Manşur Muşavvir, “the Pride of the Painters” and His Son Şahş Mużaffar, “the Rarity of the Age”

Kambiz Eslami

In his History of Muslim Rulers of Mughulistan, the Tārīkh-i Rashidī, the 10th/16th-century Chaghatai author Muhammad Haydar Dughlat, better known as Mirzā Haydar, devotes a brief section to the identification and evaluation of prominent Persian painters of the 9th/15th to mid-10th/16th centuries. He begins his account by naming a certain Uṣūdān Manşūr and his son, Şahş Mużaffar, who evidently were both at one time or another court painters of the later Timurids. The information that Mirzā Haydar provides about this father and son duo seems to have been one of the very few near-contemporary accounts available to and used (sometimes erroneously) by students of Persian painting. I shall attempt here to supplement the information about Manşūr by presenting some hitherto overlooked documents which I hope will help establish a more accurate and justifiable outline of the career of Manşūr and Şahş Mużaffar. Before that, however, it would be useful to recount what has been written about Manşūr and his son, and furthermore to offer new speculations in light of the recorded and reliable data.

Besides being too brief, Mirzā Haydar’s description of artists in the Tārīkh-i Rashidī, which is actually a chronological and rating account, suffers from the rather unfortunate (yet not too uncommon) fact that it does not give precise dates of the activities of the artists. As far as our two painters are concerned, we learn that Manşūr was most active during the time of Sultan Abū Saʿīd.1 Timūr’s great-grandson, who ruled over Transoxiana and Khurasan from 855/1451 and 863/1459, respectively, until his downfall in 873/1469 at the hands of the Apšuvūl Sultan ʿUzūn Hasan (r. 857–821/1453–78), Manşūr’s son, Şahş Mużaffar, who died at the early age of twenty-four,2 must have been a contemporary of the master Timurid Safavid painter Kamāl al-Dīn Bihzād (ca. 872–942/ca. 1467–1535/6),3 if not even slightly senior, because his name is mentioned before that of Bihzād, and because, we are told, both of them were protégés (tābial māḏāna) of ‘Allāshir Navāʾī (844–906/1441–1501), the lifetime companion and amīr of Sultan Ḥusayn Bāyqarā’ (r. 873–911/1469–1506).4 From this we may safely assume that Şahş Mużaffar too was born around 872/1467, and therefore died ca. 896/1491. A drawing in the famous Bahrām Mīrzā album in the Topkapı Palace Library in Istanbul is attributed to Şahş Mużaffar by an ‘unwān (heading) which distinctly calls him nāqšāsī ’ī Khurāsānī (Khurāsānī painter).5 Even if we question the attribution, we can still give credence to the nīṣbat of Khurāsānī, which means Manşūr could have come from Khurāsān as well.6 It is then possible that Manşūr was already an accomplished artist in the culturally thriving Harat during the fifth decade of the 9th/15th century, and that he joined Abū Saʿīd’s atelier upon, or shortly after, the latter’s conquest of Khurasan in 863/1459. If we suppose that in 867/1463 (i.e., between 863/1459 and 873/1469, the year in which Abū Saʿīd was killed by Yādgar Muḥammad) Manşūr was a man of forty years old, he must have been born in 827/1424 in Harat, which was at that time (and remained so for the next twenty-three years) under the reign of Timūr’s son Shāhrukh, who was a less skilled military and political leader but certainly a more benevolent patron of the arts than his father. As we shall see later, Manşūr could also have participated in the activities of the ateliers of the

1 Bihzād’s exact date of birth has not been established with certainty. Scholars have proposed dates as early as ca. 844/1440 (Rice 1975, 222) or as late as ca. 872/1467 (Soosdvār 1992, 86, 123, footnote no. 47, referring to Bīdāq Muḥammad Qaẓvī’ī’s ʿAvārak al-ʿaḥārīm, MS Dorm 288 in the Saint Petersburg State University Library, fol. 111r). The fact that Bīdāq Qaẓvī’ī (b. 916–7/1510–2)—the only known and reliable contemporary source mentioning anything about Bihzād’s age at the time of his death—suggests the early 870s as his birthdate argues for its use here.


3 Topkapı Palace Library, İstanbul, Hazine 2154, fol. 40v, for a reproduction, see Binoyos, Wilkinsen, Gray [1933] [1971], pl. xxv. Relying primarily on stylistic grounds, Abūlha ṣ Soudawar has rejected the attribution, suggesting that the drawing displays Jalāyirdī or early Turkman traits and should not be considered an original work by Şahş Mużaffar, see Soosdvār 1992, 95, 122–3, footnote nos. 37–8. It has also been maintained (Lentz and Lowry 1989, 313; Adde 1990, 230, 235) that the ‘unwāns added to the paintings of this muraqqā are the work of Dūst Muḥammad, the Harat-born Safavid calligrapher and painter, who oversaw the compilation of the muraqqā; and who wrote the now famous introduction on the calligraphers, painters and illuminators of the past to it. It is thus rather surprising that in his introduction Dūst Muḥammad does not even mention the name of his fellow Khurāsānī painter Şahş Mużaffar, whom he allegedly describes in the ‘unwān as “the rarity of the age” (nīṣbat al-ṣāliḥ)—a phrase used in the captions only for one other painter, Bihzād, see Dūst Muḥammad 1993; Roxburgh 1996, 2:869, 942.

4 As we shall see later, Manşūr may have originally come from Shirāz and moved back and forth between Shirāz and Harat.
Qaragoyunjlu Sultan Pir Badq ibn Jahanshah and Sultan Husayn Bayqara', and could have worked in different capacities in those rulers' libraries.

