Muqarnas

An Annual on the Visual Cultures
of the Islamic World

Editor

Gülru Necipoğlu

Managing Editor

Karen A. Leal

VOLUME 33

Sponsored by

The Aga Khan Program for Islamic Architecture
at Harvard University and the Massachusetts Institute
of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts

BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

2016

CONTENTS

GÉZA DÁVID, <i>In Memoriam: Győző Gerő</i> (1924–2011)	vii
HEBA MOSTAFA, The Early Mosque Revisited: Introduction of the <i>Minbar</i> and <i>Maqṣūra</i>	1
DIANA ISAAC BAKHOUM, The Foundation of a Tabrizi Workshop in Cairo: A Case Study of Its Influence on the Mosque of Emir Altunbugha al-Maridani	17
SANDRA AUBE, The Uzun Hasan Mosque in Tabriz: New Perspectives on a Tabrizi Ceramic Tile Workshop	33
ELOÏSE BRAC DE LA PERRIÈRE, Manuscripts in Bihari Calligraphy: Preliminary Remarks on a Little-Known Corpus	63
KEELAN OVERTON, Book Culture, Royal Libraries, and Persianate Painting in Bijapur, circa 1580–1630....	91
CHARLES MELVILLE, New Light on Shah ‘Abbas and the Construction of Isfahan	155
FARSHID EMAMI, Coffeehouses, Urban Spaces, and the Formation of a Public Sphere in Safavid Isfahan	177
CONRAD THAKE, Envisioning the Orient: The New Muslim Cemetery in Malta	221
NOTES AND SOURCES	
ÜNVER RÜSTEM, The Spectacle of Legitimacy: The Dome-Closing Ceremony of the Sultan Ahmed Mosque	253
MOUNIA CHEKHAB-ABUDAYA, AMÉLIE COUV RAT DESVERGNES, and DAVID J. ROXBURGH, Sayyid Yusuf’s 1433 Pilgrimage Scroll (<i>Ziyārātnāma</i>) in the Collection of the Museum of Islamic Art, Doha	345
HANS BARNARD, SNEHA SHAH, GREGORY E. ARESHIAN, and KYM F. FAULL, Chemical Insights into the Function of Four Sphero-Conical Vessels from Medieval Dvin, Armenia	409

KEELAN OVERTON

BOOK CULTURE, ROYAL LIBRARIES, AND PERSIANATE PAINTING IN BIJAPUR, CIRCA 1580–1630

In the nascent yet burgeoning field of Deccani art history, Ibrahim ‘Adil Shah II (r. 1580–1627), the sixth ruler of the ‘Adil Shahi dynasty (1490–1686), has attracted considerable scholarly attention. Ibrahim ruled for nearly fifty years, and many of the masterpieces of Deccani architecture date to his reign, including the Ibrahim Rauza (ca. 1627–35), popularly dubbed “The Taj of the South.” In Mark Zebrowski’s pioneering *Deccani Painting* (1983), Ibrahim was heralded as “the greatest patron of the arts the Deccan produced,”¹ a sentiment repeated a decade later in the second installment (1994) of Yale’s Islamic art survey and several subsequent publications.² In addition to panegyric praising Ibrahim’s proficiency in music, calligraphy, and poetry, the presumption of his prolific patronage has stemmed from his sixteen contemporary portraits; in other words, the ruler’s place as subject has secured his stature as patron.³ An exquisite portrait of “Ibrahim hawking,” now preserved in St. Petersburg,⁴ graced the cover of Zebrowski’s book and was later described as “one of the greatest images in Indian or Islamic art.”⁵

Ibrahim’s elevation as a “genius” patron has been fueled equally by his religious tolerance and eclecticism, which have inspired comparison to the Mughal emperor Akbar (r. 1556–1605).⁶ Nominally a Sunni, Ibrahim adopted Hindi titlature (*Jagat Gurū*, World Teacher) and founded a composite religious system devoted to the Prophet Muhammad, the Hindu goddess Saraswati, and the Deccan’s most famous Sufi saint, Sayyid Muhammad Gisu Daraz (d. 1422). It is an oft-repeated staple of scholarship that the ruler’s *Kitāb-i Nawras* (Book of Nawras),⁷ an innovative collection of fifty-nine songs in Dakhni,⁸ opens with invocations to the Prophet, goddess, and saint.⁹ Such syncretic proclivities have led

scholars to conclude that “Ibrahim was the product of a hybrid civilization. It is hard to label him either a Muslim or a Hindu.”¹⁰

Notwithstanding the noted risks of scholarly veneration¹¹—culminating in Richard Eaton and Phillip Wagoner’s insistence “to qualify the conventional image of Ibrahim II as something of a beads-and-flowers hippie *avant le temps*”¹²—the ruler remains the axis mundi of Bijapuri art. In the catalogue accompanying the Metropolitan Museum of Art’s recent exhibition on the Deccan (2015), it is argued, “Ibrahim’s court attracted some of the most talented artists of the age, *who gave expression to the sultan’s inner vision* and whose works offer a glimpse into an opulent and sensuous world [emphasis added].”¹³ Building on (and dramatizing) such sentiment, a reviewer for the *New York Times* offered a conclusion replete with “neo-Orientalist undertones”:¹⁴ “One source of the Deccan’s instability may have been, as the show’s subtitle of ‘opulence and fantasy’ suggests, that *the sultans had a greater interest in culture and leisure than governing* [emphasis added].”¹⁵ While acknowledging the deserved iconic status of Ibrahim’s *Kitāb-i Nawras* and the contemporary description of Bijapur as an “elixir of mirth and pleasure,”¹⁶ this article attempts to investigate the ruler as but one link in a long chain of intercultural production, rather than the singular source of inspiration, and the Deccan itself beyond the tropes of “otherworldliness,” “leisure,” and “mystery.”

Much of the recent emphasis on Ibrahim’s syncretism and patronage can be traced to a portrait of the goddess Saraswati, the focus of his spiritual devotion, seated on a gold throne (fig. 1).¹⁷ Although the major iconographical elements of “Saraswati enthroned” rely heavily on the ruler’s *Kitāb-i Nawras*, the composition is fundamen-

Fig. 1. "Saraswati enthroned," signed by Farrukh Husayn, Bijapur, ca. 1595–1609. Jaipur, Brigadier Sawai Bhawani Singh of Jaipur, City Palace, JC-1/RJS.1326-RM 177. (From Chandramani Singh and Madhvendra Narayan, *From the Collection of Maharaja of Jaipur: Six Multicoloured Prints, Surat Khana, Jaipur, 16th–17th Century, Mughal and Deccani* [Jaipur: Jaigarh Public Charitable Trust, 2003], pl. C)

tally rooted in the conventions of late sixteenth-century Persian painting. The explanation for this Bijapuri-Iranian fusion rests in the peregrinations of its maker, Farrukh Husayn (as he signs on the steps), whose identity has been the subject of debate since Robert Skelton's seminal 1957 thesis that the Mughal Farrukh Beg and Bijapuri Farrukh Husayn were one and the same.¹⁸ The prevailing consensus supports Skelton¹⁹ and favors the following biography: Farrukh perhaps hailed from Shiraz²⁰ and subsequently migrated to Khurasan, where he was associated with the Mashhad library-atelier of Ibrahim Mirza (d. 1577). The painter and his brother Siyavush then became "trusted companions" (*mu'tamidān*) of the Safavid heir apparent Hamza Mirza (d. 1586).²¹ In Khurasan, Farrukh adopted many of the stylistic traits of Muhammadi (fl. late-sixteenth century), and the two artists may have worked together.²² Farrukh next traveled to the independent kingdom of Kabul, ruled by Mirza Muhammad Hakim (d. 1585), Akbar's half-brother and rival.²³ In December 1585, the artist entered Akbar's service at Rawalpindi and spent approximately a decade at the Mughal court, where he was known as Farrukh Beg.²⁴ Around 1595–1600, he migrated to Ibrahim's Bijapur, where he signed "Farrukh Husayn" and became a leading court portraitist.²⁵ By 1609 at the latest, he had reentered Mughal service under Jahangir (r. 1605–27), where he was again known as Farrukh Beg.

An investigation of Farrukh's decade-long tenure in Bijapur leads to the ostensible crux of medieval and early modern Deccani history: the ongoing conflict between local-born Muslims (*Dakkanī*) and foreigners (*gharībān*) from western Islamic lands.²⁶ Farrukh's meteoric success in Bijapur was conditioned by a court hierarchy dominated by Iranian immigrants, and it is the contention here that a deeper understanding of the painter's Bijapur period requires contextualization within this diasporic climate. I begin with a preliminary mapping of book culture at the 'Adil Shahi court. Which Perso-Islamic intellectual patterns, archetypes, and prerogatives prevailed? How did they foster Ibrahim's participation in connected systems of sovereignty between Iran and the subcontinent? The goal is to balance the narrative between Ibrahim as an isolated and eccentric "genius" patron (as understood through panegyric, the *Kitāb-i Nawras*, and a narrow prism of album portraits)

and 'Adil Shahi Bijapur as a courtly culture enmeshed in wider Perso-Islamic systems (as attested by the material record in its broadest sense, including seals, coins, titlature, library collections, metalwork, bookbinding, and wall painting).²⁷ In many ways, Farrukh and his portraits bridge the divide between Ibrahim and his court while stimulating larger questions about agency, reception, and translation across the Indo-Persian world. In turn, the art historical conversation shifts away from the often impenetrable question of original hand, at least partially. For the general field of Deccani studies, artist and oeuvre also challenge the deep-rooted Deccani-Westerner binary, which is applicable in certain contexts but tends to be unilaterally emphasized.²⁸

CONNECTED SYSTEMS OF IRANIAN PEREGRINATION AND PATRONAGE

Unlike their consistently Shi'i contemporaries in Qutb Shahi Golconda, the rulers of 'Adil Shahi Bijapur vacillated between Sunnism and Shi'ism, and routinely shifted their allegiances between local and foreign factions. Since the mid-twentieth century, some scholars have argued that Ibrahim's reign witnessed the tipping of the scales in favor of the former. Evidence in support of this theory has included the ruler's restoration of Hanafi Sunnism in 1583, as well as his broken (*shikasta*) Persian, use of Hindi titlature (*Jagat Gurū*), devotion to Saraswati, and the collection of songs (*Kitāb-i Nawras*) he wrote in the Deccani vernacular (Dakhni).²⁹ As recently as 2006, it was argued that "the height of Persian and Shi'i influence was during the reign of 'Ali 'Adil Shah (r. 1558–80), who had the Shi'i khutba read in mosques. A brief Sunni restoration, coupled with a move away from Persian influence, took place under his grandson [actually his nephew] Ibrahim 'Adil Shah II (d. 1618) [actually d. 1627]."³⁰

The above conclusions are problematic on several levels. First, they presume a linear relationship between religious sectarianism and culture, that is, Shi'ism = Persian and Sunnism = non-Persian. Second, although the first decade of Ibrahim's rule was indeed marked by a series of *Dakkanī* regencies led by former African slaves (*habashī*, deriving from *al-Habash*, Abyssinia or Ethio-

pia), the *Khān-i Khalīl* (Table of the Friend of God) of Nur al-Din Muhammad Zuhuri (d. 1616) and Malik Qummi (d. 1616) confirms that by the turn of the seventeenth century the ruler's inner entourage was dominated by six Iranian émigrés (the biases of the Iranian authors notwithstanding).³¹ The first individual, Shah Navaz Khan (Khvaja Sa'd al-Din 'Inayatullah Shirazi, d. ca. 1611), hailed from Shiraz and was a student of the renowned polymath Mir Fathullah Shirazi (d. 1590),³² a pupil of Jamal al-Din Mahmud, in turn a student of Jalal al-Din Davani (d. 1501). Fathullah spent time in Bijapur during the reign of 'Alī I (r. 1558–80), and his presence may explain his student's migration to the city (talent lures talent). Shortly after Ibrahim assumed power in 1590, in the wake of the regencies described above, Shah Navaz Khan became prime minister (*jumda al-mulk*). In addition to being an accomplished mathematician and astronomer, he supervised the construction of Bijapur's sister city, Nawraspur, in 1599, encouraged Ibrahim's education in Persian language and literature, and established a welcoming climate for foreigners (*gharībān*).³³ Several itinerant poets enjoyed Shah Navaz Khan's patronage, and tenure at his court seems to have been a critical stop in poetic peregrinations among Iran, the Deccan, and the Mughal north. Mirza Abu Talib Kalim Kashani (d. 1651), for example, composed a lengthy inscription in *maṣnavī*, classified as "architectural panegyric," for the prime minister's Nawraspur palace, Qasr-i Nawras Bihisht.³⁴

Like Shah Navaz Khan, the calligrapher Khalilullah Butshikan (Idol Destroyer, in reference to his namesake, the prophet Ibrahim) (d. 1626) played a significant role in Bijapur's political and cultural circles. Khalilullah began his career in Khurasan, followed Shah 'Abbas (r. 1588–1629) to Qazvin, and migrated to Bijapur circa 1596.³⁵ He served as Ibrahim's ambassador to Iran on two occasions (1613–14 and 1618–20), and Shah 'Abbas was particularly enamored of his calligraphy, even composing a quatrain in his honor.³⁶ Khalilullah's stature as Ibrahim's leading calligrapher in *nasta'liq* is attested by his writing of an imperial copy of the *Kitāb-i Nawras*, which was presented to Ibrahim in 1027 (1617–18) and earned the calligrapher the title *pādishāh-i qalam* (King of the Pen).³⁷ He subsequently copied a fine manuscript

of Nizami's *Khamṣa* (Quintet), as confirmed by his signature reading *Mīr Khalīl mulaqqab pādishāh-i qalam*.³⁸

Khalilullah's counterpart in the field of painting was Farrukh Husayn, who painted at least five portraits of Ibrahim during his tenure in Bijapur between circa 1595 and 1609. Farrukh's "Ibrahim hawking" (St. Petersburg) and "Ibrahim playing the tambur" (fig. 2) are celebrated icons of Deccani painting. Closely related to the former is a lesser-known portrait of the ruler holding a *ṣafīna* (small oblong album) while seated on a throne in a landscape (fig. 3). Farrukh's final two portraits of Ibrahim depict him riding Atish Khan, his favorite elephant, praised throughout the *Kitāb-i Nawras*.³⁹ A variant of one of the elephant compositions appears as a wall painting in the artist's "Saraswati enthroned" (fig. 1), which has been heralded as a "masterful representation of the idealized vision of self, state, and culture that Ibrahim espoused," despite its inaccessibility.⁴⁰

The final three courtiers described in the *Khān-i Khalīl*—Haidar Zehni, Malik Qummi, and Zuhuri—were the leading Iranian literati of Ibrahim's court. Zuhuri served as Ibrahim's poet laureate from circa 1601 until his death in 1616, and he often collaborated with his father-in-law, Malik Qummi (d. 1616). Probable partnerships between the two include the *Khān-i Khalīl* itself and *Nawras*, both part of the trilogy known as *Sih Naṣr* (Three Essays), as well as an imitation (*nāḍira*) of Nizami's *Makhzan al-Asrār* (Treasury of Secrets) entitled *Manba' al-Anhār* (Source of the Rivers).⁴¹ Although not mentioned in the *Khān-i Khalīl*, two additional Iranian intellectuals in Ibrahim's Bijapur deserve mention yet require little introduction: Muhammad Qasim Hindushah Astarabadi (known as Firishta, d. 1611) and Rafi' al-Din Shirazi (d. 1620). Firishta composed his well-known history *Gulshān-i Ibrāhīmī* (Rose Garden of Ibrahim) upon the ruler's request (the two recensions are dated 1015 [1606–7] and 1018 [1609–10]). Shirazi's major work was his *Tadhkirat al-Mulūk* (History of Kings, completed between 1608 and 1611), a history of the 'Adil Shahi dynasty and contemporary Indian and Iranian courts that has been largely neglected in favor of Firishta.

The careers of the Iranian migrants discussed above were all characterized by continual peregrination in

Fig. 2. “Ibrahim playing the tambur,” ascribed to Farrukh Beg (Farrukh Husayn) at the Mughal court by Muhammad Husayn Zarin Qalam, Bijapur, ca. 1595–1609. Folio from the Salim/Jahangir Album, north India, ca. late 1590s–1620s. Prague, Nápstrek Museum of Asian, African and American Cultures, A. 12182. (Photo: courtesy of the Nápstrek Museum)

search of patronage, both within Iran and across the subcontinent.⁴² Malik Qummi, Firishta, and Zuhuri, for example, spent their initial years in the Deccan at the Nizam Shahi court of Ahmadnagar and only later migrated to Ibrahim’s Bijapur.⁴³ The poet Kalim perhaps best exemplifies the interconnectedness of knowledge systems and peripatetic networks. His courts of tenure and associates included ‘Adil Shahi Bijapur (with Shah Navaz Khan), Safavid Isfahan (ca. 1618–20), Qutb Shahi

Golconda (possibly with Mir Muhammad Amin Shahristani/Ruh al-Amin)⁴⁴, and Mughal India, until his death in 1651 in Lahore.⁴⁵

The widespread celebrity of Iranian intellectuals in the early modern Deccan and the relative ease with which they circulated were conditioned by heightened proximity and diplomacy associated with military conflict. In his account of his mission to the Deccan in 1591–93, the Mughal poet Fayzi (Abu’l-Fayz b. Mubarak, d. 1595) praised both Malik Qummi and Zuhuri and singled them out for recruitment, and Malik Qummi appears to have briefly entered the service of ‘Abd al-Rahim Khan-i Khanan (d. 1627) after the Mughal general’s siege of Ahmadnagar in 1595.⁴⁶ Once Malik Qummi had settled in Bijapur, his works continued to circulate via the hands of fellow peripatetic Iranians. The Shirazi savant Mir Jamal al-Din Husayn Inju (d. 1625–26), whom Akbar had dispatched as ambassador to Ibrahim in 1600, reportedly transported Malik Qummi’s work back to Agra and presented it to the still smitten Khan-i Khanan.⁴⁷

For his part, Ibrahim had to contend with steady Mughal incursions into the Deccan, initiated by Akbar in the 1590s, and the northern empire’s dismissal of him as a mere *khān* rather than *shāh*.⁴⁸ Concurrently, the Bijapuri ruler exchanged embassies with Shah ‘Abbas, who faced his own military engagement with the Mughals in Qandahar.⁴⁹ In one letter transported by Khalilullah in 1612–13, Ibrahim described Bijapur and the Deccan as part of the Safavid Empire, declared that the names of the Safavid monarchs were recited in the Friday sermon, and titled himself a *manṣabdār* (subordinate, lit. “holder of rank”) ruling on “His Majesty’s behalf.”⁵⁰ Such letters underscore the fluidity and practicality of sectarianism during Ibrahim’s reign. Although Hanafi Sunnism was restored in Bijapur in 1583, it was in Ibrahim’s best interest to join his Shi’i Deccani neighbors—especially Muhammadi Quli Qutb Shah (r. 1580–1612) and Muhammad Qutb Shah (r. 1612–26) of Golconda—in the cultivation of brotherhood with Safavid Iran.⁵¹ As aptly summarized by Sanjay Subrahmanyam, this Deccani-Safavid alliance was more symbolic than practical: “It was clear of course that no military alliance was really possible that might straddle the distance between Chaul and Dabhol, and the ports of Fars, but other forms of

Fig. 3. "Ibrahim offering obeisance to Jahangir," attributed to Farrukh Husayn, Bijapur, ca. 1595–1609. Folio from the Salim/Jahangir Album, north India, ca. late 1590s–1620s. Tehran, Gulistan Palace Library, no. 1663, fol. 87. (Photo: Keelan Overton)

real and symbolic affinity tied the predominantly Shi'i sultans of the Deccan to Iran rather than to the Sunni Mughals who were gradually encroaching upon them from the north."⁵² It is to these "other forms of real and symbolic affinity" that we now turn.

BOOK CULTURE IN IBRAHIM'S BIJAPUR

A perusal of Ibrahim-era portraiture underscores the privileged status of books, and, by extension, erudition, in Bijapuri iconography. A number of single-page paintings conform to the Indo-Persian trope of a noble youth holding a book symbolic of his intellect, and many are remarkable for the detail afforded to the depiction of the codices. In "A youth with swans and rabbits,"⁵³ a courtier holds a book whose Persian-style binding is embellished with red stones, and in "Mullah,"⁵⁴ a sensitive portrait of one of Bijapur's religious dignitaries, the book's endband (stitching reinforcement at the head and tail of the text block, often in a chevron pattern) is subtly indicated by a red line. In "Ibrahim feeding a hawk,"⁵⁵ a luxurious red velvet case protecting an esteemed volume is held by an attendant behind the ruler, and in "Ibrahim visiting a Sufi saint,"⁵⁶ the pages of the book next to the saint are bookmarked for future reading by the binding's envelope flap.

Despite the prominence of bound codices in Ibrahim-era portraiture, only a handful of manuscripts dating to the ruler's reign are extant.⁵⁷ The text surviving in the highest number is the *Kitāb-i Nawras*, and the most well-known manuscripts include a copy by 'Abd al-Rashid dated 990 (1582–83) (appendix, no. 15) (fig. 4),⁵⁸ one by 'Abd al-Latif Mustafa with a terminus ante quem of 5 Muharram 1022 (February 24, 1613) (appendix, no. 16),⁵⁹ and the aforementioned luxury example by Khalilullah, transcribed after 1617 (appendix, no. 17).⁶⁰ Other surviving Ibrahim-era manuscripts include an unillustrated *Ikhtiyārāt-i Badī'ī* (Selections of Badī'ī) dated 990 (1582–83) (appendix, no. 10); an illustrated *Pem Nem* (Toils of Love) datable to circa 1591–1604 (thirty-four miniatures);⁶¹ an illustrated *Ni'matnāma* (Book of Delights) (two miniatures, one of which is a portrait of Ibrahim);⁶² the above-mentioned unillustrated *Khamṣa* of Nizami copied by Khalilullah after 1617;⁶³ and an illustrated

Fig. 4. Flyleaf with a type D Bijapuri notation dated 17 Jumada I 1037 (January 24, 1628). Folio from a *Kitāb-i Nawras* of Ibrahim 'Adil Shah II, copied by 'Abd al-Rashid, Bijapur, dated 990 (1582–83) (see appendix, no. 15). Hyderabad, Salar Jung Museum, M. 177, fol. 1r. (Photo: courtesy of the Salar Jung Museum)

Shāhnāma (Book of Kings) datable to circa 1600–10 (approximately two dozen paintings are known).⁶⁴ The *Ni'matnāma* portrait of Ibrahim confirms the importance of text-image relationships in Bijapuri painting while demonstrating that the city's *nawras*—"nine

moods,” based on the *rasas* of Indian aesthetic theory, or “new arrival,” from the Persian *naw* and *rasīdan*—and Persianate cultures were anything but exclusive. The Persian couplet above the ruler reads, “The master/lord of all existing things, who made this workshop / Had as his intention love, [but] he made *nawras* a pretext.”⁶⁵ As elsewhere, the precise meaning of *nawras* remains elusive. If a Persian interpretation is favored, the “pretext” in question could be defined as aesthetic freshness and innovation, qualities that indeed exemplify Ibrahim-era art.

Although a few of the manuscripts listed above have been the focus of individual studies, the current understanding of Ibrahim-era painting is framed by single-page album portraits, especially of the ruler himself, of the type described at the beginning of this article. The majority of these paintings have been ruptured from their original parent albums, and the result is that it can be difficult to move beyond formal analysis and connoisseurship toward an emic understanding of function and reception. To date, the *Kitāb-i Nawras* has provided the most useful launching point for deeper understanding. In “Ibrahim playing the tambur” (fig. 2), the ruler’s iconography—red nails, necklace of *rudraksha* (dried berries) beads, *tanbūr* (long-necked lute), and elephant Atish Khan—parallels his verbal self-portrait in songs 15 and 56,⁶⁶ and in “Saraswati enthroned” (fig. 1), verses from song 56 appear in the composition.⁶⁷ While acknowledging that the *Kitāb-i Nawras* was synonymous with Ibrahim both at home and abroad,⁶⁸ the present goal is to explore additional knowledge systems that permeated Bijapuri culture and in turn impacted sovereignty and artistic production. Toward this end, the books collected into Ibrahim’s and the city’s libraries present a valuable resource, because many bear precisely what the detached album portraits do not: concrete data concerning provenance and traceable connections to the ruler himself. It is through an examination of book culture that we can begin to map patterns of intellectual taste and circulation in Bijapur, trace the literary fluency of the court, and further consider Ibrahim’s multivalent identities.

As was the case at virtually all early modern Islamic courts, the formation of a comprehensive library of Arabic and Persian classics was a prerogative of ‘Adil Shahi

kingship. The seals of Ibrahim’s bibliophile predecessors—Isma‘il (r. 1510–35) and ‘Ali I (r. 1558–80)—are known,⁶⁹ and Shirazi observed both the latter’s fondness for books and the size of his collection and *kitābkhāna* (comprising “sixty men, calligraphists, gilders of books, book-binders and illuminators”).⁷⁰ The likelihood that Ibrahim inherited a well-oiled library bureaucracy is attested by acquisitions and protocols dating to the regency period (1580–90). As early as 1586, when the ruler was just fifteen, his books were being marked with a distinct *ex libris* (fig. 5) and a small, oval seal inscribed *Ibrāhīm nawras* (fig. 6). Given Ibrahim’s youth and recent accession, the word *nawras* might again warrant a Persian interpretation, hence translating the legend as “Ibrahim freshly sprouted” (into youth, *nawjavān*) or “Ibrahim newly arrived” (as Bijapur’s king).⁷¹ Regardless of precise meaning, the use of *nawras* during the volatile regency period raises questions of agency. Who was responsible for developing it as a word and concept at this early stage?

At present, it is possible to track approximately seventy books associated with Ibrahim specifically and/or Bijapur’s royal library (*kitābkhāna-i ‘āmira* or *kitābkhāna-i ma’mūra*) during his reign. Approximately 50 were among the 430 books discovered in Bijapur’s Asar Mahal (completed 1647)⁷² in 1853 and subsequently transferred to the India Office Library (now British Library).⁷³ Although the Asar Mahal collection was once part of Bijapur’s royal library, it cannot be considered representative of the institution’s original quality, size, or scope (in 1604, upon the marriage of his daughter to Akbar’s son, Ibrahim gave 2,000 books alone to the Mughal ruler).⁷⁴ The majority of the books are fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Arabic texts on Sufism, ethics, logic, and law (noticeably absent are Korans and historical texts),⁷⁵ and the collection includes just seventeen Persian volumes and only a single literary classic (Nizami’s *Makhzan al-Asrār*).⁷⁶ Although some of the Asar Mahal volumes were rated first class (*avval*) by Bijapur’s librarians,⁷⁷ few, if any, can be classified as “luxury” codices in holistic art-historical terms, that is, utilizing the finest materials (paper, pigments, gold, leather) and including exceptional calligraphy, illumination, painting, and/or binding.⁷⁸ We can presume that these manuscripts remained in the Asar Mahal until the British discovery

Fig. 5. Illuminated ex libris of Ibrahim II dated 21 Dhu'l-Hijja 994 (December 2, 1586). Partially visible to the left is the word *avval* and a type B Bijapuri notation dated 8 Rabi' I 1003 (November 21, 1594). Folio from a Gloss by Jurjani on the Commentary by Qutb al-Din al-Razi on the *Maṭāli' al-Anwār* of Urmawi, apparently copied by Taqi al-Din al-Husayni (d. 1476–77). London, British Library, Loth 525/B 181 (former B 181A), fol. 3r. (Photo: courtesy of the British Library)

precisely because they were not lavish enough to incite removal.⁷⁹

To locate the finest books in Ibrahim's possession, we must look outside of the British Library's Asar Mahal collection. Based on textual evidence summarized below (see "Ibrahim's marks of ownership"), I have to date identified seventeen manuscripts once owned by the ruler and now in collections across the globe: nine Persian literary classics, one Persian medical treatise, three Arabic volumes (two Korans, one *dīwān*), and four Bijapuri texts (Persian or Dakhni) (appendix, nos. 1–17).⁸⁰

Fig. 6. Impression of the oval seal of Ibrahim II (inscribed: *Ibrāhīm nawras*; dimensions: 13 x 20 mm). Folio from a Koran, Shiraz, ca. 1570 (see appendix, no. 11). Hyderabad, Jagdish and Kamla Mittal Museum of Indian Art, 76.851, Ms. 1. (Photo: courtesy of the Jagdish and Kamla Mittal Museum of Indian Art)

As a whole, these books are of a far higher aesthetic quality than those in the Asar Mahal collection. A few deserve an art-historical, first-class valuation (*avval*) and include the work of famous calligraphers and illuminators (Yaqut al-Musta'simi, d. 1298; Shah Mahmud Nishapuri, d. 1564–65; Jalal al-Din Baghnavi, fl. in late sixteenth-century Shiraz). Others have illustrious provenances in Greater Iran (Abu Sa'id, r. 1458–69; Rustam b. Maqsud, r. 1493–97; Shah Isma'il, r. 1576–78) and/or subsequently entered royal collections in India ('Alamgir, r. 1658–1707; Tipu Sultan, r. 1782–99). In addition to these seventeen bound manuscripts, two album folios with calligraphy framed by marbled borders (appendix, nos. 18–19) bear evidence of Ibrahim's ownership.⁸¹

Notwithstanding its severe limitation in number, this dispersed corpus rounds out the better known Asar Mahal collection and in turn underscores the dual function of books in Bijapur's courtly culture: as prerequisites in established intellectual curricula (primarily Asar Mahal texts) and as luxury enterprises in the visual arts (mainly dispersed examples). Moreover, Ibrahim's nine imported Persian classics (from Shiraz, Herat, and Isfahan)—in tandem with the Khalilullah *Khamṣa* and illustrated *Shāhnāma* produced in Bijapur—suggest that Persian

Fig. 7. “Rustam recognizing the dying Sohrab.” Vault A, North Arch, Kumatgi, Bijapur, early seventeenth century. See fig. 8 for a line drawing of this now badly damaged wall painting. (Photo: Keelan Overton)

literature occupied a privileged place at the ‘Adil Shahi court, as it did at all Persianate courts of the day.

