

Persian and Turkic from Kazan to Tobolsk

Literary Frontiers in Muslim Inner Asia

Devin DeWeese

Our understanding of the widespread use of Persian in literary culture from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries has been shaped largely by attention to what we might call the southern route of Persian linguistic penetration, from Iran proper through Central Asia to India and Southeast Asia; less often considered are the remarkably long-lasting legacies of Persian literacy and Persian literary production along a more northerly trajectory, in which the northern and eastern frontiers of Persian literary culture largely correspond with the northern and northeastern frontiers of Islam in Eurasia. This trajectory mostly reflected Central Asian roots—though also patterns of transmission from Azerbaijan through the Caucasus or via Astrakhan—and led to the widespread production, use, and transmission of works in Persian in the Volga and Ural valleys, in western Siberia, and in “Eastern Turkistan” (i.e., Altishahr, the Tarim basin).

It is the first two of these regions that will be the focus of this chapter. In the next part of this book, Eastern Turkistan (or Xinjiang) is treated in David Brophy’s chapter 6, which is complemented by Alexandre Papas’s discussion in chapter 8 of a particular niche of Persian “literary” production there. Although the regions discussed in this chapter are also covered in chapter 7 by Alfrid Bustanov—upon whose work part of the present survey depends—the overview offered here reflects a somewhat different approach, and a different perspective, rooted to the south, in Central Asia, where the trajectory of Persian usage helps frame the basic pattern that might be expected to the north, from the Volga valley to western Siberia. Indeed, the extent and longevity of Persian’s domination of literary expression in Central Asia is not always recognized. It is therefore helpful to outline the contours of the late use of Persian in much of Central Asia, which may explain, and certainly parallels, its longevity further north.

First, however, some general observations of relevance for all the frontier regions considered here are in order. To begin with, the players and the general direction

taken in the game are fairly clear: the contest was between Persian and various written forms of Turkic, with regional differences in the latter largely subsumed within the literary language now usually referred to as Chaghatai. The latter term can cover all literary forms of “Eastern Middle Turkic,” from the thirteenth century to the early twentieth, and represents the “other” sphere of Turkic literary culture, beyond the Ottoman. Ironically, the term “Chaghatai” was in fact used more often in Ottoman, Indian, and, to a lesser extent, Iranian contexts than in the geographical range in which “Chaghatai” was actually deployed. There it was more often referred to simply as “Türki.” Despite regional differences in orthography and, to a lesser extent, in grammar and morphology, the written Chaghatai language served as a common literary medium throughout Central Asia, including Eastern Turkistan, and throughout western Siberia and the Volga valley as well (though in the latter region, elements of Ottoman orthography combined with local linguistic particularities to distance “Türki” from “standard” Chaghatai, creating a third distinct Turkic literary sphere by the end of the eighteenth century). That common literary medium largely masked local differences, and was used by communities whose languages would devolve into the host of “national” languages in the twentieth century, from Noghay and Tatar and Bashkir to Qazaq and Uyghur and Türkmen.

As for the general direction of the contest, Persian eventually lost out, and the major languages used across western “Inner Asia” today, though filled with Persian elements, are Turkic. If we can speak more broadly of the “retraction” of Persian language and literary culture into Iran alone by the nineteenth century, the case of Persian’s fate in Central Asia is in some ways even more dramatic: it retreated into the small country of Tajikistan and parts of Afghanistan. The dramatic contraction of the Persian sphere—of written Persographia, that is, more readily measurable than the sphere of spoken Persophonía—came quite late, however, as noted below.

A second general point to note is the enormous impact of Persian language and literary culture on the varieties of Turkic spoken, and later written, throughout northern and northeastern Eurasia. It is no exaggeration to say that Islamic Turkic literature is practically entirely modeled on and inspired by Persian genres and styles. Moreover, Persian was the chief “mediating” language for entire swaths of cultural assimilation. Direct influence from Arabic certainly occurred, but Persian had a much greater direct impact. If we consider linguistic influence, Persian’s impact on Turkic languages throughout northern Eurasia was immense. That influence extends even beyond the frontiers of Islam. The religious vocabulary of various “pagan” peoples of the north of Russia, including parts of Siberia, includes numerous Persian borrowings, such as *khuda* (Persian: God) and *karamat* (Persian: miracle). Whether these came directly from Persian, or through contacts with Turks who had already borrowed the Persian terminology, is less clear. But the latter is more likely, and in fact the likelihood that Turks were transmitting an originally non-Turkic cultural vocabulary says even more about the *linguistic* (as opposed to simply human) impact of Persian.

Third, throughout the regions considered here, Persian tended to dominate in particular fields. In his studies of Siberian Muslim literature, Alfrid Bustanov has referred to Persian as the language of poetry and Sufism. Although there were clearly other fields in which Persian retained its importance, there is certainly some truth in this. However, it is not so much Turkic that Persian competed with in particular fields of learning in these regions, but Arabic. Turkic did compete with Persian in historiography, and in that field came to replace Persian in the more northerly regions (and in Eastern Turkistan as well, though only by the middle of the eighteenth century). But Arabic remained the dominant language of the Quranic sciences and jurisprudence (*fiqh*), and continued to compete with Persian in the natural sciences—above all medicine and astronomy.

Fourth, and finally, there are in principle various means for gauging the late and gradual transition from Persian to Turkic, or, put another way, the lingering prominence of Persian. One way might be to focus on the sponsorship of translations from Persian into Turkic. As discussed below, this approach turns out to be not of much help. Another way is to focus on the creation of original works in Persian, representing composition in Persian by local inhabitants, or immigrants, based in these distant outposts of “Persianate Islam.” Such original works are of particular interest in terms of the use of Persian to frame local and regional history and religious consciousness, or to memorialize locally or regionally prominent individuals or dynasties. Adopting this approach, however, would lead us to date the demise of Persian quite a bit earlier than is suggested by other evidence.

That other evidence may be drawn from data on the continued copying of Persian manuscripts in regions where we would expect to find Turkic literary production dominating. In some cases, that expectation can be confirmed, but must be balanced by recognition that there was ongoing manuscript production in Persian, reflecting the copying of Persian works for a local and regional readership. There was, that is, a market for Persian manuscripts, and, presumably, an educated readership for material in Persian alongside Turkic, well after the time in which writers in these regions had ceased to use Persian for the creation of original literature or works of learning. The extent, and longevity, of this phenomenon are just now becoming clear through the cataloguing and description of Islamic manuscript collections in the Volga-Ural region, and in western Siberia. Although such cataloguing and description is now under way, coverage is still quite incomplete, and as a result we can apply this promising strategy only unevenly.

A PERSIAN/TURKIC LITERARY CURVE: THE CASE OF CENTRAL ASIA

For western Central Asia (the portion that came under Russian and then Soviet rule), the general pattern of the late shift from the literary domination of Persian is reasonably clear. However, the issue is now fraught with nationalistic claims and

counterclaims, rooted in the Soviet-era relegation of Tajikistan to a relatively marginal status vis-à-vis the more numerous, and more populous, republics dominated by Turkic speakers. That is, Turkic literary production remained a small part of literary culture in most of Central Asia until the nineteenth century, with Persian remaining by far the major medium of learned expression in all parts of the region down to the nineteenth century, and only slowly giving way to Turkic—and then not in all parts of Central Asia—in the course of the nineteenth century.¹ It may be helpful to sketch this development, as a sort of benchmark for considering the status of Persian in more northerly regions.

Turkic literary production had hardly begun before the Mongol conquest. The fourteenth and fifteenth centuries still saw only a handful of Turkic-language works produced—with many surviving only in copies made in the sixteenth century. However, the Timurid era of the fifteenth century did see an increase in the body of Turkic literature produced in Central Asia—in part through the individual efforts of Mir ‘Ali Shir Nawa’i toward the end of the Timurid century—but it was still dwarfed by the Persian literary production patronized by the Timurid elite. After all, this was the era of the small explosion of historiography reflected in the works of Nizam al-Din Shami, Hafiz-i Abru, Sharaf al-Din ‘Ali Yazdi, Kamal al-Din ‘Abd al-Razzaq Samarqandi, Mirkhwand, and Khwandamir, to name only the most notable authors. All of them wrote in Persian, defining and framing the legacy of a dynasty rightly regarded as reflecting Central Asia’s growing Turkification following the Mongol conquest. The fifteenth century also saw the beginnings of a dramatic rise in hagiographical production in Central Asia that would reach its peak in the sixteenth century; it is virtually all in Persian, and hagiographical production remained an almost entirely Persian undertaking in the region until the genre began to wither in the latter part of the nineteenth century.

