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Pavilion’. Both show courtly architecture with a re-entrant dais presented symmetrically; the palette is similar in both, with strong blue, red and orange contrasting with a more neutral ground, and both have the problem of fading green in their fruit trees; both have areas of buff tiles; and both favour a round face.

It thus seems probable that the ‘Bahram Gury’ Painter is the Shahnamah’s Painter B, and also is Khwaja Ali al-Farabi. The fact that his illustrations in the Khamsah are more traditional than those we attribute to him in the Shahnamah, notably the ‘Paladins in the snow’, may result from his being older, from the taste of his patron, or from a lesser input from Painter C.

Of the remaining two Khamsah pictures, the first, ‘Faridun pursues the gazelle’, is finely drawn but it is chiefly distinctive for having a ground of green vegetation, a feature that seems to arise in Tabriz, and for being in the first place in the manuscript. The second picture by this hand, ‘Majnun at the Ka’bah’ (pl. 67), is very remarkable indeed. The narrative subject of Majnun clapping the ring of the Ka’bah is conflated with a devotional representation of the Ka’bah with angels above it: Nizami’s poem makes no mention of angels at this point, though Majnun does make a solemn dedication of himself to love. The vision of the Ka’bah recalls a double-page illustration of the site, and also a ‘Mi’raj’ (pl. 13) in Iskandar Sultan’s Anthology Add. 27261. Around the sacred precinct, Mecca is represented by small-scale buildings; while on the right the surrounding desert is indicated by purple rocks, tents and camels. The miniature buildings point to a tradition from ‘An angel offers a city to the prophet Muhammad’ (pl. 8). In the Khamsah the pilgrims have bearded faces drawn with a soft touch and attention to individual expression. This also points to a Jalayirid tradition, one that can be traced to the Divan of Sultan Ahmad. In the sky above the pilgrims, angels pouring dishes of golden fire recall not only the ‘Mi’raj’ in Iskandar’s manuscript, but also ‘Abd al-Hayy’s ‘Angels inspire Khvajü Kirmani’ (pl. 9). The painter of ‘Majnun at the Ka’bah’, however, introduces an idea that seems to be entirely his own. The two angels on the left of the picture are seen against the blue of the sky; but five angels on the right of the picture are shown to have broken through the blue sky from a golden empyrean beyond. This conception may have been stimulated by the Mi’rajnamah copied in Herat in 1446, though it is closer in visual style to the Jalayirid picture.

These two pictures are surely the work of Painter C in the Shahnamah, who painted ‘Firdausi encounters the court poets of Ghazni’.

Opposite, and detail: Pl. 67.
Majnun at the Ka’bah.
Khamsah of Nizami,
849/1445-46.
111b, H. 781. Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi, İstanbul
with its careful, bearded faces, and 'Isfandiyār slays Arjasp in the Brazen Hold' with its miniature buildings, and who consistently produced inspired work. We cannot know why he did not paint more in the Kathmeh, but perhaps he departed on pilgrimage or died. Possibly this opened the way to the unusual colophon claim with regard to Khvājah 'Ali.

Legacy in subsequent Persian Painting

Muhammad Jāki's Shāhnāmah remained in the Persian sphere for some three-score years only. It is not entirely easy to distinguish what influence it may have had on later fifteenth-century Herat painting, as distinct from what might be received from Bāysunghur's manuscripts. Various points of detail were mentioned in the previous chapter, and perhaps the illustrations in the Garrett Zafarnāmah (John Hopkins University) —whether or not produced in Herat—gained a greater depth for their portrayal of warfare. Probably more important are matters of a more general nature. Muhammad Jāki's manuscript would have furthered the tradition of the guiding composition that leads the viewer's reading of the scene by colour, placing and detail; and it may have transmitted a greater vitality and intensity. In addition, scribes and patrons would have become more aware of the possibilities offered by careful selection in the cycle. In addition, it may be suggested that the style of its two greatest painters may resonate in the work of the two greatest painters of late fifteenth-century Herat in their different directions. At a time when the interest of the great patrons was tending to shift away from the fabulous, the subject 'Paladins in the snow' would confirm Bihzād's interest in the everyday world; while 'Firdausi encounters the court poets of Ghazni' and 'Isfandiyār slays Arjasp in the Brazen Hold' may have influenced the elevated compositional style of Qāsim 'Ali.
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Notes

