



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 5

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

Previously in Chapters 3 and 4, connections between the Ottomans and Abū'l-Khairids were manifested via manuscript transfers, be they 'Abdullāh's Persian-language *Shāhnāma* to Murad III, or the Turkic-language *Shāhnāma* theorized to have been scribed in Istanbul and reworked in Khurasan. In the third and fourth periods of Abū'l-Khairid manuscript production, the artisans 'Abdullāh Khan had formerly employed dispersed and sought commissions from the local Abū'l-Khairid military and religious aristocracy. Others ventured abroad to find their fortune in Mughal dynasty (1526–1857) domains and further south. This final chapter covers the fifth period, in which artisans formerly associated with Abū'l-Khairid workshops found employment with the new Tūqāy-Tīmūrid dynasty emerging in Transoxiana (1598–1740; Map 3: The Tūqāy-Tīmūrid domain, ca. 1605). They also trained in Indo-Persian workshops in India following 'Abdullāh's death in 1598, which marks the end of Abū'l-Khairid power.

The prior shift that occurred, during which Abū'l-Khairids toppled Timurid dynasts circa 1500, indicates an external regime change. In this scenario, a Jūchid line replaced a Chaghataid to restore a perceived Chinggisid legitimacy. Later in circa 1600 when power transferred from Abū'l-Khairid to Tūqāy-Tīmūrid control, it essentially constituted an internal restructuring of political authority because both were Jūchid lines.⁶³² During these two eras at the start and end of the sixteenth century, artisans

⁶³² Known by various names, the preferred “Tūqāy-Tīmūrid” label for this group emphasizes their descent from Chinggis Khan's other grandson Tūqāy Tīmūr (brother to Shībān) who was given the lands that would become the Golden Horde. The other dynastic designation “Astrakhanid” refers to the group's geographic connections to Astrakhan on the Caspian Sea. A Chinggisid prince from Astrakhan, Yār Muḥammad, fled the Russian invasion in 1556. 'Abdullāh Khan's father Iskandar welcomed him, and allowed him to marry 'Abdullāh's own sister Ma'sūma. The “Jānid” appellation used for the Tūqāy-Tīmūrids refers to Jānī Muḥammad, the attributed first ruler after the fall of Abū'l-Khairid rule. Jānī Muḥammad, the son of Yār Muḥammad Khān, should not be confused with the 1550s Abū'l-Khairid leader of the same name. Janid and Astrakhanid dynastic classifications assume a clear-cut chronological and dynastic shift. However, given the power struggles and decentralized rulership at the time, the situation was more complex and opaque. Jānī Muḥammad administered Samarqand while his son Bāqī Muḥammad made Bukhara his operational base while doing away with the Abū'l-Khairid dynasts there. Information derived from Audrey Burton, “Imam Quli and Iran,” in *Proceedings of the Third European Conference of Iranian Studies held in Cambridge, 11th to 15th September 1995*. Part 2: Mediaeval and Modern Persian Studies, ed. Charles Melville (Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 1999), 289; Idem, “Who were the First Ashtarkhānid Rulers of Bukhara?” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 51, no. 3 (1988): 482-88; R.D. McChesney, “The ‘Reforms’ of Bāqī Muḥammad Khān,” *Central Asiatic Journal* 24, no. 1/2 (1980): 69-84. For information on the twists and turns of the interregnum between summer 1598–spring 1599, consult McChesney, “CENTRAL ASIA VI. In the 16th-18th Centuries.”

working in them produced *Shāhnāma* manuscripts for local Jūchids in Transoxiana, and also Chaghataid clientele who had migrated south to India.



Map 3: The Tūqāy-Tīmūrid domain, ca. 1605. Taken from Thomas Welsford, *Four Types of Loyalty in Early Modern Central Asia: the Tūqāy-Tīmūrid Takeover of Greater Mā Warā al-Nahr, 1598-1605* (Leiden, 2013), 304.

I. Ottomans in decline, Mughals on the rise

While we previously reviewed manuscripts that revealed Ottoman connections, Istanbul and Baghdad do not figure in this present chapter. Although a powerful authority in the mid-sixteenth century, the Sublime Porte had started to precipitously weaken in the final quarter. As a result, artistic exchanges with Abū'l-Khairids petered out while the Mughals' patronage superseded the Ottomans in attracting artisans and merchants from Transoxiana and Iran. In just two decades, Ottoman currency devalued to such an extent that the *akçe* (the main silver coinage) in the 1580s was worth half of what it was in the 1560s.⁶³³

⁶³³ Baki Tezcan, "The Ottoman Monetary Crisis of 1585 Revisited," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 52, no. 3 (2009): 460-504.

The currency in Transoxiana had become similarly debased, weighing less than half a Mughal rupee in the sixteenth century and becoming increasingly worthless after the death of ‘Abdullāh Khan.⁶³⁴ Mustafa ‘Āli himself witnessed both the Ottoman empire’s political weakening (which he attributed to ignorance and corruption), and the concomitant decline in royal artistic patronage. ‘Āli hyperbolically “demanded that all palace artists be killed” as they pandered to the sultans’ appeals to decorum and pretense rather than actual erudition and refinement.⁶³⁵ ‘Āli “specifically calls miniature painters ‘a bunch of disgraceful, ill-fortuned wretches... inhabiting the corners of coffee houses and wine taverns[. ...Their] revenues should immediately be cut off’.”⁶³⁶ Facing shrinking financial resources at the court, in the late sixteenth century Ottoman artisans turned to lesser, independent patrons and collectors in the noble classes: viziers, pashas, governors, finance ministers, chancellors and provincial land grant holders (*timar*).⁶³⁷ Similarly, Abū’l-Khairid artisans also turned to patrons outside the central court during the same period.

The Ottoman decline and weakened state of the late Abū’l-Khairid and early Tūqāy-Tīmūrid dynasties correspond to the ascent of the Mughals and Deccan Sultanates in India. Some artisans who formerly worked for the Abū’l-Khairids in Bukhara and Khurasan went to India where they received training. They then later returned to a Transoxiana ruled by the Tūqāy-Tīmūrid dynasty that administered a smaller region than that formerly held by the Abū’l-Khairids. For this reason, we see a shift in artistic styles in Uzbek painting that assimilate Indo-Persianate forms. After discussing fin-de-siècle geo-political affairs in Transoxiana and the dynastic shift from Abū’l-Khairid to Tūqāy-Tīmūrid administration, I will address a group of commercial Firdausian *Shāhnāma* manuscripts copied in Samarqand meant for purchase. Created in the early years of the new Tūqāy-Tīmūrid dynasty, Karin Rührdanz and Maria Szuppe both previously examined them.⁶³⁸ Another unpublished copy held in the Abu Rayhan Biruni Institute of Tashkent also relates to this group.

Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* manuscripts fall into two categories: a prolific shorter period of commercial production between 1600–05, and a longer decade in circa 1610–20 which saw fewer copies produced, but of higher aesthetic standards. After asserting their talents, some of the original

⁶³⁴ Foltz, *Mughal India and Central Asia*, 21.

⁶³⁵ Mustafa ‘Āli, *Epic Deeds of Artists*, 111.

⁶³⁶ *Ibid.*, 103, fn. 56.

⁶³⁷ *Ibid.*, 92.

⁶³⁸ Rührdanz, “The Samarqand Shahnamas”; Szuppe, “Family and Professional Circle of Two Samarkand Calligraphers.”

artists in the earlier period later went on to produce the more lavish manuscripts for courtly and religious elites. The career of the particularly active and well-known artist Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī appears well-documented due to his signatures appearing on works. He filled in all the empty picture spaces to the Firdausian *Shāhnāma* that was scribed earlier in Khiva in 1556 reviewed in Chapter 4. Here, we analyze the illustrations of this manuscript that he added to it, and delve into his training in northern India that I argue coincided with the death of the Mughal emperor Akbar and the accession of Jahāngīr in 1605.

Alongside these bound *Shāhnāma* texts, I will analyze isolated folios held in the British and Fitzwilliam Museums, and the Los Angeles County Museum of Art. I will examine select illustrations to the Samarqandī *Shāhnāma* manuscripts and attend to the ways in which artists interacted with earlier compositions and figures from the royal Abū'l-Khairid kitābkhāna in Bukhara, and other illustrative models from the Khurasan workshops. I will conclude both the chapter and dissertation as a whole with a topic worth exploring in more detail: the migration of artisans and manuscripts between Transoxiana and India. The Mughals avidly received ruler-*nāma* copies enumerating Chinggisid, Timurid, and Abū'l-Khairid dynastic lines. Personnel and materials transferred from domains overseen by the Tūqāy-Tīmūrids to the Mughals; the manuscript arts on both sides benefited from this exchange.

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

In the last chapter, we encountered Abū'l-Khairid governors tasked with controlling parts of Khurasan that had come under the command of 'Abdullāh Khan. Some of these local administrators, like Dīn Muḥammad, availed themselves of the workshops in and around Herat to commission illustrated manuscripts (the subject of Chapter 4). Qul Bābā, 'Abdullāh's second in command, had fought alongside 'Abdullāh Khan's son 'Abd al-Mu'mīn in the Abū'l-Khairid victory in the third Khurasan war in 1588. Whereas Qul Bābā received Herat, 'Abd al-Mu'mīn surely felt snubbed when he was ordered back to Balkh to lead that smaller appanage. He assumed he was entitled to a position of power based on his birthright, even if others surpassed his military and administrative prowess.

With 'Abdullāh Khan's death in February 1598, 'Abd al-Mu'mīn seized Bukhara and assuaged his jealousy by killing Qul Bābā.⁶³⁹ 'Abd al-Mu'mīn in turn was assassinated just four months after his

⁶³⁹ Qul Bābā's demise recounted by multiple period chroniclers is recorded in Rosemary Stanfield-Johnson, "Yuzbashi-ye Kurd Bacheh and 'Abd al-Mu'min Khan the Uzbek: A Tale of Revenge in the Dastan of Husayn-e Kurd," in *Muraqqa' e Sharqi*, eds. Soussie Kerman-Rastegar and Anna Vanzan (Dogana: AIEP Editore S.r.l., 2007), 168-70. Muṭribī Samarqandī's account is in *Nuskhah-yi zībā-yi Jahāngīrī*, 126.

rule began.⁶⁴⁰ Between the autumn of 1598 until summer of 1599, Qazaqs occupied Samarqand before Dīn Muḥammad's brother Bāqī Muḥammad liberated the city and was rewarded with its governorship.⁶⁴¹ Bāqī Muḥammad actually supported the Abū'l-Khairids and had no desire for insurrection. Samarqand at this point operated as an alternative princely court by the inchoate Tūqāy-Tīmūrids to compete with Bukhara, which was the site of ongoing inter-Jūchid clashes. In contrast, Dīn Muḥammad proclaimed an independent khanate in Khurasan and Sistan and promised vassalage to Shah 'Abbās I in exchange for Safavid aid, but he later changed his mind and as a result was killed in Herat by attacking Safavid armies.⁶⁴² The Safavids thus reabsorbed Khurasan into their fold. Prior to his death, Dīn Muḥammad appointed his father Jānī Muḥammad governor of Samarqand, which officially precipitated the Tūqāy-Tīmūrid dynastic line in 1599.⁶⁴³ Bāqī Muḥammad received critical military support from the Ottoman sultan Mehmet III in his domestic struggle against his brother Valī Muḥammad for control of Samarqand.⁶⁴⁴ This weaponry also aided Bāqī Muḥammad and the Uzbek general Rustam Muḥammad Khan to successfully repel a Safavid attempt to take Balkh in 1602. This event further consolidated Tūqāy-Tīmūrid power.⁶⁴⁵

Upon Jānī Muḥammad's death in Samarqand in 1603, Imām Qulī Khan, son of Dīn Muḥammad, assumed control. Then, after ousting his uncle Valī Muḥammad in 1611, he ascended the Bukharan throne. Imām Qulī ruled Samarqand between 1603–11 while Valī Muḥammad administered Bukhara during the same period. Significantly, after his expulsion in 1611, Valī Muḥammad visited Shah 'Abbās I at the recently-established Safavid capital at Isfahan, where he is depicted in the courtly

⁶⁴⁰ 'Abdullāh died on 8 February 1598 (2 Rajab 1006); 'Abd al-Mu'mīn on 30 June 1598. These troubled months are enumerated by Burton, *The Bukharans*, 95; and idem, "First Ashtarkhanid Rulers." Thomas Welsford has made the disarray of concurrent dynastic dissolution and consolidation in late-sixteenth to early-seventeenth century Transoxiana orderly and comprehensible in *Four Types of Loyalty*.

⁶⁴¹ The Qazaqs remained in Tashkent until 1606. Listed in "Table 28: The Appanage 'khans'" in McChesney, "CENTRAL ASIA VI. In the 16th-18th centuries."

⁶⁴² Foltz, *Mughal India and Central Asia*, 19. Some chronicles say the khanate was to be for himself and his grandfather Yār Muḥammad Khān (Burton, "First Ashtarkhanid Rulers," 483). Details on Shāh 'Abbās's acts in Mashhad immediately following his victory over the Uzbeks are in Sheila Canby, *Shah 'Abbas: the Remaking of Iran* (British Museum Press, London, 2009), 191-95.

⁶⁴³ Welsford describes Dīn Muḥammad's political life (*Four Types of Loyalty*, 54-60).

⁶⁴⁴ Burton reports that in the confused period following 'Abdullāh's death, players were busy establishing power and infighting; no embassies were sent to Istanbul or vice versa until Bāqī Muḥammad Khān restored relations with Mehmet III (d. 1603). Recalling the coalition between Süleyman and Naurūz Aḥmad half a century earlier, Mehmet sent 20 guns and 200 arquebuses to Bukhara for use against the forces of Iran backed by Muscovites and Qazaqs (Burton, "Relations between the Khanate of Bukhara and Ottoman Turkey," 94-95).