Ironically, then, just as the Mongol conquest, and the new waves of Turkic-speaking communities it brought into Central Asia and Iran, had yielded a flowering of Persian historiography under the Il-Khans, the Timurid era likewise saw the proliferation of historical works in Persian in Iran and Central Asia, and extensive patronage of Persian literature in general. Two Turkic histories were evidently written in Timur’s own day, before the flowering of Timurid historiography in Persian, but no Turkic historical work has survived from the Timurid era—unless we include ‘Ali Shir Nawa’i’s prose contributions, which are focused not on the Timurid dynasty, but on the pre-Islamic prophets and the ancient kings of Iran. The case of Nawa’i is particularly instructive, insofar as he himself wrote in Persian too and used Persian classics as the models for his Chaghatai Turkic literary production. Though Nawa’i is now typically regarded as a sort of patron saint of Turkic literature, especially in Uzbekistan, despite his praise for the greater versatility of Turkic over Persian and Arabic (he devoted one work to this claim), he may be regarded as the major “Persifier” of Turkic language and literature in the Timurid era.²

Although Turkic historiography got under way in the early sixteenth century, through the patronage of the Shībanid, or Abu al-Khayrid, clan that ousted the Timurids and restored Chinggisid rule, its products were relatively few. The career of Muhammad Shībani Khan inspired one Chaghatai Turkic historical work in verse (Muhammad Salih Bilgüt's *Shībani-nama*), and the khan himself sponsored another (the *Tawarikh-i Guzida-yi Nusrat-nama*). Yet his career also inspired at least two substantial Persian histories (the works of Bina'i and Shadi), thus balancing the use of Turkic. More striking, in some regards, is the extensive program of translations from Persian sponsored by Muhammad Shībani Khan and his successors in the various appanage centers of Mawarannahr ("the Land beyond the River," viz. Transoxiana), yielding six known Chaghatai translations of important Persian works dating from the first three decades of the sixteenth century.³ In addition, a major universal history, known as the *Zubdat al-Asar*, was compiled in Turkic in this era, which may be regarded as a translation of sorts, since its author relied almost entirely upon earlier Persian historiography, and there appears to be little original in it.⁴ Here, too, Abu al-Khayrid patronage is balanced between Persian and Turkic. Soon after the *Zubdat al-Asar* was completed, another Khurasani in Mawarannahr produced yet another universal history that culminates in the career of the dynasty's founding figure. The *Tarikh-i Abu al-Khayr-khani*, as this work is called, was thus sponsored by, and celebrated, the Turkic-speaking Chinggisid dynastic clan that came to power and prominence in the steppes of the northern Dasht-i Qipchaq and depended on the nomadic Uzbek tribal groups for its military power; but it is written in Persian.⁵

Despite this balance of Persian and Turkic historiography in terms of original works, the translation program of the early Abu al-Khayrid polity suggests that the early sixteenth century might have become a tipping point in a transition toward Turkic literary dominance; but this was not the case. In other contexts, that is, patronage of translations might be understood as marking, in effect, the passing of one language's dominance and the emergence of a new learned language—one "made learned," indeed, by the sponsored translations. Such patronage may be understood as preparing the way for a new literary, and historical, idiom, and as clearing away a past linguistic and literary legacy—in this case, Persian—by rendering it in the new soon-to-be dominant language and thus making the works in the old language disposable.

Yet this did not happen in sixteenth-century Central Asia. Despite the translation program, and the patronage of Turkic literature,⁶ which seems to have reached its peak in the 1520s, the brief experiment in promoting or sponsoring Turkic literature seems to have come to an end by the second half of the sixteenth century.⁷ The substantial body of historical—and hagiographical—literature prompted by the centralization of rule in Central Asia under 'Abdullah Khan ibn Iskandar (d. 1598) was again all in Persian. If we consider the *central* Central Asian region of Mawarannahr during the seventeenth and eighteenth

centuries, Turkic literary production practically ceases, outside occasional Turkic verse (recorded, moreover, not in substantial *diwans* or even anthologies, but mostly in the ad hoc form of the *bayaz*). The one notable exception to this overwhelmingly Persian literary scene is a medical work in Chaghatai Turkic ascribed to Subhan-Quli Khan (r. 1681–1702) of the Ashtarkhanid dynasty, based in Bukhara.⁸ Otherwise there is practically no evidence of the use of Turkic as a literary language, much less a language of learning, in Mawarannahr from the second half of the sixteenth century down to the nineteenth. Indeed, a sign of a reversion from Turkic to Persian may be found already in the early Ashtarkhanid era in the translation into Persian of ‘Ali Shir Nawa’i’s *Tarikh-i Anbiya wa Hukama wa Muluk-i ‘Ajam*, done in 1640–41 at the request of an official at the court of Imam-Quli Khan.⁹

It was only in Khwarazm that Turkic literature had a greater presence than Persian, though in this case literary production was in general much more limited. Aside from two translations from Persian into Turkic sponsored by the Khwarazmian Uzbek dynasty during the second half of the sixteenth century—of Rashid al-Din, again, and of a Persian Quran commentary (*tafsir*)—three Turkic historical works (one from the 1550s and two from the middle of the seventeenth century) dominate the Khwarazmian literary scene during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. This meager production is noteworthy primarily because Persian literary production during this period was even less substantial, making Khwarazm the only part of Central Asia for which we can claim some sort of parity between Persian and Turkic before the nineteenth century.

Persian continued to dominate in the rest of Central Asia during the eighteenth century, and it was not until the emergence of dynastic states dominated by the Uzbek tribal elites in the nineteenth century that the situation began to change. That change was again most pronounced in Khwarazm, where the Qonghrat dynasty sponsored historiographical production in Chaghatai Turkic, as well as an extensive program of translations into Turkic from Persian (and in some cases from Arabic), as discussed by Marc Toutant in chapter 10 of this volume. The Khivan khanate’s patronage of Chaghatai letters during the nineteenth century yielded by far the largest body of literary material in Central Asian Turkic, and this patronage continued into the early twentieth century. In this case, the ‘tipping point’ was reached very quickly. Yet even as Chaghatai Turkic literature dramatically overtook production in Persian, and as Turkic came to be used overwhelmingly (and indeed exclusively, from the late 1850s on) in official documents, a preference for Persian was maintained in some spheres well into the nineteenth century. Endowment deeds (*waqf-namas*) and other documents produced by *qazis* were often written in Persian until the second half of the nineteenth century; deeds of sale (*wasiqas*) preserved in the Khivan archives are overwhelmingly in Persian until 1857, when they abruptly begin to be written exclusively in Chaghatai, suggesting a deliberate bureaucratic decision to switch.¹⁰

Another feature of the shift from Persian to Turkic in Khwarazm is worth noting. The ornate Chaghatai literary language used in the historical works of the early nineteenth century, above all the *Firdaws al-Iqbal* of Mu'nis (d. 1829) and his nephew Agahi (d. 1874), is filled, not simply with Persian terminology, but with extensive Persian syntactic units fitted into a broader Turkic structure that sometimes all but disappears for line after line. Indeed, reading some of the introductory sections of the *Firdaws al-Iqbal*, one can find Persian phrasings continuing for pages, with just a few Turkic suffixes occasionally interspersed to remind the reader that this is a Chaghatai work. The prevalence of this high style, with Turkic infused with (and sometimes crowded out by) Persian, prompted a new, if smaller, wave of literary production in Khwarazm at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth. At that time, several writers were commissioned to produce *simplified* Chaghatai Turkic versions of the earlier histories produced by Mu'nis and Agahi, with the florid Persian material reduced substantially or omitted altogether. It is thus not until the early twentieth century that we can rightly speak of the replacement of Persian by a more substantially de-Persified Turkic, even in the most thoroughly Turkified region of Central Asia.

Elsewhere in the region, Chaghatai literary production increased substantially in the khanate of Khoqand, especially through the activity of poets writing in Turkic, but never displaced Persian as in Khwarazm, at least not before the liquidation of the khanate in 1876. The historiography of the Ming dynasty of Khoqand is again almost entirely in Persian, and bureaucratic practice, while including some document production in Turkic, continued the overwhelming dominance of Persian. Under the Manghit dynasty in Bukhara, finally, Persian continued to dominate literary and bureaucratic culture, down to the end of the khanate in 1920. With the inclusion of much of Mawarannahr, including the major cities of Samarqand and Bukhara, into the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic during the mid-1920s, the question of the relationship of Persian and Turkic literary cultures entered the realm of Soviet language and nationalities policy.

A final phenomenon worthy of note in the interplay of Persian and Turkic in the western part of Central Asia is the creation of what might be considered hybrid texts, in which Persian and Turkic syntax and vocabulary were integrated to a degree not encountered in earlier times. The adoption of Persian lexical elements—not just words, but *izafat* constructions and other compounds—into Turkic was under way before the Mongol era, and was a standard feature of Chaghatai, leaving a substantial Persian element still today in most Central Asian Turkic languages. Borrowing went in the other direction as well, especially after the increasing prominence of Turks in the wake of the Mongol conquest. Timurid Persian historiography is filled with Turkic and Mongolian terminology, above all dealing with military and administrative matters. But in the second half of the nineteenth century, we find works such as the *Tarikh-i Jadida-yi Tashkand*, an enormous compilation by one Muhammad Salih, completed already after the Russian conquest

of Tashkent in 1865. Tashkent was another heavily Turkified part of Central Asia, with a large Uzbek and even Qazaq population base, but the basic framework of this work is Persian. Nevertheless, we find entire Turkic phrases inserted into the Persian structures, and vice versa, on a far greater scale than before; a particular saint is identified, for instance, as the *sarwar-i toqsan-toquz ming masha'ikh* (leader of 99,000 shaykhs), combining Arabic, Persian, and Turkic words in an essentially Persian construction. This sort of hybridization goes well beyond the incorporation of Persian words and syntactically significant phrases into Turkic languages, or the imitation of Persian style in Chaghatai literature.

