

BETWEEN THE SAFAVIDS AND THE MUGHALS: ART AND ARTISTS IN TRANSITION*

By Abolala Soudavar

Houston, Texas

In the year 1544, the Mughal emperor Humāyūn (r. 1530–40 and 1555–56) came to the Safavid court seeking Shāh Ṭahmāsb I's help to recapture his kingdom. Ṭahmāsb (r. 1524–76) obliged and Humāyūn eventually recovered his throne.

The political consequences of the Safavid encounter notwithstanding, Humāyūn's visit is mostly remembered as a fortuitous event that launched the development of the Mughal school of painting. From an art historical perspective, its timing could not be more propitious; Persian courtly painting had reached new heights but, at the same time, the royal Safavid library-atelier was sliding into disarray. It thus prompted the departure of the celebrated painters Mīr Sayyid 'Alī and 'Abd al-Ṣamad for the Mughal court. Other artists followed suit. Some remained there, and some came back and paved the way for the migration of the next generation of painters.

This study focuses on the conditions that led to three successive migratory waves between the Safavid and Mughal courts from 1544 to 1585, with an emphasis on the stylistic development of one particular third wave artist, the famous Farrukh Beyg.

1. THE FIRST WAVE

The discovery of Persian painting masterpieces

Humāyūn arrived in Iran accompanied by his Khurasanian wife, Ḥamīda Bānū (d. 1604).¹ Both were interested in illustrated manuscripts, and the trip to the Safavid domains provided an opportunity to see Persian painting at its best: Herāt library treasures that Timurid princes—who had fled the Shībānīd occupation of Khurasan—had brought westward, and the new Safavid synthesis that emerged from the blending of the Herāt and Turkoman styles of painting. Each had a different reaction towards the old and the new. While Humāyūn sought Safavid artists for his own library-atelier, Ḥamīda Bānū expressed a preference for the acquisition of Timurid manuscripts from her ancestral Khurasan. Indeed, notations on the famous 1486 *Gulistān* of Sa'ādī (AHT, no. 36) copied by Sulṭān-'Alī

Mashhadī and probably commissioned by Mīr 'Alī Shīr as a present for Sulṭān-Ḥusayn Bāyqarā (r. 1470–1506),² specify that it was Ḥamīda Bānū and not Humāyūn who acquired this *Gulistān* manuscript (Pl. XVa).³ At her death, it was inherited by her son and was integrated into the Mughal royal library.

A Timurid and Safavid jousting field

Another *Gulistān* manuscript (FGA, F1998.5) that found its way into the Mughal royal library probably came to India as a gift from Ṭahmāsb. Although there are no direct references to this effect, an array of circumstantial evidence upholds the contention that, through the gift of this manuscript, Ṭahmāsb had sought to honour Humāyūn's lineage.

Copied by Sulṭān-'Alī Mashhadī in 1468, and originally illustrated with five Timurid paintings, this small-scale *Gulistān*'s calligraphy was rather weak and inferior to the prevailing *nasta'liq* standards of the 1540s; and apart from a small illuminated opening heading, it had no other illumination or embellishing detail.⁴ Nevertheless, very elaborate Safavid margin paintings, mostly attributable to Āghā Mīrak, were added over some sixteen pages.⁵ As the margin paintings are stylistically more colourful and intricate than those of the Shāh Ṭahmāsb *Khamsa* (BL, Or. 2265) of c. 1539–43,⁶ they should be dated to the mid-1540s.⁷ This dating, in conjunction with the facts that the manuscript was copied in 1468 during the last year of the reign of Humāyūn's great grandfather, the Timurid Sultan Abū Sa'īd (r. 1451–69), and that it was still in the Mughal library in the early years of Akbar's reign (r. 1556–1605),⁸ leads to the conclusion that Humāyūn was thus honoured by Shāh Ṭahmāsb with a manuscript from the library of his direct ancestor.⁹ No other explanation can account for the addition of elaborate margins by the hand of the Shāh's chief painter and household superintendent, Āghā Mīrak, to a manuscript that did not seem to merit such extra embellishment.

While the apparent intent of the gift was to honour Humāyūn, the unusually elaborate Safavid margins¹⁰ were also meant to overshadow the Timurid illumination and illustrations and to hint at the superiority of the new Safavid style.¹¹ In the same

vein, the subsequent repainting of the original Timurid illustrations may have been an attempt to counter the earlier Safavid taunt with the highly developed Mughal style of the Shāh Jahān (r. 1628–57) period.

Although a recent study attributes the cause of Mughal repainting to water damage sustained during a palace fire in 1644,¹² two distinctive sets of water-stains—from two different periods—are indications to the contrary. One set can be seen near the outer edge of the Safavid margins with no extension to the text area (Pl. XVb). Had flooding damaged illustrations during the palace incident, water-stains would have extended from edge to centre.

A second set lies within the text area only and does not appear on the Safavid margins (see Pl. XVb). It is the result of water damage sustained prior to the addition of those margins. If the paintings had suffered damage then, it would have been minimal for, judging from the remains of the Timurid painting apparent under a flaked area of the *Prophet and the Zoroastrian* (see Pl. XVc), the old pigments seem complete and solidly attached to the paper substrate.¹³ Also, the Safavids would have most likely restored any such damage prior to giving the manuscript to Humāyūn. Furthermore, the Mughal paintings number six, one more than the original five, which means that at least one of the Mughal paintings was a new addition.¹⁴ Thus the Shāh Jahān period repainting seems to have been motivated by a factor other than a desire to cover water damage. It was probably an attempt to overshadow the Safavid work with the finest quality of imperial Mughal painting, and that is why six of the top Shāh Jahānī painters were chosen for this task: Govardhan, ʿAbid, Bālchand, Payāg, Lālchand and Murār.¹⁵ For two centuries this *Rose Garden* of Saʿdī had turned into a jousting field between Timurid and Safavid artists.¹⁶

Humāyūn's invitation

Humāyūn arrived at a time when the two great Shāh Ṭahmāsb manuscripts, the *Shāh-nāma* and the *Khamṣa*, had been substantially completed.¹⁷ In the process, a new generation of artists had been trained, the most important of whom were the three ʿAlīs: Mīrzā ʿAlī, son of Sulṭān-Muḥammad, the leading artist of the Tabriz studio; Muẓaffar ʿAlī, a grand-nephew of the celebrated Bihzād; and Mīr Sayyid ʿAlī, son of Mīr Muṣavvir; each a master in his own right. If Ṭahmāsb wished to impress Humāyūn with the prowess of his painters, it was wholly unnecessary. Humāyūn was captivated by their works and expressed his delight by offering a huge sum for the discharge of one of the Shāh's painters: "If the emperor (i.e. Ṭahmāsb) releases Mīr Muṣavvir to

me, I shall offer one thousand *tumāns* in exchange."¹⁸ This proposal is related by Būdāq-i Munshī-yi Qazvīnī who, in 1544, as secretary of Ṭahmāsb's brother, Bahrām Mīrzā (1517–49), was well placed to comment on the event.¹⁹ Būdāq then adds: "It is thus that the Mīr's son, who had become better than his father, went earlier to India, and the father followed him there." Būdāq's text is subsequently plagiarised by Qāzī Aḥmad in his famous *Gulistān-i hunar* treatise with one exception: he omits the important information that "Mīr Muṣavvir was undoubtedly a man (of strong character), and was in disgrace" at the time of Humāyūn's arrival.²⁰ This omitted information is the key to our understanding why Humāyūn picked the ageing Mīr Muṣavvir instead of a younger and more promising second generation painter; as a guest of Ṭahmāsb, it was improper for him to ask for painters who were still official employees of the royal library-atelier. He therefore chose the one master-painter that the Shāh had dismissed.²¹ Būdāq's contention that Humāyūn's invitation was addressed to the Mīr and that his son seized upon the occasion and went to the Mughal court first, is corroborated by the text of Mīr Muṣavvir's letter to Humāyūn, reproduced in a painting attributed to Mīrzā Sayyid ʿAlī (Pl. XVd). This letter is illustrated as a petition in the hands of a kneeling old man that has been erroneously assumed to represent Mīr Muṣavvir.²² The Mīr cannot be writing a letter from afar and presenting it to Humāyūn at the same time. Indeed, in his letter, the Mīr apologises to the emperor for his delay in joining the Mughal court and promises that he will soon do so:

Petition from the old and long time slave, Mīr Muṣavvir: It is a great honour to report that it has been a while since this slave's son (i.e. Mīr Sayyid ʿAlī) has entered the services of Your Majesty. It is hoped that he will become the subject of royal munificence. [As for me,] I am hopeful to start my journey soon and join Your Majesty's services. God willing, the shadow of your radiance [shall protect us forever].²³

Furthermore, the kneeling old man is portrayed with a sumptuous gold embroidered robe, and a dark skin, which, according to Persian painting conventions, designates a man from India. He is therefore most probably a vizier or secretary to Humāyūn in charge of presenting and reading petitions to the emperor.

The letter clearly indicates that Mīr Muṣavvir was expected at the Mughal court, and that the presence of his son did not relieve him from his obligation to join Humāyūn. The Mughal chronicler Bāyazīd reports that Humāyūn summoned ʿAbd al-Ṣamad and Mīrzā Sayyid ʿAlī through an imperial rescript

entrusted to a returning Safavid envoy in 1546.²⁴ However, a more likely scenario is that, once artists discovered Humāyūn's enthusiasm for Persian painting, they expressed their interest in joining his library-atelier, and Humāyūn replied favourably only after he had regained Qandahār and had partially recovered his kingdom. Bāyazīd's subsequent observation that the painter Dūst-Muḥammad came without a prior permission seems to imply that most other artists had conveyed—on their own initiatives—their desire to join the Mughal library-atelier and were then granted permission to do so.²⁵

Ṭahmāsb's lack of interest

Humāyūn's largesse and the Timurids' reputation for generous patronage certainly influenced some artists to join the Mughal emperor,²⁶ and the wine-drinking prohibition imposed by Ṭahmāsb induced others to consider such move.²⁷ But these factors alone did not generate the massive disaffection of artists from what should be perhaps considered as the greatest library-atelier of all times. The fundamental reason was Ṭahmāsb's waning interest in the activities of his library-atelier, which eventually led to the dismissal of most of the remaining artists.

Dickson and Welch have surmised that Ṭahmāsb's estrangement from painting culminated with the 963/1556 Edict of Sincere Repentance "which formally banned secular arts from his realm," thus insinuating that religious considerations were at the root of such decision.²⁸ The Edict of Sincere Repentance, though, was not for Ṭahmāsb himself to repent but addressed the Qizilbāsh *amīrs* and Safavid nobles, who were required to take an oath of abstinence from forbidden worldly pleasures and repent of past sins.²⁹ Ṭahmāsb's own "sincere repentance" had most probably occurred at Jājarm in 1534, and was subsequently proclaimed in Herat.³⁰ It was followed by a decree that banned "irreligious" activities (*nā-mashrū'āt*) such as pigeon-flying (*kabūtar-bāzī*), shaving one's beard, and *ṭanbūr* and *naqqāra* music,³¹ and ordered the closing of taverns, opium dens and brothels where the "forbidden things" (*manāhī*, such as wine drinking), was pursued.³² It caused a substantial loss of revenue for the royal treasury, amounting by one estimate to 12,000 *tūmāns* per year.³³ By this measure alone, the repentance of the avaricious Ṭahmāsb must be considered as quite sincere.³⁴ Conspicuously absent from this decree is any reference to painting and calligraphy. Ṭahmāsb not only did not ban painting but tolerated painters' infractions of the decree. Thus, Būdāq reported: "that master Bihzād, who reached the age of seventy, could not live a moment without ruby-red wine or the ruby-red lips of a wine-bearer; constant wine had kept him young and despite the ban, he continued

drinking and the Shāh knew it [but did not mind]."³⁵ This is in sharp contrast with Ṭahmāsb's reaction towards Qizilbāsh *amīrs* such as the long-trusted Vizier of the *Qurchīs* (royal guards) Shāh-Qulī, whom he ordered to be decapitated for the sin of wine-drinking in spite of the ban.³⁶

Painting is not explicitly banned by the Qur'ān, but the cloud of uncertainty that hung over painting was associative in nature: orthodox Sunnī theologians considered it as duplicating creation or an attempt to return to idolatry.³⁷ Shi'ite theologians may never have addressed the issue. Had there been a Shi'ite prohibition of painting, Ṭahmāsb would have been a master at finding ways to circumvent it. A point in case is Ṭahmāsb's annulment of the immunity he had granted the Ottoman prince Bāyazīd in the year 1559. Vying for the Ottoman throne, the prince Bāyazīd had fought unsuccessfully against the combined forces of his father, Süleymān the Magnificent (r. 1520–66), and brother, Selīm (the future Selīm II, r. 1566–74). He was defeated and took refuge with Ṭahmāsb, but before reaching the capital city of Qazvin he obtained through a religiously-binding oath a grant of immunity that was supposed to block every avenue of treachery. Ṭahmāsb avowed in his own diaries that for the sake of good relationship with Süleymān—with whom he had finally concluded a peace treaty in 1555—he had to return the prince but was bound by his oath neither to kill him, nor to hand him to Süleymān or his men.³⁸ However, Ṭahmāsb broke his oath pretending that he "had not vowed not to return him to his brother Selīm", and so the unfortunate prince and his four sons were delivered to Selīm's men, who decapitated them on the spot.