The latter assertion is borne out by related visual evidence suggesting the widespread popularity of Persian classics in Bijapur. At Kumatgi, a pleasure palace located approximately ten miles east of the capital, two wall paintings in the central bath hall, which is datable to Ibrahim’s reign, illustrate iconic episodes from the *Shāhnāma* and *Khamsa*.⁸² The *Shāhnāma* scene is located directly across from the entrance and depicts Rustam’s agony—his tearing open of his shirt—upon realizing that he has stabbed his son, Sohrab, who identifies himself by pointing to the armband given to him by his mother, Rustam’s wife (figs. 7 and 8).⁸³ This same scene was chosen for illustration in the Bijapuri

Shāhnāma,⁸⁴ and its privileged location in the bath hall stimulates questions about meaning and relevance.⁸⁵ The second wall painting shows an emaciated Majnun in the wilderness being visited by his mother and his uncle Salim ‘Amiri (fig. 9).⁸⁶ While the Rustam-Sohrab tragedy appears to have been a rather exceptional selection for a palatial wall painting, the Majnun example conformed to architectural trends throughout contemporary India.⁸⁷

Ibrahim’s marks of ownership

In addition to illuminating patterns of Persianate literary taste in Bijapur, Ibrahim’s books include marks of ownership that shed light on the ruler’s self-representation outside of the *Kitāb-i Nawras* framework. This evi-

Fig. 8. Line drawing of “Rustam recognizing the dying Sohrab” (see fig. 7). (From Henry Cousens, *Bijāpūr and Its Architectural Remains, With an Historical Outline of the ‘Ādil Shāhi Dynasty* [repr., Delhi: Bharatiya Publication House, 1976], pl. cxiii)

dence can be divided into three categories: seal impressions (versus the actual matrices, none of which have been identified), ex libris, and scribal notations by librarians.⁸⁸ Like many rulers of the day, Ibrahim (or at least his librarians) employed several seals. One of the most common—appearing in both *Asar Mahal* (British Library) volumes and dispersed ones—was the aforementioned oval example inscribed *Ibrāhīm nawras* (fig. 6). A second far larger, circular seal (fig. 10) has been erroneously associated with Ibrahim Mirza of Mashhad (d. 1577), and its known impressions are currently limited to the dispersed corpus.⁸⁹ Its long inscription is a Koranic verse concerning the prophet Ibrahim (Abraham):

And who turns away
From the religion of Abraham
But such as debase their souls

Fig. 9. “Majnun in the wilderness visited by his uncle and mother.” Vault B1, South Arch, Kumatgi, Bijapur, early seventeenth century. As with fig. 7, this wall painting is badly damaged. (Photo: Keelan Overton)

Fig. 10. Impression of the circular seal of Ibrahim II (inscribed with Koran 2:130; diameter: 41 mm). Folio from a *Dīvān* of Jami, copied by Shah Muhammad al-Katib al-Shirazi, probably Shiraz, dated 971 and 972 (1563–65) (see fig. 19 and appendix, no. 1). Doha, Museum of Islamic Art, Ms. 260. (Photo: Keelan Overton)

Fig. 11. Dish, Bijapur, ca. 1600. Copenhagen, The David Collection, 11/1992. (Photo: Pernille Klemp)

Fig. 12. Tympanum with Koran 2:130, Ibrahim Rauza, Bijapur, ca. 1627. (Photo: Ameen Hullur)

With folly? Him We chose
 And rendered pure in this world:
 And he will be in the Hereafter
 In the ranks of the Righteous (2:130).

The inscription reads from top to bottom in bold *thuluth*, and elongated letters (*kashida*) in the words *millat*, *fi*, and *iṣṭafaynahu* create a series of four horizontal registers (see how the *yā* of *fi* extends backwards across the middle of the seal). Like the *nawras* example, the Koranic seal is double-ruled, and its background features an even spiral accented with small leaves and floral blossoms. Stylistically, the seal closely resembles a number of Bijapuri bronze dishes with stacked *thuluth* inscriptions, often including exaggerated horizontal extensions, on delicately spiraling grounds (fig. 11).⁹⁰

The codification of Bijapuri epigraphic arts acknowledged, Ibrahim's Koranic seal is unique in several respects. Unlike the seals of his contemporaries, it features neither a date nor the monarch's full name or titlature. The seal's allusion to Ibrahim is just that: the chosen Koranic verse honors his namesake, the prophet Ibrahim, by way of his pure path (*millat-i Ibrāhīm*). In doing so, it alludes to the Bijapuri Ibrahim's repentance (*tawba*), which was spearheaded by the city's "landed" and "reformer" Qadiri and Shatarri Sufis in reaction to his syncretic Hindu-Muslim spirituality.⁹¹ This assertion is supported by the same verse's prominent position in the tympanum over the east door of the Ibrahim Rauza, the ruler's tomb (fig. 12).⁹² Recent analysis of the tomb's epigraphic program reveals the widespread and deliberate selection of verses honoring the prophet Ibrahim Khalilullah (Friend of God) and encouraging the life of a *hanif* (a pure believer who submits to God and true monotheism).⁹³ The exclusive selection of 2:130 for Ibrahim's large seal must therefore be contextualized in light of the ruler's reorientation toward orthodox Islam, a process desirable for public broadcasting in propagandist visual terms.⁹⁴

The two ex libris and four types of scribal notations (types A–D) present in Ibrahim's books constitute further raw data through which to explore the ruler's identity/identities. Each ex libris can be associated with one of the royal seals (*nawras* or Koranic). The first is in the form of an illuminated rectangle, cartouche, or *shamsa*

Fig. 13. Flyleaf with the illuminated ex libris of Ibrahim II dated 27 Rabi' II 10[0]3 (January 8, 1595) and a type B Bijapuri notation dated 27 Rabi' II 1003 (January 8, 1595). Folio from a *Dīvān* of Jami, possibly an autographed copy, probably Herat, dated 5 Rajab 871 (February 10, 1467) (see appendix, no. 2). Hyderabad, Salar Jung Museum, M. 276, fol. 1r. (Photo: courtesy of the Salar Jung Museum)

(sunburst) framing a stacked inscription written directly on the plain paper (fig. 13; see also fig. 5).⁹⁵ The primary color scheme is red and blue—alternating between the inscription and illumination—and the latter includes simple floral designs and minimal gold. Although the illumination is unremarkable in comparison to Timurid and Mughal ex libris, the inscription is notable for its length and detail pertaining to the codex in ques-

Fig. 14. Flyleaf with the Koranic seal ex libris of Ibrahim II, type B Bijapuri notation dated 22 Ramazan 1014 (January 31, 1606), and type C Bijapuri notation in *raqam* equivalent to 1,555 rupees. Folio from a *Majālis al-'Ushshāq* of Kamal al-Din Husayn Gazurgahi, copied by Ahmad al-Hafiz, Shiraz, ca. 1580s (see appendix, no. 3). Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, SP 1559, fol. 3r. (Photo: courtesy of the Bibliothèque nationale de France)

tion, hence necessitating modification for each application.⁹⁶ It always opens with the name and author of the book and type of script (*khatt*), but what follows is rarely consistent. It can describe the binding (*jild*) and include the phrase “collected into the library of the Refuge of the World (*Ālampanāh*) Ibrahim ‘Adil Shah, may God

Fig. 15. Flyleaf with the Koranic seal ex libris of Ibrahim II, type A Bijapuri notation (largely effaced), and type B Bijapuri notation dated 20 R[...] 1014 (1605–6). Folio from a *Kulliyāt* of Sa'di, Iran, late sixteenth century (see appendix, no. 6). London, British Library, Add. 17961, fol. 2r. (Photo: © The British Library Board)

perpetuate his kingdom,” a variant of which can alone comprise many ex libris (fig. 13).⁹⁷ Alternatively, it can record the volume’s provenance (as a gift, *pishkash*, from a specific individual) and the presence of the *nawras* seal (*muhashshā bā sikka* [?] *nawras*) (fig. 5).⁹⁸ In sum, this ex libris blends conventions of such owner-

Fig. 16. Flyleaf with the Koranic seal ex libris of Ibrahim II, Type B Bijapuri notation dated 28 Ramazan [...]4, and the word *nawras*. Also visible is the seal impression of Ibrahim's father and predecessor 'Ali I (circular, triple ruled, with the names of the Twelve Imams). Folio from a *Khamsa* of Amir Khusraw Dihlavi, Yazd (?), 1430–40 (see appendix, no. 8). Doha, Museum of Islamic Art, Ms. 302, fol. 1r. (Photo: courtesy of the Museum of Islamic Art)

ship marks (illumination, the name of the ruler) with codex-specific detail usually reserved for notations. All currently known examples are dated and reveal its consistent use for the duration of Ibrahim's reign.⁹⁹

The inscriptional content of the second ex libris (figs. 14–16) is abbreviated and formulaic, but its design is exceptional for its inclusion of Ibrahim's Koranic seal as the central unit of a tripartite composition lacking illu-

mination.¹⁰⁰ Above the seal is an inscription in two lines separated by a lengthy extension (*kashīda*) of the letter *bi* in the opening word *kitāb* (book). It typically reads, "Book of the . . . from the library of," followed by a series of honorifics (*ashraf*, most noble; *aqdas*, most holy; *a'lā*, most sublime; *arfa'*, most high; *humāyūn*, blessed) culminating in Ibrahim's name (*Ibrāhīm 'Ādilshāh*) in the top line (where it is sometimes effaced, as in fig. 14). The

Fig. 17. Flyleaf with the Koranic seal of Ibrahim II and a type A Bijapuri notation in the inverted triangle format. Folio from a *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā* of Jami, copied by Shah Mahmud Nishapuri, Tabriz, dated 950 (1543–44) (see appendix, no. 5). Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, SP 1919, fol. 2r. (Photo: courtesy of the Bibliothèque nationale de France)

Fig. 18. Flyleaf with a type A Bijapuri notation dated 11 Rajab 1029 (June 12, 1620) and the word *nawras*. Folio from a *Laylā va Majnūn* of Hatifi, copied by Shah Mahmud Nishapuri, Herat, dated 969 (1561–62) (see appendix, no. 9). St. Petersburg, The State Hermitage Museum, VR-995, fol. 1r. (Photo: © The State Hermitage Museum. Photo by Vladimir Terebenin)

final component of the ex libris is the phrase *kitābkhāna-i ḥudūr*, which is inverted on a diagonal to the upper left of the seal (sometimes overlapping the impression, as in fig. 16). Read in conjunction with the seal, it can be preliminarily interpreted as “library in the presence of [Ibrahim],” in other words, a privy library.

The titlature outlined above presents an important Persian counterpart to the locally inspired Hindi title, *Jagat Gurū*, by which Ibrahim is most commonly known. The term *‘ālampanāh* was a popular *laqāb* (epithet, title) also employed at the contemporary Safavid, Mughal, and Ottoman courts.¹⁰¹ Similarly, the honorifics *ashraf*, *aqdas*, *a‘lā*, *arfa‘*, and *humāyūn* reflect global trends in Persian titlature from the Timurid to Ottoman courts and beyond, and, in the case of Shah ‘Abbas, were often combined with *‘ālampanāh*.¹⁰² Used at the onset of Ibrahim’s reign, this titlature placed him on equal footing with contemporary Islamic sovereigns while perhaps serving as yet another level of symbolic affinity with Iran specifically.¹⁰³

The first scribal notation (type A) is associated with the royal library (*kitābkhāna-i ‘āmira*), ranges from two to nine lines (often in the shape of an inverted triangle, as in fig. 17), and may have been written by a variety of hands (compare the precision of fig. 17 to the sloppiness of fig. 18). In addition to describing the book’s physical appearance (script, binding, rulings, paper), it can record its provenance (*bābat* [estate] and/or *pīshkash* [gift]), the date it entered the royal library, the presence of a particular seal (Ibrahim’s *nawras* or Koranic examples, or that of a different owner),¹⁰⁴ and, less frequently, its ranking (*avval*, *duvvum*, *sivum*) and/or presence in a subcollection. The second notation (type B) is an *‘arzdida* (inspection notice) typically dated 1003 (1594–95) or 1014 (1605–6) (figs. 13 and 14). The third (type C) is a monetary valuation sometimes rendered in *raqam*, an accountant’s system of numerical symbols, which is rare in the known corpus (fig. 14).¹⁰⁵ The fourth and final notation (type D) comprises two to five lines of fine *nasta‘liq* written by a single librarian who appears to have subsequently worked for Ibrahim’s successor, Muhammad (r. 1627–56) (see the date of 1037 [1628] in fig. 4).¹⁰⁶ Its simplest form records Ibrahim’s titlature and possession of a “special” book (fig. 21), while its longer iteration repeats information in the type A and

offers critical updates. The type D in Ibrahim’s *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā* (appendix, no. 5), for example, reiterates portions of the now-cropped type A on the subsequent folio (see fig. 17) while adding two lines about a refurbishment: “Newly bound with yellow lining and red binding.”¹⁰⁷

Bijapur’s libraries

The marks of ownership summarized above reveal that Ibrahim’s books were preserved in at least two, and probably three, repositories. The main distinction appears to have been between Bijapur’s royal library (*kitābkhāna-i ‘āmira*) and Ibrahim’s wardrobe (*jāmadārkhāna*). The precise location of the royal library is unknown, but we can assume that it was the source of the 2,000 volumes, some with paintings “entirely the work of masters,” that Ibrahim presented to Akbar in 1604.¹⁰⁸ As for the *jāmadārkhāna*, we can presume a smaller collection and a greater degree of physical proximity to the ruler (within his palace?). Upon entry into the *jāmadārkhāna*, many books were decorated with the illuminated ex libris and impressed with the *nawras* seal.¹⁰⁹ Some were subsequently transferred to the *kitābkhāna-i ‘āmira*, as documented in type A and/or type D notations. A large-scale relocation of books seems to have occurred in 1615, on the eve of Ibrahim’s final decade of rule. Other transfers took place after his death in 1627 (see fig. 4, where the type D notation is dated 1037 [1628]).

One particular first-class fifteenth-century manuscript—Glosses by the Timurid scholar Sayyid Sharif Jurjani (d. 1413) on the commentary by Qutb al-Din al-Tahtani al-Razi (d. 1364) on the *Maṭālī‘ al-Anwār* (Rising of Lights) of Siraj al-Din Mahmud Urmawi (d. 1283)¹¹⁰—bears three dated ownership marks spanning three decades that support the hypotheses above. The earliest is Ibrahim’s illuminated ex libris with the following stacked inscription in blue (fig. 5):

Glosses (*hāshiya*) of Mir Sayyid Sharif on the commentary (*sharḥ*) of Qutbi on the *Maṭālī‘ al-Anwār* of Urmawi, completed in logic. In *shikasta* script. Annotated (*muhashshā*) with the [?] *nawras* seal (*sikka*) [indeed visible on fol. 3v] of the Refuge of the World (*‘Ālampanāh*), may God perpetuate his kingdom. Gift (*pīshkash*) of Mir Zahid, on the twenty-first of Dhu’l Hijja, year 994 [December 2, 1586].¹¹¹

The second is a type B notation (*‘arz̄dīda*) written next to the ex libris and dated 8 Rabi‘ I 1003 (November 21, 1594). The third and final mark is a nine-line type A notation in the inverted triangle format on the previous folio (fol. 2r). It confirms the book’s earlier presence in the *jāmadārkhāna*, where it presumably received the illuminated ex libris and *nawras* seal, and its accession into the *kitābkhāna-i ‘āmira* on 5 Rajab 1024 (July 31, 1615).¹¹² This transfer took place with the permission of the keeper of the wardrobe (*bi parvānigī-i jāmadārkhān*) and was carried out by one Farrukh Aqa, presumably a young page (*khursāla*) in Ibrahim’s entourage.

Since most of the *jāmadārkhāna* books are of average quality in aesthetic terms, this repository may have been a mundane functional collection, a source of canonical books of the “textbook” sort that Ibrahim would have consulted regularly as part of his intellectual syllabus. The inclusion of the phrase *kitābkhāna-i ḥuḍūr* in the ruler’s Koranic seal ex libris suggests that an additional, more luxurious collection was also kept in his immediate presence. The value of the *kitābkhāna-i ḥuḍūr* volumes likely explains their physical separation from the more routine *jāmadārkhāna* ones.

The Paris *Majālis al-‘Ushshāq* (Assemblies of Lovers) (appendix, no. 3)—including a double-page illumination signed by Jalal al-Din Baghnavi (fols. 3v–4r) and seventy-five paintings attributable to Shiraz circa 1580—supports these preliminary conclusions.¹¹³ In addition to the Koranic seal ex libris (with the standard phrase *kitābkhāna-i ḥuḍūr*), it includes a type C notation recording its value as 1,555 rupees (fig. 14).¹¹⁴ This high valuation suggests that the Paris *Majālis* was especially esteemed and therefore suitable for the *kitābkhāna-i ḥuḍūr*.¹¹⁵ The volume traveled fairly quickly from its place of production (Shiraz) to Bijapur, as attested by its type B notation (*‘arz̄dīda*) dated 22 Ramadan 1014 (January 31, 1606) (fig. 14). It may have been a treasured gift to Ibrahim from one of Bijapur’s leading Shirazi émigrés (Shah Navaz Khan?). Alternatively, it could have come directly from a Shirazi atelier of the type known to have supplied the Ottoman court.¹¹⁶

The recently identified *Laylā va Majnūn* (appendix, no. 9) copied by the famed Shah Mahmud Nishapuri in Herat further complicates our understanding of Bijapur’s library collections.¹¹⁷ According to its type A nota-

tion (see fig. 18), it entered the royal library (*kitābkhāna-i ma‘mūra*) on 11 Rajab 1029 (June 12, 1620) from the *ḥuḍūr nawras* (*bābat-i ḥuḍūr nawras*). The notation further records that it was impressed with the *nawras* seal, and the word *nawras* is written prominently on the upper edge of the same folio (fig. 18).¹¹⁸ This volume therefore reveals that both the *nawras* and Koranic seals were used to impress luxury manuscripts kept in Ibrahim’s presence (*ḥuḍūr*). Was the *ḥuḍūr nawras* a subcollection within the *kitābkhāna-i ḥuḍūr*? Why were some luxury manuscripts associated with *nawras* (vis-à-vis the seal and word itself), while others were marked with the Koranic seal or Koranic seal ex libris?¹¹⁹ Finally, why were no volumes impressed with the latter seal present in the Asar Mahal at the time of the British discovery in 1853? At present, we can only speculate while acknowledging the existence of a sophisticated library administration and a collection of books divided among several repositories depending on rank, value, and probable use.

Value, reception, and refurbishment

The application of Ibrahim’s Koranic seal presents an opportunity to explore further the reception and valuation of certain books in his collection. Two of the ruler’s finest manuscripts were marked with multiple impressions of this seal. His *Dīvān* of Jami copied by Shah Muhammad al-Katib al-Shirazi and dated 971 and 972 (1563–65) features nineteen such impressions (appendix, no. 1).¹²⁰ The first appears on the opening flyleaf (fol. 1r) above a largely effaced type A notation in the inverted triangle format.¹²¹ The remaining eighteen are located in the borders of all but one of the book’s nineteen illustrated folios (fig. 19). In a few instances, they slightly overlap the rulings and picture plane.

The second example of multiple seal impressions occurs in Ibrahim’s *Dīvān* of al-Hadira (Qutba b. Aws) dated 629 (1231–32) (appendix, no. 13).¹²² Here the number of impressions is far less (just two), but their placement speaks volumes. The first appears in the border of the incipit page (opening page of text) next to the bismillah (fig. 20), and the second in the border adjacent to the colophon reading “end of the poetry of al-Hadira ... written by Yaqut al-Musta‘simi” (fol. 36v). The great

Fig. 19. Illustrated folio with the Koranic seal of Ibrahim II. Opening from a *Dīvān* of Jami, copied by Shah Muhammad al-Katib al-Shirazi, probably Shiraz, dated 971 and 972 (1563–65) (see appendix, no. 1). Doha, Museum of Islamic Art, Ms. 260, fols. 77v–78r. (Photo: Keelan Overton)

‘Abbasid calligrapher Yaqut (d. 1298) was widely eulogized in Persian poetry at Ibrahim’s court,¹²³ and the presumption of his hand likely explains the two seal impressions bookmarking the text.¹²⁴ The manuscript’s high value is further confirmed by the two-line type D notation appearing at the top of the title page: “Special book of the blessed, most noble, most holy, most high, Ibrahim ‘Adilshah” (fig. 21).¹²⁵

In possessing a volume thought to be the work of Yaqut, Ibrahim found himself on equal footing with its previous bibliophile owners, who also left their marks on the title page (fig. 21). A signed reader’s note

written diagonally across the lower edge suggests that the manuscript circulated at the early Timurid court.¹²⁶ Two royal seals in the middle of the folio—the circular one belonging to Rustam b. Maqsud (r. 1493–97) and the niche-shaped one to a descendant of Ya‘qub (r. 1478–90)—confirm its subsequent presence in Aqqoyunlu Tabriz.¹²⁷ Thereafter, the book migrated southeast to Safavid Qazvin, as documented by the seal of Isma‘il II (r. 1576–78) on the previous folio.¹²⁸ The latter court of tenure reveals that the volume likely entered Bijapur (and India in general) for the first time during Ibrahim’s reign (beginning 1580), presumably via the hands of an

Fig. 20. Incipit page with the Koranic seal of Ibrahim II. Folio from a *Dīwān* of al-Hadira (Qutba b. Aws), said to be copied by Yaqut al-Musta'simi, dated 629 (1231–32) (see appendix, no. 13). Rampur, The Raza Library, 5207, fol. 4v. (Photo: courtesy of The Raza Library)

Iranian immigrant previously engaged at the Safavid court.

Like the adoption of titulature echoing that of Shah 'Abbas, the use of multiple seal impressions may have been part of a larger cultural effort to align Bijapur symbolically with Iran. The excessive impressions of Shah 'Abbas's 1017 (1608–9) Ardabil waqf seal are well known. Well over half of the twenty-nine illustrated folios in Ibrahim Mirza's *Haft Awrang* (Seven Thrones) of Jami dated 963–72 (1556–65) were stamped with this seal,¹²⁹ and the same can be said for five of the eight illustrated folios in the *Manṭiq al-Ṭayr* (Language of the Birds) dated 892 (1487).¹³⁰ In the Deccan, redundant seal impressions also appear in the Qutb Shahi context, as attested by the seal of Muhammad Qutb Shah (r. 1612–26) on each of the five illuminated title pages in the renowned Timurid *Khamsa* of Nizami dated 835 (1431–32).¹³¹ Considered together, these Safavid, 'Adil Shahi, and Qutb

←

Fig. 21. Title page with a type D Bijapuri notation and various Aqqoyunlu and Timurid (?) seals and notations. Folio from a *Dīwān* of al-Hadira (Qutba b. Aws), said to be copied by Yaqut al-Musta'simi, dated 629 (1231–32) (see appendix, no. 13). Rampur, The Raza Library, 5207, fol. 3v. (From W. H. Siddiqi, *Raza Library: Monograph* [Rampur, U.P.: Rampur Raza Library, 1998], pl. 7)

Shahi practices sharply contrast with contemporary Mughal ones. Although the seals of Jahangir's librarians and disciples appear frequently in his manuscripts, the emperor's seal was used rather sparingly, and he preferred to compose his own lengthy inscriptions on fly-leaves, illuminated frontispieces, and/or colophons.¹³² Given that Ibrahim spent the majority of his reign thwarting threats from the Mughals and the Abyssinian military leader Malik 'Ambar (d. 1626), it can be tempting to suggest that his incessant seal impressions were symptomatic of both value and fear, the latter paralleling Safavid anxieties.¹³³ Although the Doha *Dīwān* and Rampur *Dīwān* seem to have evaded confiscation, some (many?) of Ibrahim's books were accessioned into the Mughal library upon, or shortly after, the conquest of Bijapur in 1686 (appendix, nos. 5, 8–10).

A final mark of ownership closely related to Ibrahim's Koranic seal is found not on the pages of his books but rather on their bindings, many of which were likely practical refurbishments in the Bijapuri workshop (the binding taking the brunt of a codex's damage and often requiring replacement).¹³⁴ The mark in question is a large (height: 95 mm), diamond-shaped medallion (likely *turanj* in contemporary usage) with scalloped edges that frames an inner circle with stacked *thuluth* inscriptions in four registers on a spiral ground (fig. 22). This central epigraphic portion is immediately recognizable as a replica of Ibrahim's Koranic seal (see fig. 10), albeit slightly larger (diameter: 47 mm versus 41 mm).¹³⁵ We can presume that the original seal and stamp matrices—the first for impression on paper, the second for pressing into leather, and not to be confused as a single object—were produced by the same designer/engraver/workshop, whose style can in turn be associated with contemporary examples of Bijapuri metalwork (see fig. 11).¹³⁶ To date, a comparable phenomenon of a royal seal refashioned as a binding stamp, with *minimal* alteration to the seal's epigraphic design, has not been identified.¹³⁷

Ibrahim's "scalloped seal stamp," as I prefer to call it, has hitherto been identified on only one binding: the example sheathing the Koran transcribed by Muhammad Mu'min b. 'Abdullah Murvarid (appendix, no. 12).¹³⁸ This important manuscript is well recognized by both Islamicists and South Asianists as

the only known Koran ostensibly copied for Abu Sa'īd (r. 1458–69) and later owned by Tipu Sultan of Mysore (r. 1782–99).¹³⁹ The stamp is not visible on the binding's covers (fig. 23), whose eclectic central panel combines the favored geometry of Timurid Herati illumination¹⁴⁰ with Safavid-style floral embellishment, the latter carrying over into the twelve stamps of the outer border (four cornerpieces [*kunjī*] and eight cartouches [*katiba*]).¹⁴¹ Instead, it is found in the center of each doublure (fig. 24), where it is framed by two small pendants (*turanj va sar turanj* or *turanj va barg*, as in appendix, no. 16) and four corner pieces, a typical arrangement.

Thanks to their protected internal placement, the two stamp impressions are in excellent condition. Every detail remains in sharp relief, including the fine spiral ground familiar from the original seal and the bold floral scroll of the "new" scalloped frame, replete with cleverly placed curves. In addition to implying the sophistication of Bijapuri metallurgy and bookbinding, the stamps break a 350-year silence (ca. 1440–1790) in the Koran's biography, illuminate an earlier sojourn on the subcontinent (its first?), and confirm that volumes of the highest pedigree made their way to Ibrahim's Bijapur.¹⁴² The latter underscores the city's cultural and commercial centrality despite its physical location in a region deemed peripheral (at least in contrast to the Mughal, Ottoman, and Safavid "centers").

The decision to commemorate Ibrahim's possession of this esteemed Koran on the *inside* of its new Bijapuri binding was anything but standard. When ownership is recorded on a binding, it generally takes the form of an elongated horizontal stamp on the *exterior* of the fore-edge flap or spine.¹⁴³ Moreover, such inscriptions name the owner in explicit terms, rather than Koranic allusion, and begin with the common *ex libris* phrase *bi-rasm-i kitābkhāna-i* (or a variant thereof).¹⁴⁴ At present, the closest parallel to the St Andrews binding (more specifically, its doublures) can be found in a Koran made for the Mamluk sultan Qansuh al-Ghawri (r. 1501–16) while he was still amir.¹⁴⁵ The composition of the Mamluk doublures is familiar—a large medallion framed by axial pendants—and the epigraphic commemoration again appears in the central element. In this instance, however, the owner/amir is named in the conventional terms described above (*bi-rasm-i khizāna-i*), the inscrip-

tion is continuous between the front and back doublures (instead of being repeated), and the technique in question is gilded filigree (rather than a gold-blocked stamp).

Although Ibrahim's scalloped seal stamp remains a confounding unicum—What explains the cross-fertilization with the royal seal? Who developed this “dual-purposing”? Were there any precedents?—it nonetheless magnifies the incessant seriality, and hence significance, of the Koranic verse in question (2:130). This verse was not only selected for a prominent tympanum of Ibrahim's tomb (fig. 12), but was also cast as his royal seal (fig. 10), and that circular form was in turn elevated to an *ex libris* (figs. 14–16) and replicated as the central portion of a laborious binding stamp (fig. 22). These visual variations of a single verse—in stone, metal, paper, and leather—leave open the question of additional iterations, perhaps including a metal dish of the standard type (fig. 11). For the moment, we are left with a poignant and pervasive verbal portrait of Ibrahim as a *hanīf* on the pure path, one that stands in sharp contrast to his figural image as a syncretic seeker (as perpetuated in “masterpiece” paintings such as figs. 1 and 2).

There can be little doubt that the metal binding stamp—an outstanding work of art in its own right—was used to mark and beautify other books in Ibrahim's possession, and the future discovery of additional volumes will yield exciting results.¹⁴⁶ Moving forward, the sole known application in the St Andrews Koran provides a concretely Bijapuri point of reference for the study of “Deccani” metalwork (fig. 11),¹⁴⁷ while underscoring that we have hardly scratched the surface of understanding the Bijapuri codex in holistic terms. For this reason, we must be wary of attributions of the type recently applied to the *Khamsa* transcribed by Khalilullah in Bijapur (see page 94)—“The manuscript's extremely fine Safavid binding indicates that the manuscript made its way [from Bijapur] to the Safavid court in Isfahan”¹⁴⁸—which presumes that style is fixed in place, rather than potentially in the hand of the maker. In the interconnected Perso-Deccani context in question, the *Khamsa*'s *Safavid-style* (not necessarily Safavid) binding could have been made in Bijapur by an Iranian immigrant operating in a conservative Persianate mode, much like the painter Farrukh Husayn, as we

shall see.¹⁴⁹ It was perhaps vis-à-vis such an Iranian émigré that the St Andrews Koran and other esteemed books arrived in Bijapur in the first place, and that suggestion leads us to the question of how the city's collections were built.

