Qazaqliq*, xxxiv-xxxv.

⁴¹⁰ M. Annanepesov, “The Khanate of Khiva (Khwarazm),” in *History of Civilizations of Central Asia*, 67.

⁴¹¹ Colophon reads: *Īn nāma ki Hamdamī namūdash arqām / az 'aun-i 'ināyat-i 'alīm-i 'alām / dar Khīva ba-sa'i-yi Īsh Muḥammad Sulṭān / dar nuḥṣad u shaṣt u chār gardīd tamām.*

⁴¹² Information on Dost Muhammad and Esh Sultan in Henry Hoyle Howorth, *History of the Mongols, from the 9th to the 19th Century*, Part 2, issue 2 (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1880), 885-86.

Safavid territory unarmed on their way back to the Sublime Porte.⁴¹³ These Ottomans unknowingly fueled a domestic dispute between the two brothers, with Dūst Muḥammad of “a mild and peaceable disposition, while his brother Īsh, who was a dissolute person, was exceedingly passionate.”⁴¹⁴ It is understandable that the younger Khivan regent would have sought a personal copy of Firdausī’s work as a means to legitimize his claims to rulership; the favoritism shown to the mythical Īraj might have resonated with the ambitious Īsh Muḥammad. Then again, and similar to ‘Abdullāh Khan over in Bukhara with his own commissioned copy, the title’s actual contents chronicling kings and battles between Iran and Turan could have been less important than possession of the object as a whole to assert the majesty and mastery of the patron.

By 1558, both ‘Arabshāhid regents were dead. Īsh Muḥammad had demanded that Urganj should be handed over to him, and not be retained by the Khwarazmian leader of the Urganj appanage Ḥājjī Muḥammad (Ḥajjim) Khan (d. 1603) while Dūst Khan ruled in Khiva.⁴¹⁵ After a few months in 1558, Ḥajjim Khan secured allies and had the brothers Dūst and Īsh killed. He was proclaimed the khan of Khiva and overall Khwarazm, and exiled Īsh Muḥammad’s sons to Bukhara, where they died.⁴¹⁶ Although we do not know exact days and months, it is fair to assert that the writing out to the Khivan *Shāhnāma* took place in between the Ottoman admiral’s visit (1556) and the death of its patron (1558).

Might Īsh Muḥammad’s sons have brought with them their father’s unfinished *Shāhnāma* manuscript to Bukhara? I believe this to be more feasible than the theory of Mukaddima Ashrafī that the Khivan *Shāhnāma* was transported decades later from Khwarazm to Bukhara as spoils of war following ‘Abdullāh Khan’s successful campaign in 1593.⁴¹⁷ According to her, one of ‘Abdullāh’s generals may have taken it when Khwarazm was brought under Abū’l-Khairid control, causing Ḥajjim Khan to flee to the Safavids to seek refuge (to be covered in the upcoming §III.ii.c).⁴¹⁸ I acknowledge that this is a possibility, but visual material in the Khivan *Shāhnāma* and in ‘Abdullāh’s personal copy

⁴¹³ “Medieval Sourcebook: Sidi Ali Reis (16th Century CE).”

⁴¹⁴ Howorth, *History of the Mongols*, 885.

⁴¹⁵ Information on Ḥajjim Khan is in Annanepesov, “Relations between the Khanates and with Other Powers,” 66.

⁴¹⁶ Historical overview derived from Howorth, *History of the Mongols*, 885-86.

⁴¹⁷ M. Ashrafī, “K voprosu o vremeni sozdania miniatur Mukhammada Murada Samarkandi k ‘Shakh-Name’ 1556 g,” in *Mittelalterliche Malerei im Orient*, ed. Karin Rührdanz (Halle: Martin Luther Universität, 1981), 16.

⁴¹⁸ After his exile in the Safavid realm he returned to Khwarazm in 1600 (Annanepesov, “Relations between the Khanates and with Other Powers,” 66).

supports the Khivan manuscript's earlier arrival into Bukhara. Thus, I claim that the Khivan *Shāhnāma* was carried off by ʾIsh Muḥammad's sons in the late 1550s, and some illumination was added to the unadorned codex in Bukhara shortly thereafter.

ʿAbdullāh Khan's *Shāhnāma*

ʿAbdullāh Khan's *Shāhnāma* of 1564 (TSMK H.1488) is the only known courtly Abū'l-Khairid production of this work. The timing of its patronage comes in the midst of the leader domestically solidifying hegemony. It appears that the Khivan *Shāhnāma* motivated some components to ʿAbdullāh Khan's *Shāhnāma* copy. For one, the two manuscripts share similar physical dimensions, format, and page layout. ʿAbdullāh's courtly *Shāhnāma* measures 33x22 cm, while the Khivan *Shāhnāma* is 32x23 cm. Furthermore, the frontispieces of the two volumes (ff.8r-9v in the Khivan *Shāhnāma*, as it has two) clearly derive from Herati illumination practices (figs. 58–59) deployed across Abū'l-Khairid arts of the book. This illumination to the Khivan *Shāhnāma* may have been an initial, unfinished experiment prior to the completion of ʿAbdullāh Khan's personal Firdausian copy.

In the colophon to ʿAbdullāh Khan's *Shāhnāma*, the scribe Muḥammad Bāqī states that he completed it in the workshop of Abū al-Ghāzī ʿAbdullāh Bahādur Khān (ʿAbdullāh Khan's full title) in early Muḥarram 972 AH (August 1564), “in the splendid city of Bukhara.” The same calligrapher signed written specimens dated between 1557–60 in a Safavid album taken from Ardabil now held in Saint Petersburg (NLR Dorn 147, ff.5v, 19r), which attests that he had some clout and there was reason to collect his work.⁴¹⁹ Mustafa ʿĀli describes a “Bāqī Muḥammad of Bukhara” as a scribe skilled in six scripts, who was a “famous master of those with praiseworthy pens and elegant penmanship.”⁴²⁰ Mustafa ʿĀli includes Bāqī Muḥammad in a list of scribes who found success in Rum, the Levant, and Tabriz. This is supported by one of the scribe's above-mentioned album pages written out in Damascus several years before ʿAbdullāh Khan's *Shāhnāma* project.

The gilt binding of leather impressed with a panel stamp onto thick paper board on ʿAbdullāh's courtly *Shāhnāma* (fig. 60) is nearly identical to the cover of another royal Bukharan manuscript of Nizāmī's *Makhzan al-asrār*, completed under the direction of Sulṭān Mīrak for ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz in 1545 (BNF Sup Pers 985). The perimeters of the boards in both bindings are embossed with cartouches filled

⁴¹⁹ Bāqī is mentioned in Akimushkin, “Biblioteka Shibanidov,” 333. Specimens of his calligraphy are reproduced in O.V. Vasilyeva and O.M. Yastrebova, *Arts of the Book in the 15th-17th-Century Mawarannahr: From the Collection of the National Library of Russia, Saint Petersburg, Russia*, (Tashkent: Zamon Press, 2019), 65.

⁴²⁰ Mustafa ʿĀli, *Epic Deeds*, 199 and 459 (entry no. 58). The same author denotes the six scripts as *thuluth*, *naskh*, *taʿlīq*, *rayḥānī*, *muḥaqqāq*, and *riqāʿ* (35).

with imaginary figures such as Chinese-inspired qilin interspersed with fox heads. In the center, a dragon with squat tail assaults a deer and hisses at a confrontational simurgh above. At the top, spiraling clouds ascend like smoke, while a monkey rides a bear at lower left beside rabbits and foxes congregating amidst a landscape dotted with oversized flowers. Given that some elements are in reverse and the shapes of animals and clouds have subtle differences in size, different tools and patterns were used to imprint the motifs into the leather, but ‘Abdullāh Khan seems to be asserting himself and his patronage to be on par with that of his bibliophile predecessor ‘Abd al-‘Azīz.

The colophon, binding, and several illustrated folios repeat the name of the patron ‘Abdullāh Khan. Thirty-one illustrations follow ‘Abdullāh Muşavvir’s characteristic style; however, twenty-nine other blank spaces interspersed throughout the manuscript indicate that it was never fully finished. To Barbara Schmitz, the work is significant and “contains the largest cycle of illustrations known in a royal Bukhara manuscript.”⁴²¹ Those illustrations present in ‘Abdullāh Khan’s *Shāhnāma* emphasize Rustam in terms of quantity of depictions. Bahrām Gūr comes second and there are several paintings of his exploits. To date, Güner İnal published the only comprehensive analysis of the volume nearly half a century ago.⁴²² She also compared its illustrations with those in another *Shāhnāma* completed in Tabriz in 1522 (TSMK H.1485).⁴²³ İnal suggests the latter copy was produced for the Safavid shah Ismā‘īl I prior to the more elaborate *Shāhnāma* commission that would come to be known as the *Shāhnāma* of Shah Ṭahmāsp. İnal compares the composition of the death of Dara (f.382r) in the Ismā‘īl copy to its Abū’l-Khairid counterpart (f.428r), and identifies the former as a significant “model for some later illustrations of the same story” produced in the workshops of Bukhara and Shiraz.⁴²⁴ İnal proposes that imagery created in Tabriz circa 1522 transferred to Bukhara in 1564 by means of another Safavid *Shāhnāma* copy “from the same family [as] H.1485” taken during one of the Abū’l-Khairid occupations of Herat in 1535. She notes, “later when the Uzbek ruler wanted to have a *Shahnameh* to be designed for himself, the illustrator deliberately took a miniature of this manuscript as a model for his scene.”⁴²⁵

⁴²¹ Schmitz, “BUKHARA vi. Bukharan School of Miniature Painting.”

⁴²² İnal, “Bir Özbek Şehnamesi.”

⁴²³ Güner İnal, “Şah İsmail devrinden bir Şehname ve sonraki etkileri” (Eng. summary “A Manuscript of the Shahnameh from the Period of Shah Ismā‘īl and its Influences on later Shahnameh Illustrations”), *Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı / Journal of Art History* 5 (1973): 497-545.

⁴²⁴ Ibid., 541. The Shiraz copy mentioned is from 1539 scribed by Murshīd al-Shīrāzī, and was in the Kraus collection at the time İnal’s article was written (1973).

⁴²⁵ Ibid., 544.

Other iconographic features in ‘Abdullāh Khan's *Shāhnāma* appear in other manuscripts closer to it in terms of place and time, found in other manuscripts produced in the Bukhara kitābkhāna. “Rustam defeating the white div” (fig. 61) might be a later version of the same scene painted on silk attributed to mid-sixteenth century Bukhara in the Keir collection (fig. 62).⁴²⁶ Both render a similarly garbed Rustam in green with a tiger-skin tunic trimmed in white fur, and a cobalt blue quiver of arrows at his waist. Rustam’s facial features in the Keir painting recall the portrait of Chinggis Khan I attributed to Maḥmūd Muḥahhib in the *Nuṣratnāma* discussed previously (fig. 32).⁴²⁷ A young Rustam lassoing the colt Rakhsh in H.1488 (fig. 63) is derived from depictions of Dārā and the herdsmen that originated in a *Būstān* of Sa‘dī illustrated by Bihzād in 1488 (fig. 64). This composition was subsequently emulated multiple times for Abū’l-Khairid patrons.⁴²⁸ *Shāhnāma* battle scenes with frontally-facing drummers in the top left corners in ‘Abdullāh’s Khān's *Shāhnāma* (fig. 65; also in ff.83r, 290v) parallel depictive schemes in Darvīsh Muḥammad’s *Ṭīmūr-nāma* examined in Chapter 2 §III.ii.b (fig. 46).

The ambitious *Shāhnāma* production of 1564 was the only copy made for an Abū’l-Khairid elite. Karin Rührdanz identifies two detached folios from a common manuscript (ROM 970.268.1 and 2) as “a faint echo” of another *Shāhnāma* intended for ‘Abdullāh that indicate “there must have been one other illustrated manuscript made about the same time.”⁴²⁹ Further dispersed folios with the same dimensions, short-legged figures, and square-jawed horses are also evidently from this same manuscript. Several pages were formerly in the Keir Collection and are now held in the Dallas Museum of Art (fig. 66 is one example), one folio is in the possession of Lady Humayun Renwick, and other pages were auctioned in recent years.⁴³⁰ Although Rührdanz describes them as a “modest offshoot of ‘Abd-Allah’s commission,” they stylistically resemble Bukharan productions of the 1570s through the

⁴²⁶ The Keir folio is reproduced in B.W. Robinson, et al., *Islamic Painting and the Arts of the Book: The Keir Collection* (London: Faber and Faber, 1976), entry III.227.