BEYOND CENTRAL ASIA: PERSIAN LITERATURE IN NORTHERN EURASIA

A similar pattern, and a similar timetable, might be expected in areas closely linked with Central Asia, such as western Siberia and the Volga-Ural region. In fact, the situation appears to be different in each of these regions, reflecting both the different kinds of information available to us about these connected, but distinct, regions and doubtless genuinely different patterns.

To a large extent Persian literary production in these regions has fallen through the cracks of scholarly interest, at least until recently; attention has tended to focus on Turkic literary production in the regions, as the precursor of modern literary cultures. Indeed, the prominence of Persian in all these regions—including even the western part of Central Asia—has been obscured by twentieth-century historical constructions framed by and for politically dominant Turkic constituencies—especially in the Volga-Ural region, Eastern Turkistan, and four of the five former Soviet republics of Central Asia—determined to project a Turkic literary heritage deep into the past. With access to manuscript collections assembled from throughout the Russian Empire and the USSR, Soviet-era specialists based in Leningrad were well equipped to comment on the literary legacies of the Volga-Ural region and western Siberia, but for the most part they paid scant attention to Persian writings there.¹¹

The Volga-Ural Region

In the Volga-Ural region, despite the overwhelmingly Turkic-speaking Muslim population, there was a remarkable continuation of Persian literary culture through the nineteenth century.¹² Persian language and literature appeared relatively early in this region, as evidenced by the extensive Persian *masnawi* produced in Crimea during the reigns of Özbek and Jani-bek, khans of the Jochid *ulus* (the khanate of Chinggis Khan's eldest son, Jochi, or Golden Horde), in the first half of the fourteenth century.¹³ This clearly reflects the transplantation of Persian speakers and writers from Anatolia, but Muslim jurists and scholars from Khwarazm were also influential in the Golden Horde, ensuring access to Persian literary production

from Central Asia as well. During the fourteenth century, moreover, the central lands of the Golden Horde yielded a Turkic rendering of the story of Khusraw and Shirin, clearly based on a Persian model, by a poet named Qutb from Saray.¹⁴ Here we can only infer the circulation of Persian literature, based on the influence of Persian models on Turkic literature produced in the Golden Horde and on evidence of Persian speakers from Iran and Central Asia dwelling for a time in the Volga valley.

It becomes increasingly difficult to trace Persian literary production—or Turkic, or Arabic, for that matter—in the central lands of the Golden Horde during the latter part of the fourteenth century and through the fifteenth century, a time of major political disorders. The bureaucratic language reflected in the few surviving documents from the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries is Turkic, usually in the Uyghur script. But the fifteenth century saw still more Central Asian scholars moving through the lands of the Golden Horde (by then largely defunct), and there is no reason to assume that Persian (or Arabic) letters disappeared at this point. Scattered references to the education of the Chinggisid elites of the Dasht-i Qipchaq, and to the presence of both schools (*maktabs*) and learned tutors for princes of the blood, suggest that some knowledge of both Persian and Arabic, and hence at least a limited market for literary production in multiple languages, were sustained through the fifteenth century. In his early sixteenth-century anthology (*tazkira*) of royal poets, *Rawzat al-Salatin*, Fakhri Harawi devotes an entry to Muhammad Amin Khan, “ruler of the province of Qazan,” characterizing him as an intelligent, good-natured ruler with the heart of a dervish, and affirming that he wrote poetry in Persian.¹⁵ Muhammad Amin was a great-grandson of Ulugh Muhammad Khan (who was a grandson of Toqtamish), and ruled what was left of the Golden Horde in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries as khan in 1484–85, 1487–95, and 1502–18. We unfortunately know next to nothing of Persian literary training or production in this region during that period. Things worsen from the time of the Russian conquest of the region in the middle of the sixteenth century, as we mostly lose sight of any literary activity or continuity. It is not until the eighteenth century that we can trace substantial literary production again, with Persian well represented alongside Turkic (“Tatar”) and Arabic.

Here again, seeking a translation-based “tipping point” is of no avail.¹⁶ The only prominent translation from Persian into Turkic from this region was an adaptation of portions of Rashid al-Din’s *Jami‘ al-Tawarikh* (Compendium of Chronicles), with additional information about the Golden Horde during the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries, compiled by Qadir-‘Ali Bek Jalayiri at the beginning of the seventeenth century. This was produced in the khanate of Kasimov, a Chinggisid principality under Moscow’s rule, in 1602, and bears a dedication to the tsar, Boris Godunov.¹⁷ It is of interest chiefly for the additional material on the later Chinggisid lineages active in the territory of the former Golden Horde, but for present purposes its production attests to the continued circulation there of Rashid al-Din’s Persian original at the end of the sixteenth century.

As regards original works in Persian in the Volga-Ural region, we have little to go on; but there is one remarkable work worthy of note, with a relatively late date, from this thoroughly Turkified frontier of Persian literary culture. The chief manuscript collection at the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts in Saint Petersburg preserves a short text, written in Persian by an anonymous author, probably in the last quarter of the eighteenth century, and copied in the Volga valley during the first half of the nineteenth century on Russian paper water-marked 1820. It was acquired for the collection in Soviet times, in Astrakhan; the manuscript catalogue assigns it the title *Hikayat* (Tales) and it also bears the heading *Jaza-yi Jang*,¹⁸ but neither title is very illuminating. Its contents, described in the manuscript catalogue, were explored more extensively by M. A. Salakhedinova over half a century ago.¹⁹ The manuscript comprises “legends and narratives relating to the history of the Kazan Tatars and Bashkirs,” and is divided into two sections. The first occupies just two folios (37b–38b) and presents a legendary account of Timur’s campaign against the city of Vladimir, and of his conquest of Bulghar, as well as an account of the founding of Kazan, a list of the khans of Kazan, and an account of the conquest of Kazan by the Russians in 1552; the material on Timur echoes some of the narratives known from the Turkic *Tawarikh-i Bulghariyya*.²⁰ The second part (38b–45b) contains various accounts dealing with the history of the Bashkirs, covering the period from the second half of the sixteenth century to the first half of the eighteenth. This section appears to have been based on accounts of oral informants, and includes an account of a Bashkir uprising that lasted from 1735 to 1741.

A “Tatar” version of this work was known to exist, but only a Russian translation of that Turkic version survives. A comparison undertaken by Salakhedinova revealed that the Persian version was often more complete and more detailed (judging by the Russian translation). Whether this indicates that the Persian version was original is less clear. But in any case, the use of Persian to render such material on the history of the Volga River Basin’s Muslim communities in the late eighteenth century is certainly worthy of note, as is the copying of this text in the first half of the nineteenth century.

Unlike the situation with western Siberia (or Eastern Turkistan), there is more abundant, and above all more accessible, evidence on the production, and importation, of such copies of Persian manuscripts in the Volga-Urals. That evidence comes from manuscript catalogues, which are by no means uniform in their descriptive practices or quality, but nevertheless allow a picture of the Persian manuscript market to emerge. The evidence such catalogues provide, of both local manuscript production and importation, suggests a substantial, and lively, readership for Persian material in the Volga-Urals through most of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

In the mid-1960s, Yuri Bregel published an article on the historical manuscripts preserved in Kazan (chiefly in the collection of Kazan University).²¹ Most

of the works he discussed were in Persian, reflecting his interests in Central Asian historiography. The collection was significantly enlarged through the efforts of Mirkasym Usmanov, Marsel' Akhmetzianov, and Al'bert Fatkhiev in the 1970s and 1980s, but little was done in terms of actually utilizing this rich manuscript heritage, whether in Turkic or Persian, until after the collapse of the Soviet Union. In the late 1990s, Allen Frank and Michael Kemper published important studies that began to make the manuscript culture of the Volga-Urals more widely known, if still not widely used in historical study of the region.²²

In the latter connection, it is worth noting the clear impact of Muslim educational institutions in the maintenance of Persian literacy. The studies of Kemper, Frank, and of others have explored the topography of Muslim learning in the Volga-Urals and western Siberia, and the major madrasa centers under the jurisdiction of the Orenburg Muslim Spiritual Assembly (*Dukhovnoe sobranie*), established in 1788. Such studies highlight the vibrant intellectual activity in Orenburg itself, but especially in Omsk and Semipalatinsk, as well as in Ufa and Kazan, alongside other regional centers such as Sterlitamak. Persian works were studied in these madrasas down to the early Soviet era. Although it is difficult to link this activity directly with the region's Persian manuscript legacy, it is clearly part of the story of Persian's persistence there.

As for that manuscript legacy, it is still not possible to give a thorough accounting of the Persian manuscripts preserved in Kazan (much less Ufa), as a marker of local production or consumption of Persian materials. But partial catalogues of three important collections with significant holdings of manuscripts obtained in the Volga-Urals are now available, and allow some preliminary observations about the contours of Persian literary production in the region.

To begin with, the most important, and largest, collection of Persian manuscripts in Russia is that of the Saint Petersburg Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, noted above. To date, nine volumes of a descriptive catalogue of the institute's Persian manuscripts have been published, beginning in the mid-1950s. However, a far larger number of works is covered in a two-volume handlist published in 1964, giving minimal information (author, copy date, foliation), but including each manuscript's provenance.²³ The catalogue reveals Persian manuscript production and use in the Volga-Ural region throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and throughout the region, from the major cities to small villages. The sample of material produced and/or obtained in the Volga-Ural region is relatively small overall, but the profile it yields for the circulation of works in Persian corresponds reasonably well with what is suggested by the larger samples made available more recently.

