

# A note on manuscripts of the *Zubdat al-āthār*, a Chaghatay Turkic History from sixteenth-century Mawarannahr by Devin DeWeese\*

The manuscript collections of Soviet Central Asia<sup>1</sup> offer a vast and still largely untapped store of Islamic manuscripts that remains especially unfamiliar to many western specialists in Middle Eastern studies. This is due in part to language barriers (the catalogues of these collections are virtually all in Russian, which has yet to be regarded as an essential research tool among Islamicists) and to the inevitable (and, one hopes, currently diminishing) difficulties in conducting research in Soviet institutions; but in part it is due to a still frequently-encountered tendency among students of the Islamic Middle East to forget that Central Asia is part of the Islamic world. A few surveys of the major collections and of their holdings in particular languages or fields have been published in the west, beginning with Karl Menges' notes on Chaghatay Turkic manuscripts in Tashkent<sup>2</sup>, Robert McChesney's report on collections of value for Central Asian history<sup>3</sup>, and more recently Eleazar Birnbaum's survey of the status of Turkic manuscript cataloguing<sup>4</sup>. For the most part, however, Soviet Central Asian collections of Arabic, Persian, and Turkic manuscripts remain little known beyond the Soviet Union.

These collections, and above all those in several libraries of Tashkent, Dushanbe, and Samarkand, house important and often rare works of interest to specialists in Islamic studies and Islamic book production in general. For works dealing with Central Asian history and civilization, naturally, these collections are unparalleled, and their often exclusive representation of vital — but still unpublished and often unstudied — historical, biographical, and geographical sources grows even stronger for later historical periods. If important sources on pre-Mongol Central Asia, and even on the Mongol and Timurid eras, are reasonably well represented in manuscript repositories outside Soviet Central Asia, works from the Uzbek period (16th-19th centuries) are much more 'concentrated' in Soviet collections, primarily in Central Asia; and for the 18th and 19th centuries even the most common standard historical works are often found only in Central Asian collections.

This historically-based distribution of Central Asian manuscripts is paralleled by a linguistically-based distribution: Persian-language works are much more likely to be found in manuscript collections outside Central Asia — e.g. in Iran, India, and even Turkey — than are Turkic-language sources. Outside of a few signal Chaghatay Turkic historical works (the *Bābur-nāmah*, the *Tavārīkh-i guzīdah-i nuṣrat-nāmah*, and the Turkic *Shayhānī-nāmah*, for instance) which made their way to India (or were produced there) and thence to western Europe, the overwhelming majority of manuscripts of Chaghatay Turkic literary productions from the Uzbek era (whether poetic *Dīvāns*, religious works, histories, or hagiographies) remained in Central Asia — from which, of course, prized works were often carried off to St. Petersburg, whose orientalist institutions were thereby enriched in the same fashion as those of other colonial capitals. Nevertheless, Central Asian collections, and especially those in Tashkent, remain the most important repositories for Central Asia's literary and historical heritage in Chaghatay Turkic.

Among the most valuable holdings of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the Uzbek SSR, in Tashkent, is an early and extensive (although still incomplete) manuscript of the original Chaghatay Turkic history written by 'Abdullāh b. Muḥammad b. 'Alī Naṣrullāhī, a native of Balkh, soon after 931/1525, at the behest of Sulṭān Muḥammad b. Söyünc Khoja Khan; this work, entitled *Zubdat al-āthār*, was intended as a universal history in eleven *faṣls*, but registered surviving copies are all incomplete. On the basis of the initial study of the work by the great Russian orientalist V.V. Bartol'd, the importance of the *Zubdat al-āthār* has been repeatedly acknowledged in surveys of Central Asian historical works and of Chaghatay literature<sup>5</sup>; as noted already by Bartol'd and repeated by later writers who knew the work primarily or exclusively through Bartol'd's description and excerpts from the text — that is, with little or no consultation of the actual manuscripts of the works — its author was an eyewitness and often

participant in the events surrounding the end of Timurid power in Mawarannahr and the establishment of Uzbek rule, and despite his dependence in the earlier portions of the work upon other well-known historical sources, he cites also a now-lost work on the history of Chingiz Khan and his successors, entitled *Tārīkh-i khānī*, written in 'in the Uyghur script and language' by Uyghur *bakhshīs*. Despite its obvious value for Central Asian history, however, Bartol'd's 85-year old account of the *Zubdat al-āthār* remains the most extensive description of the work and provides the only substantial portions of the text available in published form.