⁴²⁷ Rustam’s helmet and visage in the Keir folio also resemble a folio of Ṭīmūr and his troops defeating Qipchaqs in a *Ṭīmūr-nāma* of Hātifi of an uncertain provenance, although it is quite Herati in style (WAM W.648, f.75v).

⁴²⁸ Compare the herds of horses in the following copies of *Būstān* manuscripts: RAS 251, f.20b (ca. 1530s); HAM 1979.20.19 (ca. 1542); FMC PD.202-1948 (ca. 1550s); MMA 11.134.2 (ca. 1523); MKG 2164 (ca. 1562); Christie’s London auction 7 October 2013, lot 175. A similar scene in a *Shāhnāma* sold at a Christie’s London auction 16 October 2001, lot 76 was attributed to Khurasan; however, Schmitz attributes it to 1586–97 (“Miniature Painting in Harāt, 1570-1640,” ms. LII).

⁴²⁹ Rührdanz, “The Samarqand Shahnamas,” 214.

⁴³⁰ Some of the Keir Collection folios (labelled III.337–41; now DMA K.1.2014.154.A-B; and K.1.2014.750) are reproduced in Robinson et al., *Arts of the Book: The Keir Collection*, 197–98; Lady Humayun Renwick’s folio was discovered on the Cambridge Shahnama Project website (<[http://shahnama.caret.cam.ac.uk/new/jnama/card/ceillustration:-1999101622](http://shahnama.caret.cam.ac.uk/new/jnama/card/ceillustration:-1999101622>)>); pages auctioned in London were sold at Christie’s (22 April 2016, lot 312); Sotheby’s (15 July 1970, lots 293 through 295); Sotheby’s (8 October 2014, lot 74).

1590s when ‘Abdullāh Khan’s patronage of illustrated manuscripts declined. Manuscripts completed in Bukhara during this period were for regional courtly, religious, and military elites.⁴³¹ Others featuring subjects appealing to markets further afield in India shall be examined in the final chapters.

II.iii.b. *Tīmūr-nāma* manuscripts

Tīmūr-nāma versions were also produced during the reign of ‘Abdullāh Khan. Compared to his singular aforementioned Firdausian *Shāhnāma* H.1488 above, the quantity of illustrated biographies of Tīmūr’s feats is remarkable. Five manuscripts survive either as complete copies or dispersed folios. Although some scribes employed in the Bukhara kitābkhāna wrote them out, none in this *Tīmūr-nāma* group is explicitly dedicated to a specific ruler. Therefore, they were likely produced for courtiers and military elites. After ‘Abdullāh’s patronage of illustrated manuscripts waned in the 1570s, the noble Jūibārid family subsequently sponsored Bukharan production and members of it were also the intended recipients of manuscripts, to be examined in the final chapters 4 and 5.

Despite having incomplete or missing colophons, the illustrations look to have been executed at the same time as, or after the completion of, ‘Abdullāh Khan’s *Shāhnāma* from 1564. What might be the earliest, now just a detached folio in the Harvard Art Museum (fig. 67), is the only specimen derived from Yazdī’s *Zafarnāma* in our group. It depicts Tīmūr’s troops hunting, elements of which are echoed in the Abū’l-Khairid *Shāhnāma*, which suggest they were produced concurrently. Beside obvious figural and sartorial parallels, the arc of the horizon depicted on the Harvard folio and in ‘Abdullāh Khan’s *Shāhnāma* (fig. 65) is punctuated with hatch marks in black ink. Lobed trees and shrubs in both works feature prominent protruding twigs painted against golden hillsides.

According to the colophon of a *Tīmūr-nāma* of Hātifi in the Beruni Institute (ARB 2102), the scribe ‘Alī Rizā al-Kātib completed it in 1568.⁴³² If one trusts only the colophon, one would assume its three illustrated diptychs post-date paintings in ‘Abdullāh Khan’s *Shāhnāma*. However, the illustrations in the Beruni *Tīmūr-nāma* are adhered to the pages and might be a rare case in which the illustrations predate the text. They could have been produced around the same time as H.1488 was illustrated, were briefly retained, and then pasted. For example, Tīmūr’s troops laying siege to a fortress in Khurasan (fig. 68) recall soldiers in H.1488 scaling the walls of Kai Khusrau’s castle as defensive archers take

⁴³¹ Assadullah Souren Melikian-Chirvani offers a case study of a royal manuscript made in the royal Bukharan atelier during ‘Abdullāh’s reign but not for him [“The Anthology of a Sufi Prince from Bukhara,” in *Persian Painting from the Mongols to the Qajars*, ed. Robert Hillenbrand (London: IB Tauris), 151–85].

⁴³² The manuscript is published in Madraimov, et al., *Oriental Miniatures*, 161–63. The scribe ‘Alī Rizā copied several other manuscripts between 1564 and 1581 for ‘Abdullāh Khan and nobles.

aim in the upper portion (fig. 69). In the Beruni *Tīmūr-nāma*'s siege scene, a soldier in red on the left plunges his dagger into the chest of a fallen warrior, taking the same pose as Rustam killing Suhrāb in H.1488 (fig. 70). The same light pink ground punctuated by red, blue, and green rocks depicted in the Beruni *Tīmūr-nāma*'s scene of Tīmūr surveying his troops beneath an umbrella (fig. 71) is also found on the battlefield scenes in H.1488.⁴³³ Tīmūr's soldiers sport helmets topped with colorful flags and small black tufts and one wields a lance with a black feathered puff.⁴³⁴ One of the troops even dons a tiger skin tunic akin to the character Rustam. Similar features of headwear and tasseled horse armor appear in H.1488.⁴³⁵

The frontispiece to the Beruni *Tīmūr-nāma* (fig. 72), however, betrays a subtle pictorial shift from the precise style of 'Abdullāh the kitābdār. Despite the visual parallels enumerated above to the 1564 *Shāhnāma* of 'Abdullāh Khan, the paintings in the *Tīmūr-nāma* are closer to the 1568 date of transcription. Francis Richard observes that at that time, Mīr 'Alī's student Mīr Ḥusain Ḥusainī Kulangī the calligrapher—whose career was previously recounted in Chapter 2—was appointed kitābdār. He may have shared duties with his colleague 'Abdullāh the painter prior to the latter's death in 1575.⁴³⁶ After this point the Bukhara kitābkhāna weakened, but was not altogether closed.

Yet another *Tīmūr-nāma* of Hātifi in the British Library (BL Add. 22703) has a similar frontispiece to the Beruni copy. It was divided in half, with one folio pasted at the beginning and the other at the end of the manuscript. Putting them together (fig. 73), we see a ruler presiding over an outdoor gathering. His attendant grasps the handle of a wine ewer resting on a low table set with three other vessels, features also found in the Beruni version. On the left side of the original diptych in the BL manuscript, there are musicians and inebriated guests swooning in front of a gate bearing the same checkered pattern as in the Beruni copy of the text. Golden hills looming behind blossoming pink and white trees are also found in both versions. These illustrative schemes belie a post-1568 provenance. The BL *Tīmūr-nāma* even contains distinct details in the rendering of tiles and clouds present in

⁴³³ Reproductions of these illustrations to H.1488 with this pink ground cluttered by rocks are in İnal, "Bir Özbek Şehnamesi," figs. 11, 12, and 14.

⁴³⁴ Similar headwear—tufted helmets—and golden diadems found in Bukharan manuscripts from the late 1590s appear in the *Tārīkh-i Chingīz Khān* (SPBGU OB 950), attesting to overpainting carried out in Bukhara onto this earlier Timurid work. See Melville, "Genealogy and exemplary rulership."

⁴³⁵ Note the caparisons and armor reproduced in İnal, "Bir Özbek Şehnamesi," figs. 3 and 5.

⁴³⁶ It is my own proposition that 'Abdullāh the painter and Kulangī the scribe worked for a period of time as a kitābdār team. Francis Richard suggests Kulangī was officially kitābdār much earlier than the usual 1568 date, and has kindly shared with me his forthcoming text "Illustrated Manuscripts from Mawarannahr in French Collections."

Bukharan manuscripts with colophons dated to 1575.⁴³⁷ The two *Tīmūr-nāma* manuscripts are executed in a style that persisted into the early years of the following century, to be further examined in Chapter 5.

The BL *Tīmūr-nāma* is an incomplete excerpt of Hātifi's original text and lacks a colophon. However, its illuminated margins bear pasted flanking medallions cut from colorful papers that resemble borders attributed to 'Abd al-'Azīz's workshop. The volume's dimensions (28.6 x 17.8 cm) conform to others that he commissioned; however, the production of manuscripts with similar dimensions, sprayed stenciled borders, and colored paper appliqués persisted in Bukhara into the 1570s.⁴³⁸ It is thus unknown when the text was written, but it could have been completed anytime between the 1540s–1570s. Besides the divided frontispiece, the other illustrations to the BL manuscript reflect later trends in India and Transoxiana after the Abū'l-Khairid downfall and will be treated in Chapter 5.

There exists another undated and damaged copy of Hātifi's *Tīmūr-nāma* in the Royal Asiatic Society (RAS 305A).⁴³⁹ Two badly abraded illustrations in it (figs. 74–75) evoke fighters and horses painted under the supervision of the kitābdār 'Abdullāh in the Bukharan workshop. A warrior in a blend of tiger and leopard skin with red shield on the far right of the first illustration (fig. 74) has the long face and sad eyes of figures associated with Maḥmūd Muzahhib, but stylistically the overall composition can be dated to the 1560s. In the second illustration, a rider astride a square-shaped horse with blue caparison in the upper portion of fig. 75 is the mirror image of a similar rider atop a horse with an orange and gold caparison trimmed in silver near the bottom section of a later *Tīmūr-nāma* to be discussed in the final chapter (fig. 147). Most of the BL manuscript's illustrations were produced three decades later and reflect interactions with the arts of northern India; I shall examine its illustrative program and also relationships between Transoxiana and India in the concluding chapter. But I can here assert that although more *Tīmūr-nāma* copies were produced in the last four decades of 'Abdullāh Khan's rule than the *Shāhnāma*, the single Abū'l-Khairid copy had many more illustrations in this one volume than all the other *Tīmūr-nāma* combined.

⁴³⁷ Compare a manuscript illustration to a manuscript of *Rauzat al-aḥbāb* by Jamāl al-Ḥusainī (ARB 2134, f.168v) reproduced in Madraimov, et al., *Oriental Miniatures*, 176.

⁴³⁸ For example, Kulangī completed a *Tuḥfat al-aḥrār* of Jāmī with similar margins (NLR Dorn 425).

⁴³⁹ RAS 305A has an enigmatic provenance: it was presented by Col. Francis Younghusband, the British Army officer and explorer who bought it in Yarkand while on a mission to Chinese Turkestan in the 1880s/90s. The final pages have Turkic poetic passages and several references to somebody named 'Umar Khān. Under 'Abdullāh Khan, Abū'l-Khairid dominion stretched up to Khutan and Kashghar in the east; the manuscript seems to have stayed within the region of its original production.

I will close this discussion by considering a final detached folio that is connected to the Bukharan *Tīmūr-nāma* corpus. Now held in the Grassi Museum of Applied Arts (fig. 76), its rendered floor tiling, figural types, and decorated fabrics resemble other works supervised by Kulangī between the 1570s and 1590s.⁴⁴⁰ Paired hills on the horizon have anthropomorphic forms that are akin to composite figures popular in Khurasan in this period.⁴⁴¹ An inscription at the top identifies the illustration as depicting *amīr Tīmūr ṣāhib qirān*, but this is admittedly but a tenuous linkage to the *Tīmūr-nāma*. While the seated ruler on a platform with bent leg comports with depictions of the dynastic founder, Philipp Walter Schulz notes the painting's similarities to an illustration from a *Gulistān* of Sa'dī (BL Or. 5302, f.25v).⁴⁴² Schulz attributes the latter scene to the painter Shaikhm who originally trained in Bukhara but later migrated to India where he served in Akbar's kitābkhāna. Kulangī states in the colophon of this Sa'dī manuscript that he completed writing it in 1567, a year before the scribe 'Alī Rīzā completed the Beruni *Tīmūr-nāma* (ARB 2102).⁴⁴³ Their chronological proximity suggests simultaneous coordination between the two texts.