⁶⁴⁵ Shah 'Abbās I's ill-fated campaign against the Tūqāy-Tīmūrids at Balkh in 1602 to expand Safavid prestige is covered by Sheila Blair, "The Ardabil Carpets in Context," in *Society and Culture in the Early Modern Middle East: Studies on Iran in the Early Safavid Period*, ed. Andrew J. Newman (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 132.

wall paintings of the Chihil Sutūn Palace.⁶⁴⁶ With Safavid support, Valī Muḥammad sought to retake Bukhara but died in 1612; Imām Qulī Khan would not budge. For the next three decades, Samarqand would fade in importance while the sons of Dīn Muḥammad— Imām Qulī Khan in Bukhara and Nazr Muḥammad in Balkh— presided over a bipartite Uzbek state, with Bukhara as its predominant center.⁶⁴⁷

Quite truly caught between the twilight of the Abū'l-Khairid sixteenth century and the dawn of the Tūqāy-Tīmūrid seventeenth century, documentation dated 31 December 1599 (13 Jumādā II 1008) speaks of the devastation wrought in Transoxiana and Khurasan. The upheaval resulted from wars directed inward during the consolidation of Tūqāy-Tīmūrid power, and outwardly in battles with the troops of Shah 'Abbās.⁶⁴⁸ Akin to the shift from the Timurid to the Abū'l-Khairid dynasties a century earlier, the instability and lack of royal commissions prompted artisans to move again. Previously, they appear to have selected Samarqand and Herat. However, this time they would ultimately gravitate towards Samarqand and northern India as stable sites for artistic creation. This late-sixteenth to early-seventeenth century dispersal of artistic talent coincided with the end of Abū'l-Khairid control over Transoxiana with Bukhara as its centralized capital. The early Firdausian *Shāhnāma* manuscripts produced in Samarqand, discussed next, emerge from this political context.

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

In this final body chapter, as in the first, we explore *Shāhnāma* production at a fin de siècle during an interim period between one dynasty's fall and the onset of another. To make ends meet, artisans privately collaborated with each other to create multiple copies of a small number of titles that they could sell to any prospective client. Firdausian *Shāhnāma* manuscripts appeared during significant moments of dynastic change, much like a century prior. We shall examine some of the nuances of these dynastic displacements and the concomitant surge in Firdausian *Shāhnāma* productions below.

Maria Szuppe and Audrey Burton both note that historical chronicles do not document the first decade or so of Tūqāy-Tīmūrid power very well. However, we can glean information from courtly

⁶⁴⁶ This period of "Dinid" competition (the sons of Dīn Muḥammad) with the "Valid" heirs of Valī Muḥammad is explained in Schwarz, "Safavids and Ozbeks," 361; also in Sussan Babaie, "Shah 'Abbas II, the Conquest of Qandahar, the Chihil Sutun, and Its Wall Paintings," *Muqarnas* 11 (1994): 127.

⁶⁴⁷ Foltz, *Mughal India and Central Asia*, 19.

⁶⁴⁸ The report is written by a Mehmet b. Yusuf el-Hüseyn to the Iranian shah about people in cities located in Samarqand, Herat, Balkh, Bukhara, Tashkent, Khurasan, and Sirgan who ran away to Turkestan due to the wars between khans and sultans (BOA doc. TSMA E 750.9 f).

commissioned historiographies, and also from other popular titles and poetic works. Rührdanz examined a Firdausian *Shāhnāma* group from this period numbering seven codices.⁶⁴⁹ Six feature surprisingly specific colophons listing both the day and year of production spanning 1600 through 1604, and an undated one is linked to them by its illustrations. Remarkably, some of them even name the street in Samarqand as their site of production.⁶⁵⁰ The illustrative cycle of the Khivan *Shāhnāma* written out in 1556 (ARB 1811) relates to this set. Half a century after its ink dried, the artist Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī illustrated the empty spaces and signed his name upon five folios. Such rare documentation of an artist in this period and region afford us invaluable insight. Records attest to his travels in India which I will argue left a mark on his later painting style. We will first consider the earlier Abū'l-Khairid techniques practiced in Khurasan and Bukhara before discussing how Indian painting affected early Tūqāy-Tīmūrid arts of the book in §V.iii.b below.

All these manuscripts betray artisanal migrations during the dynastic change in Transoxiana. Abū'l-Khairid scribes and artists in Bukhara and Khurasan who had worked during the final quarter of the sixteenth century promptly congregated in Samarqand with the establishment of Tūqāy-Tīmūrid rulership. While Jānī Muḥammad (r. 1599–1603) and Imām Qulī (r. 1603–11) oversaw the city, these artisans produced copies of Firdausī's text anew or filled in existing codices. However, they did not make them for those rulers, who did not concern themselves with manuscript patronage.⁶⁵¹ Our discussion of Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* manuscripts divides itself between prolific commercial manuscript production in 1600–05, and a later period that saw fewer copies made, but with a higher aesthetic standard that reflects increased contacts with the Indian subcontinent. Some of those Samarqandi artists later followed Imām Qulī to Bukhara in 1612, and produced more lavish manuscripts for military, religious, and political elites in the center.

III.i. Scribal practices in Samarqand

The turbulent politics commencing in 1598 and the resulting decline in royal patronage prompted legions of itinerant artists to join commercial workshops across Khurasan, India, and also

⁶⁴⁹ Rührdanz, "Samarqand Shahnamas in the Context of Dynastic Change."

⁶⁵⁰ The series, in chronological order of scribal completion, includes: BL IO Islamic 301 (Sha'bān 1008/February 1600); PUL O-16/7249 (Rabī' I 1009/October 1600); PFL 59G (Šafar 1009/September 1601); PUL O-15/7248 (1010/1601-02); NLR PNS 90 (1011/1602-03); AIIT Pers. 2.01 BD (Zū al-qā'da 1012/April 1604); BL Or. 14403 (incomplete and lacking a colophon but stylistically related to the others; ca. 1600-04). Beside year and scribe, the colophons to many of these include the street names of the calligraphers as though to advertise the location of the commercial workshop producing them, and are discussed in: Szuppe, "Family and Professional Circle of Two Samarkand Calligraphers," 326-27; Rührdanz, "Revival of Central Asian painting in the early 17th century," 387-88, fn. 9; idem, "Samarqand Shahnamas in the Context of Dynastic Change," 225.

⁶⁵¹ Rührdanz, "Samarqand Shahnamas in the Context of Dynastic Change," 228-29.

under new Tūqāy-Tīmūrid governance in Transoxiana.⁶⁵² The Samarqand *Shāhnāma* manuscript group reflects a commercial enterprise with staff coordinating work on every component. Some had received more training and produced finer quality compositions, others were more active and produced a larger quantity of illustrations with lesser refinement. Some illustrations in the group copy compositions across versions. Other paintings appear indebted to earlier Abū'l-Khairid workshops in Bukhara and Khurasan.

Akin to the truncated *Shāhnāma* redactions in the *Qīṣaṣ al-anbiyā'* style attributed to Baghdad that we have returned to in Chapters 2 and 3, Rührdanz's examination of the seven Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* manuscripts reveals how they also emphasize fantastic adventures of legendary heroes over Firdausī's final historical section.⁶⁵³ Szuppe further analyzed five of them copied by the scribes Ādīna-yi Bukhārī and Mīr Māh b. Mīr 'Arab.⁶⁵⁴ Thanks to her, the oeuvre of the scribe Ādīna-yi Bukhārī furnishes valuable insight into the collaborative nature of early seventeenth-century manuscript production in Samarqand. The (presumed) Bukhara native Mīr Māh flourished in Samarqand between 1595–1605 where he fully copied three *Shāhnāma* works: BL IO Islamic 301 (February 1600); PUL O-16/7249 (October 1600); and AIIT Pers 2.01 (April 1604). In the midst of these, he completed half of the text in PUL O-15/7248 (1601). Ādīna signed other manuscripts that include Muḥyī al-Dīn Lārī's *Futūḥ al-ḥaramain* (CWH 684, dated 1595), and the anonymous *Tafṣīr-i tazkirat al-anbiyā' wa'l-umām* (BL IO 319, dated 1604). Szuppe acknowledges that more could be discovered.

Szuppe provides some interesting “statistical suppositions” based on the specificity of the colophon dates above. She calculates the average speed of each Ādīna-scribed *Shāhnāma* copy to be around fourteen and fifteen months given that he “produced three and a half copies of the *Shāhnāma* during a period of over four years, 1600-04.”⁶⁵⁵ Szuppe also determines other professional practices of scribes in early seventeenth-century Samarqand (and their capacity to work on concurrent projects). She notes their “semi-serial production process” in transcribing other works, or second copies of the same while in the midst of one assignment.

⁶⁵² Schmitz, “Miniature Painting in Harāt,” 131.

⁶⁵³ Rührdanz distinguishes NLR PNS 90 as the only manuscript of the Samarqandi group more akin to truncated manuscript production in that it has a double-page frontispiece painting and ‘modern’ text model comprising the Baysunghuri preface and parts of the *Garshaspnama* (“Samarqand Shahnamas in the Context of Dynastic Change,” 218).

⁶⁵⁴ Szuppe includes the helpful table “Chronological list of *Shāhnāmas* copied by Ādīna Buḥārī and by Mīr Māh b. Mīr 'Arab” with this information (“Family and Professional Circle of Two Samarkand Calligraphers,” 325).

⁶⁵⁵ Ibid., 333-34, 342.

Ādīna-yi Bukhārī may not have been famous, but he was prolific. The scholar of calligraphic and codicological materials Hamidreza Ghelichkhani explicitly names Ādīna-yi Bukhārī among the most productive of the *Shāhnāma* copyists with his four transcriptions of the work. Questioning why other great scribal masters with more clout than Ādīna did not copy the *Shāhnāma*, Ghelichkhani suggests: “famous calligraphers preferred [titles] which needed less time to be finished in order to create more works at the same time.”⁶⁵⁶

III.ii. Illustrative programs to the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* manuscripts

Whereas a small number of copyists completed the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* manuscripts, the great artistic variety present in their illustrative schemes indicates that many different artists contributed to the overall project.⁶⁵⁷ Rührdanz suggests that all of the contributors probably did not physically interact in a single kitābkhāna setting. More likely, the illustrations “reflect a meeting on the level of models” referring to painters with limited experience and/or reliant upon available designs to reproduce various scenes or recombine figures in the compositions.⁶⁵⁸ While I cannot cover the full stylistic diversity in all the illustrations in this study, I will focus on examples that reflect past visual formulae from Khurasan and Bukhara.

III.ii.a. Elements from late-16th century Khurasan

The Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* copies contain figures and forms associated with the Herat and Mashhad branches of production in Khurasan. One such volume written out by Ādīna-yi Bukhārī (AIIT Pers 2.01 BD) exemplifies artistic transfer from Khurasan to Samarqand within this manuscript group.⁶⁵⁹ Rührdanz’s brief entry on this AIIT manuscript remarks on its “27 illustrations by an inexperienced hand ...[showing] some impact of late 16th-century Qazvin and Herat work.”⁶⁶⁰ However, we can refine her description by making nuanced comparisons.

Stylistically, the AIIT *Shāhnāma* appears closer to illustrations made in Mashhad that are identifiable by colorfully-garbed individuals with slender necks. The previous chapter explained how in

⁶⁵⁶ Ghelichkhani, *The scribes of Shahnameh*, introduction (unpaginated).

⁶⁵⁷ Rührdanz, “Samarqand Shahnamas in the Context of Dynastic Change,” 224.

⁶⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 225.

⁶⁵⁹ Preliminary research on it has been done by Maria Szuppe, “A preliminary account of the Persian Manuscripts in the collection of the late Sir Harold Bailey,” *Iran* 35 (1997): 118-19.

⁶⁶⁰ Rührdanz, “Samarqand Shahnamas in the Context of Dynastic Change,” 218. The comparative example she gives is a loose album folio (BL IOL J.26.6) that has been misattributed to Bukhara at the end of the sixteenth century, instead interpreted as containing elements from Herat (evident in the autumnal *chīnār* tree with magpies perched in the branches and rock renderings). The IOL composition and figures appear to be contemporary to paintings in a *Būstān* of Sa’dī (CBL Pers. 297, f.22a) from a later 1616 Tūqāy-Tīmūrīd workshop.

the late sixteenth century, this style geographically and chronologically crossed both the Oxus and half a century, as Safavid and Abū'l-Khairid spheres converged in the intermediary realm of Khurasan. Thus, the AIIT *Shāhnāma*'s illustrations attributed to the early Tūqāy-Tīmūrid period did not evolve directly from Mashhad, but via artists in Khurasan, or their models from circa 1580 to 1600. The bound work of excerpts from the *Būstān* of Sa'dī in the Soudavar collection (AHT no. 66, fig. 97) examined in Chapter 4 shares some visual elements with the Tajikistan Turkic-language *Shāhnāma*, as well as the AIIT *Shāhnāma*. The AIIT *Shāhnāma* illustration with Rūdāba atop a pink tower handing her hair to Zāl so that he may climb up it (fig. 108) appears as a feminized version of an outdoor gathering in the earlier "late-Mashhad" volume of the Soudavar *Būstān* (fig. 109). Note the crouching attendants dressed in red holding candles in the AIIT manuscript, and in the *Būstān* there is a long-necked wine decanter; in both manuscripts, we also observe a seated figure with knees splayed open. The fuzzy gray cap and *ghabghab*—double chin—on Zāl in the *Shāhnāma* also appear on the servant proffering a white vessel in the *Būstān* folio.

The Khivan *Shāhnāma* illustrated by Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī serves as visual proof of the artist's training in Khurasan in the 1580s and 1590s that underpins his enigmatic personal style.⁶⁶¹ Muḥammad Murād completed all 115 illustrations, sometimes rendered two on a page, with images that face each other in a series of continual painted narratives. In five of these, he signs his name with and without the Samarqandī nisba. Due to the manuscript's colophon giving the date and location of its textual component as Khiva, 1556 (covered in Chapter 3 §II.iii.a), many initially concluded he illustrated it at that time, but subsequent scholarship confirms that he added the manuscript's extensive visual elements half a century later.⁶⁶² As was mentioned, the manuscript contains two fully illuminated, double-page frontispieces based on Herati traditions (ff. 1r-2v, 8r-9v). I previously claimed one of these illuminations (fig. 58) was added once the manuscript arrived in 'Abdullāh Khan's courtly Bukharan kitābkhāna in the late-1550s. Through comparison to the coarser frontispiece adorning the AIIT copy (fig. 110), it becomes obvious that they are not of the same workshop or time period.

⁶⁶¹ E.M. Ismailova and Sh. M. Musaev pinpoint visual elements from Khurasan in "Miniatiury Mukhammeda Murada Samarkandi k Khivinskomu spisku "Shakh-name" (k voprosu o novatorstve khudozhestvennogo stilija)," *O'zbekistonda Ijtimoiy Fanlar* vol. 12 (1983): 42. Rührdanz also notes elements from Khurasan in Muḥammad Murād's practice and suggests he even trained in one of the workshops there ("Die Entwicklung der mittelasiatischen Buchmalerei," 118).

⁶⁶² Descriptions of the illustrations are in Madraimov, et al., *Oriental Miniatures*, 141–60. For in-depth analysis of the corrected visual program, read Ashrafi, "K voprosu o vremeni sozdania miniatur"; O.I. Galerikina, "Zur Charakteristik der Miniaturenmalerei Mawarannahrs im 16. Jahrhundert," *Ars Turcica: Akten des VI. internationalen Kongresses für türkische Kunst, München vom 3. bis 7. September 1979* (Munich, Editio Maris, 1987): 522–31.

