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In addition, some faces do indeed resemble others in the rest of the book, but no traces have been detected. Robinson relays Skelton's opinion that the Mughal painter is Miskin, working about 1600–5. Miskin's hand seems very probable, since the rock tends to divide into smallish, relatively smooth, upstanding segments. The picture may well have been painted in association with the inspection of 1602.

The trace of Muhammad Juki's Shāhnāmah in Mughal painting

Writing in 990/1582, the historian Badā 'uni records that a Shāhnāmah had been made for Akbar. Unfortunately the manuscript is not known to survive, but Skelton has tentatively attributed to it the 'Zal and Rūdābāh' of the Keir Collection. It would appear that the only possible trace of influence from Muhammad Juki's Shāhnāmah on this could be the adventurous use of rock in the shell upon which the heroine kneels.

Another single picture 'Zal in the Simurgh's nest', recently published by S. C. Welch, is much smaller than the Keir picture and in a relatively more Persianate style, so it is not likely that it is from the same manuscript. Welch attributes this to Mir Sayyid 'Ali, formerly a painter for the Safavid Shāh Tāhmasp, and he dates it to the time of Humāyūn, the mid-sixteenth century. In a rocky landscape, Zal is seen in a nest of jutting twigs at the top of a centrally placed chindār tree; he faces left towards the Simurgh who offers to feed him, while an eager simurgh chick waits behind him to the right. The tree is occasionally found in Safavid painting as the location of the nest, instead of the more usual rocks. The treatment of bird, boy and nest does not particularly resemble that in any of the three illustrations relating this episode in the Šahānāmah produced for Shah Tāhmasp in Tābīz in the 1520s. In each of the latter the bird has a distinctive bend in the neck, and tail feathers that drift upwards; the boy is seated in one picture, skirted in one, and seemingly omitted from the third, while the nest has a rather smooth structure. The case is different between the single picture and 'The Simurgh restores Zal to Ŝam' in Muhammad Juki's Šahānāmah. In both, the Simurgh is less a motif and more a credible bird, its neck-bend is obscured, its tail streams straight, and the plumage of its wings includes a distinctive white band. In both the boy is in a kneeling posture, while the twigs of the Herat nest are even more rugged than those of the Mughal. These factors tend to suggest that the Mughal painter is referring to Juki's Šahānāmah rather than to a memory of Safavid painting; and this in turn suggests that he is probably not Mir Sayyid 'Ali. Indeed the technique used for the foliage of the chindār—a dark ground with leaves upon it—suggests an Indian rather than a Persian one. The small scale of the Mughal picture, together with the quite numerous naturalistic portrayals of small birds that it includes, calls to mind two manuscripts of the middle years of Akbar's reign, the Galītān of 990/1582–83 (Royal Asiatic Society, MS. 238) and the Divān of Anwārī of 996/1588 (Harvard University Art Museums, 1960.117.15). The date might thus be in the 1580s; the hand would again appear to
be that of Miskin, who, as well as having a distinctive manner with rock, was skilled in the depiction of birds and beasts. Other illustrated Shāhānāmaḥs of Akbar’s period may emerge, but in the late 1580s and 1590s much of his studio’s attention was directed to works of more recent history. In these there may be a general influence from ‘Gushāisp in battle with Arjasp at Balkh’ in Muhammad Juki’s Shāhānāmeh on densely packed scenes of battle melée, but this is not easily distinguished from the legacy of other manuscripts, such as the Garrett Zafarānāmah. A distinctive borrowing does, however, appear to be made in an illustration to the Bābumānāḥ, now in the Victoria and Albert Museum. A double page, this is one of a number of pictures that are thought to come from the earliest copy of the Persian translation of Bābar’s memoir by Akbar’s foremost courtier, the Khān Khānān ‘Abd al-Rahim. The presumed parent volume, now lost, was presented to Akbar in November 1589. The double-page illustration shows Bābar returning from Herat to Kabul at the turn of 1506 to 1507, on the right (IM 263-1913) Bābar’s approach through the snow, and on the left (IM 271-1913) Kabul in hostile hands (pls. 69–70). If Bābar indeed acquired the Shāhānāmah in Herat, he would have been carrying it with him at this moment. It may be, then, that the Bābumānāḥ painter consulted the Shāhānāmah because he or ‘Abd al-Rahim was aware of this historical background, or he may simply have had recourse to it in seeking models for the depiction of such unfamiliar topics as snow and Central Asian architecture. For the first he uses ‘The paladins in the snow’ (pl. 52), reworking its twisting grey clouds, mountains defined in dull green, and light purplish ground flecked with white. For the second he draws on ‘The fortress of Gang Dizh attacked with mines’ (pl. 51) and ‘Isfandiyar slays Arjasp in the Brazen Hold’ (pl. 57) adopting the walls, gates, bastions, and the jumble of rubbed small-scale, mainly flat-roofed buildings; from the latter he also takes the significant central space, in which to locate some saddled horses, emblematic of the rebels who had seized power in Kabul.