These different threads— multiple *Tīmūr-nāma* texts, Bukhara-trained artists and scribes, connections to Akbar's courtly workshop in late-sixteenth century India—contribute to our understanding of the period and its arts. It seems that Bukharan artisans, likely alarmed by dwindling royal patronage in the 1560s, prepared *Tīmūr-nāmas* that stylistically appealed to the Mughal market. Whereas some copies were produced for local clients and may have remained in Transoxiana (such as ARB 2102, and perhaps the original manuscript containing HAM no. 1965.477), others completed in Bukhara appear to have been taken to the subcontinent where they either served as models there (RAS 305A, GMAA no. B.11.5r), or local Transoxianan artists picked up skills in India and applied them once back in their local region (BL Add. 22703—to be discussed more in Chapter 5). With regard to the purpose and appeal of these Bukharan *Tīmūr-nāma* in India, what could be more attractive than a

⁴⁴⁰ Comparable work of Kulangī's supervision is a *Duvalrānī u Khizr Khān* of Dihlavī (NLR PNS 276) scribed by Mīr Šāliḥ b. Mīr Ṭāhir al-Bukhārī in 1598.

⁴⁴¹ See Francis Richard, "Composite figures in the *Hadiqat al-haqīqa wa Shari'at al-tariqa* of Sana'ī," in *Ferdowsi, the Mongols and the History of Iran: Art, Literature and Culture from Early Islam to Qajar Persia. Studies in Honour of Charles Melville*, eds. Robert Hillenbrand, A.C.S. Peacock, and Fīruza Abdullaeva (London: IB Tauris, 2013), 341–57.

⁴⁴² Schulz, *Die persisch-islamische Miniaturmalerei*, pl. 75.

⁴⁴³ Kulangī in this *Gulistān* copied in 1567 goes by Mīr 'Alī Ḥusainī. Six paintings commissioned at Akbar's request are ascribed to the artist Shaikhm who had trained in Bukhara. Seven more paintings were added in a courtly Mughal style, probably between 1605 and 1609.

laudatory chronicle of the Chaghataid son-in-law prepared in the Mughals' ancestral homeland?⁴⁴⁴ As for their attractiveness to Abū'l-Khairid elites within Transoxiana, the stories provided excitement but also brought to mind the latest heroics and territorial conquests of the leader 'Abdullāh Khan.⁴⁴⁵

II.iv. Unillustrated ruler-*nāma*: biographies of 'Abdullāh Khan

In contrast to the above, the Mughals would not appreciate an unillustrated, laudatory chronicle of the Jūchid challenger and then-current Abū'l-Khairid ruler 'Abdullāh Khan. Intended to remain in Transoxiana, 'Abdullāh commissioned several chronicles of his reign. Whereas his earlier patronage of illustrated Persian poetry served to rival 'Abd al-'Azīz, his patronage of personal biographies emulates those completed for Muḥammad Shībānī Khan. Both Bregel and McChesney have thoroughly reviewed this "flurry of writing about the past, centered in particular on the most powerful political figure of the latter half of the century, Abd-Allāh Khān."⁴⁴⁶ My investigation does not attempt to expand upon their scholarship, but shall instead focus on two surviving texts that have connections to Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* and the *Tīmūr-nāma* versions of Hātifi and Yazdī.

McChesney highlights three major Persian works commissioned by or gifted to 'Abdullāh: Ḥāfiẓ-i Tanīsh ibn Mīr Muḥammad Bukhārī's *'Abdullāh-nāma* (also called *Sharafnāma-yi shāhī*), and two versified *Ẓafarnāma* by Badr al-Dīn Kashmīrī and Ḥāfiẓ Muqīm Bustānkhānī; however, the latter does not survive. Alas, whether due to 'Abdullāh's disinterest in manuscripts later in the century, domestic political tensions, or the reallocation of funds for massive public building projects instead of manuscripts, a pictorial scheme was never planned. One can only wonder how two works discussed below, the 1589 *'Abdullāh-nāma* by by Ḥāfiẓ Tanīsh and Kashmīrī's *Ẓafarnāma* of 1593, would have been illustrated.⁴⁴⁷

II.iv.a. *'Abdullāh-nāma* of Ḥāfiẓ Tanīsh

According to Bregel, Ḥāfiẓ Tanīsh's *'Abdullāh-nāma* / *Sharafnāma-yi shāhī* was the longest and most detailed historical work written under the Abū'l-Khairids.⁴⁴⁸ Commissioned by 'Abdullāh's

⁴⁴⁴ Melville reaches the same conclusion ("On Some Manuscripts of Hatifi's *Timurnama*").

⁴⁴⁵ Galerkina asserts as much when she writes: "In Abdallah's time the chronicles telling of the Timurid campaigns...were once again rewritten. In this way historical parallels were created, which emphasized the greatness of Abdallah and his father Iskandar Khan" (*Mawarannahr Book Painting*, 15).

⁴⁴⁶ McChesney, "Historiography in Central Asia since the 16th Century," 508; Bregel, "HISTORIOGRAPHY xii. CENTRAL ASIA."

⁴⁴⁷ McChesney dates Kashmīrī's *Ẓafarnāma* to 1598 in "The Conquest of Herat 1587-88: Sources for the Study of Safavid/qizilbāsh – Shībānīd/Uzbek Relations," in *Etudes Safavides* 39, ed. Jean Calmard (Paris and Tehran: Bibliothèque Iranienne, 1993): 71.

⁴⁴⁸ Bregel, "HISTORIOGRAPHY xii. CENTRAL ASIA." Several copies survive: ARB D.88; ARB mss. 2207, 1415, 5363, 9262; Central Bukhara Library, former Barthold collection no. 17; BL Or. 3497, BL IO 574; IU F.1338-1339; CWH 778/II.

closest confidante Qul Bābā Kūkaltāsh (to reappear in Chapter 4), Tanīsh wrote it between 1584 and 1589 to commemorate the recapture of Herat from the Safavids. It covers the life of ‘Abdullāh from his birth to events in 1589. By this period, ‘Abdullāh had headed Bukhara since 1557, and the broader khanate since 1582 as great khan. Bukhara had unofficially been the seat of whoever was the most powerful Abū’l-Khairid appanage leader since ‘Ubaidallāh, but with ‘Abdullāh it displaced Samarqand as the Abū’l-Khairid capital.⁴⁴⁹ ‘Abdullāh’s elimination of rival claimants to the Chinggisid mantle—even having his own brother assassinated—resulted in internal strife, beginning with his siege of Samarqand in 1569, and he waged a civil war until 1578.⁴⁵⁰ The following year, with the aid of the elite Jūibārid family who led the Naqshbandi Sufi order, ‘Abdullāh finally defeated his former ally-cum-rival Darvīsh Muḥammad the Suyunjuqid and with his father Iskandar took control of Samarqand.⁴⁵¹ ‘Abdullāh then steadily consolidated his power and in June 1582 was proclaimed supreme khan after an enthronement ceremony held near Istaravshan (present-day Tajikistan).⁴⁵² Even before he was officially declared great khan, the Ottoman sultan Murad III had invited him to celebrate the circumcision of his son, Şehzade Mehmet, held that same month in Istanbul. Unable to attend in person, he sent an ambassador in his stead.

McChesney has summarized the *‘Abdullāh-nāma*. It is written in rhymed Persian prose, “periodically punctuated by appropriate verse (perhaps as much as twenty percent of the text) and Qor’anic quotations.”⁴⁵³ It specifically promotes the Janibegid family of the Abū’l-Khairid Shībānids as the legitimate Chinggisid dynastic line, and celebrates the lives of Khwāja Sa’d al-Dīn, the son of the Naqshbandi Sufi leader Khwāja Muḥammad-Islām Juibārī. The main attention is given to Khwāja Sa’d al-Dīn’s disciple and supporter ‘Abdullāh. Tanīsh attributes ‘Abdullāh’s political success to the Jūibārid-led Naqshbandi religious authority supporting him.

Tanīsh’s motivations for composing the *‘Abdullāh-nāma* were twofold: firstly, he wanted to commemorate ‘Abdullāh’s new status as great khan. Secondly, he clearly conceived it to emphasize the

⁴⁴⁹ Several scholars have repeated the mistaken claim of Bukhara being a capital too early. Robinson credits ‘Abd al-Laṭīf in 1540 with making Bukhara (*A Descriptive Catalogue of the Persian Paintings in the Bodleian Library*, 126); others perpetuate the claim that ‘Ubaidullāh declared Bukhara the capital (Mukminova and Mukhtarov, “The Khanate (Emirate) of Bukhara,” 41).

⁴⁵⁰ ‘Abdullāh’s brother ‘Ibādullāh was assassinated 16 August 1586. Reported in McChesney, “Historiography in Central Asia since the 16th Century,” 520.

⁴⁵¹ Events of 1569 are recounted in *Ibid.*, 515. The context of 1578 is described in Dickson, “Shah Tahmasp and the Uzbeks,” 27.

⁴⁵² The exact location of the ritual was in Nafrandi, near Ura Teppa (Tiube). Information on the act is in McChesney, “Zamzam water on a white felt carpet.”

⁴⁵³ McChesney, “Historiography in Central Asia since the 16th Century,” 511.

recapture of Herat from the Safavids in 1588, as evinced by the last episode in all the surviving copies. The *‘Abdullāh-nāma* celebrates the ruler’s victories over his appanage rivals, his unification of the khanate, and the territories wrested from the Safavids. Much as the successful siege of Samarqand from the Timurids in 1500 inspired chronicles of Shībānī’s reign, the 1588 conquest of Khurasan elicited similar productions. So, these motivations parallel those that inspired the composition of the *Faṭḥnāma* and *Nuṣratnāma* manuscripts at the onset of the sixteenth century.

The contents of the *‘Abdullāh-nāma* parallels *Tārīkh-i Abū’l-Khair Khānī* and *Nuṣratnāma* in that they insert ‘Abdullāh into the line of Mongol forefathers, recalling Kūhistānī’s portrayal of Abū al-Khair with an explicit Mongol pedigree. Historical and biographical accounts at the beginning of the Abū’l-Khairid dynasty incorporated Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ’s *Shībānī-nāma* biography of Shībānī Khan, and the older texts of Rashīd al-Dīn’s *Jāmi‘ al-tawārīkh* and Yazdī’s *Ẓafarnāma*. Tanīsh expanded on these but referenced Bannā’ī’s Persian chronicle of Shībānī’s life as opposed to Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ’s. In an introductory section on ‘Abdullāh’s Chinggisid genealogy, Tanīsh regularly quotes passages from these earlier chronicles as well as Mīrkhwhānd’s *Rauzat al-ṣafā*.

II.iv.b. *Ẓafarnāma* of Kashmīrī

Kashmīrī is credited by his contemporary Muṭribī Samarqandī (whom we will encounter again in Chapter 5 §V.iii.c) with having written a response to Firdausī’s *Shāhnāma* in his four-part versified general history: the *Rasūl-nāma*.⁴⁵⁴ Within it is included a biographical account of ‘Abdullāh’s life, and its final fourth section is titled *Ẓafarnāma*. The author intended to present it to ‘Abdullāh as a gift but the khan died just before he could receive it in 1598.⁴⁵⁵ While Tanīsh lived all of his life in Bukhara, Kashmīrī, who had been born in India where he was informed by Timurid-influenced chronicles of the early Mughal dynasty, left for Bukhara in 1553. In Transoxiana he joined the Jūibārid Naqshbandī shaikhs, and much as Tanīsh, Kashmīrī’s panegyrics praise ‘Abdullāh and acknowledge his Jūibārid support.

⁴⁵⁴ Analyzed by Devin DeWeese, “The Problem of the *Siraj al-salihin*: Notes on two hagiographies by Badr al-Din Kashmiri,” in *Writing and Culture in Central Asia and the Turko-Iranian World, 10th-19th Centuries*, eds. Francis Richard and Maria Szuppe (Paris: Association pour l’avancement des études iraniennes, 2009), 49-51. DeWeese examines the larger corpus of Kashmīrī’s work modeled on Niẓāmī’s *Makhzan al-asrār*, ‘Attār’s *Manṭiq al-tair*, Sa’dī’s *Būstān*, and other poetry specimens by Dihlavī, Jāmī, and Hātifī.