Much occurred during the intervening years between the text's completion and the addition of Muḥammad Murād's illustrations, presumably in Samarqand. While Rührdanz dates the paintings to the first decade of the seventeenth century, Mukaddima Ashrafi argues for their completion between 1604 through 1616.⁶⁶³ After comparing the Samarqandi *Shāhnāmas* located in London (BL IO 301), Saint Petersburg (NLR PNS 90), and Cambridge (AIIT 2.01), I argue the illustrations date to the beginning of the seventeenth century. The paintings' similarities to Khurasan manuscripts in the late sixteenth century, and contemporary Samarqand *Shāhnāma* copies from the early seventeenth prompt this revision. A nuanced pre-1605 attribution seems fitting and is derived from other visual traces and clues left by the artist.

Previously working in Abū'l-Khairid-administered Khurasan, Muḥammad Murād might have learned the "spare techniques" of the style popularized by the master Muḥammadī in Herat. Comparing painted folios from Muḥammadī's *Shāhnāma* (CBL Pers. 295, figs. 87-88), we see how Muḥammad Murād adopts compositional devices. The lovers Bīzhan and Manīzha seated beneath an enclosed arch in Muḥammad Murād's composition (fig. 112) derive from Muḥammadī's work circa 1580 (fig. 87). Note the standing female figures with swaying bodies glancing over their shoulders on the left in Muḥammadī's composition, and those in Muḥammad Murād's rendition of Tahmīna approaching Rustam's bed chamber (fig. 112). Muḥammad Murād's female spectators witnessing Faraidūn defeating Żahhāk (fig. 113) also appear similar to those distributing wine in the AIIT *Shāhnāma* (fig. 108); I mentioned earlier how they manifest Mashhadi qualities. Muḥammadī and Muḥammad Murād depict women in their *Shāhnāma* copies sporting elegant black aigrettes rising from their headwear, and their warriors wear the same armor: compare Muḥammadī's climbing soldier in a poppy-red tunic with circular breastplate and black boots (fig. 88), and Muḥammad Murād's version in yellow in fig. 114.⁶⁶⁴

With the onset of tumult in Khurasan upon 'Abdullāh Khan's death in 1598, the Safavid armies under Shah 'Abbās I retook the province. Abū'l-Khairid control waned and the Tūqāy-Tīmūrīds' power waxed, and it is at this time that I posit that Muḥammad Murād ventured from Khurasan back to his

⁶⁶³ Ashrafi, "K voprosu o vremeni sozdania miniatur," 16.

⁶⁶⁴ Rührdanz also indicates his appropriation of forms from Khurasan ("Revival of Central Asian painting in the early 17th century," 390).

presumed hometown.⁶⁶⁵ Samarqand was the site of increased production of commercial copies of the *Shāhnāma* to sell to the regional elites of the new dynasty and elsewhere. The Tūqāy-Tīmūrīds came into possession of unfinished volumes left in the courtly workshops of Bukhara and took these to their base in Samarqand in a move that politically and culturally undermined Abū'l-Khairīd authority. Many artisans subsequently sought to make a living and appeal to potential Tūqāy-Tīmūrīd patronage through these various *Shāhnāma* productions in Samarqand between 1600–04.

Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī illustrated the Khivan manuscript in the context I have presented.⁶⁶⁶ Perhaps motivated less by money, he might have filled in the blank areas to display his innovative artistic skills to secure employment in the new Tūqāy-Tīmūrīd region. He completed the illustrations prior to departing for India, a period which we shall discuss in §V.iii.b.

III.ii.b. Elements from Bukhara

Rührdanz did not deem the illustrations to the Samarqandī *Shāhnāma* group to be of the finest caliber, and suggested they were instead derivative versions of visual models originally produced in late-century commercial workshops within Khurasan.⁶⁶⁷ This is partly true, but Samarqandī *Shāhnāma* compositional schema also reflect vestiges derived from the highest levels of the courtly Abū'l-Khairīd workshops in Bukhara. Several manuscripts of 'Abdullāh's patronage in the 1560s and others produced for nobles have striking floor patterning and wall paneling with hexagons and six-pointed stars. A courtly Bukharan innovation, this tessellation repeats in four Samarqandī *Shāhnāma* copies: BL IO Islamic 301 (fig. 115); BL Or. 14403 (figs. 116, 121); NLR PNS 90 (figs. 122, 127); and in the loose, lavish *Shāhnāma* folios to be discussed below.

Limited to just one courtly *Shāhnāma* copy from Bukhara as a source of inspiration, some of the Samarqandī manuscripts emulate elements from this volume in 'Abdullāh Khan's collection that he gifted to Sultan Murad III (TSMK H.1488, the subject of Chapter 3). Although it does not directly copy an illustration in 'Abdullāh's *Shāhnāma*, the undated Samarqandī *Shāhnāma* in the British Library (ms. Or. 14403) confirms that exchanges of Abū'l-Khairīd models from the courtly kitābhāna in 1560s

⁶⁶⁵ Foltz cites the Mughal chronicle *Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī* that states the artist was either from Marv or Herat (Foltz, *Mughal India and Central Asia*, 81, fn. 57). Whether Samarqand, Marv, or Herat, Muḥammad Murād clearly lived in a center under Abū'l-Khairīd control as a cognitive adult.

⁶⁶⁶ Haider speculates that Khwarazmian ruler Īsh Muḥammad invited the artist to illustrate it in Khiva appears, but does not adequately support her assertion in *Central Asia in the Sixteenth Century*, 354.

⁶⁶⁷ Rührdanz, "Samarqand Shahnamas in the Context of Dynastic Change," 225.

Bukhara reached Samarqand in the early 1600s. Rustam rescuing Bīzhan from a strangely-shaped pit resembling a test tube appears in ‘Abdullāh’s 1564 rendition (fig. 117) as it does in the British Library manuscript (fig. 118).⁶⁶⁸ A perusal of the scene in the *Cambridge Shahnama Project* database only turns up these two distinctive versions of the pit iconography, which intimates their linkage.⁶⁶⁹

Sartorial selection to render characters in the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* manuscripts could also come from designs in H.1488. Soldiers in the AIIT and NLR Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* copies wear helmets with black tufts emerging from pointed tops, akin to those in H.1488 (figs. 61, 65) and the late-century Bukharan *Tīmūr-nāma* copies explored in Chapter 3 §II.iii.b, figs. 46, 71). Warriors in one of the Punjab University Library’s Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* manuscripts (PUL O-15/7248, fig. 140) sport a different version with additional pointed feathers emerging above the black puffs.⁶⁷⁰ This form of headwear is linked not to H.1488, but to the since-dispersed *Shāhnāma* I attributed to Bukhara, post-1570 (Chapter 3 §II.iii.b, fig. 66). Civilian dress also connects certain manuscripts. Rustam as a youth smiting the white elephant wears a similar tunic tucked into his belt as he bludgeons the animal in both H.1488 (f.73r) and PUL O-16/7249. In this same PUL manuscript, Rustam hoists Afrāsiyāb by the belt as do other characters in H.1488 (ff.90r and 69v). I must concede that the mentioned scenes are popular in *Shāhnāma* iconography and so these comparisons to H.1488 may seem superficial. However, a full composition lifted from H.1488 and recopied in the AIIT Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* best points to the circulation of visual material from ‘Abdullāh’s *Shāhnāma* after it had left Transoxiana.

The illustration of Siyāmak being attacked by the div Khazarvān in the AIIT *Shāhnāma* (fig. 119) is directly taken from the same scene in ‘Abdullāh Khan’s courtly volume (fig. 120). In both settings, swathes of color appear layered over one another. A strip of green grass demarcates the foreground, above it pink hills take up the middle ground topped by golden hills in the background, while the uppermost section features a strip of blue sky. The placement of the main characters mirror each other in the two copies. The frantic horse in the center of the compositions has exactly the same hoof positioning and contorted body in both versions; so too, does the large central div who claws the clambering Siyāmak below. We observe both princes’ pointed, turned-out boots and outstretched arms

⁶⁶⁸ The iconography in the folio from H.1488 is appropriated from versions of Yūsuf freed from the well found in contemporaneous copies of Jāmī’s *Yūsuf u Zulaikhā*. Compare MMA 67.266.7.8v; NYPL Spencer Pers. 64; CWH 1872; DC 53.1980; BL Or. 4389; AHT no. 80.

⁶⁶⁹ Accessed 14 May 2020.

⁶⁷⁰ Both plumed helmet types are found in later Tūqāy-Tīmūrid manuscripts, such as a Nizāmī *Khamsa* (NLR PNS 66) dated 1648, and a Firdausian *Shāhnāma* from 1664 (ARB 3463).

braced on the grass in both copies. Two divs and one horseman gather on opposite sides in the AIIT *Shāhnāma*, whereas ‘Abdullāh’s copy has five figures in each group on either side of its composition.

This shared illustration provides insight into the ways visual material transited from Abū’l-Khairid Bukhara to the new Samarqand workshops once regional administration shifted to Tūqāy-Tīmūrid.⁶⁷¹ Given that the Abū’l-Khairid *Shāhnāma* manuscript was presented to the Ottomans in January 1594 and therefore must have left Bukhara by the middle of 1593, it can be assumed that there existed sketches and studies of its individual compositions which continued to circulate amongst artists and workshops in the Uzbek sphere spanning both Bukhara and Samarqand. Although the actual materials have not physically survived, these drawings and models for courtly productions were retained and factored into commercial productions decades later.

The Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* copies directly borrow from other Bukharan manuscripts produced across the last quarter of the sixteenth century, following ‘Abdullāh’s disinterest in manuscripts. They evince how figural and compositional elements, and painters themselves traveled the short distance from Bukhara to Samarqand following the Abū’l-Khairid dissolution. Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* copies BL IO Islamic 301, NLR PNS 90, and BL Or. 14403 contain figures and forms associated with the declining Bukharan workshops. Shāpūr enthroned in BL Or. 14403 (fig. 121) with pink floor patterning and attendants sitting beneath an enthroned monarch appears plucked from a late-century Abū’l-Khairid Bukharan frontispiece. NLR PNS 90 and BL IO Islamic 301 manuscripts have double-page illustrations with courtly scenes that are related to the *Tīmūr-nāma* frontispieces examined in Chapter 3 (figs. 72-73). The NLR copy (fig. 122) features a proper opening frontispiece, but the BL version (fig. 121) places it in a common mid-manuscript break showing Kai Khusrau handing over kingship to Luhrāsp.

III.ii.c. Connections to later materials in different media in Samarqand

Above, I have pointed out the reverberations of past Abū’l-Khairid visual formulae in the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* group. The manuscripts in turn contain figures and compositions that would factor into pictorial cycles of later materials in Samarqand. Lest we think the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* versions only derive or echo forms and styles produced before them, this group also possesses generative qualities later emulated elsewhere.

⁶⁷¹ This story of Siyāmak appears to have held significance to the Abū’l-Khairids. Pouya reports that the *Tārīkh-i Abū’l-Khair Khānī* extensively narrates the story from Firdausī’s *Shāhnāma* in “Intertextual analysis of the History of Abū’l-Khair,” 622.

As a sole example of a motif crossing media, the AIIT *Shāhnāma* contains a small detail that appears on tile-work in Samarqand. In the illustration of Jamshīd enthroned and held aloft by divs (fig. 123), an anthropomorphic sun (not unlike the *khānum khurshīd* design in present-day Iran) peers over the horizon similar to the mosaic faces smiling above the backs of tigers in the Shīrdār Madrasa on the Rīgistān plaza (fig. 124). The ovular heads have slanted eyes, arched eyebrows, wide noses, small dimpled mouths, and symmetric tendrils of hair on the sides of their faces. The tiled version has *khāl* (beauty marks) on the cheeks, whereas the AIIT counterpart on paper has a forehead marking. Ruling on behalf of Imām Qulī, the governor of Samarqand Yalangtūsh Bahādur Alchīn (1578–1656) built the architectural monument between 1619–36, and the mosaics with powerful heraldic symbolism link to him.⁶⁷² Any connection between Yalangtūsh and possible ownership of the AIIT *Shāhnāma* is purely speculative, as Yalangtūsh would have been young in 1604 when the AIIT *Shāhnāma* was created. But as both a military commander and religious elite of the Dihbīdī clan of the Naqshbandī order (as well as one of the wealthiest men in Transoxiana at the time), Yalangtūsh would be an ideal owner of such manuscript copies.⁶⁷³ The books continued to circulate after their completion, and illustrated details could have impacted both their original readers and different art mediums in Samarqand.

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

To the existing studies on the early seventeenth-century Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* group by Rührdanz and Szuppe, I here add an unpublished *Shāhnāma* manuscript located in Tashkent (ARB 872).⁶⁷⁴ It bears a Russian inscription in pencil on the opening page (f.1v) that states it was gifted to General Mikhail Grigorievich Cherniaev (1828–98) in Tashkent in 1865. Having first stormed Shymkent in September 1864, during the reign of Tsar Alexander II and together with Konstantin von

⁶⁷² Yalangtūsh Bī Alchīn's biography is provided in McChesney, "Islamic culture and the Chinggisid restoration," 259-60; Foltz, *Mughal India and Central Asia*, 59, fn. 47. His name, meaning "bare-chested," was an honorific given to him on account of his heroism in battle. The symbolism of the Shīrdār madrasa's decoration scheme, with its lion and sun symbol also in Timūr's coat of arms, is in Brentjes, "Islamic Art and Architecture in Central Asia," 56; Sulhiniso Rahmatullaeva, "Samarqand's Rigestān and its Architectural Meanings," *Journal of Persianate Studies* 3 (2010): 180; Samie, "The Shibanid Question," 154-59.

⁶⁷³ Jasmin Badr and Mustafa Tupev mention Yalangtūsh's wealth in "The Khoja Zainuddin Mosque in Bukhara," *Muqarnas* 29 (2012): 238. Yalangtūsh's Sufi background is in McChesney, "The Chinggisid restoration in Central Asia: 1500-1785," 290.

⁶⁷⁴ A ninth copy might have existed based on two dispersed folios: one in the Netherlands (NMVW RV-2103-4) depicting Qubād slain by Bārmān, and the other with Tūr slain by Manūchīhr formerly in the Keir Collection (DMA K.1.2014.751). Robinson attributes the latter to Bukhara, early 17th century, and its visuals are connected to the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* copies depicting a battle between Iranians and Turanians in St. Petersburg (NLR PNS 90, f. 296v), and London (BL IO Islamic 301, 169b). Note the rearing horses with sinuous necks on the right sides of the compositions.