Building collections: Gharībān contributions

In contrast to the genial nature of Mughal collecting, wherein a new ruler absorbed the library of his predecessor/father and genealogical seals were common, ‘Adil Shahi collecting appears to have been more of an individual, rather than dynastic, enterprise.¹⁵⁰ Only a handful of manuscripts in Ibrahim's known collection were previously owned by his predecessor and father, ‘Ali I (r. 1558–80), or subsequently acquired by his successors (Muhammad, r. 1627–56; ‘Ali II, r. 1656–72).¹⁵¹ The former circumstance raises questions about how, where, and from whom Ibrahim obtained his books. The extant scribal notations reveal that, with the exception of volumes acquired during military conflict (especially the conquest of Muhammadabad/Bidar in 1619), the majority were gifts from individuals or their estates. The notations therefore function as a veritable “Who's Who” of Bijapur's courtly culture, particularly its Iranian contingent.

Given Zuhuri and Malik Qummi's praise of Shah Navaz Khan's literary knowledge and other sources' insistence that the prime minister played an instrumental role in Ibrahim's linguistic and literary education, it is not surprising that this illustrious immigrant had a significant impact on Bijapur's libraries.¹⁵² In 1617, Shah Navaz Khan's son (*farzand*) presented at least thirteen books as gifts (*pīshkash*) to the *kitābkhāna-i ‘āmira*, a process at times overseen by one Salim Khan.¹⁵³ We can presume that Shah Navaz Khan himself had acquired many of these volumes in Iran and, more specifically, in Shiraz. A few are impressed with the prime minister's seal,¹⁵⁴ the majority belong to the Shiraz school of philosophy,¹⁵⁵ and some were copied in the city and/or associated with its rulers. Examples include a first-class sixteenth-century manuscript of Davani's gloss on the commentary by ‘Ala al-Din Qushji (d. 1470) on the *Tajrīd al-Kalām* (Abstract of Theology) of Nasir al-Din Tusi (d. 1274), with Davani's preface dedicated to the Aqqoyun-

Fig. 22. Impression of the scalloped seal binding stamp of Ibrahim II (dimensions: H: 95 mm). Detail from the front doublure (fig. 24) of the Bijapuri binding, ca. 1580–1627, of the Koran copied by Muhammad Mu'min b. 'Abdullah Murvarid (see appendix, no. 12). University of St Andrews Library, Ms. 19 O. (Photo: courtesy of the University of St Andrews Library)

Fig. 23. Front cover of the Bijapuri binding, ca. 1580–1627, of the St Andrews Koran (see appendix, no. 12). University of St Andrews Library, Ms. 19 O. (Photo: courtesy of the University of St Andrews Library)

Fig. 24. Front doublure of the Bijapuri binding, ca. 1580–1627, of the St Andrews Koran (see appendix, no. 12). Each doublure features an impression of the scalloped seal stamp of Ibrahim II (fig. 22). University of St Andrews Library, Ms. 19 O. (Photo: courtesy of the University of St Andrews Library)

lu ruler Sultan Khalil (r. 1478), who was earlier the governor of Shiraz (1471–78),¹⁵⁶ a late sixteenth-century Shirazi copy of Davani's gloss on the *Tahdhīb al-Manṭiq wa'l-Kalām* (Manual of Logic and Theology) of Sa'd al-Din Taftazani (d. 1389);¹⁵⁷ a volume dated 3 Rabi' II 984 (June 30, 1576) of Jurjani's gloss on the commentary by Qutb al-Din al-Razi on the *Maṭālī' al-Anwār* of Urmawi;¹⁵⁸ and a second-class copy of the supergloss by Sayyid 'Ali (d. 1455) on the preceding glosses of Jurjani.¹⁵⁹ The Shah Navaz Khan group also included one book with an illustrious Deccani provenance: a manuscript dated 4 Rabi' I 824 (March 8, 1421) of the commentary by Muhammad b. Abi Bakir al-Damamini (d. 1424) on the

Mughnī al-Labīb (a compendium of Arabic grammar) of Ibn Hisham (d. 1360) impressed with two seals of Bidar's famous merchant-turned-statesman Mahmud Gavan (d. 1481).¹⁶⁰

In addition to Shah Navaz Khan, the names that appear frequently as donors in the scribal notations include Mir Muhammad Tahir Mousavi, Mir Muhammad Amin, Rustam Khan, Mulla Payanda, Shaykh 'Alam Allah, and Shah Abu'l Hasan. While the identities of these individuals remain to be unraveled, the final name likely referred to Shah Abu'l Hasan Qadiri (d. 1635), a "reformer" Sufi who arrived in Bijapur during the first year of Ibrahim's reign (1580) and has been credited with per-

suading the ruler to revert to orthodox Islam.¹⁶¹ According to the type A notation in a mid-fifteenth-century copy of the commentary by Shams al-Din Mahmud Isfahani (d. 1345) on the *Tawālīʿ al-Anwār* of ʿAbdullah b. ʿUmar Baydavi (d. 1286),¹⁶² the saint appears to have presented the book to the *jāmadārkhāna* no later than 4 Rajab 1003 (March 15, 1595), the date recorded in a type B notation (*ʿarzdāda*) immediately below. The volume was assigned a first-class valuation, impressed with Ibrahim’s *nawras* seal (as described in the type A notation), and adorned with the ruler’s illuminated ex libris in the form of a large red *shamsa* (the inscription was never completed).¹⁶³ By the order of the *jāmadārkhān*, the codex was subsequently transferred to the *kitābkhāna-i maʿmūra* on 2 Ramadan 1024 (September 25, 1615), an event that seems to have signaled the composition of the type A notation.

That this volume was a gift from the Qadiri reformist saint in question, rather than some other Shah Abuʿl Hasan, is reinforced by its provenance, which in turn illuminates networks of taste, collecting, and knowledge within the Deccan’s *gharībān* circles. According to its colophon, the manuscript was transcribed by Jaʿfar b. Jaʿfar al-Riza al-Urayzi al-Husayni on 30 Rabiʿ I 861 (February 25, 1457) for Shah Habib al-Din Muhibullah (d. ca. 1506), a member of the Niʿmatullahi Sufi family based in Bidar.¹⁶⁴ In the early fifteenth century, Ahmad I Bahmani of Bidar (r. 1422–36) invited Shah Niʿmatullah Vali of Kirman (d. 1431), the spiritual head of the order, to relocate to the Deccan.¹⁶⁵ The shaykh declined, sending his grandson Nurallah (d. ca. 1430) in his stead, and his son Shah Khalilullah (d. ca. 1442–54) eventually led a second migration (arriving some time before 1435).¹⁶⁶ One of Shah Khalilullah’s sons, Shah Muhibullah (for whom the volume in question was copied and whose seal appears on the flyleaf discussed above), married the daughter of ʿAlauddin Ahmad II (r. 1436–58), became Bidar’s most prominent religious figure, and received statesmen such as Mahmud Gavan at his feet.¹⁶⁷ The link between Shah Muhibullah of mid-fifteenth-century Bidar and Abuʿl Hasan of late sixteenth-century Bijapur is that the latter’s family had also migrated to Bidar (in this case, from Baghdad) during the Bahmani period.¹⁶⁸ In fact, it was a combination of Niʿmatullahis from Mahan/Kirman/Taft, Qadiris from Baghdad, and other émi-

gré families that contributed to Bidar’s rapid rise as a “pan-Islamic” Qadiri center in the fifteenth century.¹⁶⁹ It is therefore not surprising that a manuscript owned by a leading Niʿmatullahi shaykh of Bahmani Bidar would have been acquired by a prominent Qadiri saint of ʿAdil Shahi Bijapur a century later.

Books with illustrious Bahmani provenances also entered the Bijapur library in a different manner, namely, as war booty from the conquest of Bidar in 1619. At least three such codices—a mid-fifteenth century copy of the first half of the *Hidāya* (Guidance) of Burhan al-Din Marghinani (d. 1196), a commentary on his own *Bidāyat al-Mubtadī* on Hanafite law;¹⁷⁰ an anthology including Taftazani, transcribed by one of his pupils;¹⁷¹ and a fifteenth-century manuscript of the *Tāj al-Maṣādir* (Crown of Sources), a dictionary of Arabic infinitives, by Abu Jaʿfar Bayhaqi (Bu Jaʿfarak; d. 1150)¹⁷²—were previously in the possession of Mahmud Gavan, as confirmed by his double-ruled, circular seal.¹⁷³

The current corpus of approximately seventy volumes associated with Ibrahim and/or Bijapur’s royal library during his reign allows us to draw some broad conclusions about book culture and intellectualism in the Deccani city. First, Bijapuri collecting patterns were deeply informed by transregional precedents and tastes. During the Bahmani period, which witnessed the initial influx of many Iranian immigrants to the Deccan, the stage was set for the long-term appreciation of prominent Timurid and Turkmen thinkers.¹⁷⁴ The Khurasani polymath Taftazani was the teacher of Mir Fazlullah Inju, the prime minister of Firuz Shah Bahmani (r. 1397–1422), and Davani of Shiraz dedicated his *Shawākil al-Hūr* (The Houri’s Haunches) to Mahmud Gavan. Second, Bijapur’s royal library was far from a provincial backwater but rather a vibrant, cosmopolitan institution. As in the Bahmani period, this reality was in large part conditioned by peripatetic *gharībān*, whether those residing in Bijapur (and some associated with Ibrahim’s inner circle) or passing through temporarily (as ambassadors, military officials, merchants, artists, or poets). These “foreigners” physically transmitted the canonical texts of Arabic and Persian literature to Bijapur, and the result was a courtly culture poised to participate in knowledge systems prevalent at the major Islamic courts of the day (Mughal, Safavid, and Ottoman).¹⁷⁵

The degree to which this *gharībān*-dominated book culture can be linked to Ibrahim specifically remains to be determined. The large number of Sufi texts, including the *Majālis al-Ushshāq*, could be indicative of the ruler's mystical inclinations; alternatively, they could simply reflect widespread popularity. In some cases, the marks of ownership do seem to communicate a more precise, and perhaps intimate, relationship between Ibrahim and his collection. Consider, for example, the volumes preserved in the *kitābkhāna-i huḍūr* (appendix, nos. 3, 6, 8) or *jāmadārkhāna* (wardrobe) (appendix, no. 15), described as *khāṣṣ* (special, outstanding) (appendix, nos. 4, 10, 13), bearing multiple seal impressions implying high worth and associated paranoia (appendix, nos. 1, 13), and sheathed in bindings with the scalloped seal stamp (appendix, no. 12). As a whole, Ibrahim's book collection likely served two purposes for him personally: to contribute universality, depth, and discipline to his daily intellectual syllabus,¹⁷⁶ one that was influenced by learned *gharībān* such as Shah Navaz Khan and Shah Abu'l Hasan, and to position him as a monarch who participated in a chief prerogative of Perso-Islamic kingship, that is, the formation of a coveted and comprehensive library.

This consideration of Ibrahim's book collection has thrown into sharp relief the ruler's cultural fluency and mutability. Nominally a Hanafi Sunni, Ibrahim surrounded himself with notable Shi'i Iranian émigrés, intervened on behalf of Shi'i causes,¹⁷⁷ employed a *Nād-i 'Alīyyān* seal,¹⁷⁸ and issued coinage with the simultaneous legends *Ghulām-i Murtaẓā 'Alī* and *Ibrāhīm Ablā Balī* (Hindi, "Strength of the Weak") (fig. 25). As *Ablā Balī* and *Jagat Gurū*, Ibrahim excelled in creative endeavors of a personal and Deccan-centric kind, as exemplified by his *Kitāb-i Nawras* and trifold devotion to the Prophet Muhammad, Saraswati, and Gesu Daraz. As *'Ālampanāh*, *Ghulām-i Murtaẓā 'Alī*, and *Khalilullah* (the title held by his namesake), he participated in the universal paradigms of Islamic kingship and, in this capacity, was also cast as a repentant *hanīf* (recall his Koranic seal and its mutations; see figs. 10, 12, 14–16, 22). These multifarious identities were not rigid binaries but rather complementary and *strategic* conversations. Indeed, Ibrahim's (and his court's) skills of reconciliation and inclusivity must have played a central role in securing his kingship

Fig. 25. Copper coins of Ibrahim II (legends: *Ghulām-i Murtaẓā 'Alī* [obverse] and *Ibrāhīm Ablā Balī* [reverse]). (Diagram: courtesy of Klaus Rötzer)

for nearly five decades (1580–1627), a phenomenon also equated with Akbar's longevity.

“SARASWATI ENTHRONED” (AS BILQIS):
FARRUKH HUSAYN'S TRANSLATION
OF THE SOLOMONIC METAPHOR

With an understanding of Perso-Islamic intellectual patterns in Ibrahim's Bijapur, we now turn to the question of how such systems may have impacted its painting ateliers. Perhaps the most effective way to map this relationship is through an actual immigrant, Farrukh Husayn, the artist singled out for praise in the *Khān-i Khalīl*.

At stake are the following questions: To what degree did a Khurasan-trained painter integrate Persian conventions into his Deccani repertoire? How did he negotiate his personal itinerant experience with the local paradigms espoused by Ibrahim? Finally, did his Bijapuri production in any way complement the Perso-Islamic knowledge systems outlined above?

During his decade-long tenure in Bijapur (ca. 1595–1609), Farrukh painted at least five album portraits of Ibrahim and two manuscript illustrations. Four of these paintings—“Saraswati enthroned” (fig. 1), “Ibrahim playing the tambur” (fig. 2), and two portraits of the ruler riding an elephant¹⁷⁹—appear fundamentally

rooted in *Kitāb-i Nawras* iconography. The remaining three—“Ibrahim hawking” (St. Petersburg), “Ibrahim offering obeisance to Jahangir” (fig. 3), and “Abu’l Ghays al-Yamani and the lion” (fig. 26)¹⁸⁰—immediately strike the viewer as conservatively Persian in both style and content.

The painting that initially seems the most indebted to the *Kitāb-i Nawras* and Deccani context—“Saraswati enthroned” (see fig. 1)—is in fact a brilliant exercise of visual translation and hence facilitates the exploration of Bijapuri art in light of the complementary (local/translocal) conversations called for above.¹⁸¹ To depict the foreign (to him) subject of a Hindu goddess, Farrukh

Fig. 26. “Abu’l Ghays al-Yamani and the lion” (“Sufis/Saints in a landscape”), attributed to Farrukh Husayn, probably Bijapur, ca. 1595–1609. St. Petersburg, National Library of Russia, Dorn 489, fol. 24v. (Photo: courtesy of the National Library of Russia)

relied heavily on Ibrahim's book of songs, wherein Saraswati has four arms, wears a white dress, and sits on a throne (song 53). The *Kitāb-i Nawras* was also sourced for the verses in *nasta'liq* that appear just beneath the arch (song 56: "Ibrahim whose father is guru Ganapati [Ganesh], and mother the pure Saraswati").¹⁸² Additional details of local dress and accoutrement—striped gold *patkas* (sashes), large necklace pendants (known as *urbasi*), thick arm bracelets—contribute a Bijapuri spirit to the scene.

Upon sustained inspection of the painting, however, one increasingly exits the Bijapuri sphere of the patron and enters the peripatetic referents of its Iranian artist. The composition is neither a "fantastic" nor "dreamlike" landscape (of the type unilaterally associated with Deccani painting), nor is it populated with the naturalistic elements favored by the Bijapuri painter 'Ali Riza.¹⁸³ Apart from a handful of album paintings and manuscript illustrations from the *Pem Nem*, "Saraswati enthroned" is one of the few Ibrahim-era compositions framed by an architectural backdrop (landscapes being preferred, at least in the current known corpus). Whereas the palatial settings in the *Pem Nem* are conspicuously Bijapuri (low-springing ogee arches, bulbous domes on lotus-petal bases, projecting eaves and balconies),¹⁸⁴ the arrangement in "Saraswati enthroned" is resolutely Persianate. The architectural backdrop recalls Farrukh's earlier manuscript illustrations (especially "Babur receives a courtier," fig. 27,¹⁸⁵ and "The Prophet's bier"¹⁸⁶) but is aggressively condensed into three zones: a foreground garden with a fountain outlined in burgundy and rendered parallel to the picture plane; a large arch suggestive of a deep iwan; and the rear wall of the palace. Saraswati sits on a magnificent throne adjacent to the fountain (note the throne's similar placement in fig. 27), a peacock strolls by, and an attendant approaches with a bejeweled ostrich egg vessel. The spandrels of the arch feature swans amid Chinese-style clouds, and the rear wall includes, from bottom to top, a dado of brickwork, an unadorned white zone, the aforementioned *Kitāb-i Nawras* verses, and a mural painting of Ibrahim riding an elephant. The lower zones of the wall are punctuated by a door leading to an exterior green space, yet another one of Farrukh's favorite tropes (see fig. 27, where the white wall is embel-

lished with tinted drawings of the type seen on the vases in "Saraswati enthroned").

Like the formulaic Persian-style composition, additional details in "Saraswati enthroned" stand out as disconnected from Bijapuri iconography and the *Kitāb-i Nawras*.¹⁸⁷ The sizable gold throne with a high scalloped back is at odds with the low-lying *takht* (lit. "throne") ubiquitous in Deccani painting,¹⁸⁸ and the prominent *parīs* shading the goddess with a gold brocade are a curious addition.¹⁸⁹ The latter winged creatures provide the most conspicuous clue for understanding Farrukh's masterful recasting of his Hindu-Deccani subject into more familiar terms. The iconography of *parīs* shading an enthroned figure (with their wings or other items) immediately recalls Solomonic imagery. In his *Qīṣaṣ al-Anbiyā'* (Tales of the Prophets), Abu Ishaq Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Tha'labi (d. 1035) describes Solomon's divan as protected by birds who shade the sun and create shadows with their wings.¹⁹⁰ Such textual accounts have led Priscilla Soucek to conclude, "The use of flying creatures who hover over the ruler's head is one of the most characteristic themes in Solomonic imagery."¹⁹¹ In "Saraswati enthroned," three sets of winged creatures (parakeets, *parīs*, cranes) constitute a veritable "living baldachin" above the goddess.¹⁹² The parakeets, in particular, recall the bejeweled pigeons perched on Solomon's throne who sang every hour.¹⁹³

The Solomonic allusions of "Saraswati enthroned" are confirmed by comparison with contemporary Shirazi painting, specifically, the illustrated frontispieces of Solomon and Bilqis enthroned in luxury manuscripts.¹⁹⁴ The architectural backdrop of the Bilqis painting in a *Shāhnāma* of circa 1580–85¹⁹⁵ closely parallels that of "Saraswati enthroned"; it, too, has a small fountain in the foreground and a door in the rear leading to a green exterior. Like Saraswati, Bilqis sits on an extravagant throne and faces left toward an approaching female attendant carrying a vessel, as a pair of *parīs* hover above (in this instance, they swoop down carrying gold vessels). Even more explicit parallels can be drawn between "Saraswati enthroned" and the Bilqis side of a *Khamṣa* frontispiece of circa 1580.¹⁹⁶ In both images, the wings of the *parīs* flanking the throne rise upward and nearly touch, thereby echoing the large arch above. In addition, both thrones feature a high scalloped back, vertical pan-

Fig. 27. “Babur receives a courtier,” attributed to Farrukh Beg (Farrukh Husayn), Kabul or Lahore, ca. 1580s. Folio from a *Bāburnāma*, Lahore, ca. 1589. Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.: Purchase—Smithsonian Unrestricted Trust Funds, Smithsonian Collections Acquisition Program, and Dr. Arthur M. Sackler, S1986.230.

els enclosing the figure and topped with finials, dangling fabric along the lower edge, and small steps.¹⁹⁷ In a related, yet earlier, Tabrizi drawing of Solomon’s ascension,¹⁹⁸ two *parīs* shade him with a piece of rectangular cloth in keeping with the brocade held above the goddess in “Saraswati enthroned.” In all of these Safavid examples, the *parīs* wear short-sleeve jackets on top of long robes, again of the type visible in the Bijapuri painting (with the addition of the Deccani *patka*).

The precise mechanics of Farrukh’s casting of Saraswati in Solomonian terms remain to be determined. Did the artist rely on an actual Shirazi model in one of Bijapur’s libraries? To date, a Shirazi depiction of Solomon and/or Bilqis enthroned has not been located in a Bijapuri repository,¹⁹⁹ but there is a high probability that such imagery existed in the city, especially given the prominence of Shirazis in elite society (Shah Navaz Khan, Rafi al-Din Shirazi) and the existence of illustrated

Shirazi manuscripts in the royal library (*Dīvān* of Jami, *Majālis al-Ushshāq*; appendix, nos. 1, 3, 4). Even if Farrukh did not have a direct model at his disposal in Bijapur—and that seems unlikely—others would have circulated nearby. Qutb Shahi Golconda was a vital center of Shiraz-inspired manuscript production, and at least three major Golconda manuscripts—a *Sinbadnāma* of circa 1575,²⁰⁰ a *Dīvān* of Muhammad Quli (r. 1580–1612),²⁰¹ and a *Falnāma* (Book of Omens) of circa 1610–30²⁰²—include paintings of Solomon and Bilqis enthroned. We can presume a high degree of cultural flow between Bijapur and Golconda during Farrukh's tenure, for Ibrahim and Muhammad Quli shared a fondness for Persian classics and ordered their best émigré poets (Malik Qummi, Zuhuri, Ruh al-Amin) to compose imitations of Nizami.²⁰³ Moreover, important paintings and manuscripts were exchanged between the two courts. Shortly after its creation in circa 1605, the most famous of Bijapur's yogini paintings was assembled into an album for Muhammad Quli,²⁰⁴ and at least one of Muhammad Quli's books—an anonymous commentary on the *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam* (Seals of Wisdom) of Ibn 'Arabi (d. 1240)²⁰⁵—entered Bijapur's royal library.

Farrukh also may have been prescient of Shirazi prototypes from his artistic training in Iran. Skelton has argued that the artist hailed from Shiraz and was perhaps raised in the household (under Mawlana Darvish Husayn) that hosted Zuhuri prior to the poet's departure for India (Skelton's next conclusion being that Zuhuri later lured Farrukh to Bijapur).²⁰⁶ That Farrukh was at least proficient in Shirazi models is suggested by his signature on the throne's steps in "Saraswati enthroned," which echoes the placement of 'Abd al-Jalal's in the Topkapı *Khamsa* frontispiece.²⁰⁷ Unlike 'Abd al-Jalal's simple *'amal* formula, however, Farrukh signed with the more extensive *ḥarrarahu* (?) *Farrukh Ḥusayn muṣavvir-i Ibrāhīm 'Adilshāhī* ([drawn by?] Farrukh Husayn the painter [in the service of] Ibrahim Adil Shah [II]).²⁰⁸ The *ḥarrarahu-muṣavvir* formula was common in late sixteenth-century Khurasani circles, and Farrukh had employed it about fifteen years earlier in his portrait, dated 992 (1584–85), of the ruler of Kabul, "Mirza Muhammad Hakim with Hajji Yaqut" (fig. 28).²⁰⁹

Farrukh's translation of the Solomonic metaphor in "Saraswati enthroned" was but one reflection of a Bija-

puri courtly culture steeped in such allusions. The dated inscription on the south side of the Ibrahim Rauza describes Ibrahim's wife Taj Sultan as "dignified like Zubayda and exalted like Bilqis," and the first four verses on the turban worn by the ruler in the Copenhagen *Bust Portrait of Ibrahim*²¹⁰ read: "He is Khalil / The celestial sphere has no pearl in the shell like you / Faridun and Jamshid have no offspring like you / Throne of Solomon [rest of inscription effaced]." ²¹¹ With the exception of the opening *huwa 'l khalil* (a common reference to Ibrahim via his namesake),²¹² these verses were extrapolated from the *Sāqīnāma* (Book of the Cupbearer) of Hafiz (d. 1392).²¹³ Of relevance here is the fact that the final words alluding to Solomon vis-à-vis his throne (*takht-i Sulaymān*) were deliberately changed from Hafiz's original reference to *Sikandār* (Alexander), thereby solidifying the Solomonic metaphor. Similar Solomonic language characterizes the poems in the *Sih Naṣr*. In *Nawras*, Ibrahim's castle is compared to that of Solomon, and the *Khān-i Khalīl* proclaims, "Just as the wind carried aloft the throne of Solomon [*takht-i Sulaymān*], so, also, the throne of his [Ibrahim's] fame is wafted on the shoulders of breath."²¹⁴ A less explicit Solomonic reference can be found in the central bath hall of Kumatgi, the aforementioned pleasure palace east of Bijapur. One of the building's ceiling paintings depicts alternating peacocks and *parīs*, the latter dressed in Persian garb (one with a topknot, one with a lobed Persian crown) and carrying a variety of vessels.²¹⁵ Such imagery held widespread Solomonic allusion in bath halls throughout the subcontinent.²¹⁶

Given the pervasiveness of the Solomonic archetype in Ibrahim's Bijapur,²¹⁷ the formal dependency of "Saraswati enthroned" on Shirazi prototypes, and the fact that such Persianate models were commonly composed in double format, we are left with a final important question: In its original codex, was "Saraswati enthroned" possibly the left-hand side of a double-page composition?²¹⁸ If so, did the right-hand folio depict a male counterpart cast in a Solomonic light, perhaps Ibrahim himself or the elephant god Ganapati (Ganesh)? Would this male figure have been enthroned in a landscape surrounded by lions, leopards, hares, and other animals, as opposed to the architectural setting favored for Bilqis? At present, we can only speculate, but because the

Fig. 28. "Mirza Muhammad Hakim with Hajji Yaqut," signed by Farrukh Husayn, Kabul, dated 992 (1584–85). Folio from the Salim/Jahangir Album, north India, ca. late 1590s–1620s. Tehran, Gulistan Palace Library, no. 1663, fol. 199. (Photo: Keelan Overton)

Kitāb-i Nawras verses selected for “Saraswati enthroned” positioned Ganapati as Ibrahim’s father and Saraswati as his mother, I currently favor the elephant god as the subject of a possible right-hand page.

“Saraswati enthroned” is one of the most successful known visual reconciliations of Bijapur’s local and translocal cultures. Its duality parallels the coinage described above (*Ibrāhīm Ablā Balī* and *Ghulām-i Murtaẓā ‘Alī*; see fig. 25), but the effect is subtler. The painting would have been immediately legible to its patron (Ibrahim), yet simultaneously familiar to the court’s Iranian notables, particularly its Shirazi savants. On a more personal level, “Saraswati enthroned” was a quintessential example of what is perhaps best termed “a painter’s painting.” While conforming to the expectations of the Deccani patron, as dictated by the *Kitāb-i Nawras*, it concurrently spoke an internal dialogue perhaps appreciated in full only by Farrukh himself. In this classic example of peripatetic visual translation, the artist synthesized more than two decades of artistic experience: his possible upbringing in Shiraz, formative training in Khurasan, tenure on the Mughal periphery in Mirza Hakim’s Kabul, decade in Lahore at Akbar’s court, and present circumstances in Ibrahim’s Bijapur. When we set aside the painting’s obvious Shirazi (Solomon and Bilqis) and Bijapuri (*Kitāb-i Nawras*) iconographies, we are left with an image whose technical precision in illumination, drawing, and calligraphy finds its closest parallels in the manuscript illustrations of Safavid Khurasan, particularly those attributed to Muhammadi and his school.²¹⁹ Farrukh’s exactitude is exemplified by his handling of the throne, which is not filled with loosely painted floral designs in the typical Shirazi manner²²⁰ but rather with intricate, voluminous drawing recalling the borders of the Freer Jami (see the serrated leaves overlapping blossoms, and the lotuses with feathery edges).²²¹ The artist’s apparent use of the *ḥarrarahumuṣavvir* formula was apropos, for the painting does indeed synthesize a wide range of artistic skill and specialization best conveyed by these two words in combination.

“YOUTH WITH ṢAFĪNA”: FARRUKH HUSAYN’S MEDIATION OF MUHAMMADI

As early as 1957, Robert Skelton emphasized Farrukh’s Khurasani training and drew stylistic parallels to Muhammadi, a topic that has been expanded by Abolala Soudavar in particular.²²² Muhammadi is best known for his portraits of smiling, moon-faced youths holding cups, *ṣafīnas*, and flowers (particularly narcissus).²²³ That this genre of portraiture became popular in India and was there specifically associated with Farrukh is confirmed by seven paintings with Mughal ascriptions to the painter (*‘amal-i nādir al-‘aṣr Farrukh Beg* [work of the Wonder of the Age, Farrukh Beg]) in a *Khamṣa* of Amir Khusraw Dihlavi copied in Herat and dated 978 and 979 (1570–72).²²⁴ The intimate gestures in the manuscript’s “Entangled pair” (fig. 29) can be compared to those in Muhammadi’s “Young man offering a wine cup to a girl,”²²⁵ while “Standing woman with cup”²²⁶ is closely related to several of the Khurasani artist’s portraits of ladies holding wine cups or flowers.²²⁷ Since the faces and backgrounds of the *Khamṣa* paintings have been heavily overpainted and extended, it is difficult to assess the viability of Farrukh’s hand.²²⁸ Their ascriptions nonetheless confirm that, within Mughal circles, Farrukh was closely aligned with Muhammadi and the Khurasan School.