⁴⁵⁵ Abdulgani Mirzoev and Aleksandr Boldyrev, *Katalog vostochnykh rukopisei Akademii nauk Tadzhikskoi SSR* [A catalogue of oriental manuscripts of the Academy of Sciences of the Tajiks SSR], vol. I (Stalinabad [Dushanbe]: 1960), 75, no. 61.

Lola Dodkhudoeva has examined a manuscript of Kashmīrī held in Tajikistan (CWH 779).⁴⁵⁶ She describes the first section, the *Ṣaḡīr-nāma*, as a history of the prophets from Adam to Jesus including several sovereigns of Iran from the Pishdadian, Kayanid, Arsacid (Parthian), and Sasanian dynasties. It is thus indebted to a tradition instigated by Firdausī that was also utilized by Kūhistānī in his *Tārīkh-i Abū'l-Khair Khānī*. The second part, titled *Iskandar-nāma*, provides information about the legendary Alexander, the favored hero of Islamic civilization. The third part, the *Muṣṭafā-nāma*, embraces the entire history of Islam from the Prophet Muḥammad up until Muḥammad Shībānī Khan. The fourth and final part of this grandiose work entitled *Ẓafarnāma* focuses on the reign of 'Abdullāh Khan. In it Kashmīrī alludes to both a *Shāhnāma* character and Sasanian ruler by referring to 'Abdullāh as “the second Ardashīr,” a historical figure also included in *TAKK*.⁴⁵⁷

Besides Firdausī, Kashmīrī's stand-alone *Ẓafarnāma* consciously emulates biographies of Tīmūr. In addition, Kashmīrī explicitly states in his preface that he intended to imitate Nizāmī's *Iskandar-nāma* as well.⁴⁵⁸ The work covers 'Abdullāh's birth, his conquest of Samarqand from his appanage rivals, capture of Badakhshan and Kulab from the Mughals, march to Khurasan and seizure of Herat, Mashhad, and Marv from the Safavids, and ends with the conquest of 'Arabshāhid Khwarazm in 1593. Dodkhudoeva interprets these conquests as expressions of 'Abdullāh's irrepressible desire to expand his dominions territorially, but also to prove the religious superiority of the Hanafī Sunni school to which he and the Naqshbandis based in Bukhara adhered.⁴⁵⁹

The accounts of Ḥāfiẓ Tanīsh and Kashmīrī not only fashion 'Abdullāh Khan as Shībānī's equal on paper. 'Abdullāh was personally determined to portray himself as a “second” Shībānī who enlarged the Abū'l-Khairid state to its original extent established by his predecessor, encompassing Khurasan and Khwarazm. Under 'Abdullāh, the Abū'l-Khairids reached the height of their power and the empire witnessed its greatest territorial expansion. Between 1588–1598, Herat flourished economically and culturally under his hegemony with his sponsorship of public architecture as well as irrigation projects that increased agricultural production.⁴⁶⁰ McChesney contrasts 'Abdullāh's reputation in Transoxiana

⁴⁵⁶ Dodkhudoeva, “K voprosu ob instrumentakh formirovaniia imperskoi ideologii,” 53. Another version is held in London, catalogued as *Rauzat al-ṣalāḡīn* (BL Or. 14244).

⁴⁵⁷ DeWeese, “The Problem of the *Siraj al-salihin*,” 66.

⁴⁵⁸ Dodkhudoeva, “K voprosu ob instrumentakh formirovaniia imperskoi ideologii,” 65.

⁴⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 64.

⁴⁶⁰ For details on the Abū'l-Khairids' hold on Herat lasting a decade, consult Burton, “The Fall of Herat”; McChesney, “The Conquest of Herat.”

as a builder to Chinggis Khan's infamy as a destroyer.⁴⁶¹ Due to the strength of its urban infrastructure constructed at this time, Bukhara would remain the capital of Transoxianan rulers until the late nineteenth-century Russian conquest.⁴⁶²

The domestic turmoil engendered by 'Abdullāh's pursuit of power prior to 1582 was not an environment conducive for a kitābkhāna to produce illustrated manuscripts. Periods of political strain negatively impacted artistic output, whereas stable times fostered it. 'Abdullāh's patronage of the workshops never recovered in part because it took all of his effort to maintain his greatly enlarged empire. For example, his troops had seized Khurasan in 1588 only to loosen their grip on the region in the campaign to take Khwarazm in 1592. By 1593 the Abū'l-Khairids had obtained Khwarazm but at the expense of Khurasan, necessitating its recapture.⁴⁶³ During these events, manuscripts previously completed in the Bukharan kitābkhāna would go on to have greater utility beyond Abū'l-Khairid domains, as explained below.

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

Presentations of manuscripts as diplomatic gifts by Abū'l-Khairid envoys were not only a prevailing custom among Turco-Persianate political elites of the so-called "gunpowder empires" but also a well-established practice throughout the broader Muslim world. In a major exhibition highlighting such exchanges, Linda Komaroff explains how gift-giving creates an obligatory system of presenting and receiving that does not conform to universal rules.⁴⁶⁴

In the Turco-Persianate world the word for these exchanges is *pīshkash*, and it has played various roles in Islamic courtly cultures during the last 1400 years. Ann Lambton has explained nuanced interpretations of the Persian term as a tribute, tax, bribe, or gift.⁴⁶⁵ It demarcates the status of the giver and recipient within the dynamics of political power, and comes with obligations to give,

⁴⁶¹ McChesney, "Islamic culture and the Chinggisid restoration," 253. Scott Levi compares 'Abdullāh II to his contemporaries Akbar and 'Abbās in his appreciating transregional commerce and constructing "hundred of bridges, caravansarais, and securing critical trade routes contributing to an upsurge in regional commerce" in "India, Russia and the Eighteenth-Century Transformation of the Central Asian Caravan Trade," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 42, no. 4 (1999): 529.

⁴⁶² Yuri Bregel, "Abdallah Khān B. Eskandar," *Encyclopædia Iranica*.

⁴⁶³ Burton, "Relations between the Khanate of Bukhara and Ottoman Turkey," 91.

⁴⁶⁴ Linda Komaroff, ed., *Gifts of the Sultan* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2011), 20.

⁴⁶⁵ Ann Lambton, "Pīshkash: Present or Tribute?" *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 57, no. 1 (1994): 145.

accept, or reciprocate.⁴⁶⁶ Hedda Reindl-Kiel's examinations of Ottoman gift exchanges articulate political and social dimensions "which precisely made the status of the present's receiver visible and tangible. Thus, gifts established not only real values but also what we might call symbolic capital in kind."⁴⁶⁷ When dealing with manuscripts, this symbolic worth, however, was lost after it was accessioned by the library or treasury, but it could be revived when given to another person.⁴⁶⁸ In Sinem Arcak's examinations of Ottoman-Safavid gift-giving, she similarly interprets the objects as indicators of "economic, symbolic and artistic values" and the circumstances of their distribution as "a courtly performance" involving spectators, recipients, and bestowers. She notes how for the Ottomans, "there was the expectation to not only reciprocate, but to return the favor through the giving of a comparable or even more valuable object or sum of money worth twice the value of the original given item."⁴⁶⁹ Thus, the gift functions as a financial transaction, and an immediate second gift can eradicate the indebtedness created by the first. This secondary exchange provides a way for a ruler to express his superiority while still accepting the original gifted item.

III.i. Abū'l-Khairid manuscript diplomacy

As the above scholarship attests, these Ottoman and Safavid pīshkash transfers provide insight into how these powers' dispatch and receipt of illustrated manuscripts and can inform similar Abū'l-Khairid exchanges with other dynastic heads. Lâle Uluç's findings on the Ottoman predilection for illustrated Firdausian *Shāhnāmas* also influences my study.⁴⁷⁰ I shall overlook the earlier period of Abū'l-Khairid diplomacy and pīshkash to focus on manuscripts that were likely transferred during the reign of 'Abdullāh Khan (consult the three subsets to App. 6: Abū'l-Khairid manuscripts gifted in the 16th century). This is due to a paucity of sources concerning transfers of book objects between courts in the first half of the sixteenth century; the second half is better documented.

⁴⁶⁶ Ashley Mayeri Burns condenses these theories of Marcel Mauss in her paper "The Gift of Diplomacy: Case Studies in Safavid Gifting, 1567—1583" (MA thesis, School of Oriental and African Studies, 2015), 7.

⁴⁶⁷ Hedda Reindl-Kiel, "East is East and West is West, and Sometimes the Twain Did Meet: Diplomatic Gift Exchange in the Ottoman Empire," in *Frontiers of Ottoman Studies: State, Province, and the West*, Vol. 2, eds. Colin Imber and Keiko Kiyotaki (London: IB Tauris, 2005), 114.

⁴⁶⁸ Ibid., 115, 116.

⁴⁶⁹ Sinem Arcak, "Gifts in Motion: Ottoman-Safavid Cultural Exchange, 1501-1618" (PhD diss., University of Minnesota, 2012), 21–23.

⁴⁷⁰ In particular: Lâle Uluç, "Ottoman Book Collectors and Illustrated Sixteenth Century Shiraz Manuscripts," *Revue des mondes musulmans et de la Méditerranée* 87-88 (September 1999): 85-107; "Selling to the Court: Late-Sixteenth-Century Manuscript Production in Shiraz," *Muqarnas* 17 (2000): 73-96; "A Persian Epic, Perhaps for the Ottoman Sultan," *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 29 (1994): 67–68.

‘Abdullāh’s victories over all the appanages and control of the Bukhara kitābkhāna made him the main patron in the late-1550s throughout the 1560s, and the illustrated manuscripts that had been previously assembled in Bukhara for ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, Naurūz Aḥmad, and Yār Muḥammad were available to him. Later in his rule however, he gifted some of his own commissioned copies—and perhaps those originally owned by his predecessors—to foreign powers. I have identified three manuscripts given by the Abū’l-Khairids to the Safavids, (App. 6a), twenty-eight volumes likely presented to the Mughals (App. 6b), and twenty-eight others that were sent to the Ottomans (App. 6c). Regrettably, many either lack records regarding their transfer or there are limited seals and notes that might better indicate previous ownership, and these impede thorough analysis on them. Fortunately, there is sufficient documentation regarding ‘Abdullāh’s gift of his *Shāhnāma* to Sultan Murad III in 1594 to permit a case study of Abū’l-Khairid pīshkash. By analyzing the complex, intertwined Ottoman—Abū’l-Khairid political and artistic relationships surrounding the volume, I shall articulate both the intended impact that the Abū’l-Khairids desired in giving it, and the actual outcome after the Ottomans accepted it.

III.i.a. Safavids (Appendix 6a)

As the main enemies of the Abū’l-Khairids, it is not surprising that few manuscripts found their way from courtly Abū’l-Khairid workshops into the hands of the Safavids. Nevertheless, at least three manuscripts produced under Transoxianan patronage were presented to Safavid royalty and remained in Iran for a few centuries. Those that did must have been gifted to Shah ‘Abbās I in Isfahan after the death of ‘Abdullāh Khan when the two polities were on peaceful terms. Afterwards, their new owner commissioned his kitābkhāna artists to conduct further amendments. Based on added illustrations, seal impressions, and inscriptions, we can point to two that were then regifted by the Safavids to the Mughals (App. 6a, no. 2) and Ottomans (App. 6a, no. 3).

III.i.b. Mughals (Appendix 6b)

A more systematic review of the extensive holdings of Abū’l-Khairid manuscripts in Mughal libraries numbering twenty-eight volumes will be given in Chapter 5 §V.i. Some of those given on ‘Abdullāh’s behalf by emissaries were intended to cement alliances against the Safavids, while others were directly taken by artists originating from Transoxiana to India. Paratextual elements in some of these volumes await analysis that could shed light on their accession. Many of the works lack such

explicit documentation but bear features that merit their inclusion, such as Mughal overpainting that proves the objects spent time in India.

