Hidden from Scholarly Eyes for a Century: An unknown Bāysunghurī manuscript sheds new light on his court and library
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Abstract

This paper introduces a dual-text manuscript produced in 833/1430 at Herat in the library of the Timurid prince, Bāysunghur (1399-1437), which has escaped previous scholarly attention. Its scribe, Sa’d al-Mashhādī, was previously known only for his copy of the Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā of ‘Atā-Malik Juvaynī, as well as reports on his works in the Arža-dāsht by Bāysunghur’s chief librarian, Ja’far Tabrīzī, where he is referred to as Maulānā Sa’d al-Dīn. However, there is no other information about Sa’d as a calligrapher or an artist in contemporary or later sources. After a brief description of the manuscript, which bears the name of Bāysunghur on its binding, the article attempts to discover a fuller picture of Sa’d al-Mashhādī’s identity. A number of biographical dictionaries appear to equate him with a poet called Ḥāfīẓ Sa’d, an exact contemporary who was also a prominent riddle writer, evidently attached to the court of Bāysunghur. This investigation in turn provides further evidence of an intellectual exchange between the courts of Bāysunghur Mīrzā and Ibrāhīm-Sultan, where the celebrated writer ʿAlī Yazdī also composed riddles, including some concerning Sa’d al-Dīn.
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Introduction

The output of manuscripts produced in the celebrated library of the Timurid prince, Bāysunghur Mīrzā, (1399-1437), has attracted ample scholarly attention for more than a century. However, there are still several examples of the Herat School’s arts of the book

---

1 I am grateful to Prof. Charles Melville, for his valuable help and support in completing this article.
2 Among the earliest studies in the 20th century is Martin (1912), in which he refers to the kitābkhāna as ‘Bāysunghur’s Academy’. Some other scholarly works, mainly centred on Bāysunghur’s library, include the comprehensive research done by Thomas Lentz for his unpublished PhD dissertation: “Painting at Herat under Baysunghur ibn Shah Rukh” (1985); Roxburgh (2001): “Baysunghur’s Library: Questions Related to its Chronology and Production”; Akimushkin (1997): “The Library-Workshop (kitābkhāna) of Bāysunghur-Mīrzā in Herat”.

under Bāysunghur’s patronage that have not been properly identified or introduced. One such manuscript is preserved in a library in Istanbul.

This as yet neglected manuscript is preserved in the Yeni Cami library, catalogue no. 937. It contains the *Kunūz al-wadī‘a min rumūz al-żarī‘a ilā makārim al-sharī‘a*, and a translation of *al-Faraj ba‘d al-shidda wa al-żīqa*, copied by Sa‘d al-Mashhadī in a carefully-written *nasta‘līq* script in 833/1430. It is an unillustrated codex in 475 ruled folios, set in 25 rows, decorated with two Bāysunghurī *ex libris* as well as three illuminated sarlavāhs.

After describing the manuscript in detail, this paper will focus on confirming the identity of the scribe and his connection with the court of Bāysunghur.

**Codicology**

**The binding**

The 600-year history behind the Bāysunghurī productions that have survived to our time is sufficient to explain why they are seldom found in their original bindings; especially considering the fact that the output of Bāysunghur’s royal workshop was moved and plundered several times after his death.³ Although not in pristine condition, the original cover of the Yeni Cami manuscript has been preserved in the course of conservations; this alone gives it considerable codicological significance.

The binding in medium and light brown leather has been restored at some point. The dark brown leather used in the course of its traditional conservation is easily distinguishable.

³ Lentz (1985): pp. 134-135, believes that at least five original book-bindings executed for Bāysunghur are still extant: *Kalīla va Dimna* (833), *Kalīla va Dimna* (834), *Tārīkh-i Isfahān* (834), *Tārīkh-i Tabarī* (833), and *Chahār Maqāla* (835). In my opinion, the binding of the *Tārīkh-i Isfahān* is from a later period.
The original binding was evidently damaged along the edges and has been remounted carefully in its former place after the damaged parts were restored, both on the outer cover and inside. The spine is the sole part that had to be replaced. The cover is decorated with fine patterns that are tooled on the margins, enclosing a turanj (a pointed shamsa) and four corner pieces on the boards. A limited tooling adorns the doublures and the inside of the envelope flap. The spine of the flap, similarly tooled and with the same decorative motifs, exceptionally encompasses an inscription in suls (thulth) script, which reads:

«اللهم خلّد دولة السلطان الأعظم * بايسنغر بهادرخان خلّد الله مملكته»

The age of the leather, as well as the inscription in the name of Bāysunghur, confirms the authenticity of the Bāysunghurī binding. Among other productions of his workshop, the only manuscript that now carries the name of Bāysunghur on its binding is the Kalīla va Dimna (833/1430), in the Topkapi Palace Library (H. 362). His name appears in Kufic on the arabesque-decorated cartouches on both the front and back doublures.