Kaufman and Mikhail Skobelev, Cherniaev led the Russian conquest of Central Asia and took Tashkent the same year the book was presented to him. The tsar later appointed Cherniaev the Governor General of Turkestan between 1882–84. His *Shāhnāma* is a complete Persian text and has a final section covering the reign of the last Sasanian king Yazdigird, implying it contains Firdausī’s historical section and is not truncated. Multiple blank spaces were reserved for illustrations that were never carried out. It is not a lavish copy, and has but one incomplete illustration (fig. 125) located halfway through the text, and no descriptive information in the colophon placed at the end of the first section. With similar dimensions (24x36 cm) and rulings (4 by 25) as the other Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* copies, it could have been written out between 1600–05 alongside them and was among the last to have had an illustration added in Transoxiana.⁶⁷⁵ Or, if postdating 1605, it could have been drafted in Bukhara when the site became a center of manuscript production under Valī Muḥammad after a brief period of production in Samarqand.⁶⁷⁶ The artist responsible for the Cherniaev illustration, whom I tentatively attribute to the artist Muḥammad Sharīf (to be further discussed in §V.iii.a), appears to have created more paintings later in Bukhara. These were produced after 1612 and were perhaps intended for Valī Muḥammad’s successor Imām Qulī Khan, whose long reign (1612–42) provided political stability in Transoxiana not seen since the reign of ‘Abdullāh Khan.

Cherniaev’s *Shāhnāma* is at once linked to the earlier Samarqandi specimens, and also to a later lavish *Shāhnāma* created in circa 1610–15 with three illustrations to it since dispersed across various museum collections: LACMA’s “Zaḥḥāk enthroned with the two daughters of Jamshid” (fig. 128), the Fitzwilliam Museum’s “Ruler seated in a pavilion surrounded by courtiers and attendants, one of whom is leading in a Christian priest” (Fig. 129), and the British Museum’s painting “The execution of Afrāsiyāb in front of Garsīvāz” (fig. 130).⁶⁷⁷ In crafting a trajectory of early Tūqāy–Tīmūrid manuscript painting utilizing existing Abū’l-Khairid talent, I approach the Cherniaev *Shāhnāma*’s single illustration at a temporal and geographical nexus. Stylistically located between Transoxiana and India,

⁶⁷⁵ One wonders if these measurements and rulings were not a standardized format since a majority of *Shāhnāma* mss. from several locations and time periods have these characteristics as well.

⁶⁷⁶ The other manuscripts that can be attributed to this same workshop in Bukhara are: *Majālis al-‘ushshāq* (ARB 3476 ca. 1606), *Mihr u mushṭarī* (KBOPL 148 ca. 1609), *Būstān* (MMA 13.228.23 ca. 1610), *Yūsuf u Zulaikhā* of Durbek (ARB 1433 ca. 1615), *Būstān* (CBP Pers. 297 ca. 1616).

⁶⁷⁷ I group these three pages and interpret them as being from a singular copy. Rührdanz instead speculates the three folios are evidence of two high-quality *Shāhnāma* manuscripts for (or during the reign of) Valī Muḥammad. She groups the FMC and BM folios together, stating they are “obviously from the same manuscript” (“Samarqand Shahnamas in the Context of Dynastic Change,” 226, fn. 37). I include the stylistically-dissimilar LACMA folio due to a contemporaneous *Būstān* attributed to Bukhara, 1616 (CBP Pers. 297) also having illustrations in similar styles assembled together in one work.

it stands chronologically between the early Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* copies from 1600–05 and the three dispersed pages of the lavish Bukharan *Shāhnāma* probably produced in circa 1610–15.

I cannot confirm that Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī contributed to the Cherniaev and lavish *Shāhnāma* visual materials. However, based on stylistic analysis and comparanda to other works on paper, I argue that he and his colleagues (all with the name Muḥammad) played important roles in Tūqāy-Tīmūrid manuscript production. After closely analyzing the Cherniaev illustration and its connections to earlier materials, I relate it to the three detached folios of the dispersed courtly *Shāhnāma* to embark upon a discussion encompassing artistic exchanges between Transoxiana and India that I cover in more depth in the final sections V and VI.

IV.i. Connections to the earlier Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* group (pre–1605)

Elements in the Cherniaev *Shāhnāma*'s single unfinished illustration appear in the Samarqandi copies. Its image comes at the end of the first section and depicts Luhrāsp enthroned on a single full page lacking text. In the upper section, the outline of a dome extends into the margin. Beneath it is a pavilion with an unfinished multi-lobed *īvān* opening. Ladies look out of small windows from the levels of a two-tiered structure on the left. On the right side, an attendant in a yellow robe with chocolate-brown outer tunic stands beneath a leafless tree, and a sketched goose flaps its wings overhead. The large central ruler rendered in a very Mughal profile (to be investigated below) is seated under a lobed arch. His upward handlebar mustache may have been added later along with the other scribbles that mar the manuscript's pages. He wears a tight-fitting turban in the Indian style and holds a white *piyāla* (unstemmed cup), now faded. In front of him there are preparations for a feast: a *shashlīk* griller wearing a rubbed pea-green robe prepares a duck roasting on a skewer; an *āshpaz* (cook) wields a spoon and gestures towards two men who dance holding ewers of a libation that is the presumable source of their merriment. Young boys horse around in the bottom right corner beside an oversize potted plant with ribbing around the neck and halfway down the vessel's belly. From it emerges large five-petaled flowers.

We can compare details here to other Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* illustrations: the most obvious parallels are to one of the Punjab copies also depicting Luhrāsp enthroned (PUL O-16/7249, fig. 126), which features figures similar to the same scene in BL IO Islamic 301. The PUL illustration carries additional features in its lower section that are closer to the Cherniaev image, with cooks, a portly man with a staff, and men carrying a cauldron. In an illustration to another scene depicting Garshāsp

seeking to wed the daughter of the Qaisar in Rum in NLR PNS 90 (fig. 127), women wearing outer garments opened to their navel peer down at the courtly spectacle. The same multi-lobed *īvān* composition dominates the opening in the center that remains unfinished in the Cherniaev drawing. Comparing both these sets of voyeurs to those in BL 301 who oversee the coronation of Luhrāsp (fig. 115), we get the impression that an older painter perpetuating Abū'l-Khairid formulae illustrated BL 301 earlier, or its visual elements came from late sixteenth-century Khurasan.

The figures in the PNS 90 and Cherniaev copies reflect emerging sartorial changes in Transoxiana as a result of increasing contacts with India. These changes in female fashion are most overt in the loose LACMA folio featuring Żahḥāk with his concubines (fig. 128). Likely derived from a lavish *Shāhnāma* since dispersed for which two other paintings were produced (figs. 129-130), the Cherniaev illustration could have been the model for the more refined LACMA work. A single artist (could it be Muḥammad Sharīf?) may have carried out both works using the Cherniaev *Shāhnāma* as a template. He may have also relied upon earlier compositional formulae from other Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* versions.⁶⁷⁸ I already noted this common practice for the completion of manuscripts in previous chapters, and explained how the unfinished Tajikistan *Shāhnāma* illustrations appear to have been added as visual studies in advance of a more formal, intricate version intended for the court. Whoever was responsible for the Cherniaev and LACMA works, they seem intimately familiar with artistic currents in India, or had perhaps even visited there themselves.

IV.ii. Connections to later Bukharan *Shāhnāma* materials (ca. 1610–15) and increasing contacts with India

Tracking plunging necklines in the tailoring of women's robes and fashions current in India points to geographical linkages in arts of the book in Transoxiana during the first quarter of the seventeenth century. Earlier, when women appear in Bukharan manuscripts during the first half of the sixteenth century, they wear conservative high-necked robes (figs. 19, 28, 45). Later, circa 1580 in Khurasan, women in Muḥammadī's *Shāhnāma* wear garments with longer frontal slits down their chests (fig. 87). The underclothing showing through is a thin line beneath their necks. By the time the AIIT and Muḥammad Murād's *Shāhnāma* illustrations were painted around 1600, the cut in the fabric now extends to the abdomen with differently-colored material showing through. In a page within BL Or. 14403, could that be a naked bellybutton spied between the fastenings of the woman in red and

⁶⁷⁸ This is visible in the pointed palmettes around the edges of Żahḥāk's throne that are sketched upside-down beneath Luhrāsp in the Cherniaev illustration.

green hastily dressing in the corner to gawk at the spectacle outside (fig. 131)? Are those flesh-tones painted between the narrow robe openings donned by women assembled outside Rūdāba's tower in the AIIT illustration (fig. 108)? The female figures in all these depictions appear modestly flat-chested, but such conservative morals dissipate around 1605, which coincides with my attribution for the Cherniaev illustration. The painter of a woman wearing fuchsia and red robes in the upper left rectangle is depicted with delineated underbreasts, while the LACMA folio detached from the lavish *Shāhnāma* (fig. 128) features more volume in its depiction of the female form.

In a move towards greater eroticism, the perky breasts on Ṣaḥḥāk's yellow-clad consort in the LACMA folio truly "point" to the migration of artists and manuscripts between Transoxiana and India. Bare chests on women feature in manuscript painting in Transoxiana by the mid-1600s, evident in a *Khamsa* of Niẓāmī with illustrations added in the 1650s (NLR PNS 66).⁶⁷⁹ Stylized, hemispherical breasts prominently feature in several Mughal female depictions, such as women in a courtyard recoiling at Faraidūn assaulting Ṣaḥḥāk from Jahāngīr's personal *Shāhnāma* copy made in 1610 (fig. 132).⁶⁸⁰ A *Shāhnāma* containing figures wearing Humāyūn's distinctive style of headdress contains multiple women naturalistically portrayed; in it, white-haired Zāl fondles Rūdāba in their court (fig. 133).⁶⁸¹ Outside the Mughal realm, shapely women also fill the composition of a folio attributed to Bijapur in the Deccan ca. 1600–10 (fig. 134). Two men in this same illustration wear black Europeanized headwear, one seated in the foreground and another small figure in the background.

As a hallmark of painted arts from the Indian subcontinent in this period, this hat features in a contemporary folio from Transoxiana in the Fitzwilliam Museum that is detached from the dispersed lavish *Shāhnāma* (fig. 129). Once part of a manuscript, a compiler later mounted it in an album now held in the Fitzwilliam Museum. Catholic iconography observed in Mughal albums and manuscript paintings from the period resulted from well-attested exchanges made by visiting Jesuit priests and Portuguese emissaries to Akbar's court.⁶⁸² These black hats are in a few illustrations within the *Akbar-nāma* produced in 1604 (BL Or. 12988). In one, a sea scene depicts the Portuguese governor of the

⁶⁷⁹ Reproduced in Vasilyeva and Yastrebova, *Arts of the Book in the 15th-17th-Century Mawarannahr*, figs. 9.30, 9.40.

⁶⁸⁰ LACMA M.78.9.5. We can see similar features in a scene of two women dancing from a Mughal *Zafarnāma* of Yazdī for an unnamed patron (BL Or. 1052, f.50v).

⁶⁸¹ BKBm ms. no. unknown.

⁶⁸² Ebba Koch, "The Influence of the Jesuit Missions," in *Mughal Art and Imperial Ideology: Collected Essays* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2001), 1-11. Rice has compiled related publications on the reception and adaptation of Catholic art at the Mughal court during the late sixteenth into the early seventeenth centuries authored by Milo Beach and Gauvin Bailey ("The Emperor's Eye and the Painter's Brush," fn. 246).

Indies, Nuno da Cunha, and his Jesuit soldiers directing a naval operation against the army of Sultān Bahādūr (fig. 135).⁶⁸³ The Fitzwilliam *Shāhnāma* folio appears to have been painted following the aforementioned works from the Indian Deccan and Mughal courts. It depicts a ruler seated under a pavilion surrounded by courtiers and attendants, one of whom leads a Christian priest wearing a black hat and voluminous white robes. While it lacks lines of descriptive poetry and the reverse cannot be viewed due to its album mounting, I infer that this Fitzwilliam painting comes from the historical section of Firdausī's final chapters. It depicts a scene taking place during the reign of Khusrau Parvīz in which a Christian emissary of the Roman Qaisar arrives at his court. The conspicuous foreigner in black hat would be a fifth-century Nestorian figure, according to Firdausī's chronology. But in curious contrast to other attendees, the character wears headwear associated with Jesuits in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century India. Therefore the Fitzwilliam painting by an artist presumably working in Bukhara circa 1615 essentializes Christians through distinctly Jesuit attire that demarcates their membership in a non-Muslim faith group.

In their depictions of seated rulers, the lavish LACMA folio of Žahhāk—inferred to be from the same manuscript as the Fitzwilliam folio—as in the Cherniaev illustration depart from *Shāhnāma* iconographic conventions. They incorporate features associated with arts of the book in India, such as, notably, the profile rendering of Luhrāsp in the Cherniaev *Shāhnāma*. In comparison, sixteenth-century Ottoman, Safavid, and Abū'l-Khairid illustrated manuscripts almost exclusively render enthroned monarchs in three-quarter view.⁶⁸⁴ Art historians highlight various aesthetic and political reasons for this shift, concluding that Jahāngīr promoted the full profile to visually differentiate himself from his father Akbar.⁶⁸⁵ Prior to his accession to the throne in 1605 while still known as Prince Salīm, Jahāngīr appears in profile in a painting from 1601 (fig. 136).⁶⁸⁶ In this portrait he wears a robe with ribboned fastenings dangling on his right side; the Cherniaev sketch of Luhrāsp also includes some uncolored

⁶⁸³ Reproduced in Jeremiah P. Losty, *Indian Book Painting* (London: The British Library, 1986), 19, fig. 12.

⁶⁸⁴ Jeremiah Losty, "From three-quarter to full profile in Indian painting: revolutions in art and taste," in *Das Bildnis in der Kunst des Orients*, ed. J.M. zur Capellen et al. (Wiesbaden, 1989), 153-60. Ebba Koch has also examined how naturalistic profiles in Mughal manuscript arts signified class distinction and hierarchical divisions between the ruling emperor and lower classes. Rebels were "shown in the freest views and most drastic realism, in what could be described as a three-dimensional degradation" ["Jahāngīr as Publius Scipio Maior: The Commensurability of Mughal Political Portraiture," in *Portraiture in South Asia since the Mughals: Art, Representation and History*, ed. Crispin Branfoot (London: I.B. Tauris, 2018), 77]. Only the portraits of Badr al-Dīn Lū'lū' depicting him centrally facing the viewer come to mind as specimens of royal portraiture rendered head-on.