In the absence of an in-depth analysis of the work (which is not intended here), the work has been the subject of some confusion in the scholarly literature, and the confusion begins with the quite rudimentary problem of identifying its manuscripts: two manuscripts were known to Bartol'd, and two manuscripts are known from published manuscript catalogues, but it has been wrongly assumed, in virtually all the scholarly literature devoted to the work, that these were the *same* two manuscripts. In fact there are *three* manuscripts in Soviet collections, two in Tashkent and one in Leningrad, and outlining the history of these three copies may serve to clear up the confusion; such a clarification is the sole purpose of this brief communication.

The work was first discussed by Bartol'd in his 'Report on an Expedition to Turkestan', which originally appeared in 1904<sup>6</sup>: here he published extensive extracts from the work based on two copies:

(1) A manuscript in the collection of V.L. Viatkin in Samarkand, incomplete at the beginning and end, comprising (in Bartol'd's numbering) 471 folios. It begins in the midst of the second *faṣl*, on the pre-Islamic prophets, includes the third *faṣl* on the pre-Islamic kings of Iran as well as the beginning of the fourth *faṣl* on the history of the Prophet Muḥammad, in the midst of which the text jumps abruptly (and without notation) to the beginning of the eighth *faṣl*, on the 'Abbāsīd Caliphs; the 8th, 9th, 10th, and 11th *faṣls* (covering, respectively, the 'Abbāsīds, the regional dynasties contemporary with them, the descendants of Yāfīth including in particular the Chingizids, and the Timurids) are preserved in their entirety, but the text ends abruptly in a section on the Shaybānīds (just after the account of Shaybānī Khān's death in the battle with Shāh Ismā'īl in 916/1510) which follows the 11th *faṣl* without any separate heading. This copy clearly preserves the most extensive portion of the text, and Bartol'd described it as a much more accurate manuscript than the second; in his discussion of the work he assigned this copy the *siglum* 'S' (i.e., Samarkand).

(2) An older manuscript (dated 1076/1665-66), obtained by Bartol'd in 1894 and turned over to the Asiatic Museum of the Russian Academy of Sciences

in St. Petersburg, comprising 132 folios and including only the 9th, 10th, and 11th *faṣls* (that is, the sections on the dynasties contemporary with the 'Abbāsīd Caliphs, the Mongols and Turks and the descendants of Chingiz Khan, and Timur and his successors, respectively); as Bartol'd noted, the sections had been bound in the wrong order, with the 11th *faṣl* found on ff. 1a-99a. This copy, to which Bartol'd assigned the *siglum* 'P' (i.e., Petersburg), is of value insofar as it contains the end of the work, missing in the 'Samarkand' manuscript; it appears, however, that this manuscript 'P' is of such poor quality that even Bartol'd did not venture to publish the text of that portion of the work not available in the superior 'S' manuscript. He in fact described manuscript 'P' as a clearly inferior copy, and concluded the portion of the text which he published where the Samarkand copy breaks off, noting of manuscript 'P' that 'the text is preserved so unsatisfactorily that is hardly possible to reconstruct the original text according to this one manuscript.' Instead, he merely paraphrased the contents of the additional pages, which amount to only four folios beyond what is included in manuscript 'S'.

Bartol'd's manuscript 'P' remained in the St. Petersburg collection and now bears the designation 'D 104' in the library of the Leningrad Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. (LOIV): it was described in the first volume of that institute's catalogue of Turkic manuscripts, published in 1965<sup>7</sup>.

Bartol'd's manuscript 'S' from Viatkin's collection was transferred to the State Public Library in Tashkent and later to the Institute of Oriental Studies. Now the first volume of the catalogue of this institute's manuscripts, published under the editorship of A.A. Semenov in 1952, described a manuscript of the *Zubdat al-āthār* copied in 1346/1927, in 217 folios, containing a portion of the work from the 8th *faṣl* through the description of Shaybānī Khān's death in 916/1510<sup>8</sup>; in view of the similarity of the endings it seems likely that this copy was transcribed from Bartol'd's manuscript 'S', omitting the earlier sections of the work, but in any case from its length and transcription date — 25 years after Bartol'd examined Viatkin's copy — it is certainly clear that the copy described in the Tashkent catalogue, bearing the Inventory No. 608, is *not* the same as Bartol'd's manuscript 'S'. Nevertheless, precisely this identification is made in the editor's notes to the republication of Bartol'd's 'Otchet' in his *Sochineniia*<sup>9</sup> and the same is implied in H.F. Hofman's survey of Chaghatay literature<sup>10</sup>, in several articles by S.K. Ibragimov dealing with the *Zubdat al-āthār*<sup>11</sup>, and in the introduction to the translation of extracts from the work published in 1969 in a collection of texts on the history of the Kazakh khanates<sup>12</sup>. Among the scholars who have dealt with the *Zubdat al-āthār*, apparently only

the Tajik historian A.M. Mukhtarov has even noted the discrepancy between the 1927 transcription date for Inventory No. 608 and the existence of the Viatkin manuscript 'S' in 1902; he calls their identification 'a curious error whose origin requires explanation in the future.'<sup>13</sup>

