We have spoken already of the Uzbek as opponents of the Safavi, and of their temporary occupation and subsequent sacking of Herat which had been the great art centre of the later fifteenth century. These wars and the ferocious hatred between the Shi'a and the Sunni which added so much to their destructive effects, dissipated the greater part of that heritage; so that Khurasan ceased to hold its old position of cultural leadership. One of the heirs of that tradition became the Uzbek capital of Bukhara, which kept alive the Timurid style of painting almost until the end of the century. The exact date of the foundation of this school is uncertain, for it seems that Herat remained a centre for some years after its capture by the Safavi Isma'il in 1510. For instance, the calligrapher Mir Ali al-Husaini, known as al-Harawi on account of his birth at Herat of a family of Sayyids, moved for a time in 1506 to Meshhed, but soon returned to Herat, and remained there, until in 1528 'Ubayd Khan Uzbek captured the city and took him to Bukhara, where he worked until his death, which was not before 1544 and probably even later. While still at Herat he copied in 1519 a *Bustan* of Sa'di now in the Turkish and Islamic Museum in Istanbul, containing two old-fashioned miniatures, showing the Bihzadian figures in simple open compositions, but with the men wearing the Safavi *hulâb*. This manuscript seems to belong to the Herat school rather than that of Tabriz to which it is assigned by Robinson. The earliest manuscript which is assigned by the colophon to Bukhara is the romantic poem by Assar recounting the loves of Mihr and Mushtari, which was copied there in 1533. The four miniatures, now in the Freer Gallery, Washington, are in the full Herat style but are probably not versions of earlier paintings. They suggest that by this date one or two skilled painters had already migrated to Bukhara; but it is only some twenty years later that Bukhara manuscripts become frequent.

The *Mihr and Mushari* miniatures retain the old-fashioned dumpy figures, the strictly frontal buildings, and the division into simple planes, of which there are generally not more than two, which had been the tradition at Herat; but the colouring has already begun to be confined to the strong primary colours which were to be so vivid a feature of later Bukhara painting. One of the scenes shows the favourite night sky of the school of Bihzad, with crescent moon and many stars; another, one of those school-scenes
which had been so typical of the late Timurids; but the finest is no doubt the landscape
with Mihr hunting a lion, in which the spacing of the figures is masterly and daring,
as those in the second plane move down into a fold in the ground; while the horse on
which Mihr is mounted forms with the lion a chain stretching almost across the page.
The sensitively painted frieze of foliage in the foreground saves the scene from rigidity,
while at the same time setting it at a certain distance from the spectator. Structural
clarity is still the rule, rather than the all-over richness aimed at in the Mir Ali Shir
of 1526 (Sup. Turk 316, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris), discussed in the last chapter,
which although written at Herat was surely illuminated at the Safavi capital.

The Bustan of 1524 (Veever Collection) retains the clarity of Herat, but the landscape
reveals the new decorative sense of the Safavi, so that though there are no Safavi hiliha,
it seems likely that the manuscript was illuminated, as well as written, in Herat. However,
as we have seen, by then the Bukhara school already existed, under the patronage of
'Ubayd Allah, who took up his residence there in 1512. His resources were increased
when he succeeded as Khan in 1533. In 1528, and again in 1536, he seized Herat and
sought out for slaughter the prominent Shi'a notables there; but craftsmen and artists
he tried to persuade to return with him to Bukhara. Although some manuscripts survive
written at Bukhara in his time, the miniatures which they contain seem all to be of later
date. Perhaps he was too much occupied by his constant campaigns to be able to give
his attention to such matters.