One other original binding that still protects its manuscript belongs to the Naṣāyiḫ-i Iskandar, preserved in the Dublin Chester Beatty Library and catalogued as Ar. 4183. The copyist is Jaʿfar Bāysunghurī, and it is dated 829/1426. Its binding is the closest to Yeni Cami’s in technique and design. Analogously, the original parts were saved and remounted on the repaired edges; however, in this case, the flap spine has been replaced in conservation and no inscription is witnessed, if it ever existed. It is made of medium brown leather of finest quality with very similar decorative motifs and the same subtle technique of tooling (fig. 1). The Naṣāyiḫ-i Iskandar’s binding enjoys an absolutely pristine condition, whereas the Yeni Cami MS’s is worn on the boards (fig. 2) This similarity eliminates doubts about the originality of Chester Beatty’s MS, which was puzzling for its Ottoman-type green silk pasted on the sheets facing the doublures.⁴

⁴ Roxburgh indicated the original binding for this MS in his list of Bāysunghurī productions in his lecture series (‘Modeling Artistic Process: The Kitābkhāna and Arzadāsht’, Yarshater Lecture Series, SOAS,
The text

The first part of the codex is a Persian translation of the original book, *al-Ẓarīʿa ilā makārim al-sharīʿa* (“The Path to Virtue”) by Rāghib Iṣfahānī (d. c. 402/1008-9) written in Arabic in the 10th century. It was translated by Ẓāfir ibn Shams al-Dīn Ḥasan in 768/1367. The main subject of the book is ethics and mysticism in seven chapters on taming carnality, particularly by controlling lust and anger. The author employed Quranic verses and hadith as well as poems and proverbs.5 *Al-Ẓarīʿa* has been compared with the *Akhlāq-i Nāṣirī*, which is considered among the most influential didactic works, and sometimes considered even more important.6 According to the *Kashf al-ẓunūn*, al-Ghazālī praised *al-Ẓarīʿa* and always carried it with him.7

The manuscript begins with the *ex libris* of Bāysunghur’s library on fol. 1r, which is embellished with an elaborate pointed *shamsa*, and reads:

«برسم خزانة الكتب السلطان الاعظم و الخاقان الاعدل الاکرم بایسنغر بهادر خان خلدالله ملكه»

The first part contains two other *sarlauhs*. The preface of the first book begins with an adorned *sarlauh* on fol. 1v, with a white Kufic *bismillah* on an ultramarine blue (lapis) ground (see fig. 3), which reads:

«بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم»

---


7 Ḥājjī Khalīfa (1360 AH/1940): I, p. 827.
The second *sarlauḥ* appears on fol. 9v and bears a similar inscription with a white Kufic *bismillah* on an ultramarine blue (lapis) ground, which reads:

»بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم و به نستعين

The first colophon on fol. 184r gives the completion date as late Shawwāl 833/July 1430.

تم كتاب كنز الوديعه من رموز الذريعة الى مكارم الشرعية في اواخر شوال حتم بالخير و الإقبال بعام ثلث و تلثين و ثمان ماهين

Figure 3: *sarlauḥ*, fol. 1v, no. 937, Yeni Cami library, Istanbul

The next part, *al-Faraj ba’d al-shidda wa al-żīqa* (“Relief after Difficulty and Distress”), was originally written in Arabic by Qāżī Abū ‘Alī Muḥassan ibn ‘Alī Tanūkhī, also in the 10th century. It contains stories of the heroic and moral behaviour of people suffering hardships who finally find relief and wellbeing.8 According to the scribe, the book was copied from its second Persian translation by Ḥusayn ibn As’ad ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Dihistānī in the 13th century. No record of the first translation by Muḥammad ‘Auffī has survived to our time. The book begins at fol. 185r, where the second *ex libris* appears within another exquisite illuminated *shamsa*. It reads:

برسم خزانة الكتب السلطان الاعظم الاعدل الاكرم غياث الحق و السلطنة و الدين و الذين بياستنر بهادر خان خلد

The second *shamsa* is also pointed (*turanj*), and is embellished with similar patterns and decorative arabesques.

The preface of the second book (fol. 185v) is adorned with an illuminated *sarlauḥ*, with an inscription in white Kufic script:

8 See also Elise Franssen (2010): pp. 64-66, for a description of the author and the work.
The beginning of the body of the second book, *al-Faraj ba‘d al-shidda wa al-zīqa*, is marked by another *sarlauh* of the same style on fol. 195v. The white Kufic script on lapis ground, introduces the first chapter:

«بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم. این آغاز باب اول است
باب پنجمین»

The second colophon appears on fol. 472v, and gives the date of completion as: 18 Rabī‘ al-akhir 833/11 January 1430, and the name of the scribe as Sa‘d al-Mashhadī.

«تم الكتاب الموسوم بفرج بعد الشده بعون الله و حسن توفيقه في الثامن و العشرين ربيع آخر حجة ثلث و ثلاثين و
ثمانی ماشه على يد العبد الضعيف التحيف اقل عبيد السلطاني سعد المشهدى غفر الله ذنوبه و ستر عيوبه امين»

It is worth noting that the reason why the first colophon gives a later date than the second is obscure. The fact that the name of the scribe only comes at the end of the manuscript suggests that this was the intended order for the combination of the two texts.

**Visual features**

As correctly observed by Roxburgh, ‘didactic works represented a high proportion of Bāysunghur’s library’.⁹ This codex is also comprised of two mystic-didactic works, both written in the 10th century. Since they did not lend themselves to being a proper vehicle for illustration, the care given to producing them in such a fastidious manner reveals the importance attached to their content.

