

RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
THE INSTITUTE OF ORIENTAL STUDIES
ST. PETERSBURG BRANCH



Manuscripta Orientalia

International Journal for Oriental Manuscript Research

Vol. 1 No. 3 December 1995

THESA
ST. PETERSBURG—HELSINKI

T. I. Sultanov

THE STRUCTURE OF ISLAMIC HISTORY BOOK (The Method of Analysis)

Among the requirements Muslim historians were expected to answer was the ability to arrange their materials so as to achieve a harmonious composition and an attractive form [1]. Among the criteria applied when estimating a work on history, the question of its structure was among those of primary importance. In this article we shall try to outline the principal forms of arranging materials employed by the medieval authors writing in Persian and Turkish and to define the place and functions of the main structural components of their works.

An accomplished historical work by a medieval Muslim author displays, as a rule, a clear structure formed by the following three components: the introduction, the main text and the conclusion. There was no established definition for the notion of “composition”. Different words and combinations were used by Muslim authors to express it: *tartīb*, *tarkīb*, *naẓm*, *siyāq*, *nasaq*, *tansīq*, *tabvīb*, *ṣūrat*, *ilaj*; *tarz wa tartīb*, *jam‘ wa tartīb*, *ṣūrat-i rabṭ wa tartīb*, etc.

The introductory part usually consisted of a preface and an introduction (*dībācha*, *pīshgustār*, *muqaddima*). This is the most significant part of a historical work, performing very important functions. The preface and the introduction contain information about the author, the name and the character of his work, the motives and the circumstances impelling him to write it, the time when the work was written and, often, a dedication. Sometimes the author explains there, how his materials had been collected, providing the list of his principal sources and their characteristics. Sometimes the plan of the work is given there also, along with its detailed contents (*fihrist*). This part is very important for understanding the theoretical views of the author; often the theory and the principles of historiography are explained there. There are introductory parts writ-

ten with some special aim in mind. Thus Vasif in the introduction to his book was trying to prove that after the first four righteous Khalifs there had been no sovereigns better than the Ottoman sultans [2].

Introductions to works on history are not uniform. Some are written in verse, some in prose, others in prose mixed up with verse. Usually the volume of the preface and the introduction is equal to just one page of the text, but sometimes the introductory part grows up into an independent composition which gets its own name. Thus the introduction to *Zafar-nāma* by Yazdī — on the genealogy of the Turks and the Mongols and the history of Chinghiz Khān and his descendants — became known under the title *Tārikh-i Jahāngīr* or simply *Iftitah* (“The Beginning”).

Among the questions arising in connection with medieval works on history is the sequence of their making: when the introductory parts were written — before or after the main text? There is still no definite answer supported by any convincing arguments. The solution of this problem depends, first of all, on the primary materials we select for our study. The most reliable source here can be the autographs of historical treatises. The table below contains data on seven autographs from the Manuscript Collection of the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies.

No such elements as capital letters or division into paragraphs are present in Muslim manuscripts. Graphically the text is a single whole, with no blanks or spaces, which was dictated by a desire to use the space available as fully as possible — paper was not cheap. One of the important characteristics of the text is the equal number of lines on each folio. The course of our reasoning when making the table was basing upon these principal features of the graphic structure of Muslim manuscripts.

No.	Date	Call No.	Title	Total number of folios	Folios of preface and introduction	Number of lines		Folio and line between introduction and main text
						preface and introduction	main text	
1.	1336	C 372	<i>Majma‘ al-ansāb</i>	235	1b—24b	24	24	blank page between introduction and main text, 25a
2.	1516	C 491	<i>Tārikh-i khānī</i>	350	1b—4b	12	12	4b; 4th line from below

No.	Date	Call No.	Title	Total number of folios	Folios of preface and introduction	Number of lines		Folio and line between introduction and main text
						preface and introduction	main text	
3.	1781	microfilm	<i>Durr al-akhbār</i>	132	1b—5b	29	29	5b; 13th line from top
4.	1804	C 571	<i>Firdaus al-iqbāl</i>	611	3b—16b	17	17	16b; 4th line from top
5.	1822	C 471	<i>Shāh-nāma-i ‘Umar-khānī</i>	149	17b—56a	14—17	14—17	56a; 7th line from top, blank folio between preface (17b—29b) and introductory chapter
6.	1867	C 439	<i>Tārikh-i jahān-numā</i>	843	9b—19a	29	29	19a; 4th page from top
7.	1869	C 440	<i>Tukhfāt al-tawārikh-i khānī</i>	360	1b—15b	17	17	15b; 1st page from below