More specifically, regarding the chronological range represented by the manuscripts from this collection, the dates of copying in the region are all in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The earliest dates to 1738–39 and the latest to 1884. Of the twenty-eight separate manuscripts (rather than works) clearly from the Volga-Ural region, six are undated, nine belong to the eighteenth century, and

thirteen date from the nineteenth century. The eighteenth-century distribution is of particular interest, insofar as Persian manuscripts were being copied extensively both before and after the administrative, and intellectual, impact of the Orenburg Muslim Spiritual Assembly's establishment in 1788 (as is borne out by data from the other collections as well).

As noted, in geographical terms the Persian manuscripts were produced throughout the Volga-Ural region. There was a heavy concentration (twelve) from present-day Tatarstan, with half of these copied in or near Kazan,²⁴ and half from elsewhere in Tatarstan.²⁵ One was produced as far west as the Chuvash republic;²⁶ and no fewer than six came from Bashqortostan—and not just from the prominent towns of Ufa and Sterlitamak (one each), but from small towns and villages throughout the Bashkir territory.²⁷ The small sample of works copied in Bashqortostan represents the major genres in which Persian was most important (two Sufi works, a copy of Sa'di's *Gulistan*, one work on Arabic grammar, one *tafsir*, and one Persian translation of a collection of hadiths). Several more were evidently produced southward along the Volga valley.²⁸ Three came from much further south and east, with two from Astrakhan and one from Ural'sk (along the middle course of the Ural River, not far west of Orenburg).²⁹ The manuscripts from Bashqortostan skew somewhat earlier than the rest, with two from the eighteenth century, and the latest from 1837. This pattern might be held to signal the longer persistence of Persian literacy closer to the “learned” center of Kazan, but the nineteenth-century manuscripts from as far away as Astrakhan and Ural'sk seem not to confirm this, and of course the sample is quite small in the first place.

The most extensive catalogues so far available for any manuscript collection in the Volga-Ural region—two volumes compiled by Alsu Arslanova—are devoted to Persian manuscripts in the collection of Kazan University.³⁰ Unfortunately, the descriptions rarely include information on *where* the manuscripts described were copied.³¹ It is sometimes possible to infer a general location from the *nisbas* (onomastic place attributions) of the copyists. Even the copyists' *nisbas* are of limited value, however, given the extensive contacts between the Volga-Ural region and Central Asia, for instance, both before and after the Russian conquest, and the pattern of “Tatar” students travelling to study in the madrasas of Bukhara (where their studies might also include the copying of manuscripts), as explored recently by Allen Frank.³²

At the same time, those same contacts and patterns may help us to contextualize the current state of the collection in Kazan. In other words, given both the particular status of the Volga-Ural region within the Russian empire prior to the second half of the eighteenth century, and the relative isolation of the region in Soviet times—through most of the twentieth century, that is—it stands to reason that both the importation and local copying of Persian manuscripts would have peaked between the latter eighteenth century and the early twentieth century. The peak may have been pushed toward the earlier part of that range—say, the second

quarter of the nineteenth century—by the broader pattern of increasing Turkification, or “Tatarification.”

Arslanova’s catalogue confirms the presence in the Kazan collection of many manuscripts copied in Central Asia—above all, Bukhara, less often, Samarqand, and occasionally Kabul—that were brought to the Volga-Ural region in the nineteenth century (the approximate dates of their arrival in the region are often indicated through owners’ marks). Together with a few manuscripts copied in India and presumably transported through Central Asia, we can see the tangible evidence of the market or readership for Persian manuscripts in the Volga-Ural region during the nineteenth century. Some of these manuscripts were clearly copied in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. This suggests again that travelers and students from Kazan and elsewhere were obtaining manuscripts in Central Asia, or copying them themselves. But quite a few old manuscripts held in Kazan most likely reflect this avenue for the acquisition of Persian manuscripts as well, and thus likewise confirm a readership for—or, more properly, a constituency that valued the ownership of—Persian manuscripts in the Volga-Ural region. There are some manuscripts, to be sure, produced in Iran or in the Caucasus, and more (mostly in Turkic) from Istanbul. But it seems clear that collections in the Volga-Ural region were substantially enriched, not only by ongoing local production, but by the importation of Persian literature from and through Central Asia.

For instance, an old manuscript of ‘Abd al-Rahman Jami’s *Shawahid al-Nubuwwa* (on the life of the Prophet), copied in 1489, had made its way to the Volga-Urals by 1847.³³ A sixteenth-century copy of Mirkhwand’s *Rawzat al-Safa*, completed in 1595, was evidently brought to the region in the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century.³⁴ And the same is most likely true of the sixteenth-century copy of Dawlatshah’s *Tazkirat al-Shu’ara*, dated 1580.³⁵ The collection also holds much older Persian material, and although it is not impossible that it was brought to the Volga-Ural region in earlier centuries, the shifts in the Russian administration of the Muslim communities in the region point to the second half of the eighteenth century, at the earliest, as the time in which private collections were being assembled, even when a particular work’s acquisition in the late eighteenth or nineteenth century is not explicitly confirmed. This era in turn points, again, to Central Asia as the immediate source.³⁶

On the other hand, not just classical or old and rare works, but later works as well evidently held appeal for the Volga-Ural community and were in all likelihood sought by travelers and students who spent time in Central Asia. For instance, the collection holds a copy of the *Matlab al-Talibin*, a hagiography of the Juybari *khwajas* of Bukhara compiled in the second half of the seventeenth century, which was copied in Central Asia in the early nineteenth century.³⁷ It also holds two copies of Muhammad Yusuf Munshi’s *Tazkira-yi Muqim-Khani*, from the early eighteenth century—a work of much more local Central Asian interest than the universal history of Mirkhwand—both produced in Bukhara in the nineteenth



FIGURE 7. Sufi Protector of the Steppe: the shrine of Ahmad Yasawi, Turkistan, Kazakhstan. Photograph by Nile Green.

century.³⁸ And it holds single copies of two other works likewise of local Central Asian focus: Muhammad Vafa Karminagi's *Tuhfat al-Khani*, from later in the eighteenth century, on the emergence of the Manghit dynasty in Bukhara, copied in 1844, and the *Tarikh-i Shahrukhi* of Muhammad Niyaz Khuqandi, a history of the khanate of Khoqand completed in 1871–72.³⁹ Also of interest, from roughly the same era, is a nineteenth-century copy of *Fawa'id-i Khaqaniyya*, a relatively uncommon work in the “Mirror for Princes” genre, written in the second half of the seventeenth century by the Yasawi shaykh Muhammad Sharif Bukhari (who dedicated the work to Nazr Muhammad Khan, of the Ashtarkhanid dynasty).⁴⁰ Two other copies are known in Tashkent, and two in Saint Petersburg. This copy was made by Sarīghay ibn Yana-si [*sic*] Qazani, but it is not clear whether he produced it during a stay in Bukhara—where he or some intermediary must have come into contact with this relatively obscure work—or in his native town.

The Kazan University collection thus holds a number of manuscripts from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, as well as works from the eighteenth century, that seem to suggest an interest in, or close connection with, Central Asia. More broadly, Arslanova's catalogue offers an idea of what local readers of Persian were having copied, and there seem to be clear patterns in the kinds of literature in which Persian continued to be important.

First of all, the catalogue reveals a particularly strong representation of Persian-language grammars of Arabic, certainly in the eighteenth century but still in the nineteenth century as well; this is evident in the materials from Saint Petersburg outlined above, but Arslanova's catalogue is of particular interest for reflecting additional examples of locally collected manuscripts.⁴¹ What this pattern suggests about when and where Persian might have been used as a medium for studying or teaching Arabic remains uncertain, but Arabic grammar was clearly a subject that prompted considerable copying, and original production, of works in Persian. Of interest in this connection is a lexical work, intended for teaching children, entitled *Sharh Nisab al-Sibyan*, using Persian to teach Arabic, which was composed in the second half of the sixteenth century by Muhammad ibn Fasih ibn Muhammad al-Dasht-bayazi and was copied in 1755 by Salim-Jan ibn Dust-Muhammad Bulghari.⁴² An exception to this rule, however, reflecting direct interest in Persian itself (rather than its apparent use in mediating knowledge of Arabic), is an eighteenth-century copy—evidently done in the Volga-Ural region, to judge from the description of its target language as “Tatar”—of the *Lughat-i Ni'matullah*, a sixteenth-century Persian-Ottoman lexicon, evidently adapted to the local Turkic language when copied in 1731.⁴³

Persian was also notable in the field of medicine. Three Persian medical works, including the famous *Jami' al-Fawa'id* of Yusuf al-Harawi, were copied by 'Abd al-Jabbar ibn 'Abd al-Mannan al-Bulghari in Kazan in 1842.⁴⁴