⁶⁸⁵ Advanced by Jeremiah P. Losty, *The Art of the Book in India* (London: The British Library, 1982), 84.

⁶⁸⁶ The folio in the "Allahabad Album" (RIOS Album E-14, f.3a) is signed by Manuhar and Manṣūr 1600-01. My gratitude to Mehreen Chida-Razvi for bringing this work to my attention.

fastenings on his left.⁶⁸⁷ Both Jahāngīr/Salīm and Luhrāsp wear close-fitting turbans associated with Indian wrapping styles. As in the sixteenth century, the seventeenth century was still an era in which headwear was an important indicator of identity. Tightly-wound turbans and figures of people originating from India feature in manuscripts from Khurasan and Transoxiana from the 1570s onwards. The Cherniaev *Shāhnāma* is unusual, however, in garbing a major ruler in such attire.

Equally surprising, Żahḥāk's toes in the LACMA folio distract the viewer accustomed to enthroned *Shāhnāma* rulers in Ottoman, Safavid, and Abū'l-Khairid illustrated manuscripts that never show their bare feet visible. Sovereigns either wear boots or they sit cross-legged with their robes spread taught over their covered laps. In the Prince Salīm/Jahāngīr album portrait however, the monarch-to-be reveals his entire bare foot, as do other royal figures in the *Ḥamza-nāma*, *Akbar-nāma*, and *Bābur-nāma* copies made for Akbar. Żahḥāk's two crossed feet also show tight-fitting trousers gathered at the ankle similar to Jahāngīr's. We also observe this same feature in a painting of a seated amir attributed to Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī working in his mature style (post-1615).⁶⁸⁸ Other Indian elements—associated with painting in Kashmir and the Deccan, among other locales—in the painting of Żahḥāk include the subject's toes and a big bolster placed behind the sitter. We see these same two details in the Princeton Samarqandī *Shāhnāma* dated 1600 (PFL 59G, fig. 137). Rührdanz links some of the illustrations in that volume to an anonymous artist influenced by Indian models of a sub-imperial level. According to her, that painter would go on to illustrate later Tūqāy-Tīmūrid manuscripts, such as the *Zafarnāma* of 1628 to be discussed in the final section (VI.iii).⁶⁸⁹

Both the barefooted Żahḥāk in the LACMA folio and square-jawed Luhrāsp sketched in “Mughal” profile within the Cherniaev illustration must be by an artist familiar with Jahāngīr's artistic preferences. These features indicate that imported paintings and manuscripts from India served as models that inspired artists working in the Tūqāy-Tīmūrid sphere. That, or those individuals traveled to

⁶⁸⁷ My gratitude to Jake Benson for pointing out this Mughal sartorial marker, and the Deccani custom to wear fastenings tied on both sides.

⁶⁸⁸ Although misattributing it to Shaikh Muḥammad, 1564, Stuart C. Welch, Sheila R. Canby, and Nora Titley reproduce the painting and comment that the “turban exudes the energy of a Neapolitan wedding cake. The organic wriggle of the sleeves is almost intestinal” (*Wonders of the Age: Masterpieces of Early Safavid, 1501-1576* (London: Fogg Art Museum, 1979), 205).

⁶⁸⁹ Rührdanz examines and dates the illustrations to PFL 59G (purchased in August 1907 for £30 in Istanbul) to the second or third decade of the 17th century in “Revival of Central Asian painting in the early 17th century,” 398-400; idem, “The Arts of The Book in Central Asia.” Its figures with pursed red lips and black boots with pointed heels and toes carrying illuminated designs on them are also in the album NLR Dorn 489, f.21. It is attributed to Muḥammad Nādir Samarqandī working in Kashmir, 1650. Reproduced in Vasilyeva and Yastrebova, *Arts of the Book in the 15th-17th-Century Mawarannahr*, 80.

the subcontinent, gained experience in workshops there, then returned to Bukhara and Samarqand fueled by their encounters, to be treated in the upcoming §V.iii.

V. The appeal of India

As previously noted in Chapter 4, Abū'l-Khairid artisans left Transoxiana during periods of political tension. Recall the civil unrest across the appanages when 'Abdullāh arrived in Bukhara in 1557 with the intention to rule it, and the domestic disarray between 1569–79 while 'Abdullāh secured control of Samarqand. In the 1570s, Khurasan offered secure employment to artisans facing dwindling prospects in Bukhara. Manuscripts produced there during the last quarter of the sixteenth century contain figures wearing Indian clothing. Robinson suggests artists added these to appeal to the manuscripts' intended Indian customers.⁶⁹⁰ He contends that Khurasani artists did not copy Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* in earnest due to the non-royal Indian markets that they targeted lacking interest in such imports. Until around 1600, Khurasani manuscripts naively rendered Indian fashions, as few artists seem to have actually directly visited the region prior to this time or directly interacted with individuals originating from this region. This changed at the end of the Abū'l-Khairid period and the onset of the early Tūqāy-Tīmūrid dynasty.

Vi. Manuscripts used in courtly exchanges between Transoxiana and India

While late sixteenth-century Khurasani manuscripts attest to book commerce between Transoxiana and India, courts in the two spheres also exchanged them as gifts. See App. 6b for Abū'l-Khairid manuscripts presumed to have been gifted to the Mughals; nos. 1-12 could have been destined for Akbar himself. John Seyller examined and traced the trajectory of numerous Transoxianan manuscripts as attested by ownership seals and notations by Mughal administrators, and sometimes the rulers themselves.⁶⁹¹ Most of the volumes conspicuously display undated overpainted imagery and full illustrations added in the Mughal kitābkhāna. Like the works gifted to the Safavids after the death of 'Abdullāh Khan in 1598, most of the manuscripts that were produced for 'Abd al-'Azīz were later acquired by Jahāngīr (r. 1605–27) then inherited by his son and successor Shāh Jahān (1628–58).

A few of the manuscripts produced in Transoxiana but deposited into Mughal libraries bear inscriptions containing information about their transfer. Political events and territorial skirmishes also

⁶⁹⁰ Robinson, "Muḥammadī and the Khurasan Style," 27.

⁶⁹¹ Seyller, "The Inspection and Valuation of Manuscripts in the Imperial Mughal Library."

assist in determining when the manuscripts transited. Due to unsettled Uzbek-Mughal frontier zones and border skirmishes in the 1560s, it seems unlikely that manuscripts would have been exchanged during this decade. Several embassies circulated between the courts of ‘Abdullāh Khan and Akbar beginning in 1572 through 1596 that facilitated the objects’ transfer.⁶⁹² Not always successful, these were gifted to solicit friendship and thereby preempt the threat of a Mughal invasion.

Even in the midst of their own armies battling one another, ambassadors from Bukhara and Agra passed through and within each other’s domains. Although often unlisted in court registers, manuscripts surely count among the items brought by these diplomats. By 1573, ‘Abdullāh retook Balkh from its Mughal occupiers, and he then sent a delegation in 1577 before prying Badakhshan and Kulab from Mughal control in 1584.⁶⁹³ In 1585, ‘Abdullāh sent an embassy to Akbar’s court with his own court poet (*malik al-shu‘arā*) ‘Abdurahmān Mushfiqī (1538–88) to recite laudatory *qaṣīdas* to the Mughal emperor.⁶⁹⁴ A particular embassy of ‘Abdullāh’s headed by the ambassador Mīr Quraish arrived at Akbar’s court wishing to secure a joint campaign in Khurasan against the Safavids in summer 1586.⁶⁹⁵ Akbar reciprocated with a delegation that arrived in Bukhara in 1587. The two powers then upheld an official alliance between 1588–90 when Safavid armies attempted to infiltrate their domains.⁶⁹⁶ By 1593, despite mutual skepticism, good relations further eased movements across the two states’ Hindu Kush border.⁶⁹⁷

Barbara Brend speculates the *Nuṣratnāma* (examined in Chapter 2) came into the Mughal library prompting Akbar’s workshops to imitate it in crafting the *Bāburnāma* of 1590.⁶⁹⁸ A copy of the

⁶⁹² Exchanges of envoys between Bukhara and Agra took place in 1577, 1578, and 1586, among others. Mansura Haider explores some of these in “Relations of ‘Abdullāh Khan Uzbek with Akbar,” *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique* 23, nos. 3–4 (Juillet-Décembre 1982): 313–31; She reports ‘Abdullāh’s first embassy to the court of Akbar arrived in 1572. The primary account of this exchange is in Ḥāfiẓ Tanīsh’s *‘Abdullāh-nāma/Sharafnāma shāhī*, covered in McChesney, “Historiography in Central Asia since the 16th Century,” 513–14. Manuscript diplomacy is briefly covered in Adamova and Bayani, *Persian Painting: the Arts of the Book and Portraiture*, 435–36.

⁶⁹³ Haider, “Relations of ‘Abdullāh Khan Uzbek with Akbar,” 317.

⁶⁹⁴ Mushfiqī had already gone to India prior to this mission. Details on the poet are in Jan Rypka, *History of Iranian Literature* (Netherlands: Springer, 1968), 503; and A.A. Semenov, “K voprosu o kul’turno-politicheskikh svyaziakh Astarkhanidov Bukhary (XVII v.) s ‘Velikimi Mogolami’ Indii,” in *Izobrannye sochnineniia pod obshchei redaktsiei akademika R. Masova* (Dushanbe, 2013), 198.

⁶⁹⁵ Mīr Quraish’s mission in India is recounted in McChesney, “The Conquest of Herat,” 82, fn. 40.

⁶⁹⁶ Haider, “Relations of ‘Abdullāh Khan Uzbek with Akbar,” 324–25.

⁶⁹⁷ Historical information on diplomatic visits between Transoxiana and India is in Losty, *Art of the Book in India*, 86, fn. 55; Burton, “Relations between the Khanate of Bukhara and Ottoman Turkey,” 77; McChesney, “Historiography in Central Asia since the 16th Century,” 521–22. Mughal and Abū’l-Khairid ambassadorial exchanges around 1585 are also mentioned by B. Spuler, “Central Asia from the Sixteenth Century to the Russian Conquests,” in *The Cambridge History of Islam* vol. 1A, eds. P.M. Holt, Ann K.S. Lambton, Bernard Lewis (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 471; and McChesney, “The Conquest of Herat,” 82.

⁶⁹⁸ Brend, “Sixteenth-Century Manuscript from Transoxiana,” 114.

Jāmī ‘*al-tawārīkh* (RRK P.1820) with a few illustrations that are similar to the *Nuṣratnāma*’s (but perhaps later emulations by Mughal artists) may have also been gifted at this time.⁶⁹⁹ Borrowing certain compositions, Brend notes equivalent depictions of assaults on fortresses with troops storming drawbridges in the *Nuṣratnāma* as in the *Bāburnāma*.⁷⁰⁰ We know that ‘Abdullāh offered manuscripts from his collection—those of his own patronage and objects he inherited from preceding Abū’l-Khairid appanage leaders—to other heads of state in the form of pīshkash. He might have given the *Nuṣratnāma* to Akbar in the 1580s. Bestowing this particular title, a Jūchid dynastic chronicle, would proclaim their shared Chinggisid origins and function to solidify goodwill between them. However, the move could have also carried a backhanded assertion of Abū’l-Khairid superiority, since the text and illustration scheme included the defeat of Akbar’s ancestor Bābur and the fall of Chaghataid power in Transoxiana. Either way, perhaps Mughal artists in the taṣvīrkhāna drew inspiration from the Abū’l-Khairid dynastic chronicle as well as original Timurid manuscripts to visualize comparable siege and enthronement scenes in the newly translated Mughal chronicles of Bābur’s life. The Mughals particularly valued Abū’l-Khairid artisans from Bukhara and Khurasan, along with these practitioners’ compositional models and ruler-*nāma* manuscripts. Based on manuscripts produced for him, Akbar appears to have desired his own dynasty’s written and illustrated works to feature similar visual and textual content as the *Nuṣratnāma*. Whether the *Nuṣratnāma* manuscript was directly consulted cannot be proven. However, it is feasible that some artisans and materials from Transoxiana helped to fashion Mughal illustrated histories alongside staff and objects already operating in the courtly Mughal taṣvīrkhāna.

V.ii. Artisans traveling between Transoxiana and India during ‘Abdullāh’s lifetime

Beside illustrated works, individuals also circulated back and forth.⁷⁰¹ A special quarter in Bukhara housed a large colony of non-Muslim, Hindu merchants who had resided there and in other parts of the region since the 1550s, if not earlier.⁷⁰² Along with Muslim Multani merchants from

⁶⁹⁹ Rice, “Mughal Interventions.”

⁷⁰⁰ Ibid., 112-13.

⁷⁰¹ Titley suggests manuscripts with origins in Transoxiana, rather than artists, “found their way to Mandu in central India,” and also says artists from Bukhara took manuscripts with them to India in the mid sixteenth century (*Persian Miniature Painting and its Influence on the Arts of Turkey and India*, 76).

⁷⁰² Semenov, “K voprosu o kul’turno-politicheskikh svyaziakh,” 199. Economic exchanges (significantly the horse trade) between Central Asia and India are covered in Alam, “Trade, State Policy and Regional Change,” 209.

today's northern Pakistan, they boosted Samarqand's economy during this period.⁷⁰³ According to Mansura Haidar, "large-scale migrations [of Abū'l-Khairid subjects] to other places are recorded in the sources, which indicate a state of internal instability. Skilled artisans and workers migrated to India and other regions. It was no wonder then that Abdullah complained of the acute lack of efficient people, like Qul Baba, in his empire."⁷⁰⁴ Since 'Abdullāh ruled Khurasan at the height of these migrations from the eastern flank of the Turco-Persianate world to the southeastern, he seemingly grumbles about the exodus of talent to India, a particularly attractive and lucrative site for artists in the final two decades of the sixteenth century.

Although he refers to military and political elites serving in Abū'l-Khairid administration relocating to India, Foltz's reasons why these individuals sought Mughal service applies to artisans as well. They did so to not only escape local unrest, but they were also attracted by the lure of India's proverbial riches and the Mughals' reputation for generosity. Despite being a greater distance away than Khurasan, regular caravans plied seven different routes through the Hindu Kush to India, and these artisans and their creations could easily journey from Bukhara, Samarqand, and Balkh to Agra or Delhi.⁷⁰⁵ The third kitābdār of the Bukharan workshop since 1568, Mīr Ḥusain Ḥusainī Kulangī (encountered in Chapter 3) left for India with or without 'Abdullāh Khan's agreement to do so. Kulangī himself worked on Akbar's *Ḥamza-nāma* in the 1570s, a heroic epic about Prophet Muḥammad's uncle.⁷⁰⁶ Kulangī did not remain in India, and also copied manuscripts while on his pilgrimage to Mecca. He returned to Bukhara and there completed his last known signed work which is a copy of Jāmī's *Yūsuf u Zulaikhā* dated 1585.⁷⁰⁷ Kulangī exemplifies how serving multiple dynastic heads in this period did not result in stigmatization or accusations of disloyalty. We might also consider that 'Abdullāh Khan may have sent not only painted manuscripts, but also their very manufacturers as well.