1. If introductory parts (prefaces and introductions) were written after a book had been accomplished, we could have expected to find blanks on those pages where they were joint to the main text: it is practically impossible to calculate in advance the space required for these parts and then to arrange the text on the blank pages left for this purpose strictly maintaining the number of lines per page. On the other hand, if the introductory part was written before the main text, there could be no problems with arranging the whole text, and no artificial joints between the two parts could be expected. What can the autographs of Muslim historians tell on this subject?

Let us return to the table. None of the manuscripts considered here reveal any traces of artificial joints. Pages containing the introductory part and the main text have the same number of lines; in six cases (of the seven) the main narrative starts from the same line where the introduction ends (Nos. 2—7). If we take the contents of these introductions, none of them bears any traces of a sudden interruption or deliberate prolixity — to be fitted into the space left. None of the usual techniques of condensing or rarefying of a manuscript text are used — diagonal lines, close or sprawling handwriting, etc. The free space between the introduction and the main text of *Majma‘ al-ansāb* is probably connected with the specific features of the manuscript itself. These are the following. The autograph has two prefaces and an introduction. Blank pages are left not only between the introduction and the main text, but also between the first and the second preface and between separate parts of the main text. The blank pages were intended, most probably, for illustrations. According to the words of the author of the manuscript, as well as from its appearance and the manner of execution, the manuscript was meant to be presented to one of the members of the Hulguid royal family reigning at that time in Iran. For some reason, however, this work has not been completed.

The presence of two blank pages (ff. 30a, 30b) between the preface and the introductory part of *Shāh-nāma-i ‘Umar-khānī* is explained by the fact that the preface to this work has been left unfinished. Some free space was probably left by the author, who intended to deal with this part later. He thoroughly worked on the preface: many pages bear additions and notes on the margins, there are

corrections in the text, some part of the text on folios 25a—27b is crossed out.

2. If prefaces and introductions were written after the book had been completed, then we could have expected to find the real contents of the book in its plan drawn in the introductory part. We often find, however, when we study autographs and copies of historical treatises, that there are considerable differences between their plans and their real contents.

3. If the introductory parts of history-books were written later than the main text, then prefaces and introductions would have been missing in the books left unfinished because of their author's death or for some other reason. We find, however, that all (or nearly all) works of this kind have introductions by their authors or both an introduction and a preface. Among these are *Majma‘ al-ansāb*, *Firdaus al-iqbāl*, *Shāh-nāma-i ‘Umar-khānī* (Nos. 1, 4, 5), also *Shajara-i turk* by Abu'l-Ghāzī and many other works.

It is evident now, that the introductory part of a work on history was written by Muslim authors in the first turn. In other words, the structural component which usually becomes the culmination of long reflections and is written by a modern author in the last turn, was serving a starting point for a Muslim historian.

In some cases doubts arise in connection with the sequence of writing of the main text and the preface. In the last chapters of *Zubdat al-tawārikh* by Sa‘dallāh A.H. 952 (A.D. 1545/1546) is twice mentioned as the date of its composition [3]. At the same time in its short (only one page) preface it is said that the title of this work is *Zubdat al-tawārikh* and that it contains a description of events “from Adam till the time when this brief codex (*muhtasar*) was written, *i. e.* till year 957 of the Hegira” [4]. N. D. Mikluho-Maklay, who described the manuscript, suggested that the preface to this work had been written later than the main text. This suggestion, basing upon the assumption that the date in the preface and the date in the main text were different from the very beginning in the autograph of the work, can not be verified, because the autograph is missing. Such an inversion presents a rare exclusion. Its assumption is founded on a hypothesis, moreover that the main text of *Zubdat al-tawārikh* mentions also A.H. 966 (A.D. 1558/1559) as the current year. N. D. Mikluho-Maklay suggested, that “this date could be just a mistake

made by the scribe when copying the work” [5]. But the same can be true in respect to 957/1550 — the presumed date of the preface.