As expected, there is a heavy preponderance of Sufi works among the Persian manuscripts held at Kazan University. These include some important old copies of both well-known and obscure works, noted above, but the later copies produced in the Volga-Ural region are instructive about particular currents of Sufism and their impact in the region. Not surprisingly, Naqshbandi works are well represented, and aside from some works produced in Central Asian Naqshbandi circles in the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries, works reflecting the northward spread of the Mujaddidiyya, through Central Asia but often through the Ottoman realm, in the form of the Khalidiyya, are more common.⁴⁵ Two biographies of Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi (d. 1624), the *mujaddid* (Renewer) himself, copied together in Istanbul, in 1828, by Muhammad Rajab Badakhshani, may reflect this more complex transmissional and personal history.⁴⁶ However, one of these works, and yet another hagiography focused on Sirhindi, are represented in the collection in much older copies.⁴⁷ The collection also holds six copies of Sirhindi's *Maktubat*.⁴⁸ The oldest of these, copied in 1721, may not have been produced locally, but at least three of the others were clearly copied in the Volga-Ural region, on paper produced in Russian factories (including one copied in the late nineteenth century by Mulla Hasan ibn Mulla Ja'far al-Naratbashi). Similarly, the five copies of the *Maktubat* of Sirhindi's son, Muhammad Ma'sum, include one from 1772 that is not clearly a local product, but also two clearly produced in the region, likewise copied on Russian factory-produced paper.⁴⁹ One was copied as early as the late 1780s or 1790s, and another was copied in 1811 by 'Ubaydullah

ibn Kalimullah al-Aldirmishi, who later, in 1840, copied treatises of Makhdum-i A'zam, as noted above.

The Kazan University collection holds two copies, including one produced in the Volga-Urals in 1830, of a Persian work by the Central Asian Mujaddidi, Musa Dahbidi (d. 1776).⁵⁰ Not surprisingly, it also holds numerous locally produced copies of Persian works by the famous Sufi Allahyar (d. ca. 1720), a Naqshbandi Mujaddidi shaykh whose works—some in Persian, some in Turkic—became quite popular throughout the Volga-Ural region.⁵¹ His *Maslak al-Muttaqin* is represented in twenty-eight copies in this collection,⁵² and his *Murad al-'Arifin* is preserved there in nine copies.⁵³ But perhaps more telling with regard to the extent of the use of Persian in Sufi intellectualism are the two manuscripts of the Persian commentary on Sufi Allahyar's *Murad al-'Arifin*, entitled *Tuhfat al-Talibin*, written by the prominent "Tatar" litterateur 'Abd al-Rahim ibn 'Uthman ibn Sarmaqi Utiz-Imani al-Bulghari (d. 1834).⁵⁴ A Mujaddidi teaching certificate (*ijaza*) preserved in the collection reflects Central Asian links,⁵⁵ but the origins of particular works included in a collection of Mujaddidi treatises suggest more diverse connections, including links to the North Caucasus.⁵⁶

The Kazan catalogue thus confirms an ongoing presence of Persian-language Sufi works well into the nineteenth century. However, it is also worth noting the extent and range of religious literature in Persian outside the sphere of Sufi literature, and in fields normally dominated by Arabic, represented in the Kazan University collection. This includes numerous locally copied Persian works on Hanafi jurisprudence (*fiqh*) from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.⁵⁷ Among them are copies of a Persian discussion of Hanafi inheritance law, evidently compiled by a local scholar, Yunus ibn Mulla Ivanay, active in the second half of the seventeenth century.⁵⁸ The collection also includes a dozen locally produced copies—mostly from the eighteenth century—of several old Persian Quran commentaries (*tafsir*).⁵⁹ Of particular interest are the three manuscripts in the Kazan University collection—two from the late eighteenth century and evidently locally copied—preserving a late-sixteenth-century Persian work on Quran recitation (presenting and explaining particular verses to be recited in various situations), entitled *Riyaz al-Abrar*, by Muhammad Sadiq ibn 'Abd al-Baqi ibn 'Izz al-Din al-Farghani, completed in 1591; one manuscript copy was finished in 1784, by a copyist whose *nisba* of al-Bulghari suggests its production in the Volga-Ural region, while the other was copied in Kazan a year later, in 1785.⁶⁰

A final sample of Persian manuscripts from the Volga-Ural region is presented by a recent catalogue published by a Tatar scholar, S. M. Giliazutdinov, describing Persian manuscripts from a substantial collection in Kazan, that of the Institute of Language, Literature, and Art.⁶¹ The first volume covers 332 manuscript works. This material substantially confirms the impression conveyed by the smaller Saint Petersburg sample and by Arslanova's catalogue, with regard to both the kinds of Persian material produced or held in the Volga-Ural region, and the wide distribution of Persian manuscript copying—again, not only in urban areas, but in the

countryside as well. For example, let us take the case of the sixteen copies of the Persian commentary on the Arabic grammatical work commonly referred to as *al-Mu'izzi* (ascribed to 'Izz al-Din Zanjani, d. 1257) included in the first volume of Giliuztdinov's catalogue.⁶² Of these, only three give both the date and place of copying, and all were done in rural villages.⁶³ An additional ten indicate the date of copying, or provide evidence for a range of dates (one was copied before 1772, another in 1781, five in the first half of the nineteenth century—1812, 1813, 1822, 1837, and 1844—and three in the mid-1880s—1883, 1884, and ca. 1886). Another work represented by a substantial number of copies in Giliuztdinov's catalogue is a very short Persian poem recounting an episode from the Prophet's life.⁶⁴ Of the twenty-one copies, seven, ranging in date from 1756 to 1867, indicate where they were copied, and of these only one was produced near Kazan⁶⁵ (seven of those that do not indicate the place of copying give a date or provide evidence for arguing a range: 1717–18, between 1742 and 1769, ca. 1787, 1823, 1865, 1879, and 1915).

Western Siberia

Unlike western Central Asia and Eastern Turkistan, Siberia is not, to say the least, a region immediately associated with Persian literary culture, or with a strong, or deep, literary culture of any sort; nevertheless, we are just beginning to appreciate the wealth of Islamic manuscripts preserved there, and indeed the long presence there of Persian literacy. A gravestone discovered in 1991 in the nature preserve known as Saadak-Terek, on the right bank of the Khemchik River in the Tuvan Republic (now officially Tyva), bore an inscription, in Arabic and Persian, dated to 1194, identifying the deceased as a *sayyid*, or descendant of Muhammad, Shaykh Rashid al-Din 'Umar ibn Muhammad ibn 'Ali al-Balkhi.⁶⁶

Still further east, in the Mongol steppe, an inscription in Persian celebrating the establishment of a Sufi *khanaqah* in the Mongol capital of Qaraqorum, dated 1341–42, was discovered and published in 1999 by a team of Japanese scholars. Among the figures identified as responsible for the *khanaqah*'s establishment are several bearing Central Asian names and *nisbas*. These include as Khwaja Sa'd al-Din Balasaghuni, Hamid al-Din Almalighi (identified as a donor), and two figures to whose name the honorific *'azizan* is attached, namely, Khwaja Taj al-Din Andukani (i.e., a native of the town later known as Andijan), and 'Imad al-Din Bulghari.⁶⁷

These inscriptional relics clearly reflect the migration of individuals or small groups into these northerly and northeasterly regions, above all from Central Asia. The inscriptions can hardly stand as evidence of a significant implantation of Persian literary culture among the local population. Yet it was precisely this sort of movement that eventually led to the Islamization of Western Siberia, beginning from the sixteenth century and continuing into the twentieth. The Central Asians involved in that movement, who brought Islam and came and settled in towns and villages of the region, chiefly for commercial reasons (usually becoming known locally as Bukharans), also brought Persian literature to Siberia.

There is, to be sure, little evidence so far available to confirm the endurance or continuity of any sort of Persian literary culture in the West Siberian region. We cannot point to major works produced locally in Persian and neither have any local Turkic works been identified as clear translations from Persian. Much less do we have any evidence of a local translation program of the sort encountered elsewhere. The region was, after all, in Russian hands nearly by the time such translations from Persian to Turkic were being sponsored in Mawarannahr, and prior to those done in eastern Turkistan.

We likewise find little help from manuscript cataloguing with regard to western Siberia. Local collections have scarcely begun to be inventoried and described. As a result, what we know of literary production in the region must come from the relatively few specialists who have utilized local historiographical and literary production in sketching the history of the region both before and after the establishment of Russian rule in the latter sixteenth century. Among the pioneers in this regard have been specialists based in Kazan, such as Mirkasym Usmanov and Marsel' Akhmetzianov, or in Ufa (R. G. Kuzeev). Usmanov in particular has expanded the reach of the archaeographical expeditions he conducted in Tatarstan and Bashkortostan further east, into the Baraba steppe.⁶⁸ Most of the material explored so far has been in Turkic, and is now typically classified as "Tatar."

Special mention must be made, however, of the remarkable researches of Alfrid Bustanov. Almost single-handedly, over the past several years Bustanov has delved into the manuscript culture of his native Siberian region, yielding above all an important monograph on the book culture of Siberian Muslims.⁶⁹ It is chiefly because of his work that we can begin to piece together something of the role of Persian literary culture in this region, and to understand how long Persian remained part of the cultural arsenal of Siberian Muslims.