Bound in one volume, the beginning of each book is presented with an elaborate *shamsa*, one on fol. 1r and the other on fol. 185v, as noted above. The Bāysunghuri style of

---

illumination is not only echoed in their high precision and meticulous rendering, but also in applying wispy arabesques, which were heavily employed in Bāysunghur’s library.

By the year 1427, the *ex libris* began to serve as emblematic of Bāysunghurī productions and as a mark of a distinctive royal quality. The first example of this is seen at the opening of the Chester Beatty’s *Gulistān* of Sa‘dī, 830/1427, which is comparable with the *shamsa* of *al-Zarī‘a ilā makārim al-sharī‘a* (fig. 4), both in terms of its pattern and design. The motifs and colour palette of the two *shamsas* are so similar as to suggest that although they were not produced in the same year, they could have been executed by the same hand. In both *ex libris*, the dedication note is written in a white *riqā‘* script on green and gold trim.\(^{11}\)

*Figure 4: al-Zarī‘a ilā makārim al-sharī‘a, 1430, fol. 1r, no. 937, Yeni Cami Library, Istanbul*

The patterns, design and the characteristics of the Kufic script applied to the ornamentation of the *sarlauhs* are closest to the Bāysunghurī manuscript of the Malik Library (no. 6031), which contains the *Shāhnāma* of Firdausī and the *Khamsa* of Niẓāmī, copied by Muḥammad Muṭḥahhar, and dated 833/1430 (figures. 5 & 6).\(^{12}\)

*Figure 5: the Khamsa of Niẓāmī, 1430, p. 679, no. 6031, Malik National Library, Tehran*

---


\(^{11}\) Another Bāysunghurī *shamsa* that resembles these two is found in the *Kulliyāt* of ‘Īmād al-Dīn Faqīh Kirmānī (834/1431) with regard to the script, design, patterns and the pointed ends of the *shamsa*. But it is slightly different in colour scheme, as the two aforementioned examples lack the reddish hue (vermilion red). The *Kulliyāt* of ‘Īmād, 1431, Elliott 210, Bodleian Library, Oxford. The *Tārīkh-i Iṣfahān* of Ḥamza ibn al-Ḥasan Iṣfahānī, copied by Ja‘far Bāysunghuri in 834/1431, now housed in the British Library, London (Or. 2773), also boasts a *shamsa* of the same sophisticated quality and composition. Albeit here the *shamsa* is round, without a pointed top and bottom, it includes the vermilion red in its palette. It is worth noting that the *riqā‘* script is not written by the same calligrapher in any of the four examples mentioned.

\(^{12}\) For a comprehensive study of the codex, see Mihan (2016b, in press).
Apart from the initial ornamentation of *shamsas* and *sarlaухs*, only changes in the ink colour used for Quranic verses or rubrics enliven the remaining folios.

**The Scribe**

As noted above, the colophon of our MS gives the name of the scribe as Sa‘d al-Mashhadī. He was also responsible for copying the *Tārīkh-i jahāngushā* of ‘Atā-Malik Juvaynī, dated Rabī‘ I 834/December 1430, as stated in the colophon.\(^{13}\) That is, he completed two manuscripts within about six months of each other, but to date there is no other record of a text copied by him.

When Ja‘far Tabrīzī was appointed as head of the court library-workshop (*kitābkhāna*) he was responsible not only for supervising courtly projects, but also for reporting the progress of the workshop’s activities to the prince. One extant folio of such a regular report is a document, originally written in the form of a scroll,\(^{14}\) widely known as the ‘*Arža-dāsht*,\(^{15}\) in which Ja‘far itemises the manuscripts in production and the artists or scribes working on them. It does not mention Sa‘d al-Mashhadī in this list of works in progress; however, there is a Maulānā Sa‘d al-Dīn. Ja‘far refers to the activities connected to Maulānā Sa‘d al-Dīn in three cases:

Khwāja ‘Atā, the rulings draftsman (*jadval-kash*), has finished Maulānā Sa‘d al-Dīn’s *Tārīkh* …

Khwāja ‘Atā has finished the sections of the *Gulistān* and the *sarlaух* for the history that Maulānā Sa‘d al-Dīn has copied.

---

\(^{13}\) National Library of Russia, St. Petersburg, PNS. 233, fol. 279v.

\(^{14}\) Akimushkin (1997): p. 22, discusses the original form of this document before being pasted in the H. 2154 album.

\(^{15}\) Topkapi Palace Library, Istanbul, H. 2154, fol. 98r. For more information on technical terms used in this document, see Mihan (2016a, in press).
Maulānā Sa’d al-Dīn has finished the lid of the Begum’s little chest and one side of it is ready for the final touches.\textsuperscript{16}

Thomas Lentz considers that the \textit{Tārīkh-i Maulānā Sa’d al-Dīn} is problematic and otherwise unknown, though he also refers to Maulānā Sa’d al-Dīn as a ‘known calligrapher’.\textsuperscript{17} Thackston, however, believes that, it ‘must be the \textit{Tārīkh-i Jahāngushāy} by Juwaynī copied by Sa‘uddin al-Mashhadī in 834’\textsuperscript{18}.