1 A background element to this usage may be the production of illustrated copies of the Kāfīlāt al-Dināū, considered as a 'Mirror for Princes'. The Ept Date, 2790 may be cited as a manuscript that supports the patron's sense of present status by reference to the past; The 'Gazette' Zafar-nāma (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University), copied for Hasan Rokqārī in 872/1467-68, a year before he addressed the conquest of Herat; Sir Thomas W. Arnold, Akbar and his Paintings in the Zafar-nāma MS. London, 1930. Eleanor G. Simon, The Gazette Manuscript of the Zafar-nāma: a Study in Fifteenth-century Timurid Patronage, (unpublished dissertation) New York University, 1973. It is surely an exercise in psyching up—conjecture that becomes yet more compelling if one believes that the illustrations were selected from a work that predates the text (Brend, PP, pp. 170-73).

2 Brend, PP, p. 187, H. 676, Topkapī Saray Kütüphanesi, and p. 192, a separate manuscript for Rādi al-Zamāni. Also, though it is hard to imagine that Akbar kept close track of all subjects of illustration in his manuscripts, areas of interest and concern can sometimes be detected (Barbara Brend, The Emperor Akbar's Khamsa of Nūrānī, London, 1995, p. 70).

3 In the RAS manuscript Nos. 1, 5, 9, 13.

4 Masāʾil 477, pp. 39, 41, 42.

5 While frequently illustrated combats are passed over, two relatively obscure scenes follow in fairly quick succession: 'Hūdūd al-Shībā' p. 257, 'Combat of Rūm and Berān' and p. 318, 'Combat of Gūzār and Pirān'.


7 Bahār, pl. 58.

8 Robinson, R.579, pp. 94-95.

9 Stchoukine, 'Khamshah de Nūrīmī', the missing picture is in last position, so Stchoukine's numbering is not affected; Nos. 9, 13, in which, p. 49, influence from tapestries is suggested. Çagım, Tiṇātd and Rogers, No. 68, invoke the mid-fifteenth-century Gonzoli frescoes of the Palazzo Medici-Riccardi, Florence — to which may be added those of the Castello del Buonconsiglio, Trento. See also Tiṇātd, 'Ottoman Workshops', pp. 351-53; Bağış, et al., Osmania Resmi, Nos. 23, 74.

10 Stchoukine, 'Khamshah de Nūrīmī', Nos. 3, 4, 5, 8, 10.

11 Stchoukine, 'Khamshah de Nūrīmī', Nos. 7, 11, 12 — the last touched by Oral, the Ottoman artist.

12 Antecedents, No. 3, Julišt-i, Nos. 7, 10, 13, from Masud Skrānī, No. 8, earlier Herat. See also N. M. Tiley, Persian Miniature Painting: The Repetition of Compositions during the Fifteenth Century', Iran, VII. Internationale Kongreß für Iransche Kunst und Künstler, München 7-10 September, 1976, Berlin, 1979, pp. 471-91; Lenz and Luszy, pp. 76-78, wherein however there are two errors of numbering, p. 377, since H. 781 is represented by 29 and 3a.

13 Stchoukine, 'Khamshah de Nūrīmī', Nos. 9, 16, 48C1, pls. LI, LIV.

14 Stchoukine, 'Khamshah de Nūrīmī', p. 49.

15 Stchoukine, 'Khamshah de Nūrīmī', p. 48 and fig. 11; Robinson, R.579, pp. 90, 91, and pl. III.

16 Sims, Parsīm, No. 51.
Chapter VI
Muḥammad Jūkī’s Shāhnāmah in the Mughal World

The manuscript is lost to sight during the second half of the fifteenth century but reappears in the sixteenth in the hands of the Mughal dynasty, descendants of the Timūr, who were to rule in northern India from 1526 to 1858. With the passage of the Shāhnāmah into India we are entitled to look for signs of links between it and the arts of the Mughals. Within the manuscript, signs of Mughal possession take three forms: the mark of royal seals, notes, and contributions to the illustration. What influence the manuscript’s illustrations might have had on Mughal painting is a more speculative question, but nevertheless an intriguing one.