Prefaces to the defective copy of *Al-Fuṣūl* by a 15th century anonymous author, which belongs to the collection of the Institute, and to several copies of *Kunūz al-a‘zam* by ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Sīrat are, evidently, of a later date than the main parts of these works. The reason for this is still not clear. In the words of N. D. Mikluho-Maklay the relation of the preface to the main text of *Al-Fuṣūl* “gives rise to certain doubts, and the preface to *Kunūz al-a‘zam* doubtless bears traces of a later revision (by a copyist? — T. S.)” [6]. The circumstances and motives of writing a historical work could be different. There were cases when prefaces were written later than the main part. All these cases, however, must be considered as exclusive. We should try to find out why some historians were deviating from the general rule — to begin a historical narrative with the introductory *bismillāh* formula (*bī-ism Allāh ar-rahmān ar-rahīm*) and to end it with the words *tammāt al-kitāb* (“the book is completed”).

Let us consider the second component of the structural triad, which was developed in historical works most thoroughly. In the Later Muslim historiography there were several ways of arranging materials of the main text. One of them was the chronological method, when the whole work was built up as a chronicle — events described according to their chronological sequence, grouped under headings like “year so-and-so” or “events of the year so-and-so”. Often, when materials are sorted by dates, facts and events with no connection between them are placed side by side. The only link is the time, since all these events took place in the same year. A good illustration of this method is presented by *Tārīkh-i bihān* dedicated, in the words of its author, “to the outstanding and insignificant events of history in general” [7].

Fasihi, a Timurid historian, explains the advantages of arranging materials by years: “if someone wants to find out when and where this or that event took place, he will quickly achieve it” [8]. The 14th century historian Rashīd al-Dīn is, on the other hand, criticizing the chronicle pattern dominating in the Arabic historiography. In chronicles, where events are sorted by years, their connection with other circumstances of the lives of historical personalities does not become evident, so “the events do not become known as they should be, in their proper sequence and order”. “Disorderly stories concerning different periods” can not be “of real use” to their readers [9].

Another way of arranging a historical work is the politico-regional. Here materials are disposed according to their geographic attribution. As an example we can take *Tārīkh-i Ḥaydarī*, a vast treatise on universal history, divided into five parts (*bāb*) each of them dedicated to one region: 1) Arab world, 2) Iranian world, 3) Central and East Asia, 4) the West, 5) India. Within the chapters the chronological principle is maintained.

One more pattern is the thematic one. It was used in books on universal history as well as in monographs dedicated to some particular event or personality. *Ma‘āthir al-mulūk* by Khwāndamīr or *Mihmān-nāma-i Bukhārā* by Ibn Rūzbikhān can be taken as examples.

The dominating compositional principle in the historiography of the Later Medieval period was, however, the sorting of materials by dynasties and separate reigns. It

was applied both to universal history books and to dynastic chronicles. The chronological order was followed within each chapter.

In each case the selection of this or that compositional method was made in view of the type and subject of the work, its sources and the aims of its author. In some works we find a mixture of different structural principles and methods of composition. All these ways and methods were learnt by every new generation of historians from the works of their predecessors. The imitation of established patterns consisted in the acceptance of the plan, structure and form of the work selected. Sometimes even several different works could be used as patterns for a single compilation — one for each of its parts. According to his own words, Mirza Haydar was imitating the composition of *Zafar-nāma* by Yazdī; Hazārfann “chose the structure and form (*tarz wa tartīb*)” of *Jahān-numā* by Kātib Chālabī; historian Ḥusayn imitated *Hasht bihishht*, but in some parts of his “Wonderful Events” he “followed the same order” and arranged his materials “according to the same rules” as the author of *Tawārīkh-i Āl-i ‘Uthmān*; the compiler of *Tārīkh-i Aḥmad-khānī* imitated, answering the request of his customer, the style and structure of *Tārīkh-i Nādirī* by Mahdī-khān Astrābādī. Versified histories by many court poets of the 15th—19th centuries were composed, according to their own words, as imitations of the 10th century poem *Shāh-nāma* by Firdausī. Compositional imitations not always resulted from a conscious act. Often compilers were “copying”, not even noticing it, along with the contents of their source also its form and structure.