In the case of painting, Ṭahmāsb did not even have to invent a justification: there was a ready-made theory that his contemporary, the calligrapher Dūst-Muḥammad, had referred to in his preface to the Bahrām Mīrzā album of c. 1544. By this theory, the art of illumination and painting that adorned the written Word went back to the venerated first Shi'ite imam, 'Alī, who was also credited with the invention of the Islamic scroll pattern.³⁹ Painting was thus protected by the sanction of the highest Shi'ite authority, the Imam 'Alī himself.

Interestingly, Būdāq emphasises in separate instances that Ṭahmāsb repudiated both calligraphers and painters from his library-atelier. If painting had been from time to time the subject of religious controversy, calligraphy was not only immune from such controversy but represented Islamic art *par excellence*. Therefore, if Ṭahmāsb expelled calligraphers along with painters, a reason other than religious fanaticism must be sought. That reason may be a weakening of Ṭahmāsb's eyesight caused by a hereditary ophthalmic disease that was accelerated

by a severe illness contracted in the year 1543 and reported by the chronicler Qāzī Aḥmad-i Ghaffārī. In contrast to his usual concise reporting style, Ghaffārī devoted considerable space to the incident and wrote verses which oddly make repeated use of the word “*‘ayn*” “eye” and seem to indicate that the illness had affected Ṭahmāsb’s eyes:

From today to eternity, it is incumbent upon mankind

To praise the Lord one thousand times a day.

For the “Seeing Eye of Created Beings” (*‘ayn-i bāsira-yi āfarinīsh*) is in absolute health (*‘ayn-i siḥḥat*), by the will of the Creator.

You are the soul of worldly events, and as all souls are linked to yours, may you live as long as the world shall be.⁴⁰

By calling Ṭahmāsb the Seeing Eye of Created Beings, the author is implicitly attributing to him a vision so strong that it encompasses the seeing power of all created beings. It is an odd and uncommon way to praise a king in Persian poetry, and perhaps an indication to the contrary.

The possibility of a hereditary ophthalmic disease is strengthened by the fact that the eyesight of Ṭahmāsb’s eldest son, the future Shāh Muḥammad Khudābanda (1531–88), inexplicably deteriorated when he was sixteen or seventeen years old, and that he was almost blind soon after.⁴¹ Medically speaking, it is a very rare phenomenon to have a young man go blind at such an early age and it strongly suggests “macular degeneracy” (a retina disease) of a hereditary type. Ṭahmāsb was thus likely to have been afflicted by macular degeneracy as well, perhaps not as extreme as his son’s, but severe enough to impair his ability to focus and to see clearly, as happens to people with Best’s Disease, Starguard Disease or other macular degeneracy problems.⁴²

Three other considerations may reinforce this theory. The first is the concept of the *Fāl-nāma*, a large-format manuscript produced c. 1550, with unusual large-size calligraphy and bold designs that are devoid of minute detail-work, as if the manuscript was prepared for a patron unable to see miniature details yet appreciated coloration and elegant composition (Pl. XVIId).⁴³ It was possibly a last-ditch attempt by members of the royal library-atelier to keep alive the artistic interest of a patron with a vision problem.

The second is the continued activity of artists, calligraphers (such as Mālik-i Daylamī) as well as painters (such as Muẓaffar ‘Alī), in the architectural decorations of the Qazvin palace of Ṭahmāsb, for several years after 1544.⁴⁴ According to the contemporary chronicler ‘Abdī Beyg-i Shirāzī, Ṭahmāsb returned to Qazvin after the departure of Humāyūn for Qandahār, and decided that “from then on (i.e.

from 1544) the court would stay in winter quarters (*qishlāq*) in Qazvin and that a new government palace (*dawlat-khāna*), surrounded by [appropriate] gardens, would be erected there.”⁴⁵ As 1544 is also the approximate date of the expulsion of calligraphers and painters from the royal Safavid library-atelier (see below), the further work of artists at the Qazvin palace seems to indicate once again that Ṭahmāsb could see—albeit not very clearly—large-scale calligraphy and architectural painting but not manuscript-size detail work.

Finally, a very odd aspect of Ṭahmāsb’s reign is that he seldom went hunting. Hunting was an essential activity of Turco-Mongol princes, one that was believed to develop the combat skills of the warrior. Prowess in hunting was equated with prowess in combat and a substitute for it. Thus the Persian chronicler who wished to gloss over Shāh Ismā‘īl’s defeat at Chāldirān in 1514 portrayed him as leaving the battle scene for quail hunting while the Qizilbāsh troops were being massacred by the Ottomans!⁴⁶ Strangely, Ṭahmāsb did not go hunting but went fishing. To ennoble this peculiar activity, the chroniclers, and Ṭahmāsb himself, termed it *shikār-i māhī* (lit. “fish-hunting”), as if, like some North American Indians, he was shooting trout with a bow and arrow up and down mountain streams.⁴⁷ Luckily, we have the account of an eyewitness, the Venetian Michele Membré, who mentions that Ṭahmāsb carried a thin cane for fishing and spent considerable time at it.⁴⁸

Most sources seem to indicate that Ṭahmāsb was present at a hunting expedition in honour of Humāyūn which was organised as a *jarga* hunt (hunt with beaters), i.e. an easy hunt in which the game is driven towards the hunter. Even so, it is not clear from the sources whether Ṭahmāsb was actively participating or not.⁴⁹ While the reference to this *jarga* hunt is very concise in Persian chronicles, a lengthy, and relatively unnecessary, sentence in the same sources is devoted to the death of the Shāh’s standard-bearer (*‘alam-dār-i khāṣṣa*), who was accidentally shot during this hunt.⁵⁰ One wonders whether Ṭahmāsb mistook the standard-bearer for a deer!

The dispersal of Safavid artists

Whatever the reason for Ṭahmāsb’s disaffection regarding painting, by the year of Humāyūn’s arrival, the Shāh’s artists had sought alternative patronage. The likeliest choice was of course the younger brother of Ṭahmāsb, Bahrām Mīrzā, a bon-vivant and talented calligrapher and painter, who was in the process of assembling his famous album (TKS, H2154, completed c. 1544) with the help of one of the Shāh’s calligraphers, Dūst Muḥammad.⁵¹ Works from a number of other artists appear in the same album, and it is more than likely that some

were produced specifically for inclusion in it and that a few artists had switched to Bahrām's library-atelier. Most informative in this respect is a recently published manuscript (TKS, R.957) that bears a dedication to the library of the prince and incorporates the signatures of three artists who had previously worked on Shāh Ṭahmāsb's *Khamsa*.⁵² On fol. 2a, the painting of a seated prince is incorporated in a colophon-looking page with a legend that reads: "Has painted it 'Alī al-Ḥusaynī and has copied it Shāh Maḥmūd al-Nīshābūrī" (see Pl. XVIa). The calligrapher has not only signed his name on this page but also included, by proxy, the signature-name of the painter Mīr Sayyid 'Alī. One should note that since *Mīr* and *Sayyid* both indicate descent from the Prophet Muḥammad, their simultaneous inclusion in a signature-name that already emphasises descent from the Ḥusaynī branch of the Prophet's progeny, would have been redundant and they were therefore omitted.⁵³ Furthermore, a quick comparison of this seated prince with the seated ruler in *Night-time in palace* (Arthur M. Sackler Museum, Harvard University Art Museums, 1958.76) that has been attributed to Mīr Sayyid 'Alī⁵⁴ brings to light many of his stylistic particularities: high distance between eye and eyebrow, earth-tone carpet with a white stencilled border, fine details, precise fingernails and a seated posture that depicts a comfortable and stable seated position in perfect harmony with the laws of gravity. As noted by M. S. Simpson, a page from the Bahrām Mīrzā album (TKS, H. 2154, fol. 148a), with a similar calligraphic layout and the same poems written by the same hand on the top of the page, shows a sumptuously dressed standing prince with a *sitār* in his hands (Pl. XVIc). Because of the elaborate textile details and the same facial characteristics as those of the prince in the previous painting, this too is attributable to Mīr Sayyid 'Alī. It most probably depicts Bahrām Mīrzā whose musical talents are highly praised by his brother Sām Mīrzā (1517–67) in his *Tuhfa-yi Sāmi*.⁵⁵ Its slightly different legend reads: "Has copied this by way of practice, Shāh Maḥmūd al-Nīshābūrī, may God forgive his sins and cover his shortcomings, in the year 950 [1543–44 A.D.]." The strong affinity between the two pages suggests a close date of production for both.

Facing the seated prince, and on the opposite page of this manuscript, is depicted the portrait of a kneeling prince presenting a petition addressed to the king and signed by the artist Muẓaffar 'Alī, who is undoubtedly the author of the painting (Pl. XVIa). Unlike Mīr Sayyid 'Alī, Muẓaffar 'Alī has no sense of weight and his kneeling prince seems to float in space. The petition reads:

The least of the slaves Muẓaffar 'Alī submits to the loftiest court that His Imperial Majesty (*nawāb jahān-bānī*) is well aware that the stipend of this lowly [servant] was six *tūmāns* while in the services of His Fortunate Majesty (*nawāb kāmrānī*), but is now [reduced] to three *tūmāns*, as a result of which the life of this lowly [servant] is quite distressed. Your orders shall be obeyed whatever they shall be.⁵⁶

The kneeling prince is wearing a sumptuous robe and a turban with an ostrich feather; he is therefore of high rank, and because the painting has been inserted at the very beginning of a manuscript made for Bahrām Mīrzā, it must depict him in the process of presenting a petition to the Shāh on behalf of Muẓaffar 'Alī, perhaps on the very occasion of Humāyūn's visit when Bahrām joined Ṭahmāsb in Abhar (between Qazvin and Zanjān). Since the time of the Mongols, court protocol had dictated that princes and dignitaries, as well as attendants and wine-bearers, should approach the ruler on their knees. The positioning of the kneeling Bahrām opposite a seated prince with three ostrich feathers in his turban (usually an attribute of kingship), may suggest that the latter represents Ṭahmāsb.⁵⁷ Speculating on the sequence of events, it seems that the portrait of Bahrām Mīrzā with a *sitār* was the first to be incorporated in the manuscript, followed by the addition of the kneeling Bahrām. But to make the double page more meaningful, the portrait to the left was "upgraded" to represent the Shāh as the receiver of the petition. The same, rather weak, poem appears on the original and replacement page; perhaps this was a poem of Bahrām that the seated Ṭahmāsb was meant to read.

More importantly, the petition reveals that c. 1544, Muẓaffar 'Alī, and most probably the other artists whose names appear in this manuscript,⁵⁸ had left the royal library-atelier or had been transferred to the library-atelier of Ṭahmāsb's brother with a reduced stipend.⁵⁹

A manuscript of the *Silsilat al-dhahab* of Jāmī (St. Petersburg, Dorn 434), copied by Shāh Maḥmūd al-Nīshābūrī in Ardabil at the very beginning of Sām Mīrzā's tenure as governor of that city,⁶⁰ and dated 1 Sha'bān 956/25 August 1549, with a double-page frontispiece attributable to Mīrzā 'Alī,⁶¹ is a further testimony to the precarious situation of master painters and calligraphers who had sought the patronage of this rebellious prince.⁶² Any association with Sām Mīrzā, was susceptible to attract the wrath of Ṭahmāsb, as perhaps it did in the case of Mīr Muṣavvir in prior years.⁶³

With his appointment to Ardabil, Sām Mīrzā may have nurtured the idea of reviving his own library-atelier. But Ṭahmāsb stripped his brother of all

sources of revenue and so reduced his stipend that the prince had to engage in commerce (*tijārat*) in order to generate a meagre income.⁶⁴ In such a case, Sām Mīrzā could hardly afford a library-atelier of his own.