Apart from the light that the two MSS completed by Sa’d al-Mashhadī in 834/1430 might throw on the date of the ‘\textit{Arţa-dāsht}, the question remains whether Sa’d al-Mashhadī and Maulānā Sa’d al-Dīn are indeed one and the same person, and if so, what else can be known about him to indicate his attachment to the court and \textit{kitābkhāna} of Bāysunghur Mīrzā.

\textbf{Who was Sa’d?}

Sa’d al-Mashhadī does not figure in either contemporary or later sources as a prominent calligrapher. There is only indirect evidence of a homonymous figure. However, in the famous preface to the Safavid album prepared for Bahrām Mīrzā, Dūst Muḥammad refers to two Maulānā Sa’d al-Dīns in the line of prominent calligraphers:

Khwāja ‘Abdullāh Šayrafī instructed his nephew Shaykh Muḥammad Bandgīr, who instructed Maulānā Sa’d al-Dīn Tabrīzī, ….

\textsuperscript{16} Thackston (2001): p. 43.
\textsuperscript{17} Lentz (1985): pp. 150-151, does not mention the \textit{Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā}, dated 834/1430, among the Bāysunghurī productions; however, he refers to the \textit{Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā}, dated 835/1432 in the Keir collection, which contains Bāysunghur’s \textit{ex libris}, but no scribe’s name. See also Robinson (1976): p. 296, VII.62 and plate 42.
\textsuperscript{18} Thackston (2001): p. 44.
Maulānā Ma’rūf was a student of Maulānā Sa’d al-Dīn ‘Irāqī, who was a student of Pīr Yaḥyā Ṣūfī.\textsuperscript{19}

In his book on the calligrapher and painters, \textit{Gulistān-i hunar}, Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī does not mention any Sa’d or Sa’d al-Dīn in this lineage, but taking his account of Pīr Yaḥyā\textsuperscript{20} and the date of Ṣayrafī’s death (d. after 1345-46)\textsuperscript{21} into consideration, neither of the two Sa’d al-Dīns in Dūst Muḥammad’s preface could be contemporary with Bāysunghur, even disregarding their origins as ‘Irāqī or Tabrīzī, rather than Mashhadī.

The only account of Sa’d Mashhadī that I have found is in the \textit{Tažkira-yi ‘Arafāt al-āshiqīn} (completed in 1024/1615) of Auḥḍā b. 1002/1593 – which contains information on almost 3500 poets. Auḥḍā introduces Sa’d Mashhadī as one of the well-natured men (\textit{khush-tab’ān}) of the time and records a couplet by him.

Strangely, in an entry immediately before Sa’d Mashhadī’s, the same couplet is attributed to a homonymous poet called Ḥāfīz Sa’d. In the words of Auḥḍā, Ḥāfīz Sa’d was “a star in the sky of eloquence and oratory”.\textsuperscript{22} He then refers to ‘the author of \textit{Majālis}’ and repeats Mīr ‘Alīshīr Navā’ī’s account in the \textit{Majālis al-nafāyis}, which is the earliest \textit{tazkira} to mention Ḥāfīz Sa’d. In this work (completed in 1491), ‘Alīshīr Navā’ī (1441-1501) reports that Ḥāfīz Sa’d was one of the followers of Qāsim Anvār. Sa’d’s behaviour caused his expulsion from Anvār’s circle of intimates.\textsuperscript{23} That brought him immense affliction and torment, and he died in that state.\textsuperscript{24} Navā’ī then quotes the same couplet, including a number of other verses, including a riddle on the name of a certain Aḥmad

\textsuperscript{23} See Subtelny (1979-1980), for a pioneering study of ‘Alīshīr Navā’ī. For a more recent analysis of his political life and his cultural, scientific, social and economic works, see Ni’matī Līmā’ī (1393/2015).
\textsuperscript{24} ‘Alīshīr Navā’ī (1363/1984): pp. 8-9 and 184-185.
Mīrāk. ‘Auḥadī adds several more verses; all of these are found in the Dīvān of Ḥāfīẓ Sa’d, along with many more panegyric verses praising Qāsim Anvār.

In the Taḏkira-yi Haft Iqlīm, written in 1018/1609, Amīn Aḥmad Rāzī presents Sa’d Gul, as a poet from Shiraz, whose poems are fresh like Kashmir’s waters; he records the same verses as those attributed to Ḥāfīẓ Sa’d in the Majālis al-nafā’is and later by ‘Auḥadī.25

Thus, at face value, this would suggest all three Sa’ds are the same. Sa’d Gul is the least significant figure for the argument. The information about him is repeated in later sources who persist in equating him with Maulānā Sa’d in the Majālis al-Nafa’is.26 The best known of these three names is Ḥāfīẓ Sa’d; so the question now becomes, can the calligrapher Sa’d Mashhadī be equated with the poet Ḥāfīẓ Sa’d?