III.i.c. Ottomans (Appendix 6c)

Out of all the dynastic powers, Abū'l-Khairid gifts of manuscripts and albums to the Ottomans were the most numerous, with some delivered by Bukharan ambassadors to the Sublime Porte while others could have been given to Ottoman ambassadors in Bukhara to then transport back to Istanbul.⁴⁷¹ This discussion shall primarily focus on those illustrated manuscripts known to have been gifted by ‘Abdullāh Khan in his lifetime that are still preserved today in the Topkapı Palace Library. We have already examined some Abū'l-Khairid manuscripts that appear to have arrived earlier, prior to ‘Abdullāh Khan’s leadership, such as the *Tīmūr-nāma* of Hātifi (TSMK H.1594), discussed in Chapter 2 §III.ii. There are also a few copies of Firdausian *Shāhnāma* that traveled from east to west, between Transoxiana and Constantinople. One of these is the *Shāhnāma* in the big-figure style (TSMK H.1509) that was examined in Chapter 1 §III.ii; another copy (TSMK R.1549) with some little-figure illustrations was finished in the Ottoman realm circa 1530s through 1540s (covered in Chapter 1 §III.iii and Chapter 2 §III.iii.d). The text to the truncated *Shāhnāma* (TSMK H.1514) was written in Bukhara in 1535 but found its way into the royal Ottoman collection decades later (discussed in Chapter 2 §III.i).

Some of the manuscripts originally gifted by Abū'l-Khairid rulers to their Ottoman counterparts were subsequently acquired by other collections and remain today outside of Istanbul, and these shall also necessarily be considered (App. 6c, nos. 25–28). In circa 1900, the Swedish diplomat and dealer F.R. Martin acquired objects from the Ottoman collection. Scholars have since noted Martin’s infamy in “returning to his villa in Florence with important paintings and manuscripts removed surreptitiously or with the tacit approval of unscrupulous librarians from the libraries of Istanbul.”⁴⁷² This explains how some illustrated manuscripts of Bukharan manufacture known to have been gifted to the Ottomans left the Sublime Porte.

⁴⁷¹ Burton references Abū al-Ghāzi’s *Shajara-yi Turk* reporting an Ottoman envoy named Sala Shah was “loaded with gifts” in Bukhara upon his return to Istanbul at some point in 1589, although he was reported to have been robbed in Khwarazm (“Relations between the Khanate of Bukhara and Ottoman Turkey,” 89-90).

⁴⁷² Glenn D. Lowry and Susan Nemazee, *A Jeweler’s Eye: Islamic Arts of the Book from the Vever Collection* (Washington, D.C.: Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, 1988), 31, fn. 44. For further information on manuscript materials coming into F.R. Martin’s possession under suspicious circumstances, consult Stuart Cary Welch, “Private Collectors and Islamic Arts of the Book,” in *Treasures of Islam*, ed. Toby Falk (Bristol: Artline Editions, 1985), 26.

There are other unillustrated texts that have remained in the Topkapı collection, such as original copies of ‘Ubaidullāh’s and Shībānī’s *Dīvān* compositions of personal poetry, and it is quite feasible that these too were gifted.⁴⁷³ It is easy to believe that these precious volumes of the premier Abū’l-Khairid dynastic leaders would have been presented to Ottoman rulers in a display of fraternity and literary pretension. Since they only contain illuminated headings and have no other visual schema, they are not included in the list but are important examples of Uzbek-Ottoman exchanges of manuscripts.

III.ii. Dispatches of Firdausian *Shāhnāma* to the Ottomans

When exchanged at the courtly level, manuscripts gifted to the Ottomans did not come for free; they accompanied letters asking for political favors, or were proffered after the conclusion of peace and trade agreements. Having been produced in 1564, here we will focus on the afterlife of ‘Abdullāh Khan’s *Shāhnāma* when it was gifted to Sultan Murad III in 1594 and the politics surrounding its transfer. Although Karin Rühdanz claims that ‘Abdullāh’s *Shāhnāma* “was specially made with the intention of being presented at Istanbul by an embassy negotiating Ottoman help against the Safavids,” the work does not seem to have been created with the aim of passing it along. Firstly: it had been in ‘Abdullāh’s collection for three decades and remained there despite other earlier occasions to part with it. Secondly, characterizing ‘Abdullāh’s exchange of the manuscript as an act of subservience and supplication glosses over important circumstances surrounding its transfer.⁴⁷⁴ ‘Abdullāh’s gift was actually intended to convey his status equivalent to its intended recipient while concurrently securing political favor. His selection of that particular title implies his knowledge of a prevailing Ottoman predilection for illustrated *Shāhnāmas*. By extension, it also reflects his awareness of Firdausian *Shāhnāmas* given by other dynastic leaders to the Sublime Porte.

III.ii.a. Courtly Firdausian *Shāhnāma* copies gifted before 1575

The earliest documented Firdausian *Shāhnāma* manuscript exchange between Transoxiana and the Ottomans occurred when the last Timurid ruler of Herat, Bāiqarā’s son and brief successor Badī‘ al-Zamān (d. 1514), presented a copy to Sultan Selim I (r. 1512–20) when he sought refuge in Istanbul in 1514.⁴⁷⁵ Over ensuing decades, the Ottomans were avid collectors of Firdausī’s work and the Safavid

⁴⁷³ I allude to the undated *Dīvān* (in Turki) of ‘Ubaidullāh (TSMK A.2381), and the *Dīvān* (also in Turki) of Shībānī (TSMK A.2436) scribed by Sulṭān ‘Alī in 1507.

⁴⁷⁴ Rühdanz, “The Samarqand Shahnamas,” 214.

⁴⁷⁵ A contemporary account of this exchange is noted in Uğur, *The Reign of Sultan Selim I in the Light of the Selim-name Literature*, 269, and it is illustrated in a *Selim-nāma* of Bitlīsī (H.1597–98), completed in ca. 1525. See Tanındı, “The Illustration of the *Shahnama* and the Art of the Book in Ottoman Turkey,” 144.

workshops were prolific in producing copies of the title, with some designated as sites to satiate this desire (such as Shiraz).⁴⁷⁶

In 1567, Shah Ṭahmāsp dispatched Shāh Qulī Khān Ustajlū as his ambassador to the enthronement ceremony of Selim II's new reign in Edirne. There Shāh Qulī presented the shah's own lavish Firdausian *Shāhnāma* on 16 February 1568.⁴⁷⁷ Commenced in 1522, during Ismā'īl's reign, the manuscript encased in a jewel and pearl-encrusted binding was later completed for his successor Ṭahmāsp in 1537.⁴⁷⁸ It was the most lavish rendition of the *Shāhnāma* that the Safavids or any other dynasty ever produced. Its presentation to the Ottomans by the Safavid ambassador, shown deeply bowing in a very subservient posture, is featured in an illustration within Selim's biographical ruler-*nāma*, the *Shāhnāma-yi Salīm Khān* by Sayyid Luqmān.⁴⁷⁹

Rather than simply signifying Ṭahmāsp's full allegiance and devotion to the Ottoman ruler, the bestowal of this opulent gift served critical cultural and political aims on both sides. The Safavids and Ottomans individually viewed themselves as the sole possessors of cultural and artistic superiority. The Safavids, who saw themselves as the prevailing arbiters of refinement and cultural production in the Turco-Persianate world, knew the impact that the object would have. The Ṭahmāsp *Shāhnāma* — truly the pinnacle of Safavid manuscripts with its rich and compelling illustrative pictorial scheme — would later inspire Ottoman artists to reproduce some of its compositions.⁴⁸⁰ Ünver Rüstem notes how Ṭahmāsp's gift stimulated production of truncated and illustrated *Shāhnāmas* in the Ottoman Empire, as discussed in Chapter 2.⁴⁸¹

Arcak explains that the presentation of lavish manuscripts manifested power relations and was a tool in Safavid diplomacy to obtain concessions in political and military negotiations with the more

⁴⁷⁶ Consult Uluç, "Ottoman Book Collectors and Illustrated Sixteenth Century Shiraz Manuscripts."

⁴⁷⁷ This event is recounted in Tanındı, "Additions to Illustrated Manuscripts in Ottoman Workshops," 147.

⁴⁷⁸ Zarinebaf-Shahr describes the manuscript's manufacture in "Cross-Cultural Contacts in Eurasia," 538. Stuart Cary Welch claimed it was originally commissioned in 1522 by Shah Ismā'īl for the nine-year-old Ṭahmāsp, who that year returned to the capital Tabriz from Herat [*A King's Book of Kings: The Shāh-Nameh of Shah Tahmasp* (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1972), 16].

⁴⁷⁹ TSMK A.3595, ff.53b–54a, completed in Istanbul, ca. 1571–81. Extensively reproduced.

⁴⁸⁰ Illustrations of "The Iranian Qaran slays the Turanian Barman" (Ṭahmāsp *Shāhnāma* f.102v) and "The Iranian army with Rustam and Barzu fighting the Turanian (Transoxianan) army" (*Shāhnāma* HDA br. A. 1, f.323b), both completed in 1573 in Baghdad, feature noticeable parallels. The Ṭahmāsp folio "Combat of Rustam and Shangul" (f.279v) could have been the model for "Rustam lifts Pilsam off his horse on a spear" in a *Şehnâme-i Türki* verse translation by Şerif Âmidî, ca. 1616-20, Istanbul (NYPL Spencer Turk. 1, f.199v). All illustrations to the Ṭahmāsp *Shāhnāma* are reproduced in Sheila R. Canby, *The Shahnama of Shah Tahmasp: the Persian Book of Kings* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2004).

⁴⁸¹ Ünver Rüstem, "The Afterlife of a Royal Gift: The Ottoman Inserts of the *Shāhnāma-i Shāhī*," *Muqarnas* 29 (2012): 247.

powerful Ottomans.⁴⁸² Safavid artistic prowess could also convey political mastery. What is more, Ṭahmāsp may have gifted his valuable manuscripts as a result of his second Edict of Sincere Repentance in 1556. He decreed new standards of public morality and piety, denounced the arts and disbanded his kitābkhāna. Ṭahmāsp's acts of gifting thereby may have also served as a conscious display of the shah's newfound ascetic humility—and Shi'ite spiritual superiority—to the Sunni Ottomans as a form of religious power play that elevated the position of the giver over the receiver. However, Christine Woodhead has analyzed the Ottoman response in acquiring precious works of Safavid make as diplomatic gifts, such as Ṭahmāsp's *Shāhnāma*, which reinforced Ottoman notions of their own superiority in being given such a valuable object. Both the Ottomans and the Safavids in their own way each thought they were the stronger party.⁴⁸³

III.ii.b. Truncated *Shāhnāmas* TSMK mss. H.1503 and H.1514—illustrative programs

As was mentioned in Chapter 2 §III.i, based on their textual and visual contents, truncated *Shāhnāma* versions lack much or all of the historical component to Firdausī's original text and were mostly the product of Ottoman workshops and would have been attractive to Abū'l-Khairid and Ottoman readers. Focusing on the two truncated specimens written by scribes working in or from Bukhara (TSMK mss. H.1503 and H.1514), I can track the manuscripts' movements through analyzing their illustrations. Written in Bukhara in 1535, H.1514 was later carried west and was taken in and finished by artists connected to a workshop presumed to be in Baghdad when it was under Ottoman rule in the late sixteenth century. H.1503 could have been produced entirely in this workshop at the same time as the illustrations to H.1514 were added. Together, the manuscripts serve as a cautionary tale in using colophon information to attribute a single provenance to a work. Like so many of the objects mentioned in the chapters to this research, H.1503 and H.1514 are specimens of amalgamated manuscript manufacture. I will examine them individually then will comment on their cumulative illustrations executed in styles shared between them.

H.1514: illustrative program

The stylistically uniform imagery within H.1514 rendered in a bold style (figs. 77-78, 103) yields a different chronology and provenance than the text that accompanies it. Analysis of the illustrative program—foreign to Abū'l-Khairid workshops—helps to chronicle the trajectory the

⁴⁸² Arcak, "Gifts in Motion," 19.

⁴⁸³ Woodhead, "Reading Ottoman 'Şehnames'," 74.

manuscript took following its exit from the Abū'l-Khairid domain after it was written out in 1535. Through comparisons to other Ottoman materials in a similar style such as paintings within albums, I theorize that the text to H.1514 ended up in the Ottoman realm where illustrations were added sometime between the 1570s through 1580s. An Ottoman album folio depicting Rustam seated on a rock (TSMK H.2145, f.30v) features similar leg armor as Garshāsp smiting an orange div in H.1514 (fig. 77).⁴⁸⁴ The Garshāsp composition is obviously painted after the text was written since the rocks and tree extend over the original rulings in the upper portion. A letter dated January 1572 indicates an envoy of the ruler of Tashkent (Darvīsh Khān being in power at this time) carried out a pilgrimage upon the completion of the members' ambassadorial duties. The document explains financial exchanges linking Ottoman centers. A cash sum originally paid by the ambassadors was to be refunded by Ottoman treasury administrators in Baghdad. The coins initially bestowed by the Tashkent envoy in Basra were to be taken from there and sent to the *beylerbey* (provincial governor) of Damascus, who was ordered to return the customs fee to them there upon their return from Mecca and guarantee their safety so that they would not be attacked while transiting in the Ottoman realm.⁴⁸⁵ There is no mention of a manuscript exchange, but the meeting of Uzbek and Ottoman officials and the linkage of geographical centers at this time provide an appropriate backdrop for H.1514 to have transited from east to west in the custody of Uzbek noblemen engaged in diplomacy and pilgrimage. They might have traded the manuscript text for goods and services in lieu of heavier (and riskier) hard currency transported across long distances.