There are not many historical works following a “free plan” — these were produced, as a rule, by non-professional writers. Sometimes they even admit the compositional inferiority of their works [10].

The general principle of the internal organization of historical materials is their sequence in time: materials are grouped in their relation to events, and the events are arranged in chronological order. The history of mankind is divided into separate periods. In one case this division is basing upon the dynastic principle: the rise and fall of great dynasties serve the chronological frames of history. In another case the religious principle is accepted: history is divided into the pre-Islamic (*jahiliyya* — the time of “paganism”, the “ignorance of the divine law”) and the Islamic periods. The calendar of Islam is not uniform, even though it is connected with the events in the life of Muḥammad. In some histories it begins from “the year of the Elephant” — A.D. 570, the presumed date of Muḥammad's birth — “year two from the year of the Elephant”, “year three from the year of the Elephant”, etc. [11]; in some — from the year of Muḥammad's death (A.D. 632), like in *Tārīkh-i Alfī*; in the majority of historical works it starts from the year of the Hegira (A.D. 622).

Events usually coincide with real space and historical time, being dated after the Hegira and the twelve-year cycle calendar (the calendar of “twelve animals”). The Islamic era is used more often; in several cases both systems are applied, which sometimes leads to contradictions in dates. Thus, according to Naṭanzī who wrote in Fars, Al-guy “died in 664/1265—1266, corresponding to the year of the Pig” [12]. In reality A.H. 664 corresponds to the year of the Panther. Maḥmūd b. Valī, a Central Asian historian of the 17th century, is mentioning the year of the Mouse (A.D. 1468) as the year of the Shibanid ruler Abu'l-Khayr-

khān's death. At the same time he is dating this event to A.H. 874, corresponding to A.D. 1469/1470 [13]. In one Turkish version of *Tārīkh-i Rashīdī* it is mentioned, that this translation has been done in East Turkestan “in the year 1160, corresponding to the year of the Sheep” [14]. In reality not 1160 but 1164 (A.D. 1751) corresponds to the year of the Sheep.

In similar cases of chronological discrepancies present in works written in Turkestan “one should presume a mistake in the Muslim date, because the natives of the land were more familiar with the animal-cycle calendar” [15]. This subtle observation made by V. V. Barthold was basing upon a long and thorough study of all the Muslim sources available at that time. When we apply it in practice, however, we must take into account one fact not considered by V. V. Barthold: in Turkestan and its neighborhood the twelve-year cycle calendar was not uniform. It is testified by several historians. Mahmud b. Vali is mentioning, though not with full confidence, that there was some difference between the calendar “day and week” in Kashgar and those in Maverannah, Balkh and other regions. He is referring to “a rumour” [16].

The evidence recorded in *Tārīkh-i amniya* by a Turkestan historian Mulla Mūsā is more definite. In his work it is said that in the reign of Sa'īd-khān (1514—1533) a correction was introduced into the twelve-year cycle calendar used in “the Seven Cities”. The result was that “in these cities the reckoning of years is by four years ahead of the reckoning of other cities. The (Hegira) dates there are, however, the same as elsewhere” [17].

Evidently, it is not enough to refer to the available synchronistic tables when translating dates of one calendar into another system of reckoning. The examples cited above show, that local “corrections” must be taken into account to explain discrepancies between the Hegira dates and the years of the twelve-year cycle calendar.

One should notice certain particularity in translating dates of the Muslim calendar into the European system of reckoning. Sometimes, when dates are translated to an approximation of the day of the month and of the week, there occur discrepancies within one day. The reason for these chronological problems is not the inaccuracy of Muslim authors or the inadequacy of the method of calculation but the difference between the European and the Medieval Muslim way of reckoning days. According to the European tradition every new day begins at 12 o'clock p.m. ending after 24 hours; in the Muslim tradition a new day begins immediately after sunset and continues till the next one. In that way every day of the Muslim calendar coincides with two days of the European calendar.

The Hegira dates are usually written in Arabic. Chronological dates written in numerals rarely occur in Muslim manuscripts. Sometimes dates are recorded as chronograms composed in a way that their letters summed up according to the *abjad* (i. e. to their numeric values) make the required Hegira date. There are some curious cases. For example, in one of the copies of the Turkish translation of *Tārīkh-i Rashīdī* the name of the Khazakhs is written sometimes as qazāq, sometimes as qadāq. It continues till page 229. This page contains the passage: “... one scholar composed a chronogram on this event: Āshī//qadāq. According to the *abjad* the date required (A.H. 919 of the Persian original) could be obtained only from the combination āshī//qazāq. For this reason the word qadāq is

crossed out and qazāq inscribed above it. After that only the word qazāq is used for “Khazakh” in the rest of the text [18].