Another copy of the work, however, is noted in the card catalogue of the Institute of Oriental Studies in Tashkent, under Inventory No. 5368; it does not appear in the institute's published catalogue, but I was able to examine it (as well as Inventory No. 608) during my research at the institute in 1983-1984. This copy runs to 471 folios<sup>14</sup>, begins in the middle of the second *faṣl*, and in all other respects as well coincides with Bartol'd's description of the Viatkin manuscript 'S'. The copy is not dated, but judging from the paper and the fine *naskh* it belongs most likely to the 17th century. It is clear that Inventory No. 5368 at the Institute of Oriental Studies in Tashkent is Bartol'd's manuscript 'S', from the Viatkin collection, which Bartol'd regarded as the most complete and accurate copy of the *Zubdat al-āthār*.

The following brief notes on this manuscript's disposition, which Bartol'd did not discuss specifically, may help to give some idea of the contents of the *Zubdat al-āthār*. The first column gives the more recent penciled-in pagination, the second gives the older Arabic-script pagination employed by Bartol'd, and the third gives the sections or headings beginning on the given folio:

- |      |   |  |
|------|---|--|
|      | 1a  | abrupt beginning, in the 2nd <i>faṣl</i> , on the pre-Islamic prophets, in the account of Ibrāhīm (Ismā'īl, 11a: 'Īsā, 88b)                  |
| 109a | 3rd <i>faṣl</i> , 'ajam pādšāhlarī dhikridā (Afrāsiyāb's coming to Iran, 125a/116a; Sāsānīlār, 163a/154a) |  |
| 192b | 4th <i>faṣl</i> , on the Prophet Muḥammad   |  |
| 249b | last heading within 4th <i>faṣl</i> , on the 2nd year of the <i>hijrah</i>                                |  |
| 251b | 8th <i>faṣl</i> , on the 'Abbāsīd Caliphs   |  |
| 276b | 9th <i>faṣl</i> , on the <i>sultāns</i> under the 'Abbāsīds   |  |
| 277a | Ṭāhirīds  |  |
| 280a | Sāmānīds  |  |
| 291a | Ghaznavīds  |  |
| 303a | Āl-i Saljūq   |  |
| 317a | Khorezmshāhs  |  |
| 323b | 324b  | Atabeks  |
| 324b | 325b  | 10th <i>faṣl</i> , on Chingiz Khan and his descendants (Ügetäy Khān, 339a/340a; Güyüq, 340b/341b; etc.)                                      |
| 342b | 343b  | <i>Dašt-i Qipchāq-da salṭanat qilgan khānlar dhikridā</i>  |
| 343b | 344b  | <i>Īrān vilāyatidā salṭanat qilgan khānlar dhikridā</i>  |
| 352a | 353a  | Chaghatayīds   |
| 356a | 357a  | 11th <i>faṣl</i> , on Timur and his successors (reference to <i>Tārīkh-i khānī</i> , 357a/358a; Shāhrukh, 435b; Sultān Ḥusayn Bayqarā, 460a; |
| 471b | 462b  | <i>Šībānī Khān bin Jöcī Khān avlādī-ning aḥvālī va Muḥammad Šībānī va khāqān-i a'zam Söyünč Khwājah Khān khurujī dhikridā</i>                |

(Abū'l-Khayr Khan, 472a/463a; Shāh Bakht Khān's taking of Khorezm, 476a/467a; death of Shāh Bakht Khān, 478b/469b; abrupt end of text, 480b/471b)