First to mark the Mughal appropriation was Bābur, founder of the dynasty, whose seal appears on two folios. Bābur, who is known to us with unusual clarity from his memoirs, was a descendant of Timūr in the fifth generation, from the line of Timūr’s son Miran Shāh. Born in 888/1483, Bābur succeeded his father as ruler in Ferghana in Ramadān 889/June 1494. He was able to capture the ancestral capital of Samarqand and to hold it briefly on three occasions: from rabi’ 1 1903/November 1497 for three months; from late Autumn 906/1500 to the Summer of 907/1501; and again in 917–8/1511–12. On the latter two occasions the city was taken by the Uzbeks who continued their advance into Timurid lands. Having established a realm in Kabul in 1504, Bābur was able in 1526 to defeat Ibrāhīm Lodi of Delhi, and to replace him as ruler of northern India, or Hindustan.

We do not know for certain when Bābur acquired the Shāhnāmah. It is possible that the manuscript had travelled to Samarqand and that Bābur made it his own there; however each time that he was obliged to abandon the city he experienced difficulties that might have made its preservation difficult. It is much more probable that he acquired it in 1506 in Herat. In 1505 Bābur was summoned by his senior cousin, Husayn Bāyqara, ruler of Herat, to support him against the Uzbeks. The campaign failed since Husayn Bāyqara died at its outset. Bābur, who had not yet joined him, proceeded to Herat in the hope of engaging with Husayn Bāyqara’s son in defence of the Timurid cause. It was in Herat that, in addition to learning the pleasures of wine, Bābur had the opportunity to study the painting style of the major artists of the court. It may be that his burgeoning interest was rewarded with the gift of this time have...
with the gift of the Šáhnámáh, which might by this time have seemed rather old-fashioned in its place of origin. Finding that his cousins had no will to defeat the Üzbégs, Bábúr left Herat on 24th December 1506, and, possibly in possession of the Šáhnámáh, returned to Kabul through snow to the level of the horses' knees.

Bábúr's seal is a product of his second capture of Samarqand. A disc of diameter 32 mm, it is impressed in the upper left-hand of folio 3a and the centre foot of folio 353a. Within a double ring border, in bold thulth whose line shows little variation in thickness save in the tails of letters, is the legend: Ḥabirá al-Din Muhammad Bábúr bahádír ibn Sulájan ‘Umar Shaykh Khán Khánán, 96 (appendix D, Seal imprint A). The numerals must, as Wilkinson has pointed out, stand for 906/July 1500 to July 1501. Bábúr's personal nomenclature, with the epithet bahádír 'warrior', and the date cupped by the nun of Din, is in the disc's lower hemisphere; this is divided from that of his father in the upper hemisphere by a horizontal line with a short vertical crosspiece on its left-hand end. To the left of the line are three ring-dots arranged in a triangular formation, point to the left, and to its right are two ring-dots, one above the other.

The handsome design is carefully calculated to express the legitimacy of his rule in Samarqand. Khánán, 'son-in-law', the title attributed to Bábúr's father, is used by Timúr in relation to the Mongol Khán, through his marriage to Saraý Malik Khánám, daughter of the Khán of Qázín. The central bar might be intended to represent an arrow; it is in the tradition of the nomadic tampahtá, a tribal identifying mark or cattle brand. In using a tampahtá Bábúr may be marking his connection to the Mongols, through his mother Qúluq-nigár Khánám, daughter of Yúnás Khán, a descendant of Chagháti Khán, son of Chingiz. However, there is certainly reference to Bábúr's paternal descent. The triple ring-dot device had been used on coinage by Timúr, and also by Ulugh Bég: Clavijo, who saw it on Timúr's 3a Saráy in 1404, tells us that Timúr had adopted it from the previous ruler. In Timúr's usage the triangle is usually point down, though sometimes point up; though pointing to the left, Bábúr's version must surely refer to Timúr's badge.