Looking for confirmation of the lines quoted, I consulted two manuscripts of the Dīvān of Ḥāfīẓ Sa’d, both of which contain all the verses cited by the aforementioned taḏkira writers, as well as his other poetical works. One manuscript was certainly made in Shiraz for Pīr Budāq, and it seems evident that this is true of the other also. The earlier of the two is housed in the British Library, Or. 11846 (henceforth, BL) and is beautifully illuminated. The colophon states that the manuscript was copied by Shaykh Maḥmūd Pīr Budāqī, in Ṣafar of the year 864 (December 1459), at Shiraz. It bears the ex libris of Pīr Budāq (d. 870/1466) that appears in an adorned shamsa. The inscription reads: “For the treasury of the Shadow of God the Beneficent, refuge of the Khaqans of the age, Abu’l-Fatḥ Pīr Budāq Bahādur Khān, may God support him with victory and favour”.

«برسم خزانة ظل الله المنان ملاذ خواقين الزمان ابولفتح پیر بوداق بهادر خان ایبده الله بالنصر و الاحسان»
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The manuscript includes a later illustration on fol. 148r, portraying Pîr Bûdâq and his courtiers in a bazm, celebrating the reception of the completed manuscript.\(^{27}\) It has been added subsequently (probably in the 19\(^{th}\) century) at the end of Sa‘d’s rubâ‘iyât (quatrains).\(^{28}\)

The other copy is kept in the Tehran Majlis Library (no. 13159), copied by Maḥmûd ibn Muḥammad ibn Maḥmûd Khumârî, dated Shawwâl 864/July 1460 (henceforth, ML).\(^{29}\) The note on the shamsa (fol. 1r) is damaged and illegible. On fol.1v, the inscription of the sarlauḥ reads: Dīvān-i Ḥâfīz Sa‘d, with no nisba or indication of his origin. Although the colophon gives no reference to its location, and the patron is not named, it seems certain that this also was made for Pîr Budâq, on account of the date and scribe. According to Bayânî, Khumârî worked as a well-known copyist at the court of Pîr Budâq Qara-Qoyunlu, in Shiraz.\(^{30}\)

Both manuscripts contain 185 folios, completed in the same year and probably the same place. Comparing their frontispieces, they also share a similar page layout, illumination motifs and colour scheme in the sarlauḥ (fig. 7).\(^{31}\) Although the BL manuscript is more elaborately illuminated, the vacant spaces in the Majlis manuscript corroborate the idea

\(^{27}\) For the patron and the scribe, see also Robinson (1991): pp. 29-34.

\(^{28}\) For a comprehensive study of this manuscript, see Barbara Brend (forthcoming). I am grateful to Dr. Brend for sharing her unpublished article and also for her feedback on this paper.

\(^{29}\) In the library label the author is wrongly identified as Jalâl al-Dîn Sa‘d-Allâh Tabrîzî. This probably misled Şidâqat Hüsaynî, who equates Ḥâfîz Sa‘d with “Jamâl al-Dîn Ḥâfîz Sa‘d Tabrîzî, known as Sa‘d-Allâh” in his article on the Dîvûn of Ḥâfîz Sa‘d; see Şidâqat Hüsaynî (1392/2013): pp. 161-178. He refers to Tarbîyat (1234/1853), pp. 181-182, where the same verses of Ḥâfîz Sa‘d and his relations with Qâsim Anvâr are associated with Maulânâ Jalâl al-Dîn Ḥâfîz Tabrîzî, known as Sa‘d-Allâh. The first person to call Ḥâfîz Sa‘d, Sa‘d-Allâh Tabrîzî is Şâbâ (1297/1880): pp. 291-292, who refers to the story of Qâsim Anvâr and quotes two lines from Navâ‘î. According to Āqâ Buzurg Tihrânrî (1403/1983, p. 446), this is the source of Tarbîyat’s identification of Ḥâfîz Sa‘d with Tabriz.

\(^{30}\) For other works copied by him, see Bayânî (1363/1984): pp. 873-874.

\(^{31}\) The digital images of the Dîvûn of Ḥâfîz Sa‘d (Or. 11846, British Library, London) are accessible online: http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/Viewer.aspx?ref=or_11846_fs001r# (last accessed March 19, 2016).
that it was planned to be adorned in a similar fashion, but was left incomplete for some reason. All these details point to the fact that they were commissioned by the same patron, Pīr Būdāq, who probably encountered Saʿd’s Dīvān while in Herat at the time of the Qara-Qoyunlu capture of city in 1458.\textsuperscript{32} He was the eldest son of Jahānshāh Qara-Qoyunlu, who came back to Shiraz in 864/1460 after aiding his father to suppress his brother’s rebellion in Azarbayjan.\textsuperscript{33} He then ordered the repair and fortification of the city walls,\textsuperscript{34} before rebelling himself against his father. Eventually, he had to escape to Shūshtar, when Jahānshāh sent an army to repel him in the spring of 865/1461, and then sent him to Baghdad the following year.\textsuperscript{35} Jahānshāh appointed Pīr Budāq’s brother, Mīrzā Yūsuf, to the governorship of Shiraz.\textsuperscript{36} This would probably explain the incomplete decoration of the Majlis manuscript, which was transcribed around seven months after the BL manuscript and on the eve of Pīr Budāq’s revolt.