⁷⁰³ Muzaffar Alam, "Trade, State Policy and Regional Change: Aspects of Mughal-Uzbek Commercial Relations, c. 1550-1750," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 37, no. 3 (1994): 205, 211. Alam also notes the British emissary Anthony Jenkinson encountered merchants from north India, Multan, and Bengal in Bukhara in 1558.

⁷⁰⁴ Haider, *Central Asia in the Sixteenth Century*, 299. Foltz lists specific migrations in 1557 and 1567 that coincide with the civil war in which 'Abdullāh Khan killed off his rivals to unite the state (*Mughal India and Central Asia*, 73–74). These would be optimal periods for artists to migrate to India.

⁷⁰⁵ Foltz cites *Ā'in-i Akbarī* for this figure (*Mughal India and Central Asia*, 7).

⁷⁰⁶ Several scholars have dealt with the provenance to the *Ḥamza-nāma* manuscript: Faridany-Akhavan, "Dating the Hamzanama"; Seyller, "A Dated *Ḥamzanāma* Illustration," 501-05.

⁷⁰⁷ KMSM ms. no. unknown. Referenced by Szuppe, "Family and Professional Circle of Two Samarkand Calligraphers," fn. 60.

V.iii. Artisans traveling between Transoxiana and India in the early Tūqāy-Tīmūrid period

Objects and individuals circulated between Transoxiana and northern India in the Abū'l-Khairid period, and continued to do so in earnest during the Tūqāy-Tīmūrid.⁷⁰⁸ Following 'Abdullāh's death, the Uzbeks threatened the Safavids more than the Mughals. An amenable Uzbek-Mughal relationship developed under the Tūqāy-Tīmūrids which facilitated exchanges between various social groups. Based on the rendering of manuscript illustrations, Burchard Brentjes claims Indian painters worked in Bukhara in the first few years of the 1600s, but we know that Samarqand was the predominant artistic center at the time.⁷⁰⁹ He contends these non-native artists contributed to illustrations in a *Majālis al-ushshāq* manuscript dated 1606 (ARB 3476, figs. 138-139). Brentjes asserts that these individuals utilized prototypes not found in Mughal workshops, "but in Kashmiri and Deccan styles." Rather than solely identifying these illustrations as works by Indian artists in Uzbek workshops, Uzbek artists could have also traveled to India where they gained experience in and outside of Mughal-controlled territories.⁷¹⁰ These artists could have then introduced subcontinental methods, forms, figures, and fashions to Transoxiana upon their return.

V.iii.a. The Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* group and political and artistic exchanges with India

Whether Central Asian and Khurasani artists played a role in the production of *Shāhnāma* manuscripts in India merits further examination.⁷¹¹ However, here I emphasize how the manuscripts in the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* group squarely connect to Abū'l-Khairid vestiges, and contain new sources of inspiration from India. For this reason, I will examine how entire manuscripts and select illustrations within the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* group demonstrate these interactions. Much as in the LACMA folio of Żahhāk and the Cherniaev *Shāhnāma* illustration, the *Shāhnāma* of PFL 59G (fig. 137) depicts sartorial and physical forms that reflect a hybrid illustrative program based upon Indian—namely

⁷⁰⁸ Larisa Dodkhodoeva points to sources asserting "the co-operation of different artistic schools, for example of Bukhara and Delhi" ("Persian Miniature Painting: Collection of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tajikistan," 80).

⁷⁰⁹ Brentjes, "Islamic Art and Architecture in Central Asia," 69.

⁷¹⁰ Some scholars assert that Bukhara-trained artists worked in Golconda before 1600. Douglas Barrett mentions a copy of *Shīrīn u Khusrāu* by Hātifī dated 1568 written by a scribe named Yūsuf perhaps for Ibrāhīm Quṭb Shāh (KBOPL no. 499) ["Some unpublished Deccan miniatures," *Lalit Kalā* 7 (1960): 10]. However, Laura Weinstein is suspicious of this manuscript's Golconda provenance in "Variations on a Persian Theme: Adaptation and Innovation in Early Manuscripts from Golconda," (PhD diss., Columbia University, 2011), 58-61.

⁷¹¹ Some *Shāhnāma* manuscripts needing further research could shed light on this matter, among them BL Add. 5600 (commissioned by Jahāngīr to present to a noble, dated 1616); BL Or. 11842; SB Or. f.172; BKBM (shelfmark unknown); SDMA nos. 1990.300, 1990.322, 1990.331, 1990.332, 1990.340, 1990.437. Any attributions to Central Asian artisans in these manuscripts would be premature at this time. For studies on the reception of primarily non-imperial Firdausī *Shāhnāmas* in India see Alka Patel, "The *Shahnama* in India," in *Epic Tales from Ancient India* (San Diego, CA: The San Diego Museum of Art, 2016), 142-53; Laura Weinstein, "Illustration as Localization: A Dispersed Bijapuri Manuscript of the *Shahnama*," in *Shahnama Studies III*, 347-72; John Seyller, *Workshop and Patron in Mughal India: The Freer Rāmāyana and Other Illustrated Manuscripts of 'Abd al-Rahīm* (Switzerland: Artibus Asiae, 1999), 32-33, 263-73.

Kashmiri— models. Those artists may have spent time in India, then replicated any techniques they learned there after returning to Tūqāy-Tīmūrid domains.

Some other manuscripts in the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* group indicate Indian workshops contributed to their manufacture. Two distinct styles of illustrations in PUL O-15/7248 demonstrate this. One mode, demonstrated in fig. 140, depicts battling troops rendered in garments and landscapes in a manner completely foreign to Uzbek workshops. Rustam kneeling in profile before his slain victim suggests a hand fully trained in a non-courtly Indian workshop. Its differing style indicates that this painting and the others stylistically related to it were added sometime after the manuscript left Transoxiana. A Samarqandi artisan could have transported the unfinished manuscript to India and completed it there with new colleagues, or perhaps gave it away unfinished, or sold the incomplete object. Either way, non-visual elements in the manuscript might have appealed to an Indian audience. Mīr Māh b. Mīr ‘Arab (fl. 1592–1613), nephew to ‘Abdullāh Khan’s kitābdār Kulangī (the workshop overseer who went to India in the 1570s referenced above), copied the volume in 1601.⁷¹² Mughal royals and nobles in India valued objects associated with the lost Timurid heartlands of Transoxiana, and particularly Samarqand. For this reason, it seems unsurprising that PUL 15/7248 would transit to India and be finished there and remain in Punjab.

The illustrations to PUL O-15/7248 in the second style (exemplified by fig. 141) are contemporary to the textual component, and are locally produced in Samarqand. I tentatively attribute these to Muḥammad Sharīf, a colleague of Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī, or one working in a similar style. It appears that both Muḥammads originally worked in Abū’l-Khairid Khurasan based on the formal properties of their work. Muḥammad Sharīf’s signed extant materials render visages with wide noses, thick eyebrows, and outlined eyes that resemble figures populating some of the other Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* versions. Although they are unsigned, his figures inhabit some paintings within BL Or. 14403 (figs. 116, 121), the Cherniaev *Shāhnāma*, and the three loose folios from the dispersed lavish copy (figs. 128–130). Muḥammad Murād completed and signed the margins of a double-page album painting for which Muḥammad Sharīf rendered the larger central figures, now divided between Washington DC and Paris (fig. 142).⁷¹³ Muḥammad Sharīf’s facial types with wide noses and thick

⁷¹² Szuppe analyzes such scribal familial networks in “Family and Professional Circle of Two Samarkand Calligraphers.”

⁷¹³ Now divided between “Seated Princess,” NMAA S1986.304; and “Man Reading,” LM OA 7109. Muḥammad Murād’s marginal figures bear striking similarities to decorative borders in a manuscript completed for Akbar and Jahāngīr, reproduced in J.P. Losty, “The ‘Bute Hafiz’ and the Development of Border Decoration in the Manuscript Studio of the Mughals,” *The Burlington Magazine* 127, no. 993 (Dec. 1985): 855–71.

apostrophe-shaped eyebrows appear in the *Majālis al-‘ushshāq* manuscript from 1606 (figs. 138-139), and a *Zafarnāma* copy to be discussed next (BL Add. 22703, figs. 146-149). As noted in Chapter 3 regarding stock figures associated with ‘Abdullāh Muṣavvir from the 1550s and 1560s, I cannot definitively attribute all items with formal similarities to Muḥammad Sharīf. However, he and his colleagues would have worked outside any particular Tūqāy-Tīmūrid royal kitābkhāna between 1600–20 since no documented site exists. These artists could travel between Transoxiana and India and transport manuscripts along with their own skills, and offer both to any workshops that hired them.

Muḥammad Sharīf collaborated with Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī and Muḥammad Darvīsh (more a poet and calligrapher) to produce elaborate paintings during the early reign of Imām Qulī Khan in Bukhara (post-1611), albeit nothing expressly commissioned by this ruler.⁷¹⁴ A portrait painter named Muḥammad Nādir is reported to have accompanied Muḥammad Murād and Muḥammad Sharīf on a trip to India, where these three men worked together.⁷¹⁵ Rührdanz credits Muḥammads Murād and Sharīf with bringing about “a new Central Asian style” personally shaped by their creativity and previous experiences in the commercial workshops of Khurasan.⁷¹⁶ While I hesitate to assign authorship to the unfinished Cherniaev *Shāhnāma* and the three lavish detached folios, their common features and shared forms suggest the work of several artists collaborating at the same time and place, likely Samarqand between the years 1600–15.

V.iii.b. Case study: Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī

In consulting period sources, several scholars assert Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī crisscrossed dynastic and geographic lines demarcating Central from South Asia, while others appear unconvinced that he ever left Transoxiana.⁷¹⁷ Even if he did, whether he worked during ‘Abdullāh Khan’s lifetime or afterwards, and at what level—courtly or sub-imperial—remains unanswered. Russian-language scholarship states that ‘Abdullāh Khan himself sent Muḥammad Murād to Akbar, but this claim cannot be verified.⁷¹⁸ Whatever the intentions of his travel, if Muḥammad Murād did not

⁷¹⁴ Rührdanz states there are no manuscripts attributed to Imām Qulī’s patronage (“Revival of Central Asian painting in the early 17th century,” 400-02).

⁷¹⁵ Information on the Muḥammads is in Y. Porter, “le kitābkhāna de ‘Abd al’Aziz Khān (1645-1680) et le mécénat de la peinture à Boukhara,” *Cahiers d’Asie centrale* 7 (1999); and Schmitz, “BUKHARA vi. Bukharan School of Miniature Painting.”

⁷¹⁶ Rührdanz, “Samarqand Shahnamas in the Context of Dynastic Change,” 225; idem, “Arts of the Book in Central Asia,” 108.

⁷¹⁷ Robert Skelton voices his skepticism in “Relations between Mughal and Central Asian painting in the seventeenth century,” in *Indian Art & Connoisseurship, Essays in Honour of Douglas Barrett*, ed. J. Guy (Chidambaram Ahmedabad, India: Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts in association with Mapin Pub., 1995), 282.

⁷¹⁸ Semenov, “K voprosu o kul’turno-politicheskikh svyaziakh,” 197.

leave for India in the 1590s he could have done so early in the 1600s. Various sources place him in courtly and commercial Mughal centers in Kashmir, Lahore, Allahabad, Delhi, and Agra, as well as the Deccan Sultanates of Bijapur and Golconda.⁷¹⁹ According to Galina Pugachenkova and Olimpiada Galerkina, Muḥammad Murād and his colleague Muḥammad Nādir ventured to India and worked in Delhi between 1590 through the mid-seventeenth century; however, we cannot corroborate this long duration.⁷²⁰ Pugachenkova later revised her analysis to express a degree of skepticism. In her subsequent collaboration with Abdumajid Madraimov, they posited that Muḥammad Murād arrived at Akbar's court—Agra, if post-1599—before the emperor's death in 1605.⁷²¹ Foltz cites I.G. Nizamutdinov who “pushes his arrival in India up to the 1620s, thereby leading one to conclude that Muḥammad Murād may have returned to Central Asia in Akbar's time and come again to India during Jahāngīr's.”⁷²² However, Muḥammad Murād's signed materials do not support this trajectory, and visual analysis instead tacitly suggests another chronology.

Setting aside textual accounts, I derive information on the painter's peregrinations through his known extant works. In this way we can track Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī's various residencies theorized to have started in Abū'l-Khairid Khurasan during the 1580s–1590s. He then proceeded to Tūqāy-Tīmūrid Samarqand in the first few years of the 1600s, illustrating the unfinished Khivan *Shāhnāma* manuscript in an individual style inflected by Khurasani models which implies he had not secured imperial patronage.⁷²³ Since we do not observe Indian sartorial and stylistic forms and figures in that *Shāhnāma*, it seems he ventured to India afterwards. One drawing signed by the artist (fig. 143) depicts a man wearing a robe with four-pointed hem along the bottom edge (*chakdār jāma*), male attire popular during Akbar's rulership.⁷²⁴ This suggests that he probably arrived in the Mughal realm before

⁷¹⁹ Kashmir and Delhi are posited in G.A. Pugachenkova and A.A. Madraimov, “Miniatiura Mukhammada Murada Samarkandi iz fonda Instituta Vostokovedenia AN UzSSR,” *O'zbekistonda Ijtimoiy Fanlar* vol. 2 (1984): 47. Weinstein cites the work of Mark Zebrowski who asserts that paintings during the early Quṭb Shāhī dynasty in the Deccan were done by “Turco-Iranian émigrés - the greatest number coming from Bukhara, Bakharz (in Khorasan) and Shiraz” (“Variations on a Persian Theme,” 50-51).

⁷²⁰ Pugachenkova and Galerkina, *Miniatiury srednei azii*, 49. Brentjes confirms Muḥammad Murād accompanied him (“Islamic Art and Architecture in Central Asia,” 69).

⁷²¹ Pugachenkova and Madraimov, “Miniatiura Mukhammada Murada Samarkandi,” 47.

⁷²² Foltz, *Mughal India and Central Asia*, 81, fn. 58.