Farrukh’s affinity with Muhammadi during his subcontinent sojourns is further demonstrated by a group of four closely related portraits of a standing youth holding narcissus (fig. 30).²²⁹ The subject retains the sinuous and elegant form of the Muhammadi type but now sports three conspicuously Deccani items of dress and accoutrement: a flat turban wrapped in a gold sash, a long gold *patka*, and a gold belt that could secure the former or a sword. One of these portraits was inscribed in the picture plane *‘amal-i Farrukh Beg*,²³⁰ while another (fig. 30) was assembled into the famed Salim/Jahangir Album,²³¹ where it was surrounded by excellent illumination and ascribed to Farrukh by the emperor himself (“drawn by Farrukh Beg in his seventieth year”).²³² Regardless of actual hand (Farrukh or a follower),²³³ the four paintings confirm the widespread appeal of the Muhammadi poetic type in Mughal and

Fig. 29. "Entangled pair," ascribed to Farrukh Beg (Farrukh Husayn) at the Mughal court, probably Khurasan or Lahore, ca. 1580–95. Folio from a *Khamse* of Amir Khusraw Dihlavi, Herat, dated 978 and 979 (1570–72). Cambridge University, King's College, Pote 153, fol. 101v. (Photo: courtesy of King's College)

Fig. 30. "Youth with narcissus," ascribed to Farrukh Beg (Farrukh Husayn) at the Mughal court by Jahangir (see his shaky handwriting above), probably Bijapur, ca. 1595–1609. Folio from the Salim/Jahangir Album, north India, ca. late 1590s–1620s. Tehran, Gulistan Palace Library, no. 1663, fol. 86. (Photo: Keelan Overton)

Deccani circles and further position Farrukh as its chief ambassador-conduit from Khurasan to India.

Farrukh's mediation of Muhammadi provides a suitable foundation upon which to explore "Ibrahim offering obeisance to Jahangir" (fig. 3), his most sophisticated portrait of the Bijapuri ruler in the guise of the Persianate collector and intellectual, as discussed earlier. Of Farrukh's five portraits of Ibrahim, the Tehran example (fig. 30) has received the least attention, perhaps because it lacks conspicuous Bijapuri references (by way of the *Kitāb-i Nawras*) and its landscape is not as impressive as the celebrated St. Petersburg "Ibrahim hawking." It is, however, closely related to this masterpiece, and there can be little doubt that the two portraits were painted in tandem. In both, Ibrahim's youthful, heavily shaded face features rosy highlights, and he wears a pink robe accented with gold rosettes in combination with a Bijapuri turban sash and *patka*. In the St. Petersburg image, he holds a formidable hawk while seated on a richly caparisoned horse,²³⁴ and in the Tehran one, he sits on small gold throne and tilts his head toward an inscribed *ṣafīna*. Both landscapes invite the patient viewer to pore over their meticulous brushwork (note the incessant stippling), atmospheric waterfalls, dark hills streaked with golden highlights, and delicate trees perched incongruously on cliffs, but the St. Petersburg portrait is more elaborate and colorful (the Tehran example has been cropped and repainted on its lower edge).

The Tehran painting's presentation of Ibrahim as a poetic youth is firmly grounded in the Muhammadi figural type genre described above, as well as the Khurasani artist's expanded pastoral compositions in *nīm qalam* (lit. "half pen," or tinted drawing). These landscapes depict princes participating in the leisurely prerogatives of kingship (feasting, poetic recitation, music making), as emphasized by various props (cup, *ṣafīna*, instrument).²³⁵ The popularity of the Muhammadi *nīm qalam* model persisted through the turn of the seventeenth century, when it was translated into fully saturated paintings. In "Youth and dervish in conversation,"²³⁶ a prince holding a *ṣafīna* sits before an ascetic in a tripartite composition (lower vegetation and stream, middle mountains, upper sky) closely paralleling that of "Ibrahim offering obeisance." Yet another Safavid point of

comparison is Riza ‘Abbasi’s “Seated page,”²³⁷ which includes a similar throne and *şafina*-holding subject, as well as the artist’s explicit inscriptional debt to Muhammadi: “likeness of the work of Master Muhammadi of Herat.”²³⁸

The widespread popularity of the *şafina* genre in the early modern Indo-Persian world hinged on the codex’s varied functions. As a generic metaphorical prop, it conveyed its holder’s status as a literary aesthete, and in this symbolic context, its surface was often unadorned (London “Seated page”) or minimally embellished (Toronto “Youth and dervish”). Alternatively, when inscribed with legible writing, the *şafina* functioned as a canvas for explicit messages presented by its bearer.²³⁹ In this case, a reciprocal and interactive dialogue was intended between the internal subject and an external recipient/viewer/reader.

It is to the latter performative category that Ibrahim’s *şafina* belongs. Its two lines of sizable *nasta‘līq* read: “Fortunate is that head, on which your foot rests/ Luck [is] in that heart in which there is room for you.”²⁴⁰ This couplet was drawn from Nizami’s *Makhzan al-Asrār* (Treasury of Secrets), and through this verbal allusion to the physical act of prostration, Ibrahim conveyed his unequivocal allegiance to the portrait’s recipient: Jahangir.²⁴¹ By implying that his head was literally beneath Jahangir’s foot, the Bijapuri ruler joined countless deferential individuals who knelt before the emperor and/or kissed his foot, forms of internal ritual and international diplomacy that were routinely visualized in Mughal painting and pervasive throughout the subcontinent and elsewhere.²⁴² Ibrahim presented this pledge of obeisance to his Mughal rival in light of the northern empire’s increasing incursions into the Deccan and positioning of its rulers as mere tributaries (*khāns* versus *shāhs*).

Two layers of related circumstantial evidence suggest that Ibrahim’s visual-verbal acquiescence was both understood and well received by its intended Mughal recipient. Jahangir was undoubtedly familiar with the poem in question, for Nizami was widely popular at Indian courts of the day and the emperor owned a fine Bukhara copy of the *Makhzan al-Asrār* dated 944 (1538).²⁴³ While ownership does not necessarily guarantee use and understanding, the fact that this volume

was written by Jahangir’s favorite calligrapher, Mir ‘Ali (fl. ca. 1505–45), and refurbished in the Mughal atelier, strengthens the assumption that the emperor was indeed familiar with the poem in question.²⁴⁴ That Jahangir sanctioned Ibrahim’s message and appreciated the portrait in general is further implied by the painting’s assembly into the Salim/Jahangir Album.²⁴⁵

The question of who exactly bore responsibility for the portrait’s sophisticated interpolation of text and image returns us to the literary culture discussed earlier and the elusive issue of agency. Was this successful diplomatic painting a group effort—among the painter (Farrukh), the subject (Ibrahim), and various Iranian savants (Shah Navaz Khan, Zuhuri, Malik Qummi)—or should we assign credit to the artist alone? It may not be farfetched to imagine that Farrukh would have been capable of recasting poetic verse as political allegory.²⁴⁶ The extrapolation of Hafiz in the Copenhagen *Bust Portrait of Ibrahim* suggests, however, that such word-image combinations may have been common practice in the Bijapuri atelier, as in most Indo-Persian *kitābkhānas* of the day.

As far as Ibrahim is concerned, we can infer a degree of involvement, or at least accommodation. The ruler appears to have favored Nizami and imitations of his work, as attested by the Bijapuri *Khamisa* copied by Khalilullah, the collected *Khamisa* of Amir Khusraw and *Laylā va Majnūn* of Hatifi (appendix, nos. 8, 9), and the commissioning of the *Manba‘ al-Anhār* after the *Makhzan al-Asrār*.²⁴⁷ Some viewers of the portrait—Bijapuri ones, at least—may therefore have interpreted the couplet in a positive light, as emblematic of Ibrahim’s literary fluency and patronage, rather than just his political fragility. A second level of intimacy vis-à-vis the ruler-subject can be found in his red nails, which derive from his *Kitāb-i Nawras* iconography (cf. fig. 2). Once again, Farrukh successfully integrated his patron’s local and translocal identities (in this case, the emphasis being on the latter). Moreover, while positioning Ibrahim as compliant and metaphorically on his knees, he simultaneously cast him as a literary connoisseur capable of subtly extrapolating Nizami. It is difficult to imagine a more complementary and graceful image of submission.

While the precise agent or agents responsible for the poetic and political subtleties of “Ibrahim offering obei-

sance to Jahangir” may never be known, we can be confident that Farrukh himself developed the painting’s visual mechanics. Like “Saraswati enthroned,” “Ibrahim offering obeisance to Jahangir” was a culmination of decades of itinerant artistic experience. The portrait was far from Farrukh’s first depiction of a ruler in a pastoral-leisurely guise of the type associated with Muhammadi. His first documented forays into this genre occurred at the Kabul court of Mirza Hakim (d. 1585), where he created two tinted drawings of Akbar’s half-brother. “Mirza Muhammad Hakim and Hajji Yaqut” (fig. 28) depicts the ruler and his eunuch-counselor in animated conversation in a springtime landscape. Farrukh’s lengthy upper inscription, dated 992 (1584–85), identifies the subjects and clarifies the garden setting (Shahrara Garden, Kabul). On the lower left, he has signed the drawing “*ḥarrarahū al-muẓnib Farrukh Ḥusayn-i muṣavvir*,” a typical Khurasani formula likewise used by Muhammadi (also see the earlier discussion concerning “Saraswati enthroned”).²⁴⁸ In “Mirza Muhammad Hakim and two pages,”²⁴⁹ two courtiers flank the seated ruler, a similar willow tree with birds engulfs the background, and Farrukh has signed his name on a rock (*rāqimahu Farrukh Ḥusayn*). Both portraits are rendered in Muhammadi’s favored technique of *nīm qalam* and include his codified vocabulary of forms (willow and almond trees, foreground stream with rocks, moon-faced youths, and striped turbans with fluttering endings).

When Farrukh painted “Ibrahim offering obeisance to Jahangir” fifteen to twenty years later in Bijapur, his Kabul portraits surely loomed large in his mind. For Ibrahim’s pose, the artist recycled that of Mirza Hakim in his portrait dated 992 (1584–85) (fig. 28). He again perched his subject on the edge of a gold throne, and although he altered aspects of the lower body (legs not crossed), he repeated the upper part (right arm across the body and left hand gripping a waist sash, with the elbow jutting forward). What remained was to translate the Kabul ruler’s headgear and waist sash into their Bijapuri equivalents, replace the cup with an inscribed *ṣafīna*, and paint a more dynamic background. While the latter suggests a new direction in Farrukh’s landscapes—the dark hills with golden accents appear here, and in other Bijapuri works, for the first time²⁵⁰—it simultaneously reflects his long-standing interest in

enlivening his compositions with a variety of trees in different scales.

As noted above, Farrukh’s “Ibrahim offering obeisance to Jahangir” was ultimately incorporated into the Salim/Jahangir Album. There it was appreciated in tandem with the artist’s five other pastoral portraits of individuals and figural types: his two Kabul drawings of Mirza Hakim (fig. 28); “Youth holding narcissus” (fig. 30); “Falconer,”²⁵¹ which has been argued to be Jahangir, albeit as Prince Salim;²⁵² and a second portrait of the Bijapuri ruler, the Prague “Ibrahim playing the tambur” (fig. 2). Although the latter is routinely positioned as the iconic visualization of Ibrahim’s verbal self-portrait in his *Kitāb-i Nawras*, it, too, is rooted in the conventions of Persian painting—specifically, enthronement scenes in which a seated ruler gazes down at courtiers (often overlapped to imply depth) while an attendant or attendants stand behind. Farrukh employed comparable figural groupings in his earlier manuscripts’ illustrations, including “Babur receives a courtier” (fig. 27) and “Youth holding a wine cup listens to the recitation of verses,” from a *Dīvān* of Hafiz.²⁵³ The Prague “Ibrahim playing the tambur” (fig. 2) and the Rampur “Youth holding a wine cup” are virtually identical in their handling of the main subject’s posture (seated Indian-style against large bolsters, with conspicuously flayed toes) and inclusion of a prominent tree trunk next to the standing attendant. The most significant differences rest in the background (landscape versus architecture).

Considered together, Farrukh’s six portraits in the Salim/Jahangir Album—which span at least two decades (ca. 1585–1605)—confirm a well-known fact: as both prince and emperor, Salim/Jahangir was especially fond of Persianate painting. The individual who played a formative role in influencing this taste was Aqa Riza, who was in the prince’s envoy by 1588–89 and then led his Allahabad studio (ca. 1600–1604). Prior to entering central Mughal lands, Aqa Riza appears to have worked in Mirza Hakim’s Kabul with Farrukh,²⁵⁴ an assumption borne out by close parallels between Aqa Riza’s portrait of Mirza Hakim²⁵⁵ and Farrukh’s two drawings of the same subject (see fig. 28).²⁵⁶ Aqa Riza was likely the initial supervisor of the Salim/Jahangir Album and responsible for some of its exceptional borders and paintings.²⁵⁷ Given his probable tenure in Kabul with Farrukh, we

can imagine that he was instrumental in selecting his colleague's six Persianate portraits for inclusion.²⁵⁸ We might further wonder if Aqa Riza was responsible, in theory or execution, for framing some of Farrukh's works in exceptional Khurasani-style landscapes.²⁵⁹ Until the Salim/Jahangir Album is published in full, such speculations can be neither confirmed nor denied. It seems likely, however, that the personal connection between these two Iranian migrants played a significant role in the formation of this illustrious *muraqqa'* (album), thereby underscoring the importance of the artist-artist relationship in Indo-Persian production, not just the artist-ruler one.²⁶⁰ If a lack of Safavid court benefaction often created the "push" out of Iran, itinerant colleagues frequently provided the initial "pull" to India and subsequently influenced circulation and patronage patterns within the subcontinent.²⁶¹

CONCLUSION

The landscapes of "Ibrahim offering obeisance to Jahangir" (fig. 3) and "Ibrahim hawking" lead us to a final work attributed to Farrukh: "Abu'l Ghays al-Yamani and the lion" (fig. 26). In this painting, the artist essentially reversed the landscape of "Ibrahim hawking": the pastel-colored mountains now engulf the composition and the gold-streaked hills are limited to the background. A large *chinār* (plane tree) frames the scene, and Farrukh's other staple trees and flowers are rendered throughout. In addition to numerous birds and animals, several anecdotal passages are visible: a hunter sits patiently while a ram peers down at him (a humorous element), two shepherds rest with their flock, and a man leads a pair of oxen bearing two women seated sidesaddle, one holding a baby, across a bridge (the latter two passages are in minute scale). Four large male figures stand in the foreground, and one holds a snake and is accompanied by a lion carrying wood. Skelton has identified the scene as a possible illustration to Jami's *Nafahāt al-Uns min Ḥaḍarāt al-Quds* (The Breaths of Divine Intimacy), a collection of 611 Sufi biographies composed in 883 (1478) for Mir 'Ali Shir Nava'i (d. 1500) of Herat.²⁶² The *Nafahāt al-Uns* section on Abu al-Ghays Jamil al-Yamani relates

how, after a lion had killed his ass, the saint made the animal carry his wood and used a snake to whip him.²⁶³

Four aspects of this unsigned painting have prompted its attribution to Farrukh, and, more specifically, to his Bijapur period (ca. 1595–1609): the cityscapes with distinctly Bijapuri basalt architecture (note the bulbous domes with gold finials and lotus-petal bases, and the slender minarets or towers with comparable forms), the hunter wearing a Deccani sword hilt-belt (cf. fig. 30), the precise and vibrant landscape filled with the artist's favorite trees (*chinār*, willow, almond, and unidentifiable examples that are overlapped and stippled), and similarly, his stock figural types.²⁶⁴ If the painting is indeed a product of Farrukh's Bijapur period,²⁶⁵ it further confirms his freedom to embrace Khurasani paradigms as he saw fit in his adopted Deccani sphere. In this instance, the Khurasani references occur on two levels. The four men in the foreground immediately recall the figural types of late Timurid Herat, as practiced by Bihzad (d. 1535–36) and his immediate circle (see their gaunt faces, long beards, turbans with fluttering edges, plain scarves, and robes with extended sleeves).²⁶⁶ If the image was conceived as an illustration to Jami's *Nafahāt al-Uns*, we may wonder if Farrukh deliberately adopted Bihzadian figures to lend a degree of contemporaneity between text and image. Concurrently, he placed his Timurid-style figures in an exuberant landscape recalling those of Safavid Herat and Mashhad in more recent memory (late sixteenth century).²⁶⁷ The painting's overwhelmingly Khurasani, archaic, and foreign (to Bijapur and India more generally) aesthetics are underscored by comparison with the same scene in the Mughal *Nafahāt al-Uns* dated 1012 (1604–5) and copied by the celebrated 'Abd al-Rahman 'Anbarin Qalam.²⁶⁸ The Mughal illustration includes standard Akbari figural types and a staid landscape, with the inclusion of the dead ass in the background.

Farrukh's "Abu'l Ghays al-Yamani and the lion" stimulates a series of new questions while returning the discussion to Bijapur's culture of Persian intellectualism. What is the likelihood that an illustrated copy of Jami's *Nafahāt al-Uns* was produced at Ibrahim's court? Although only a handful of Ibrahim-era manuscripts survive (*Kitāb-i Nawras*, *Pem Nem*, *Ni'matnāma*, *Shāhnāma*, *Khamsa*), just two of which are Persian clas-

sics, the extant record must not be read at face value. This article has shown that Persian literature permeated many aspects of courtly culture and artistic production in Bijapur: recall Zuhuri and Malik Qummi's imitation of the *Makhzan al-Asrār*, the portraits of Ibrahim extrapolating Nizami and Hafiz, the Kumatgi paintings of Rustam and Majnun. Moreover, it must be remembered that Bijapur's library, which was substantial enough to supply Akbar with 2,000 books in 1604, suffered considerably during later centuries. With an increased understanding of Ibrahim's marks of ownership and Bijapur's library practices, new volumes will surely come to light, including those misattributed to other courts and Ibrahim's.²⁶⁹

If we return to the book culture outlined above, the possibility of an Ibrahim-era manuscript devoted to Jami's *Nafahāt al-Uns* is left open. Ibrahim's mystical inclinations are well known, and the extant corpus of his books suggests an interest in Jami and, by extension, the Sufi literary culture of late fifteenth-century Herat (appendix, nos. 1, 2, 5). The ruler also appears to have been fond of a second compilation of Sufi biographies written in late Timurid Herat, the *Majālis al-'Ushshāq* of Gazurgahi (d. 1470), as attested by his two heavily illustrated Shirazi volumes, one of which was assigned the high value of 1,555 rupees (appendix, nos. 3, 4). That Jami's biography of Sufi saints was known on the subcontinent and selected for luxurious production is further confirmed by the Mughal *Nafahāt al-Uns*.

Despite the mysteries surrounding it—part of a manuscript (albeit lacking a text block), a single-page unicum intended for an album, or an image whose fate and function simply shifted with time and circumstance?—"Abu'l Ghays al-Yamani and the lion" exemplifies the privileged place of Perso-Islamic systems in Ibrahim's Bijapur. Between circa 1600 and 1610, at least nine illustrious Iranian immigrants (Shah Navaz Khan, Rafi' al-Din Shirazi, Firishta, Malik Qummi, Zuhuri, Haider Zehni, Kalim, Khalilullah, and Farrukh Husayn) occupied key positions in the fields of government, history writing, poetry, and the visual arts.²⁷⁰ Given this exceptional pool of expatriate Iranian talent, it is hardly surprising that the 'Adil Shahi court participated in widespread patterns of Perso-Islamic sovereignty, as evinced in titulature, diplomacy, collecting, and portrai-

ture. Although scholarship to date on Ibrahim-era painting has emphasized local Dakhni texts such as the *Pem Nem* and *Kitāb-i Nawras*, and while the latter has conditioned an emphasis on the ruler's personality and patronage,²⁷¹ the material presented here calls for increasingly integrative and decentralized approaches moving forward. The intersections between Bijapur's local and translocal ideologies, as conspicuously juxtaposed in Ibrahim's coins (fig. 25) and delicately synthesized in Farrukh's paintings (figs. 1–3), and the expansion of Bijapur's patronage base to include its Iranian diaspora yield intriguing insights into a courtly culture poised at the crossroads of Indo-Persian experience.

In terms of art-historical practice, "Abu'l Ghays al-Yamani and the lion" also urges a degree of pause and revision, as it underscores the limitations of the extant visual record, complicates notions of agency and schools of production, and warns against the formation of rigid binaries (Mughal versus Deccani, naturalistic versus fantastical, Sunni versus Shi'i, *āfāqī* versus *Dakkani*). Like many of Farrukh's paintings, it is a complex intermingling of artistic reference that is most appropriately investigated as an "object of translation."²⁷² The mediations inherent to it rest first and foremost with its itinerant maker rather than in its place of physical production. While it can be tempting to classify its "fanciful" landscape as quintessentially Deccani, many of its tropes—including pastel-hued cliffs with tortuous surfaces and a variety of meticulously rendered trees—were far from "new" but rather established practices of the artist.²⁷³ The painting is therefore less a product of place (Bijapur? Agra?) or patron (Iranian notable? Ibrahim himself?) and more a reflection of an artist's mobility within a cultural network linking Greater Iran, the Mughal empire, and the Deccan.

Although this article has sought to illuminate connections between Bijapur's visual culture and its Iranian diaspora, it has only begun to explore the resonance of Persianate painting in the Deccani city. In addition to Farrukh's Khurasan-inspired works, a number of Ibrahim-era images can be compared to contemporary Safavid painting, as practiced in Qazvin and Isfahan by artists like Riza 'Abbasi. In "The kiss,"²⁷⁴ a princely type kisses a woman as she places her hands erotically in his lap, and in "Siesta,"²⁷⁵ an effeminate prince reclines lan-

guidly as attendants fan him and rub his feet.²⁷⁶ Were these androgynous, corporal, and informal figures independent Bijapuri developments, or were they indicative of increased aesthetic dialogue with the Safavid center?

The latter question underscores that this article has investigated visual translation primarily as a one-way street: from Iran and Khurasan to Bijapur via immigrants like Farrukh. It is imperative to emphasize, however, that many of these itinerants returned to their homeland, whether as temporary ambassadors or long-term residents. The case of the calligrapher-cum-diplomat Khalilullah, who traveled to the Safavid court on two occasions and was encouraged to return perma-

nently by Shah 'Abbas,²⁷⁷ leaves little doubt that portable examples of Bijapuri art (books, calligraphies, paintings, bejeweled items, metalwork, textiles) made their way into Safavid collections, whether as diplomatic gifts or endowments to religious institutions.²⁷⁸ Such circumstances leave open the question of the Bijapuri impact on Safavid art, a topic of increasing significance from the mid-seventeenth century onward.²⁷⁹ Future research will ideally balance the scales of cultural exchange and bring the dialogue full circle.

*Independent scholar,
Santa Barbara, Calif.*

APPENDIX

Manuscripts and Album Folios belonging to Ibrahim ‘Adil Shah II (r. 1580–1627) in Global Collections
(excluding the British Library’s Asar Mahal collection)* = *not studied firsthand*

Manuscripts: Persian

Title	Details of the Codex	Ibrahim II’s Marks of Ownership (and/or the Bijapur Library)	Provenance ^a and Select Bibliography
1. <i>Dīvān</i> of Jami	– Shah Muhammad al-Katib al-Shirazi – Probably Shiraz, dated 971 and 972 (1563–65) – 2 double-page illuminated frontispieces and 19 paintings attributed here to Shiraz, ca. 1565–80	19 impressions of Ibrahim’s Koranic seal: – opening flyleaf, largely effaced (fol. 1r) – 18 illustrated folios (fig. 19) (one illustrated folio does not bear the seal, fol. 217v) Type A notation: illegible, effaced (fol. 1r)	Sotheby’s 1988, lot 208; Christie’s 2000, lot 79; Overton 2011, 334
Doha, Museum of Islamic Art, Ms.260			
2. <i>Dīvān</i> of Jami	– Autograph copy? Attributed by Ashraf as “most probably by the poet himself” – Probably Herat, dated 5 Rajab 871 (February 10, 1467) – Illuminated <i>‘unvān</i> (fols. 2v, 8v)	Ibrahim’s illuminated ex libris: dated 27 Rabi‘ II 10[0]3 (January 8, 1595): “ <i>Dīvān</i> of Jami in <i>naskh ta‘liq</i> . Newly bound with red binding with gold lines. Collected into the library of the Refuge of the World, Ibrahim ‘Adil Shah, may God protect his kingdom, on the 27th of Rabi‘ al-Thani, in the year 103 [<i>sic</i>]” (fol. 1r, fig. 13) Type B notation: dated 27 Rabi‘ II 1003 (January 8, 1595) (fol. 1r, fig. 13)	Ashraf 1967, no. 1568; Overton 2011, 335
Hyderabad, Salar Jung Museum, M.276			
3. <i>Majālis al-‘Ushshāq</i> of Kamal al-Din Husayn Gazurgahi	– Ahmad al-Hafiz – Shiraz, ca. 1580s – 75 paintings, attributed by Uluç to Shiraz ca. 1580; most faces repainted in the Deccani style of ca. 1700 – Double-page illumination signed by Jalal al-Din Baghnavi (fols. 3v–4r), attributed by Uluç to Shiraz, ca. 1580 – The original Shirazi binding has been tampered with (see Uluç)	Ibrahim’s Koranic seal ex libris (fol. 3r, fig. 14) Type B notation: dated 22 Ramazan 1014 (January 31, 1606) (fol. 3r, fig. 14) Type C notation: “Price” (<i>qīmat</i>), followed by a valuation in <i>raqam</i> equivalent to 1,555 rupees (fol. 3r, fig. 14)	Richard 1993–94, 100, fig. 11; Richard 1997, cat. no. 135; Richard 2000, fig. 6–8, 243–45; Uluç 2006, 191n18; Overton 2011, 336–37
Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, SP 1559			

Title	Details of the Codex	Ibrahim II's Marks of Ownership (and/or the Bijapur Library)	Provenance ^a and Select Bibliography
4. <i>Majālis al-Ushshāq</i> of Kamal al-Din Husayn Gazurgahi London, British Library, IO Islamic 1138	– Shiraz, late sixteenth century – Illuminated double-page frontispiece (fols. 1v–2r) – 49 paintings attributed by Robinson to Shiraz, ca. 1590–1600; attributed by Richard to Isfahan, ca. 1600	Type D notation: “Special book of the <i>Majālis al-Ushshāq</i> of the most noble, most holy, Ibrahim ‘Adilshah. Collected into the royal library” (fol. 1r)	‘Abd al-Khaliq: oval seal dated 116[2?] (1748–49), regnal year 1 (fol. 1r) Tipu Sultan (r. 1782–99) Ethé 1980, no. 1871; Robinson 1976, no. 464; Richard 2000, 243–44; Overton 2011, 337
5. <i>Yūsuf va Zulaykhā</i> of Jami Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, SP 1919	– Shah Mahmud Nishapuri – Tabriz, dated 950 (1543–44) (fol. 54v) – Illuminated ‘ <i>unvān</i> (fol. 2v) and title pieces, attributed by Richard to Bijapur – 2 paintings (fols. 17r, 32v) attributed by Richard to Bijapur, reign of Ibrahim II (this attribution is supported here)	Ibrahim's Koranic seal (fol. 2r, fig. 17) Type A notation, directly below the Koranic seal, in five lines, cut off on the left edge but completed and expanded in the type D (fol. 2r, fig. 17) Type D notation, middle of the folio, in six lines: “ <i>Yūsuf va Zulaykhā</i> of Mawlana Jami in beautiful <i>nasta‘liq</i> . Written by Shah Mahmud Nishapuri. With the large seal [Koranic] of the Refuge of the World [Ibrahim]. Eggplant binding with gold lines. Gift of the estate of Shah Mirza Naqib, head of the royal library collection. Newly bound with yellow lining [double] and red binding” (fol. 1r)	‘Alamgir (r. 1658–1707): a notation records that the book entered the Mughal library as “booty from the victory of Bijapur”; seal of Qabil Khan <i>khānāzāda-i ‘Ālamgīr</i> dated 1097 (1685–86) (fol. 1v) Blochet 1928, vol. 3, no. 1701; Seyller 1997, 297; Simpson 1997, 388; Richard 2000, figs. 9–12, 245–46; Overton 2011, 338–39
6. <i>Kulliyāt</i> of Sa‘di London, British Library, Add. 17961	– Attributed by Rieu to Iran, “the close of the 16th century” – Double-page illumination (fols. 2v–3r) – No paintings	Ibrahim's Koranic seal ex libris (fol. 2r, fig. 15) Type A notation, largely effaced, only two precisely written lines remain visible; assumed to have read: “ <i>Kulliyāt</i> of Sa‘di in <i>nasta‘liq</i> . Gilded binding with the large seal. Collected into the royal library” (fol. 2r, fig. 15) Type B notation: dated 20 R[...] 1014 (1605–6) (fol. 2r, fig. 15)	Rieu 1966, 599; Overton 2011, 340–41

Title	Details of the Codex	Ibrahim II's Marks of Ownership (and/or the Bijapur Library)	Provenance ^a and Select Bibliography
7. <i>Shāhnāma</i> of Firdawsi London, British Library, IO Islamic 3254	– Qazvin or Isfahan, late sixteenth century – Double-page illumination (fols. 1v–2r) – 49 paintings attributed by Robinson as “a transitional style between Qazvin and Isfahan . . . provincial work”; two paintings are unskilled Indian additions	Ibrahim's Koranic seal (fol. 1r) Type A or D notation, partially effaced: “Collected into the royal library” (fol. 1r)	Ethé 1980, no. 880; Robinson 1976, nos. 953–1001; Overton 2011, 341
8. <i>Khamṣa</i> of Amir Khusraw Dihlavi Doha, Museum of Islamic Art, Ms. 302	– Attributed by Black and Saidi to Yazd (?), 1430–40 – 10 paintings, attributed by Black and Saidi to Yazd (?), 1430–40	Ibrahim's Koranic seal ex libris (fol. 1r, fig. 16) Type B notation: dated 28 Ramadan [...]4 (1014 in light of other examples?) (fol. 1r, fig. 16) The word <i>nawras</i> : upper edge (fol. 1r, fig. 16)	‘Alī ‘Adil Shah I (r. 1558–80): circular seal with a radiating inscription naming the Twelve Imams (fol. 1r) Mughal library: a purchase note records acquisition in Aurangabad on 1 Rabi‘ I 1107 (October 10, 1695) (fol. 1r) Muhammad Shah (r. 1719–48): seal dated 1156 (1743), regnal year 26 Black 2005, no. 27; Overton 2011, 342
*9. <i>Laylā va Majnūn</i> of ‘Abdullah Jami Hatifi St. Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum, VR-995	– Shah Mahmud Nishapuri – Herat, dated 969 (1561–62) – Illuminated <i>‘unvān</i> (fol. 1v)	Type A notation, dated 11 Rajab 1029 (June 12, 1620), in a variety of hands, with sloppy addendums, legible portions read: “Book of the <i>Laylā va Majnūn</i> of Hatifi in <i>naskh ta‘liq</i> . Gilded binding. Impressed with the <i>nawras</i> [?] seal. Written by Mahmud al-Nishapuri. Estate of the special <i>nawras</i> (<i>bābat-i ḥuṣūr nawras</i>). Collected into the royal library on the 11th of Rajab 1029” (fol. 1r, fig. 18) The word <i>nawras</i> : upper edge (fol. 1r, fig. 18)	‘Alamgir (r. 1658–1707): seal of Qabil Khan <i>khānazāda-i</i> <i>‘Ālamgīr</i> Nadir Shah (r. 1736–47): presumably booty from the sack of Delhi Adamova 2012, no. 5, 287–90

Title	Details of the Codex	Ibrahim II's Marks of Ownership (and/or the Bijapur Library)	Provenance ^a and Select Bibliography
* ₁₀ . ^b <i>Ikhtiyārāt-i Badīʿ</i> of ʿAli b. Husayn al-Ansari Calcutta, National Library, no. 229	– Bijapur, dated 990 (1582–83)	Ibrahim's Koranic seal (fol. 1r) Type D notation: "Collected into the royal library" (fol. 1r) Type D notation, considerable stacking of words: "Special book of the <i>Ikhtiyārāt-i</i> <i>Badīʿ</i> of the blessed, prosperous, most noble, most holy, most high, Ibrahim ʿAdil Shah II" (fol. 43r)	Muhammad Khan, son of Dilavar Khan ʿAdil Shahi: written for his library ʿAlamgir (r. 1658–1707): seal of Qabil Khan <i>khānazāda-i</i> <i>ʿĀlamgīr</i> dated 1097 (1685–86) (fol. 1r) Seyller 1997, 343; ^c Ḥasīr Raḍawī 1921, no. 229; Overton 2011, 346

Manuscripts: Arabic

11. Koran Hyderabad, Jagdish and Kamla Mittal Museum of Indian Art, 76.851, Ms. 1	– Shiraz, ca. 1570	Ibrahim's <i>nawras</i> seal (flyleaf, fig. 6) Type B notation, dated 14 Safar 1003 (October 28, 1594) (flyleaf)	Overton 2011, 343
12. Koran University of St Andrews Library, Ms. 19 O	– Muhammad Muʿmin b. ʿAbdullah Murvarid – dated 845 (1441–42) (reworked, not original) – Binding: Bijapur, ca. 1580–1627 (reign of Ibrahim II)	2 impressions of Ibrahim's scalloped seal binding stamp (one on each doublure, figs. 22, 24)	Abu Saʿid (r. 1458–69): said to be the original patron in the colophon (requiring further assessment) Tipu Sultan (r. 1782–99): note adhered to the front cover and flyleaf inscription East India Company: inscriptions dated August 15, 1805 and 1806, the latter recording the presentation of the Koran to the University of St Andrews Lentz and Lowry 1989, cat. no. 141; Overton 2011, 102–15; Overton forthcoming (Research conducted at St Andrews in August 2016 [at the time of press] has significantly altered and enhanced understanding of the manuscript and will be presented in the co- authored Overton forthcoming.)