In issuing his verdicts on the merits of the painters' works, Mirza Haydar draws candid comparisons between them. He calls Mansur an ustād “than whom there was none better” during the time of Sultan Aba Sa'id. Aside from his son Shah Muzaffar, no one else had Mansur's “fine, thin brush.” Still, it was “somewhat dry.” His “hunting [scenes]” (gīrīf va girī) were extremely effective, although again Shah Muzaffar surpassed him in that many times over. Shah Muzaffar himself painted with extreme subtlety, grace, and maturity (naẓuki, mu'ākat va pukhtigi). He left behind seven or eight finished paintings, some pen-and-ink drawings (qalam stāyi), and at least a pupil, Darvish Muhammad, who later became Mirza Haydar's own painting teacher. A little further on, Mirza Haydar even goes so far as to ranking the painters: in first place was Khvajah 'Abd al-Hayy, second was Shah Muzaffar, and third was Bihzad.

Shah Muzaffar is also mentioned by the 10th/16th-century Mughal Emperor Zahir al-Din Muhammad Bâbur in his memoirs Bânârnâmâh. He describes him as having “painted delicately” and having done “swift and delicate floral work.” Bâbur reiterates the fruitful relationship that existed between Mir 'Alishir and the two painters, Shah Muzaffar and Bihzad, saying that it was through Mir 'Alishir’s good offices “that master Bihzad . . . and Shah-Muzaffar became so famous for painting.” Whether there was a good relationship between the two painters themselves is not known. Some sort of rivalry must have existed between the two; after all, they were both regarded

8 Khushkhar is evidently the word used in both the manuscripts on which W. Thackston has based his translation, see Muhammad Haydar Dughlāt, 1996, 164. According to T. W. Arnold, the word used in the manuscripts from which he translated his text is khatkhar (Binyon, Wilkinson, Gray [1933] 1971, 189), which does not necessarily make sense in this context. It is likely that the scribes of the manuscripts (or perhaps Arnold) mistranslated khushkhar. In fact, Arnold seems to have combined two separate sentences and come up with a rather far-fetched translation. In the Persian text edited by Thackston these sentences are: Amānī-e shahsakht-est. Gīrīf va girī rā bi-gūzāt muhammād sālīkhī (Muhammad Haydar Dughlāt 1996, 164), Arnold’s translation reads: “But he [Mansur] was somewhat more refreshing (as an artist) in that his strokes were firmer” (Binyon, Wilkinson, Gray [1933] 1971, 189).  

9 Thackston has translated girīf va girī as “animal combat [scenes]” (Muhammad Haydar Dughlāt 1996, 164 and 199b, 130); for a comment on Arnold’s translation of this sentence, see footnote no. 8.  

10 Muhammad Haydar Dughlāt 1996, 166 and 199b, 131. Fakhri Hariri, the 10th/16th-century translator of Mir ‘Alishir’s Majālis al-sifrī, says that Darvish Muhammad was a student of Bihzad, see Mir ‘Alishir Navi’s [1945] 1984, 154.  


13 See ibid., 214. as masters of their craft,14 and both must have felt proud to have been brought up by such leading artists of the period as Mansur and Mirak. It is even possible that the competition between the two was perhaps so strong that those sources sympathetic toward Bihzad (e.g., Khvānd Amir, Vāsīf, Bādqūzī, and Qāżī Ahmad) reacted to the whole situation by choosing to ignore Shah Muzaffar and remaining completely silent about him (and his father).

It was with the exhibition of miniatures at Burlington House in January–March 1931 and with the publication, two years later, of its detailed catalog, Persian miniature painting, by L. Binyon, J. V. S. Wilkinson, and B. Gray, that Mansur and Shah Muzaffar were introduced to western audiences. Among the items exhibited at Burlington House was the Bahram Mirza album, mentioned earlier, which included (as it does now) two drawings attributed to Shah Muzaffar. One of the drawings depicts the prophet Muhammad on his ml-ulj (ascension) to heaven,15 while the other one shows an angel offering a certain Sayf al-Muluk on a horse what seems to be a plate of fruits (Fig. 1). The catalog of the exhibition also provided a translation of both Mirza Haydar’s and Bâbur’s texts pertaining to our painters.16

14 The last sentence in Mirza Haydar’s evaluation of Shah Muzaffar can be read in two different ways: Usūdān-i in namā‘ār-i bi-gūzāt ‘azīl māīdāwīdān (The masters of this art consider him very dear), or Usūdān in namā‘ār-i bi-gūzāt ‘azīl māīdāwīdān (The masters [of this art] consider this art of him [pen-and-ink drawing] very dear), see Muhammad Haydar Dughlāt 1996, 165.  

15 See footnote no. 6.  

16 Topkapı Palace Library, Istanbul, Hazine 2154, fol. 8tr. In his study of album-making under the Timurids and Safavids, David Roskrow has provided the most detailed examination of the drawing yet, speculating that the character named Sayf al-Muluk may be referring to “Ali ibn Abi Tālib, as Roskrow 1996, 2909. A more probable explanation can be found in a classic folk tale known by the same name as that of the main character. Below is a very brief summary of the story from the only version available to me (Sayfīnāmlâk hikâyeyi, 1959). The Gharnaviz Sultan Mahmud was fortunate to have a wazir-like Khvajah Ahmad ibn Hasan Muyamand, who was always ready to tell strange and amusing stories. Khvajah had heard of the story of Sayf al-Muluk, but was eager to learn more, so he sent his men everywhere to see if they could find more details about the story. One of the men goes to India, where he stumbles upon a storyteller who happens to be the only man alive who knows the complete story of Sayf al-Muluk. According to the storyteller, Solomon—here a prophet, advocating conversion to Islam—grants the wishes of an heirless Egyptian ruler named ‘Asim ibn Safwān and his childless wazir ‘Nu‘man to have children, on the condition that they accept Islam and spread the word of Islam in their land. Both sides keep their promises. The king and his wazir each become a father to a son, whom they name Sayf al-Muluk and Sa‘id, respectively. On his twentieth birthday, Sayf al-Muluk receives presents from Solomon, including a ring and a picture of a beautiful girl. He falls in love with the girl and leaves the kingdom to look for her, eventually finding her after much hardship. The drawing attributed to Shah Muzaffar may depict the point when presents from Solomon are delivered to Sayf al-Muluk.  