Sometimes, to improve the general structure of the text, its author was changing the sequence of his narrative deviating from the usual chronological order and confusing it. Starting to describe one thing he is freely changing the subject; often one and the same theme is repeated at different places, the narrative is interrupted by recollections and additions often ending in words like “let us now return to our story”. Additions-digressions from the main subject are sometimes so vast, that the author is obliged to introduce after them a special chapter titled “Back to the principal story” surveying in brief the contents of the chapter interrupted by this insertion. Sometimes “inserted works” — usually small compositions by other authors — are introduced into the main text. There are, for example, three insertions of this kind in *Tārīkh-i Rashīdī*. Their contents is in no way connected with the main text. On the other hand, they can not be treated as something alien to the structure of *Tārīkh-i Rashīdī*. Two of these compositions belong to the spiritual guide of Mirza Ḥaydar — the author of *Tārīkh-i Rashīdī*. These insertions present a compositional method answering with the author's intention to give his readers some more hints on his personality and his biography.

In some historical works there are words addressed by their authors to the reader, urging him to supplement their works by a description of contemporary events. In the world-history *‘Ibrat al-nāzirīn* by Māsīhī the narrative is brought down to the time of Tīmūr's death. At the end of the book it is said, that if the author has more years to live, he will write also the history of the events following, if not — let anyone, who is able and willing, add it to his work [19]. Sometimes this appeal was getting a response from “those able and willing”: among historical works there are books with *dhayl* (addition, supplement) written by a different author. Often the composition of a *dhayl* follows, in its turn, the familiar three-fold scheme: a preface, the main text (supplement) and a conclusion.

There is one more structural peculiarity which occurs, in particular, in Central Asian histories. It is known that among the Central Asian dynasties of the 15th—19th centuries only the Shibanids and the Ashtarkhanids, the khans of the Khazakhs and of Khiva, could claim to be the descendants of the family of Chinghiz. Tīmūr and the Timurids (1370—1506), the Mangyt dynasty of Bukhara (1785—1868) and the rulers of Kokand of the Ming dynasty (1709—1876) were not connected to the Chinghizids. Meanwhile the exclusive right to ascend the khan's throne belonged only to the Chinghizids, the descendants of Chinghiz through the male line. Any emir who managed to seize power and to found a new (non-Chinghizid) dynasty was striving either to marry a khan's daughter (like amir Tīmūr) and thus to obtain the honourable title of *ghurghan* (khan's son-in-law) [20] — in this case court historiographers could compose a fantastic genealogy for him; or he could add additional links to his genealogy, thus connecting his family with one of the dynasties previously reigning in Central Asia (like in the case of the Ming dynasty). It was not only a tradition. The necessity of such substantiation was recognized in official circles. Genealogy was an important factor in the state and political life of that time. The tradition to choose khans only from the

members of the Chinghizid family continued till the middle of the 19th century.

This tradition is reflected in several dynastic histories. It affected, first of all, the introductory parts of these chronicles. Many dynastic histories written under Timur or the Timurids, Shibanids, Ashtarkhanids, the khans of Khiva have introductory chapters containing a brief survey of political events in Central Asia preceding the reign of the dynasty or the ruler — the main subject of the narrative. This survey usually begins with the story of Chinghiz Khān's conquests or contains the pedigree of the ruler to whom the work is dedicated, its principal aim — to prove this ruler's connection with the Chinghizid family. Historical works by scholars from Ferghana start with the genealogy of the khans of Kokand, of the Ming dynasty, tracing it to Tīmūr through Babur, and in this connection relating the events of Babur's time (1483—1530). In the history by Qadir 'Alī-beg (17th cent.), who came from the Khazakh tribe of Jālaīr, much attention is given to the genealogy of Khazakh khans and sultans who, according to the tradition, were descendants of Tūghā-Tīmūr, the grandson of Chinghiz Khān.