The date of the presentation (November 1589), is a year later than the first of the notes read by Mr Morton, which is dated to early 997, November or December 1588, and which shows an excited personage passing the manuscript to someone who, though of considerable importance, is nevertheless his inferior. Might the more important figure be ‘Abd al-Rahim? The production of an illustrated Bābumānāḥ would have taken well over a year, so the fact that the Shāhānāmah changed hands in 997 does not preclude this. It would, indeed, seem possible that the Shāhānāmah had been in ‘Abd al-Rahim’s possession for some years, and that it was he who ordered the confection of ‘Talhand dies’, since he is known to have renovated another Persian manuscript. It is not clear precisely when the Shāhānāmah returned to the Mughal library, but it would seem that, whether from direct reference or from memory, ‘Isfandiyar slays Arjasp in the Brazen Hold’ again proved a useful resource for illustrations to the Akbarnāmah produced about 1530–95 (Victoria and Albert Museum). The conception of a fortress high on a rocky mountain, whose central courtyard frames figures rendered small by distance, underlies a number of illustrations treating the Mughal conquest of the Rajput strongholds of Chittor and Ranthambhor, but the connection is particularly clear in ‘Destruction of a tower at Chittor’, a double page, and ‘Siege of Ranthambhor’ (pl. 73). The latter includes females in the background, faces lining the walls, rolling clouds, a gate on the left, rock rising in waves to the walls, and in the foreground pinkish rock topped with green. It may not be without significance that both these scenes are composed by Miskin. He had perhaps become familiar with the manuscript at the time of the Simurgh illustration; and later perhaps an acknowledged familiarity with it may have caused him to be selected to complete its illustration with ‘Yazdagird hides in a mill’.

Beyond this the particular traits of Muhammad Juki’s Shāhānāmah seem merged into the general tradition of Persian influence on Mughal painting, though it is possible that further references to it may come to light.
Notes

1 For the Persian readings see appendix C, Notes 1—4 and Seals A—C.


3 The manuscript could possibly have stayed with Babur's sister Khāzinah Begum, who fell into Afghan hands, and was reunited with Babur in 1511 (Breweridge, p. 107).

4 Williamson, p. 3.

5 It bears comparison with langka used in the thirteenth century by the Mongols (Dr Judith Kolbas, in conversation 9th June, 2004).

6 Claib, p. 308. See also S. Lane Poole, The Costume of Babur (Transumanza) in the British Museum, from the Time of Tamerlane to the Persian Days: Colonies and, London, 1882, nos. 27, 29, 32, 33, 34, 36. The triangle of dots may point up or down.

7 JRAS, 1834, pp. 134, and note on folio 3a of the manuscript, which includes 'Nahla' [sic], but see Wilkinson, p. 3. The former view is recorded by John Seyller, 'The Inspection and Valuation of Manuscripts in the Imperial Mogul Library', Album online, XVII, 3/4, p. 316.


9 Seyller, 'Inspection', pp. 274—75, Table 1.

10 I thank Mr Morton for this reading. He inclines to seeing the descender is not intending 6.

11 The जिला calendar of the 'Divine ERA' was invented by Akbar in 592/1584; reckoned from Nauruz, the Spring

12 Arnold, Babur, facing page 1, Seyller, 'Inspection', Fig. 1.

13 Chapter VII, The Notes, 6, 7.

14 Williamson, p. 3 has '6th day of Jamada II', Seyller, 'Inspection', p. 136, corrects it without comment. I thank Mr Morton for elucidating the use of elevatus and the final symbol: see chapter VII, notes 17 and 19.

15 An example in the Chester Beatty Library, dated to the 3rd regnal year, again 1630—31, shows Akbar in the centre with Jalaspur on the left and Shah Jahan (see Linda Y. Locash, Mughal and other Indian Paintings from the Chester Beatty Library, London, 1994, i, pp. 40—11, No. 3.29).

16 See p. 4 and appendix D, note 4.

17 Williamson, p. xxii, 46.


19 Verma, Mogul Painters, pp. 62—69.

20 Wilkinson, pp. xx.

21 Wilkinson, p. 86; Gray, PP, p. 92.

22 Robinson, JRAS, 1979, pp. 100—1; JRAS, 1986, p. 5.

23 Robinson has in mind the occasion when Jahangir required one of his painters to make individualisable copies of a picture brought by Sir Thomas Roe.

24 I thank David Jacob, Senior Conservator at the British Library, for looking at this with me, over a light-board and by ultraviolet light. Similarly, No. 31 shows no trace of Timurid work.

25 Schickaha, MTS, pls. XXXIX, LXIX; Bahar, Iftah, figs. 6a, 6b.

26 Crowe, Persian Painting, pl. 56; Bremond, PPS, pl. 81.


28 Etinghausen et al., Agra, No. 130.

29 Jeremiah E. Lacy, The Art of the Book in India, London, 1982, p. 51; Norah M. Titley, Persian Miniature Painting [...], London, 1983, pp. 190—91, and pl. 34. A further question is raised regarding the painter whose name appears on four pictures as Shāhkhān: on the analogy of Beg-Begin and Khān-

Khaism, this might be a woman.