Title	Details of the Codex	Ibrahim II's Marks of Ownership (and/or the Bijapur Library)	Provenance ^a and Select Bibliography
13. <i>Dīwān</i> of al-Ḥadira (Qutba b. Aws)	– colophon signed by Yaqut al- Mustaʿsimi and dated 629 (1231–32) (spurious?)	2 impressions of Ibrahim's Koranic seal (opening and closing pages of text: fol. 4v, fig. 20, and fol. 36v)	Early Timurid court, ca. 1400 (?): reader's note by Shaykh Muhammad al-Tabrizi al-Sultani (fol. 3v)
Rampur, Raza Library, 5207		Type D notation: "Special book of the blessed, most noble, most holy, most high, Ibrahim 'Adil Shah" (fol. 3v, fig. 21)	Aqqoyunlu Tabriz: – Rustam b. Maqsud (r. 1493–97): seal (fol. 3v) – a descendant of Ya'qub (r. 1478– 90): seal (fol. 3v) Shah Ismaʿil II (r. 1576–78): seal (fol. 3r) Siddiqi 1998, pl. 7; Qutba b. Aws 2010, esp. 43–44, 76; Overton 2011, 96–101, 343

Manuscripts: Bijapuri Texts (Persian or Dakhni)

14. <i>Nujūm al-'Ulūm</i> of 'Ali 'Adil Shah I	– Bijapur, dated 978 (1570–71) – 400 paintings	Misc. notation (does not appear to be the standard type A): "Book of the <i>Nujūm</i> <i>al-'Ulūm</i> by order of the king of Bijapur, Ibrahim, the world teacher (<i>Jagat Gurū</i>), bought by Navab Sayyid Rustam Khan" (fol. 1r)	Navab Sayyid Rustam Khan (period of Ibrahim II): purchase note on fol. 1r
Dublin, Chester Beatty Library, Ms. 2			Leach 1995, 2:819; Hutton 2006, 50–69; Flatt 2011; Overton 2011, 344
15. <i>Kitāb-i Nawras</i> of Ibrahim II	– 'Abd al-Rashid – Bijapur, dated 990 (1582–83) (questioned)	Type D notation, dated 17 Jumada I 1037 (January 24, 1628): " <i>Kitāb-i Nawras</i> in Rayhān. Written by 'Abd al-Rashid. Newly bound with a red binding with a gold medallion (<i>turanj</i>) [in reference to the central stamp] and chain (<i>zanjīra</i>) [in reference to the outer thin border]. From the wardrobe. Collected into the royal library on the 17th of Jumada I in the year 1037. Thirty-two pages. Colored lines (?)" ^d (fol. 1r, fig. 4)	Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh II/Aḥmad 1956, 84–86; Haidar 2011, 26– 27, fig. 3; Overton 2011, 344
Hyderabad, Salar Jung Museum, M. 177			

Title	Details of the Codex	Ibrahim II's Marks of Ownership (and/or the Bijapur Library)	Provenance ^a and Select Bibliography
*16. <i>Kitāb-i Nawras</i> of Ibrahim II Hyderabad, Central Records Office	– ‘Abd al-Latif Mustafa – Bijapur, before 5 Muharram 1022 (February 24, 1613) (the type D notation provides terminus ante quem)	A third seal of Ibrahim II: circular, inscribed ‘ <i>ahd Ibrāhīm ‘Ādil moḥur tabdīl</i> (title page) Type D notation: “ <i>Kitāb-i Nawras</i> written by the most noble, most holy, most high, the Shadow of God [Ibrahim]” (title page) Type D notation, dated 5 Muharram 1022 (February 24, 1613): “ <i>Kitāb-i Nawras</i> in the two pens [in reference to <i>naskh</i> and <i>suls</i>] of ‘Abd al-Latif. Newly bound with a gilt binding with a gold medallion (<i>turanj</i>) and pendants (<i>barg</i>) [in reference to a central stamp framed vertically by two smaller ones] and rope (<i>ṭanāb</i>) and chain (<i>zanjīra</i>) [in reference to the outer thin borders]. Forty pages. Collected into the royal library on the 5th of Muharram in the year 1022” (title page) ^e	Ibrāhīm ‘Ādil Shāh II/Aḥmad 1956, 84–86; Haidar 2011, 26–27, fig. 3; Overton 2011, 344
17. <i>Kitāb-i Nawras</i> of Ibrahim II Dispersed: *Delhi, National Museum, 69-22/1-6; Cleveland Museum of Art, 2013.284.b	– Khalilullah – Bijapur, ca. 1617–18 – Likely the copy presented to Ibrahim by Khalilullah in 1027 (1617–18) – Finely illuminated text blocks with drawings of birds and animals in landscapes	*Flyleaves have not been located	Ibrāhīm ‘Ādil Shāh II/Aḥmad 1956, 37, 92; Skelton 1982, no. 43; Haidar 2011, figs. 5–12; Haidar and Sardar 2015, cat. no. 45

Album Folios

*18. ^f Opening calligraphic folio, from an album with marbled borders Delhi, National Museum, Ms. 55.45, page 61 (fol. 31r)	Per Jake Benson, 2015: – Ms. 55.45 is comprised of at least three albums – the folio in question features the <i>bismillah</i> and a portion of Koran 2:58 – the folio in question is likely the opening of a distinct marbled album	Ibrahim's Koranic seal: central calligraphic field, directly below the <i>bismillah</i> (the irregular piece of uncolored paper bearing the calligraphy and Ibrahim's seal was framed in a thin gold border and in turn enclosed in a perfect rectangle of borders and rulings) The word <i>nawras</i> : in the peach border framing the central field (same orientation as Ibrahim's seal)	Mir Hafiz Khan: seal dated 1155 (1742–43) or 1175 (1761–62) (the same seal is visible on the Ms. 55.45 folio reproduced as cat. no. 77 in Haidar and Sardar 2015)
---	--	--	--

Title	Details of the Codex	Ibrahim II's Marks of Ownership (and/or the Bijapur Library)	Provenance ^a and Select Bibliography
*19. Calligraphic folio, originally part of the <i>Qit'āt-i</i> <i>Khushkhaṭṭ Album</i> ^g Delhi, National Museum, Ms. 55.45, page 15 (fol. 8r)	Per Jake Benson, 2015: – Ms. 55.45 is comprised of at least three albums – the folio in question bears a series of prayers in Arabic – the folio in question is from the <i>Qit'āt-i Khushkhaṭṭ Album</i> , which is generally attributed to Ahmadnagar, late sixteenth century (research ongoing). The majority of this album is preserved in the University of Edinburgh (Or. Ms 373)	Probable type A notation, on a strip of white paper in the lower left corner of the outermost marbled border: "From the wardrobe. Collected into the royal library on the 6th of [loss])" ^h Misc. notation, beneath the above, in the gold ruling: "Two pens" (in reference to <i>naskh</i> and <i>suls</i> , as in no. 16)	Haidar and Sardar 2015, cat. nos. 18–19 (dispersed folios attributed to the <i>Qit'āt-i</i> <i>Khushkhaṭṭ Album</i>)

a When available, evidence of provenance (e.g., seal, inscription) is briefly described.

b I thank John Seyller for kindly sharing photographs.

c Seyller's citation of the Buhar catalogue as no. 181 requires correction to pp. 181–82 (no. 229).

d Since Ibrahim died in September 1627 and he was the author of the book in question, it is safe to presume that the *jāmadārkhāna* (wardrobe) mentioned in the notation was indeed his and that the volume was transferred to the royal library upon or shortly after the accession of his son Muhammad.

e I thank Jake Benson for his comments on these bookbinding terms.

f I am sincerely grateful to Jake Benson for bringing this folio (and no. 19 below) to my attention, sharing photographs, and offering his insight on the original albums. These critical folios expand our scope of inquiry into Bijapuri collecting beyond the manuscript alone.

g Benson's essay on the *Qit'āt-i Khushkhaṭṭ Album* is forthcoming in Overton, *Iran and the Deccan*.

h Since the type D notation was continued by a librarian who worked for Ibrahim's son and successor, Muhammad (see no. 15, fig. 4, where it is dated 17 Jumada I 1037 [January 24, 1628]), we must leave open the possibility that this type A notation post-dates 1627. However, because it describes a type of transfer common during Ibrahim's reign (from the wardrobe to the royal library), I currently favor his ownership (as with no. 15).

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

(for the appendix)

- Adamova, Adel. 2012. *Persian Manuscripts, Paintings and Drawings from the 15th to the Early 20th Century in the Hermitage Collection*. Translated by J. M. Rogers and edited by Simon Hartly. London: Azimuth Editions.
- Ashraf, Muhammad. 1967. *A Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts in the Salar Jung Museum & Library*. Vol. 4, *Concerning 546 MSS. of Poetry, From Beginning to 900 A.H., Firdausi to Jami*. Hyderabad: Salar Jung Museum and Library.
- Black, Crofton, and Nabil Saidi. 2005. *Islamic Manuscripts*. London: Sam Fogg Rare Books and Manuscripts.
- Bloch, Edgar. 1905–34. *Bibliothèque nationale: Catalogue des manuscrits persans*. 4 vols. Paris: Réunion des Bibliothèques nationales.
- Christie's, London. 2000. *Islamic Art and Manuscripts*. Sale held April 11, 2000.
- Ethé, Hermann. 1980. *Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts in the India Office Library*. London: India Office Library & Records.
- Flatt, Emma. 2011. "The Authorship and Significance of the *Nujūm al-'Ulūm*: A Sixteenth-Century Astrological Encyclopaedia from Bijapur." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 131, no. 2: 223–44.
- Haidar, Navina, and Marika Sardar, eds. 2011. *Sultans of the South: Arts of India's Deccan Courts, 1323–1687*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- Haidar, Navina, Marika Sardar, et al. 2015. *Sultans of Deccan India, 1500–1700: Opulence and Fantasy*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- Ḥasir Raḍawī, Qāsim, and 'Abd al-Muqtadir. 1921. *Catalogue raisonné of the Būhār Library*. Vol. 1, *Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts*. Calcutta: Imperial Library.
- Ibrāhīm 'Adil Shāh II. 1956. *Kitāb-i-Nauras [Kitāb-i Nawras]*. Edited and translated by Naẓir Aḥmad. New Delhi: Bharatiya Kala Kendra.
- Leach, Linda. 1995. *Mughal and Other Indian Paintings from the Chester Beatty Library*. 2 vols. London: Scorpion Cavendish.
- Lentz, Thomas W., and Glenn D. Lowry. 1989. *Timur and the Princely Vision: Persian Art and Culture in the Fifteenth Century*. Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art; Washington, D.C.: Arthur M. Sackler Gallery.
- Overton, Keelan. 2011. "A Collector and His Portrait: Book Arts and Painting for Ibrahim 'Adil Shah II of Bijapur (r. 1580–1627)." PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles.
- , ed. Forthcoming. *Iran and the Deccan: Persianate Art, Culture, and Talent in Circulation, c. 1400–1700*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Overton, Keelan, Bruce Wannell, and Kristine Rose Beers. Forthcoming. "Between Herat, Bijapur, and Mysore: The Qur'an in the University of St Andrews Library." In *Iran and the Deccan: Persianate Art, Culture, and Talent in Circulation, c. 1400–1700*, edited by Keelan Overton. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Quṭba b. Aws. 2010. *Dīwān shi'r al-Ḥādīra*. Copied by al-Yāqūt al-Musta'ṣimī, with an introduction and commentary by Mukhtār al-Dīn Aḥmad. Rampur, U.P.: Maktaba Riḍā.
- Richard, Francis. 2000. "Some Sixteenth-Century Deccani Persian Manuscripts in the Bibliothèque nationale de France." In *The Making of Indo-Persian Culture*, edited by Muzaffar Alam, Françoise 'Nalini' Delvoye, and Marc Gaborieau. New Delhi: Manohar.
- . 1997. *Splendeurs persanes: Manuscrits du XIIIe au XVIIIe siècle*. Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France.
- . 1993–94. "La signature discrète d'un doreur persan à la fin du XVe s.: Mīr 'Azod al-Mozahheb." *Revue des Études Islamiques* 61–62: 99–108.
- Rieu, Charles. 1966. *Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts in the British Museum*. London: British Museum.
- Robinson, B. W. 1976. *Persian Paintings in the India Office Library: A Descriptive Catalogue*. London: Sotheby Parke Bernet.
- Seyller, John. 1997. "The Inspection and Valuation of Manuscripts in the Imperial Mughal Library." *Artibus Asiae* 57, nos. 3–4: 243–349.
- Siddiqi, W. H. 1998. *Rampur Raza Library: Monograph*. Rampur, U.P.: Rampur Raza Library.
- Simpson, Marianna Shreve. 1997. *Sultan Ibrahim Mirza's Haft Awrang: A Princely Manuscript from Sixteenth-Century Iran*. New Haven: Yale University Press; Washington, D.C.: Freer Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution.
- Skelton, Robert, ed. 1982. *The Indian Heritage: Court Life & Arts under Mughal Rule*. London: Victoria and Albert Museum.
- Sotheby's, London. 1988. *Oriental Manuscripts and Miniatures*. Sale held October 10, 1988.
- Uluç, Lâle. 2006. *Turkman Governors, Shiraz Artisans and Ottoman Collectors: Sixteenth Century Shiraz Manuscripts*. Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

NOTES

Author's note: This article is the culmination of dissertation research carried out since 2007 and is dedicated to my adviser, Professor Irene "Renie" Bierman-McKinney (1942–2015), who introduced me to the Deccan and launched me on the path of Iran-India connections with her signature grace, encouragement, and intellect. For warm receptions and permission to publish images, I thank the staffs of the Raza Library, Salar Jung Museum, Jagdish and Kamla Mittal Museum of Art, Gulistan Palace Library, Museum of Islamic Art (Doha), Nápstrek Museum of Asian, African and American Cultures, National Library of Russia, State Hermitage Museum, University of St Andrews Library, Cambridge University Library, British Library, David Collection, Bibliothèque nationale de France, and Arthur M. Sackler Gallery. Mansoureh Azadvari, Gabriel Sewell, Maia Sheridan, and Ursula Sims-Williams deserve special thanks, and Klaus Rötzer and Ameen Hullur kindly approved the use of their personal images. Finally, I owe an immense debt of gratitude to Gülru Necipoğlu and Karen Leal for their exceptional editing and generous allocation of space and figures (I further congratulate the latter on her final volume and am delighted to have had the opportunity to work with her), the reviewers for their careful reading and support, and many colleagues who have shared their expertise over the years (specific contributions, of which there are many, are credited individually).

1. Mark Zebrowski, *Deccani Painting* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1983), 67. This exhaustive monograph remains a critical source on all things Deccani.
2. The Yale survey describes Ibrahim as "probably the most brilliant patron in the Deccan." Sheila S. Blair and Jonathan M. Bloom, *The Art and Architecture of Islam, 1250–1800* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 296. The Cambridge survey of Deccani art concludes: "Ibrahim elevated Bijapur painting to a level of expressive power and technical refinement that rivalled the greatest Mughal and Safavid works, but with an atmosphere of mystery that had no place in the classic phases of the other schools. Ibrahim was a dreamer, with an almost morbid sensitivity to art and music." George Michell and Mark Zebrowski, *Architecture and Art of the Deccan Sultanates*, New Cambridge History of India, ed. Gordon Johnson, pt. 1, vol. 7 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 163.
3. In her inspiring 2006 monograph, Deborah Hutton devoted a section to eight contemporary portraits of Ibrahim. Deborah Hutton, *Art of the Court of Bijapur* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2006), 96–107. I have assigned sixteen portraits to Ibrahim's reign, or immediately thereafter. Keelan Overton, "A Collector and His Portrait: Book Arts and Painting for Ibrahim 'Adil Shah II of Bijapur (r. 1580–1627)" (PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 2011), app. 2, "Contemporary Portraits of Ibrahim."
4. St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies, E-14, fol. 2.
5. See Michell and Zebrowski, *Architecture and Art of the Deccan Sultanates*, 169, where it is also reproduced as pl. 1.
6. See, among others, Zebrowski, *Deccani Painting*, 67; Michell and Zebrowski, *Architecture and Art of the Deccan Sultanates*, 163. These comments parallel the early twentieth-century assessment of Basil Gray, "Deccani Paintings: The School of Bijapur," *Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* 73, no. 425 (August 1938): 74.
7. The word *nawras* was ubiquitous at Ibrahim's court. Depending on the pronunciation of the first syllable (*naw* or *noh*), it can be translated as "nine moods" (based on the *rasas* of Indian aesthetic theory), "nine juices" (alluding to a wine recipe combining nine flavors), or "newly arrived" (from the Persian "new," *naw*, and "to arrive," *rasīdan*, in reference to a fresh garden or something generally innovative). Hutton, *Art of the Court*, 110, underscores that the term's popularity rested in its widespread appeal across Bijapur's composite culture. Local Indian audiences likely interpreted it through the *rasas* concept (as a specific emotion conveyed by a work of art), whereas members of the Iranian diaspora (see Hutton's quoting of Zuhuri) may have been more sensitive to the notion of freshness and newness (in light of linguistic parallels such as *Nawrūz*, lit. "new day," in reference to the Iranian New Year). At some point, the word evolved into a linguistic trope, as demonstrated by its designation of everything from coins (*hun-i nawras* [*hun* is Sanskrit for "pagoda"] to the royal flag (*'alam-i nawras*) to palaces (Qasr-i Nawras Bihisht/Nawras Mahal) to cities (Nawraspur). On the latter palace and city, see Hutton, *Art of the Court*, 111–19.
8. Dakhni is a Deccani vernacular and early form of Urdu. For an overview of Dakhni literature, including some of the Bijapuri texts discussed here, see D. J. Matthews, "Eighty Years of Dakani Scholarship," *Annual of Urdu Studies* 8 (1993): 91–107. Each song in the *Kitāb-i Nawras* is set to a specific *raga* (melody), and the book also includes seventeen couplets (*dohras*).
9. Ibrāhīm 'Adil Shāh II, *Kitāb-i Nauras* [*Kitāb-i Nawras*], ed. and trans. Nazīr Aḥmad (New Delhi: Bharatiya Kala Kendra, 1956), 128.
10. Michell and Zebrowski, *Architecture and Art of the Deccan Sultanates*, 163.
11. As early as 1995, John Seyller concluded, "Abundant visual and literary evidence has encouraged some scholars to stress the role of the patron's personality in the development of style, particularly in the case of the Muslim states of the Deccan and the Mughal empire. In this view, the patron Ibrahim 'Adil Shah II (reg 1579–1627) of Bijapur not only had the means and desire to summon talent to his court but also the force of personality to transmit his own poetical and musical interests to his painters, who translated them into melancholic colour schemes, fantastic landscape forms and sensitive rhythms of drapery and pattern [emphasis added]." John Seyller, "Indian Subcontinent, S XII, 2: Patronage: Painting," in *The Dictionary of Art*, ed. Jane Turner (New York: Grove's Dictionaries, 1995), 739–40. Deborah Hutton subsequently emphasized the phenomenon of "historiomachy," in which modern scholarship

- transforms prominent historical figures into heroes or villains, and further challenged Ibrahim's presumed patronage of Bijapuri monuments such as the Ibrahim Rauza. See Hutton, *Art of the Court*, 18, 125–32, building off of Seyller and Carl Ernst's assessment of "historiomachy" in *Eternal Garden: Mysticism, History, and Politics at a South Asian Sufi Center* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992), 20, 285n61.
12. Richard M. Eaton and Phillip B. Wagoner, *Power, Memory, Architecture: Contested Sites on India's Deccan Plateau, 1300–1600* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 161n84.
 13. Navina Haidar and Marika Sardar, et al., *Sultans of Deccan India, 1500–1700: Opulence and Fantasy* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2015), 79. While I challenge aspects of this presentation of Ibrahim, such criticism is minor in light of the exhibition's groundbreaking presentation of Deccani art and the catalogue's significant scholarly contributions. It also goes without saying that curators face tremendous external and internal pressures in public outreach and branding when developing international "blockbuster" exhibitions of this scale.
 14. I borrow this phrase from David J. Roxburgh, "After Munich: Reflections on Recent Exhibitions," in *After One Hundred Years: The 1910 Exhibition "Meisterwerke muhammedanischer Kunst" Reconsidered*, ed. Andrea Lerner and Avinoam Shalem (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 382.
 15. Roberta Smith, "'Sultans of Deccan India,' Unearthly Treasures of a Golden Age at the Met," review of the exhibition "Sultans of Deccan India, 1500–1700: Opulence and Fantasy" at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, *New York Times*, April 23, 2015, <http://nyti.ms/1PnDJ7S> (accessed November 15, 2015). Like many of the reviews summarized in the final section of Roxburgh, "After Munich" (pp. 377–84), this example includes several neo-Orientalist recursions, particularly the trend toward formalism and aestheticization (note the use of terms such as "dazzling," "ravishing," "beautiful," and "lavishness," which are of course intended to appeal to the general public approaching the material for the first time). These criticisms aside, the reviewer aptly recognizes the technical sophistication of the artworks on display and acknowledges the rarity of their presentation in a single venue.
 16. Nur al-Din Muhammad Zuhuri (d. 1616), quoted at the beginning of Hutton, *Art of the Court*, 1. See Zuhūrī, *Sih Naṣr*, in Muhammad 'Abdul Ghani, ed. and trans., *A History of Persian Language and Literature at the Mughal Court, with a Brief Survey of the Growth of Urdu Language (Bābur to Akbar)*, 3 vols. (Allahabad: Indian Press, 1930), 3: 397–98.
 17. The painting was first published in Chandramani Singh and Madhvendra Narayan, *From the Collection of Maharaja of Jaipur: Six Multicoloured Prints, Surat Khana, Jaipur, 16th–17th Century, Mughal and Deccani* (Jaipur: Jaigarh Public Charitable Trust, 2003), pl. C, where the authors argue, "Ibrahim Adil Shah was a great devotee of Saraswati, the goddess of speech. His book *Kitab-i-Nauras* begins with an invocation to the goddess. The painting could be the *unwan*-opening page of the book or an independent work commissioned by the Sultan."
 18. Robert Skelton, "The Mughal Artist Farrukh Beg," *Ars Orientalis* 2 (1957): 393–411. I am indebted to Robert for his inspiration, hospitality, encouragement, and encyclopedic insight throughout my dissertation project and the years following.
 19. Among others, see John Seyller, "Farrukh Beg in the Deccan," *Artibus Asiae* 55, nos. 3–4 (1995): 319–41; Abolala Soudavar, "Between the Safavids and the Mughals: Art and Artists in Transition," *Iran* 37 (1999): 49–66; Milo C. Beach, "Farrukh Beg," in *Masters of Indian Painting*, vol. 1, 1100–1650, ed. Milo C. Beach, Eberhard Fischer, and B. N. Goswamy, 2 vols., *Artibus Asiae Supplementum* 48 (2011): 187–210. See also Skelton's current thinking in "Farrukh Beg in the Deccan: An Update," in *Sultans of the South: Arts of India's Deccan Courts, 1323–1687*, ed. Navina Najat Haidar and Marika Sardar (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2011), 12–25; Keelan Overton, "Farrukh Ḥusayn," in *Encyclopaedia of Islam Three*, forthcoming 2016. Despite this relative consensus, only the following is incontrovertible, and presented here according to five distinct stages of production/patronage. First, Farrukh Beg was a "trusted companion" of the Safavid heir apparent Hamza Mirza (evidence: *Tārīkh-i 'Ālam-ārā-yi 'Abbāsī*). Second, Farrukh Ḥusayn was affiliated with the Kabul ruler Mirza Hakim in 1584–85 (evidence: two signed portraits, one dated—Tehran, Gulistan Palace Library, no. 1663, fols. 199 [fig. 28], 234). Third, in 1585, Farrukh Beg entered Akbar's service, and works ascribed to him subsequently appeared in major Mughal manuscripts (evidence: *Akbarnāma* text and ascribed manuscript illustrations, including, but not limited to, London, Victoria and Albert Museum, IS.2.117-1896 [*Akbarnāma*], and Washington, D.C., Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, S1986.232 and S1986.231 [*Bāburnāma*]; the *Bāburnāma* illustration reproduced here [fig. 27] does not bear an ascription). Fourth, Farrukh Ḥusayn was one of the most accomplished painters in Ibrahim's Bijapur (evidence: *Sih Naṣr* text, two signed paintings—"Saraswati enthroned" [fig. 1] and the St. Petersburg "Ibrahim hawking," with a partial signature discussed in Seyller, "Farrukh Beg in the Deccan"—and a second portrait of Ibrahim ascribed to the artist at the Mughal court [fig. 2]). Finally, Farrukh Beg was prominent at Jahangir's court circa 1609–19 (evidence: *Jahāngīrnāma* and *Iqbāl-nāma-i Jahāngīrī* [Book of Fortune] texts and several ascribed paintings [figs. 2, 30]).
 20. As first proposed in Skelton, "Mughal Artist," 401–2, and further elaborated in Soudavar, "Between the Safavids and the Mughals," 60.
 21. Soudavar, "Between the Safavids and the Mughals," 55.
 22. Soudavar suggests that both Muhammadi and Farrukh contributed one painting to Ibrahim Mirza's renowned *Haft Awrang* (Washington, D.C., Freer Gallery of Art, 46.12). Abolala Soudavar, "The Age of Muhammadi," *Muqarnas* 17 (2000): 65–66. He also attributes twenty-nine paintings in Hamza Mirza's *Haft Awrang* (Istanbul, Topkapı Pal-