The first critical attempt to identify potential finished miniatures of Shāh Muzaffar was made in 1961 by Basil Gray in his Persian painting, where he tried to explain the “old-fashioned” nature of a series of miniatures that some scholars had considered to be works of Bihzād by attributing them to an earlier group of painters, including Shāh Muzaffar. The miniature which Gray selected to attribute to Shāh Muzaffar and to reproduce belongs to a manuscript of Mir ‘Alishtī’s Khansāh which was copied in Harāt in 890/1485, the year in which Mir ‘Alishtī actually finished the composition of one of its pieces, Sadd-i Iskandarī.20 In “Shaykh ‘Irāqi overcome at parting”21 the most original of the volume’s paintings, as he put it, Gray saw a composition fundamentally different from that of Bihzād’s. Whereas Bihzād generally preferred to let “internal rhythms” dictate his “formal” patterns, the painter of “Shaykh ‘Irāqi” has put aside the subtle manifestations of individual emotions to emphasize his group scene.22

Shāh Muzaffar and Mansūr became subjects of discussion in yet another study by Gray—this time about 9th/14th-century Persian painting.23 Here—still using Mirzā Haydar’s work as his supporting source—he associated the era of Mansūr’s activities not with the Timurid Sultān Abū Sa’īd but rather with the Ilkhanid Abū Sa’īd (r. 717–36/1317–35), and suggested a Jalayirid painting from the same Hamze 2154 album as a possible work of Shāh Muzaffar.24

A new context for understanding the disposition of Mansūr’s and Shāh Muzaffar’s works was provided by Abolala Soudavar in his 1992 publication, Art of the Persian courts. The book, which contains selections from Soudavar’s own collection—the Art and History Trust Collection—offers a new perspective on Shāh Muzaffar’s oeuvre, while attributing, for the first time in many years, a painting from that collection to Mansūr. In the “Coronation of Sultan Husayn Mirzā Bāyqara,” a painting from an unknown manuscript, Soudavar found evidence of Mansūr’s style and technique as reported by Mirzā Haydar and Bābur.25 Soudavar’s attribution is further fortified by his argument that the painting is contemporaneous with the actual coronation of Sultan Husayn Bāyqara (873/1469), and that Mansūr was the only painter at the court at the time whose status was high enough for him to be asked to paint the ceremony. Mansūr probably also supervised the painting of “The harem of Sultan Husayn Mirzā Bāyqara,” which Soudavar attributes to his son Shāh Muzaffar. The painting, from a divān of Amir Khusrav Dīlāvī, is dated 886/1481, and can very well represent the work of a very young Shāh Muzaffar. Soudavar furthermore traces the development of the young artist by convincingly attributing to him five other illustrations which meet the criteria posed by constraints of quantity, date, and style.27 All five illustrations were most likely created within a span of less than five years, from ca. 888/1483 until 891/1486, and have in common such elements as similar facial features and generally youthful ambiance. One of the illustrations (“A camp scene”) is from the same Khansāh of ‘Alishtī Navâ’i (dated 890/1485), mentioned earlier;28 one (“Shirin receiving Khusrav in her palace”) is from a Khansāh of Amir Khusrav Dīlāvī;29 one (“The two wrestlers”) is from a Gulistān of Sa’dî (dated 891/1486);30 two (“Humay and Humayūn entertained” and “Humayūn hunting”) from a Humay u Humayūn of Khvāhī-yi Kirmānī (ca. 1332).

21 Ibid., 90. 
22 Zerøn Tanîndî has noted similarities among some of these illustrations in her study (1979), but did not attribute any one to any particular artist. 
23 Laylū u Maqṣūm, John Rylands Library, Manchester, MS Turk 3, fol. 16v. Robinson (1958, 67 and 1980, 116) suggests that the only other painting in Laylū u Maqṣūm (“Maqṣūm visited by camel-rider”), and “The portrait of a princess shown to Bahram Gūr” in Bodleian Library’s Sab’-i-i sayyārah are probably also by the same painter who painted “A camp scene.” 
24 Khansāh, Chester Beatty Library, Dublin, MS 163, fol. 54v. 
25 Gulistan, Art and History Trust Collection, Houston, Texas, MS 36, fol. 21r (Soudavar 1992, 101–5). This fine copy of Gulistan was most likely made for ‘Alishtī Navâ’i, and was in the library of several Mughal emperors, some of whom wrote inscriptions on its second page. Soudavar has identified Jahangīr’s (r. 1014–37/1605–27) note which says the volume’s paintings are all by Usūlāzādāh (lit. son of usūl), whom Soudavar identifies as Shāh Muzaffar because Mansūr was the only painter of his time to be known as usūl. Jahangīr had initially added the name of this Usūlāzādāh, but now only “Shāh M” is visible to the naked eye, see Soudavar 1992, 98.
The painting “Humâyûn hunting” (Fig. 2) is the most lively of them all, one which displays force and human vitality in a most colorful manner, one which the young Shah Muzaffar must have particularly enjoyed creating. It has all the elements that Bâbur and Mirzâ Haydar recounted when they compared Shah Muzaffar’s work with that of his father Manşûr: an extremely effective hunting scene, delicate flowers, graceful movements, and skillful execution. It is as if Mirzâ Haydar and Bâbur were looking at this very painting when they were describing Shah Muzaffar’s style. It is also tempting to think that at the same time they were perhaps looking at a similar scene by Manşûr.