Bustanov's focus in his recent study is on private collections, in which it seems clear that works in Turkic (Tatar) and Arabic predominated. This suggests that Persian material might have been squeezed out into public collections. In other words, Persian manuscripts were given up by recent owners who by contrast kept their Turkic and Arabic materials (Turkic for comprehension, Arabic for sacrality). Such a pattern is suggested by one manuscript Bustanov discusses, produced in Tara in the 1860s, containing copies of Persian and Arabic religious works. The Persian texts alone have been supplied with Tatar translations under each line. Other manuscripts, however, provide Turkic equivalents for Arabic texts as well.⁷⁰

Another work of particular interest is a section of a nineteenth-century manuscript Bustanov discusses, containing an account, by Rahmatullah ibn Mulla Yusuf al-Tarawi, of the status of Muslims in Siberia. The author—who also uses the *nisba* al-Sibiri (the Siberian) wrote in 1858–59, and although the basic text is in Tatar, he freely includes Persian verse and passages in Arabic as well.⁷¹ This work thus cannot be said to represent the use of Persian to recount local history and religious issues. But it does attest to a degree of literacy in Persian, and Arabic—as

would be expected, after all—among those with an interest in local history and local religious culture.

Bustanov also devotes substantial attention to the Biktimerov collection. This is a private collection of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century manuscripts from Siberia (mostly from the region of Tiumen'), comprising 182 works in all.⁷² The majority by far are in Turkic or Arabic, but a few Persian works are named. Finally, in his description of numerous other manuscripts from private collections, Bustanov suggests the same pattern as found in the case of the Volga-Urals: Persian was used for Sufi works—whether *ijazat* and *silsilas*,⁷³ defenses of the vocal *zikr*,⁷⁴ the letters of Ahmad Sirhindi,⁷⁵ or Sufi Allahyar's *Murad al-'Arifin*⁷⁶—and for works on Arabic grammar.⁷⁷

CONCLUSIONS

Overall, it seems safe to conclude that literacy in Persian, and the reading of Persian literature, continued on a much wider scale, and considerably later, than might have been assumed on the basis of the contemporary linguistic situation, or of the remoteness of the regions explored here from other historic homes of Persian literature, Iran and Central Asia. Educated Muslims from Kazan to Tobolsk appear to have read Persian and to have sought out materials in Persian, keeping Persian manuscript culture alive until well toward the end of the nineteenth century. To be sure, by that time, Persian literary production was dwarfed by that in various Turkic vernaculars. Its persistence is worth noting, but it was no longer in serious competition with Turkic. Nor did Persian, in certain spheres, offer competition with Russian, the imperial language in most of the regions considered here. It should also be kept in mind that the educated reader in these regions expected to read Persian above all when dealing with certain distinct spheres. As we have seen, Persian was still routinely important in Sufi literature, and Persian-language interpretations of the Quran remained popular, as did Persian poetry. The high representation, in manuscript collections, of grammars of Arabic written in Persian suggests that Persian may have served as a medium for studying Arabic, or may have been studied in conjunction with Arabic. It is also, finally, worth stating the obvious: literacy *exclusively*, or even primarily, in Persian is not what we observe here. This, perhaps, may be the lesson of those earlier periods marked by extensive translations from Persian into Turkic, inasmuch as Turkic was *made* into a literary language, able to compete with Persian, on the model of Persian.

NOTES

1. The linguistic shift in literary production happened somewhat earlier in Eastern Turkistan, where Persian was dominant into the early eighteenth century; by the second half of that century, however, Turkic literary production had largely replaced that in Persian, and the nineteenth century brought a dramatic expansion of the corpus of Chaghatai literature produced in the region.

2. Mir ‘Ali Shir [Nawa’i], *Muhakamat al-Lughatain*, trans. R. Devereux (Leiden: Brill, 1966), praises Turkic as more versatile than Persian and Arabic.

3. Four of these translations, evidently done at the Köchkünjid court in Samarqand, are discussed in Devin DeWeese, “Chaghatay Literature in the Early Sixteenth Century: Notes on Turkic Translations from the Uzbek Courts of Mawarannahr,” in *Turkish Language, Literature, and History: Travelers’ Tales, Sultans, and Scholars since the Eighth Century (A Volume of Studies in Honor of Robert Dankoff)*, ed. Bill Hickman and Gary Leiser (London: Routledge, 2016), 99–117. Two others (translations of al-Ghazali’s *Nasihat al-Muluk* and of Najib Hamadani’s *Aja’ib al-Makhlūqat*) were done at the court of Muhammad Shībani Khan himself.

4. See Devin DeWeese, “A Note on Manuscripts of the *Zubdat al-āthār*, a Chaghatay Turkic History from Sixteenth-Century Mawarannahr,” *Manuscripts of the Middle East*, 6 (1992), 96–100, with further references.

5. On the *Tarikh-i Abu al-Khayr-khani*, see Ch. A. Stori, *Persidskaia literatura: Bio-bibliograficheskii obzor*, trans. Iu. È. Bregel’, 3 vols. (Moscow: Nauka, 1972), 1: 397–99.

6. On another product of this patronage, from Bukhara, see Devin DeWeese, “Telling Women’s Stories in 16th-Century Central Asia: A Book of Guidance in Chaghatay Turkic for a Royal Lady of the Bukharan Court,” *Oriens* 43, 1–2 (2015), 154–222.

7. The translation gauge is somewhat more helpful for Eastern Turkistan (see David Brophy’s discussion of translations from Persian in his chapter 6 in the present volume). Undoubtedly, more evidence of Turkic translations from Persian will come to light as manuscript collections are better described, but nearly all of the Turkic translations from Persian known from catalogued collections were produced in two periods: the first half of the eighteenth century—a time that indeed seems to correspond to the transition from Persian to Turkic in literary production—and the first half of the nineteenth century (especially the second quarter)—ironically, before the major expansion of literary production associated with the rule and patronage of Ya’qub Beg, but reflecting the patronage of local elites that administered regions in Eastern Turkistan on behalf of the Qing emperor.

8. See *A Turkic Medical Treatise from Islamic Central Asia: A Critical Edition of a Seventeenth-Century Chagatay Work by Subhān Qulī Khan*, ed. and trans. László Károlyi, Brill’s Inner Asian Library, 32 (Leiden: Brill, 2015).

9. Manuscripts of this translation by one Salihi are preserved in Saint Petersburg and Kazan.

10. The shift is noted, and its possible implications suggested, in Iu. È. Bregel’, “Arkhiy khivinskikh khanov (Predvaritel’nyi obzor novykh dokumentov),” *Narody Azii i Afriki*, 1966, no. 1: 67–76 (p. 72). Bregel’ estimated that one-sixth of the documents he surveyed from the Khivan archives were in Persian. Of 1,700 Khivan documents (dating from the second half of the eighteenth century down to the 1920s) described in *Katalog khivinskikh kaziiskikh dokumentov XIX–nachala XX vv.*, ed. A. Urunbaev, T. Khorikava, T. Faiziev, G. Dzhuraeva, and K. Isogai (Tashkent/Kyoto: Institut Vostokovedeniia im. Abu Raikhana Beruni Akademii nauk Respubliki Uzbekistan / Kyoto University of Foreign Studies, 2001), 199 (just under 12 percent) are in Persian, all of them dated before 1860.

11. See the survey of Persian manuscript production by the noted Iranist O.F. Akimushkin, “Persidskaia rukopisnaia kniga,” *Rukopisnaia kniga v kul’ture narodov Vostoka: Ocherki*, Kniga pervaiia (Moscow: Nauka, GRVL, 1987), 330–406. In the same volume, L. V. Dmitrieva, “Tiurkoiazychnaia arabopis’mennaia rukopisnaia kniga po ee arealam,” 407–77, discusses the Volga-Ural region (437–42) and Eastern Turkistan (417–23), along with Central Asia, Azerbaijan, and Asia Minor, as distinctive regions of manuscript culture, but only in terms of Turkic literary production.

12. This designation, though by now conventional, is somewhat misleading, being derived from the regions in which the Muslim population of European Russia has historically been concentrated; this population—now mostly counted as “Tatars,” but including the Bashkirs as well, and historically linked with the legacy of Islam in the Mongol successor state of the Golden Horde—in fact extends from the Volga-Kama confluence, near Kazan, down the Volga to Astrakhan, west and south to the Crimea, and east to the Ural mountains and the valley of the Ural/Yaiq River. Before the late tsarist

and Soviet eras, many in this Muslim community seem to have preferred to identify themselves with the Muslim legacy of Bulghar rather than with the ethnonym “Tatar,” but the latter term—long used by Russians, somewhat indiscriminately, to refer to the indigenous inhabitants, of diverse linguistic and “ethnic” affiliations, of the region through which Russian control spread during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, especially in the Volga valley and Western Siberia—gained wide acceptance during the twentieth century.

13. See Devin DeWeese, “A Persian Sufi Work from the Golden Horde: The *Qalandar-nāma* of Abū Bakr Rūmī,” in *Mongols, Tatars and Turks in the Persianate World*, ed. Benedek Péri and Ferenc Csirkes (Leiden: Brill, forthcoming). See also Devin DeWeese, “*Khāns* and *Amīrs* in the *Qalandar-nāma* of Abū Bakr Rūmī: Praise of the Islamizing Jochid Elite in a Persian Sufi Work from Fourteenth-Century Crimea,” *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* 21 (2014–15 = *Festschrift for Thomas T. Allsen in Celebration of His 75th Birthday*, ed. P. B. Golden, R. K. Kovalev, A. P. Martinez, J. Skaff, and A. Zimonyi [Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2015]), 53–66.