- ace Library, H. 1483) to Farrukh circa 1580–83, and one to Muhammadi, arguing that this manuscript was begun at the court of Ibrahim Mirza and refurbished under Hamza Mirza. Soudavar, “Between the Safavids and Mughals,” 56–57; Soudavar, “Age of Muhammadi,” 65. Hamza Mirza’s library-atelier was at one point controlled by the vizier Mirza Salman (d. 1583), and Soudavar posits (“Between the Safavids and Mughals,” 59) that the vizier’s assassination in 1583 may explain Farrukh’s migration to Kabul. For the most recent analysis of Muhammadi’s production under Mirza Salman, see Abolala Soudavar, “The Patronage of the Vizier Mirza Salman,” *Muqarnas* 30 (2013): 213–34.
23. On the independent kingdom of Kabul under Mirza Hakim, see Munis D. Faruqi, “The Forgotten Prince: Mirza Hakim and the Formation of the Mughal Empire in India,” *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 48, 4 (2005): 487–523.
 24. Farrukh’s Akbar-period production may prove to be his most ambiguous. Some of his ostensible (per ascriptions) *Bāburnāma* and *Akbarnāma* illustrations could have been painted in Khurasan or Kabul, and were simply recycled in these later Mughal manuscripts. See the critical observation in Susan Stronge, *Painting for the Mughal Emperor: The Art of the Book, 1560–1660* (London: V&A Publications, 2002), 44; also Beach, “Farrukh Beg,” 196, 200. I thank Susan Stronge for ongoing conversations about this artist.
 25. For the artist’s departure from Akbar’s court to Ibrahim’s, the date of which is again based on circumstantial evidence, see Seyller, “Farrukh Beg in the Deccan,” 340; Beach, “Farrukh Beg,” 204.
 26. Throughout this article, I employ the term *gharībān* over the more commonly used *āfāqī*. The latter is largely a product of twentieth-century scholarship, as underscored in Roy Fischel, “Society, Space, and the State in the Deccan Sultanates, 1565–1636” (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2012), 180n4, building upon the earlier work of Richard Eaton, *A Social History of the Deccan, 1300–1761: Eight Indian Lives* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 68n27; Eaton, “‘Kiss My Foot,’ Said the King: Firearms, Diplomacy, and the Battle for Raichur, 1520,” *Modern Asian Studies* 43, 1 (January 2009): 294n10. Contemporary chroniclers generally describe the immigrants in question as *gharībān*, which Fischel translates as “foreigners,” thus distinguishing between *gharīb* (foreigner) and *gharībī* (westerner). On the so-called Deccani-Westerner rift originating during the Bahmani period (1347–1527), see Richard Eaton in Haidar and Sardar, *Sultans of the South*, 4–6. For variants of the term *Dakkanī*, see Fischel, “Society, Space, and the State,” 53.
 27. It is not within the scope of this article to comment on all aspects of Bijapur’s cosmopolitan culture. For recent scholarship on Europeans affiliated with Ibrahim, see Deborah Hutton and Rebecca Tucker, “A Dutch Artist in Bijapur,” in *The Visual World of Muslim India: The Art, Culture and Society of the Deccan in the Early Modern Era*, ed. Laura Parodi (London: I. B. Tauris, 2014), 205–32 (on the painter Cornelis Claesz de Heda); Keelan Overton, “*Vida de Jacques de Coutre*: A Flemish Account of Bijapuri Visual Culture in the Shadow of Mughal Felicity,” in Parodi, *Visual World of Muslim India*, 233–64 (on the jewel merchant Jacques de Coutre). Sanjay Subrahmanyam has written extensively on Bijapur-Portuguese connections. See, for example, Sanjay Subrahmanyam, “An Infernal Triangle: The Contest between Mughals, Safavids and Portuguese, 1590–1605,” in *Iran and the World in the Safavid Age*, ed. Willem Floor and Edmund Herzig (London: I. B. Tauris, 2012), 121–48. Subrahmanyam’s scholarship inspired much of my 2011 dissertation, aspects of which are continued and developed here.
 28. This binary is challenged in Subah Dayal, “The Career(s) and Memory of Neknam Khan in Seventeenth-Century Deccan” (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association, Washington, D.C., January 2014, and chapter 3 of her dissertation entitled “Landscapes of Conquest: Patrons and Narratives in the 17th-Century Deccan” (University of California, Los Angeles, 2016). I thank the author for sharing her work in advance of publication.
 29. For Asad Beg’s description of Ibrahim’s “broken” Persian, see P. M. Joshi, “Asad Beg’s Mission to Bijapur, 1603–1604,” in *Mahamahopadhyaya Prof. D.V. Potdar Sixty First Birthday Commemoration Volume*, ed. Surendra N. Sen (Poona: D.K. Sathe, 1950), 191.
 30. Sajjad H. Rizvi, “Bijapur,” in *Medieval Islamic Civilization: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Josef W. Meri and Jere L. Bacharach, 2 vols. (New York: Taylor & Francis, 2006), 1:108. Khandalavala had earlier argued, “He [Ibrahim] restored Sunni rites and saw to it that Deccanis and Abyssinians replaced the Persians who held all the high offices of state. He also changed the official language from Persian to Deccani.”: Karl Khandalavala, “Five Miniatures in the Collection of Sir Cowasji Jehangir,” *Marg* 5, 2 (1952): 26.
 31. For an English translation of the *Khān-i Khalīl* section in question, see Zuhūri, *Sih Naṣr*, ed. and trans. Ghani, 453–67. On Zuhuri, see Paul Losensky, *Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition* (henceforth *EI2*), s.v. “Zuhūri Turshīzī” (the same author’s expanded article on Zuhuri is forthcoming in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*). On Malik Qummi, see Munibur Rahman, *EI2*, s.v. “Malik Qummi.”
 32. For Fathullah Shirazi, see Ali Anooshahr, “Shirazi Scholars and the Political Culture of the Sixteenth Century Indo-Persian World,” *Indian Economic and Social History Review* 51, 3 (2014): 331–52.
 33. Shah Navaz Khan’s impact on Ibrahim’s Persian education is discussed in T. N. Devare, *A Short History of Persian Literature at the Bahmani, the Adilshahi, and the Qutbshahi Courts: Deccan* (Poona: S. Devare, 1961), 83–86. On his palace at Nawraspur, see Hutton, *Art of the Court*, 111–15. For panegyric in praise of Shah Navaz Khan, see Devare, *Short History*, 166–67.
 34. Paul Losensky, “‘Square like a Bubble’: Architecture, Power, and Poetics in Two Inscriptions by Kalim Kāshāni,” *Journal of Persianate Studies* 8 (2015): 42–70. I am grateful to the author for sharing his essay in advance of publication.

35. Mahdi Bayānī, *Aḥvāl va āṣār-i khushnīvisān*, 2 vols. (Tehran: Intishārāt-i 'Ilmī, 1363 [1985]), 1:177–80, no. 697 (s.v. “Khalillullah Shāh—Mīr”); Nazir Ahmad, “Shāh Khalilullāh Khushnawīs: The Royal Calligraphist of the ‘Adilshahi Court,” *Islamic Culture* 44 (January 1970): 35–55. Hamidreza Ghelichkhani’s assessment of the calligrapher is forthcoming in Keelan Overton, ed., *Iran and the Deccan: Persianate Art, Culture, and Talent in Circulation, c. 1400–1700* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press).
36. Sotheby’s, London, *Arts of the Islamic World*, April 9, 2014, lot 60.
37. Most of the known pages from this dispersed manuscript are preserved in the National Museum, New Delhi. See Haidar and Sardar, *Sultans of Deccan India*, cat. no. 45; Navina Haidar, “The *Kitab-i Nauras*: Key to Bijapur’s Golden Age,” in Haidar and Sardar, *Sultans of the South*, figs. 5–11.
38. Sotheby’s, *Arts of the Islamic World*, April 9, 2014, lot 60.
39. Private collection and former Sitaram Sahu collection (now missing), reproduced in Haidar and Sardar, *Sultans of Deccan India*, cat. no. 31, fig. 50. A drawing of Atish Khan (Washington, D.C., Freer Gallery of Art, F1997.16) has also been attributed to Farrukh. Milo Cleveland Beach, *Imperial Image: Paintings for the Mughal Court* (Washington, D.C.: Freer Gallery of Art, 2012), no. 50. In the same publication, also see a drawing of the Madonna and Child (no. 51) attributed to Farrukh’s Bijapur or Mughal periods, ca. 1605–10 (a related painting is preserved in Delhi, National Museum, 58.20/26). For a complete survey of works attributed to Farrukh, not all of which are discussed here, see the various sources cited in n. 19.
40. Haidar and Sardar, *Sultans of Deccan India*, 100. The color plate in Singh and Narayan, *Six Multicoloured Prints*, is the best available reproduction. The painting is in a private royal collection and unavailable for study.
41. An early copy of the *Manba‘ al-Anhār* is preserved in a *Kulliyāt* (Collected Works) of Zuhuri bearing seals of Shah Jahan (r. 1628–58) dated 1045 (1635–36) and 1046 (1636–37). See Hermann Ethé, *Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office* (London: India Office Library & Records, 1980), 820–22, no. 1500, no. 2; Devare, *Short History*, 85–86, 202 (no. 8), 219. For a *maṣnavī* by Malik Qummi in the meter of *Khusraw va Shīrīn*, see Ethé, *Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts*, 820, no. 1499; Devare, *Short History*, 201 (no. 5). Zehni was also reportedly asked to compose a response (*javāb*) to Nizami’s *Makhzan al-Asrār*. Devare, *Short History*, 86.
42. The variety of “push-pull” factors determining migration are discussed in Sanjay Subrahmanyam, “Iranians Abroad: Intra-Asian Elite Migration and Early Modern State Formation,” *Journal of Asian Studies* 51 (1992): 340–63.
43. For the rise of Mahdawi millenarianism in 1580s Ahmadnagar, and associated negative implications for Shi‘i Iranian émigrés such as Firishṭa, see Subrahmanyam, “Infernal Triangle,” 126.
44. Mir Muhammad Amin’s circulation patterns paralleled those of Kalim. Originally from Shahrīstan, near Isfahan, he migrated to the Deccan around 1600, rose to the post of *mir jumla* (prime minister) of Golconda during the reign of Muhammad Quli Qutb Shah (r. 1580–1612), briefly returned to Iran, and subsequently excelled under both Jahangir and Shah Jahan.
45. On Kalim, see Wheeler Thackston, “The Poetry of Abū Tālib Kalim; Persian Poet-Laureate of Shāhjahān,” 2 vols. (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1974).
46. For Fayzi’s praise of Malik Qummi and Zuhuri, and suggestion that they be “called to the Mughal court,” see Muzaffar Alam and Sanjay Subrahmanyam, “A Place in the Sun: Travels with Faizi in the Deccan, 1591–93,” in *Les sources et le temps / Sources and Time: A Colloquium, Pondicherry 11–13 January 1997*, ed. François Grimal (Pondicherry: Institut français de Pondichéry, Ecole française d’Extrême-Orient, 2001), 294. On Malik Qummi and Khan-i Khanan, see Devare, *Short History*, 204–5, relying on the *Ma‘āṣir-i Raḥīmī* (Memoirs of ‘Abd al-Rahīm) of ‘Abd al-Bāqī Nihāwandī; Rahman, “Malik Qummi.”
47. Devare, *Short History*, 205, building on the firsthand account of ‘Abd al-Bāqī, *Ma‘āṣir-i Raḥīmī*. For Mir Jamal al-Din’s role as Akbar’s ambassador to Bijapur, including his arrangement of the marriage of Ibrahim’s daughter to Prince Daniyal, see Muzaffar Alam and Sanjay Subrahmanyam, “The Deccan Frontier and Mughal Expansion, ca. 1600: Contemporary Perspectives,” *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 47, 3 (2004): 380–82. Mir Jamal al-Din’s inordinately long delay in Bijapur prompted Akbar to dispatch a second envoy, Asad Beg, as extensively discussed in Alam and Subrahmanyam, “Witnessing Transition: Views on the End of the Akbari Dispensation,” in *The Making of History: Essays Presented to Irfan Habib*, ed. K. N. Panikkar et al. (New Delhi: Tulika, 2000): 104–40.
48. Ahmadnagar was annexed by the Mughals in 1636, Bijapur in 1686, and Golconda in 1687. On Bijapur’s tenuous political circumstances in the shadow of Mughal felicity, and the associated visual record, see Overton, “*Vida de Jacques de Coutre*.”
49. The extensive literature on Safavid-Deccani diplomacy includes Ahmad, “Shāh Khalilullāh”; Iskandar Munshī, *History of Shah ‘Abbas the Great = Tārīkh-i ‘Ālam-ārā-yi ‘Abbāsī*, trans. Roger M. Savory, 3 vols. (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1978), 2:1079–80, 1172 (Khalilullah’s two missions); Riazul Islam, *A Calendar of Documents on Indo-Persian Relations, 1500–1750*, 2 vols. (Tehran: Iranian Culture Foundation, 1979–82), 2:131–37; Nazir Ahmad, “‘Adilshāhī Diplomatic Missions to the Court of Shāh ‘Abbās,” *Islamic Culture* 43, 1 (April 1969): 143–61; Nazir Ahmad, “Letters of the Rulers of the Deccan to Shah ‘Abbas of Iran,” in *Medieval India: A Miscellany* (Aligarh: Asia Publishing House, 1969), 280–300; Syed Muhammad Raza Naqvi, “Shah Abbas and the Conflict between Jahangir and the Deccan States,” in *Medieval India: A Miscellany*, 272–79.
50. This letter is most recently discussed in Subrahmanyam, “Infernal Triangle,” 128–29. Also see Islam, *Calendar of Documents*, 2:131–35 (Dn. 298.1).

51. A brief summary of Qutb Shahi-Safavid diplomacy is provided in Laura Weinstein, "Variations on a Persian Theme: Adaptation and Innovation in Early Manuscripts from Golconda" (PhD diss., Columbia University, 2011), 35–38.
52. Subrahmanyam, "Infernal Triangle," 128–29.
53. Dublin, Chester Beatty Library, In 07A.17, reproduced in Elaine Wright et al., *Muraqqa' Imperial Mughal Albums from the Chester Beatty Library* (Alexandria, Va.: Art Services International, 2008), cat. no. 52.
54. London, British Library, Johnson Album 25, no. 14, reproduced in Keelan Overton, "Ali Riza (The Bodleian Painter)," in *Masters of Indian Painting*, vol. 1, 1100–1650, ed. Beach et al., fig. 9; Haidar and Sardar, *Sultans of Deccan India*, cat. no. 41.
55. Staffordshire, Earl of Harrowby Collection, reproduced in Overton, "Ali Riza (The Bodleian Painter)," fig. 3.
56. London, British Museum, 1997.1108.01, reproduced in *ibid.*, fig. 12; Haidar and Sardar, *Sultans of Deccan India*, cat. no. 46.
57. This is not to say that other texts were not commissioned and written during Ibrahim's reign. In addition to the well-known chronicles and panegyric (Firishṭa, Shirazi, Malik Qummi, Zuhuri), a treatise on perfumery (*Itṛīyya-i Nawras Shāhī*) was composed for the ruler. A copy dating to the reign of Muhammad 'Adil Shah survives in the British Library. Ethé, *Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts*, no. 3076/B 490.
58. Hyderabad, Salar Jung Museum, M. 177. See the text page reproduced in Haidar, "Kitāb-i Nauras," fig. 3. The date of 990 has been debated.
59. Hyderabad, Central Records Office.
60. Dispersed. For Delhi, National Museum, 69-22/1-6 and Cleveland Museum of Art, 2013.284.b, see Haidar and Sardar, *Sultans of Deccan India*, cat. no. 45.
61. London, British Library, Add. 16880. This Sufi romance by Hasan Manjhu Khalji was extensively analyzed in Deborah Hutton, "The *Pem Nem*: A Sixteenth-Century Illustrated Romance from Bijapur," in Haidar and Sardar, *Sultans of the South*, 44–63, building upon her earlier discussion in *Art of the Court*, 73–83. Also see the most recent publication in Haidar and Sardar, *Sultans of Deccan India*, cat. no. 29.
62. Hyderabad, State Museum. See Ghulam Yazdani, "Two Miniatures from Bijapur," *Islamic Culture* 9 (1935) H: 212–16; Robert Skelton, "Documents for the Study of Painting at Bijapur in the Late Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Centuries," *Arts Asiatiques* 5, 2 (1958): 99–100; Zebrowski, *Deccani Painting*, 76, fig. 52.
63. Sotheby's, *Arts of the Islamic World*, lot 60.
64. Dispersed. See the forthcoming essay by Laura Weinstein, "The Shahnama in the Deccan: A Dispersed Bijapur Shahnama of ca. 1610," in *Shahnama Studies III*, ed. Charles Melville and G. R. van den Berg (Leiden and Boston: Brill), and her assessment in cat. nos. 34–37 in Haidar and Sardar, *Sultans of Deccan India*, 106–9.
65. *Ustād-i kā'ināt ki in kārkhāna sākht / maqṣūd 'ishq būd ki nawras bahāna sākht*. I am grateful to Wheeler Thackston for this amended translation of Zebrowski, *Deccani Painting*, 76.
66. Ibrāhīm 'Adil Shāh II, *Kitāb-i Nauras* [*Kitāb-i Nawras*], ed. and trans. Aḥmad, 134–35, 146–47. Analyses of the Prague painting include Hana Knížková, "Notes on the Portrait of Ibrahim 'Adil Shah II of Bijapur in the Náprstek Museum, Prague," in *Facets of Indian Art: A Symposium Held at the Victoria and Albert Museum on 26, 27, 28 April and 1 May 1982*, ed. Robert Skelton et al. (London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 1986), 116–23; Zebrowski, *Deccani Painting*, 95–96; Hutton, *Art of the Court*, 101–2; Haidar, "Kitāb-i Nauras."
67. Ibrāhīm 'Adil Shāh II, *Kitāb-i Nauras* [*Kitāb-i Nawras*], ed. and trans. Ahmad, 125, 146.
68. For Jahangir's comments on Ibrahim's songs, see Wheeler Thackston, ed., *The Jahangirnāma: Memoirs of Jahangir, Emperor of India* (Washington, D.C.: Freer Gallery of Art, 1999), 164.
69. The circular seal accompanying a notation dated 24 Ramadan 920 (November 12, 1514) in a two-volume anthology dated 838–40 (1435–36) (Dublin, Chester Beatty Library, Ms. 124) is commonly associated with Isma'il (per the date of the notation). See Arthur J. Arberry, Mujtabā Minuṣī, and Edgar Blochet, *The Chester Beatty Library: A Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts and Miniatures*, vol. 1, MSS. 101–150, ed. J. V. S. Wilkinson (Dublin: Hodges Figgis, 1959), 53; Barbara Brend, *Perspectives on Persian Painting: Illustrations to Amīr Khusrāu's Khamsah* (London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003), 79; Overton, "Collector and His Portrait," 46–47. This seal and its host folio are available for viewing on the Chester Beatty Library's "Islamic Seals Database," <http://www.cbl.ie/islamicseals/View-Seals/346.aspx> (accessed November 15, 2015). At least two seals can be associated with 'Alī I; see the impressions in London, British Library, Loth 463/B 185, and Doha, Museum of Islamic Art, Ms. 302 (appendix, no. 8). These seals, and many other Bijapuri and Deccani examples, are translated and analyzed in Keelan Overton and Jake Benson, "Deccani Seals: Sources for the Study of Indo-Persian Book Arts and Collecting, c. 1400–1680," in *Empires of the Near East & India: Voices from the Safavid, Ottoman, and Mughal Societies*, ed. Hani Khafipour (Columbia University Press, 2017).
70. Rafī' al-Din Shirazi, quoted from P. M. Joshi, "Ali 'Adil Shah of Bijapur (1558–1580) and His Royal Librarian: Two Ruq'as," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bombay*, n.s., 31–32 (1956–57): 97. This oft-cited passage is also discussed in Saleemuddin Qureshi, "The Royal Library of Bijapur," *Pakistan Library Bulletin* 11, 3–4 (September–December 1980): 2–3; Zebrowski, *Deccani Painting*, 61; Hutton, *Art of the Court*, 51; Overton, "Collector and His Portrait," 47–48.
71. I thank Wheeler Thackston for his comments on Persian interpretations of *nawras*.
72. For the Asar Mahal, a pillared hall facing onto a large tank, see Mark Brand, "Bijapur under the Adil Shahis (1490–1686)," in *Silent Splendour: Palaces of the Deccan, 14th–19th Centuries*, ed. Helen Philon (Mumbai: Marg Publications, 2010), 70–73, fig. 6.

73. On the Asar Mahal collection, see Qureshi, "Royal Library"; Otto Loth, *A Catalogue of the Arabic Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office* (London, 1877). Volumes in this repository are henceforth identified as Loth xyz/B xyz (Loth's Arabic catalogue is ordered chronologically by the former; the "B" number follows and indicates Bijapur/Asar Mahal volumes). Chapter 2 of my dissertation ("Collector and His Portrait") built upon Qureshi's critical scholarship but diverged in three ways: it focused on collecting during Ibrahim's reign, identified the ruler's marks of ownership, and used the latter to locate dispersed volumes (thereby expanding the scope of inquiry beyond the British Library's Asar Mahal collection). I sincerely thank Ursula Sims-Williams for recently taking and sharing photographs of critical Asar Mahal volumes, and for accommodating (along with her colleagues) several research visits over the years.
74. Skelton, "Mughal Artist," 98.
75. Qureshi, "Royal Library," 13.
76. Ethé, *Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts*, nos. 3060–76.
77. Consider London, British Library, Loth 525/B 181 (originally published by Loth as B 181A, see p. 144), where the word *aval* is written prominently on fol. 3r (fig. 5). For this ranking system at the Mughal court (first, second, and third class, each with varying grades), see John Seyller's magisterial "The Inspection and Valuation of Manuscripts in the Imperial Mughal Library," *Artibus Asiae* 57, 3–4 (1997): 273–76, esp. table 1.
78. I have not examined each manuscript firsthand and acknowledge that there may be exceptions to this general observation.
79. Upon the Mughal conquest of Bijapur in 1686, many of the Asar Mahal manuscripts were inspected by Qabil Khan, a librarian under 'Alamgir (r. 1658–1707) (see appendix, nos. 5, 9, 10). 'Alamgir seems to have adopted the Asar Mahal library partially as his own, for some of the manuscripts bear his marks of ownership, predating the conquest of Bijapur by decades. The library was systematically inspected during the reign of Nizam al-Mulk (r. 1724–48), the founder of the Asaf Jahi dynasty of Hyderabad, and manuscripts dating to the early eighteenth century confirm that it was active until this period. The library suffered its most extensive destruction during Bijapur's Maratha period (1760–1818) and not during 'Alamgir's conquest, as commonly assumed. See Qureshi, "Royal Library"; Loth, *Catalogue of the Arabic Manuscripts*.
80. The appendix here ("Manuscripts and Album Folios belonging to Ibrahim 'Adil Shah II [r. 1580–1627] in Global Collections") is a revised and expanded version of appendix 3 in Overton, "Collector and His Portrait." With the exception of the dispersed *Kitāb-i Nawras* copied by Khalilullah (no. 17), all of the codices contain at least one of Ibrahim's marks of ownership. Because the Khalilullah *Khamsa* was presented to Ibrahim and earned the calligrapher the title *pādishāh-i qalam*, the ruler's possession is presumed.
81. The two folios are currently part of a single album preserved in the National Museum, Delhi (Ms. 55.45), but research by Jake Benson, who kindly brought them to my attention, reveals that they originally belonged to two separate albums. It is currently unclear if Ibrahim owned these single sheets alone or their entire respective albums. On the art of marbling in the Deccan, see Jake Benson, "The Art of *Abri*: Marbled Album Leaves, Drawings, and Paintings of the Deccan," in Haidar and Sardar, *Sultans of Deccan India*, 157–59. Benson's essay on one of the albums in question (the example preserving no. 19) is forthcoming in Overton, *Iran and the Deccan*.
82. Kumatgi and its wall paintings are discussed in Overton, "Collector and His Portrait," chap. 3.
83. As the wall painting is in very poor condition, the line drawing reproduced in Henry Cousens, *Bijāpūr and Its Architectural Remains, With an Historical Outline of the 'Ādil Shāhi Dynasty* (repr., Delhi: Bharatiya Publication House, 1976), pl. cxiii (see fig. 8), proved critical to my identification of the scene.
84. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1985.404.1, reproduced in Haidar and Sardar, *Sultans of Deccan India*, cat. no. 34.
85. For a discussion of the Rustam-Sohrab wall painting in light of the Bijapuri *Shāhnāma* and the collected Qazvin or Isfahan manuscript (appendix, no. 7), see Overton, "Collector and His Portrait," 135–39, figs. 132–37.
86. *Ibid.*, 143–44, figs. 149–52.
87. For a *Jahāngīrnāma* illustration with a wall painting of Layla visiting Majnun (St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies, E-14, fol. 21r), see Susan Stronge, *Made for Mughal Emperors: Royal Treasures from Hindustan* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2010), pl. 95. Jahangir's self-identification with Majnun is discussed in Ebba Koch, "The Mughal Emperor as Solomon, Majnun, and Orpheus, or the Album as a Think Tank for Allegory," *Muqarnas* 27 (2010): 278–311. For contemporary Rajput murals with Majnun, see Edward Leland Rothfarb, "The Architecture of Raja Bir Singh Dev of Orchha (r. 1605–27): Continuity, Adaptation and Invention" (PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 2010), figs. 189 (Datia), 190 (Bairat). For a Qutb Shahi history describing the decoration of palaces with "likenesses of Abdullah Qutb Shah and rulers from other kingdoms, scenes of hunting and royal sport, and images of the literary couples Yusuf and Zulaykha and Layla and Majnun," see Marika Sardar, "Golconda and Hyderabad under the Qutb Shahis (1495–1687)," in Philon, *Silent Splendour*, 87.
88. An overview of these ownership marks is provided in François Déroche, Annie Berthier, Muhammad Isa Waley, et al., *Islamic Codicology: An Introduction to the Study of Manuscripts in Arabic Script* (London: Al-Furqān Islamic Heritage Foundation, 2006), 311–44. The study of Islamic seals is gaining momentum and visibility. Major contributions of recent years include Venetia Porter, Shailendra Bhandare et al., *Arabic and Persian Seals and Amulets in the British Museum* (London: British Museum, 2011); Annabel Teh Gallop and Venetia Porter, *Lasting Impressions: Seals from the Islamic World* (Kuala Lumpur: Islamic

- Arts Museum Malaysia, in association with the British Library and the British Museum, 2012); Muḥammad Javād Jiddī, *Dānishnāma-i Muhr va ḥakkākī dar Īrān* (Tehran: Kitābkhāna, Mūzih va Markaz-i Asnād-i Majlis-i Shūrā-yi Islāmī, 1392 [2013]); and the Chester Beatty Library's Islamic Seals Database, <http://www.cbl.ie/islamicseals/> (accessed November 15, 2015). John Seyller's meticulous cataloguing of Indian seals, and their related inscriptions, for over two decades requires little introduction (see some of his findings in "Inspection and Valuation"). The author and many others continually build upon his foundational work; see, for example, the exemplary Adel T. Adamova and Manijeh Bayani, *Persian Painting: The Arts of the Book and Portraiture* (London: Thames & Hudson Ltd, 2015), 435–42. As this article was in press, Jake Benson informed me of an important essay on Qutb Shahi seals: 'Alī Ṣafarī Āqqal'a, "Muhrhā va yāddāshthā-yi Sulṭān Muḥammad Qutbshāh va muhr-i Sulṭān 'Abdullah Qutbshāh dar barkhi nuskhahā-yi Kitābkhāna-i Qutbshāhīyān," *Awraq-i 'Atiq* 4 (2015): 221–50.
89. This seal was correctly attributed to Ibrahim II in Seyller, "Inspection and Valuation," 297; and Francis Richard, "Some Sixteenth-Century Deccani Persian Manuscripts in the Bibliothèque nationale de France," in *The Making of Indo-Persian Culture*, ed. Muzaffar Alam, Françoise 'Nalini' Delvoye, and Marc Gaborieau (New Delhi: Manohar, 2000), 244. It was nevertheless misattributed to Ibrahim Mirza in Christie's, *Islamic Art and Manuscripts*, London, April 11, 2000, lot 79, 52–53 (concerning appendix, no. 1); and Crofton Black and Nabil Saidi, *Islamic Manuscripts* (Catalogue 22) (London: Sam Fogg Rare Books and Manuscripts, 2005), 72–73, no. 27 (concerning appendix, no. 8), which further misidentifies the book with Ibrahim I (r. 1535–58). My current understanding is that this seal does not appear in any of the British Library's Asar Mahal manuscripts.
 90. Also see New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1983.227; Paris, Musée du Louvre, MAO 2089, among others. The approximately twenty vessels of this type are the focus of ongoing research by Abdullah Ghouchani and Navina Haidar. See their preliminary findings, with Marika Sardar, in "Inscribed Sacred Vessels," in Haidar and Sardar, *Sultans of Deccan India*, 259–67.
 91. Richard Eaton, *Sufis of Bijapur, 1300–1700: Social Roles of Sufis in Medieval India* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1978), 110–11. For Ibrahim's devotion to the Prophet, Saraswati, and Gesu Daraz, see Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh II, *Kitāb-i Nauras* [*Kitāb-i Nawras*], ed. and trans. Ahmad, 128.
 92. Abdullah Ghouchani and Bruce Wannell, "The Inscriptions of the Ibrahim Rauza Tomb," in Haidar and Sardar, *Sultans of the South*, 290 (E-1-9).
 93. Bruce Wannell, "The Epigraphic Program of the Ibrahim Rauza in Bijapur," in Haidar and Sardar, *Sultans of the South*, 255–56, 259, 266.
 94. For Koranic verses appearing on royal seals (for example, all of Sura 112), see Porter et al., *Arabic and Persian Seals and Amulets*, 17, 60.
 95. In some cases, the illumination was completed but the inscription never added. See London, British Library, Loth 422/B 177A; Loth 426/B 203, fol. 4r; Loth 428/B 223A, fol. 3r.
 96. The short inscriptions in Timurid ex libris begin with the phrase *bi-rasm-i* (by the order of) or *li-khizāna al-kutub* (for the treasury of books), followed by the ruler's name and titles alone. For the ex libris of Baysunghur (d. 1433), see David Roxburgh, *The Persian Album, 1400–1600: From Dispersal to Collection* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), fig. 19. An even more concise inscription appears in Shah Jahan's ex libris in his eponymous album (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 55.121.10.39). See *Masterpieces from the Department of Islamic Art in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*, ed. Maryam D. Ekhtiar et al. (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2011), no. 250A.
 97. Consider the Baysunghur example: Roxburgh, *Persian Album*, fig. 19.
 98. Additional provenance recorded in the illuminated ex libris is as booty from the conquest of Muhammadabad/Bidar. See, for example, London, British Library, Loth 299/B 323, fol. 1v.
 99. London, British Library, Loth 525/B 181, fol. 3r (fig. 5) is dated 21 Dhu'l Hijja 994 (December 2, 1586); Hyderabad, Salar Jung Museum, M. 276, fol. 1r (fig. 13) is dated 27 Rabi' II 10[0]3 (January 8, 1595); and London, British Library, Loth 299/B 323, fol. 1v is dated 12 Sha'ban 1027 (August 3, 1618).
 100. The elevation of a seal to an ex libris (or the incorporation of a seal into an ex libris) is a rare but not unparalleled phenomenon. For a Timurid-Ottoman comparison, see Roxburgh, *Persian Album*, 77, where he writes, "Further signs of the Ottomans' historical attitude are two discs of paper cut out and glued into the illuminated medallions added above and below Baysunghur's ex libris. These paper circles are the impressions of the library seal of Ibn Husayn (d. 1513–14), son of Sultan Husayn (d. 1506), the last ruler of the Timurid dynasty. The seals have been elevated by the Ottomans from a mark of ownership to an ex libris." A similar process can be seen on the second *shamsa* folio of the Shah Jahan Album (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 55.121.10.40), where the innermost circle elsewhere reserved for Shah Jahan's titles (55.121.10.39) features the seal of 'Alamgir (r. 1658–1707), clearly a later owner of the album.
 101. For this *laqāb* and Shah 'Abbas, see Christie's, *Art of the Islamic and Indian Worlds Including Art from the Collection of Dr. Mohammed Said Farsi*, London, October 5, 2010, lot 249, discussed further in Overton, "Collector and His Portrait," 276. In the Mughal context, the phrase *khusraw-i 'Ālampanāh* appears on a silver Jahangir-period rupee dated 1019 (1610–11), and Mughal officials often styled themselves *ghulāmān-i 'Ālampanāh* (slaves of the Refuge of the World).
 102. Christie's, *Art of the Islamic and Indian Worlds*, lot 249. For a manuscript that passed before "the vision of the most noble, most holy" (*naẓar-i ashraf-i aqdas*), in reference to Jahangir, see A. H. Morton, "Notes and Seal Imprints," in