Another Dīvān housed in the Central Library of the University of Tehran (no. 225/2), also contains most of Saʿd’s verses; however, this time in the name of Saʿd Bukhārī (undated, c. 16\textsuperscript{th} century). This copy includes only 360 lines of his poems, while the other two editions have more than 4500 lines.\textsuperscript{37} The only tazkira with an account of Ḥāfiẓ Saʿd Bukhārī is the Tazkira-yi Naṣrābādī (1072/1662), which just mentions two riddles.\textsuperscript{38}

Concerning the poetry, all the lines attributed to ‘Saʿd’ in the scattered biographical dictionaries are found in his complete Dīvān. This suggests that they all represent the

\textsuperscript{32} For a concise account of Pīr Budāq, see Jalālī (1385/2004): pp. 119-121.

\textsuperscript{33} Khwāndamīr (1353/1974): IV, p. 75.

\textsuperscript{34} Fasāʿī (1367/1988): I, 347; II, p. 902.


\textsuperscript{36} Khwāndamīr (1353/1974): IV, p. 85.

\textsuperscript{37} Āqā Buzurg Tihrānī (1403/1983, vol. 9, part 2, p. 446) referring to this manuscript, naturally assumes Ḥāfiẓ Saʿd was from Bukhara, and draws attention to the confusion between Ḥāfiẓ Saʿd and the Saʿd-Allāh Tabrīzī, mentioned by Ṣabā (1297/1880): pp. 291-292 and Tarbīyat (1234/1845): p. 181. See above note 29.

\textsuperscript{38} Naṣrābādī Iṣfahānī (1378/1999): p. 756.
same poet, Ḥāfiẓ Sa’d, who lived in Herat, was once Qāsim Anvār’s intimate, and therefore was contemporary with Prince Bāysunghur.

Figure 7: Dīvān of Ḥāfiẓ Sa’d, 864/1460, fol. 2v, no. 13159, Majlis Library, Tehran.

The title ‘Ḥāfiẓ’, was a common epithet for scribes. In the case of Sa’d, it can be construed from the dedication *shamsa* of the BL’s *Dīvān*, that he was a reciter of the Quran. The inscription describes him as: ‘ṣāḥib al-furqān’ (master in the Quran) *al-mushtahar bi* (known as) Ḥāfiẓ Sa’d.

Being a famous poet and a Quran reciter, we could expect him to be well versed in calligraphy as well. It is hardly necessary to recall the strong interconnection between poets and calligraphers, and that most calligraphers also wrote poetry, to which they usually referred as ‘*li muḥarririhi*’.

Thomas Lentz discusses how Timurid artists, like their Safavid counterparts, often possessed considerable literary talents that may have been expected at this elite social level.39 Such a connection was indeed conspicuous at Bāysunghur’s court, judging from contemporary and later historical sources. The *Jung-i marāṣi* that contains eulogies on Bāysunghur’s death is a good example: it shows that not only his court poets, but also the artists who were involved in the royal projects of the *kitābkhāna*, expressed their loss via poetry, one way or another (fig. 8).40 That being so, and taking ‘Auḥḍā’ī’s entries on Sa’d Mashhadī and Ḥāfiẓ Sa’d into consideration, it could be surmised that the well-known poet was the scribe of the two Bāysunghurī codices.41

40 The *Jung-i marāṣi* begins with seven pages of lament by Ja’far. This implies his superior position as the head of the library as well as being a testimony to his knowledge of literature and outstanding quality as a poet. *Jung-i marāṣi*, 837/1434, scribe: ʿAzhar, no. 2967, the Central Library of Tabriz.
41 Roxburgh (2005): p. 107, mentions a scribe named Ḥāfiẓ Sa’d Shīrvānī in association with signed specimens in the first part of the calligraphy album prepared for Bāysunghur (B. 411, Topkapi Palace
To elaborate this theory, we need to look back a few years. After Aḥmad Lur’s unsuccessful regicide attempt on Shāhrūkh, and regarding his connection with Qāsim Anvār – of whom Shāhrūkh was wary due to his fame and the large number of followers he had gained in Herat – it was a justified pretext to execute or exile many sufis, among whom was Qāsim Anvār himself. Eventually, Bāysunghur exiled him from Herat in 830/1427.

According to the aforementioned taṣkiras, Qāsim Anvār ordered the destruction of Saʿd’s chamber and the removal of its soil, before the miserable poet’s expulsion. Be it the case that the well-known poet, Ḥāfīz Saʿd, was the same as the calligrapher, Saʿd (al-Dīn) Mashhadī, it is plausible to imagine him joining the court library after his exclusion from Anvār’s circle. The hostile attitude of Bāysunghur towards Qāsim Anvār reinforces the possibility of his offering his patronage to the deprived poet. A closer investigation of Saʿd’s poems provides more evidence to support this theory.

**Riddles**

Writing riddles became very popular in the 15th century. ‘Alīshīr Navāʿī records a number of riddle-writers in his taṣkira, among whom Maulānā Badīʿī, ‘Alī Yazdī and...
Jāmī have treatises on the principles of riddles. The *Risāla-yi mufradāt dar fann-i mu’mmā* is a treatise by Navā’ī to teach the skills of writing and decoding riddles from basics. For instance, a riddle from the *Hulal-i muṭarraz* of ‘Alī Yazdī would clarify how to interpret and decode them:

در شصت عدد کار تمام است و لیک به صنعت در آن پروتاید

With the number (‘adad) 60, the work is done, but only if 1 and 30 come in between

In the *Abjad* writing system, each symbol stands for a consonant and is related to a number.