The material of historical books usually presents a text written in prose or versified. Few authors were introducing tables or various graphic figures as “visual aids”. The major part of the texts of *Mu'izz al-ansāb* and *'Umdat al-tawārikh* represents rows of circles, large and small, with names written within them, and with historical explanations in prose arranged nearby. Several folios are covered with circles containing tribal names, other pages show tamgas (heraldic devices) of different tribes, etc. [21] The majority of works on history contain verse, both by their authors and by other poets, inserted into the prosaic text. Usually these versified insertions serve only as literary decorations, though some of them contain valuable information.

Any historical narrative is subject to the inner logic of events, so its text has, as a rule, a multistage structure. It can be divided into volumes (*jild*, *mujallad*, *kitāb*) or parts (*qism*, *daftar*, *rūkn*, etc.), chapters (*bāb*, *faṣl*, *rauza*, *dāstān*, *ṭabaqa*, *hikāyāt*, etc.) or sections (*maqāla*, *tāi'fa*, *juṃla*, *chamana*, etc.) which, in their turn, may be split into smaller fractions beginning with words *dhikr*, *bayān*, *guftār*, *qiṣṣa*, etc. The main principle of division of the main text is, however, by chapters. There is no strict order regulating the use of all these terms. Often definitions used for large structural units by one author, are employed by another to indicate smaller units, or vice-versa.

The structural function of sections can be different. The medieval Moslem historians were sometimes explaining the reason for this division of their works into volumes and parts and into a certain number of chapters. At the end of the St. Petersburg copy of *Tārikh-i jahān-numā* it is said that its author, considering the formidable size of his work, “decided to divide it into two volumes (*daftar*) for the convenience of those reading and understanding (the

book)” [22]. In the words of Mirza Haydar, his intention was to write the history of the Mongols. After a long consideration over the composition of his work, he decided to divide it into two *daftars*. The first one was to contain everything obtained from written sources and from recollections, the second — to describe the events of which the author himself was the evidence. According to this plan each *daftar* presented a compositional whole, including, besides the main text, a preface and a conclusion. Each part was subject to the general idea of the work. The historian claims, that by arranging his materials in that way he could most efficiently realize his intention [23].

Abu'l-Ghāzī in the preface to his work tells, that he called it *Shajara-i turk* and distributed his materials among nine chapters (*bāb*). “These nine chapters made a wonderful conformity, because, as the wise men say: ‘the degree of all being does not exceed nine. Nine is a limit to everything’” [24].

We should mention, that the initiative of dividing a book into volumes and smaller units not always belonged to its author. The will of his customer was a decisive factor in the choice of the structural form of his work.

Historical books usually have an epilogue (*guftār dār iḥtītām*), a conclusion (*ḥātima*, *iḥtītām*) or a supplement (*tatimma*, *dhayl*). These final parts of historical works are far from being uniform. Some contain a geographic supplement, some — biographies of the celebrated, from the author's point of view, people of his time or of the author himself, and some — just entertaining stories. There is no case, however, when an author repeats the contents or gives a summary of the main text of his work. The word “conclusion” as we understand it — the summary of author's results and principal ideas — can not be applied to the works of medieval Muslim historians.

Materials on the structure of a Muslim historical treatise considered here in general terms can be, as a whole, interpreted in the following way. A high level of unification, even of standardization of various kinds of historical books, conservatism and almost total absence of structural development are characteristic of the medieval Muslim historiography. Serious changes in the established patterns of thinking and in the way of presenting materials are comparatively rare. The process of structural development of historical sources was connected, first of all, with a transition from “universal histories” to regional and dynastic chronicles. This, doubtless, affected the structure of a book. Often it led to local tendentiousness, making the outlook of a historian more provincial. It is natural that the methods of approach to historical materials developed in the course of making of Muslim historiography turned to be very stable and uniform for the whole Islamic world. These circumstances, in our opinion, allow us to apply effectively the method of comparative historical analysis (including typological comparison) to apparently different historical works written at different periods, in different regions and in different languages.