2. THE SECOND WAVE

The reverse tide

The premature death of Bahrām Mīrzā in 1549 dashed all hopes for a continuing Safavid princely patronage, and swelled the wave of migrating artists. But like so many other instances in the history of Turco-Mongol princes, wine and opium suddenly changed the course of events. In early 1556, leaning on a staff and under the spell of opium, Humāyūn dozed off in the middle of a discussion with his generals and fell to his death from a rooftop.⁶⁵ This tragedy, in conjunction with the appointment of Sulṭān-Ibrāhīm Mīrzā (1544–77) as governor of Mashhad a few months later, reversed the migration tide, and some of the artists who had gone to the Mughal court came back to join the library-atelier of this talented and enthusiastic young prince. Būdāq-i Munshī provides information on two such artists, Mīrzā ʿAlī and Shaykh Muḥammad.⁶⁶ Of the latter he wrote:

Mullā Shaykh-Muḥammad is from Sabzavār. His father was Mullā Kamāl, pupil of Mawlānā ʿAbd al-Ḥayy; he wrote well in *thulṭh* and *naskh* and Qurʾāns copied by him were being sold at three to four *tumāns*. Together with his children he joined the services of [the Mughal emperor] Mīrzā Humāyūn. His son, Mullā Shaykh-Muḥammad, was a pupil of Dūst-i Dīvāna and matured there. Later on, when he came to Khurasan, Ibrāhīm Mīrzā, son of Bahrām Mīrzā, tutored him. Without exaggeration, he was an excellent painter, illuminator, and outliner (*muḥarrir*) and wrote well in *nastaʿlīq*. [In painting] he rivalled Chinese painters, and for the likeness of his Chinese-style portraiture people exclaimed: “Well done!”⁶⁷

Less explicit and more problematic is his information about Mīrzā ʿAlī which comes at the end of an entry for Sulṭān-Muḥammad: “he had an equally talented son who, after the death of his father, went to India and prospered there.”⁶⁸ Oddly, he is silent on Mīrzā ʿAlī’s activity at the library-atelier of Sulṭān Ibrāhīm Mīrzā in Mashhad, perhaps because this section of Būdāq’s *Javāhir al-akhbār* was written earlier, and not fully updated when he hastily dedicated his work to Ismāʿīl II (r. 1576–77) in 1576.⁶⁹ But since he is usually accurate, his account carries weight. Moreover, the reference to both of these artists’ passage to India was suppressed in the *Gulistān-i hunar* of Qāzī Aḥmad. Patterns of omission

are sometimes more telling in Persian sources than written words. In this case, the omissions were probably intended to minimise in Safavid chronicles both the rising fortunes of the Mughals and the state of disarray at Ṭahmāsb’s library-atelier.

A scenario in which Mīrzā ʿAlī went to “India” (i.e. the Mughal court) and returned to Mashhad c. 1556 does not conflict with the chronology of works attributable to him. His last works before the 1556–65 *Haft awrang* of Sulṭān-Ibrāhīm Mīrzā (FGA, 46.12) are datable to the year 1549 by (a) the aforementioned frontispiece of the St. Petersburg manuscript; and (b) three paintings (fols. 66a, 102b, 139a) from another copy of the *Silsilat al-dhahab* of Jāmī dated 1549 (AMSG, S86.0044).⁷⁰

A recently published painting from the Gulshan album that was assembled for the Mughal emperor Jahāngīr (r. 1605–27), reinforces the possibility of a brief stay of Mīrzā ʿAlī at the Mughal court (GPL, nos. 1663, fol. 46, see Pl. XVIIa).⁷¹ It displays many characteristics of his paintings: the majestic and serene appearance of the seated king, the shape of the turbans (bulging in the front with dipping curves in the back), his favourite plane tree with yellow and red leaves, the division of the crowd into interacting pairs (see e.g. the top right corner where the hand of one party is naturally resting on the other’s shoulder and the latter is reciprocating the affectionate gesture by grabbing his counterpart’s belt) and, finally, the wonderful sense of balance that his characters can convey in the most awkward positions (such as the page boy hanging a lantern in the plane tree, see Pl. XVIIb). The size, general composition and gold-painted borders of this miniature recall paintings of the Shāh Ṭahmāsb *Khamsa*, especially fol. 202v, *Bahrām Gūr exhibiting his hunting prowess*, painted by Mīrzā ʿAlī’s father.⁷² Furthermore, the margin rulings of the painting follow the unique pattern and sequence of the *Khamsa*: (from inside outwards) gold, black, natural paper, red, natural paper, green, thick gold, two thin black lines, natural and dark blue (Pl. XVIIb).⁷³ It was intended for the *Khamsa* yet it was integrated in the first section of the Gulshan album no later than 1610.⁷⁴ The question, then, is how did such an important painting end up in Mughal hands? Most likely its presumed author, Mīrzā ʿAlī, finished it at a time when Ṭahmāsb became uninterested in painting and took it to “India” as a present for Humāyūn (or as proof of his prowess). The only other transfer scenario within the seventy-year time span—from the production of the *Khamsa* to the assembly of the Gulshan album—is a gift from Shāh ʿAbbās I (r. 1588–1629) to Jahāngīr. However, it is highly improbable that Shāh ʿAbbās would have sent a single page, and not a complete manuscript, as a gift to the Mughal Emperor.⁷⁵ Moreover, the first major Persian embassy sent by

Shāh ʿAbbās reached the Mughal court in 1611; by then, the first section of the album was probably closed and any gift-page from it would have been incorporated in the second section.

In the light of this discovery, we may reconsider the previously accepted notion that other dispersed pages of the Shāh Ṭahmāsb *Khamsa* were removed c. 1675 when the painter Muḥammad Zamān inserted some new pages and retouched the faces on some existing pages. Since all the previously known paintings that were removed from that manuscript are attributable to Mīrzā Sayyid ʿAlī,⁷⁶ we may assume that these, too, were taken by their author to the Mughal court.⁷⁷

Also, the dating of another painting attributed to Mīrzā ʿAlī, *Princely lovers* (AHT, no. 65; Pl. XVIIc) should perhaps be revised from c. 1544 to c. 1550.⁷⁸ It was previously argued that the painting hinted at a love affair between Humāyūn's trusted companion Bayrām Khān and Ṭahmāsb's sister Princess Sulṭānum.⁷⁹ But considering that Ṭahmāsb had betrothed his sister to the (disappeared) Shi'ite Twelfth Imām, and taking into account his violent reaction towards possible suitors,⁸⁰ it now seems more likely that Mīrzā ʿAlī painted the *Princely lovers* on his way to the Mughal court with the intention of offering it to Bayrām Khān, the second most powerful man of the Mughal empire.

The Mashhad library-atelier and stylistic expectations for Farrukh Beyg

Generally hailed as one of the great schools of Persian painting, the vigorous and eccentric Mashhad style that emanated from the library-atelier of Sulṭān-Ibrāhīm Mīrzā, is as much a reflection of the taste of a refined patron as the genius of its two leading artists, Mīrzā ʿAlī and Shaykh Muḥammad, who, after exploring distant horizons, injected new blood into the veins of the stagnating Safavid style of painting.⁸¹ The Mashhad style of Mīrzā ʿAlī and Shaykh Muḥammad inevitably influenced the next generation of painters, the most talented of which were undoubtedly Muḥammadī and Farrukh Beyg. Since both artists ended up in library-ateliers of rivals of the Safavids, no individual entry was devoted to them in Safavid sources. Any reference to their works was accidental or *en passant*.⁸² In an entry on the painter of Georgian origin, Siyāvush, Iskandar Beyg mentioned that he "was the pupil of Ustād ʿAlī (i.e. Mīrzā ʿAlī),⁸³ and under the reign of the Nawāb with the Dignity of Alexander (i.e. Shāh Muḥammad Khodābanda), he (Siyāvush) and his brother Farrukh Beyg were among the trusted companions (*muṭamidān*) of the young and fortunate prince Ḥamza Mīrzā; and under the reign of his Exalted Majesty (i.e. Shāh ʿAbbās I), he served His Majesty

for quite a while and lost his life while in the retinue of his Holiness (i.e. Shāh ʿAbbās I)."⁸⁴

Even though the Mughal and Deccani works of Farrukh Beyg have been extensively analysed in recent studies, no attempt—apart from an ink drawing (Musée Guimet, Paris; Pl. XVIIIa) and a manuscript (King's College Library, Cambridge, K11, see Pl. XVIIIb) with five miniatures bearing attributions to him—has been made to discover pre-Mughal works of the artist.⁸⁵ As for the written attributions on the Safavid works, they have remained controversial since the connection to later paintings of Farrukh Beyg is not easily recognisable.⁸⁶

In an attempt to identify other Safavid paintings of Farrukh Beyg, and prior to a stylistic analysis of his works, we may already make certain assumptions based on the information provided by Iskandar Beyg, and test their validity as we proceed forward: (a) since Siyāvush was taught by Mīrzā ʿAlī, works of his brother Farrukh Beyg are likely to show the influence of Mīrzā ʿAlī; (b) equally likely is the influence of Shaykh Muḥammad; and (c) since Farrukh Beyg was a contemporary of Muḥammadī,⁸⁷ some of his works may evoke Muḥammadī's style.

Testing our assumptions against the above-mentioned attributed works, we can readily see that the Cambridge set is very much in the style of Muḥammadī⁸⁸ and that the Paris drawing is yet another replica of the yoked Uzbek prisoner, originated by Shaykh Muḥammad. Following the portraiture style of Shaykh Muḥammad, the artist has drawn here an elaborate three-quarter portrait with a flat nose.⁸⁹

An interesting aspect of the work is the Mughal inscription that identifies the yoked prisoner as Bayrām Oghlān, the Uzbek ruler of Gharjistān who surrendered in the year 1551 to the Safavid governor of Herat.⁹⁰ This was a relatively minor incident unlikely to be well known at the Mughal court half a century later, and the identity of the prisoner was therefore most probably provided by the author himself. We may then surmise that, similar to the *Khamsa* page by Mīrzā ʿAlī, and perhaps to those by Mīrzā Sayyid ʿAlī, these Safavid period works were brought to India by Farrukh Beyg as samples of his work and/or as exchange goods to allow him a fresh start there.⁹¹

Although stylistically different from his later paintings, each of these early works includes characteristics that remain with Farrukh Beyg until the very end of his career: (a) the Cambridge painting has a very high and vertical background which surrounds the painted figure and makes it the focal point of the composition; (b) the portrait of the yoked prisoner is highly elaborate; and (c) his left sleeve is partially turned inside out and displays its inner lining (Pl. XVIIIa). More generally, Farrukh Beyg frequent-

ly tries to show the lining, or the reverse side, of a skirt or a sash blowing in the wind. This is a direct influence of Mīrzā ʿAlī, most noticeable in the sleeve and the robe of Absāl in *Salāmān and Absāl repose on the happy isle* (see Pl. XXc). However, as we shall see, Farrukh Beyg's sashes and rippled robes tend to be starchy and stiff and less fluid than the elegant curves created by Mīrzā ʿAlī.

These are too few characteristics to establish a precise stylistic profile for the works of Farrukh Beyg. To do so, we need to start with later paintings and work our way back to some of his earlier masterpieces.

Tracing back Farrukh Beyg's works

We shall begin with two almost identical paintings of a *Deccani youth holding a narcissus*. The first is a painting from the Gulshan album (GPL no. 1663, fol. 86) that reportedly bears an inscription "has drawn it (*rāqimuhu*) Farrukh Beyg at the age of seventy"; it may be a reliable attribution, even though the second part of the legend, "at the age of seventy," appears on so many paintings attributed to this artist that it is *a priori* suspect (Pl. XXIa).⁹² The second is a close duplicate from the Binney Collection (San Diego Museum of Art, 1990:0318) and bears an attribution to Farrukh Beyg (Pl. XXIb).⁹³ The following characteristics can immediately be detected: (a) as in the Cambridge paintings, both have a very high vertical background but with an added distinction: they are horizontally stratified with parallel rows of green tufts; (b) two dominant colour schemes are used, one is the "pink family" with hues that range from pinkish red to violet, and the other is the "green family" that encompasses many shades of green, from light to dark; and (c) a geometric pattern is favoured for the design of the sashes that comprise a multitude of juxtaposed zigzag lines creating a string of diamond motifs in between.

A recently discovered minute inscription (see Appendix) on *Ibrāhīm ʿĀdil Shāh hawking* (Institute of Oriental Studies St. Petersburg, ms. E. 14, fol. 2) attributes this magnificent painting to Farrukh Beyg and firmly establishes him as a Deccani court painter (Pl. XVIIIc).⁹⁴ The painting is dominated by a combination of the previously-mentioned green and pink scheme of colours, and the sash is drawn with Farrukh Beyg's usual geometric pattern. Two other characteristics can be noticed: (a) the horse is drawn with a heavy upper body, rounded hindquarters smoothly ending in a reverse concave curve above the back knee, and extra-large kidney-shaped nostrils that in some other painting would look as if they were stuck on the horse's nose; and (b) rainbow coloured peonies adorn the gold saddle cloth.