In view of its age, its size, and its quality (as attested already by Bartol'd), it is curious that this manuscript has not drawn more attention from either historians or Turkologists<sup>15</sup> — not even enough attention to establish its identity! To be sure, as noted by Bartol'd and others, the *Zubdat al-āthār* is a compilation from a number of earlier sources and is of independent historical value primarily for the end of the Timurid era and the Uzbek conquest of Mawarannahr. Nevertheless, neither Bartol'd nor anyone else has thoroughly analyzed the *Zubdat al-āthār*'s accounts of Mongol or Timurid history, and it cannot be excluded offhand that the work may contain valuable data unavailable in other extant sources<sup>16</sup>; the section on the Chaghatayid dynasty, for instance, appears to include data not known from other sources, and the author's use of the 'Uyghur' chronicle of the Chingizid dynasties was noted above. In particular, the author's service to the late Timurid rulers in his native Balkh prior to the Shaybānīd conquest, and his subsequent service to the early Shaybānīd princes, provided a unique vantage point on the transition from Timurid to Uzbek power in Central Asia, and his treatment of this period may offer otherwise unavailable material beyond the excerpts published by Bartol'd. At any rate, an analysis of the author's use of his sources is of obvious importance for historiographical research in the development of the Shaybānīd-era historical tradition, while his presentation of events should be of interest for exploring the intellectual history of his own time. And finally, the *Zubdat al-āthār* is one of the most extensive prose texts in Chaghatay Turkic dating from the first half of the 16th century and offers considerable hitherto-untapped material for Turkologists.

It is hoped that the task of publishing the text will be taken up at the Institute of Oriental Studies in Tashkent; in the meantime, a microfilm of folios 303a-480b from the best manuscript (Inv. No. 5368), covering part of *faṣl* 9 (beginning with the account of the 'Āl-i Saljūq') and all of *faṣls* 10 (ff. 325b-357a) and 11 (ff. 357a-471b) down to the abrupt ending, was provided by the Institute, and is now available in the Central Asian Archives (a collection of microfilms of unpublished manuscript sources on the history and civilization of Islamic Central Asia) at the Research Institute for Inner Asian Studies (RIFIAS) at Indiana University.

#### NOTES

\* Indiana University

<sup>1</sup> During the 1983-84 academic year I had the opportunity to work in several manuscript collections of Soviet

Central Asia for research in Persian and Turkic historical and hagiographical sources on Islamic Central Asia. A broader survey of Chaghatay Turkic materials in these collections is currently in preparation.

<sup>2</sup> K.H. Menges, 'Report on an Excursion to Leningrad and Taškent for Research in Čayataj Manuscripts,' *Central Asiatic Journal*, 8 (1963), pp. 231-252 (especially pp. 244-252); and his 'Report on the Second Excursion to Taškent for Research in Čayataj Manuscripts,' *Central Asiatic Journal*, 11 (1966), pp. 87-133.

<sup>3</sup> R.D. McChesney, 'A Guide to Orientalist Research in Soviet Central Asia,' *Middle East Studies Association Bulletin*, 12/1 (1978), pp. 13-25.

<sup>4</sup> Eleazar Birnbaum, 'Turkish Manuscripts: Cataloguing since 1960 and Manuscripts still Uncatalogued; Part 3: U.S.S.R., Iran, Afghanistan, Arab Lands (except Palestine), Israel and Palestine, India and Pakistan, China,' *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 103 (1983), pp. 691-707 (pp. 692-695 on Soviet Central Asian collections).

<sup>5</sup> In addition to the discussions of the work noted below, the *Zubdat al-āthār* is mentioned also by J. Eckmann in his survey of Chaghatay literature ('Die tschagataische Literatur,' in *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*, II (Wiesbaden, 1964), pp. 309-402, p. 367 on this work), by Carl Brockelmann in his *Osttürkische Grammatik der islamischen Literatur-Sprachen Mittelasiens* (Leiden, 1954, p. 17-18, where the author's name is given wrongly as 'Nawallāhī'), and by Zeki Velidi Togan in his brief account of Central Asian Islamic Turkic literature (in *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, 5/1, Turkologie (Leiden-Köln, 1963), p. 236), in his *Tarihde usul* (Istanbul, 1950), p. 235, and in his *Bugünkü Türkili (Türkistan) ve yakın tarihi*, I (Batı ve kuzey Türkistan) (İstanbul: Arkadaş, İbrahim Horoz ve Güven Basimevleri, 1942-1947), pp. 192 (n. 195), 195, 572, 583, citing Bartol'd's 'Otchet' (see below). Menges (see above, note 2), whose focus was primarily linguistic and literary, made no mention of the *Zubdat al-āthār*.

<sup>6</sup> 'Otchet o komandirovke v Turkestan,' *Zapiski Vostochnago otdeleniia Imperatorskago Russkago Arkheologicheskago obschestva (ZVO)* (St. Petersburg), 15 (1904), pp. 173-280 (on the work in question, pp. 187-205; reprinted in Bartol'd *Sochineniia*, VIII (Moscow, 1973), pp. 119-210 (on the work in question, pp. 130-145).