With the dynasty established in India, and based primarily in Agra, the Šáhnámáh would have passed on Bábúr's death in 1530 to his son, Humáyún. It was his fortune to hold north India for ten years, to be put to flight by Sher Shah Súr, to find refuge in the Safávíd court in Tabrız in 1544, to return to Kabul, and to rule again briefly in Hindustan in 1555–56. It seems that Humáyún's ownership of the manuscript is marked by two different seals. On the mid-left of folio 3a a right-hand segment of a disc remains, its greater part having been lost at the remargining. When entire, it would have been a small trifle smaller than Bábúr's seal, perhaps 36 mm, and without the horizontal bar, but in a similar bold thulth with a similar double-ring border.

The fragment of legend retained reads: Šáh [ . . . ] in its lower sector, ibn at mid-level, and Mub [ . . . ] above (Seal B). It was apparently taken by Doyle as the seal of Humáyún's son Akbar, but ascribed with some caution to Humáyún himself by Wilkinson. Assuming that the format corresponds to that of Bábúr's seal, with personal name in the lower sector and patronymic above, this would be Humáyún's seal. A similar layout is employed on the seal that is indubitably his, though the style is very different. In the upper centre of folio 3a, and level with that of Bábúr, this is again circular with a double-ring border, but measures a mere 23 mm—the impression of a small peak off axis is caused by the illumination on the verso. This seal reads: Humáyún bin Muhammad Bábúr pâdshâh al-ghâzi, 'Humáyún, son of Muhammad Bábúr, emperor, the warrior against the infidel' (Seal C).

Humáyún bin is in the lowest sector; the name Muhammad—shared by father and son—is extended to form a bar between that and Bábúr pâdshâh in the mid sector; al-ghâzi is in the upper sector above a bar formed by the return of its last letter. In contrast to the previous examples, the script is a fine nasta’líq with lines of varying thickness, backed by very delicate vegetal scrolling. It seems evident that during Humáyún's first rule in India a seal was produced for him in the Central Asian tradition, and that the second seal expresses a new aesthetic learned in his sojourn in Safávíd Iran. Given this Persianate example for Humáyún, it is not to be supposed that Akbar would have commissioned a seal that reverted to the older script, but was exceptionally to be read from the top downwards.

If then, as it appears, the manuscript was owned by Humáyún from his first reign and continued to interest him, there is the possibility that it was among special, royal volumes that he lost to his brother Kámir at the battle of the Qíchqáq Pass in 1550, but which were resored to him in good condition when two laden camels were taken as booty after a defeat of Kámir some two months later at Ushárgram.
Though a seal does not appear for Akbar, it is probable that a library classification was added in his reign, since that is when the system was most active.3 Khāyāth, ‘special, royal property’, appears in the upper right of 3a, and ra āvāl dyārum ‘and first (class) second (level)’ is between the later seal of Humāyūn and that of Bābur (Note 1), with ghī ‘correct’ below it.10 Since Humāyūn’s second seal divides the phrase it would appear to have been already in place. The writing is rather bold but it is more fluent than the bold farvārdin (March–April)—the first month of Akbar’s ilišī year 1—which is attested as in Akbar’s hand in the Garrett Zafar nāma (Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore),11 another Timurid work to reach the Mughal library. Further notes of the time of Akbar—and later—recently revealed on folio 536b are discussed in the following chapter by Mr Morton. For present purposes it is sufficient to say that the manuscript was not in the royal library in 997/1588–89, but that it was inspected there in 1602.12 The seal of Jahāngīr appears on f. 3a below Humāyūn’s second seal and on f. 536a to the left of Bābur’s. A disc of 19 mm diameter, it is engraved in a delicate nasta’īq within a circle: Jahāngīr Shāh-i Akbar Shah, 1015, or ‘Jahāngīr the king, son of Akbar the king 1606–7’ (Seal D). The year is rendered on the mid-right, it is that which follows the accession. It appears that Jahāngīr may also have written a note on f. 3a, since below Bābur’s seal there is a sweeping line that might have topped a fīz from his pen.