John Seyller and Ellen Smart, who discovered the

above inscription, also attribute two paintings from the Gulshan album (AHT, nos. 128b and c) to Farrukh Beyg (Pls. XVIIId and XIX) which come from a dispersed *Zafar-nāma*.⁹⁵ The attributions are based on certain similarities between these two and Farrukh Beyg's paintings from the c. 1586 *Akbar-nāma* pages (VAM, I.S. 2-1896), the most important of which are "the doleful bearded figures in gray holding the standard and riding beside the parasol bearer."⁹⁶

As in the two Deccani paintings, these two *Zafar-nāma* pages are dominated by the green and pink families of colours. Both have high vertical backgrounds with a mounted Tīmūr (r. 1370–1405) as their focal point. The horses have the large kidney-shaped nostrils. Similar to the saddle cloth in the St. Petersburg painting, the one in Pl. XIX is in gold with rainbow-coloured peonies, and Tīmūr's armour has the same geometric pattern as Farrukh Beyg's Deccani sashes. The sleeve of the foot-soldier beneath Tīmūr is turned inside-out (Pl. XIX). The three-quarter elaborate portraits of Tīmūr and some other warriors are reminiscent of Shaykh Muḥammad's style of portraiture. More generally, (a) we recognise Farrukh Beyg's tendency to striate white beards (and yak-tails hanging from the horses' necks) with black, or red, lines or vice-versa; and (b) horse-covers, parasols and awnings have an indigo blue section covered with gold floral motifs.⁹⁷

Based on the above, the *Horse and a groom* drawing from the Musée Guimet⁹⁸ can now be attributed to Farrukh Beyg (Pl. XXa). The horse is typical, with large nostrils, strong upper body and rounded hindquarters; and the belt of the horse-cover displays Farrukh Beyg's favourite geometric pattern. The left sleeve of the groom is turned inside-out to show its inner lining and the back side of the groom's frozen-looking sash can be detected between the ripples. These similarities notwithstanding, the most important element, and usually easiest to identify, in stylistic attributions is facial similarity. Here, the groom's face is similar to the face of the prince in *Youth with a wine-cup and a falcon* (GPL, no. 1663, fol. 47)⁹⁹ and the face of the Khān in *Mīr Muʿizz al-Mulk and Bahādur Khān meet in 1567* (Pl. XXb),¹⁰⁰ a type that is described by Seyller as "oval-shaped, squinty eyes, and thin dark eyebrows" and with a drooping moustache.¹⁰¹

Farrukh Beyg's Haft awrang paintings

It would have been rather odd if Farrukh Beyg arrived at the Akbar's court in 1585, a mature painter at the age of forty,¹⁰² ready to tackle major projects such as the above-mentioned *Zafar-nāma* or the c. 1586 *Akbar-nāma*, without prior accomplish-

ments. He must have had solid credentials. We shall propose that Farrukh Beyg's major Safavid-period accomplishment was the painting series for a *Haft awrang* copied by the scribe Muḥibb ʿAlī between 1570 and 1572 (TKS, H.1483), a lavish manuscript that rivals in many ways the Sulṭān-Ibrāhīm Mīrẓā *Haft awrang* of 1556–65. All but one of the miniatures (twenty-five text illustrations, one frontispiece and four colophon finispieces in total) of the manuscript are attributable to Farrukh Beyg. The one exception, fol. 109a, is as we shall see attributable to Muḥammadi.

The twenty-nine paintings attributable to Farrukh Beyg are so strikingly different from other contemporary works that they can be immediately recognised as a homogeneous group and the work of one artist.¹⁰³ We shall therefore limit the justification for our attributions to a few examples.

Fol. 55a, *Choosing a vizier* (Pl. XXIIIa), and fol. 77a, *Majnūn's father requesting Laylī's hand in marriage for his son* (Pl. XXIIIc), have each the characteristic high vertical background with the horizontal stratification. The dominant colour scheme for the first painting is the pink family and for the second one the green family.¹⁰⁴ Elongated faces noticed by Seyller¹⁰⁵ and visible in Pl. XXb appear in both, and a number of the faces are depicted with striated black and white beards. Another painting, fol. 86, *Laylī and Majnūn meet at the Ka'ba* (Pl. XXIIIb), has the same high vertical background but is devoid of the stratification with green tufts, since the scene takes place in the desert near the Ka'ba. Instead, the ground is covered with pebbles thrown by the pilgrims during the *hajj* ceremonies; the colour scheme is nonetheless of the pink family.¹⁰⁶ Men with elongated faces appear in the top right, and striated black and white beards appear on the left side of the painting.

Besides the intensity of colours, what is most striking about these illustrations is the elaborate, individualised portraiture that often exaggerates facial features. It is the continuation of a trend set by Mīrẓā ʿAlī and Shaykh Muḥammad. By the mid-1560s, Mīrẓā ʿAlī's portraits have elongated cone-shaped necks and bulging eyes (Pl. XVIIId),¹⁰⁷ and Shaykh Muḥammad portraits get increasingly eccentric.¹⁰⁸ Farrukh Beyg not only created elongated faces but also further individualised his characters by playing with the position of their chin. Thus in the Mughal period he often opted for a small, depressed and vanishing chin (Pl. XXIVa), whereas in the Safavid period he was bent on producing protruded jaws with forward chins (Pl. XXIVb).

Finally, the double-page frontispiece with a Mīrẓā ʿAlī-inspired composition (Pls. XXVa–b) has facial types very similar to the previous ones and horses that are drawn with the previously-observed charac-

teristics. Noteworthy is the special shape of cloud bands, which as a repeat pattern usually represents a distinctive signature-like motif for each individual artist. The colour scheme of the left cloud bands, which differs from the more conventional one on the right, juxtaposes black against white and beige, similar to Farrukh Beyg's striation of beards and yak-tails. While the colour scheme is different on the two sides, they have a common motif in the fibulae-shaped spirals at the centre of cloud formations. This fibulae-shaped motif not only appears in other illustrations of this manuscript (see for instance Pl. XXII), but resurfaces in a Deccani-period painting of Farrukh Beyg as gold embroidery on the robe of *Youth in a Garden* (Pl. XXVd).¹⁰⁹

Farrukh Beyg's Safavid-period works

At this stage of our inquiry, four other paintings are attributable to Farrukh Beyg. The first is an ex-Rothschild painting depicting two seated learned men (Pl. XXVIa),¹¹⁰ one of them with a typical heavy protruding jaw (Pl. XXVIIa). As one can see, the inner lining of the robes of both men is visible through the bottom ripples.

Next is the *Shepherd with a goat* (Pl. XXVIId) whose facial characteristics, including the drooping nose and almond shaped eyes—with the upper and lower contour lines joined at the two ends—are very similar to those of the *Two learned men* (Pl. XXVIIa, b, c).¹¹¹ Also noticeable are the sawed-off tree trunks and branches which reappear in a painting (FGA, 46.12 fol. 64b) that Farrukh Beyg contributed—perhaps at a date later than the 1556–65 calligraphy period—to the Freer *Haft awrang*: *Bandits attack the caravan of ʿAynia and Riyā* (Pl. XXVIc).¹¹² It was previously attributed to Shaykh Muḥammad by S. C. Welch but a close look reveals that it is much different in composition as well as details (e.g. grass tufts and faces) than the rest of illustrations attributed to the same artist (fols. 114b, 132a, 253a, 264a, 298a and 120a which is actually signed).¹¹³ On the other hand it displays many Farrukh Beyg characteristics: almond-shaped eyes, high background with stratified turf lines, zigzag pattern on a saddle-belt, and a multitude of armoured horses as in the *Zafarnāma* pages. The peculiar shape of turbans with a prominent diagonal fold and a flat drooping tail is a constant feature and an important characteristic (Pl. XXVIIa, b, c, d, e and f). The black Scythian-like cap worn by Khurāsāni peasants is another Farrukh Beyg favourite (e.g. Pl. XXIIIc).

The fourth is a page of yet another Jāmī manuscript (AHT, no. 72). Many of the previously-defined characteristics are visible (Pl. XXVIIb): elongated faces with striated beards, youths with red cheeks

resembling those in Pl. XXVIIIf, an indigo blue awning with gold motifs, and a geometric pattern of bricks that produces an horizontal string of diamond shapes. It is probably the earliest of the group that we have just attributed to Farrukh Beyg.¹¹⁴

Muḥammadī and the dating of Farrukh Beyg's Haft awrang paintings

Stylistically, the above mentioned four paintings should be dated c. 1570–80. Such a dating necessitates a reconsideration of the dating of the Topkapi *Haft awrang* paintings as being contemporary with the text (1570–72)¹¹⁵ because they all seem to be posterior to the above four paintings. Also, if the illustrations of the Topkapi *Haft awrang* were contemporary with the text, we would still be left with a dilemma similar to the one which we evoked at the beginning of the previous section: what happened to Farrukh Beyg between 1572 and 1585, and why did he not produce other masterpieces at the Safavid court? The answer is that the painting series of this manuscript was Farrukh Beyg's last Safavid project and was executed c. 1580–83.

A first observation is that colophon pages are illustrated in this manuscript; a fact that usually points to a post-calligraphy attempt to use the maximum available space for decoration purposes by a painter who does not have access to the initial production team of the manuscript and cannot request a new arrangement of the text with more space devoted to illustration. Also, in comparing two of these pages, we can see that in Pl. XXVIIIb there are six illuminated cartouches plus the illustration at the bottom, while in Pl. XXVIIIa the cartouches are filled with tiny paintings. It suggests that, in the first production phase of the manuscript, the calligraphy of the manuscript was terminated and the illumination was halfway through. Most probably, no illustration had been added because in the regular course of manuscript decoration, painting came last. The cartouches of Pl. XXVIIIa were probably left empty and were painted later on by Farrukh Beyg. *Choosing a vizier* (Pl. XXIIIa), seems to confirm this: the section-heading space in the middle of the page is still devoid of illumination. Left with a previously-designed page with an empty section reserved for painting and little room to manoeuvre, Farrukh Beyg used in a major *tour de force* every bit of space, including the inter-columnar one, in order to squeeze in a maximum number of his elaborate portraits. To avoid a visual clash between the central cartouche and surrounding painting, Farrukh Beyg left it unfilled. The fact that it remained empty suggests that perhaps the renewed project lacked an accomplished illuminator and that Farrukh Beyg was single-handedly refurbishing the manuscript.

Because his style is so different and no dated landmarks exist for comparison purposes, the dating of Farrukh Beyg's *Haft awrang* series is difficult. Fortunately, the single painting that is not by him, *The Prophet Moses bearing a stray sheep on his shoulders* (Pl. XXVIIIc), allows a fairly accurate dating of that body of work. The similarity of Moses' faces in this page with *Moses debating with a heterodox person* (Pl. XXVIIId) from another Jāmī manuscript (State Public Library, Dorn 429, fol. 37)¹¹⁶ is striking and is proof that both were painted by the same hand. However, what is of use here is not the similarity but the contrast between the two paintings. The landscape of Pl. XXVIIId is in the conventional style of the 1570s, while the edges of the rock formations in Pl. XXVIIIc are filled with white patches that are characteristic of the 1580s.

Both of these paintings will be discussed and attributed to Muḥammadī in a forthcoming article by the present author that will focus on the artist's painting activity rather than on his famous ink drawings.¹¹⁷ Interestingly, Pl. XXVIIIc has also much in common with another painting attributed to Muḥammadī, *Throwing down the impostor*, which belongs to a *Ṣifāt al-ʿāshiqīn* manuscript (AHT no. 90) copied in 1582.¹¹⁸ The most visible similarity resides in the treatment of the leopard skin in the two paintings (see Pls. XXIXa,b). Each artist develops his own peculiar style of small, repetitive details such as leopard spots. Here, the spots are identical in both paintings; they are mostly painted as clusters of five loose dots in a regular pentagon formation. Other Muḥammadī favourites are the emerging necks of what are supposed to be mountain goats¹¹⁹ from the rock formations under the leopards in both paintings, and the depiction of white spotted domesticated goats. Muḥammadī's single painting thus allows a 1580s dating for the series.

Based on the above observations, we now have a preliminary framing of Farrukh Beyg's *Haft awrang* paintings: they must have been created in the 1580s but no later than 1585, the year of his departure for India.

The patron of the Haft awrang paintings

As suggested elsewhere, the *Ṣifāt al-ʿāshiqīn* manuscript was made by the order of the vizier Mīrzā Salmān as a present for Ḥamza Mīrzā (1566–86), the elder brother of the future Shāh ʿAbbās I, son of Shāh Muḥammad Khūdābanda.¹²⁰ Since the latter was almost blind, nominal power revolved around the heir apparent Ḥamza Mīrzā. But effective power resided with Mīrzā Salmān, who not only controlled the administration but had also gained the upper hand over the Qizilbāsh *amīrs* after leading them in two successful campaigns. To strengthen his posi-

tion, Mīrzā Salmān arranged the marriage of his daughter Safiyya Khānum to Ḥamza Mīrzā in April 1582.¹²¹ She was ten and he was sixteen. The frontispiece of the TKS *Haft awrang* manuscript (Pl. XXVa–b) may thus illustrate the marriage ceremony that Mīrzā Salmān had lavishly organised in his home.¹²² As in the *Ṣifāt al-‘āshiqīn* frontispiece, where the vizier is depicted with a long staff in his hand (Pl. XXIXc),¹²³ Mīrzā Salmān appears here on the bottom right of the presumed marriage scene with exactly the same clothes. The dignitary with a staff on the opposite corner may be the vizier’s son Mīrzā ‘Abdallāh, whom Mīrzā Salmān had appointed vizier to Ḥamza Mīrzā.¹²⁴

In full circle, we are back to Ḥamza Mīrzā and Iskandar Beyg’s remark that Farrukh Beyg was in his retinue. The illustrations added to the unfinished TKS *Haft awrang* were probably all painted for the young crown prince, whose early career heralded the appearance of a valiant and refined ruler for the future of the Safavid state.

3. THE THIRD WAVE

Farrukh Beyg’s departure

Mīrzā Salmān was killed by the Qizilbāsh *amīrs* on 13 June 1583.¹²⁵ Ḥamza Mīrzā was in turn killed on 10 December 1586 by a disgruntled lover.¹²⁶ The exact date of Farrukh Beyg’s departure is not known, but according to the *Akbar-nāma*, after the death of Akbar’s half-brother, Muḥammad-Ḥakīm, Farrukh Beyg left Kabul for India in December 1585. An inscription on a portrait of Mīrzā-Ḥakīm accompanied by one Ḥājji Yāqūt bears the signature of Farrukh Ḥusayn, alias Farrukh Beyg (see Appendix), and situates him in Kabul in the year 992/1584. He must have left Safavid territory earlier, perhaps in late 1583.