Truncated *Shāhnāma* versions visually comparable to H.1514 have been associated with commercial productions assembled in Baghdad later in the sixteenth century at the time the Tashkent delegation passed through the eastern Ottoman lands. The compositions and figures to some illustrated scenes are reused across the group of truncated *Shāhnāma* productions examined by Rührdanz which have stylistic parallels to illustrations in *Qīṣaṣ al-anbiyā'* manuscripts.⁴⁸⁶ With the exception of H.1514, none of the manuscripts with illustrations in this style mention a locale in their colophons, but

⁴⁸⁴ The div closely follows that depicted in an often reproduced dispersed folio to a *Fālnāma* (LM no. MAO 894) with Imam Rizā saving the sea peoples, ca. 1550-1565. TSMK H.2145, f.30v is reproduced as pl. XXVIIa in Ivan Stchoukine, *La Peinture Turque d'après les manuscrits illustrés Ilme partie de Murad IV a Mustafā III, 1623-1773* (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1971).

⁴⁸⁵ BOA no. DVNSMHM.d.16/657 (979 § 19).

⁴⁸⁶ Rührdanz, "The Transformed *Shāhnāma*," 601. For an extensive analysis of this style and suggested Baghdad center, consult Rachel Milstein, et al., *Stories of the Prophets: Illustrated Manuscripts of Qīṣaṣ al-Anbiyā'* (Costa Mesa, California: Mazda Publishers, 1999).

Rührdanz has given the group an Ottoman provenance that she locates in Istanbul.⁴⁸⁷ Other scholars have (arguably more convincingly) situated their manufacture in Baghdad, but the location cannot definitively be determined at this present state of research.⁴⁸⁸ Ottoman-controlled workshops in Baghdad began operating in 1573 but decreased their production at the close of the sixteenth century as a result of political instability and wars between Ottomans and Safavids.⁴⁸⁹

Baghdad manuscripts were predominantly commercial enterprises. Workshops there produced illustrated texts for court and military elites. Some copies of Persian poetry originating there found their way to India where they were retouched by local artists.⁴⁹⁰ Others were later owned by the Emir of Bukhara and subsequently gifted to Tsar Nicholas II in the late nineteenth century, while several remained in the Ottoman realm and were accessioned by the Topkapı collection.⁴⁹¹ H.1514 has some identical compositions and figures as another truncated *Shāhnāma* copy in the Topkapı (TSMK R.1544) that is dated 1576 which follows the standard four-part division discussed in Chapter 2, containing sections labelled *Shāhnāma*, *Khusrau-nāma*, *Bahman-nāma*, *Iskandar-nāma*.⁴⁹² Both H.1514 and R.1544 are lavish: every illustration in R.1544 is awash in gold or has gilded accents, and H.1514 is endowed with two diptychs at the beginning and end of the manuscript each with illuminated margins. The double-page frontispiece in H.1514 (fig. 78) is similar to that in R.1544 (fig. 79), and in both there are two figures beside a horse on the left side wearing kalpak headwear (red and yellow in

⁴⁸⁷ Arguing against an Istanbul provenance for the truncated *Shāhnāmas* and any other Persian-language Firdausian *Shāhnāma* copies, Uluç has asserted in publications that the Ottoman capital at the end of the sixteenth century was only producing Persian-language historical chronicles (ruler-*nāma*) and Turkic translations of Firdausian *Shāhnāmas*. This will be taken up in §IV in this present chapter, and Ch. 4 §I.

⁴⁸⁸ Rührdanz posits an Istanbul attribution in “Truncated Shahnamas,” 129. Read also her contributions in Kwiatkowski, *The Eckstein Shahnama* for her theory on the influence of Iranian styles (derived from Isfahan and Qazvin) or artists from these locales working on illustrations in Ottoman workshops. Her analysis comes from her earlier collaborative work with Milstein, et al., *Stories of the Prophets*. The Baghdad school has been used as a stylistic designation to refer to a single group of non-royal illustrated manuscripts copied and illustrated between 1565–85 by artists from different backgrounds (Tabriz, Qazvin, Shiraz, Khurasan, and Ottoman workshops) gathered together in one place (Baghdad). Their coherence as a group is questioned, but stylistic diffusion and the formation of mixed styles after 1576 increases perhaps as a result of the Ottomans annexing Tabriz and disrupting workshops. On the Istanbul versus Baghdad debate, Melis Taner gives an overview in “‘Caught in a Whirlwind:’ Painting in Baghdad in the Late Sixteenth-Early Seventeenth Centuries” (PhD diss., Harvard University, 2016), 21–22.

⁴⁸⁹ Taner connects the workshop’s collapse with the death of the Baghdad governor and patron Hasan Paşa, rekindled warfare between Ottomans and Safavids in 1603, and instability in Baghdad with local uprisings and the campaigns of Shah ‘Abbās (“Caught in a Whirlwind,” 254).

⁴⁹⁰ The truncated *Shāhnāma* in All Souls’ College, Oxford—Codrington Library 288—was later purchased in Muradabad by a member of the British East India Company. Provenance in Robinson, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Persian Paintings in the Bodleian Library*, 185.

⁴⁹¹ Two Nizāmī manuscripts that are examples of the Bukhara-to-Muscovy gift exchange are RIOS mss. PNS 272 (*Khamsa* dated 1579), PNS 84 (*Iskandar-nāma* dated 1571). See fn. 644.

⁴⁹² Information on TSMK R.1544 in Lâle Uluç, “Vezir-i Azam Sinan Paşa’dan Gelen Kitabdır—Sene 999,” in *Günsel Renda’ya Armağan (Essays in Honor of Günsel Renda)*, eds. Zeynep Yasa Yaman and Serpil Bağcı (Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Hastaneleri Basımevi, 2011), 245–53.

H.1514, and black and white in R.1544). The figures have unique wispy beards that might distinguish them as heralding from Transoxiana. R.1544 was gifted by Sinan Paşa (the grand vizier to five sultans) to Mehmet III in 1590, five years before Mehmet would ascend the Ottoman throne. R.1544 was created as a commercial manuscript with illustrations derived from a set repertoire used for truncated *Shāhnāma* copies, but from these commercial origins it became royal through the act of gifting it to the future Ottoman sovereign. H.1514 has no identifiable seals or markers to pinpoint past owners or dates of transmission, but like R.1544 its current location in the Topkapı Palace asserts its dispatch into the royal collection.

H.1503: textual production

Like H.1514, the entire manuscript H.1503 in the Topkapı has also been catalogued as “Bukharan” or “Shībānīd” because of its colophon, however the information undergirding this classification is not explicit. H.1503’s colophon follows a similar format as H.1514 and reads: “the book was finished under the auspices of the most munificent king by the hand of the humblest worshipper the illuminator Muḥammad the Bukharan [*al-bukhārā’ī*] / forgive his sins.”⁴⁹³ Mustafa ‘Āli mentions several Muḥammads of Bukharan origin who were trained by Mīr ‘Alī but they have longer names (e.g., Muḥammad Ma‘ṣūm Ḥusainī, or Muḥammad Nāṣir). Other Muḥammads are listed with a first name and a nisba naming Mashhad and Herat. The Bukharan nisba in H.1503 suggests Abū’l-Khairid scribal origins but no production site or year are listed, and so it cannot be confirmed that the manuscript had any connection to Transoxiana beyond the site where the scribe might have originally trained. A nisba suggests the named individual’s background but does not assert definitive personal origins, and it by no means implies the person remained in the center from which he or his family hailed. The Bukharan moniker could designate an artisan of Transoxianan origin working as part of a team far from this center; indeed another truncated *Shāhnāma* (MMA 13.228.11) has a colophon naming “Shāh Muḥammad, the Sabzivārī scribe” with the date 1584, but its illustrations do not come from Sabzivar, in Khurasan. As we shall see, the illustrations to H.1503 could demonstrate that the birthplace of the scribe is not the place of the manuscript’s ultimate assemblage.

H.1503 is a large volume measuring 47.5x32.5cm and is written out in 4 columns with 21 rows. These specifics are common to another truncated *Shāhnāma* copy (MMA 13.228.14). These

⁴⁹³ The colophons to H.1514 and H.1503 have very similar formats. Some work on colophon formulae has been done by Ramazan Şeşen, “Esquisse d’une histoire du développement des colophons dans les manuscrits musulmans,” in eds. François Déroche and Francis Richard, *Scribes Et Manuscrits Du Moyen-Orient* (Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France, 1997), 189-221.

measurements also apply to other *Shāhnāma* manuscripts in the Topkapı with illustrations and illuminations stylistically attributed to Baghdad, Isfahan, and Qazvin in the last quarter of the sixteenth century.⁴⁹⁴ H.1503 was the personal copy of Davud Paşa (d. post-1596), the Ottoman governor of Ganja, Van, and Shirvan who was a general on the eastern front in battles with the Safavids.⁴⁹⁵ He brought this *Shāhnāma* along with the other truncated copies H.1502 and H.1512 to the Topkapı Palace at some point between 1594–1604. In the next section we will examine the types of illustrations to these *Shāhnāma* works that are posited to have been produced for the Ottoman market, and the manuscripts' migration and the cadre of artists originally trained in far-flung workshops coming together to complete them.

H.1503: illustrative program

H.1503 has illustrations done in two styles, those in the same bold style (fig. 80) we saw in H.1514 that are akin to the *Qışaş al-anbiyā'* manuscripts from Baghdad, and a more lyric style.⁴⁹⁶ The second manner of painting (fig. 81) is associated with the work of artists trained in Safavid workshops located in Qazvin and later Isfahan who replicated the works of Shah 'Abbās I's court painter and kitābdār Şādiqī Beg (d. 1610).⁴⁹⁷ It is not likely that there were two sites of illustration to complete the visual components of this manuscript in the two styles. Artists originally trained in two different workshops might have feasibly come together in one site, posited to be Baghdad. The artists there used the same paints since the color saturation and pigments are the same in all the illustrations to H.1503. This raises the valid point that different pictorial modes can and did coexist within a center and workshop; we are dealing with handmade creations and mobile bodies after all. Later, or while Muḥammad the Bukharan wrote the text to H.1503, illustrations in the “bold” and “lyric” styles filled the picture boxes he had left empty. I interpret these as the work of two artists from different backgrounds working at the same time and in the same place where Muḥammad copied the text. The manuscript would have been completed by 1600 for it to have come into the possession of Davud Paşa.

⁴⁹⁴ TSMK mss. H.1512: 48.7 x 32.5cm; H.1502: 48 x 31.2cm; H.1503: 47.3 x 31.5cm; H.1492: 36.7 x 24.5cm (an outlier but possibly trimmed); Eckstein ms.: 46 x 33.5cm.

⁴⁹⁵ Schmidt, “The Reception of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* Among the Ottomans,” 125.

⁴⁹⁶ Some reproductions are in Güner İnal, “Topkapı Sarayı Muzesindeki Bazi Şah Abbas Dönemi Sehname'lerinin Minyatürleri,” *Hacettepe Beseri Bilimler Dergisi* 10, no. 3 (Haziran 1980): fig. 21 (lyric), figs. 22-24 (bold).

⁴⁹⁷ I have also discovered this same “lyric” style in another *Shāhnāma* manuscript (MMA 13.228.14) that has an identical binding and dimensions as H.1503. The style parallels illustrations found in the following manuscripts: a *Shāhnāma* (LG O.117); and *Qışaş al-anbiyā'* scribed by Ishāq b. Ibrāhīm al-Nishāpūrī illustrated by Şādiqī Beg or Rızā, circa 1595 (BNF Sup Pers 1313).