14. Ananiasz Zajczkowski, *Najstarsza wersja turecka Ғусрāv u Šīrīn Quṭba*, 3 vols. (Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1958–61), 1 (*Tekst*), 2 (*Fac-similé*), 3 (*Słownik*).

15. Sultan Muhammad ibn Muhammad Harawi Fakhri, *Tazkira-yi Rawzat al-Salatin*, ed. ‘Abd al-Rasul Khayyampur (Tabriz: Intisharat-i Mu’assasa-yi Tarikh wa Farhang-i Iran, 1345/1966), 26.

16. Dmitrieva comments that in the Volga-Ural region, translations into “Tatar” were not uncommon from Arabic, but were less often done from Persian. See Dmitrieva, “Tiurkoiazychnaia arabopis’mennaia rukopisnaia kniga,” 441.

17. On Jalayiri’s work, see H. F. Hofman, *Turkish Literature: A Biobibliographical Survey; Section III, Moslim Central Asian Turkish Literature*, 6 vols. in 2 (Utrecht: University of Utrecht, 1969), 5: 114–15, and M. A. Usmanov, *Tatarskie istoricheskie istochniki XVII–XVIII vv.* (Kazan: Izdatel’stvo Kazanskogo Universiteta, 1972), 33–96. Kasimov is in the district of Ryazan, 160 km east-southeast of Moscow.

18. MS B4070, fols. 37b–45b; described in N. D. Miklukho-Maklai, *Opisanie persidskikh i tadzhikskikh rukopisei Instituta vostokovedeniia*, no. 3: *Istoricheskie sochineniia* (Moscow: Nauka, GRVL, 1975), 400–401, no. 509.

19. M. A. Salakhedinova, “Ob odnom neizvestnom persidskom sochinenii po istorii narodov Povolzh’ia,” *Strany i narody Vostoka*, no. 4 (Moscow, 1965), 147–54.

20. On this work, most likely compiled in the early nineteenth century, see especially Allen J. Frank, *Islamic Historiography and “Bulghar” Identity among the Tatars and Bashkirs of Russia* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), esp. 47–91, and Michael Kemper, *Sufis und Gelehrte in Tatarien und Baschkirien, 1789–1889: Der islamische Diskurs unter russischer Herrschaft* (Berlin: Klaus Schwarz, 1998), 324–54, with further references.

21. Iurii Bregel, “Vostochnye rukopisi v Kazani,” *Pis’mennye pamiatniki Vostoka, Ezhegodnik 1969* (Moscow, 1972), 355–73.

22. Frank, *Islamic Historiography*; Kemper, *Sufis und Gelehrte*; Allen J. Frank, *Muslim Religious Institutions in Imperial Russia: The Islamic World of Novouzensk District and the Kazakh Inner Horde, 1780–1910* (Leiden: Brill, 2001).

23. *Persidskie i tadzhikskie rukopisi Instituta narodov Azii AN SSSR (Kratkii alfavitnyi katalog)*, ed. O. F. Akimushkin, V. V. Kushev, N. D. Miklukho-Maklai, A. M. Muginov, and M. A. Salakhedinova (Moscow: Nauka, 1964), hereafter *Kratkii alfavitnyi katalog*. Works are listed by title, with each copy of distinct works numbered consecutively (nos. 1–4680, with an additional 110 items in a supplement, nos. 1*–110*).

24. *Kratkii alfavitnyi katalog*, no. 340, B2717 (128ff.), a copy of Sa’di’s *Bustan* done in Kazan in 1182/1768–69; no. 2467, A1090 (fols., 1b–28a), a copy of the *Sharh-i Sarf-i Mir*, a commentary on the beginning section of al-Jurjani’s (d. 1413–14) grammar of Arabic, here called the *Sharh-i Da’ud* (the commentary is by Da’ud ibn ‘Abd al-Baqi ibn ‘Isa ibn Baba Turkistani), done in Kazan, n.d.; no. 2748, B2531 (2b–20b), a copy of the *Sarf-i Mir* itself, by Jurjani, a Persian grammar of Arabic, done in Kazan in 1881; no. 2758, B2856 (1b–14b), another copy of the *Sarf-i Mir*, done in Kazan, n.d.; no. 829, B2592

(91ff.), a copy of Ya'qub Charkhi's Persian *tafsir* done in the village of Tashkichu, northeast of Kazan, n.d.; no. 48* [suppl.], B4401 (68b–94a), a defective copy of the *Siraj al-Qulub*, a Persian work by Abu Nasr Sa'id ibn al-Qasim al-Ghaznawi, likewise done in Tashkichu, near Kazan, in 1738–39 (1151).

25. Manuscripts from elsewhere in present-day Tatarstan: *Kratkii alfavitnyi katalog*, no. 3573, B3315 (126ff.), a copy of Sa'di's *Gulistan* done in the village of Kishit in 1775–76 (1189); no. 344, B2941 (25b–156b), a copy of Sa'di's *Bustan* done in the village of Urnash in 1813 (1228); no. 4374, B3300 (52b–64a), a copy of the Persian poetic work known as *Nan-u-Halwa* by Baha al-Din Muhammad ibn Husayn al-'Amili done in 1849 in the village of Bikbak; no. 1588, B4104 (27b–36b), a copy of the poetic *Diwan* of Farishta done in Kargaly, in Chistopol' district, in 1806; no. 1287, A1416 (106ff.), a copy of Nawbahari's Sufi work, *Durr al-Majalis*, done in the village of Baraskai in 1748–49 (1162); no. 2339, B2729 (11b–60b), a copy of a Persian commentary on part of an Arabic grammatical work known as *al-Mu'izzi*, ascribed to 'Izz al-Din Zanjani (d. 1257), done in the village of Darvish in 1771–72 (1185).

26. *Kratkii alfavitnyi katalog*, no. 2345, B2856 (18a–65b), a copy of the Persian commentary on *al-Mu'izzi* done in 1782–83 (1197) in the village of Alman, in the present-day Chuvash republic.

27. Manuscripts from present-day Bashkortostan: *Kratkii alfavitnyi katalog*, 1: no. 2366, MS B3676 (1b–75a), a copy of a Persian commentary on the Arabic grammar known as *al-Mu'izzi* done in Ufa, n.d.; no. 3570, B2574 (104ff.), a copy of Sa'di's *Gulistan* done in 1778–79 (1192) in the village of 'Abdullah; no. 831, B4008 (1b–202a), a copy of Ya'qub Charkhi's Persian *tafsir* done in the village of Babalar in 1781–82 (1196); no. 1296, B2975 (107ff.), a copy of Nawbahari's *Durr al-Majalis* done in 1812 in the village of Qizil Chapchak; no. 4061, B3984, 200ff., a copy of Sufi Allahyar's *Maslak al-Muttaqin*, a famous Sufi work, copied in 1837 in the town of Tuymaza; no. 2651, B3695 (12b–86a), a copy of the *Shifa al-Qulub* by Muhammad ibn Muhammad al-Jami al-Almasi, presenting Persian translations of forty *hadiths*, with commentary (the original collection was compiled in 1445–46 [849]), done in Sterlitamak in 1829–30 (1245).

28. *Kratkii alfavitnyi katalog*, no. 3556, B168 (98ff.), a copy of Sa'di's *Gulistan* done in 1775 in the village of Salman; no. 2392, C2080 (19b–91b), a copy of a Persian commentary on the Arabic grammar *al-Mu'izzi* done in Yangi-Kulatka in 1879; no. 2365, B3636 (42b–99b), another copy of a Persian commentary on *al-Mu'izzi*, done in 1870 in the village of Iski Yarmak; o. 2780, B3753 (89b–103b), a copy of the Persian *Sarf-i Mir*, by Sayyid Sharif al-Din 'Ali Jurjani, done in Kulatka, n.d.; no. 3703, B2681 (39b–72b), a copy of the Persian Sufi work by Muhammad Siddiq al-Badakhshi al-Kishmi, called *al-Mabda' wa'l-Mu'ad*, done in Kulatka, n.d.; No. 16, B3333 (ff. 1a–5b), a collection of *hadiths*, with verse Persian translations, compiled by Muhammad Yar ibn 'Ala al-Din, in the village of Yanga Tazlar in 1884; no. 103*, B4401 (3a–60a), a defective copy of the *Mawahib-i 'Aliyya* of Husayn ibn 'Ali al-Wa'iz al-Kashifi done in the village of Kazaklar in 1738–39 (1151).

29. *Kratkii alfavitnyi katalog*, no. 2779, B3725 (3b–25b), a copy of the Persian *Sarf-i Mir* by Sayyid Sharif al-Din 'Ali Jurjani done in "Qal'a-yi Jayiq," evidently Ural'sk, in 1865; no. 3506, C297 (2b–368a), a copy of the lexicographical work *Kanz al-Lughat* by Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Khaliq ibn Ma'ruf done in Astrakhan in 1827–28 (1243); no. 4233, B4441 (101ff.), a full copy of the second volume of the *Maktubat* of Ahmad Sirhindi as compiled by Yar-Muhammad al-Jadid al-Badakhshi al-Taliqani, evidently done in Astrakhan in 1865–66 (1282).