What caused Farrukh Beyg’s departure was not so much the premature death of Ḥamza Mīrzā but probably the death of the vizier. By dominating the military institution and the administration, marrying his daughter to the prince and appointing his son as Ḥamza Mīrzā’s vizier, Mīrzā Salmān gained control over the prince’s activities and probably over the royal library-atelier and its artists. Farrukh Beyg was thus inevitably linked to the vizier.

The Qizilbāsh *amīrs*’ reaction to Mīrzā Salmān’s dominance was violent and vengeful. They killed him, confiscated his entire family’s wealth and even forced Ḥamza Mīrzā to divorce Mīrzā Salmān’s daughter. In such circumstances, and because of his links with Mīrzā Salmān, Farrukh Beyg must have felt threatened. He thus migrated to the Mughal court where artists were in high demand. He was

not the only one to go. Another painter, Āghā Rizā Haravī, seems to have departed at the same time and perhaps for the same reasons. Both gained fame and fortune in India as their works were prized by successive Indian rulers, especially Jahāngīr, who collected a number of their paintings for his Gulshan album.

CONCLUSION

Like the previous migratory waves, the third wave came as a result of the loss of effective patronage on one side and active patronage on the other. But unlike the first wave which included artists such as Mīr Sayyid ‘Alī who remained entrenched in his Persian mode of painting, the third wave artists had been trained by the second wave painters, who better prepared them for the Mughal taste and modes of painting. The flourishing of Farrukh Beyg’s style in India may ultimately be traced to the style which he inherited from the two returning artists, namely Mīrzā ‘Alī and Shaykh Muḥammad, and to the atelier of prince Ḥamza Mīrzā who emerges in this study as a worthy successor to his more famous cousin Sulṭān-Ibrāhīm Mīrzā.

APPENDIX

Farrukh-Ḥusayn vs. Farrukh Beyg

John Seyller has read the inscription on the St. Petersburg painting of Ibrāhīm ‘Adil Shāh II *hawking* as ‘*amal-i Farrukh Beyg ast*’ (it is the work of Farrukh Beyg).¹²⁷ The inscription though, has neither ‘*amal*’ nor ‘*ast*’ (see right figure). The reading of ‘*ast*’ was probably suggested by the



existence of two dots over the final *gāf* of Beyg. In reality, the three letters of ‘*ast*’ are non-existent and the two dots belong to the *fā* and *khā* of Farrukh. As for what was read as ‘*amal*’, it looks like the two end letters *yā* and *nūn* of words such as *kamtarīn* (“the lowliest”), or Ḥusayn. However, *kamtarīn* is an epithet used by artists in their signature, and its presence in the same legend with the epithet Beyg creates a contradiction in terms; the first is a sign of humility and the second is an honorific epithet equivalent to *Monsieur*. A painting that seems to bear Farrukh Beyg’s signature is the previously-mentioned *Youth with a wine-cup and a falcon* (GPL, no. 1663, fol. 47).¹²⁸ The visible portion of the signature reads ‘*amal-i kamtarīn Farrukh*’ (“the work of the

lowliest servant Farrukh"). One additional letter, a *mīm*, appears before the margin cut-off. It is probably the beginning letter of *muṣavvir* ("the painter"), an epithet that many painters included in their signature. Thus Beyg was not included in what appears to be a genuine signature of the artist.

A second possibility is that the two letters in the St. Petersburg inscription are the end letters of Ḥusayn, in a formula such as *ʿamal-i ibn-i Ḥusayn, Farrukh Beyg* ("the work of Farrukh Beyg son of Ḥusayn"). Based on the writings of the Deccani poet Ṣuhūrī, who had eulogised an artist by the name of Farrukh Ḥusayn in his writings, Robert Skelton had boldly suggested in a controversial article that Farrukh Beyg had worked in the Deccan and was none other than Farrukh Ḥusayn, since both were first-class artists and both were trained in Safavid Iran.¹²⁹ Skelton has further speculated that the Mawlānā Darvīsh Ḥusayn—at whose house Ṣuhūrī briefly stayed while visiting Shiraz—was perhaps Farrukh Beyg's father. Darvīsh Ḥusayn was a learned man who had taught calligraphy and painting to many Shirāzī artists, and Ṣuhūrī's stay at Darvīsh Ḥusayn's house may not have been fortuitous but perhaps the result of a prior relationship between the poet and Farrukh Beyg when both were in Khurasan.¹³⁰

Skelton's imaginative speculations may find support in the following considerations. First, Farrukh Beyg's Shirāzī connection is not far-fetched. In an entry on the Georgian Siyāvush who was Farrukh Beyg's brother, Qāzī Aḥmad wrote that he joined "his kinsmen in Shiraz."¹³¹ Their presumed father was thus likely to have resided in that city. But how a Georgian who was initially Tahmāsb's slave could become a learned man named Darvīsh Ḥusayn and father to Farrukh Beyg is still unresolved, unless one assumes that the two brothers were captured in a Georgian campaign, were orphans, and Darvīsh Ḥusayn became Farrukh Beyg's teacher and perhaps adoptive father. Second, two pages from the Gulshan album (GPL, no. 1663, fols. 199 and 234) bear a signature of Farrukh Ḥusayn.¹³² Since neither have been reproduced, stylistic comparison with works by Farrukh Beyg is not possible. However, a signature-legend on folio 199 reportedly reads "has drawn it the sinful Farrukh Ḥusayn the painter" and an inscription on the top says: "the portraits of the prince of the world and its inhabitants, Muḥammad Ḥakīm Mīrzā, and his close confidant the one who has performed the *hajj* at the Two Holy Places, Ḥājī Yāqūt; was drawn at the Shahr-ārā Garden of Kabul in the year 992 [1584]."¹³³ These two legends in conjunction with the *Akbar-nāma*'s information that Farrukh Beyg left Kabul for Akbar's court in December 1585 upon the death of Mīrzā Muḥammad Ḥakīm, make Farrukh Beyg and Farrukh Ḥusayn one and the same person. Finally,

Farrukh Ḥusayn is an odd name that only appears in certain Sufi-related milieus in which the names of the Prophet Muḥammad and the Imāms were used with epithets such as Sultān, Shāh, etc. and especially when Ḥusayn appeared in the name of the father. Such is the case of Sultān-Ḥusayn Bāyqarā's sons, who were named Farrukh Ḥusayn, Muẓaffar Ḥusayn, Ibrāhīm Ḥusayn and even Ibn-i Ḥusayn. Skelton's speculation that Farrukh Beyg/Farrukh Ḥusayn's real or adoptive father was named Darvīsh Ḥusayn is not only possible but perhaps insightful.

ADDENDUM

The belated arrival of Gulshan album slides from Tehran¹³⁴ has brought added confirmation to some of the arguments advanced in our main text and provides information about inscribed attributions:

(1) The tinted drawing with the lengthy inscription by Farrukh Ḥusayn (Pl. XXX) that we referred to in our appendix without the benefit of seeing an illustration of it, confirms many of our assumptions. First, it clearly incorporates many of Farrukh Beyg's characteristics: elaborate portraiture, refined draftsmanship as in *Horse and a groom*, geometric patterns on the sashes and turbans, and the hanging willow branches featured in the *Zafar-nāma* and *Akbar-nāma* pages. Second, this tinted drawing, which is in a style usually associated with Muḥammadī, further emphasises the parallel stylistic development of the two artists.

(2) As with Muḥammadī, Farrukh Beyg (alias Farrukh Ḥusayn) has an elegant *nastaʿliq* handwriting that will serve in future studies to differentiate between his authentic signatures and mere attributions.

(3) Some paintings by Farrukh Beyg bear an attribution written in a dot-less and awkward handwriting that is very similar to Jahāngīr's (a specimen of his handwriting is visible on the right side of the colophon on Pl. XVa). Without relying on a thorough analysis of calligraphic similarities, one can see that the location of the attributing sentences—usually prominently written on the painting itself—designates Jahāngīr as a possible candidate. For only an owner, librarian or artist with access to the library, and with pretence of connoisseurship—very much professed by Jahāngīr—would dare to add such graffiti to masterpieces of the royal treasury. However, without a correct assessment of their date and time, one should not discard other possibilities, such as inscriptions added by later princes (e.g. Shāh Jahān) imitating Jahāngīr's attribution formula. Fortunately, the location of the attribution that appears at the bottom of Pl. XXIb provides a better clue of authorship since it is located outside the painting

frame and is set within the illuminated margins. It was certainly on the painting page prior to its incorporation into the album. The fact that such poor calligraphy was not trimmed away but laboriously fitted into the marginal decoration leads to the conclusion that it was penned by Jahāngīr himself.

Abbreviations for museum and art institution names

AHT = Art and History Trust Collection, courtesy of Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C.
 AMSG = Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C.
 BL = British Library, London
 FGA = Freer Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C.
 GPL = Gulistān Palace Library, Tehran
 MG = Musée Guimet
 TKS = Topkapi Saray Museum, Istanbul
 VAM = Victoria and Albert Museum, London

* I am indebted to Sheila Canby who allowed me to present this paper at the British Museum on 25 March 1998 and suggested its publication in *Iran* and to John Seyller who, by sending me a copy of his article on Farrukh Beyg, prompted my research on earlier works of this artist and the compilation of this paper. I am also indebted to Marianna Shreve Simpson, who made available to me her own set of slides while I was waiting for a set that I had requested from the Topkapi Saray Museum.

¹ Ḥamida Bānū was a descendant of the celebrated Shaykh Aḥmad of Jām (1049–1141); Riazul Islam (1970), p. 29.

² Soudavar (1992), pp. 134–75.

³ There are two notations by Mughal librarians on this colophon page which refer to Ḥamida Bānū as Maryam Makānī (“the one with the dignity of Mary”), and one inscription on the first page by Emperor Jahāngīr—who refers to her as *mādar-i kalān* (grandmother); *ibid.*, p. 101. The earliest inscription is written in a beautiful Persian-style *nasta‘liq* with a seal that reads “Ghiyāth al-Dīn the follower of Akbar Shāh 996/1587,” perhaps the handwriting of Ghiyāth Beyg of Tehran later known as I‘timād al-Dawla. Another Timurid manuscript, the *Khamsa* of Mir ‘Alī-Shīr copied by Sulṭān-‘Alī Mashhadī in 1492 (Royal Library, Windsor, RCIN 1005032), that bears the signs of a passage through Bukhara, was acquired by Ḥamida Bānū after the death of her husband; Seyller (1997), p. 295. The manuscript has two seal marks that read:

خاتم هرکس توقع محبت باشد * (حمیده بانو بیگم) * مهر او آئینه چهره دولت باشد

When one’s seal bears the sign of love * (Ḥamida Bānū Beygom) * His (her) stamp shall become a reflection of good fortune.

The seal marks are reportedly dated 968/1560 although not visible in the reproduction (*ibid.*, fig. 6). Another manuscript that once belonged to Ḥamida Bānū is a copy of *Rāmāyānā* (private collection), copied by the Persian expatriate ‘Abdal-Rashīd-i Daylamī in 1594, the nephew of the celebrated Mir ‘Imād; *ibid.*, p. 304. Finally, a manuscript of *Adhkār-i Imām Nawā‘i* at the National Museum of Pakistan bears a seal imprint that reads: Ḥamida Bānū b. ‘Alī-akbar (see Ḥamidī (1974), p. 91). It has been suggested that the formula used on the seal indicates that she was using the manuscript even prior to her marriage to Humāyūn; *ibid.*, p. 97.

⁴ An inscription by Mun‘im Beyg, who received the manuscript from Akbar in 1567, notes that the manuscript had only five illustrations then; Soudavar (1992), pp. 332–38.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 178–79.

⁶ For reproductions of some of the original margins of the *Khamsa*, see Welch (1979), pp. 137, 144, 145.

⁷ A previous dating to the 1530s is hereby corrected; Soudavar (1992), pp. 178–79.

⁸ It was in Akbar’s library up to the year 1567; *ibid.*, p. 332.

⁹ Despite a reference by Mirzā Haydar Dyghlāt that the master painter Manṣūr was working in the library-atelier of Sultan Abū Sa‘īd, no illustrated manuscript from Abū Sa‘īd’s library and attributable to him has survived; the 1468 *Gulistān* may have originally included some works by him; *ibid.* p. 122.

¹⁰ It is unusual to have highly elaborate margins added to an older manuscript. It is also significant that these margins are even more intricate than the original illuminated margins of the prestigious and exquisite Shāh Ṭahmāsb *Khamsa* of the British Library. The only comparable margins—albeit not as colourful—are from a sixteenth-century manuscript, the text area of which was replaced by page sections from a seventeenth-century *Gulistān* copied by the celebrated calligrapher Mir ‘Imād; see Sotheby’s sale of 12 October 1990, lot 255. Some of these margins have been attributed to Sulṭān-Muḥammad, see Welch (1979), nos. 45–46, and Soudavar (1992), p. 267. However, it is not clear whether they constituted integral parts of an original manuscript or were conceived as decorative margins for the embellishment of an older manuscript and then reused to enhance the presentation of the Mir’s calligraphy.