In actuality, there is a superb painting of ca. 840/1440s which shows seven horsemen vigorously in pursuit of some fleeing animals (including a leopard, rabbits, foxes, and deer) on a field covered with tufts of grass and four bare trees, and which is inscribed in the lower left-hand corner with the name of the artist who painted it, Darvish Manşûr (Fig. 3). There is really no need to doubt the attribution, and we can safely regard the painting as one of Manşûr’s earlier works. Traces of Bûyûşhghur atelier style in it can indicate that Manşûr was perhaps trained by a master of that school. The painting is in one of the “Saray” albums in the Diez collection of the Oriental Division of the State Library at Berlin—albums which are believed to have originally belonged to the larger group of albums including Hazine 2153, 2154, and 2160. There are two drawings in the published catalog of the Diez “Saray” albums that show close similarities to the “Hunting scene,” and thus can be attributed to Manşûr as well. One is a drawing of a leopard, a peacock, and a horseman about to strike a foot soldier with his sword. The other drawing—which Íşpiroğlu dates to the late 14th century—depicts an unusually curved tree on whose leafy end branches some birds are sitting and two are mating, while a sitting fox fills the empty gap between the curved tree and the trunk of another tree. Both drawings reaffirm Manşûr’s early fascination with animals, especially birds (more on this later), and the ease and skill with which he could portray their demeanor and subtle movements. The provenance of these works clearly demonstrates that they are closely related to the two drawings attributed to Shâh Muzaffar in Hazine 2154, and to the Hazine 2153 and 2160 paintings and drawings commonly thought to be works of Muhammad Siyâh Qalam, who is probably none other than Shâh Muzaffar’s pupil, Darvish Muhammad. It would not be too far-fetched then to argue that the albums represent—among other things—the interests and efforts of their original compiler or compilers to keep the works of a father, his son, and the latter’s pupil together.

Among the Timurid sources published in Iran during the past few decades is a collection of letters and decrees, a manuscript copy of which came into the possession of the Iranian bibliophile and scholar Rûkû al-Dîn Humâyûnîfarukh in the summer of 1335 Sh./156. The majmû’î, which lacked several leaves from the beginning, was entitled Manshâ’ al-insha’, and was collected by a certain Abû al-Qâsim Shâh Shûh al-Dîn Aâmâd Khwârî known as Manshî. The manuscript, which is believed to be in Shâh Shûh al-Dîn’s hand, is dated mid-Jumâdî 1 938/late December 1531, and was dedicated to a Khvâjah Amir Beg, whom Humâyûnîfarukh identifies as Amir Beg Zâhir al-Dîn Muhammad al-Kâjânî Tâbrîzî, the then acting amâr of Khurâsan. The letters, decrees, and book notices that are included in this collection are by Shâh Shûh al-Dîn’s teacher and mentor, Nâẓûm al-Dîn (or, according to Khvâjah Amir, Kamâl al-Dîn) ‘Abd al-Vâsî Nâzîmâ (d. 909/1503–4), who worked in the Epistolary Office (Divûn-i Tarassûl) of the Timurid Sulṭân Abû Sa’îd, Yâdîr Mâhâmîd, and Sulṭân Husuyn Bâyqârâ’î, and who was famous for his dexterity in writing ornate and flowery texts—no doubt a prerequisite for someone in his position. Manshâ’ al-insha’, even in its incomplete state, displayed that characteristic quite well. It was also the same style of writing that Humâyûnîfarukh noticed in another manuscript that he acquired from an auction several years later. This other manuscript, also entitled Manshâ’ al-insha’, was in a different handwriting from that of the first manuscript, but was quite

---

11 Humâyûn u Humâyûnî, Topkapî Palace Library, Istanbul, MS Revan 10145, fols. 42v, 23v.
12 Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin - Preußischer Kulturbesitz - Orientabteilung, Diez A, Fol. 70, Bl. 1.; for a color reproduction, see Íşpiroğlu 1964, pl. xxviii. See also Kühnel (1959, 77), who identified Darvish Manşûr with our painter for the first time.
13 Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin - Preußischer Kulturbesitz - Orientabteilung, Diez A, Fol. 72, Bl. 12, Nr. 1.; for a reproduction see, Íşpiroğlu 1964, pl. xlviii.
14 Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin - Preußischer Kulturbesitz - Orientabteilung, Diez A, Fol. 73, Bl. 30, Nr. 4.; Íşpiroğlu 1964, 102; for a reproduction, see ibid., pl. xxxviii. The unadged inscription on the bottom right-hand corner of the drawing that identifies the painter as one Úsîd Shams al-Dîn Naqîqâh can be dismissed as it seems to be of a much later date.
15 Mansûr could have worked at the Sîrî court of the Qayyanûlî Sultan Pir Bûdâq ibn Jahânshâh, and have participated in the production of the illustrations of the Gûlûnî Palace copy of Kadîlah va Dinuh. For a reproduction of most of the illustrations of this manuscript, see Vladislav 1958.
16 See Robinson 1981, 63. Solomonie’s story also provides further connection between some of Muhammad Siyâh Qalam’s paintings (Topkapî Palace Library, Istanbul, Hazine 2153, fols. 164a–5; reproduced in color in Íşpiroğlu 1984, pls. 56a–b) and Shâh Muzaffar’s “Sarî al-Mulûk” drawing, see footnote no. 16; and Hasse 1961, 52–3.
17 ‘Abd al-Vâsî Nâzîmî 1979–. For a reproduction of the manuscript’s colophon, see Humâyûnîfarukh 1966, 49.
similar in the types of document it contained. Further examination revealed that Humâyûnfaru'kh had in fact obtained a copy of the missing leaves from his first copy of the Mansha' al-inshâ'. Internal evidence from the new manuscript led Humâyûnfaru'kh to believe that sometime in the late 10th/16th century, a man named Vâ'izâ Kâshîfî (not to be confused with the author of Anvar-i suhaylî) obtained the complete manuscript of the Mansha' al-inshâ' and decided to claim it as his own work. He began copying the work, replacing Shihâb al-Dîn Ahmad's name with that of his own, and deleting the name of the amir to whom Shihâb al-Dîn had dedicated his book. Judging from the poor quality of his transcription, it is clear that he must have gotten tired of copying the book he obviously found difficult to understand and transcribe, and quit halfway through. He must probably also destroyed the original leaves of the manuscript from which he had transcribed. It was this portion of the book that Humâyûnfaru'kh published in Tehran in 1799 as the first of a two-volume book-set, whose second volume—a facsimile of the part of the book believed to be in the compiler's hand—was promised to follow, but never did. Throughout all this, Humâyûnfaru'kh seems to have been under the impression that his copy of Mansha' al-inshâ' was the only copy of the book.