- 60 stands for س
- 1 stands for الف
- 30 stands for ل

Thus, according to the riddle, placing 60 س beside عدد will give the answer, provided that ال is put in between, which makes س عدد ال د. Therefore, the clue represents Saʿd al-Dīn.

The final chapter in Saʿd’s *dīwān* is dedicated to *Muʿammīyāt* (riddles). It comprises the folios from 148r to 185r in ML and 148v to 185v in BL. In Saʿd’s *Muʿammīyāt* section, each name is followed by a single couplet, which contains the clue to the person’s identity. The names are very similar in both manuscripts; however, in some cases trivial changes can be found.

The key names featuring in this chapter make their connection to Bāysunghur’s court certain. The characters from the house of Timur who have at least one riddle written for them are as shown in the table (the names are given as they appear in the BL’s copy).

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political figure</th>
<th>name in the riddle</th>
<th>ML</th>
<th>BL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shāhrukh</td>
<td>Shāhrukh Bahādur Khan</td>
<td>176v</td>
<td>177r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāysunghur</td>
<td>Bāysunghur Bahādur</td>
<td>168v</td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bāysunghur</td>
<td>175r</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bāysunghur Khusrau</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>176r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulugh Beg</td>
<td>Ulugh Beg Bahādur</td>
<td>183r</td>
<td>183v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Alā’ al-Daula</td>
<td>‘Alā’ al-Daula</td>
<td>148r, 175v, 183v</td>
<td>148v, 176v, 184r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bāysunghur’s son)</td>
<td>Mīr ‘Alā’ al-Daula</td>
<td>182v</td>
<td>183r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rukn al-Dīn</td>
<td>165v</td>
<td>166r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sūrghatmīsh</td>
<td>Sūrghatmīsh Khān</td>
<td>150v, 166v</td>
<td>151r, 167r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Shāhrukh’s son)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are many other names that cannot be definitively identified, but are very probably connected to Bāysunghur’s court. Several are identical to the artists involved in Bāysunghur’s court projects, according to the ‘Arža-dāsht. The table below provides a comparison between the names for which a riddle is written and the ones mentioned in the ‘Arža-dāsht.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Arža-dāsht</th>
<th>Dīvān of Sa’d</th>
<th>ML</th>
<th>BL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amīr Khalīl</td>
<td>Khwāja Khalīl</td>
<td>149r</td>
<td>149v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khalīl darwish</td>
<td>175r, 177r</td>
<td>175v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maulānā ‘Alī</td>
<td>‘Alī</td>
<td>148r, 172r, 179r</td>
<td>148r, 156r, 172v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mīr ‘Alī</td>
<td>167r, 160r, 157r, 150r</td>
<td>150v, 157v, 167v, 166v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khwāja Ghīyās al-Dīn</td>
<td>Ghīyās al- Dīn</td>
<td>155r</td>
<td>155v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ghīyās</td>
<td>161r</td>
<td>161v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mīr Ghīyās</td>
<td>164v</td>
<td>165r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maulānā Shihāb</td>
<td>Shihāb</td>
<td>165v</td>
<td>166r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maulānā Qavām al-Dīn</td>
<td>Qavām al-Dīn</td>
<td>158v</td>
<td>159v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Page Numbers</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maulānā Shams</td>
<td>Shams</td>
<td>171r, 182v, 151r, 158v</td>
<td>171v, 183r, 151v, 159r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥājjī Maḥmūd</td>
<td>Mīr Maḥmūd</td>
<td>181v, 155r</td>
<td>182r, 155v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khwāja Maḥmūd</td>
<td>Khwāja Maḥmūd</td>
<td>174r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khwāja ‘Aṭā</td>
<td>‘Aṭā</td>
<td>151v, 165r, 175v</td>
<td>152r, 165v, 176r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khwāja ‘Aṭā</td>
<td>161r</td>
<td>162r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maulānā Sa’d al-Dīn</td>
<td>Sa’d</td>
<td>158r, 177r, 178r, 158v, 177v, 178v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sa’d al-Dīn</td>
<td>173v, 159v (twice), 172v</td>
<td>160v, 173r, 174r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maulānā Sa’d al-Dīn</td>
<td>174v</td>
<td>175r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maulānā Quṭb</td>
<td>Quṭb</td>
<td>165r, 164r, 175v, 166v</td>
<td>165v, 164v, 176v, 167r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maulānā Muḥammad</td>
<td>Muṭahhar</td>
<td>163r, 175v</td>
<td>164r, 176r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muṭahhar</td>
<td>Mīr Muṭahhar</td>
<td>174v, 172r</td>
<td>172v, 175v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khwāja ‘Abd al-Raḥīm</td>
<td>‘Abd al-Raḥīm</td>
<td>181r, 152v</td>
<td>181v, 153r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥājjī</td>
<td>Ḥājjī</td>
<td>163r, 161r</td>
<td>163v, 161v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khatāʿī</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Abd al-Salām</td>
<td>‘Abd al-Salām</td>
<td>151r, 160v</td>
<td>151v, 161v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ustād Sayf al-Dīn</td>
<td>Sayf al-Dīn</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>161r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mīr Daulatyār</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khwāja Mīr Ḥasan</td>
<td>Mīr Ḥasan</td>
<td>153r, 163r</td>
<td>163v, 153v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mīr Shams al-Dīn</td>
<td>Shams al-Dīn</td>
<td>155r, 179r</td>
<td>156r, 180r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ustād Daulat Khwāja</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaʿfar</td>
<td>Mīr Jaʿfar</td>
<td>157r, 168v</td>
<td>157v, 169v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the table clearly illustrates, only three out of the 22 names of the ‘Arža-dāsht are not covered in the *Mu’ammāyāt*. Although some names were very common, like ‘Alī, other specific tributes like Ustād Qavām al-Dīn leave no room for doubt.