⁷²³ Referring to other contemporary “Bukhara artists”, Titley suggests they “were more likely to be employed by lesser patrons than the emperor, as Akbar did not care for the romanticised [flat] style” associated with ‘Abdullāh Khan's workshop (*Persian Miniature Painting and its Influence on the Arts of Turkey and India*, 208). The assumption that Akbar instead preferred naturalism is not fully accurate since his patronage extended to both modes of representation.

⁷²⁴ The illustration is the subject of Pugachenkova and Madraimov, “Miniatiura Mukhammada Murada Samarkandi,” 49. Pugachenkova notes its reverse contains calligraphy signed by Mīr ‘Alī in “Manuscript Miniatures from the Oriental Studies Institute of the Uzbek SSR Academy of Sciences,” *Bulletin of the Asia Institute, New Series* 4 (1990): 144. I am grateful to Jake Benson for identifying the garment.

or during the tradeoff between Akbar and Jahāngīr's reigns in 1605. The lack of visual devices derived from India in his *Shāhnāma* indicates Muḥammad Murād did not step foot in India prior to illustrating it. In the few illustrations to his *Shāhnāma* that are Indo-Persianate in their style and subject matter, Muḥammad Murād's acquaintance with Indian materials seems to be based on what was available to him in Transoxiana, and does not reflect a deep connection at the time of his painting. Had he gone there in the 1590s as has been posited by other scholars, how could that rich artistic context and experiences therein not impact his *Shāhnāma* work only to reappear decades later, post-1610?

If we accept that Muḥammad Murād illustrated the Khivan manuscript prior to departing for India, then he likely arrived shortly before Akbar's death in 1605. He might have joined the legions of artists employed in the imperial taṣvīrkhāna with access to its library collections and remained there into Jahāngīr's reign. Muḥammad Murād seems to have picked up skills and painting devices in either Mughal-controlled north India or the Deccan Sultanate—or both—that he would incorporate into his later Tūqāy-Tīmūrid Bukharan oeuvre of the second decade of the seventeenth century.

Impacted by his various experiences, Muḥammad Murād illustrated manuscripts and embellished marginal decorations with various figures in his “mature style,” evidenced by the divided frontispiece (fig. 142). His portrayal of a Mughal emissary received by a Tūqāy-Tīmūrid khan in a *chīnī-khāna* (fig. 144) further reflects cross-dynastic political and artistic exchanges in this period by its very subject matter.⁷²⁵ Pinpointing moments of stylistic transition in an artist's practice often proves difficult. However, a stint in India aptly explains Muḥammad Murād's conspicuous stylistic shift evident in his earlier additions to the Khivan *Shāhnāma* manuscript versus later illustrations incorporating his work that postdate 1615. Among the latter material is an illustration from a *Būstān* manuscript (CBL Pers. 297, fig. 145) with dark-skinned devotees in loincloths kneeling before a carved deity. The standing figure on the left with blue sash, white trousers, and red shoes wears the four-pointed garment as in the loose painting (fig. 143) mentioned above.

V.iii.c. Tūqāy-Tīmūrid dynastic chronicles and connections to India

As mentioned in Chapter 3, the historian Badr al-Dīn Kashmīrī left India forty years before he wrote his unillustrated *Ẓafarnāma* in circa 1593 extolling ‘Abdullāh's victories as the second Shībānī Khan. Concurrently, Muṭribī al-Aṣamm Samarqandī (b. 1559) commenced composition of the earliest unillustrated Tūqāy-Tīmūrid dynastic chronicle *Tazkirat al-shu‘arā* that he modified from a Persian

⁷²⁵ The painting in CSMVS (formerly Prince of Wales Museum of Bombay), shelfmark unknown, is reproduced in Skelton, “Relations between Mughal and Central Asian painting,” 290.

text in the final years of ‘Abdullāh Khan’s life.⁷²⁶ Muṭribī finished it in 1604, around the time Valī Muḥammad Khān ascended the Bukharan throne, but we cannot be certain whether the monarch accepted or acknowledged the work.⁷²⁷

Muṭribī later augmented his anthology with further information on poets in Balkh and Bukhara in order to appeal to Emperor Jahāngīr.⁷²⁸ It apparently worked; Muṭribī arrived in India in 1626— just a year before Jahāngīr’s death— and enjoyed a short stay in Lahore at the Mughal court. To Jahāngīr, Muṭribī encapsulated the wisdom of native Transoxianan thinkers and poets maintained from the Timurid age. During the few months of Muṭribī’s visit, his host called upon him to verify the likenesses of ‘Abdullāh Khan and ‘Abd al-Mu’ mīn that artists prepared for the Mughal emperor.⁷²⁹ Jahāngīr scolded Muṭribī when he expressed disdain for ‘Abdullāh Khan’s own composed poetry, perhaps in part because Jahāngīr’s father Akbar often held amicable relations with his neighbor who occupied the ancestral Mughal lands.

Since the bones of the Mughals’ Timurid ancestors remained in Samarqand’s Gūr-i Amīr mausoleum, the current Chaghataids in India expressly identified with their hereditary links to that site and the broader region of Transoxiana once governed by their ancestors.⁷³⁰ This sentiment extended to manuscripts, and they held copies of ruler-*nāma*—such as *Ẓafarnāma/Tīmūr-nāma* versions of Abū’l-Khairid manufacture and *Jāmi’ al-tawārīkh* copies— with nostalgic esteem.

VI. Tūqāy-Tīmūrid *Tīmūr-nāma* copies

Having examined early Tūqāy-Tīmūrid Firdausian *Shāhnāmas* and selected artists traveling between Transoxiana and the subcontinent, this final section dwells on other versions of Tūqāy-Tīmūrid ruler-*nāma* and their processes of completion incorporating hybrid forms derived from Transoxiana and India. As noted in Chapters 1 and 2, the Abū’l-Khairids recorded and illustrated the histories of their Muslim and Mongol forefathers at the onset of the dynasty, and also documented the

⁷²⁶ ARB 2253.

⁷²⁷ This skepticism is expressed by McChesney, “Historiography in Central Asia since the 16th Century,” 521. Foltz claims Muṭribī enjoyed the patronage of Valī Muḥammad [“Two Seventeenth-Century Central Asian Travellers to Mughal India,” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 6, no. 3 (November 1996), 368; since revived and republished as a chapter in his book *Mughal India and Central Asia*, 109].

⁷²⁸ Muṭribī’s stay in India is recounted in Foltz, *Mughal India and Central Asia*, 109-16.

⁷²⁹ Although it is impossible to determine if it is the exact drawing which Muṭribī was asked to verify, I suspect the attributed portrait of ‘Abdullāh Khan slicing melons (BM 1948,1211,0.10) is of Mughal manufacture and is not an Abū’l-Khairid production.

⁷³⁰ McChesney, “Historiography in Central Asia since the 16th Century,” 515.

accounts of living appanage rulers. This textual tradition continued under the Tūqāy-Tīmūrids, but without accompanying illustrations. Instead, the heroics of Tīmūr continued to hold appeal.

VI.i. *Tīmūr-nāma* of Hātifi (BL Add. 22703)

Depictions of Tīmūr's acts migrated from Abū'l-Khairid Transoxiana to India during Akbar's reign. This illustrated material also made a return journey and reappeared in later Tūqāy-Tīmūrid copies of the *Tīmūr-nāma*. In Chapter 3, I analyzed a frontispiece cut apart and mounted on the opening and closing pages of a probable mid-1570s Bukharan *Tīmūr-nāma* of Hātifi in the British Library (ms. Add. 22703, fig. 73). The manuscript has only attracted limited attention amongst historians of book arts produced in India and Transoxiana. Basil Robinson describes the manuscript's battle scenes as "prototypes of the crowded melees beloved by Akbar's court painters who illustrated the celebrated *Akbar-nāma* in the Victoria and Albert Museum."⁷³¹ He attributes the full manuscript to Bukhara, circa 1560, and claims the Mughals inspired the Abū'l-Khairids. Rührdanz similarly notes Mughal influence in the five main illustrations (excluding the divided frontispiece), but attributes them to products of Central Asian manuscript painting from the second decade of the seventeenth century.⁷³² Larisa Dodkhudoeva cites other scholars who identify Muḥammad Sharīf as among the painters in Samarqand responsible for illustrating scenes within the BL *Tīmūr-nāma* that are "filled with dynamism and rage."⁷³³ After reviewing these arguments and the object, I confirm components of these observations through comparisons to figures and compositions from the early Tūqāy-Tīmūrid workshops. Most of my comparisons to the BL *Tīmūr-nāma* come from the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* dated 1600 (BL Or. 14403), and the *Majālis al-'ushshāq* manuscript dated 1606 (figs. 138-39).

Clarifying the provenance to the BL *Tīmūr-nāma* manuscript, I claim it was originally an unfinished copy scribed during the reign of 'Abdullāh Khan in the 1560s or 1570s but was finished in later decades. Its divided frontispiece (fig. 73) could be contemporary to the text or was derived from another manuscript and pasted in. The remaining illustrations (figs. 146-149) were added sometime between 1605–15 in Transoxiana. They thus postdate the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* group and are contemporary to the dispersed three lavish *Shāhnāma* folios, and other Tūqāy-Tīmūrid manuscripts associated with Jūibārid—as opposed to royal—patronage in Bukhara (such as the 1606 *Majālis al-*

⁷³¹ Robinson, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Persian Paintings in the Bodleian Library*, 127.

⁷³² Rührdanz, "Revival of Central Asian painting in the early 17th century," 398.

⁷³³ Dodkhudoeva, *The Arts of the Book in Central Asia and India*, 73.

‘*ushshāq*).⁷³⁴ I contend that the illustrators of all these works had earlier Abū’l-Khairid training obtained in Khurasan during the 1590s where they worked alongside Safavid artists from Qazvin. The BL *Tīmūr-nāma*’s full-page paintings indicate those painters also borrowed Bukharan Abū’l-Khairid figural and sartorial details. The painters themselves likely worked on the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* group, but later improved their quality of execution, perhaps during stints in India. As the above scholars suggested, their exposure to Akbar’s numerous ruler-*nāma* projects might have inspired the crowded and tumultuous battle scenes in the *Tīmūr-nāma*. The architectural forms in the upper corner of the illustration depicting Tīmūr atop a yellow war elephant (fig. 146) evinces this familiarity with Indian painting and architecture. Similar white domes and ribbed structures also appear in the *Majālis al-‘ushshāq* folio (fig. 138). Figures in Indian turbans and garb are also common to both manuscripts.

Other details in the BL *Tīmūr-nāma* further substantiate its being an Uzbek production spanning several dynasties. A rider atop a square-shaped horse from within it (fig. 147) mentioned in Chapter 3 appears similar to another in a late-1560s Bukharan Hātifi *Tīmūr-nāma* (RAS 305A, fig. 75). Pavilions with colorful patterning and red fencing appear in a disturbing illustration of soldiers committing atrocities on a city’s inhabitants within the BL *Tīmūr-nāma* (fig. 148). These forms derive from Bukharan manuscripts associated with ‘Abdullāh Khan’s patronage. This underscores how Tūqāy-Tīmūrid artists had themselves painted earlier Abū’l-Khairid manuscripts, or they were familiar with their models.

Other figures and compositions in the BL *Tīmūr-nāma* are better-drafted than those in the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* group completed a decade earlier. Smiting warriors with raised swords and arched, nearly-connected eyebrows frequent BL Or. 14403 and the BL *Tīmūr-nāma*. One of Tīmūr’s troops in a poppy-red tunic in the latter manuscript wears Abū’l-Khairid armor and a helmet topped by a black tuft who battles a div poised to throw a severed head at him (fig. 149). The style of rendering seems particularly Qazvini, also akin to an illustration from Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī’s Khivan *Shāhnāma* depicting Manūchihr’s shot arrow in poppy-colored robes shooting an arrow at Tūr (fig. 150). A bare-chested figure strapped to a stretcher in the upper section of the aforementioned upsetting BL *Tīmūr-nāma* folio (fig. 148) seems like a victim about to be waterboarded. His pose and turned-out

⁷³⁴ Contemporary Jūibārid patronage includes manuscripts dedicated to Shaikh Khwāja ‘Abd al-Raḥīm in Bukhara: Durbek’s *Yūsuf u Zulaikhā* ca. 1615 (ARB 1433); and Bāiqarā’s *Majālis al-‘ushshāq* ca. 1606 (ARB 3476). A section of Yazdī’s *Zafarnāma* scribed in 1617 by a scribe named Muḥammad included in a Miscellany (BL IOL 3448) might be related, but I have not yet examined the manuscript. Robinson states its 14 illustrations are inserted from other manuscripts produced from Shiraz ca. 1515-20 (Safavid) and 1470 (Turkman), and Bukhara (date unspecified) (*Persian Paintings in the India Office Library*, 79, 153). It is an unusual example in which the colophon postdates the visual components. The fact that the manuscript was in India before it came into British hands is telling, and might be relevant to Transoxiana—India exchanges.

feet derive from an earlier, unusual image in BL Or. 14403 illustrating the great battle between Kai Khusrau and Afrāsiyāb (fig. 151). In it, men gather around a corpse to wash dirt and blood off the body of a fallen Iranian soldier before wrapping him in a shroud.⁷³⁵ Another detail on the lower right side of the same violent scene in the BL *Ṭīmūr-nāma* depicts two distraught women dressed in purple and orange with long white headscarves. An old woman crouched in blue scolds an attacking soldier in gold armor and feathered turban.⁷³⁶ These three women repeat depictions of female spectators wearing similar attire in contemporaneous manuscripts: the dispersed lavish *Shāhnāma* folio of Ṣaḥḥāk and his consorts (fig. 132), the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* copies in Saint Petersburg (NLR PNS 90, fig. 127) and the Cherniaev illustration (fig. 125).

Both the older Yazdī *Ẓafarnāma* manuscript illustrated by Bihzād for Sultan Ḥusain Mīrzā Bāiqarā, and the BL *Ṭīmūr-nāma* by Hātifi convey dramatic full-page scenes of Ṭīmūr and his troops lowered in baskets to attack the inhabitants of Nerges in Georgia (figs. 14 and 149 respectively). However, their compositional differences may be due to the fact that by the time the painters illustrated the BL *Ṭīmūr-nāma*, the Mughals had acquired Bāiqarā's *Ẓafarnāma* as a gift, so artists in Transoxiana could not consult it. The BL *Ṭīmūr-nāma* illustration instead features details that mirror elements in the AIIT Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* folio, "Aulad leading Rustam to the White Div's cave" (fig. 152). The AIIT illustration is a comparatively simpler composition, with some nearly identical figures rendered in reverse as they appear in the BL *Ṭīmūr-nāma* folio. One div in the AIIT *Shāhnāma* grips a boulder above his head that corresponds to the female figure in blue and red standing on the right in the *Ṭīmūr-nāma* version. Her sagging breasts and the indecency of her lifted leg and exposed genitals equates her with witches and sorceresses in *Shāhnāma* iconography. Her male compatriots appear similarly half-nude with phalluses dangling out of loincloths; such a detail is common in portrayals of divs in Turco-Persianate book illustrations.⁷³⁷ Rendering the Georgian enemies dwelling in caves carved into cliffs with the impropriety and barbarity of witches and divs dehumanizes the depicted enemy.