How early the painter Mahmud Muzahhib was working in Bukhara it is impossible
to say, for the only dated miniatures by his hand are of 1546 and 1548, though both of
the manuscripts in which they were painted are copied earlier; in one case nine years,
in the other five. Sakislan identified him with a well-known calligrapher who was working
at Bukhara though a native of Herat; but this is not possible, for his nisab was al-Shihabi
and he excelled in the nastaliq script which he was taught by the master Mir Ali al-
Harawi. Curiously both manuscripts, which contain the dated work by Mahmoud, were
written by Mir Ali al-Harawi: the earlier a Mahkama al-Asrar of 1537 (Bibliothèque
Nationale, Sup. Pers. 985), the later a Bustan of Sa'di of 1543 (Gulbenkian Foundation);
this contains seven double-page miniatures of which the third is signed by Mahmod and
dated, and also the sixth. There is also signed work by Abdullah in it. Mahmoud's signature
is also written on the tambourine held by a dancer in a double-page miniature which is
contained in a Tuhfat al-Ahrar of Jami' in the Bibliothèque Nationale (Sup. Pers. 1416),
which was copied in 1499, but this miniature is obviously a work of fifty years later.
All this work is in typical Bukhara style of the mid-century, that is, of rich but simple
colouring, the old-fashioned figures seen against a simpler landscape than was then
current in Safavi painting; with a curious mannerism in the drawing of the female
figures, who are shown with their heads nearly at a right angle to the axis of their bodies.
This feature serves to connect them with a group of detached figure subjects, of which
two in the Meshhed shrine collection are signed Mahmod. These are in gayer colours
but silhouetted against a plain ground, which makes the same impression of simplicity
as the manuscript illustrations.
which had been so typical of the late Timurids; but the finest is no doubt the landscape with Mihr hunting a lion, in which the spacing of the figures is masterly and daring, as those in the second plane move down into a fold in the ground; while the horse on which Mihir is mounted forms with the lion a chain stretching almost across the page. The sensitively painted frieze of foliage in the foreground saves the scene from rigidity, while at the same time setting it at a certain distance from the spectator. Structural clarity is still the rule, rather than the all-over richness aimed at in the Mir Ali Shir of 1526 (Sup. Turc 316, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris), discussed in the last chapter, which although written at Herat was surely illuminated at the Safavi capital.

The Bustan of 1524 (Vevey Collection) retains the clarity of Herat, but the landscape reveals the new decorative sense of the Safavi, so that though there are no Safavi khalq, it seems likely that the manuscript was illuminated, as well as written, in Herat. However, as we have seen, by then the Bukhara school already existed, under the patronage of Ubayd Allah, who took up his residence there in 1512. His resources were increased when he succeeded as Khan in 1533. In 1528, and again in 1536, he seized Herat and sought out for slaughter the prominent Shi'a notables there; but craftsmen and artists tried to persuade to return with him to Bukhara. Although some manuscripts survive written at Bukhara in his time, the miniatures which they contain seem all to be of later date. Perhaps he was too much occupied by his constant campaigns to be able to give his attention to such matters.

How early the painter Mahmud Muzahhib was working in Bukhara is impossible to say, for the only dated miniatures by his hand are of 1546 and 1548, though both of the manuscripts in which they were painted were copied earlier; in one case nine years, the other five. Sakisian identified him with a well-known calligrapher who was working at Bukhara though a native of Herat; but this is not possible, for his nishah was al-Shihabi and he excelled in the nusasq script which he was taught by the master Mir Ali al-Harawi. Curiously both manuscripts, which contain the dated work by Mahmud, were written by Mir Ali al-Harawi: the earlier a Mubkram az A'am of 1537 (Bibliothèque Nationale, Sup. Pers. 785), the later a Bustan of Sa'di of 1543 (Gulbenkian Foundation); this contains seven double-page miniatures of which the third is signed by Mahmud and dated, and also the sixth. There is also signed work by Abdullah in it. Mahmud's signature is also written on the tambourine held by a dancer in a double-page miniature which is contained in a Tuhfat al-Ahar of Jam' in the Bibliothèque Nationale (Sup. Pers. 1416), which was copied in 1499, but this miniature is obviously a work of fifty years later. All this work is in typical Bukhara style of the mid-century, that is, of rich but simple colouring, the old-fashioned figures seen against a simpler landscape than was then current in Safavi painting; with a curious mannerism in the drawing of the female figures, who are shown with their heads nearly at a right angle to the axis of their bodies. This feature serves to connect them with a group of detached figure subjects, of which two in the Meshhed shrine collection are signed Mahmud. These are in gayer colours but silhouetted against a plain ground, which makes the same impression of simplicity as the manuscript illustrations.
It is this simplification which gives its distinctive and attractive character to the later work of the Bukhara school, which is frequently based on compositions of Bihzad or his school, but simplified both in the number of figures and also in the colour range. Still when one has seen two or three manuscripts of this kind they become monotonous.