¹¹ The idea of impressing the Mughals with dazzling margins must have developed gradually, for the illumination on the first page is rather conventional and the shift to the highly elaborate green and gold style occurs only from the second page onwards, see Soudavar (1992), p. 179, where a detail of the first page illumination is reproduced.

¹² Welch (1985), p. 242.

¹³ For most pages with painting, the stains hardly reach the painted area, see Soudavar (1992), pp. 332–33.

¹⁴ This means that one of the paintings was added to a space that was originally left blank; perhaps *Sa‘dī in the rose garden* (fol. 6v), on the reverse of which the reflection of oxidising paint duplicates the Mughal painting without hinting at the prior existence of a Timurid one, *ibid.* p. 333, 335.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 335–38.

¹⁶ The Mughals were descendants of Timur and therefore Timurids as well.

¹⁷ Both of these manuscripts display unfinished areas.

¹⁸ Būdāq (1576), p. 111b.

¹⁹ Būdāq was Bahrām’s secretary from c. 1536 to 1549; *ibid.* pp. 316a–b, and Soudavar (1992), p. 258. Bahrām Mirzā was one of the official hosts of Humāyūn during his sojourn in Safavid territory, Qumī (1980), vol. I, p. 307.

²⁰ Būdāq (1576), p. 111a:

میر مصور ... مرد بود لا بود، در آخر پریشان اوقات شد و میرا همایون که بعراق آمد

اظهار کرد که اگر پادشاه میرمصور را بمن دهند هزار تومان پیشکش میدهم. بدین حکایت

پسر میر که از پدر بهتر شده بود، پیشتر بهند رفت، پدر هم از دنباله رفت.

²¹ Mir Moṣavvir’s fall into disgrace must have been in the mid-1530s, since he did not contribute to the British Library *Khamsa* (a signature on the wall of *Nushīravān listening to the owls in the ruined palace* (fol. 15v), previously thought as one from Mir Moṣavvir, has been attributed by this present author to Āghā Mirak; Soudavar (1992), p. 178). His down-

- fall may have been due to a close association with Ṭahmāsb's rebellious brother Sām Mirzā, who was arrested in 1535; *idem* (1997), p. 67.
- ²² Okada (1989), p. 130, Dickson and Welch (1981), vol. I, p. 189. Both publications accept the attribution to Mir Sayyid 'Alī reportedly inscribed below the painting.
- ²³ Okada refers to Stchoukine and Minorsky's spotty illustration and produces an undecipherable text; Okada (1989), p. 132. The letter must be reconfigured by reinserting within the text important words that are traditionally pulled to the margin or the top of the document:
- هو
- (الله تعالی)
- عرضه داشت پیرغلام دیرینه میرمصور بجز عرض میرساند که مدت مدید شد که
- بنده زاده در غلامی بسر میرد، امیدوار [چند] آنست که عنایت [از] او دریغ نفرمایند، امید
- [که] فقیر هم عنقریب از سر قدم ساخته، بملازمت آید، انشاء(الله تعالی) که سایه آفتاب... باد
- ²⁴ Dickson and Welch (1981), vol. I, p. 178.
- ²⁵ *Ibid.* vol. I, p. 119.
- ²⁶ The 1,000 *tūmāns* proposed by Humāyūn for Mīr Muṣāvir was quite a hefty compensation. By way of comparison, and according to the same source, calligraphy pieces (*qit'a*) by the celebrated Mīr 'Alī fetched 2,000 to 3,000 *dīnārs* while entire Qur'āns by such renowned calligraphers as Mullā Kamāl (the father of Shaykh Muḥammad) were worth 3–4 *tūmāns* each (1 *tūmān* = 10,000 *dīnārs*); Būdāq (1576), pp. 109a, 112a. Both were active in the first half of the sixteenth century.
- ²⁷ Such seems to be the case for the painter Dūst Muḥammad, who had a hard time finding wine in Safavid territory; Dickson and Welch (1981), vol. I, p. 119.
- ²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 45. The present author had previously accepted the Dickson and Welch proposition; Soudavar (1992), p. 221.
- ²⁹ Qumī (1980), p. 386.
- ³⁰ Soudavar (1997), pp. 53, 75.
- ³¹ The *ṭanbūr* is a stringed instrument and the *naqqāra* is a double drum.
- ³² Navai (1989), pp. 512–13, Būdāq (1576), p. 306a.
- ³³ Qumī (1980), p. 226. Ṭahmāsb reportedly destroyed 500 *tūmāns'* worth of high-quality opium (*tiryāq-i fā'i*); Vāla-yi Iṣfahānī (1993), p. 395.
- ³⁴ Such was Ṭahmāsb's thirst for money that he kept his seal-bearer, Khwāja Amīr Beyg-i Muhr-dār, imprisoned in the Alamut fortress for thirty-three years on the accusation that he had "gold" and would not divulge its whereabouts; Qumī (1980), vol. I, pp. 611–14. For fourteen years prior to Ṭahmāsb's death, the army had not been paid, even though the treasury coffers were full. Ismā'īl II's first act after ascending the throne was to pay these arrears; Rūmlū (1978), p. 623.
- ³⁵ Būdāq (1576), fol. 111a.
- ³⁶ Ghaffārī (1953), Qumī (1980), p. 226. In the twenty-two years' time span stretching from his own repentance to the Edict of 1556, Ṭahmāsb must have indulged from time to time into the worldly pleasures that he had banned. According to Ḥasan Beyg Rūmlū, at the wedding of his son Ismā'īl in 1556, "Ṭahmāsb danced to the tune of singers and musicians;" Rūmlū (1978), p. 500. Since Ṭahmāsb had repented once before, the 1556 Edict of Sincere Repentance, which addressed the Qizilbāsh *amīrs*, was perhaps proclaimed in lieu of a second Ṭahmāsb repentance.
- ³⁷ The theologian Abū Ḥamid Muḥammad-i Ghazzālī considered depiction of living things (*ṣūrat-i ḥayawān*) as forbidden, especially those on the walls of public baths, which had to be removed; Ghazzālī (1983), pp. 407–08.
- ³⁸ Ṭahmāsb (1562), fol. 86a,b. Another stipulation of Ṭahmāsb's oath was a pledge not to blind Bāyazīd; Qumī 1980, p. 418.
- ³⁹ Bayānī (1966), p. 196; Thackston (1989), p. 343. The same theory was later on quoted by Qāzī Aḥmad in a lengthy poem; Qumī (1974), p. 129.
- ⁴⁰ Ghaffārī (1963), p. 295:
- امروز تا بحشر بر انای روزگار شکرانه واجنست بروری هراز مار
زیرا که عین ناصره آفرینش است در عین صحت اثر لطف کردگار
تو جان روزگاری و جانها بحان تو وابسته اند، خان تو و جان روزگار
- Despite the fact that Rūmlū, Qumī and Shirāzī usually copy all the information provided by Ghaffārī, none of them reproduces this poem.
- ⁴¹ Iskandar Beyg (1971), vol. I, p. 126. It is to be noted that contrary to some recent assertions (see e.g. Membré (1993), p. 81), Iskandar Beyg's text clearly states that the prince's vision deteriorated inexplicably (*ṣa'f-i bāṣira*) without reference to illness or infection.
- ⁴² I am indebted to Drs. M. Soechting and S. Nader for providing me information on macular degeneracy problems and the hereditary aspects of certain type of this disease.
- ⁴³ For the reproduction of other pages from this manuscript, see e.g. Lowry and Nemazee (1988), pp. 120–29; Falk (1985), pp. 95–99, Soudavar (1992), p. 188. The famous Akbarian *Ḥamza-nāma*, and *Fāl-nāma* manuscripts in the TKS have a large format as well. However, they are all posterior to the Ṭahmāsb *Fāl-nāma* and may well have emulated a genre instituted by this manuscript.
- ⁴⁴ The painter Muṣaffar 'Alī added painting and the calligrapher Mālik-i Daylamī contributed calligraphy panels for Ṭahmāsb's palace in Qazvin; Iskandar Beyg (1971), p. 174, Qumī (1974), p. 94. Also to be noted is the fact that, unlike musicians, painters were not ordered to abandon their career; they were free to continue their activity outside the royal library-atelier; Vāla-yi Iṣfahānī (1993), p. 467.
- ⁴⁵ Shirāzī (1990), p. 94. The *dawlat-khāna* mainly related to the audience halls. It was in a way the seat of government. The surrounding gardens were necessary to accommodate the royal encampment for periods that Ṭahmāsb and his retinue would stay in Qazvin. For a detailed account of the gradual move of the seat of government to Qazvin, see Dickson and Welch (1981), vol. I, p. 250, n. 10.
- ⁴⁶ Ghaffārī (1963), p. 277. Quail-hunting is highly difficult if practised with bow and arrow; by emphasizing the type of hunt which Ismā'īl undertook, Ghaffārī was trying to portray him as a warrior in full control of his skills and not much concerned about the outcome of the battle with the Ottomans.
- ⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 290 and 307; Qumī (1980), p. 428; Ṭahmāsb (1562).
- ⁴⁸ Membré (1993), p. 27, who specifies that Ṭahmāsb spent the whole of October 1539 in fishing; *ibid.*, p. 28. A sentence in Rūmlū (1978), p. 383, subsequently copied in Qumī (1980), p. 294, stating that in the year 1540, Ṭahmāsb went to Georgia "hunting all the way" (*shikār-kunān*), is very suspect in the light of Membré's descriptions of the Shāh's lengthy fishing expedition the year before, unless it meant that Ṭahmāsb went "fish hunting;" neither Qāzī Aḥmad-i Ghaffārī nor 'Abdī Beyg-i Shirāzī allude to this supposed hunting trip.
- ⁴⁹ The earliest—and usually the most reliable—source, the *Tārīkh-i Jahān-ārā*, simply mentions that a *jarga* hunt was organised without further detail; Ghaffārī (1963), p. 295. Qumī repeats the same. Ḥasan-i Rūmlū seems to have altered the information of the *Tārīkh-i Jahān-ārā* by only mentioning Ṭahmāsb's presence at the *jarga* hunt; Rūmlū (1976), p. 400. Iskandar Beyg, who wrote at a later date, gives a lengthy but improbable account that the honour of inau-