<sup>7</sup> L.V. Dmitrieva, et al., ed., *Opisanie tiurkskikh rukopisei Instituta narodov Azii AN SSSR*, I (Leningrad, 1965), pp. 25-26, No. 6.

<sup>8</sup> *Sobranie vostochnykh rukopisei Akademii nauk Uzbezkoi SSR*, t. I, ed. A.A. Semenov (Tashkent, 1952), pp. 36-37, Cat. No. 69, Inv. No. 608.

<sup>9</sup> *Sochineniia*, VIII (Moscow, 1973), p. 131, n. 22.

<sup>10</sup> H.F. Hofman, *Turkish Literature: A Bio-Bibliographical Survey*; Section III (Chaghatay), Part I (Authors) (Utrecht: The Library of the University of Utrecht, 1969), IV, pp. 256-257.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. S.K. Ibragimov, 'Nekotorye dannye k istorii kazakhov XV-XVI vekov', *Izvestiia AN KazSSR*, ser. ist., ekon., fil., i prava, 1956, vyp. 3, pp. 107-113 (pp. 107-108, where in addition he mis-identifies and wrongly describes the Leningrad copy).

<sup>12</sup> *Materialy po istorii kazakhskikh khanstv XV-XVIII vekov (izvlecheniia iz persidskikh i tiurkskikh sochinenii)*, ed. S.K. Ibragimov, N.N. Mingulov, K.A. Pishchulina, and V.P. Iudin (Alma-Ata: 'Nauka,' 1969), pp. 128-134; cf. p.

128, n. 2 for the implied identification. Curiously, instead of translating the material on the Kazakhs found in those concluding pages of the work available only in the Leningrad manuscript, the editors merely reproduce Bartol'd's paraphrase of the relevant section.

<sup>13</sup> A. Mukhtarov, 'Ob avtorakh dvukh istochnikov XVI v.,' *Pis'mennye pamiatniki Vostoka*, 1974 (Moscow, 1981), pp. 66-69. Mukhtarov still notes only two extant copies of the *Zubdat al-athar*, but he deals with the manuscripts only incidentally: his purpose is to refute Bartol'd's old assumption that the *Zubdat al-āthār* was also known by the title *Tamm at-tavārīkh*. Bartol'd had asserted this identification on the basis of the 17th-century *Baḥr al-asrār*, which cites an 'Abdullāh Balkhī' as the author of the *Zubdat al-āthār*, and of an 18th-century compilatory history of Timur (now identified as the *Kunūz al-a'zam*, on which see the partial Russian translation of C.A. Storey's *Persian Literature*, i.e. *Persidskaia literatura: bio-bibliograficheskii obzor*, tr. Iu.Ė. Bregel' (Moscow, 1972), t. II, pp. 812-815), which lists among its sources the *Tamm at-tavārīkh* of 'Abdullāh Balkhī'. As Mukhtarov notes, such an identification was hardly called for to begin with, and may be finally laid to rest on the basis of Mukhtarov's discovery of a manuscript of the *Tamm at-tavārīkh* in the library of the Afghan Historical Society in Kabul (Inv. No. 1614), from which it is established that this work was written in 1006/1597-98.

<sup>14</sup> The Arabic-script foliation runs to 471 ff., but a later hand has added occasional European folio numbers; these appear sporadically through the manuscript, running one folio behind the Arabic-script enumeration, through Arabic-script f. 358, but Arabic-script ff. 460-471 bear European numbers 469-480. The catalogue card, accordingly, describes the manuscript as containing 480 ff., with the final page of the text f. 480b (European numbering) rather than 471b (Arabic-script numbering). There do appear to be errors in the original Arabic-script numbering, but it appears more accurate than the later additions; at any rate the original numbering was followed by Bartol'd and there is no good reason not to maintain it.