- Barbara Brend, *Muhammad Juki's Shahnamah of Firdausi* (London: Royal Asiatic Society and Philip Wilson Publishers, 2010), 167, no. 10.
103. An inscription at the Gulbarga *dargāh* (tomb complex) of Ibrahim's spiritual guide Gesu Daraz (d. 1422) opens with the following: *ḥaẓrat-i navāb-i kāmyāb-i gardūn iqtidār-i humāyūn-i arfa'-i aqdas-i a'lā Ibrāhīm 'Ādilshāh* (the prosperous, as potent as the celestial sphere, blessed, most high, most holy, most sublime, Ibrahim 'Adilshah). It then records how the young ruler made a pilgrimage to the shrine on 3 Muharram 989 (February 6, 1581), just a year after his accession, and that his "mother" (actually his aunt, Chand Bibi) ordered the digging of a well and planting of an orchard at the *dargāh* in Muharram 994 (December–January 1585–86). See Major T. W. Haig, "Inscriptions in Gulbarga," in *Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica*, ed. E. Denison Ross (Bombay: Education Society's Press, 1907–8), 5.
 104. The type A notation dated 992 (1584–85) in London, British Library, Loth 463/B 185, fol. 3r, includes the confounding phrase *bā sikka āya wa man yarghabu / buzurg 'Alī 'Ādilshāh*. This description seems to refer to two distinct seals, which are physically separated in the notation by their mention on two different lines. The first features a verse (*āya*) with the phrase *wa man yarghabu* (I thank Peyvand Firouzeh for her reading) and must refer to Ibrahim's Koranic example with 2:130 (indeed opening with *wa man yarghabu*). Curiously, this seal is neither impressed on the flyleaf nor mentioned in Loth (the manuscript needs to be rechecked in full), and I am currently unaware of its impression in any of the British Library's Asar Mahal manuscripts. The second seal is visible below the type A notation and is indeed the large seal of 'Alī I. This triple-ruled, circular example features explicit Shi'i content, including textual and visual references to Zulfiqar (the sword of 'Alī, d. 661); the phrase *wa man yarghabu* is definitely not part of its legend. We are likely dealing with a mistake on the part of a librarian, a circumstance supported by a thick "slash" through the phrase *āya wa man yarghabu* (indicating inaccuracy) and the underlining of *buzurg 'Alī 'Ādilshāh* (indicating accuracy). For visualizations of Zulfiqar on seals, including an Ottoman example of circa 1600, see Gallop and Porter, *Lasting Impressions*, 176–77.
 105. On *raqam*, see Seyller, "Inspection and Valuation," 256, whom I thank for kindly sharing his *raqam* chart.
 106. For additional type D notations naming Muhammad 'Adil Shah and written below his circular seal, see the 1555 *Khamṣa* of Nizami (Ahmedabad, Lalbhai Collection) and a commentary on the Koran (London, British Library, Loth 97/B 299, fol. 1r), among others. I thank Pramod Kumar for sharing information on the former.
 107. *Āstār-i zard / jild-i surkh naw basta*.
 108. Skelton, "Mughal Artist," 98.
 109. This is not a firm rule. London, British Library, Loth 299/B 323, includes the illuminated ex libris (fol. 1v) but no *nawras* seal (at least on the existing folios). The word *nawras* is, however, written prominently on fol. 1r (see the same phenomenon in appendix, nos. 8 and 9, figs. 16 and 18).
 110. London, British Library, Loth 525/B 181. On the legacy of this text in Safavid and Ottoman circles, see Francis Robinson, "Ottomans-Safavids-Mughals: Shared Knowledge and Connective Systems," *Journal of Islamic Studies* 8, 2 (1997): 177, 180. For a supergloss on this text completed in Bursa in 918 (1512) for the library of Selim I (r. 1512–20) (Baltimore, Walters Art Museum, W. 591), visit <http://art.thewalters.org/detail/18627/book-on-logic-2/> (accessed June 1, 2016).
 111. The word *avval* is written in the same hand and blue ink as the ex libris and located to its lower left.
 112. Two lines written on a diagonal (an oversight or afterthought?) further record the date of the original gift (21 Dhu'l Hijja 994), as first documented in the illuminated ex libris (fig. 5).
 113. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, SP 1559, previously analyzed in Ivan Stchoukine, *Les peintures des manuscrits safavides de 1502 à 1587* (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1959), no. 146; Francis Richard, *Splendeurs persanes: Manuscrits du XI^e au XVII^e siècle* (Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France, 1997), cat. no. 135; Richard, "Some Sixteenth-Century Deccani Persian Manuscripts," 244–45, figs. 6–8; Lale Uluç, "The Majālis al-'Ushshāq: Written in Herat, Copied in Shiraz, Read in Istanbul," in *M. Uğur Derman Armağanı: Altmışbeşinci Yaşı Münasebetiyle Sunulmuş Tebliğler = M. Uğur Derman Festschrift: Papers Presented on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. İrvin Cemil Schick (Istanbul: Sabancı Üniversitesi, 2000), 574n18; Lâle Uluç, *Turkman Governors, Shiraz Artisans and Ottoman Collectors: Sixteenth Century Shiraz Manuscripts* (Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2006), 191. A detail of Jalal al-Din's signature is reproduced in Francis Richard, "La signature discrète d'un doreur persan à la fin du xv^e s.: Mīr 'Azod al-Mozahheb," *Revue des Études Islamiques* 61–62 (1993–94): fig. 2.
 114. The valuation is in *raqam* and opens with *qūmat* (price). John Seyller has confirmed Francis Richard's original reading in *Splendeurs persanes*, 197. E-mail correspondence, April 3, 2014.
 115. In the Mughal context, most illustrated manuscripts were valued between 500 and 1,500 rupees, and manuscripts appraised at 1,500 or higher were all ranked first class (*avval*). Seyller, "Inspection and Valuation," section entitled "The Valuation of Manuscripts," 255–73.
 116. As discussed throughout Uluç, *Turkman Governors*.
 117. St. Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum, VR-995. My identification of this book's Bijapuri provenance was made possible by the reproduction of fol. 1r in Adel Adamova, *Persian Manuscripts, Paintings and Drawings from the 15th to the Early 20th Century in the Hermitage Collection*, trans. J. M. Rogers and ed. Simon Hartly (London: Azimuth Editions, 2012), 287. Adamova emphasizes that Shah Mahmud Nishapuri is typically associated with Tabriz (under Tahmasp, r. 1524–76) and Mashhad, where he died in 972 (1564–65), but presents convincing evidence that the *Laylā*

- va Majnūn* in question is his work in Herat. On the calligrapher, see Marianna Shreve Simpson, *Sultan Ibrahim Mirza's Haft Awrang: A Princely Manuscript from Sixteenth-Century Iran* (New Haven: Yale University Press; Washington, D.C.: Freer Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution, 1997), 254–69; Sheila Blair, *Islamic Calligraphy* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006), 433–36.
118. Fol. 1r (see fig. 18) also contains a finely written valuation of 200 rupees (beginning with *qimat*, but not in *raqam*). This valuation may be a Bijapuri notation and is distinct from the surrounding Mughal ones (thanks to John Seyller for his comments). For further information, see Adamova, *Persian Manuscripts*, 289, requiring some corrections informed by Seyller, “Inspection and Valuation.”
 119. The answer could rest in chronology; that is, the *nawras* seal may have been developed before the Koranic one. The earliest known application of the *nawras* seal is December 1586 (fig. 5), whereas the earliest Koranic impression is 1605–6 (figs. 14, 15) (the discovery of additional volumes may certainly modify these numbers). Ibrahim's Shirazi Koran (appendix, no. 11) further refutes any presumed parallel or consistency between the content of the volume and the selected seal (for the Koran's *nawras* seal, see fig. 6).
 120. Doha, Museum of Islamic Art, Ms. 260, discussed further in Overton, “Collector and His Portrait,” 89–96. The manuscript's Koranic seal impressions have been erroneously associated with Ibrahim Mirza: “The only name in this quotation [Qur'an 2:130], Abraham or Ibrahim, could refer to Sultan Ibrahim Mirza a son of Bahram Mirza, and the nephew of Shah Tahmasp who reigned from 1524 to 1576. . . . It is likely that this manuscript was either produced in the workshop of Sultan Ibrahim Mirza or entered his library in his lifetime.” Christie's, *Islamic Art and Manuscripts*, April 11, 2000, lot 79.
 121. Overton, “Collector and His Portrait,” fig. 41.
 122. Rampur, Raza Library, 5207. For the library's publications, see W. H. Siddiqi, *Raza Library: Monograph* (Rampur, U.P.: Rampur Raza Library, 1998), and Qutba b. Aws, *Dīwān shi'r al-Ḥādīra*, copied by al-Yāqūt al-Musta'sīmī, with an introduction and commentary by Mukhtār al-Dīn Aḥmad (Rampur, U.P.: Maktaba Riḍā, 1431 [2010]). I thank Abusad Islahi for bringing the latter to my attention. My examination of the manuscript in 2010 was brief (see preliminary findings in Overton, “Collector and His Portrait,” 96–101). The discussion here sets aside the question of authenticity (see note below) and focuses on the volume's presence in Ibrahim's collection.
 123. One excerpt from the *Sih Naṣr* reads, “If Yaqut were living, [he] too would have [his] head bowed down [before Ibrahim] like the letter *vov*.” Żuhūrī, *Sih Naṣr*, ed. and trans. Ghani, 439.
 124. Yaqut's original *Dīwān al-Ḥādīra* was widely copied and forged, particularly during the Timurid period, and the Rampur manuscript's early date of 629 (1231–32) immediately raises suspicion (e-mail correspondence with Nourane Ben Azzouna, October–November 2010, whom I thank for sharing her expertise). Also see Nourane Ben Azzouna, “Manuscripts Attributed to Yāqūt al-Musta'sīmī (d. 698/1298) in Ottoman Collections: Thoughts on the Significance of Yāqūt's Legacy in the Ottoman Calligraphic Tradition,” in *Thirteenth International Congress of Turkish Art Proceedings*, ed. Géza Dávid and Ibolya Gereyelys (Budapest: Hungarian National Museum, 2009), 113–23, esp. 116. For another example of a forgery, see Nourane Ben Azzouna, “The Gulistān of Sa'dī Attributed to Yāqūt al-Musta'sīmī and Its Multiple Identities: From the Mongols to the Mughals and Beyond,” *Ars Orientalis* 42 (2012): 139–49. For an overview of Yaqut and his legacy, see Blair, *Islamic Calligraphy*, 243–60.
 125. *Kitāb-i khāṣṣ-i hum[ā]l-yūn-i ashraf-i aqdas-i arfa' / Ibrāhīm 'Ādilshāh*. In this context, *khāṣṣ* (lit. “royal”) refers to something particularly special or outstanding in a royal collection. See Morton, “Notes and Seal Imprints,” 170, where the term is discussed as “another form of appreciation” in luxury Mughal manuscripts. The *Dīwān*'s title page was first reproduced in Siddiqi, *Raza Library: Monograph*, pl. 7, where the author observed (p. 2) that the volume “once decorated the Royal Library of Ibrahim Adil Shah of Bijapur.” Also see Qutba b. Aws, *Dīwān shi'r al-Ḥādīra*, 43.
 126. “This book is in the script of the ‘Qibla of calligraphers’ (*qiblat al-kuttāb*) . . . Yaqut al-Musta'sīmī . . . and each line is worth one piece of gold, written by Shaykh Muhammad al-Tabrizi al-Sultani.” It is possible that the scribe in question was Shaykh Muhammad b. al-Hajj Muhammad al-Tughra'i (fl. late fourteenth to early fifteenth century), an expert in writing *tughra*, who was known as Musharrijī al-Tabrizi (after his father Hajji Muhammad Bandgir of Tabriz) and who signed both “Shaykh Muhammad” and “Hajji Muhammad.” I thank Marianna Shreve Simpson for sharing her thoughts on this matter. This Shaykh Muhammad worked for several Timurid rulers and princes—including Timur (r. 1370–1405) and Khalil Sultan (r. 1405–9) at Samarkand, and Shah Rukh (r. 1405–47) and Baysunghur (d. 1433) at Herat—and his dated works span 1405–7. Biography drawn from Roxburgh, *Persian Album*, 119–21. Yaqut's *Dīwān al-Ḥādīra* was copied by Shams Baysunghuri, an accomplished calligrapher under Baysunghur, in 829 (1426). Istanbul, Ayasofya 3936, discussed in Ben Azzouna, “Manuscripts Attributed to Yāqūt,” 116. It is possible that a second copy of the text—the Rampur example—could have circulated at Baysunghur's court and there caught the attention of Shaykh Muhammad. These hypotheses demand confirmation.
 127. Each seal is accompanied by an identifying notation. I thank Denise Teece for responding to queries about these seals (e-mail correspondence, April 2010).
 128. Inscribed *Ismā'il bin Ṭahmāsp al-Ḥusaynī al-Mūsavī*.
 129. Washington, D.C., Freer Gallery of Art, 46.12. See Simpson, *Sultan Ibrahim Mirza's Haft Awrang*, 345 (15.b).
 130. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 63.210. See Yumiko Kamada, “A Taste for Intricacy: An Illustrated Manuscript of *Manṭiq al-Ṭayr* in the Metropolitan Museum of Art,”

- Orient* 45 (2010): 129–76; Ekhtiar et al., *Masterpieces from the Department of Islamic Art*, no. 127A-D.
131. St. Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum, VR-1000, discussed most recently in Adamova, *Persian Manuscripts*, no. 1. In addition to the five impressions of Muhammad's 1020 (1612) seal, the manuscript features one impression of his more elaborate example dated 1021 (1612–13) on the opening frontispiece (for a reproduction, see *ibid.*, 45). Just below this impression is the seal of 'Abdullah Qutb Shah (r. 1626–72) dated 1037 (1627–28). An analysis of Qutb Shahi seals and inscriptions is forthcoming in Overton and Benson, "Deccani Seals."
 132. Seyller, "Inspection and Valuation," documents three of Jahangir's seal impressions: the first dates to his tenure as Prince Salim (p. 311); the second is dated 1015 (1606–7) (p. 336); and the third is dated 1025 (1616) (p. 289). The Muhammad Juki *Shāhnāma* is exceptional, because it bears two impressions of Jahangir's 1015 seal. Morton, "Notes and Seal Imprints," 170–71. For seals of Jahangir's *murīds*, see Seyller, "Inspection and Valuation," 255n44.
 133. Shah 'Abbas's librarians clearly feared the looting of volumes from the Ardabil shrine. An inscription accompanying the waqf seal reads, "Whosoever wishes to read [this work] may do so, provided that he does not take it outside the shrine; anyone who takes it will be [considered] responsible for the blood [martyrdom] of Imam Husayn, may God's blessings be upon him, 1017." Simpson, *Sultan Ibrahim Mirza's Haft Awrang*, 35. This paranoia was warranted, given the imminent Uzbek threat and the Freer Jami's eventual accessioning into the Mughal library. For the Mughal seals and notations on fol. 304v, see Simpson, *Sultan Ibrahim Mirza's Haft Awrang*, 345–46 (15.c–d); Seyller, "Inspection and Valuation," 285–86.
 134. Although very few Bijapuri bindings survive (only a handful can be identified), scribal notations provide useful insight into acts of refurbishment. See figure 4, where the type D notation reads "newly bound with a red binding with a gold (*ṭalā*) medallion (*turanj*; in reference to the central element) and chain (*zanjīra*; in reference to the outer thin border)," and figure 13, where Ibrahim's illuminated ex libris reads "newly bound with red binding with gold lines." Some of Ibrahim's books were also refurbished with new paintings and illumination, as was common. See the Paris *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā* (appendix, no. 5).
 135. In addition to size, the most conspicuous difference between the paper seal impression and the leather stamp one is that the latter is not double-ruled. Minor variations in the calligraphy can also be discerned.
 136. On the interplay among engraving, bookbinding, and painting/drawing at the Ottoman court of Mehmed II (r. 1448–81), see Julian Raby and Zeren Tanındı, *Turkish Bookbinding in the 15th Century: The Foundation of an Ottoman Court Style*, ed. Tim Stanley (London: Azimuth Editions, 1993), 47–80, in particular.
 137. Jiddi, *Dānishnāma-i Muhr va hakkākī*, 550–64 and figs. 497–99, explores the relationship between seals and binding stamps, but the marks in question belong to bookbinders (*ṣaḥāf* or *ṣaḥāfbāshī*), and I do not see an example of direct replication comparable to the Ibrahim case study. For signed Mamluk stamps, see Gulnar K. Bosch et al., *Islamic Bindings & Bookmaking* (Chicago: Oriental Institute Museum, University of Chicago, 1981), nos. 2, 36, 41.
 138. University of St Andrews Library, Ms. 19 O. Francis Richard ("Some Sixteenth-Century Deccani Persian Manuscripts," 244) was the first to emphasize a connection between Ibrahim's seal and the St Andrews binding. My research is indebted to his initial and most critical observation.
 139. The Koran's richly illuminated incipit pages were displayed in the momentous 1989 Timurid exhibition. See Thomas W. Lentz and Glenn D. Lowry, *Timur and the Princely Vision: Persian Art and Culture in the Fifteenth Century* (Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art; Washington, D.C.: Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, 1989), cat. no. 141, color illus. 252. The same opening was previously exhibited in 1976 and published in Martin Lings and Yasin Hamid Safadi, *The Qur'ān: Catalogue of an Exhibition of Qur'ān Manuscripts at the British Library, 3 April–15 August 1976* (London: World of Islam Publishing Co. for the British Library, 1976), cat. no. 127 (no illustration). A detailed interdisciplinary and technical analysis of the codex is forthcoming by the author, Bruce Wannell, and Kristine Rose Beers—"Between Herat, Bijapur, and Mysore: The Qur'an in the University of St Andrews Library," in Overton, *Iran and the Deccan*—and will address the colophon and inconsistencies in dating, among other issues. I thank Kristine Rose and Rachel Sawicki for their initial structural assessment of the binding in March 2011, which informed preliminary conclusions in Overton, "Collector and His Portrait," 108–12.
 140. For examples of Timurid illuminated frontispieces with a central lobed medallion set in a twelve-pointed star extending into an interlace of polygons, see Lentz and Lowry, *Timur and the Princely Vision*, cat. no. 102, color illus. 203 (Dublin, Chester Beatty Library, Ms. 1500), and the 837 (1434) Koran copied by Shams al-Baysunghuri (Istanbul, Turkish and Islamic Museum, TIEM 294), forthcoming as the cover image of Massumeh Farhad and Simon Rettig, eds., *The Art of the Qur'an: Treasures from the Museum of Turkish and Islamic Arts* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Books, 2016).
 141. For a comparable handling of the border stamps, and associated terms in Persian, see 'Alī Šafarī Āqqal'a, Muḥammad Bāhir, and Īraj Afshār, *Nuskhāshīnākht: Pizhūhishnāma-i nuskhāshīnāsi-i nusakh-i khaṭṭi-i Fārsī* (Tehran: Markaz-i Pizhūhishī-i Mīrās-i Maktūb, 2011), 398.
 142. That esteemed volumes continued to enter Bijapuri collections after Ibrahim's reign is confirmed by the 1555 *Khamsa* of Nizami (Ahmedabad, Lalbhai Collection), which bears Muhammad's seal and a type D notation.
 143. An exception to this convention can be found in a Maghribi Koran dated 745 (1344) (Jerusalem, al-Haram al-Sharif Islamic Museum), whose front and rear covers include border panels recording the name of the Marinid ruler-copyist

- Abu al-Hasan (r. 1331–52) and his donation of the manuscript to the Bayt al-Maqdis. See Khidr Ibrahim Salamah, *The Qur'an Manuscripts in the al-Haram al-Sharif Islamic Museum, Jerusalem* (Reading: Garnet Publishing Limited, 2001), no. 3, esp. 70–73.
144. For a fore-edge flap reading *bi-rasm-i khizāna-i* (by the order of the treasury of), followed by the name of the Ottoman ruler Mehmed II (r. 1444–46; 1451–81), see Raby and Tanındı, *Turkish Bookbinding*, no. 33. Similarly, the spine of a Mamluk Koran features the following stamped inscription: “by order of the library of the most just and most noble Abu Muzaffar Shah Isma‘il [r. 1501–24].” See Arthur Upham Pope and Phyllis Ackerman, eds., *A Survey of Persian Art from Prehistoric Times to the Present*, 3rd ed., 16 vols. (Tehran: Soroush Press, 1977), vol. 5, p. 1983, and vol. 10, pl. 966; David James, *Qur'āns of the Mamlūks* (New York: Thames & Hudson, 1988), cat. no. 20.
 145. Istanbul, Turkish and Islamic Museum, TIEM 508, reproduced and discussed in Alison Ohta, “Filigree Bindings of the Mamluk Period,” *Muqarnas* 21 (2004): fig. 11 and 272–73.
 146. The largely effaced type A notation in Ibrahim’s *Kulliyāt* of Sa’di (appendix, no. 6) reads: “Gilded binding / with the large seal” (see fig. 15). Although the phrases “gilded binding” and “with the large seal” are likely meant to be read as separate descriptions (the latter referring to the Koranic seal *ex libris* located below), we cannot discount the possibility that some type A notations would have described the exceptional scalloped seal stamp in question. The volume has been rebound.
 147. See the many objects assigned this broad attribution in Haidar and Sardar, *Sultans of Deccan India*, 258–67.
 148. Sotheby’s, *Arts of the Islamic World*, lot 60.
 149. Alternatively, a local-born Deccani artist could have simply copied a Safavid Persian model.
 150. I again refer the reader to Seyller, “Inspection and Valuation.” For the Mughal genealogical seal, see Gallop and Porter, *Lasting Impressions*, 140–43; Annabel Teh Gallop, “The Genealogical Seal of the Mughal Emperors of India,” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 3rd ser., 9, 1 (1999): 77–140.
 151. As elsewhere, the future identification of additional volumes may necessitate amendments to these preliminary conclusions. For a first-class Asar Mahal volume bearing the Zulfikar seal of ‘Ali I and an Ibrahim II-period type A notation describing this large seal, see n. 104 above. Ibrahim’s illustrated *Khamsa* of Amir Khusraw (appendix, no. 8) bears an even larger circular seal of ‘Ali I, this one inscribed with the names of the Twelve Imams (fig. 16) (I thank Abdullah Ghouchani for his insights; e-mail correspondence, June 22, 2015).
 152. Devare, *Short History*, 83–86.
 153. The scribal notations generally read *pīshkash-i farzand-i* (sometimes shortened to *farz-i*) *Navāb Shāh Navāz Khān*.
 154. For example, London, British Library, Loth 526/B 181A (originally published by Loth as B 181B, see p. 144), fol. 1r.
 155. For some of these thinkers in the Persian syllabus at the Mughal court, see Muzaffar Alam, “The Pursuit of Persian: Language in Mughal Politics,” *Modern Asian Studies* 32 (1998): 326–27.
 156. London, British Library, Loth 417/B 243. The word *avval* is written prominently at the top of fol. 1r, just above the three-line type D notation dated 27 Shawwal 1026 (October 27, 1617). The type A notation on fol. 2r includes the phrase *jam‘ kitābkhāna-i ma‘mūra / avval shuda* (collected into the royal library, first [class]).
 157. London, British Library, Loth 539/B 140.
 158. London, British Library, Loth 526/B 181A. For this same text, also see Loth 525/B 181, discussed above, and fig. 5.
 159. London, British Library, Loth 528/B 210. The type A notation includes the phrase *jam‘ kitābkhāna-i ‘āmira durvum*.
 160. London, British Library, Loth 967/B 7. One of the seals is dated 876 (1471–72). On Mahmud Gavan, see Eaton, *Social History of the Deccan*, 59–77.
 161. Eaton, *Sufis of Bijapur*, 108–12.
 162. London, British Library, Loth 428/B 223A, fol. 3r. One Mulla Payanda also presented the same commentary. Loth 427/B 206.
 163. With the exception of Ibrahim’s *nawras* seal, all of this material appears on the opening flyleaf (fol. 3r). The word *avval* is written at the top of the folio and at the end of the type A notation below (in turn followed by the type B notation). Ibrahim’s illuminated *ex libris* occupies the lower half of the page, and five seals are impressed on the left edge.
 164. For a transcription of the colophon, see Loth, *Catalogue of the Arabic Manuscripts*, 111. Shah Muhibullah’s circular seal is second from the top on the flyleaf described above (fol. 3r). The volume apparently passed to his son Waliullah (*Vali Allah*), as attested by the octagonal seal immediately below. I thank Jake Benson for reading both of these seals.
 165. Ahmad I also patronized the construction of Shah Ni‘matullah’s tomb in Mahan, and the ruler’s own tomb at Ashtur-Bidar is decorated with verses by the saint. For the latter, see Helen Philon, “The Murals in the Tomb of Ahmad Shah near Bidar,” *Apollo* 152, no. 465 (2000): 3–10; Peyvand Firouzeh, “Sacred Kingship in the Garden of Poetry: Ahmad Shāh Bahmanī’s Tomb in Bidar (India),” *South Asian Studies* 31, 2 (2015): 187–214. Peyvand Firouzeh’s recent dissertation (“Architecture, Sanctity and Power: Ne‘matollāhī Shrines and Khānaqāhs in Fifteenth-Century Iran and India,” University of Cambridge, 2015) is an eagerly awaited study of the visual culture of Ni‘matullahi Sufism between Iran and India. Her essay on the Shirazi calligraphers of Khalilullah’s tomb is forthcoming in Overton, *Iran and the Deccan*.
 166. I thank Peyvand Firouzeh for sharing a detailed unpublished document (“Mausoleum of Khalilollāh, near Bidar”) that reassesses and clarifies many of the dates associated with the Ni‘matullahi saints who migrated to the Deccan, and their associated architectural monuments.
 167. Eaton, *Social History of the Deccan*, 60.
 168. Eaton, *Sufis of Bijapur*, 108–9.
 169. *Ibid.*, 54–58.