Notes

1. T. I. Sultanov, “Vzgliady pozdnesrednevekovykh musul'manskikh avtorov na istoricheskuiu nauku” (“The views of the late Medieval period authors on science of history”), *Narody Azii i Afriki*, I (1988), p. 56.
2. V. V. Bartold, *Sochineniia* (Works), vi (Moscow, 1966), p. 315, footnote 73.
3. Sa'dallāh ibn 'Abdallāh, *Zubdat al-tawārikh*. Manuscript of the St. Petersburg branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies, call number C 505, ff. 330b, 340a.

4. *Ibid.*, f. 2a.
5. N. D. Mikluho-Maklaĭ, *Opisanie persidskikh i Tadzhijskikh rukopiseĭ Instituta vostokovedeniia AN SSSR*. Fasc. 3. *Istoricheskie sochineniia* (The Description of Persian and Tadjik Manuscripts of the Institute of Oriental Studies, USSR Academy of Sciences. Fasc. 3. Historical Writings) (Moscow, 1975), No. 315.
6. *Ibid.*, No. 420.
7. *Tāriḫ-i bihān*. Manuscript of the St. Petersburg branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies, call number C 458, f. 131b.
8. Faṣīḥ Aḥmad b. Jalāl al-Dīn Khavāfi, *Mujmal-i Faṣīḥī*, i (Mashhad, 1341/1963), p. 8.
9. Rashid ad-Din, *Sbornik Letopiseĭ* (The Collection of Chronicles), i, 2 (Moscow—Leningrad, 1952), p. 73.
10. ‘Awad Muḥammad, *Tāriḫ-i jahān-numā*. Manuscript of the St. Petersburg branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies, call number C 439, ff. 834b, 835a.
11. *Mujmal-i Faṣīḥī*, i, pp. 41—64.
12. *Extraits du Muntakhab al-tavarikh-i Mu’ini* (*Anonyme d’Iskandar*), publiés par Jean Aubin (Teheran, 1957), p. 104.
13. Maḥmūd b. Valī, *Baḥr al-asrār*, vi, part 3, f. 160b (microfilm FV 82 of the St. Petersburg branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies).
14. *Tāriḫ-i Rashīdī tarjamasī*. Manuscript of the St. Petersburg branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies, call number C 570, f. 240b.
15. V. V. Bartold, *Sochineniia* (Works), vii (Moscow, 1971), p. 299.
16. Mahmud ibn Vali, *More taĭn otnositel’no doblesteĭ blagorodnykh (geografiia)* (The Sea of Mysteries Concerning Valours of the Noble. Geography). Preface, translation, notes, index by B. A. Ahmedov (Tashkent, 1977), p. 72.
17. *Materialy po istorii Kazahskikh khanstv XV—XVIII vekov (Iz vlecheniia iz persidskikh i tiurkskikh sochineniĭ)* (Materials on the History of the Kazakh Khanates of the 15—18th Centuries. Extracts from the Persian and Turkic Writings) (Alma-Ata, 1969), pp. 482—3.
18. *Tāriḫ-i Rashīdī tarjamasī*. Manuscript of the St. Petersburg branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies, call number C 569, p. 229 (European pagination).
19. V. V. Bartold, *Sochineniia* (Works), viii (Moscow, 1973), p. 406.
20. It is noteworthy that Maḥmūd b. Vali is applying the word *Ghurghaniyan* to Timūr’s dynasty (Maḥmūd b. Vali, *op. cit.*, p. 7).
21. Mīr Rabi’, *Umdat al-tawāriḫ*. Manuscript of the St. Petersburg branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies, call number B 1876, ff. 45b, 46a ff.; *Mu’izz al-ansāb*. Manuscript of the Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris, call number P. 67, ff. 6, 12, 24 ff.
22. ‘Awad Muḥammad, *op. cit.*, f. 835a.
23. T. I. Sultanov, “*Tarih-i Rashidi*” Mirzy Haĭdara Duglata (literaturnaia istoriia pamiatnika)” (“*Tāriḫi Rashīdī*” by Mirza Ḥaydar Dūghlāt. Literary History of the Text”), *Pis’mennye pamiatniki Vostoka. Istoriko-filologicheskie issledovaniia* (Moscow, 1982), pp. 121—2.
24. *Histoire des Mogols et des Tatars par Aboul-Ghazi Bēhadour Khan*, publiée, traduite et annotée par le Baron Desmaisons, i (Texte) (St. Pétersbourg, 1871), p. 4.