H.1503 has been linked to a group of truncated *Shāhnāma* manuscripts examined by İnal.⁴⁹⁸

What I refer to as the “lyric style” of illustration, she suggests it is an early example of the Isfahan style arising in the late sixteenth or early seventeenth century. İnal theorizes one workshop produced the truncated *Shāhnāma* manuscripts in the Topkapı: H.1492 (dated 1597), H.1502, H.1512, and H.1503. To this group I can add MMA mss. 13.228.11 (by the Sabzivārī scribe, dated 1584) and 13.228.14 (dated 1588).⁴⁹⁹ Many are bound in nearly identical embossed gold covers which may or may not be contemporary to the textual and illustrative programs.⁵⁰⁰ Çağman and Tanındı have since attributed İnal’s manuscript group to artisans who roamed between Khurasan (Herat and its environs in Sabzivar, Bakharz, etc., to be covered in Chapter 4 §III.iv), Isfahan, Tabriz, and Baghdad. Çağman and Tanındı do not state it, but pecuniary needs might have spurred the itinerancy of the artisans formerly employed in the Safavid domain as Shah Ṭahmāsp’s patronage declined in the 1550s. Our present focus on H.1503 adds to Çağman and Tanındı’s grouping of illustrated *Shāhnāma* copies that have abridged text and image cycles ending with the death of Alexander in Babylon.⁵⁰¹ The cited scholars presented an eclectic working environment that brought together talent originally from multiple centers to make these works. With H.1503, we can now add a scribe of Bukharan origin to this cosmopolitan roster in the second half of the sixteenth century.

Details within the truncated *Shāhnāma* copies display how the workshop staff was mindful not to fan the flames of sectarianism, and painted characters in generic flat turbans and military banners with Allāh written on them as well as Muḥammad and ‘Alī so as to appeal to a broader base of buyers. Waning Abū’l-Khairid patronage later in the sixteenth century precipitated scribes to relocate to other centers; upsets in eastern Iran and in Abū’l-Khairid territory later in the sixteenth century and the artistic fallout will be covered in Chapter 4. Shāh Muḥammad the Sabzivārī scribe of MMA 13.228.11, and the copyist of H.1503 Muḥammad the Bukharan might have ventured west to the Ottoman realm following the dissolution of courtly workshops in Bukhara in the 1570s. Baghdad was on a pilgrimage

⁴⁹⁸ İnal, “Şah Abbas Dönemi Sehname’lerinin Minyatürleri,” 12-51.

⁴⁹⁹ The truncated *Shāhnāma* MMA 13.228.11 has uniform illustrations executed in a style associated with developments in late-sixteenth century Isfahan, with some overpainting applied in India. It has similar breaklines to H.1503 which result in many of the same scenes illustrated in these two copies. MMA 13.228.14 is in the same two styles as H.1503. Illustrations to many of these manuscripts have been reproduced in the following articles: Zeren Tanandı, “Sultanlar, Şairler ve İmgeler: Şehnâme-i Firdevsi’nin Mukaddimesinin Resimleri,” *U.Ü. Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, Yıl 9, Sayı 15 (2008/2): 267-96; İnal, “Şah Abbas Dönemi Şehnamelerinin Minyatürleri.”

⁵⁰⁰ *Shāhnāma* 13.228.11 is the outlier in having lacquer covers painted in an archaizing style that is of Qajar provenance.

⁵⁰¹ Çağman and Tanındı, “Firdevsi’nin Şāhnamesi’nde Geleneğin Değişimi,” 156.

and diplomatic route linking Transoxiana to Anatolia and H.1514 might have also changed hands there, having been written out in Bukhara by Maḥmūd of Balkh half a century before. I mentioned above the delegation sent from Tashkent combining their political duties with a pilgrimage to the Hijaz, riding with members who could have carried manuscripts with them.

Whereas scholars have analyzed manuscript productions from Baghdad and truncated *Shāhnāma* versions through the lens of Safavid and Ottoman exchanges, the *Shāhnāma* manuscripts H.1514 and H.1503 are specimens of Abū'l-Khairid and Ottoman interchange but not at the courtly level.⁵⁰² Manuscripts H.1514 and H.1503 are evidence that copyists living in Abū'l-Khairid centers along with whole, unillustrated texts were transferred to courtly and commercial workshops likely under Ottoman administration in the sixteenth century, where artists there filled in the illustrations on site.

III.ii.c. Courtly Firdausian *Shāhnāma* copies gifted after 1575

In the last quarter of the sixteenth century, Safavid representatives continued to present lavishly prepared Firdausian *Shāhnāma* manuscripts as gifts to Ottoman royals and nobles. This was in spite of, and even enhanced by, the Safavid-Ottoman wars taking place between 1578–1590.⁵⁰³ In 1576, Ṭahmāsp sent another embassy led by Tūqmāq Khān and gifted illuminated manuscripts including a *Shāhnāma* copy to celebrate Sultan Murad III's succession; however, curiously, no Bukharan ambassadors seem to have attended that same event.⁵⁰⁴ This festival in Istanbul in 1576 is depicted in the first volume of the Ottoman ruler-*nāma*, the *Shāhan-shāhnāma* dated 1581.⁵⁰⁵

Later in 1582, Shah Khudābanda (r. 1578–87) sent the Safavid ambassador Ibrāhīm Khān to the eight-week circumcision festival of the sultan's son Mehmet which began in June. This time Mustafa Âli reported that the Safavid emissary “presented gifts both to the Sultan and the young heir [which included] a gilded Qur'ān, manuscripts of the *Shāhnāma* and a *Khamṣa* of Nizāmi, both decorated by

⁵⁰² Baghdad as a center of manuscript production has been most recently examined by Taner, “Caught in a Whirlwind.”

⁵⁰³ Asserted by Filiz Çağman and Zeren Tanındı, “Remarks on Some Manuscripts from the Topkapı Palace Treasury in the Context of Ottoman-Safavid Relations,” *Muqarnas* 13 (1996): 132–48.

⁵⁰⁴ According to Burton, little is known about the first embassy sent by ‘Abdullāh Khan (“Relations between the Khanate of Bukhara and Ottoman Turkey,” 87). It was led by ‘Alī Bahādur Hajjī who probably left Bukhara in 1574–75, then returned to Bukhara in 1576–77 bearing a letter from the new Ottoman Sultan Murad III praising ‘Alī's eloquence committing to fight the Safavids together. The next Uzbek ambassador (so far unidentified) would visit Istanbul in June 1582 for the circumcision of Murad's son Mehmet.

⁵⁰⁵ IUL F.1404, ff.41v–42r.

famous Persian artists.”⁵⁰⁶ Invited but unable to attend, ‘Abdullāh Khan dispatched seven *deste* (Ottoman measurement of ten-twelve units) of sable furs, sixty-three musk grains, two decorated amulets to guard against plague, a Qur’ān, and a *Shāh u gadā* manuscript of Hilālī with miniatures.⁵⁰⁷ In May 1582, a month before acquiring these goods sent by “the Khan of the Uzbeks” (as articulated by the Ottoman chronicler in attendance) ‘Abdullāh, the Ottoman grand vizier Osman Paşa received orders about the dispatch of weapons and soldiers to the Uzbek ambassador when his entourage arrived at Demirkapı.⁵⁰⁸ In the early-modern era—much as today— we see diplomacy paired with international arms deals. Rifles and janissaries were dispatched using a northern route over the Black Sea through the Crimea, avoiding Safavid territory to reach Bukhara.⁵⁰⁹

The importance of the 1582 pīshkash displays from the foreign delegations is recorded textually and visually in the second volume of the *Shāhan-shāhnāma* in which queues of figures process through the Gate of Felicity in the Topkapı Palace bearing these manuscripts and gifts.⁵¹⁰ *Shāhnāma* manuscripts continued to be given by the Safavids to the Ottomans through the 1590s.⁵¹¹ However, after both Safavid and Abū’l-Khairid ambassadors were present and observed each others’ offerings in 1582, the subsequent exchange in 1594 suggests rival displays of gift-giving by the Safavid and Abū’l-Khairid emissaries to the Ottoman court.

‘Abdullāh must have heard reports of what the Safavids presented to Murad III at the 1582 circumcision festival, and perhaps sought to curry favor with the Ottoman sultan by offering the only royal *Shāhnāma* manuscript that he had produced when the next opportunity arose. Fortunately, Ottoman historian Selânikî (Mustafa Efendi, ca. 1545–1600) chronicles the visit of the Uzbek envoy

⁵⁰⁶ Mustafa Âli lists the gifts the Safavid *īlchī* (ambassador) Ibrāhīm Khān brought, and adds that he was “infamous for his gaudy, second-rate writing” (*Epic Deeds*, 124).

⁵⁰⁷ The gifts listed in the original roster in the Topkapı archives (D.9614, f.9a) are described by Hedda Reindl-Kiel, “Power and Submission: Gifting at Royal Circumcision Festivals in the Ottoman Empire (16th–18th centuries),” *Turcica: Revue d’Études Turques* 41 (2009): 53, fn. 96. The gifted Qur’ān manuscript may have been a copy originally produced for ‘Abd al-‘Azīz in 1545 (App. 6c, no. 26). The Hilālī manuscript may have been transcribed in 1539 by Sultān Muḥammad Nūr but then later illustrated in 1565 (App. 6b, no. 14).

⁵⁰⁸ Letter dated 2 Jumādā I 990 (25 May 1582). BOA no. DVNSMHM.d 47/337.

⁵⁰⁹ Information on 16th-century passages frequented by ambassadors, pilgrims, and merchants is in Horikawa, “The Shaybanid Dynasty and the Ottoman Empire,” 65–67; and Levi, “Transformation of the Central Asian Caravan Trade.”

⁵¹⁰ TSMK B.200, ff.36v–37r, dated between 1592–97.

⁵¹¹ Soudavar describes Safavid *Shāhnāma* copies sent in 1584 to Sultan Murad III (*Art of the Persian Courts*, 66). Uluç observes how Haidar Mīrzā, Shah ‘Abbās I’s six-year-old nephew and hostage sent following a Safavid-Ottoman peace treaty, arrived in Istanbul 15 January 1590 and may have presented a *Shāhnāma* (H.1475) to Ferhad Paşa or Murad III. Uluç explains how Ottoman elites acquired Shirazi *Shāhnāma* manuscripts, purchased and as gifts, which they in turn presented to the sultan, such as those presented by Safavid emissary Zū’l-Fiqr Khān in 1595 [“A Persian Epic, Perhaps for the Ottoman Sultan,” 67–68]. Zarinebaf-Shahr documents a long list of manuscripts gifted by the embassy headed by Mahdī Qulī Khān to Murad III on 19 January 1590 (“Cross-Cultural Contacts in Eurasia,” 539). Komaroff notes gifts of poetical works and a Qur’ān said to be penned by the hand of ‘Alī himself (*Gifts of the Sultan*, 19).

Adtāsh Bahādur, from his arrival to the Sublime Porte in Istanbul on 4 January 1594 until his departure six weeks later.⁵¹² He recounts how the ambassador “tendered gifts and presents” including pelts, readymade fur garments, and five yak tails to be hung around the necks of horses, all of which historian Audrey Burton argues were “no doubt intended to show that ‘Abdullāh had healthy trade links with Muscovy and Siberia.”⁵¹³ In addition, Adtāsh Bahādur also presented two Qur’ān manuscripts (or one in two volumes), a *Khamisa* of Nizāmī, and of course the *Shāhnāma* manuscript under discussion.⁵¹⁴ In comparison to the gifts presented earlier at the 1582 circumcision ceremony, by 1594 the Uzbeks offered objects of greater value. Perhaps the gift of both *Khamisa* and *Shāhnāma* volumes that year reflects the Safavid ambassador Ibrāhīm Khān’s offerings in 1592 which acknowledged Ottoman appetites for Persian poetry by Firdausī and Nizāmī.

What is more, as opposed to 1582, by 1594 ‘Abdullāh Khan’s status had steadily risen after consolidating his power over the Abū’l-Khairid appanages to become its great khan in 1582. He no longer had to share power with Samarqand; it was centralized solely in Bukhara. ‘Abdullāh dispatched the ambassador Adtāsh Bahādur to Istanbul immediately following his conquest of Khwarazm. Along with the pīshkash gifts, Adtāsh carried a letter written in Turki and addressed “from the Ruler of the Vilayet of Samarkand and Bukhara, the Uzbek Tatar His Excellency ‘Abdu’llah Khan.”⁵¹⁵ ‘Abdullāh’s choice of title flaunts his unification of Samarqand and Bukhara to his Ottoman recipient.