However, the Egyptian National Library (the Dâr al-Kutub) holds another manuscript copy of Mansha' al-inshâ', but here the name Malik Ahmad al-Kâshîfî (or Kâshîfî) appears as the compiler of the book. There is a date (910 [1504–5]) on the last page of the manuscript, which, unlike the Humâyûnfaru'kh copy, is not part of the colophon, and may be a later addition. This copy has fewer errors of transcription, and is different from Humâyûnfaru'kh copy as far as the order of contents is concerned. Also, it seems that documents in the former are more complete than in the latter, but a final verdict on that must await the full publication of Humâyûnfaru'kh's edition.

Mansha' al-inshâ' is an obscure yet extremely important source for the study of the social, political, and cultural milieu of Khurasân during the time of the later Timurids. Among the documents preserved in it is a foreword by 'Abd al-Vâsî to a treatise—now apparently lost—written by a Maw'lânâ Mansûr Musâvîrî, "who cannot be anyone else but our painter Mansûr." The treatise, called Hamâmah 'nâmâh (Book of pigeons), contained what was probably a long time's worth of knowledge about pigeons, and, more importantly, was illustrated with paintings by Mansûr himself of various types of this bird known at the time. 'Abd al-Vâsî' begins the foreword with praise of God, and then goes on to list two incidents whereby pigeons earned their angelic reputation and man's love for them. The listing is important because it sets the stage for 'Abd al-Vâsî to offer a counter-view of the prevalent religious strictures on pigeon-keeping. The first incident occurred after the landing of Noah's Ark on the summit of Mount Jûdî, when Noah sent a pigeon to see if the earth was dry or still flooded. "As the pigeon approached the land and stepped into the water, the feathers on its feet fell out because of the bitterness of the water, and the portion of its legs touching the torturous waters became bloody and red. When it returned and described the events, Noah prayed to God that the pigeon be loved by man." The other incident mentioned relates to the prophet Muhammad and to the time when he emigrated to Medina. The polytheists were chasing him, and he sought refuge in a cave, "at whose opening a pigeon immediately laid an egg and sat on it, so that the polytheists thought that there was no one in the cave and therefore passed by it." Prophet Muhammad "petted the bird with his blessed hand and prayed to God that good and prosperity fall upon it, and that it might be loved and respected by man."

The ban imposed by religious scholars on pigeon-flying could not have been easily dismissed, so 'Abd al-Vâsî tries to explain the ban as something brought about by the actions of "the rude youth and prying individuals," who "would go on the rooftops which command views of the women's quarters of the houses of Muslems, and begin, without any fears, throwing pebbles and stones at people's houses and their neighbors." Having conveyed the inherent goodness of the bird, 'Abd al-Vâsî then moves on to introduce Mansûr's work:

Since with the passage of time and with much practice and experience, the compiler (creator) of these paintings, Mansûr Musâvîrî (may God forgive his sins) had gained complete knowledge of the characteristics of various types of pigeons, and since he could distinguish the good types from the bad types, his agreeable friends and companions kept requesting from his humble self to write a treatise containing characteristics and features of that [bird], so that those happy individuals who are interested

38 Mansha' al-inshâ', Egyptian National Library, Cairo, MS 129 Adabi Farsi, fol. 2v, 147v; Fihrist al-makhtûbât al-Farisiyâh 1966–7, 2:194–5. I am most indebted to Bernard O'Kane who sent me a copy of this manuscript.
40 It is a curious coincidence that the famous Mughal illuminator and painter Mansûr (10th–11th/16th–17th centuries) too was more than anything else a painter of nature subjects, particularly birds, see Titel, 1984, 193–4.
41 For the text of the Khurâbâh, reproduced from the Dâr al-Kutub copy, see Appendix A.
in it for enjoyment, would easily find the truth about it, and need not spend a great deal of time to gain experience for it. And God facilitated such a task, and the writing of the treatise was completed, and it was called Hamamah ‘námah.

It is difficult to date this document, but a speculation can be offered. Shihab al-Din (or Malik Ahmad) does not seem to follow any particular chronological order in compiling ‘Abd al-Vasî’s writing samples, which can be dated anywhere from the time when he worked for Abû Sa’îd Gârkanî until the time when he was employed by Sultân Husayn Bâyqarâ. What is certain, however, is that Mansûr could not have compiled Hamamah ‘námah at an early age. References to the “passage of time” and “much . . . experience” on the part of Mansûr can signify that he embarked on this project at a very mature age, perhaps in his fifties. If we suppose that he was born around 827/1424—as we suggested earlier—he then could have been working on Hamamah ‘námah when Sultân Husayn Bâyqarâ was already ruling over Khorusân in mid-870s/early 1470s. This conjecture is further strengthened by the fact that Sultân Husayn Bâyqarâ is recorded to have had quite an affinity for pigeons. Could the ever-hedonistic Sultân not also have persuaded Mansûr to take on the task of writing and illustrating a book about his favorite bird? If we accept this proposition, then we can argue that Mughal kings Akbar and Jahângîr were probably following an established pattern when they were asking their court painter Mansûr Jahângîr Şahî to paint live animals for them.