The best period of the school seems to have been under Abd al-Aziz (1540-1549) and Yar Muhammad (1550-1557), for whom the Bustan of Sa’di in the Bibliothèque Nationale dated 1556 (Sup. Pers. 1187) and two volumes of the poems of Mir Ali Shir in the Bodleian Library were written in 1553. Of the nineteen miniatures in these three volumes at least four can be traced as simplified copies of miniatures in four different manuscripts of the Herat school under Husain Bayqara executed in the 1480s. Judged by the standard of that period they are inept, especially in their incompetence in spatial composition; but they have their own quality as decorative work. Better quality work is to be seen in a manuscript of the Bustan, now in the Gulistan Palace Library, containing four miniatures, of which the first is another derivative from the Bihzad Dara and the Herdsman of the 1488 Bustan in Cairo. The colophon gives the name of the calligrapher Mir Hussain Sultani and the date 1553 at Bukhara, but one of the miniatures is dated the previous year and dedicated to Abdullah Munshi Katabari. Such dedicatory inscriptions are rather frequently found on Bukhara miniatures, combined with fine arabesque. The almond eyes in the flat faces and the flat pure colours with preference for gold skies give some of the rich and romantic charm of stained glass, and their very simplicity preserves more of the essential character of the Persian miniature than do the more illusionistic miniatures of the Safavi royal manuscripts.

This richness in intensity of colour, rather than in refinement of line or elaboration of detail, is even more characteristic of the separate figure subjects of the last Bukhara painter Abdullah, who was working at least as late as 1575. Once more it is the colour which saves his work from triviality, and his charming simplicity places no great burden on the vehicle in which he shows the mastery of a real talent and a personal style which is at once recognizable.

Apart from Bukhara the most conservative school of importance in the sixteenth century was that of Shiraz. We parted from this school in 1503. We have now to look more closely at the large production of these decades in Shiraz. One of the most active calligraphers in the city was Mun‘im al-Din al-Awadhi, whose earliest surviving work seems to be the copying in 1504 of a manuscript of Nizami now in the Bodleian Library. From the year 1513 is a Gulistan of Sa’di in the British Museum (Or. 11 1474), with twelve miniatures in the new style of Safavi Shiraz, which is as conceptual as the old, yet has made some concession to the taste for decoration of the new period, but none at all to its naturalism. This was to be the character of Shiraz painting for some time to come; concentration on the main theme of the subject and decorative arrangement of the rest, including especially the background landscape and architecture. The colouring was decorative rather than naturalistic, with a choice of bold touches of strong colour and a generally blond tone. That this was regarded as a setting, like a conventional stage drop, is revealed by the way that the figures often overlap the margination with an arm
or a lance, or even with a whole leg, as in the case of the Lassoing of a Div in a Nizami of 1537 (also copied by Mun‘im al-Din al-Ahwadi, and now in the Morgan Library, M. 471).

Another leading calligrapher of Shiraz at this period was Murshid, surnamed al-Attar, who was active at least from 1523 to 1552. That he may have died or retired in that year is suggested by the colophon of a copy of the Zafar-nama, the life of Timur, made by him, but finished by another scribe, Hasan al-Sharif in 1552. The twelve miniatures are in the style typical of Shiraz in the mid-century, decorative and romantic, perfectly controlled within the convention of manuscript illustration which had been established.

The colouring is gay, the rich costumes being foiled by the pale backgrounds of hillside usually framed by friezes or purple-edged rocks, and under an azure or gold sky. A favourite device of the painters at this time was to show a row of men, troops or grooms, silhouetted against the horizon, half-hidden behind the rocky frieze, and indeed the figures as a rule of both men and horses are drawn in silhouette like superimposed images coined from a restricted mould. The success of these illustrations is indeed due to the strict limits observed in them, of scale and colour and of intimate association with the text, which is almost invariably found above and below a part of the composition.

This same scribe Murshid was responsible for the copying of a thick manuscript in the Chester Beatty Library (p. 212) of the Wonders of Creation of Qazvini, in 1545, which is filled with a treasury of animal drawings that show the school of Shiraz in another mood altogether. Here the generalization of the landscape background makes the perfect setting for the animals which inhabit it. The very simplicity of the repeated flower and tree conventions allows the reader an easy entry into this other world in which the animal creation is at home. The long history of animal representation in Persia lies behind these sympathetic drawings of monkeys, of the bird which sings all night, or which changes its colouring like the chameleon. But the imaginative range of the artists was greater than this, and extends into the supernatural world as well, to talking apes, winged men or others who live in trees. Here the text is completely enclosed by the painting, into which it opens like a window. The blond colouring seems particularly well-suited to this fairy world and its very density not to require any sky or distance. It is hard to think of any art which so well suits the level of the marvellous, because this conceptual manner of composing suits the imaginary world just as well as the real, and the artists can carry the reader with them, just as in the same way though less perfectly the strip cartoon designer can create a fresh world with a different focus and scale and tempo. Only, the Persian artist did not need to introduce a make-believe air because he and his audience had not lost the capacity to see the marvellous in the world as it is. It rather seems that from about 1560 the Shiraz school began to rely overmuch on the pictorial repertory which it had developed for trees, rocks, clouds, flowering plants, and even human figures, whether on horseback or standing or seated. What little sky remained was coloured a flat blue or gold, and tiny wisps of cloud put in as an all-over pattern. The trees are like botanical specimens, with the leaves drawn individually, and water is more rigorously patterned. In fact pattern is carried so far that it is frequently impossible to analyse the structure of a scene.
or a lance, or even with a whole leg, as in the case of the Lassoing of a Div in a Nizami of 1537 (also copied by Mun'im al-Din al-Ahwadi, and now in the Morgan Library, M. 471).