Central in f. 3a is an inscription in the rather undisciplined nasta’īq of Jahāngīr’s son Shah Jahan (Note 2):

‘In the name of God the merciful, the compassionate. This Shāhānshah on the date of 25th of the month of Bahman ilišī, corresponding to 8th Jumāda II 1037 of the hijrī year 1037 [14 Feb 1628], which is the day of the auspicious accession, entered the library of this supplicant—the divine—court. Written by Shihāb al-Dīn Muhammad Shāh Jahān, emperor, son of Jahāngīr, emperor, son of Akbar, emperor, warrior against the infidel.

No more.’14 This is written on a ground of brush-gold that laps at the edges of Bābur’s seal, both of Humāyūn’s, and encircles that of Jahāngīr; though gold is sometimes used as a means of obliterating a previous mark, scrutiny over a light-table reveals no underlying inscription here. Shah Jahan’s seal is placed on the gold surface to the top right of his inscription. It is drop-shaped with a double border and measures 30 x 24 mm. The nasta’īq reads from the bottom in four lines: Ṣāḥīb Qrīn-i gānī Shihāb al-Dīn Muhammad Shāh Jahan pādshāh gāzī, sanat aḥad 1037 (Seal F). The epithet Ṣāḥīb Qrīn gānī ‘Second Lord of the Auspicious Conjunction’, associating Shah Jahan with Timur, is in the lowest sector, under a bar formed by an extended nūn in gānī; the konorific laqāb, Shihāb al-Dīn (‘splendour of religion’) in the second sector is separated from Shāh Jahan in the third by an extended Muhammad; the fourth contains pādshāh gāzī with the last letter returned to form a bar; the patronymic is dispensed with. The dating elements, ‘year one’ and ‘1037/1628’, are incorporated in the right and left sides, respectively. Another seal of Shah Jahan, a disc of 20 mm, is placed on f. 536a to the right of Bābur’s seal there. The imprint is dark and slightly iridescent, but neat, so that it is not clear whether some intervention was intended to embellish or deface, but probably the latter. It reads Ṣāḥīb Qrīn gānī, 4, 1040 (Seal I), the dating elements, to the right and left respectively, conveying the fourth year of the reign and 1630–31. The trio thus formed, in which two seals, left Jahāngīr and right Shah Jahan, flank a venerable central seal, may be compared with the type of dynastic, cushioned, triple portrait-developed at this period.15 The seal of Jahāngīr and the round seal of Shah Jahan are of similar size and either might be that which was imprinted on five illustrated pages and later obliterated. However, the use in those instances of brush-gold’s perhaps to be associated with Shah Jahan’s attention to the manuscript, who might have wished to remove his father’s marks.

One more seal is applied to f. 3a. Lise that of the father whom he displaced, the seal of Aurangzeb is drop-shaped and also measures 30 x 24 mm; it is placed centrally on the golden surface below Shah Jahan’s note. The nasta’īq within its single border reads (with some rearrangement): Aba’l Zafar Mahāyy al-Dīn Muhammad Ḥālamīr pādshāh gāzī, sanat aḥad, 1070 (Seal F). The arrangement of the titulature is complex: in the lowest sector the kunāb of fatherhood is followed by the date; in the second, Muhammad is placed between al-Dīn and Mahāyy, whose last letter provides a bar, and which is followed on the left by gī; in the top sector, Ḥālamīr, the regnal name adopted by Aurangzeb, is below pādshāh, while ʿīz completes gāzī and forms a bar. The first dating element ‘year one’
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