- guring the hunt went to Humāyūn, Bahrām and Sām Mīrzā, and that Ṭahmāsb shot only on the second day to teach the Chaghātāyids (i.e. Humāyūn's retinue) a lesson in hunting; Iskandar Beyg (1971), p. 99. On the Mughal side, the sister of Humāyūn, Gul-badan Beygum, relates that, according to her brother, Ṭahmāsb and his sister Sulṭānum both watched the hunt mounted on a horse side-by-side, with the reins of Sulṭānum's horse held by an old man with a white beard, a position hardly suitable for hunting; Gul-badan (1996), p. 114.
- ⁵⁰ The standard-bearer is named as Abu 'l-Qāsim Khulafā-yi Qājār, Ghaffārī (1963), p. 295.
- ⁵¹ Since the album was completed c. 1545, work had to be carried on over the previous two to three years. According to Būdāq, the calligrapher Dūst Muḥammad was the only one who remained in the royal library-atelier after Ṭahmāsb evicted all others; Būdāq (1576), fol. 111b. He must have rejoined Ṭahmāsb's library-atelier after the completion of the album or after the death of Bahrām Mīrzā.
- ⁵² Simpson (1991), pp. 376–84.
- ⁵³ Such is the case of the celebrated calligrapher Mīr 'Imād, whose signatures are mostly in the form of 'Imād al-Ḥasanī and seldom include the redundant "Mīr."
- ⁵⁴ See e.g. Welch (1979), pp. 180–81, Dickson and Welch, vol. I, p. 184, Kevorkian and Sicre (1983), p. 169.
- ⁵⁵ Sām Mīrzā (1925), p. 9.
- ⁵⁶ It is to be noted that, in compliance with scribal conventions, two important attributes (*a'lā*) and (*kām-rānī*) that were pulled out of the text and written on the top of the petition, have been reincorporated here between parentheses:
 بنده کمتربن، مظفرعلی بذروه عرض (اعلی) میرساند که بر نواب جهانبانی واضح است
 که مواجب این کمینه در سر کار نواب (کامرانی) شش تومانست و ازین ممر اوقات کمینه
 بریشان میگردد، بهر چه فرماید، حاکمند.
- ⁵⁷ An intriguing aspect of the painting is the lack of a Safavid baton for the prince, which sometimes indicates a non-Safavid prince.
- ⁵⁸ Dickson and Welch also argue that, since according to the *Gulistan-i hunar*, the calligrapher Shāh Maḥmūd died in 972/1565 and had spent twenty years in Mashhad, he must have left the royal Library-atelier c. 1545; Dickson and Welch (1981), vol. I, p. 178. While their conclusion is correct, it is based on an erroneous information by Qāzī Aḥmad; as we shall see, Shāh Maḥmūd was in Ardabil in 1549 and therefore did not spend all of those twenty years in Mashhad.
- ⁵⁹ This may also explain why Mīrak was chosen to illuminate the 1468 *Gulistan* manuscript: as the household superintendent of Ṭahmāsb, he was the only master painter left in the retinue of the Shāh.
- ⁶⁰ Sām Mīrzā was appointed governor of Ardabil in that same year of 1549 and remained in that post for twelve years; Qumī (1980), vol. I, p. 550.
- ⁶¹ Dickson and Welch (1981), vol. I, pp. 138–39; for a colour reproduction, see Loukonin and Ivanov (1996), p. 182.
- ⁶² Sām Mīrzā had rebelled twice before and was placed in house arrest the second time; Soudavar (1997), pp. 52–67, Dickson (1958), pp. 285–95.
- ⁶³ See above, n. 21. Possibly for this very reason, Mīrzā 'Alī preferred not to join the prince in Ardabil and sent his work for later insertion in the manuscript. Indeed, the double-page frontispiece has been pasted into the manuscript, a sign that the painter was not located at the production site; Lukonin and Ivanov (1996) p. 183.
- ⁶⁴ Qumī (1980), vol. I, p. 550. With no revenue, Sām Mīrzā was a lesser threat since he could neither buy influence nor raise and maintain a private army.
- ⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, vol. I, p. 378. The death of Bahrām Mīrzā was also caused by excess in wine and opium.
- ⁶⁶ It is noteworthy that Qāzī Aḥmad, who systematically plagiarised Būdāq's text for his *Gulistan-i hunar*, omitted references to the Safavid artist's temporary sojourns in "India"; Qumī (1974), pp. 137–42.
- ⁶⁷ Būdāq (1576), fol. 113b.
- ⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, fol. 112b.
- ⁶⁹ The *Javāhir al-akhbār* seems to have been initially prepared for Ṭahmāsb, but Būdāq, who repeatedly complained about the Shāh's lack of interest in his work (perhaps he was unable to read it), managed to present his manuscript to Ismā'il II in 1576, four months after Ṭahmāsb's death; Soudavar (1992), p. 200. The section on the artists of the royal Safavid library-atelier is oddly inserted in the middle of the history of the 'Abbāsīd caliphs, where he refers to Princess Sulṭānum, who died in 1562, as still living; Būdāq (1576), fol. 111b.
- ⁷⁰ Lowry *et al.* (1988), pp. 148–49; the folio number of the last painting is erroneously written as 130a in the aforementioned catalogue. Fol. 66a of this manuscript had been previously attributed to Mīrzā 'Alī by this author; Soudavar (1992), p. 201.
- ⁷¹ This painting, along with a detail, has been reproduced in Tehran as a New Year's greeting card. I am indebted to Mr. Massoud Nader for sending me this beautiful and interesting card.
- ⁷² See e.g. Welch (1979), p. 173.
- ⁷³ *Ibid.*, pp. 134–75.
- ⁷⁴ The part of the album that is in Tehran seems to include earlier works, up to 1609, and the Berlin portion seems to include later ones, with dates as late as 1618; Beach (1978), p. 43.
- ⁷⁵ Jahāngīr requested Shāh 'Abbās to send him Ulugh Beg's astrolabe; the Shāh duplicated the astrolabe and sent the original to India; Riazul Islam (1970), p. 72. One could conceive that, if a painting was somehow related to the Timurids and meaningful to Jahāngīr, it would have been sent as a single page, but no such connection can be imagined for this Mīrzā 'Alī painting.
- ⁷⁶ Welch (1979), pp. 176–81.
- ⁷⁷ One should also note that, if any of the paintings had been removed by Muḥammad Zamān, he would have replaced it with a similar subject; but none of his added paintings are in fact replacements for the dispersed pages by Mīrzā 'Alī or Mīrzā Sayyid 'Alī.
- ⁷⁸ Soudavar (1992), pp. 170–73.
- ⁷⁹ *Ibid.*
- ⁸⁰ Membré (1993), p. 25; Badā'ūnī (1868), p. 444, Soudavar (1998).
- ⁸¹ Other artists who contributed to the Freer *Haft awwang* were: Āghā Mīrak, who had probably reached the end of his career and produced uninspiring paintings for this manuscript; 'Abd al-'Azīz, still a very able artist but whose style did not influence the next generation; Muẓaffar 'Alī, who was an excellent craftsman but not an innovator and always a follower of Mīrzā 'Alī; and 'Abdallāh-i Mudhahhib-i Shīrāzī, who was primarily a good illuminator. Mīrzā 'Alī was probably recruited early on to lead the Freer *Haft awwang* project. His work dominates the first section of the manuscript; three out of four of the paintings in the first fifty pages of the manuscript are by him.
- ⁸² Because he ended up working for the Uzbeks after the capture of Herat in 1588, references to Muḥammadi are scant; Soudavar (1992), p. 237. The lack of a specific entry for Farrukh Beyg was probably due to a similar reason.
- ⁸³ For a discussion on Mīrzā 'Alī's name and signature, see *ibid.*, p. 170.

- ⁸⁴ Iskandar Beyg (1976), p. 176. The last section of the entry in the present printed version of his chronicles, due to a minor scribal error (*‘umrash* instead of *‘umrshān*), reads as if both brothers joined the services of Shāh ‘Abbās and both lost their lives at the same time there. Farrukh Beyg’s departure for India notwithstanding, the syntax of the sentence shows that it should only relate to Siyāvush and that the plural for the end-sentence is wrong; idem. However, this may have been an error perpetrated by the author himself, as Vāla-yi Iṣfahānī, who half a century later, in his *Khuld-i barīn* scrupulously follows Iskandar Beyg’s text, commits the same mistake; Vāla-yi Iṣfahānī (1993), p. 470.
- ⁸⁵ Skelton (1957), pl. 2, fig. 4 and pl. 9, fig. 18; Okada (1992), p. 120; Robinson (1992), pl. IXb
- ⁸⁶ For a similar Muḥammadī composition, see e.g. Robinson (1965), p. 76; Papadopoulou (1976), pl. 59.
- ⁸⁷ For Shaykh Muḥammad’s portraits of Özbek princes see Dickson and Welch (1981), vol. I, pp. 251–52; Welch (1979), nos. 77, 80; Soudavar (1992), p. 236.
- ⁸⁸ Dickson and Welch (1981), vol. I, pp. 251–52; Welch (1974), pp. 463–64. For a painting of the same subject signed by Shaykh Muḥammad, see *ibid.*, p. 499. The effective governor of Herat at that time was Muḥammad Khān-i Sharaf al-Dīn Oghlī Takallī; Rūmlū (1978), pp. 436–37. But the nominal governor of Herat was the almost blind Prince Muḥammad Mīrzā, who later ruled as Shāh Muḥammad Khudābanda. The popularity of the yoked prisoner subject may be due to the fact that the capture of the Özbek warlord was later on, reinterpreted as a feat attributable to Shāh Muḥammad. Farrukh Beyg, who was in the retinue of prince Ḥamza Mīrzā, thus chose to glorify his patron’s father by drawing the defeated Özbek warlord. The numerous yoked prisoners of Shaykh Muḥammad, also painted in this period, may have been drawn for the same reasons.
- ⁸⁹ This recalls the well-known practice of poets who would arrive at a court reciting new poems in the hope of remuneration from an appreciative ruler.
- ⁹⁰ In the hopelessly disorganised catalogue of the GPL albums, a colour reproduction of this painting appears next to p. 352 and the entry appears on p. 356, under the entry for fol. 86; Ātābāy (1974).
- ⁹¹ A colour reproduction appears in Okada (1992), p. 124. The attribution reads “*‘amal-i Farrukh Beyg.*”
- ⁹² Seyller (1995), p. 320.
- ⁹³ For colour reproductions, see Soudavar (1992), p. 308–09.
- ⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 338.
- ⁹⁵ Besides the two *Zafar-nāma* pages, the motif of gold peonies on a blue awning/parasol can be seen on a *Bābur-nāma* page (ASG, S86. 0230), Lowry and Nemazee (1988), p. 163, and an *Akbar-nāma* page in Seyller (1995), fig. 6, Okada (1992), p. 118.
- ⁹⁶ See Okada (1992), p. 66, where the drawing is wrongly attributed to ‘Abd al-Ṣamad. For a colour reproduction, see Okada (1989), p. 29.
- ⁹⁷ Ātābāy (1974), p. 357 and 362; Skelton (1957), fig. 13.
- ⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, fig. 1; Seyller (1995), fig. 6, Okada (1992), p. 118.
- ⁹⁹ Seyller (1995), p. 339.
- ¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 319.
- ¹⁰¹ Stchoukine (1974), pp. 5–11, and Simpson (1997), p. 244, both consider the paintings as a coherent group but neither makes an exception for fol. 109a that we attribute here to Muḥammadī.
- ¹⁰² For a colour reproduction, see Rogers *et al.* (1986), nos. 114–15.
- ¹⁰³ Seyller (1997), p. 339.
- ¹⁰⁴ For colour reproduction, see Rogers *et al.* (1986), nos. 116.
- ¹⁰⁵ See Welch (1979), pp. 201, 209 and 210; Welch and Welch (1982), pp. 85–86.
- ¹⁰⁶ See Welch (1976), pp. 122–26; Simpson (1997), pp. 201, 220.
- ¹⁰⁷ For a colour reproduction, see Okada (1992), p. 122.
- ¹⁰⁸ For a colour reproduction, see Kevorkian and Sicre (1983), p. 24.
- ¹⁰⁹ For a colour reproduction see Pope and Ackerman (1967), vol. XI, pl. 920.
- ¹¹⁰ For a colour reproduction see Simpson (1997), p. 113 or Welch (1976), p. 109.
- ¹¹¹ See relevant pages in Simpson (1997).
- ¹¹² For a colour reproduction, see Soudavar (1992), p. 225.
- ¹¹³ For the calligraphy and its dating, see Simpson (1997), pp. 278–83.
- ¹¹⁴ For a colour reproduction, see Ashrafi (1974), p. 59.
- ¹¹⁵ In a recent article (Robinson [1997], p. 40), Robinson criticises this author’s attributions to Muḥammadī and maintains an earlier position that “no fully painted miniatures are to be found among the best authenticated works of the artist” (see also Robinson [1992], p. 18), despite the fact that he himself attributes three such paintings to him (*ibid.*, paintings designated as M1, M18–19, M20). Such a position defies logic and is tantamount to saying that Picasso only painted in the Cubist mode. The bread-and-butter mode of painting for every Safavid painter was manuscript painting. This was the medium in which they were trained by previous masters and this is where they earned a living. The idiosyncratic tinted drawing style of Muḥammadī could not gain approval unless he had first established his credentials in the domain of conventional painting. It is our hope that our forthcoming article on Muḥammadī will further show the close affinity between his tinted drawings and his manuscript paintings.
- ¹¹⁶ For the attribution and a colour reproduction, see Soudavar (1992), p. 233.
- ¹¹⁷ Contrary to Farrukh Beyg, Muḥammadī depicts plain animals, such as deer and boar, as mountain goats.
- ¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 227–35.
- ¹¹⁹ Qumī (1980), vol. II, p. 724.
- ¹²⁰ Stchoukine had suggested that this scene represented the marriage of Ibrāhīm Mīrzā to Ṭahmāsb’s daughter.
- ¹²¹ For a colour reproduction, see Soudavar (1992), pp. 230–31.
- ¹²² Qumī (1980), vol. II, p. 724.
- ¹²³ Qumī (1980), vol. II, p. 746.
- ¹²⁴ Iskandar Beyg reports that death occurred on 22 Dhu ’l-Hijja 994/4 December 1586 (Iskandar Beyg [1971], vol. I, p. 347), but his dates are at times inaccurate. This period is well documented by Qumī, who cites frequent dates, usually in concordance with one another. He situates the death of Ḥamza Mīrzā at six days later; Qumī (1980), vol. II, p. 842.
- ¹²⁵ Seyller (1997), p. 320.
- ¹²⁶ Ātābāy (1974), p. 357 and 362; Skelton (1957), fig. 13.
- ¹²⁷ Skelton (1957), pp. 401–02.
- ¹²⁸ *Ibid.*
- ¹²⁹ Qumī (1974), p. 148.
- ¹³⁰ Ātābāy (1974), p. 357. Ātābāy includes “Muṣawwir” in her reading of the signature; the actual painting may show more of the signature than the reproduction does.

133 *Ibid.*

حرره المذنب فرخ حسين مصور

تصوير شاهزاده عالم و عالميان، ميرزا محمدحکيم بهادر، و مقرب الحضرت حاجی الحرمين

الشریفين حاجی ياقوت، فی مقام باغ شهرآرای کابل، سنة اثنين و تسعين و تسعمائه ٩٩٧

134 I am indebted to Messrs. Anīsi and 'Alā'īnī of the Gulistan Palace Library for their kind cooperation in the procurement of these slides.