<sup>15</sup> A brief reference to this copy found in B.A. Akhmedov's *Istoriia Balkha* (Tashkent: 'Fan,' 1982), p. 5, n. 10, appears to be the only published 'report' on its existence after Bartol'd's description; Akhmedov does not identify it, however, as the Viatkin manuscript studied by Bartol'd. Akhmedov notes only that he used this manuscript, without describing it, and curiously makes no mention of it in his discussion of the *Zubdat al-āthār* in his 1985 source survey, *Istoriiko-geograficheskaiia literatura Srednei Azii XVI-XVIII vv. (Pis'mennye pamiatniki)* (Tashkent: 'Fan,' 1985; pp. 30-33 on this work). In this work, incidentally, Akhmedov notes (p. 31, n. 62) that V. F. Minorsky had reported, in a personal letter dated January 1, 1966, the existence of additional, 'well-preserved' copy of the *Zubdat al-āthār* 'in London' (it is not clear whether it is Minorsky or Akhmedov who failed to be more specific); a microfilm of this manuscript was sent to the Institute of Oriental Studies in Tashkent, Akhmedov notes, but the microfilm's whereabouts are presently unknown. The existence of a 'London manuscript' is likewise suggested by a text edition of the section of the work on the Shaybānids prepared by E. Denison Ross for publication by the Royal Asiatic Society; the edition was never published, but a copy of the text proofs was shown to me by Yuri Bregel, who in turn had

received it from Bernard Lewis. The copy lacks introductory material and critical apparatus, and it is not clear from which manuscript or manuscripts the edition was prepared: in any case, the sequence of folios cited in the text (53a-65b; 231a-b; 6a-12b; 225a-230b; 288a-288b; 120a-123b; 289a-289b) cannot point to any of the known copies as the basis of the text, and it may be that yet another manuscript of the work was consulted by Denison Ross. Several personal inquiries failed, however, to turn up the phantom London copy of the *Zubdat al-āthār* in any public collections. Finally, a spurious reference to a London manuscript must be noted here: L. Zimin, 'Les exploits d'Emîrzâde 'Omar Cheikh fils de Timour, a Kachghar, en Ferghana et en Mongolie,' *Revue du monde musulman*, 28 (1914), pp. 244-258, specifically p. 245, n. 2, where the author cites a passage from the text of the *Zubdat al-āthār* published in Bartol'd's 'Otchet' and gives folio references to the Viatkin copy, f. 358a, 'et ms. du British Museum, fol. 2a.' Bartol'd's citation of f. 2a referred in fact to his manuscript 'P', but evidently either Zimin or the journal editor turned Bartol'd's mention of the 'Asiatic Museum' in St. Petersburg into the 'British Museum.'

<sup>16</sup> As one example among the passages I have examined for my own research, the work's presentation of the capture of Khorezm by the Uzbek chieftain Abū'l-Khayr Khan in 1430 (f. 472a [European] 463a [Arabic]) is clearly not drawn directly from extant written sources.

#### ADDENDUM

The London copy of the *Zubdat al-āthār* has at last turned up. In a letter dated November 1, 1990, Dr. Simon Digby,

former Honorary Librarian at the Royal Asiatic Society, has informed me that he has for some time owned a manuscript of this work from the collection of Sir Richard Burn, a historian of India who served for a time as Lieutenant Governor of the United Provinces (now Uttar Pradesh); his copy is dated 977/1569, making it the oldest manuscript of the *Zubdat al-āthār*, and appears to be nearly complete. Even more interestingly, Dr. Digby reports that his manuscript's copyist was 'Sālār Bābā b. Qul-'Alī Sālār Nasā'i,' he is certainly to be identified with the 'Sālār Bābā b. Qul-'Alī Sālār Kharīdārī' who produced one of the two known 16th-century Chaghatay translations of Rashīd ad-Dīn's *Jāmi' at-tavārikh*. Sālār Bābā's incomplete translation, which is not mentioned in Hofman's survey of Chaghatay literature, was preserved in a single manuscript, evidently an autograph, now at the Institute of Language and Literature of the Academy of Sciences of the Turkmen SSR in Ashkhabad. This manuscript is noted in Yuri Bregel's translation of Storey's *Persian Literature (Persidskaia literatura: bio-bibliograficheskii obzor* [Moscow, 1972], I, p. 317), on the basis of references to it in S.G. Agadzhanov, *Ocherki istorii oguzov i turkmen Srednei Azii IX-XIII vv.* (Ashkhabad, 1969), and in a recent article by N.B. Khalimov, 'Zakaznye knigi turkmen (XIV-XVII vv.)', *Izvestiia Akademii nauk Turkmenskoi SSR, seriia Obshchestvennykh nauk*, 1988, No. 1, pp. 19-24 (pp. 22-23 on Sālār Bābā's work); it was copied in 963/1556 in Nasā, and the translation itself was evidently done at the behest of the Uzbek ruler of Khorezm, 'Alī Sulṭān b. Avānīsh Khān (d. 979/1571-72).