There are also riddles on the names of other known characters, such as: Faṣīḥ al-Dīn (probably Bāysunghur’s historian, Faṣīḥ Khwāfī), ‘Abd al-Qādir (probably the famous musician and singer ‘Abd al-Qādir Marāghī), Shihāb al-Dīn (probably the famous chronicler, Ḥāfīẓ Abrū), Maulānā ‘Abd al-Raḥmān (very likely the famous poet ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Jāmī), and so on. The data presented in these tables leave no doubt about Ḥāfīẓ Sa’d’s presence at Bāysunghur’s court.

As noted above, ‘Alī Yazdī (d. 1454), the author of the *Zafarnāma*, was a leading and prominent riddle-writer. He completed his treatise, *al-Ḥulal al-muṭarraz fī al-mu’ammā wa al-lughaz*, in 832/1429 and dedicated it to Abu’l-Faṭḥ Ibrāhīm Sulṭān. It is a complete book on the subject, with many riddles on different names, some of which can be connected to contemporary figures (fig. 9). Apart from his own name, Sharaf, which is used both as his *takhalluṣ* (pen name) and the subject for many riddles, he has verses for the names of both Sa’d and Sa’d al-Dīn, as we have seen.

Figure 9: *al-Ḥulal al-muṭarraz*, 1068/1658, fol. 56r, F. 2612/1, Melli Library, Tehran

Similarly, Sa’d’s *mu’ammāyāt* include riddles for his own name too: Sa’d and Sa’d al-Dīn; but the significant point is that he also presents several riddles in name of ‘Alī Yazdī, as: Sharaf al-Dīn ‘Alī, Sharaf al-Dīn, and Sharaf. This suggests first, that it was usual for authors to refer to themselves and secondly, that they could do so under more than one name. Although it may appear an insubstantial assumption that Sa’d and Sa’d al-Dīn are the same and also refer to the author (Hafiz Sa’d) – Sa’d al-Dīn after all is not an uncommon name – there is no doubt about the different references to the same ‘Alī

---

46 Shamīlpūr et al. (1394/2015), have recently published a study on the stylistic and literary aspects of the *Ḥulal-i muṭarraz dar mu’ammā va lughaz*. 
Yazdī. Furthermore, it seems as though an exchange was taking place between the two outstanding riddle-writers of the time, or even a kind of intellectual competition between the courts of the two Timurid brothers.\textsuperscript{47}

Conclusion

This paper has identified a previously neglected manuscript issuing from the atelier of Bāysunghur Mīrzā, significant partly for the evidence of its original binding dedicated to the prince, and partly as providing another example of the calligraphy of the enigmatic Sa’d Mashhadī.

The evidence presented suggests rather strongly that the ‘Maulānā Sa’d al-Dīn’ of the ‘Arža-dāsht was the same as Sa’d Mashhadī, who was the scribe of the two codices: the Yeni Cami MS, and the Tārīkh-i jahāngushā of ‘Aṭā Malik Juvaynī, both transcribed in the year 1430. In view of the coincidence of dates and Sa’d Mashhadī’s certain activity as a scribe in the atelier at exactly this period, he can also be identified with the contemporary poet Ḥāfiẓ Sa’d, and perhaps rather better known for his poetry than as a scribe – though as a ḥāfiẓ (or khatīb) he could certainly have been skilled in calligraphy as well.

Investigating the Dīvān of Ḥāfiẓ Sa’d revealed the connection between the poet and Bāysunghur Mīrzā’s court. Ḥāfiẓ Sa’d, a devotee of the Sufi leader of his time, Qāsim Anvār, was very probably the same figure as the scribe, Sa’d Mashhadī. He could have sheltered under the protection of Prince Bāysunghur after Anvār turned him away and had his chamber destroyed completely. This must have taken place before Anvar’s exile from Herat in 1427, the latest date for Sa’d’s joining Bāysunghur’s court/workshop. This

\textsuperscript{47} Among Shāhrukh’s sons, Bāysunghur and Ibrāhīm Sulṭān were always in competition to have the top artists, poets and musicians. The story of Yūsuf Andakānī provides an obvious example. See Daulatshāh Samarqandī (1382/2003): pp. 350-351.
would also help to explain why he does not feature prominently in the *tazkiras* as a calligrapher.

Although the completion date of the *Divān* of Ḥāfīz Saʿd is not known, the interconnection of his riddles with ‘Alī Yazdī’s, completed in 832/1429, suggests an approximate date for the completion of the *Divān* of Ḥāfīz Saʿd; and together with the dates given in the colophons of the two codices transcribed by him (1430), suggest that he was definitely active around 1427 – 1430.
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