31 We do not know for certain whether Babur had paintings made for his, but his portrait of gardens is well stressed. Perhaps the pool in Portrait of the infant Rastan shown to Sam, whose head outline is unusually ornate, contributed to the formation of his taste, as evidenced in the Lotus garden at Dholpur (see Elizabeth B. Maynadi, 'The Lotus Garden Palace of Babur',],[188] VI, 1988, pp. 135—s, pl. 11.33.

32 Williamson, pp. xx, 92.

33 Robinson, JRAS, 1979, p. 102.


36 Stuart Cary Welch, Zal in the Smuragh's Nest: a painting by Mr Sayid 'Ali for a Shāhānshah illustrated for the Emperor Humayun', in Rosenmay Crill, Susan Strange, Andrew Spilka, Art of Indian Studies in Honour of Robert Skelton, Ahmadabad, 2006, pp. 36—41. Measurements given, p. 41, n. 1, 1.5 x 3.5 inches (150 x 100 mm). A 1.2 Shahshah on this scale would probably have needed to be in several volumes, so it may be that this is an album picture.

37 The text admits a wooden sub-structure (WNN, I, p. 245).

38 Martin Bernard Dickinson and Stuart
40 Vugrin, ‘Makīn’, pls. 11, 13, 16.
41 A Shāh-nāma at Sotheby’s, London, 19.10.94—lot 112, has illustrations datable to the 1580s, but painted into a manuscript of Sultanate Bengal; published pictures show some signs of Persian tradition, but no specific links with Muhammad Jāh’s manuscript.
43 Brand and Lowery, p. 145, No. 34.
44 Beveridge, p. 314.
45 The earlier date of his seal does not preclude this. At the period Bihār still hoped to conquer Sambard, and he might well not have wished to replace his seal until that time.
47 This is probably the first Mughal depiction of snow. It would be required in subsequent historical illustrations, for example the same sequence in the Sūratnāma of the National Museum, New Delhi (M. S. Randhawa, Paintings of the Bihār Nāma [sic], New Delhi, 1983, pl. XIII) or in Behn Gujarān’s scene of the Mongol army in snow in the Fārūkī’s al-tawdīh of 1596 (Golestan Palace, 2314), paginated 127, but not published to my knowledge.
48 Khamsah of Amir Khusraw
49 The scheme is also used in the Tārīkh-i Kāshânī. Printings of the Khuda Bakhsh Library (Goyt Sen, Printings from the Bihār Nāma, Varanasi, 1984, pl. 48). This manuscript was begun in the 1580s but work may have continued into the 1590s.
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Chapter VII

Notes and Seal Imprints on Folio 536b

A. H. Morton

The removal of the later backing has revealed f. 536b to be covered with notes and seal impressions of the kind familiar from other manuscripts from the Mughal Library. In combination with the well-known seal impressions and inscriptions on f. 3a, they make it possible to follow the history of the Shāhnāmeh during the Mughal period in some detail. The new material is here translated and set in context.¹

The Mughal Library

In the earlier period, the survival of the libraries of the Mughal rulers, like that of the dynasty and its individual members, was precarious. It is only from the time of Akbar that one can think of the Mughal Library as an institution enjoying a considerable degree of administrative continuity. And even then the continuity was not quite what one likes to imagine to be true of the great modern public collections. The giving and receiving of gifts was an important feature of Indian society: books were not only acquired for the library but were also on occasion given away.² The successive owners of the library did not regard it as in any way a public or even dynastic institution. As Professor Seyller has shown, manuscripts were of comparatively low monetary value compared with such things as large rubies or elephants. Even so, both Jahangir and Shah Jahan, with all the demands on their time, were willing to devote an appreciable portion of it to recording in their own hands that books from their fathers' libraries were now their personal property.³ This was how they viewed the situation: succession to the throne was always uncertain, and the one who did win it evidently felt the urge to affirm that what he had at last obtained did in fact belong to him. Another feature of the library worth bearing in mind is that it was mobile and not necessarily kept together. It can be assumed that during the great days of the empire none of the emperors left himself without reading matter for long on his frequent progresses, campaigns and hunting trips, but of course it is not precisely known how much of the library they took with them.⁴ We know from Abūl-Fazl that there were two main divisions of the library, that of the Harem and that of the Barīn or outer part of the royal quarters. He also informs us that books were further subdivided, by value, prestige, subject, form (prose being distinguished from verse) and language.⁵ Parts of it could on occasion, or even usually, have been left behind in security. It is also clear from annotations that manuscripts were customarily distributed among various individuals. There were, therefore, sub-collections, and these need not always have been kept together.

The elaborate system of recording and inspecting books introduced under Akbar and remaining to some extent in force into the eighteenth century has left many traces on the books themselves. A large number of notes record that, on a particular date, the work in question was inspected; many others when it was transferred to and from the custody of individuals, who are, in almost every case, members of the library staff. These last often include a valuation and sometimes other details. Other notes provide descriptions of a