There is still another, equally significant document in Manshâ’ al-insha that pertains to Mansûr, and that is a decree (manshur) appointing him as the head of the artists of the royal atelier in Harât.43 We know of several such decrees, including one from İbrahim Sultân ibn Shahrûkh (796-838/1394-1435), naming Nasîr al-Dîn Muhammad the illuminator (muzahhib) as the administrator of his atelier,44 one from Şah İsmâ’il (r. 907-30/1501-24)—or Şâh Tahmîs3 (r. 930-84/1524-76)—naming Bilhzâd to a similar position, but with authority at a state level, in 928/1522,45 one from Şâh Tahmîs3 to Ustad Hasân Muzhâhîb Bughdâdî,46 and one from Şâh ‘Abbâs I (r. 995-1038/1587-1629) to ‘Âqâ Rizâ Muqamî.47 The ruler granting this position to Mansûr is not named in the manshur, but—as we shall see soon—he could very well be Sultân Abû Sa’îd.

The decree48 begins with an often inscrutable introduction in praise of God, which includes quite a number of oblique metaphors and similes, and which takes up about a third of the text of the manshur. From the very beginning, the abundance of terms pertaining to visual artistic creation leaves no doubt that the manshur deals with the art of creating paintings and drawings.

The author of the decree claims that patronizing the arts (ra’ ‘âyî-i jâmb-i hunar) is an old tradition and should be part of the responsibilities of all intellectuals (aşhab-i başar). It has been one of the mandatory tasks of any eminent sultân. Therefore, since “Mawlawànà Nâşir al-Dîn Mansûr Muqamî,” the pride of the painters (iṭṭâkhîr al-muzâvvinîn), has proven his ability in creating extraordinary and fine paintings/drawings (tayyîr-i naqshbendi-i khâmâh-i liťâfàf-nigarî-i gharâ-i ‘lbdâ’îq) over others, and since he is unparalleled in the art of painting and linear calligraphy (sînhrî), it became necessary for the author of the manshur to patronize him “in the best manner possible” as if he were Mâni (Mânî’îrâ). This manshur was then written so that other painters would follow Mansûr’s way of painting (qalam-i i dastîr-i hunar . . . gerdâd). Because Mansûr has achieved the highest ranks in the field of painting, other masters and artists present at the court are by virtue of this manshur obliged to follow Mansûr’s commands. He in turn should carefully examine works of those individuals and decide on their ability and talent as artists, and delegate work to them accordingly. With his expert knowledge (didâh-i başîrît), he must identify what is good or bad in their work, and differentiate them so.

Court guards should be considerate of Mansûr and should not prevent him (unduly?) from coming to or leaving the court, as they do with other
individuals. They should consider him the greatest and best painter of the court—higher and better than other artists and employees. Mansur in turn should not deviate from his submission to the will of the Sultan, and should continue to serve him with the greatest sincerity. This way, Mansur’s honesty (yaq rangi) will earn him a place among the rare individuals of the age.

The Sultan’s children, amirs, vazirs, servants, retime, tribesmen, etc. should be thoughtful of Mansur’s rights and feelings (ra’ayat-i i i ravi jib darand va muroebat-i i i i ravi jih shihan). Consuls and falcons should not ask him for tolls for his four-legged animals; and under no circumstances should sheriffs inconvenience his relatives. In fact, they should not bother complaining [about Mansur or his relatives].

Humayunfarrikh dates this decree to before 888/1483, which he says is the year when ‘Abd al-Vasi was removed from his post in the Epistolary Office and was replaced by Khvandam Amir.49 He furthermore suggests that the decree is from Sultan Husayn Bayqara, and that Birzad was a product of Mansur’s school.49 However, as mentioned earlier, Mirza Haydar associates Mansur with the court of Abu Sa’id, which means as far as Mansur’s main forte was concerned, his relationships with other rulers (be they Pir Boudag or Sultan Husayn) were not as important in the eyes of the Chaghataiyid author. If Mansur had in fact been appointed to the highest rank of artists during the reign of Sultan Husayn, it would have been highly unlikely that Mirza Haydar would still associate him with the Abu Sa’id period.

There is still more reason to believe that the manshir is from Abu Sa’id. The Dar al-Kutub copy of the text begins with two explanatory lines to the effect that the manshir was composed by ‘Abd al-Vasi at the direction (isharat-i) of Mawlahna ‘Abd al-Hayy Munshi, who apparently was not happy with a previous nishan (proclamation) written for Mansur.51


49 Humayunfarrikh 1969, 996. Humayunfarrikh’s claim that Khvandam Amir took over the job of composing royal letters and decrees after the removal of ‘Abd al-Vasi rests on his assertion that Khvandam Amir wrote the decree about Birzad’s directorship of the royal library for Sultan Husayn Bayqara on 27 Jamadi 1 889/22 June 1484, which is thirty-nine years earlier than the date mentioned in the Paris manuscript of the decree. In 889 Khvandam Amir could not have been more than eight or nine years old.

50 Ibid.

51 Mansuri al-insha’, Egyptian National Library, Cairo, MS 129 Adab-i Farsi, fol. 76v.

Translation:

A proclamation had been written for Mansur Musavvar, and (in a gathering) writers exaggerated in praising it. In that same gathering, at the direction of Mawlahna ‘Abd al-Hayy, [‘Abd al-Vasi] wrote [this text] contemporaneously.