⁷³⁵ Gratitude goes to Mohsen Qassemi for assisting me in determining the story of the depicted scene. He notes that the surrounding text differs from canonical versions of the *Shāhnāma* by substituting Islamic references to Firdausī's Zoroastrian original phrasing; a mosque is mentioned as opposed to a fire temple.

⁷³⁶ This older female figure also appears several times in a copy of Durbek's *Yūsuf u Zulaikhā*, ca. 1615, Bukhara (ARB 1433).

⁷³⁷ Axel Langer has commented on "divs, the demons of the *Shahnama*, whose circumcised penises quite often peep out from beneath their loincloths. Unlike Persia's romantic heroes, who are motivated only by higher sentiments, *divs* are depicted as purely sexual creatures" ["European Influences on Seventeenth-Century Persian Painting: Of handsome Europeans, naked ladies, and Parisian timepieces," in *The Fascination of Persia: Persian-European Dialogue in Seventeenth-Century Art & and Contemporary Art of Teheran* (Zürich: Scheidegger & Spiess, 2013), 180].

The abundant Indian elements in the BL *Tīmūr-nāma*—figural, sartorial, architectural— seems intended to appeal to a subcontinental (perhaps royal) recipient. The manuscript has multiple layers of value: as an original Bukharan manuscript with text and marginal stenciling and illumination perhaps from ‘Abd al-‘Azīz’s workshop, with later interventions by artists connected to ‘Abdullāh Khan’s patronage, then finished by the finest contemporary manuscript artists in Transoxiana. Such an eminent volume would befit an emperor. However, whether the manuscript spent any time in India cannot yet be surmised although it could have been taken from there to then reside in its current London home.

VI.ii. *Ẓafarnāma* of Yazdī from 1628 (ARB 4472)

On account of compositional and figural formulae in Abū’l-Khairid manuscripts common to those derived from Yazdī’s *Ẓafarnāma* completed for Sultan Ḥusain Bāiqarā in the late-Timurid period, I argued in Chapter 1 that only after Muḥammad Shībānī Khan had taken Herat in 1507 could the manuscript have come into Abū’l-Khairid hands. Sometime later at a date yet to be confirmed, Bāiqarā’s precious manuscript ventured into the imperial Mughal library. Mika Natif states that it was “brought from Central Asia to Akbar’s court in India by the nobleman Mir Jamal al-Din Husayn Inju (a native of Shiraz).”⁷³⁸ Knowing it would delight Akbar, the intended recipient, Mīr Jamāl bestowed it at some point before 1572. Passed down to Akbar’s successors, notes in Jahāngīr’s own hand attribute its illustrations to Bihzād. In the *Akbar-nāma* chronicling Akbar’s own life, the author Abū’l Faẓl ‘Allāmī (1551–1602) uses Yazdī’s account of Tīmūr’s horoscope to apply to Akbar in order to reinforce the legitimacy of the latter’s reign. The marginal notes and seals of Jahāngīr, Shāh Jahān, and Aurangzīb prove these royals avidly read Bāiqarā’s personal *Ẓafarnāma*, but the absence of traces left by Akbar himself implies that he might have never seen it in his lifetime.⁷³⁹ This suggests that it was his successor Jahāngīr who received it as a gift during his rule between 1605 and 1627 by a presumably Tūqāy-Tīmūrid emissary. It is not likely, however, that the above-mentioned poet Muṭribī would have been the one to do so when he stayed with Jahāngīr in 1626.

The majority of older Abū’l-Khairid productions of Tīmūr’s life took the form of Hātifi’s *Tīmūr-nāma*. However, it is significant that Tūqāy-Tīmūrid artisans completed one illustrated copy of

⁷³⁸ Natif, “The *Zafarnama* [Book of Conquest] of Sultan Husayn Mīrzā,” 213. Regarding the object’s removal from India, the object is thought to have been taken to Iran by Nādir Shāh although there is no evidence of this. There is a Qajar seal in it, and the work transited from Iran to German collections before making a trans-Atlantic voyage to ultimately reach the Johns Hopkins University Library.

⁷³⁹ Foltz, *Mughal India and Central Asia*, 24. The first Mughal production of Yazdī’s title is a copy dated 1600 (BL Or. 1052) made in the atelier of the governor of Ahmedabad, Mīrzā ‘Azīz Koka (Losty, *Art of the Book in India*, 122).

Yazdī's *Ẓafarnāma* (ARB 4472, figs. 153–156) in 1628.⁷⁴⁰ Finished within the second decade of Imām Qulī Khan's reign in Bukhara, they may not have necessarily produced it for him, but for one of his governors. Yazdī's popularity among the Mughals may have inspired the commission of this *Ẓafarnāma* by whoever was the Tūqāy-Tīmūrid patron.

Abū'l-Khairid visual formulae influence the 1628 *Ẓafarnāma*. In one of its illustrations, Tūqtamīsh Khan cowers below Tīmūr who arrives on horseback holding the reins and brandishing a sword (fig. 153) in a pose recalling Muḥammad Shībānī in his armor in the *Faṭḥnāma* (fig. 12, right side). In another painting within the *Ẓafarnāma*, Tīmūr dressed in green sits with left knee bent while he celebrates his victory over Tūqtamīsh Khan (fig. 154). This stance iconographically derives from Timurid and Abū'l-Khairid manuscript traditions, such as the enthronement scenes discussed in Chapter 2 §III.i.b: the MIA *Bahāristān* (fig. 41) and Hātifi *Ẓafarnāma* copies from 1541 and 1551 (figs. 39 and 47 respectively). The 1628 Tūqāy-Tīmūrid rendition of Tīmūr banqueting might be a visual nod to Bāiqarā's *Ẓafarnāma* that had left Transoxiana.

The 1628 *Ẓafarnāma* contains features associated with Indian painting practices then-unusual in Uzbek book arts. In a scene completely foreign to Abū'l-Khairid painting and derived from romantic traditions further south, Tīmūr lays entwined in the hennaed feet and hands of his beloved Dilshād while a wrinkled old woman peers in profile on the left (f.152b, fig. 155).⁷⁴¹ Dilshād and Tīmūr embrace beneath a canopy with black detailing that parallels the carpeting of Muḥammad Murād Samarqandī's illustrations in the Khivan *Shāhnāma*. The iconography of Gulnār sleeping with Ardashīr in the *Shāhnāma* undeniably demonstrates the longevity of eroticism in Turco-Persianate book arts. However, the merging of the kissing lovers in the 1628 *Ẓafarnāma* into one entity marks an iconographic shift, closer and comparable to the couples painted by Chagall across several continents and centuries.

⁷⁴⁰ The 1628 *Ẓafarnāma* is a lavish work on paper with silk fibers and has stories that other copies do not, according to N.G. Mallitskii, "Protokoly i soobsheniia chlenov Turkestanskogo kruzhka liubitelei arxeologii," G.IV (1899): 71-180. A.A. Semenov provides a page-by-page description of the *Ẓafarnāma* manuscript's illustrations and gives its provenance. It was purchased by the Uzbek Academy of Sciences in 1939 from a private individual. Prior to this it was in the collection of an old Tashkent judge, Qāzī Sayyid Muhyiddīn Khwāja, and was displayed in a Paris exposition (1900?). Reproductions of several illustrations to the 1628 *Ẓafarnāma* appear in Semenov, "Miniatiury Samarkandskoi Rukopisi Nachala XVII v. 'Zafar-noma' Sharafuddina Ezdi," *Majmūai Maqolaho bakhshida ba San'ati Khalqi Tojik; Asarho* vol. XLII (Academy of Sciences Tajikistan SSR, 1956): 3-16; and E.A. Poliakova and Z.I. Rakhimova, *Miniatiura i literatura vostoka [L'art de la miniature et la littérature de l'orient]* (Tashkent: Gafour Gouliame, 1987).

⁷⁴¹ Reproduced in G.A. Pugachenkova, *Miniatures of Central Asia* (Tashkent: Editorial Office of Encyclopaedias, 1994), 36-37. The composition is evocative of the earlier work "Khusrau wooing Shirin" in a *Khamsa* of Nizāmī produced the same year as the Timurid ruler Shāh Rukh died (TSMK H.786, ca. 1447) (reproduced in Robinson, "Book-Painting in Transoxiana during the Timurid Period," 73, fig. 1).

Other Indian-inspired figures in the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* group also appear in the 1628 *Ẓafarnāma*. Parallels to some of the illustrations in the Princeton *Shāhnāma* (PFL 59G) already examined indicate production by the same workshop in 1620s Samarqand. One figure in the *Ẓafarnāma* scene depicting Tīmūr's attack on the Sīstānīs (fig. 156) awkwardly tumbles from his horse with boot upright in the air. This faller appears again in the manuscript as a victim in Tīmūr's army during their battle against the Golden Horde (f.275a).⁷⁴² He again stumbles in the rendering of Bārmān's victory over Qubād in the Princeton *Shāhnāma* version (fig. 157); here, the back of Qubād's head is a simplistic diamond. The 1628 *Ẓafarnāma*'s faller is rendered with more successful movement and perspective, and beneath him is the same white horse with red tail as Qubād's mount in the other manuscript. The simpler Princeton *Shāhnāma* composition and figures might therefore predate or be contemporary to the complex 1628 *Ẓafarnāma*.

VII. Conclusion

Throughout transitions from Timurid to Abū'l-Khairid, and Abū'l-Khairid to Tūqāy-Tīmūrid control of Central Asia, copies of Firdausī's *Shāhnāma* were again produced and peddled. Gauging the market for early seventeenth-century *Shāhnāma* manuscripts in Samarqand proves difficult. Who were their intended owners? Rührdanz suggests painters adapted *Shāhnāma* imagery for clientele who favored oral and popular retellings of the fantastic and heroic stories over the historical section of the work. These individuals may have formed their tastes for such titles during the Uzbek occupation of Khurasan in the last quarter of the sixteenth century. During that time, Rührdanz states Abū'l-Khairid governors and bureaucrats grew more acquainted with the sophisticated book culture in the regions they administered. *Shāhnāma* manuscript production continued into the following century past the dynastic decline.⁷⁴³ According to McChesney, Uzbek religious and political elites —shaikhs and amirs — maintained their status, serving both dynasties with equal loyalty.⁷⁴⁴ Thus, their purchasing power stayed constant. As a case in point, the influential Jūibārid-led Naqshbandi order sought out local

⁷⁴² Formal analysis of the Tūqtamīsh illustration is in G.A. Pugachenkova and L. I. Rempel', *Vydaiushchiesia pamiatniki izobrazitel'nogo iskusstva uzbekistana* (Tashkent, 1961), 107-08.

⁷⁴³ Rührdanz, "Samarqand Shahnamas in the Context of Dynastic Change," 227.

⁷⁴⁴ McChesney declares, "there are many instances of amirs and amirid families who served both the Shibanid and then Tuqay-Timurid dynasties with equal loyalty" ["The Amirs of Muslim Central Asia in the XVIIth Century," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* XXVI, no. 1 (1983): 58].

Uzbek scribes and artists regardless of their skills from the 1590s into the 1620s to produce desired titles.⁷⁴⁵

Domestic productions of Firdausian *Shāhnāma* copies were available in India for non-royal consumption by lesser artists familiar with the traditions of imperial workshops. However, the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* copies could compete by having a prestigious connection to Transoxiana by merit of their origin. Some of the Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* volumes catered to customers in India, both those locally born there, and also Iranian and Central Asian immigrants in the subcontinent who admired classical Persian literature and poetry. Natif writes: “In the eyes of Muslims in India during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Bukhara was particularly esteemed as a center of religious learning, supported by powerful Naqshbandi shaykhs. ... Bukharan-style illustrations... should be seen as both the expression and the continuation of the Bukharan intellectual legacy in Mughal India” and outside in the other parts not under Mughal jurisdiction.⁷⁴⁶ Despite the abundance of local talent, these patrons/purchasers in India admired Transoxianan artisans in particular. The Samarqandi *Shāhnāma* manuscript group—here broadened by adding onto Rührdanz’s original grouping in including the Cherniaev specimen, the Khivan manuscript finished by Muḥammad Murād, and the lavish copy evidenced by three loose folios (despite their Bukharan attribution)—sheds light on artistic and political exchanges between Transoxiana and Hindustan heretofore unconsidered.

I conclude with the Cherniaev manuscript and its afterlife. Although a humble offering, the fact that Cherniaev, a Russian general, was presented with this Firdausian *Shāhnāma* after his conquest of Turkestan demonstrates the timeless and symbolic power of illustrated manuscripts as gifts to royals and nobles. In the intervening centuries between its presumed completion in Samarqand in the early 1600s to its presentation in 1860s Tashkent, the gesture of giving a *Shāhnāma* as pīshkash maintained such courtly traditions. It is a pity Cherniaev did not further the project and commission artists to illustrate the empty voids and enrich its illumination scheme. Had the object’s exchange taken place

⁷⁴⁵ Jūibārīds, manuscript patronage, and political connections across Transoxiana and India converge in ways that have not yet been fully explored. The Jūibārīd ‘Abdī Khwāja Ṣa’d (1580–1607) had patronized Bukharan manuscripts in the 1590s when their quality was at their lowest. ‘Abdī Khwāja had supported Bāqī Muḥammad Khān to seize the throne in Bukhara in 1601 but was expelled to India that same year. The Jūibārīd shaikh Khwāja ‘Abd al-Raḥīm (son of ‘Abdī Khwāja Ṣa’d) was Imām Qulī’s ambassador to Jahāngīr in 1626, and he also patronized manuscripts produced in Bukhara up to his death in India in 1628. These details on Jūibārīd patronage and connections to India are in Rührdanz, “Revival of Central Asian painting in the early 17th century,” 398; Vasilyeva and Yastrebova, *Arts of the Book in the 15th-17th-Century Mawarannahr*, 224; Foltz, *Mughal India and Central Asia*, 53.

⁷⁴⁶ Natif, “The SOAS *Anvār-i Suhaylī*,” 355.

centuries earlier, he just might have followed the lead of early-modern patrons and painters to refurbish older works and bring them to completion.