Before then, ‘Abdullāh undertook campaigns against the Khwarazmians, the Kazakhs, the Tajiks, the Turkomans, Mughals, and Safavids with the aim of recapturing the full extent of territory briefly ruled by his ancestor Muḥammad Shībānī Khan.⁵¹⁶ This was the justification for ‘Abdullāh’s attack on Iran to secure control over the Khurasan province in 1588, the core subject of Chapter 4 to

⁵¹² Audrey Burton names Ushāh Bahādur as ‘Abdullāh’s emissary [*The Bukharans: A Dynastic, Diplomatic and Commercial History 1550–1702* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1997), 78]. Peachy translates and analyzes events taking place in the Sublime Porte between January 1593 through early May 1594 (“A Year in Selānikī’s History”). T.I. Sultanov also recounts the ambassadorial visit [“Sredneaziatskaia i vostochnoturkestanskaia pozdnesrednevekovaia rukopisnaia kniga,” in *Rukopisnaya kniga v kul’ture narodov vostoka* (Moscow: Izdatel’stvo Nauka, 1987): 478–503].

⁵¹³ Burton, *The Bukharans*, 78. Zdzisław Zygmuntski Jr. explains the significance of furs to the Ottomans: “Some parts of Anatolia and of Rumelia, with a cold winter climate, justified the use of furs, but in the court fashion of Istanbul furs signified simply the highest rank and wealth. Particularly in demand were the sable, squirrel, and black fox needed for the lining and edging of hilats (ceremonial caftans) and mantles of brocade” [*Ottoman Art in the Service of the Empire* (New York: New York University Press, 1992), 118–21].

⁵¹⁴ This manuscript is speculated to be either TSMK R.863 or MMA 13.228.7 (App. 6c, nos. 3, 25).

⁵¹⁵ Translated in sections XCVI: “The Arrival of an Envoy with a Letter from the Tatar Uzbek Khan ‘Abdu’llāh and the Welcome Accorded Him”; XCVIII: “The Arrival at the Sublime [Porte] of the Envoy of the Khan of the Tatar Uzbeks”; CVIII: “The Kissing of the Hand of Leave by the Envoy of the Khan of the Uzbeks and his Departure” in Peachy, “A Year in Selānikī’s History.”

⁵¹⁶ Annanepesov, “Relations between the Khanates and with other Powers,” 84.

come. ‘Abdullāh’s military aims to restore the original Abū’l-Khairid borders caused great alarm and frantically-formed alliances in the neighboring regions of Safavid Iran, the Mughals in South Asia, and the Kazakhs based in the Central Eurasian Steppe. The Russian Tsar Feodor of Muscovy (r. 1584–98) also appealed to ally with a Kazakh coalition to help Iran against ‘Abdullāh of Bukhara.⁵¹⁷ Despite a one-year lag in correspondence given the technology of the times, the Ottomans and Uzbeks attempted to coordinate attacks on the eastern and western flanks of the Safavid empire to keep the Iranians engaged and their military power distracted and divided. This strategy seems to have been in the forefront of ‘Abdullāh’s mind at the height of his military power in the 1590s.

Burton describes how by 1589, friendly relations between the Sublime Porte and Bukhara had actually weakened. Murad III “consider[ed the] Uzbeks rulers of a petty state, anxious to curb schemes for expansion which seemed excessive and inconsistent with [their] insignificant status.”⁵¹⁸ She notes that was in comparison to earlier in the century, when the Ottomans were the predominant power in the region and “relations were and remained friendly, and [an] unequal partnership flourished, bringing benefits to both sides.”⁵¹⁹ By 1594, the relationship between khan and sultan had become complicated when the Uzbeks were poised to conquer parts of Iran near Turkey. Murad III sent no congratulations on ‘Abdullāh’s success in Khurasan in 1588, only an acknowledgement of the takeover of Herat.⁵²⁰ Burton recounts:

‘Abdullāh must have resented the Sultan’s strongly expressed disapproval of further Bukharan expansion in Khurasan. ... This, surely, was an intolerable attempt to curtail his freedom of action and... it was clear that their earlier friendship had not survived the news of ‘Abdullāh’s victories. All traces of Ottoman goodwill for the khanate had in fact disappeared ... with apprehension in Istanbul, for it was thought that ‘Abdullāh might follow such a conquest with an attack on Iran proper, after which he would become Turkey’s dangerous and unwelcome neighbour. [...] In August 1592, [Murad III] went so far as to promise that he would support the Shah against ‘Osbeck Tatares.’⁵²¹

Burton’s observations illuminate the context of Ottoman political machinations when the Abū’l-Khairids presented their *Shāhnāma*: the Ottomans would secretly aid the Safavids over the Uzbeks!

⁵¹⁷ Burton, “The Fall of Herat,” 119.

⁵¹⁸ Burton, “Relations between the Khanate of Bukhara and Ottoman Turkey,” 88.

⁵¹⁹ Ibid., 103.

⁵²⁰ Burton, *The Bukharans*, 73.

⁵²¹ Ibid., 74.

When ‘Abdullāh Khan acted through Adtāsh to present his *Shāhnāma* to Murad III in 1594, it was in the midst of the Abū’l-Khairid occupation of Khurasan and recent victory over the neighboring Khwarazmian ruler Ḥajjim Khan. After the Khivan khan’s defeat by ‘Abdullāh, when an “innumerable Tatar army... poured like a raging flood upon the Khan of the Vilayet of Khwarazm,” the vanquished ruler took refuge with the Safavid shah ‘Abbās I in Qazvin.⁵²² ‘Abdullāh’s letter circuitously asked his assumed allies, the Ottomans, to plead with the Safavids to expel Ḥajjim Khan out of Iran and into the hands of the Abū’l-Khairids so he could obtain vengeance and secure his control over Khwarazm. However, the Ottoman ruler replied that “now is not the time” to vex the Safavid shah into giving up the Khwarazmian refugee.⁵²³ A few years prior in 1590, the Ottomans sought peace with the Safavids and concluded a treaty in which the Ottoman Empire kept most of its gains. Ḥaidar Mīrzā, the nephew of Shah ‘Abbās, was held hostage in the Ottoman court to ensure peace would hold, so long as he lived. What is more, since 1593 the Ottoman Empire pursued a new and costly war against the Habsburgs with an ongoing campaign in Serbia, so they could not endure further political entanglements.

Nearing the end of this excursus, a contemporary account of the Ottoman–Abū’l-Khairid relationship by a seemingly impartial witness provides final insight into the historical dynamics of this period. Anthony Sherley (1565–1635), Elizabeth I’s envoy to Shah ‘Abbās I between 1598–1601, presents the Uzbeks as “uncouth frontiersmen who do the bidding of the Ottomans ‘whose religion they professe.’”⁵²⁴ Despite his criticisms, he accurately portrays the power dynamic between Iran’s neighbors to the west and the east as an alliance of convenience couched in confessional terms. However, the Ottomans were still the authoritative power and wished to preserve it. In 1594, ‘Abdullāh wanted to pursue a simultaneous strategy against Iran more than Murad III was willing. In 1590 following a war lasting twelve years, the Ferhad Paşa Treaty was agreed between the Safavids and the Ottomans. In it, the Safavids ceded territories long held by Iranian authorities to the Ottomans: Georgia, parts of Armenia and Azerbaijan, Baghdad, and swathes of Mesopotamia. The Ottomans

⁵²² Peachy, “A Year in Selâniki’s History,” 339.

⁵²³ Ibid., 358.

⁵²⁴ Sherley would write these words while reflecting on his travels from years earlier. Quoted in K. Şahin and J. Schleck, “Courtly Connections: Anthony Sherley’s *Relation of his travels* (1613) in a Global Context,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 69, no. 1 (2016): 106. Other accounts of non-Muslim ambassadors on perceptions of Bukhara or Uzbeks are mentioned in Allworth, *The Modern Uzbeks*, 85; Scott C. Levi and Ron Sela, eds., “Anthony Jenkinson: an English Merchant in Central Asia,” in *Islamic Central Asia: An Anthology of Historical Sources* (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2010), 215–21; Foltz, *Mughal India and Central Asia*, 42–44; Rudi Matthee quoting the French visitor Jean Chardin to the late-seventeenth century Safavid court claims Iranians looked down upon the Russians and the Uzbeks in the same way as “filthy, uncultured, and obtuse” [“Facing a Rude and Barbarous Neighbor,” in *Iran Facing Others: Identity Boundaries in a Historical Perspective*, eds. Abbas Amanat and Farzin Vajdani (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2012), 103].

sought to uphold this peace agreement and retain the annexed lands in the years that followed.

Therefore, keeping their word to the Safavids in 1594 was more important than the Ottomans' rapport with the Abū'l-Khairids at the time.

Edward Allworth's chapter on diplomacy in Central Asia is relevant to this present study on pīshkash practices in or by inhabitants of Transoxiana. Diplomacy "was a metaphor for sovereignty in Central Asia [raising] the problem of parity. ... Central Asian rulers who participated in diplomatic exchanges aspired to recognition and permanence in their sovereign roles and wanted to impress the rulers they dealt with."⁵²⁵ Seen in this light, 'Abdullāh Khan's presentation of his *Shāhnāma* is an expression of power, patronage, and opulent gift-giving—not tribute—to a receiving head of state whom he viewed as his equal.

By parting with his *Shāhnāma*, 'Abdullāh Khan selected an unusual offering. Manuscripts presented as diplomatic gifts were typically completed first. However, while its text was complete, the volume remained only half-illustrated which contrasts all the other complete and distinguished works presented by ambassadors to the Ottoman palace.⁵²⁶ It is as though the empty picture boxes beg for the Ottoman sultan to commission his nakkaṣhane to complete the grand designs initiated by the Uzbeks. To me, it serves as a metaphor for 'Abdullāh's aims at territorial conquest and his desires for Uzbek-Ottoman collaboration to dominate Safavid Iran, by *infilling* the expanse separating their empires. But much like the state of the manuscript today, Ottoman interaction is only attested to by its absence and Abū'l-Khairid efforts remained one-sided, and incomplete.

IV. Conclusion

The Firdausian *Shāhnāma* is a multi-layered phenomenon. Factors such as its reproduction and gifting are statements of legitimacy and rulership in the period currently under study, and less so are they markers of identity. When the manuscript H.1488 was produced in 1564, 'Abdullāh Khan aspired to rule a unified Transoxiana and broader Khurasan. Both Abū'l-Khairid and Safavid polities ultimately succeeded in restructuring their systems of governance later in the sixteenth century. Upon ascending the throne in 1588, political consolidation under Shah 'Abbās I curtailed qizilbāsh administrative and

⁵²⁵ Allworth, *The Modern Uzbeks*, 79.

⁵²⁶ Tanındı, "Additions to Illustrated Manuscripts in Ottoman Workshops," 157.

military power and unified it under his direct control, as opposed to decentralized Mongol governance.⁵²⁷ Safavid reliance on Mongol models ruptured when ‘Abbās extricated himself from the qizilbāsh grip and moved the capital from Qazvin to Isfahan in 1598. Significantly, however, ‘Abdullāh Khan’s own centralizing policies and final defeat of the last blood rival in 1579 predate these Safavid reforms. If we define dynastic centralization as the establishment of an imperial capital, stimulation of trade to fund the state, patronage of shrines and religious architecture to support ideology, and curtailing the power of male relatives through imprisonment or death, then the Perso-Islamicate shift from Turco-Mongol customs actually took place in Transoxiana before it did in Iran.⁵²⁸

By 1578, ‘Abdullāh had launched a line of succession intending to pass authority to his son who was installed in Balkh as heir-apparent. In June 1582 ‘Abdullāh ascended the white felt carpet and assumed the title of great khan to administer his newly unified domain. Parting with illustrated works of poetry from his own collection was a diplomatic tool wielded as a regional leader operating in a new role as a singular monarch lording over his domain.

⁵²⁷ Sussan Babaie, et al., *Slaves of the Shah: New Elites of Safavid Iran* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2004), 13.

⁵²⁸ These distinguishing features of dynastic centralization in Turco-Persianate domains are listed in Liesbeth Geevers, “Safavid Cousins on the Verge of Extinction: Dynastic Centralization in Central Asia and the Bahrāmī Collateral Line (1517-1593),” *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 58 (2015): 293-326.