170. London, British Library, Loth 211/10 Islamic 605. This manuscript was not discovered in Bijapur's Asar Mahal, which explains its accession number of "10 Islamic 605" rather than the "B" preface assigned to all Asar Mahal volumes. As part of the British Library's Tipu Sultan (r. 1782–99) collection, it presents an intriguing case study in the movement of manuscripts between Indian courts (and possibly beyond) of the fifteenth through eighteenth centuries. The volume, which was copied on 9 Shawwal 861 (August 30, 1457) and embellished with an illuminated title page, entered Mahmud Gavan's collection in Bidar (his seal appears in the margin of fol. 6r and is glossed "seal of Khwaja Jahan"), was accessioned into Bijapur's royal library (*kitābkhāna-i 'āmira* or *kitābkhāna-i ḥuẓūr-i 'āmira*) upon the conquest of Bidar in 1027 (1619) (see the notations on fol. 3r and fol. 283v), received the oval seal dated 1145 (1732–33) of one 'Abd al-Majid Khan (see fol. 6r; this seal appears in several other British Library volumes), and "finally" (in terms of its subcontinent peregrinations) entered the library of Tipu Sultan in Mysore. An additional hexagonal seal on fol. 6v likely dates to the mid-fifteenth century and may belong to the Ni'matullahi Sufi order of Bidar. This seal is also present in a second Ibrahim volume acquired upon the conquest of Bidar and embellished with the ruler's illuminated ex libris (Loth 299/B 323).
171. London, British Library, Loth 426/B 203, 234.
172. London, British Library, Loth 994/B 38.
173. The distinguishing feature of this seal is the prominently rendered *Maḥmūd*, with the letter *hā'* dramatically extended (*kashida*) across the length of the circle.
174. Overton, *EI3*, s.v. "Bahmanī, forthcoming.
175. For the legacies of these texts, see Robinson, "Ottomans-Safavids-Mughals," app. 1–3.
176. The Ottoman sultan's syllabus is discussed in Shahab Ahmed and Nenad Filipovic, "The Sultan's Syllabus: A Curriculum for the Ottoman Imperial Medreses Prescribed in a Fermān of Qānūnī I Süleymān, dated 973 (1565)," *Studia Islamica* 98–99 (2004): 183–218. For authors mentioned here, see pp. 191–92, 197.
177. During 'Ashura in 1596, Ibrahim ordered the house arrest of an anti-Shi'i Shattari Sufi who had disrupted the celebrations. Eaton, *Sufis of Bijapur*, 116.
178. Reproduced in Ravinder Lonkar, *Adil Shahi Farmans* (Pune: Diamond, 2007), 4–5.
179. Private collection and former Sitaram Sahu collection (now missing), reproduced in Haidar and Sardar, *Sultans of Decan India*, cat. no. 31, fig. 50.
180. This painting is also known as "Sufis/Saints in a landscape." I use the more specific title proposed in Skelton, "Farrukh Beg in the Deccan: An Update."
181. This discussion of "Saraswati enthroned" expands my original Solomonic/Bilqis interpretation in Overton, "Collector and His Portrait," 163–68.
182. Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh II, *Kitāb-i Nauras* [*Kitāb-i Nawras*], ed. and trans. Ahmad, 146.
183. For the characterization of Deccani painting as reveling in "dream and fantasy," in contrast to the "logic and verisimilitude" of the Mughal School, see Michell and Zebrowski, *Architecture and Art of the Deccan Sultanates*, 1. This particular "branding" of the Deccan persists, as demonstrated by the tagline of the Metropolitan Museum of Art's 2015 exhibition, *Opulence and Fantasy*. The Bijapuri painter 'Ali Riza is discussed in Overton, "'Ali Riza (The Bodleian Painter)."
184. See, in particular, fol. 87, reproduced in Hutton, "*Pem Nem*," fig. 10.
185. Washington, D.C., Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, S1986.230.
186. Tehran, Gulistan Palace Library, no. 1663, fol. 170, most recently discussed in Skelton, "Farrukh Beg in the Deccan: An Update," 20, fig. 8.
187. Mark Brand has argued that the setting of "Saraswati enthroned" is Bijapur's Farakh Mahal/Chini Mahal. Brand's argument and the one presented here (in favor of a generic setting codified in late sixteenth-century Persian painting) are not mutually exclusive but rather differ in their emphasis on maker versus audience. Whereas Farrukh undoubtedly drew upon established Shirazi and Khurasani tropes to create his composition, local audiences may have interpreted the scene through a Bijapuri lens. E-mail correspondence with Mark Brand and Deborah Hutton, based on the former's conference presentation entitled "Nauraspur after Bijapur: Re-Constructing the Sultanate of Ibrahim Adil Shah II," January 2015, Delhi.
188. See, for example, Hutton, "*Pem Nem*," figs. 32, 33.
189. Haidar, "*Kitāb-i Nauras*," 37–38, suggests that the angels could have been drawn from song 17 of the *Kitāb-i Nawras*, in which the *dargāh* of Gesu Daraz is described as being attended by angels. I prefer to interpret them within the Solomonic Shirazi paradigm.
190. Serpil Bağcı, "A New Theme of the Shirazi Frontispiece Miniatures: The Divan of Solomon," *Muqarnas* 12 (1995): 104–5.
191. Priscilla Soucek, "Solomon's Throne/Solomon's Bath: Model or Metaphor?," *Ars Orientalis* 23 (1993): 122.
192. The phrase "living baldachin" is borrowed from Ebba Koch, "Notes on the Painted and Sculptured Decoration of Nur Jahan's Pavilions in the Ram Bagh (Bagh-i Nur Afshan) at Agra," in Skelton et al., *Facets of Indian Art*, 59.
193. Bağcı, "New Theme of the Shirazi Frontispiece Miniatures," 104.
194. This Shirazi paradigm is discussed in Bağcı, "New Theme of the Shirazi Frontispiece"; Uluç, *Turkman Governors*, 291–301; Marianna Shreve Simpson, "The Illustrated Shāhnāma in Sixteenth-Century Shiraz," in *In Harmony: The Norma Jean Calderwood Collection of Islamic Art*, ed. Mary McWilliams (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Art Museums, 2013), esp. 88–90, figs. 7, 8.
195. Istanbul, Topkapı Palace Museum, H. 1475, reproduced in Uluç, *Turkman Governors*, fig. 229.
196. Istanbul, Topkapı Palace Museum, A. 3559, fols. 1v–2r, reproduced in Bağcı, "New Theme of the Shirazi Frontispiece," fig. 5a–b.

197. The throne does not include the superstructure comprised of stacked colored bands visible in some Shirazi paintings. Uluç, *Turkman Governors*, fig. 229.
198. Washington, D.C., Freer Gallery of Art, F1950.1.
199. We can, however, locate a Shirazi prototype in the contemporary Qutb Shahi royal library. A Solomon and Bilqis frontispiece (fols. 1v–2r) opens a finely illuminated and illustrated *Shāhnāma* bearing Muhammad Qutb Shah's 1021 (1612–13) seal (Cambridge University Library, Ms. Add. 269, fol. 1r). The place of production is unknown, but it is likely Shiraz, and Muhammad's seal provides the *terminus ante quem*. For a reproduction of the flyleaf, see Āqqal'a, "Muhrah va Yaddāshthā-yi Sulṭān Muḥammad Qutbshāh," fig. 8.
200. London, British Library, IO Islamic 3214. See Weinstein, "Variations on a Persian Theme," 124–25, figs. 4.31–4.32; Weinstein, cat. no. 97, in Haidar and Sardar, *Sultans of Deccan India*, 203–4. Here the thrones are held aloft by demons in landscapes, thereby conforming to an earlier Shirazi mode, pre-1565.
201. Hyderabad, Salar Jung Museum, Urdu Ms. 153. See Weinstein, "Variations on a Persian Theme," 190–91, figs. 5.13–5.14; Weinstein, "The Dīwān of Muhammad-Quli Qutb Shah and the Birth of the Illustrated Urdu *Dīwān*," in Parodi, *Visual World of Muslim India*, figs. 8.3, 8.4. The paintings are neither at the front of the manuscript nor side-by-side, and the depiction of Bilqis, like that of Saraswati, conforms to the post-1565 mode (the throne on the ground in an architectural setting).
202. London, Khalili Collection, Ms. 979, fol. 21v, in which Solomon and Bilqis are seated on a single throne. See J. M. Rogers, *The Arts of Islam: Masterpieces from the Khalili Collection* (London: Thames & Hudson, 2010), no. 251.
203. For the *Khamsa-i Rūḥ al-Amin* of Mir Muhammad Amin Shahristani (Ruh al-Amin), which he dedicated to Muhammad Quli, see Ethé, *Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts*, 841–42, nos. 1539–40.
204. Dublin, Chester Beatty Library, In. 11A. 31. See David James, "The 'Millennial' Album of Muhammad-Quli Qutb Shah," *Islamic Art 2* (1987): 243–54; Hutton, *Art of the Court*, 87–89, pl. 16.
205. London, British Library, Loth 650/B 401. Three Qutb Shahi seals appear on the opening flyleaf (fol. 1r). Muhammad Quli's impression is at the top, followed by those of Ibrahim (r. 1550–80) and Muhammad dated 1021 (1612–13).
206. Skelton, "Mughal Artist," 401–2, is a persuasive argument, but the evidence remains circumstantial.
207. 'Abd al-Jalal signed on the steps of Solomon's throne. Bağcı, "New Theme of the Shirazi Frontispiece," fig. 6.
208. The opening line of Farrukh's signature has been read variously as *kutuba*, *kamtārīn*, and *harrarahu* (Beach, "Farrukh Beg," 189, no. 11; Haidar, *Kitab-i Nauras*, 34–35; Overton, "Collector and His Portrait," 195, 207–8). I continue to favor the latter, which is based on the best available color reproduction (Singh and Narayan, *Six Multicoloured Prints*). On *harrarahu*, which was often employed by calligraphers and can be translated literally as "penned this," "inked this," "outlined by," or "written by," depending on context, see Simpson, *Sultan Ibrahim Mirza's Haft Awrang*, 253n3. Given that the artistic product in question is a painted portrait, I here favor the generic "drawn by."
209. On Muhammadi's use of the *harrarahu-muṣavvir* formula in two tinted drawings of ca. 1580, see Soudavar, *Art of the Persian Courts*, no. 94, fig. 37. Also see *ibid.*, 177, where the author argues, "the word *mosavver* . . . was here used to oppose the word *harraraho*, which has calligraphic connotations."
210. Copenhagen, David Collection, 105/2007.
211. I am grateful to Wheeler Thackston and Bruce Wannell for their amended translations of Zebrowski, *Deccani Painting*, 73. Also see the most recent translation by Abdullah Ghouchani at the onset of cat. no. 27 in Haidar and Sardar, *Sultans of Deccan India*, 93.
212. For this phrase on a *farmān* dated 1034 (1624–25), see Lonkar, *ʿAdil Shahi Farmans*, 5–6.
213. I thank Navina Haidar for sharing the *Sāqīnāma* source, as identified by Abdullah Ghouchani, in advance of the publication of the Metropolitan Museum of Art's catalogue: Haidar and Sardar, *Sultans of Deccan India*, cat. no. 27.
214. Zuhūrī, *Sih Naṣr*, ed. and trans. Ghani, 326, 443.
215. Overton, "Collector and His Portrait," 146–47, figs. 157–61.
216. Ebba Koch, "Jahangir and the Angels: Recently Discovered Wall Paintings under European Influence in the Fort of Lahore," in Koch, *Mughal Art and Imperial Ideology: Collected Essays* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2001), 12–37; Koch, "Notes on the Painted and Sculptured Decoration."
217. This circumstance was far from unique in the Deccan. On the Solomonic paradigm in Bahmani kingship, see Helen Philon, "The Great Mosque at Gulbarga Reinterpreted as the Hazar Sutun of Firuz Shah Bahmani (1397–1422)," in Parodi, *Visual World of Muslim India*, 116. Like Ibrahim, Muhammad Quli also cast himself in Solomonic terms. The title of his *Dīwān* reads: "Divan of the Solomonic royal highness, may God perpetuate his reign." Weinstein, "Variations on a Persian Theme," 175.
218. Overton, "Collector and His Portrait," 168–69.
219. Consider the same burgundy-outlined fountain, tinted drawings of foxes, peach brickwork, and soaring cranes amid Chinese-style clouds in "A Devout Man Being Beheaded Unjustly," from a *Būstān* (Orchard) of Sa'di dated 987 (1579), reproduced in Soudavar, "Patronage of the Vizier," fig. 12.
220. See the throne in Uluç, *Turkman Governors*, fig. 229.
221. For the fullness of the floral patterns in the borders of the Freer Jami, see Simpson, *Sultan Ibrahim Mirza's Haft Awrang*, 65. Farrukh employed similar patterns in the gold robe of the "Falconer" (Tehran, Gulistan Palace Library, no. 1663, fol. 47), reproduced in Beach, "Farrukh Beg," fig. 6 (cropped to the picture plane); Muḥammad 'Alī Rajabī, *Iranian Masterpieces of Persian Painting* (Tehran: Tehran Museum of Contemporary Art, 2005), 443 (full

- folio). "Falconer" is signed in the picture plane *kamtārīn banda-hā Farrukh muṣ[avvir]*. The letters *vav* and *rā* of *muṣavvir* are cut off on the left edge, but the still visible *mīm* and the beginning of the *ṣad* imply that this word was indeed *muṣavvir*, as published in Badri Ātābāy, *Fihrist-i Muraqqa'āt-i Kitābkhāna-yi Sālṭanatī* (Tehran: Chāp Zibā, 1353 [1974]), 357.
222. Skelton's theory is supported in B. W. Robinson, "Muḥammadī and the Khurāsān Style," *Iran* 30 (1992): 17–29; Soudavar, "Between the Safavids and the Mughals"; Amina Okada, *Indian Miniatures of the Mughal Court* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1992), 116–24, among others.
 223. Safavid court painters such as Shaykh Muhammad had earlier codified the *ṣafīna* and/or narcissus genre of portraiture. Sheila Canby, *The Rebellious Reformer: The Drawings and Paintings of Riza-yi Abbāsī of Isfahan* (London: Azimuth Editions, 1996), figs. 17, 20.
 224. Cambridge University, King's College, Pote 153. The seven paintings of figural types appear at the end of each poem (as singles or in pairs) and bear no relation to the text itself. In one instance, the word *bahādur* appears to follow Farrukh's name but has been effaced. I am grateful to Yasmin Faghihi for facilitating my study of the manuscript in December 2014.
 225. Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, 14.595. Also see Washington, D.C., Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, S1986.295.
 226. Cambridge University, King's College, Pote 153, fol. 149r, reproduced in Skelton, "Mughal Artist," pl. 2, fig. 4; Soudavar, "Between the Safavids and the Mughals," pl. xviiiB; Robinson, "Muḥammadī," pl. ixB, all of which emphasize the painting's Muḥammadi-Khurasani style.
 227. See, for example, Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, 14.588; New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 55.121.42.
 228. It is likely that the seven ostensible Farrukhs were added to the manuscript at the Mughal court, at which time they were overpainted and extended, often poorly. Scribal notations appearing to be Mughal are dated 998 (1589–90) and 1004 (1594–95), and the folios with the paintings in question bear the remnants of two seals, suggesting their value and appeal. I thank John Seyller for his preliminary comments on these marks.
 229. All four (San Diego Museum of Art, 1990.318; Tehran, Gulistan Palace Library, no. 1663, fol. 86 [see fig. 30]; private collection, Jaipur; private collection, city unknown) are discussed in John Seyller, "Muhammad 'Ali," in Beach et al., *Masters of Indian Painting*, vol. 1, 1600–1650, 286–87, fig. 6 (private collection). On Farrukh's figural types, see Asok Kumar Das, "Farrukh Beg: Studies of Adorable Youths and Venerable Saints," in *Mughal Masters: Further Studies*, ed. Asok Kumar Das (Bombay: Marg Publications, 1998), 96–111, which reproduces many of the paintings discussed here.
 230. San Diego Museum of Art, 1990.318.
 231. I use the title Salim/Jahangir Album to refer to the codex commonly known as the Gulshan Album or *Muraqqa'ī Gulshan*, the latter inspired by the nineteenth-century notations in red ink on folios in the Gulistan Palace Library. Although this album is typically associated with Jahangir, it was in fact begun in the late 1590s, while he was still Prince Salim. Milo Cleveland Beach, "Jahangir's Album: Some Clarifications," in *Arts of Mughal India: Studies in Honour of Robert Skelton*, ed. Rosemary Crill et al. (London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 2004), 111–18, esp. 117.
 232. Soudavar, "Between the Safavids and the Mughals," 60–61.
 233. For the attribution of the private collection example to Muhammad 'Ali, see Seyller, "Muhammad 'Ali," 286–87.
 234. For a Khurasani comparison in which the horse has been transformed into a composite, see Rajabī, *Iranian Masterpieces*, 515 (Tehran, Riza 'Abbasi Museum). The closest "Mughal" (yet tellingly by an Iranian immigrant) example of the ruler-horse-hawk triumvirate is 'Abd al-Samad's "Hunting scene" of ca. 1585 (Los Angeles, Catherine and Ralph Benkaim Collection), where the horse's raised legs similarly imply his speed through space. See Sheila Canby, "'Abd al-Samad," in Beach et al., *Masters of Indian Painting*, vol. 1, 1600–1650, fig. 11.
 235. See, for example, Washington, D.C., Freer Gallery of Art, F1946.15a–d; Boston Museum of Fine Arts, 14.587.
 236. Toronto, Aga Khan Museum, 00074.
 237. London, British Museum, 1920.0917.0.298.3.
 238. Canby, *Rebellious Reformer*, no. 113. On Riza's debt to Muḥammadi, also see Soudavar, "Age of Muḥammadi," 69.
 239. Artists also used the *ṣafīna* and other paper surfaces (scrolls, flat sheets) to record their signatures and/or commentary. Among many examples, consider the self-portrait of Mir Sayyid 'Ali (Los Angeles County Museum of Art, M.90.141.1) and Dust Muhammad's portrait of Shah Abu'l Ma'ali (Toronto, Aga Khan Museum, M. 126). The latter is discussed in Laura Parodi and Bruce Wannell, "The Earliest Datable Mughal Painting: An Allegory of the Celebrations for Akbar's Circumcision at the Sacred Spring of Khwaja Seh Yaran near Kabul (1546 AD) [Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Libr. Pict. A117, fol. 15a]," *Asian Art*, November 18, 2011, asianart.com, <http://www.asianart.com/articles/parodi/index.html> (accessed November 2013).
 240. *Dawlat-i ān sar ki barū pāy-i tūst / bakht dar ān dil ki darū jāy-i tūst*.
 241. As argued in Overton, "Vida de Jacques de Coutre," 250–52, where I proposed the retitling of the painting from the previous "Ibrahim reading" to the more specific "Ibrahim offering obeisance to Jahangir." The couplet in the painting is identical to that in the sole copy of Nizami's *Makhzan al-Asrār* known to have been in the Bijapur library (former Asar Mahal; see Ethé, *Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts*, no. 3061/B 132). I have not had the opportunity to consider the couplet's wording in the recently surfaced *Khamasa* of Nizami copied by Khalilullah.
 242. On Krishna Raya's insistence that Isma'il 'Adil Khan (r. 1510–34) come to Vijayanagara to kiss his foot, see Eaton, "'Kiss My Foot,' Said the King," 306–8.

243. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Supplément persan 985. Seyller, "Inspection and Valuation," 336–37.
244. For Jahangir's comments on a Mir 'Ali *Būstān* (Orchard) kept in his presence and routinely read, see Seyller, "Inspection and Valuation," 245. Mir 'Ali's popularity at the Mughal court is discussed in Seyller, "Inspection and Valuation," 272; Wheeler Thackston, "Calligraphy in the Albums," in Wright, *Muraqqa'*, 154–56.
245. We may never know when exactly "Ibrahim offering obeisance to Jahangir" was integrated into the Salim/Jahangir Album. It could have been a gift from Ibrahim to Jahangir upon the latter's accession in 1605, a suitable moment for the expression of fidelity.
246. See Soudavar, "Patronage of the Vizier," for his crediting of Muhammadi with masterful word-image combinations.
247. Zuhuri and Malik Qummi's approach to the couplet in question in their imitation (*Manba' al-Anhār*) remains to be explored.
248. See, for example, Soudavar, *Art of the Persian Courts*, no. 94 and fig. 37.
249. Tehran, Gulistan Palace Library, no. 1663, fol. 234, reproduced in Beach, "Farrukh Beg," fig. 1.
250. It is not within the scope of this article to consider the impact of Bijapuri painting traditions on Farrukh's practice.
251. Tehran, Gulistan Palace Library, no. 1663, fol. 47.
252. Beach, "Farrukh Beg," 200, 209n33, who further argues that "Falconer" should be dated to Farrukh's first Mughal period under Akbar (1585–ca. 1595), rather than his second under Jahangir (at least 1609 onward).
253. Rampur, Raza Library, Ms. I.1 (P.3277), reproduced in Barbara Schmitz and Ziyad-Din A. Desai, *Mughal and Persian Paintings and Illustrated Manuscripts in the Raza Library, Rampur* (New Delhi: Aryan Books International, 2006), pl. 174 (listed as p. 314); Seyller, "Farrukh Beg in the Deccan," fig. 8 (listed as fol. 156v).
254. Milo C. Beach, "Aqa Riza and Abu'l Hasan," in Beach et al., *Masters of Indian Painting*, vol. 1, 1100–1650, 218, 229n17; Skelton, "Farrukh Beg: An Update," 20–23.
255. Boston Museum of Fine Arts, 14.609, reproduced in Beach, "Aqa Riza and Abu'l Hasan," fig. 1; Skelton, "Farrukh Beg in the Deccan: An Update," fig. 10.
256. Skelton further suggests that a second portrait associated with Aqa Riza and commonly identified as Babur (London, British Museum, 1921-10-11-03) is in fact Mirza Hakim. In this instance, the subject sits on a small throne and holds up a book of verses. Skelton, "Farrukh Beg: An Update," fig. 11.
257. Beach, "Aqa Riza and Abu'l Hasan," 218–22.
258. In addition to the six single-page portraits discussed here, two manuscript illustrations in the Salim/Jahangir Album have been attributed to Farrukh: "Royal garden party" (Tehran, Gulistan Palace Library, no. 1663, fol. 219) and "The Prophet's bier" (Tehran, Gulistan Palace Library, no. 1663, fol. 170). Beach, "Farrukh Beg," nos. 16–20, attributes five additional manuscript illustrations in the album to the artist. Whether six, eight, or thirteen, Farrukh's frequency in this renowned codex was significant, perhaps surpassing even that of Aqa Riza.
259. The gold border of "Ibrahim offering obeisance to Jahangir" (fig. 3) includes delicate *chinārs*, wispy willows, paired animals and birds, and dramatic vertical cliffs. The latter create a smooth visual transition between the outer frame and gold-streaked inner painting.
260. On personal networks, see Anooshahr, "Shirazi Scholars and the Political Culture."
261. Additional push-pull factors are discussed in Subrahmanyam, "Iranians Abroad."
262. Skelton, "Farrukh Beg in the Deccan: An Update," 14–15, fig. 5.
263. Nūr al-Dīn 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Jāmī, *Nafahāt al-Uns min Ḥaḍarāt al-Quds*, ed. and trans. Maḥmūd 'Ābidī (Tehran: Ittilā'āt, 1370 [1991]), no. 549, 563–65. For a related late sixteenth-century Shirazi painting of a man riding a lion and holding a snake, from a volume of Sa'di, see Sotheby & Co., *Catalogue of Valuable Persian and Indian Manuscripts and Miniatures*, London, July 19, 1935, lot 35 (source shared by Robert Skelton in 2009). The story of a mystic who tamed a lion and used a snake as a whip also appears in the *Maṣnavī* of Jalal al-Dīn Rumi (d. 1273).
264. For the first attribution to Farrukh's Bijapur period, see Skelton, "Mughal Artist," pl. 7, fig. 15. The bearded, pious gentleman leaning forward with his arms crossed and obscured in long sleeves was the subject of two portraits ascribed to Farrukh in Mughal circles. See London, Victoria and Albert Museum, IM 10-1925 and IM 11-1925, reproduced in Stronge, *Painting for the Mughal Emperor*, pls. 91, 92 (as in fig. 30, pl. 91 is inscribed by Jahangir: "The work of Farrukh Beg in his seventieth year"). The artist used comparable figural types in "Youth holding a wine cup" (Rampur, Raza Library, Ms. I.1/P.3277, fol. 156v), and "The Prophet's bier" (Tehran, Gulistan Palace Library, no. 1663, fol. 170), among others.
265. We cannot discount the possibility that Farrukh could have painted the work at Jahangir's court (ca. 1609 onward) and simply recycled elements of Bijapuri iconography.
266. See Ekhtiar et al., *Masterpieces from the Department of Islamic Art*, no. 127B ("Mantīq al-Ṭayr"), and 128 ("Dancing Dervishes").
267. For a mountainous landscape filled with ebullient foliage, humorous animals and birds, and anecdotes of pastoral life (e.g., the milking of cows, and a hunter spotting prey), see, among others, Muhammadi's "Throwing down the imposter" (Herat, ca. 1581), reproduced in Soudavar, *Art of the Persian Courts*, 233.
268. London, British Library, Or 1362, fol. 354v. The majority of this manuscript is preserved in the British Library. For six detached paintings remounted over pages of the *Farhang-i Jahāngīrī* (Dictionary of Jahangir) of Mir Jamal al-Dīn Husayn Inju Shirazi (Akbar's envoy to Ibrahim), see

- Linda Leach, *Mughal and Other Indian Paintings from the Chester Beatty Library*, 2 vols. (London: Scorpion Cavenish, 1995), 1:310–20. For valuations on some of the manuscript's individual paintings, see Seyller, "Inspection and Valuation," 277 (also 290 for his full entry on the volume). Leach, *Mughal and Other Indian Paintings*, 311n6–7, references two other possible subimperial copies of the text. The only other known contemporary illustrated manuscript of the *Nafahāt al-Uns* is the Ottoman example dated 1003 (1595) (Dublin, Chester Beatty Library, T 474), reproduced in Elaine Wright, *Islam: Faith, Art, Culture: Manuscripts of the Chester Beatty Library* (Dublin: Scala Publishers, 2009), figs. 128, 176.
269. Recall the erroneous associations of the Doha *Dīvān* of Jami and Doha *Khamṣa* of Amir Khusraw (appendix, nos. 1, 8) with Ibrahim Mirza of Mashhad, and similar confusion surrounding the provenance of the St. Petersburg *Laylā va Majnūn* of Hatifi (appendix, no. 9).
 270. The emphasis here on Bijapur's Iranian diaspora (and related Persian literary culture) does not discount the contributions of local artists, officials, and savants (and related vernaculars), which were of course significant and likewise deserve further consideration. It is worth repeating, in part, the important conclusion of Phillip Wagoner: "Although art historians have long recognized the vibrantly composite nature of Deccani art...there is still a tendency to see the courts of the Deccan as primarily Persianate and Islamic spaces, where it was generally 'Westerners' from the Iranian world who set the culture tone...But if we wish to better understand the rich complexity of the social and cultural tapestry that is the Deccan, we must move beyond Persian sources alone and recognize as well the relevance of previously ignored sources in local 'Indic' vernaculars." Phillip B. Wagoner, "The Multiple Worlds of Amin Khan: Crossing Persianate and Indic Cultural Boundaries in the Qutb Shahi Kingdom," in Haidar and Sardar, *Sultans of the South*, 97.
 271. A notable exception being Deborah Hutton's examination of Taj Sultan's involvement in the Ibrahim Rauza. Hutton, *Art of the Court*, 125–32.
 272. I borrow the language and theoretical systems espoused in Finbarr Barry Flood, *Objects of Translation: Material Culture and Medieval "Hindu-Muslim" Encounter* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2009).
 273. Okada, *Indian Miniatures*, 123, contends that the painting "abounds with Deccan-style touches new to his [Farrukh's] world, such as the small castles in the background, the unusual handling of exuberant vegetation, and the vertiginous mounds of rocks whose tortured shapes recall the baroque rocks of Persian painters Dust Muhammad and Sultan Muhammad as well as the fanciful landscapes of many Deccan miniatures." Although Farrukh amplified these motifs in "Abu'l Ghays al-Yamani and the lion," they appear regularly in his earlier works. See "The Prophet's bier" (Tehran) and "Akbar's entry into Surat" (London, Victoria and Albert Museum, IS.2:117-1896), among others. The dark, gold-streaked hills in the background of "Abu'l Ghays al-Yamani and the lion" (also see fig. 3) are a potentially "new" element in Farrukh's Bijapuri landscapes. Comparable hills appear in the work of 'Ali Riza ("The Bodleian Painter") and may indicate a Bijapuri assimilation on Farrukh's part. For a potential relationship between the two artists, see Overton, "'Ali Riza (The Bodleian Painter)," 379–82.
 274. Istanbul, Topkapı Palace Museum, H. 2138, fol. 37v, reproduced in Skelton, "Farrukh Beg in the Deccan: An Update," fig. 3.
 275. Berlin, Museum of Islamic Art, no. I. 4595, fol. 36, reproduced in Almut von Gladiss and Claus-Peter Haase, *The Radiance of Islamic Art: Masterpieces from the Museum of Islamic Art in Berlin* (Munich: Hirmer Verlag, 2008), 49.
 276. The subject of the languid prince receiving a foot rub is a common trope of Khurasani painting and also visible in "Royal garden party," attributed to Farrukh (Tehran, Gulistan Palace Library, no. 1663, fol. 219).
 277. For the quatrain that Shah 'Abbas composed for Khalilullah, see Sotheby's, *Arts of the Islamic World*, lot 60.
 278. For an exemplary Golconda Koran endowed as waqf to the Shrine of Imam Riza by Ibrahim Qutb Shah (r. 1550–80) in 970 (1562), see Maryam Habibi, "Qur'an-i khaṭṭī shumāra-i 106 bi khaṭṭ-i 'Abd al-Qādir Ḥusaynī Shīrāzī dar mūzih-i Āstān-i Quds-i Raḡavī," *Art Quarterly* 8 (1393 [2014]): 20–27, forthcoming in an English translation by Arash Khazeni in Overton, *Iran and the Deccan*. For a related Koran copied by the same scribe, see Haidar and Sardar, *Sultans of the South*, cat. no. 98.
 279. Consider the artist Shaykh 'Abbasi and shared *chihil sūtūn* (lit. "forty columns," or more generally, a pillared hall) traditions. On Shaykh 'Abbasi, see Soudavar, *Art of the Persian Courts*, 367–68. For Bijapur's Asar Mahal, which is contemporary to Isfahan's Chihil Sutun (1647), see Brand, "Bijapur under the Adil Shahis," 70–73, fig. 6.