Mawlahna ‘Abd al-Hayy was the chief munsiri of Sultan Abu Sa’id, who “became world-famous” by conducting the Sultan’s correspondence. According to Qari Ahmad, the only other rulers he served in that capacity were the Aqquoyunlus, including Ozun Hassan and Ya’qib Beg.52 No known contemporaneous source has associated ‘Abd al-Hayy with the court of Sultan Husayn Bayqara. He then could not have asked ‘Abd al-Vasi—obviously one of his pupils—to compose a decree on behalf of Sultan Husayn.53

Finally, we consider a couple of documents which may provide us with samples of Mansur’s writing. They come in another collection of letters and decrees of the period called Farā’id-i Ghiyāsī, which was collected and categorized in ten sections by Jalal al-Din Yusuf Ahi, a descendant of the famous 6th/12th-century Shi’i, Shaykh Ahmad Jam. From examining the documents in the six manuscripts that were used for the (incomplete) critical edition of the Farā’id-i Ghiyāsī, it would appear that Yusuf Ahi initially wanted to collect documents pertaining to the notables of his own family, but after he finished the first version of his compilation in 837/1433-4, the scope of his project expanded to include works of other dignitaries as well. We know for certain that he added more samples to his work as late as 860/1455-6, which seems to be the date of one of his letters to ‘Abd al-Rahman Jami included in one of the manuscript copies of the book.54 It is quite possible, however, that he—or his


53 It is interesting to see how free the higher-ranked royal manuscripts were in composing decrees, and how excluded the Sultan became in the latter part of the process.

54 Yusuf Ahi 1977-, 1:28, pref. The manuscripts on which Dr. Hessmat Mouyyad has based his edition are: (1) Universitybibliothek Tübingen copy, possibly copied by Yusuf Ahi himself, last five chapters only, 293 documents. (2) Ayanofa Kütüphanesi copy, 861/1457, selections from all ten chapters, 134 documents. (3) Kütüphanesi-i Etabl Efendi copy, 10th/16th century (seems older than 5 and 4), first five chapters only, 305 documents. (4) Bibliothèque nationale copy, 10th/16th century (seems to have been copied from 3), 247 documents. (5) Kütüphâneler-i Markazi-i Dünüaşığı-i Tibrary copy, 10th/16th century, all ten chapters, 452 documents (not all). (6) Tübingen (’7 copy, 130 documents. An apparently Turkish version of the Farā’id-i Ghiyāsī, dated Rabi’ 1 838/July 1436 and containing all ten chapters, exists in the Kehr Collection, which seems to have escaped the attention of the editor of the book, see Robinson 1978, 22. I have been unable to examine this copy for the present article.
of the letter and of the manshur that prompted it. The fact that Mansur says he wanted to go to the court may indicate that he was physically absent from the current residence of Sultan Abu Sa'id. It is possible that Abu Sa'id appointed Mansur while he was working at the court of Pir Bidaq in Shiraz during the early 860s/late 1450s. By then Mansur had probably built a reputation for himself as a masterly painter, news and evidence of which could easily have reached the Timurid Sultan. On the other hand, the tone of the manshur does not conform with the chaotic pre-863/1458 situation in Khurasan. But perhaps that is reading too much into Mansur’s statement, and we can simply assume that he was only looking forward to working at the court, and that Abu Sa'id named him head artist of his Harat atelier at some time during the last few and relatively calm years of his reign.

57 The laqab in the East Fihrist and Bibliothèque nationale manuscripts is cited as Jālāl al-Dīn and Shīḥāb al-Dīn, respectively, see ibid., 1:17, 218; but the more reliable Ayasofya and two other manuscripts give Naṣr al-Dīn as the laqab for Mansur ibn Muhammad al-Shirāzi.
58 For the text of this reply, see Appendix C. I am most grateful to Professor Heshmat Moayyad who gave me permission to reproduce the text here.
59 Mansur’s authorship of these letters should be taken into consideration with the understanding that Yūsuf Aḥl generally edited the documents in his book for maximum ornamentation, see Yūsuf Aḥl 1977–, 1:28, pref. Also, there is a “model” reply-to-ruler letter in yet another collection of letters of the period that is similar to Mansur’s letter, and could have been used by him, see Shīḥāb al-Mundih 1978, 15–6.
Fig. 1. Sayf al-Malik. Attributed to Shahrizazur. Circa 884/1479. Topkapi Palace Library, Istanbul, Hazine 2154, fol. 86r, 26 x 21 cm. By permission of the Topkapi Palace Library.

Fig. 2. Humayun hunting. Attributed to Shah Muzaffar. Circa 888/1483. Humayun, Topkapi Palace Library, Istanbul, MS Revan 1045, fol. 23r, 28.5 x 19 cm. By permission of the Topkapi Palace Library.
Fig. 3. Hunting scene. Attributed to Mansur. Circa 840/1440s, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin - Preußischer Kulturbesitz - Orientabteilung, Diez A, Fol. 70, Bl. 1, 37.5 x 23.4 cm. By permission of the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin

"Abd al-Вах аль-Низаму аль-Наим (Мансур аль-Инша), Egyptian National Library, Cairo, MS 129 Adab-i Farsi, fols. 11v-2r).
Decree appointing Mansur Masha' al-insha', Egyptian National Library, Cairo, MS 129 Adab-i Farsi, fols. 76v-77v.)
Decree appointing Mansur Musavvir Head artist (partial repeat) (Mansha' al-insha', Egyptian National Library, Cairo, MS 129 Adab-i Farsi, fols. 78r-v).
APPENDIX C
من انشا الفاضل \\ مصادر بن محمد \\ الشيرازي
في جواب احدي السلاطين
توقع مطالب و اماني
منشور حياته جاوداني

برسر نهاد وچون دل در برکفت، و آن موهفمی قدیسی را به لب جان
یوسف و بریده، مران مالیده.