Another leading calligrapher of Shiraz at this period was Murshid, surnamed al-Attar, who was active at least from 1523 to 1552. That he may have died or retired in that year is suggested by the colophon of a copy of the Zafar-nama, the life of Timur, made by him, but finished by another scribe, Hasan al-Sharif in 1552. The twelve miniatures are in the style typical of Shiraz in the mid-century, decorative and romantic, perfectly controlled within the convention of manuscript illustration which had been established. The colouring is gay, the rich costumes being foiled by the pale backgrounds of hillside usually framed by friezes or purple-edged rocks, and under an azure or gold sky. A favourite device of the painters at this time was to show a row of men, troops or grooms, silhouetted against the horizon, half-hidden behind the rocky frieze, and indeed the figures as a rule of both men and horses are drawn in silhouette like superimposed images coined from a restricted mould. The success of these illustrations is indeed due to the strict limits observed in them, of scale and colour and of intimate association with the text, which is almost invariably found above and below a part of the composition.

This same scribe Murshid was responsible for the copying of a thick manuscript in the Chester Beatty Library (p. 212) of the Wonders of Creation of Qazwini, in 1545, which is filled with a treasury of animal drawings that show the school of Shiraz in another mood altogether. Here the generalization of the landscape background makes the perfect setting for the animals which inhabit it. The very simplicity of the repeated lower and tree conventions allows the reader an easy entry into this other world in which the animal creation is at home. The long history of animal representation in Persia lies behind these sympathetic drawings of monkeys, of the bird which sings all night, or which changes its colouring like the chameleon. But the imaginative range of the artists was greater than this, and extends into the supernatural world as well, to talking apes, winged men or others who live in trees. Here the text is completely enclosed by the xainting, into which it opens like a window. The bold colouring seems particularly well-suited to this fairy world and its very density not to require any sky or distance. It is hard to think of any art which so well suits the level of the marvellous, because this conceptual manner of composing suits the imaginary world just as well as the real, and he artists can carry the reader with them, just as in the same way though less perfectly he strip cartoon designer can create a fresh world with a different focus and scale and empo. Only, the Persian artist did not need to introduce a make-believe air because he and his audience had not lost the capacity to see the marvellous in the world as it is. Rather it seems that from about 1500 the Shiraz school began to rely overmuch on the pictorial repertory which it had developed for trees, rocks, clouds, flowering plants, and human figures, whether on horseback or standing or seated. What little sky remained was coloured a flat blue or gold, and tiny wisps of cloud put in as an all-over pattern. The trees are like botanical specimens, with the leaves drawn individually, and water more rigorously patterned. In fact pattern is carried so far that it is frequently impossible to analyse the structure of a scene.
Another good example of this tendency to imprisonment within the terms of conventional picture-making can be seen in the richly illustrated copy of the *Khamsa* of Nizami dated 1584, now in the University of Pennsylvania Museum at Philadelphia, where the individually graceful figures are as if cut out in cardboard and combined to make up an attractive pattern. They serve successively in the spacious interiors of the seven pavilions in which Bahram spent the seven days of the week, in a different colour for each day. The black pavilion of the Indian princess, for instance, provides an admirable background for the silhouettes of the dancing girl, the musicians and the waiting maids, each wearing the new-fashioned wimple with a little point at the back of the head. But the whole idea of structure is negated by this building of unrelated rectangles, relieved only by a ridiculously small dome balanced on the roof, while the four quatrains introduced into the composition are neither behind nor before the picture surface. In the landscape scenes such as the *Khuras' First Sight of Shirin*, the figures of the king and his groom (mistakenly introduced in this scene) are seen in a frame of rocks which can be no thicker than pasteboard, through the holes in which trees or streams proceed. Now the reader will allow a good deal of licence to the artist in scale or perspective, but he does expect to be given some room to exercise his imagination if the result is to be more than pattern. The relationship of the miniature to the page of the book is lost if it is an all-over flat pattern on the surface.