Bibliography

- Ashrafi (1974).
Ashrafi, M.M., *Persian-Tajik Poetry in XIV–XVII Centuries' Miniatures*, Dushanbe, Tajikistan.
- Ātābāy (1974).
Ātābāy, B., *Fihrist-i muraqqa'āt-i kitābhāna-yi saltanatī*, Tehran.
- Badā'ūnī (1868).
'Abd al-Qādir b. Mulūkshāh Badā'ūnī, *Muntakhab al-tawārīkh*, Calcutta.
- Bayānī (1966).
Bayānī, M., *Aḥwāl-u āthār-i khushnīvisān*, 4 vols., Tehran.
- Beach (1978).
Beach, M. C., *The Grand Mughal. Imperial Painting in India, 1600–60*, Washington.
- Būdāq (1576).
Būdāq-i Munshī-yi Qazvīnī, *Javāhir al-akhbār*, ms. copied in 1576, State Public Library, St. Petersburg, Dorn 288.
- Dickson (1958).
Dickson, M. B., *Shah Tahmasb and the Uzbeks. The Duel for Khurasan with 'Ubayd Khan (930–48/1524–40)*, Ph.D. thesis, Princeton.
- Dickson and Welch (1981).
Dickson, M. B., and Welch, S. C., *The Houghton Shahnama*, 2 vols., Cambridge, Mass.
- Eskandar Beyg (1971).
Iskandar Beyg-i Munshī-yi Turkumān, *Tārīkh-i 'ālam-ārā-yi 'abbāsī*, ed. I. Afshar, 2nd edition, Tehran.
- Falk (1985).
Falk, T. (ed.), *Treasures of Islam*, London.
- Ghaffārī (1963).
Qāzī Aḥmad-i Ghaffārī-yi Qazvīnī, *Tārīkh-i Jahān-ārā*, ed. H. Narāqī, Tehran.
- Ghazzālī (1983).
Abū-Ḥāmid Muḥammad-i Ghazzālī, *Kīmīyā-yi sa'adat*, ed. A. Ārām, Tehran.
- Gul-badan (1996).
Gul-badan Beygum, *Le Livre de Humāyūn*, tr. P. Pifaretti and J.-L. Bacqué-Grammont, Paris.
- Grube (n.d.).
Grube, E., *Islamic Paintings from the 11th to the 18th Century in the Collection of Hans P. Kraus*, New York.
- Ḥamidī (1974).
Ḥamidī, T. H., "Common Cultural Heritage of Pakistan and Iran in the National Museum of Pakistan" in *Iran Pakistan, A Common Culture*, Lahore.
- Kevorkian and Sicre (1983).
Kevorkian, A. M., and Sicre, J. P., *Les Jardins du désir*, Paris.
- Lukonin and Ivanov (1996).
Lukonin, V. and Ivanov, A., *Lost Treasures of Persia. Persian Art in the Leningrad Museum*, Washington.
- Lowry and Nemazee (1988).
Lowry, G. D., and Nemazee, S., *A Jeweller's Eye. Islamic Arts of the Book from the Vever Collection*, Washington.
- Lowry et al. (1988).
Lowry, G. D., and Beach, M. C., with R. Marefat and W. Thackston, *An Annotated and Illustrated Checklist of the Vever Collection*, Washington.
- Membré (1993).
Membré, M., *Mission to the Lord Sophy of Persia (1539–1542)*, ed. A. H. Morton, London.
- Navā'ī (1989).
Navā'ī, A., *Shāh Tahmāsb-i Ṣafavī. Majmū'a-yi asnād wa mukātibāt-i tārikhī*, Tehran.
- Okada (1989).
Okada, A., *Miniatures de l'Inde impériale*, Paris.
- (1992).
Okada, A., *Imperial Mughal Painters*, tr. D. Dusingberre, Paris.
- Papadopoulos (1976).
Papadopoulos, A., *L'Islam et l'art musulman*, Paris.
- Pope and Ackerman (1967).
Pope, A. U., and Ackerman, P., *A Survey of Persian Art*, Tokyo.
- Qumī (1974).
Qāzī Aḥmad-i Qumī, *Gulistan-i hunar*, ed. A. Suhaylī, Tehran.
- (1980).
Qāzī Aḥmad-i Qumī, *Khulāṣat al-tawārīkh*, ed. I. Ishraqī, 2 vols., Tehran.
- Riazul Islam (1970).
Riazul Islam, *Indo-Persian Relations*, Tehran.
- Robinson (1965).
Robinson, B. W., *Persian Drawings. From the 14th Century Through the 19th Century*, Boston.
- (1992).
Robinson, B. W., "Muḥammadī and the Khurāsān Style," *Iran XXX* (1992), pp. 17–30.
- (1997).
Robinson, B. W., "An Amīr Khusraw Khamsa of 1581," *Iran XXXV* (1997), pp. 35–41.
- Rogers et al. (1986).
Rogers, J. M., Cagman, F. and Tanindi, Z., *The Topkapı Saray Museum. The Albums and Illustrated Manuscripts*, London.
- Rūmlū (1978).
Ḥasan Beyg-i Rūmlū, *Aḥsan al-tawārīkh*, ed. A. Navā'ī, Tehran.
- Sām Mirzā (1925).
Sām Mirzā Ṣafavī, *Tuḥfa-yi Sāmī*, Tehran.
- Seyller (1995).
Seyller, J., "Farrukh Beg in the Deccan," *Artibus Asiae LV/1* (1995), pp. 319–41.
- (1997).
Seyller, J., "The Inspection and Valuation of Manuscripts in the Imperial Mughal Library," *Artibus Asiae LVII/1* (1997), pp. 243–349.
- Shirāzī (1990).
'Abdī Beyg-i Shirāzī, *Takmilat al-akhbār*, ed. A. Navā'ī.
- Simpson (1991).
Simpson, M. S., "A Manuscript for the Safavid Prince Bahrām Mīrzā," in *Burlington Magazine* 133, (June 1991), pp. 376–84.
- (1997).
Simpson, M. S., *Sultan Ebrahim Mirza's Haft aurang*, Washington.
- Skelton (1957).
Skelton, R., "The Mughal Artist FB," in *Ars Orientalis*, vol. II (1957), pp. 382–411.
- Soudavar (1992).
Soudavar, A., *Art of the Persian Courts*, New York.
- (1997).
Soudavar, A., "Tawṭī'a-yi 'uzmā wa Abu'l-Muẓaffar Shāh Tahmāsb Ṣafavī," in *Iranshināsī IX/1* (Spring 1997), pp. 51–79.
- (1998).
Soudavar, A., "A Chinese Dish from the Lost Endowment of Princess Sotānum," *Papers in Honor of Iraj Afshar*, ed. K. Eslami, Princeton (in press).

- Stchoukine (1974).
Stchoukine, I., "Maulana Shaykh Muhammad: un maître de l'école de Meshed du XVI^e siècle," *Ars Asiatiques* XXX (1974), pp. 3-11.
- Ṭahmāsb (1562).
Shāh Ṭahmāsb, *Tadhkira-yi Shāh Ṭahmāsb*, British Library ms. Or 5880.
- Thackston (1989).
Thackston, W., *A Century of Princes. Sources on Timurid History and Art*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Vāla-yi Iṣfahānī (1993).
Muḥammad Yūsuf Vāla-yi Iṣfahānī, *Khuld-i barīn*, ed. M. H. Moḥaddith, Tehran.
- Welch (1974).
Welch, A., "Painting and Patronage under Shah 'Abbas I," *Iranian Studies* VII (1974), 4458-507.
- Welch (1976).
Welch, S. C., *Royal Persian Manuscripts*, London.
- (1979).
Welch, S. C., *Wonders of the Age*, Cambridge, Mass.
- (1985).
Welch, S. C., *India, Art and Culture 1300-1900*, New York.
- Welch and Welch (1982).
Welch, A., and Welch, S. C., *Arts of the Islamic Book. The Collection of Prince Sadruddin Aga Khan*, London.
- Zebrowski (1983).
Zebrowski, M., *Deccani Painting*, London.
- Credit List**
- Pl. XVa. Colophon page detail, 1486 *Gulistān*. Art and History Trust Collection, courtesy of Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C. no. 36
- Pl. XVb. Fol. 6r, 1468 *Gulistān*. Freer Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C.F1998.5. Gift in Honour of Ezzat-Malek Soudavar
- Pl. XVc. Prophet and the Zoroastrian (detail), fol. 46r, 1468 *Gulistān*, Freer Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C.F1998.5. Gift in Honour of Ezzat-Malek Soudavar
- Pl. XVd. Vizier reading Mir Muṣavvir's petition (detail), Musée Guimet, Paris, no. 3619, I, b.
- Pl. XVIa. Ṭahmāsb reading a poem, fol. 2a of ms. R. 957, Topkapi Saray Museum, Istanbul
- Pl. XVIb. Bahrām Mīrzā kneeling and presenting a petition from Muzaḥḥār 'Alī. Fol. 148a, album H. 2154, Topkapi Saray Museum, Istanbul
- Pl. XVIc. Bahrām Mīrzā with a *sitār*. Fol. 148a, album H. 2154, Topkapi Saray Museum, Istanbul
- Pl. XVIId. Bold calligraphy from the *Fāl-nāma*. Art and History Trust Collection, courtesy of Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C. no. 72 verso
- Pl. XVIIa. Outdoor feast by Mīrzā 'Alī, fol. 46, no. 1663. Gulistān Palace Library, Tehran, no. 1663, fol. 46.
- Pl. XVIIc. Princely lovers, Art and History Trust Collection, courtesy of Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C. no. 65
- Pl. XVIIId. Youth holding a booklet. Prince Saduḍḍin Aga Khan Collection.
- Pl. XVIIIa. Portrait of Bayrām Oghlān. Musée Guimet, Paris, no. 3619, I, a.
- Pl. XVIIIb. Manuscript illustration attributed to Farrukh Beyg, King's College Library, Cambridge, K11.
- Pl. XVIIIc. Ibrāhīm 'Adil Shāh hawking (detail). Institute of Oriental Studies St. Petersburg, ms. E. 14, fol. 2.
- Pl. XVIIIId. Tīmūr on the battlefield (detail). Art and History Trust Collection, courtesy of Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C. no. 128b.
- Pl. XIX. Tīmūr's army in procession (detail). Art and History Trust Collection, courtesy of Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C. no. 128c.
- Pl. XXa. A horse and a groom. Musée Guimet, Paris, no. 3619, L, a.
- Pl. XXb. Mir Mu'izz al-Mulk and Bahādur Khān meet in 1567 (detail). Victoria and Albert Museum, London, I.S. 2-1896 96/117.
- Pl. XXc. Salāmān and Absāl repose on the happy isle (detail). Freer Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C., 46.12, fol. 194b.
- Pl. XXIa. Deccani youth holding a narcissus. Gulistān Palace Library, Tehran, no. 1663, fol. 86.
- Pl. XXIb. Deccani youth holding a narcissus. Edwin Binney 3rd Collection. San Diego Museum of Art, 1990:0318.
- Pl. XXII. Iskandar suffers a nose bleed, Topkapi Saray Museum, Istanbul H.1483, fol. 224b.
- Pl. XXIIIa. Choosing a vizier. Topkapi Saray Museum, Istanbul H.1483, fol. 55a.
- Pl. XXIIIb. Laylī and Majnūn meet at the Ka'ba. Topkapi Saray Museum, Istanbul, H.1483, fol. 86.
- Pl. XXIIIc. Majnūn's father requesting Laylī's hand in marriage for his son. Topkapi Saray Museum, Istanbul H.1483, fol. 77a.
- Pl. XXIIId. Aristotle at Philip's deathbed. Topkapi Saray Museum, Istanbul, H.1483, fol. 207b.
- Pl. XXIVa. Akbar enters Surat. Victoria and Albert Museum, London, I.S. 2-1896 117/117
- Pl. XXVa-b. Double page frontispiece of the *Haft awrang*. Topkapi Saray Museum, Istanbul, H.1483.
- Pl. XXVd. Fibulae shaped cloud embroidery motif (detail). Reproduced with the kind permission of the Trustees of the Chester Beatty Library, Dublin, MS7A(18).
- Pl. XXVIa. Two learned men (private collection)
- Pl. XXVib. A page from a 1570s Jāmi manuscript, AHT, no. 88.
- Pl. XXVic. Bandits attack the caravan of 'Aynia and Riyā. Freer Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 46.12 fol. 64b.
- Pl. XXVId. Shepherd with a goat. Ex-Demotte collection as per Pope and Ackerman (1967), vol. XI, pl. 920.
- Pl. XXVIIa. Colophon with painted cartouches. Topkapi Saray Museum, Istanbul H.1483, fol. 170b.
- Pl. XXVIIb. Colophon with illuminated cartouches. Topkapi Saray Museum, Istanbul H.1483, fol. 200a.
- Pl. XXVIIc. The Prophet Moses bearing a stray sheep (1580s). Topkapi Saray Museum, Istanbul H.1483, fol. 109a.
- Pl. XXVIId. Moses debating with a heterodox (1570s). State Public Library, St. Petersburg, Dorn 429, fol. 37.
- Pl. XXIXa. Throwing down the impostor (detail). Art and History Trust Collection, courtesy of Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C., no. 90b.
- Pl. XXIXc-d. Double page frontispiece of the *Ṣifāt 'āshiqīn* manuscript. Art and History Trust Collection, courtesy of Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C., no. 90a.
- Pl. XXX. Ḥājji Yāqūt in the presence of Muḥammad Ḥakīm Mīrzā. Signed by Farrukh Beyg and dated 1584. Gulistān Palace Library, Tehran, no. 1663, fol. 47.