شرب
آنچه استنداد میان تیرگی حسن و نیابت
در سواه خد آن منشور مضمر باقتم

ز استیاق دست گهر بالش آن منشور را
گاه برک گاه برک، گاه برک باقتم
اصناف محبت و بهد نازی که در مطافی مشاه مطالع و ارج الانباع
مندرج بوده ادعیه، عرش فرسای و انتبه، آفاق پیمایی مقابل گرداهن
و مراسم جزاییه و لازم انبداییه ی افهام
وقت در طی مناجات
سکرگاهی از حضرت الفهی مسال کرد که هر تربیتی و عاطفی که
درباره اریان عمل و فضل و اهل سلاح فرمایند سلطنت نازد و عظمت
یپای انگار کرامت کاوه، اولیای دلیل را تا قیام سعیت و وسعت
قسمه به سعیت میکلم در طاعات آید، و به هر ماهی شاهی مسخر
گردد و به هر روزی ملکی روزی شزند، اندیشی حضرت و دا
زمینی زبانه، و در هر حالی زوال، زمینی مقد گردد و هر صبحی صدیحی
به شامی اکامی مدل گشته مهى در دامی گرافات آید.

پیشوسه بر پرخیه، ارادت عیشی متصرد و متبرک است که از
مهم لاانشانی خواهر الله نسیمی تعمیمی و رجایی خاتمی، گه
منشتهای احزار سعاد به پا، مهسا ملک در دبید، عرف

۱. نسخه، پارسی: از شام: الفاقل الفنیه الالهی، شهاب الذهن، المجله، و تیمور، ۱۳۳۹.
۲. نسخه، اسعد افندی: مجدد شاکری.
۳. نسخه، اسعد افندی: زیبایی اختیاریهنگاره زمانه، پارسی، انی.
۴. نسخه، اسعد افندی: دیوان.
۵. نسخه، اسعد افندی: الایام.
۶. نسخه، اسعد افندی: موشک.
۷. نسخه، سعد افندی: درون: پارسی، درون: پارسی.
۸. نسخه، سعد افندی: پارسی.
۹. نسخه، پارسی: پارسی.
۱۰. نسخه، پارسی: درون.
۱۱. نسخه، پارسی: پارسی.
۱۲. نسخه، پارسی: پارسی.
۱۳. نسخه، پارسی: پارسی.
بیت
پارچه این آرزویی از چه خوش است
تو یک بندآور مرا برتسان

پارچه یک پناه دولت و دنبال تو کرده ای
اندر پناه خویش بدار این پنجه را


Şeyhînmâlîk hikâyeleri. 1959. İstanbul : İstanbul Maarif Kitaphanesi ve Matbaası.
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EDITOR’S NOTE

For over fifty years, Iraj Afshar has been writing and publishing on Iran. The sheer volume of his output (more than 130 books, 500 articles, and growing) is prodigious and its impact on current and future studies on Iran is indisputable. Sometimes as a bibliographer, sometimes as an editor or a publisher, but always as a resourceful scholar, he has made tremendous contributions in such fields as Persian manuscripts and bibliographies, Timurid, Safavid, and Qajar history, as well as local histories of Iran. He has been the editor of several important periodicals, one of which, Farhang-i Iran zamin, is still active.1 Most students of Iranian studies are indebted to his informative and illuminating work in one way or another.

The twenty-two essays gathered in this volume represent a sincere acknowledgment of the importance of Iraj Afshar’s body of work, and a mark of respect for a truly remarkable scholar of Iranian studies. As some of the contributions are actually based on, or closely related to, specific projects carried out by Iraj Afshar,2 they also attest to the wide-ranging and significant effect of his work. The scope of the essays reflects as diverse a scope as Ustād’s own interests and achievements, and ranges over such general rubrics as Iranian historiography (Melville), local history (de Blois), foreign relations (Piemontese, Matthee, Vahman, Floor, Savory), fine arts and cultural studies (Soucek, de Foucauld, Estami, Haarmann, Soudavar, Blair, Ghaenooparvar, Robinson, Witam, Roper), as well as political, literary, and linguistic studies (Afary, Clinton, Lazard, Perry, Sprachman). Mainly because of this varied makeup, I found another form of presentation (one based on a more-or-less chronological order of the subject matter covered) to be more appropriate.

---

The transliteration system used here for Persian and Arabic words is that of the Library of Congress. Non-Roman place and proper names have in general been transliterated, with very few exceptions (e.g., Tehran for Tihar; or Iraj Afshar for Iraj Afşahr). Vernacular terms and honorific titles have also been transliterated according to the specific context in which they appear, so the reader will find vezir, vezir, and vezir appearing where the text refers to Persian, Arabic, and Turkish chief ministers, respectively. Throughout the book, an oblique stroke is used to separate the Hijri date from its Christian equivalent. Where only a Christian date was available or known, corresponding Hijri date(s) was/were supplied following the stroke.

I am deeply grateful to all the authors of the essays for their support and willingness in participating in this project. My thanks go also to Svat Soucek who translated the contributions by C.-H. de Fouchécour and Angelo Piemontese, and to Mark Farrell who made very helpful stylistic suggestions for some of the essays. I would also like to thank Ehsan Yarshater, Heath Lowry, Hossein Modarressi, Bernard O’Kane, Farhad Eslami, Yahya Žuká, Mark Becker, and Heshmat Mousyad, whose assistance is acknowledged at appropriate points in the book. I am particularly thankful to Farhad who also compiled a bibliography of Iraj Afshar and was gracious enough to allow me to include only a selection of it here. Karim Emami, Jochen Zwele, and Fred Plank helped me to have access to certain resources, and Maryam Zandi kindly provided the photograph of Iraj Afshar. I am indebted to Jalal Matini who was extremely helpful in answering my questions about two very difficult Persian texts. Finally, for giving so willingly of her expertise to help design the format of the volume, I am very grateful to Marion Carthy.

Kambiz Eslami
Princeton
March 1998