30. A. A. Arslanova, *Opisanie rukopisei na persidskom iazyke Nauchnoi biblioteki im. N.I. Lobachevskogo Kazanskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, no. 1 (Moscow/Kazan: Kazanskii gosudarstvennyi universitet/Institut istorii im. Sh. Mardzhani Akademii nauk Respubliki Tatarstan/Institut vostokovedeniia Rossiiskoi Akademii nauk, 2005); A. A. Arslanova, *Opisanie rukopisei na persidskom iazyke Nauchnoi biblioteki im. N. I. Lobachevskogo Kazanskogo (Privolzhskogo) federal'nogo universiteta*, no. II (Kazan: Kazanskii federal'nyi universitet/GBU "Institut istorii im. Sh. Mardzhani" Akademii nauk Respubliki Tatarstan/Institut vostokovedeniia Rossiiskoi Akademii nauk, 2015).

31. The principle seems to have been to avoid mentioning the place of copying unless it was explicitly mentioned, but in some cases this information is shown in excerpts from colophons but still not

included in the general description (and not indexed). Manuscripts from the Volga-Ural region often display distinctive handwriting, and can at least be generally assigned to that region to distinguish them from manuscripts copied in Central Asia, for instance; but this information and the editor's judgments about the provenance of the manuscripts have not been included.

32. Allen J. Frank, *Bukhara and the Muslims of Russia: Sufism, Education, and the Paradox of Islamic Prestige* (Leiden: Brill, 2012).

33. Arslanova, *Opisanie*, 1: 37–39, no. 4.

34. *Ibid.*, 1: 117–19, no. 54.

35. *Ibid.*, 1: 43–46, no. 7.

36. For example, the Kazan collection holds a fourteenth-century copy of Najm al-Din Razi's famous Sufi work the *Mirsad al-'Ibad*, copied in 1360 (762) by a native of Shiraz (Arslanova, *Opisanie*, 1: 209–11, no. 112), and an early fifteenth-century excerpt from the much rarer Sufi work by a grandson of Sayf al-Din Bakharzi, the *Fusus al-Adab*, copied in 1412 (815) (Arslanova, *Opisanie*, 1: 302, no. 172), as well as an astrological work (*Lata'if al-Kiram*, by "Sayyid Munajjim") copied in 1434 (838) (Arslanova, *Opisanie*, 1: 51–52, no. 10) and a copy of Kashani's Persian translation of the popular Sufi compendium of Shihab al-Din 'Umar Suhrawardi, the *'Awarif al-Ma'arif*, completed in 1491 (897) (Arslanova, *Opisanie*, 1: 249–50, no. 137); these no doubt travelled to Kazan via Central Asia, a path even more likely in the case of an old copy of Khwaja Muhammad Parsa's *Fasl al-Khitab*, completed in 1495 (901), and the sixteenth-century copies of Sufi treatises by Mawlana Ya'qub Charkhi, including one completed in 1558–59 (966), evidently by a native of Merv (Arslanova, *Opisanie*, 1: 298–302, nos. 166–71).

37. Arslanova, *Opisanie*, 2: 18–20, no. 391.

38. *Ibid.*, 1: 122–25, nos. 56–57.

39. *Ibid.*, 2: 183–84, no. 491, and 186–88, no. 493, respectively.

40. *Ibid.*, 1: 363–64, no. 244. Cf. 2: 414–16, nos. 626–27, identified as the same work but assigned the title *al-Kitab al-Khaqaniyya fi Bayan al-Jihad*.

41. For instance, the Kazan University collection holds at least a dozen copies of a Persian-language manual of Arabic grammar, assigned its "title" from its first word, *ba-dan* ("Know . . .") and in some versions ascribed to Baha al-Din al-'Amili (Arslanova, *Opisanie*, 1: 86–93, nos. 33, 36–39; 2: 32–40, nos. 401–8); all were evidently produced in the Volga-Ural region, in the eighteenth and (mostly) nineteenth centuries. Likewise registered are at least a dozen copies, produced from the late eighteenth century through the nineteenth, of a locally produced Persian commentary ascribed to a certain 'Abdullah ibn Aq-Muhammad (see n. 62 below) on *al-Mu'izzi* (Arslanova, *Opisanie*, 1: 94–99, nos. 40–43, 2: 23–31, nos. 393–400; additional copies or fragments are mentioned among the *majmu'as* described by Arslanova), including one (no. 43) copied in Kazan in 1800 (1215) by 'Ubaydullah ibn Kalimullah al-Bulghari (who also copied Sufi works noted below); original Persian works on Arabic grammar evidently written by this copyist are registered in Arslanova, *Opisanie*, 2: 43–44, no. 411, and 51–52, no. 419. For a copy of the Persian grammatical work known as the *Sarf-i Zanjani*, done in the Volga-Urals in 1742 (1155), see Arslanova, *Opisanie*, 1: 100–101, no. 45; cf. 2: 40–43, nos. 409–10. In the second volume of Arslanova's catalogue, the section on grammatical works (in which the overwhelming majority are Persian works dealing with Arabic grammar) is the second-largest (II, 23–173, nos. 393–484), surpassed only by the catch-all section on belles lettres (pp. 476–714, nos. 667–820), comprising chiefly works of poetry.

42. Arslanova, *Opisanie*, 1: 143–44, no. 66.

43. *Ibid.*, 1: 132–34, no. 61.

44. *Ibid.*, 1: 165–66, nos. 86–88; cf. the mostly anonymous Persian medical treatises described in 2: 214–28, nos. 511–16.

45. The collection includes, e.g., a Persian treatise of Khwaja Muhammad Parsa copied in Kazan in 1871 (1288) by Mulla Khwaja ibn Mulla Muzaffar al-Bulghari (Arslanova, *Opisanie*, 1: 277–78, no. 154); five copies of the famous hagiography *Rashahat-i 'Ayn al-Hayat*, most ascribed to the eighteenth century and probably "local" (Arslanova, *Opisanie*, 1: 266–72, nos. 147–50, 2: 323–24, no. 584); two

apparently partial sets of the treatises of the sixteenth-century shaykh known as Makhḍum-i Aʿzam, one of which was copied in Bukhara in 1840 (1256), but by “‘Ubaydullah ibn Kalimullah al-Bulghari al-Ghazani al-Aldirmishi” (Arslanova, *Opisanie*, 1: 312–25, nos. 180–205 [misidentified], and 338–40, nos. 223–25); and copies of treatises, otherwise unknown from Central Asian collections, ascribed to the rather obscure sixteenth-century Naqshbandi shaykh Khwajagi Darwish Imkanagi (Arslanova, *Opisanie*, 1: 344–45, nos. 230–31).

46. Arslanova, *Opisanie*, 1: 284–85, no. 158.
47. Arslanova, *Opisanie*, 2: 281–82, no. 554 (the *Zubdat al-Maqamat* of Muhammad Hashim Kishmi, copied in 1670 (1081)), and 291–92, no. 561 (the *Hazarat al-Quds* of Badr al-Din Ibrahim Sirhindi, copied in 1648 (1058) by Miftah al-Din ibn Sabit al-Jamaqi al-Bulghari). It is not clear whether these older copies reflect an earlier Mujaddidi presence in the Volga-Urals, or the later importation of these manuscripts into a region with a strong Mujaddidi presence.
48. *Ibid.*, 225–29, nos. 123–25; 2: 279–81, no. 553, 283–85, nos. 555–56.
49. *Ibid.*, 1: 229–33, nos. 126–28; 2: 285–88, nos. 557–58.
50. *Ibid.*, 243–44, no. 134, and 2: 321, no. 582 (the *Zubdat al-Haqa’iq*).
51. On Sufi Allahyar, see Hofman, *Turkish Literature*, 2: 71–81.
52. Arslanova, *Opisanie*, 1: 214–22, nos. 114–20; 2: 240–68, nos. 523–43.
53. Arslanova, *Opisanie*, 2: 293–303, nos. 562–70 (with an anonymous commentary on the work, 303–3034, no. 571).
54. Arslanova, *Opisanie*, 1: 287–89, no. 160, 2: 317–18, no. 580. On Utiz-Imani, see Kemper, *Sufis und Gelehrte*, 174–212, and Frank, *Islamic Historiography*, 37.
55. Arslanova, *Opisanie*, 2: 322–23, no. 583.
56. Arslanova, *Opisanie*, 2: 348–51, no. 593.
57. Arslanova, *Opisanie*, 1: 366–91, nos. 246–64, among which one (no. 254) deals with Shafi’i *fiqh*; 2: 438–74, nos. 641–65.
58. Arslanova, *Opisanie*, 2: 455–60, nos. 653–56; on the author, see Kemper, *Sufis und Gelehrte*, 217.
59. Arslanova, *Opisanie*, 1: 346–55, nos. 233–38, including copies of works by Ya’qub Charkhi, Muhammad Parsa, and Husayn Wa’iz Kashifi, as well as still older works from twelfth- and thirteenth-century Mawarannahr; cf. 2: 371–73, nos. 601–2 (one “local” and one much older “imported” copy of Charkhi’s *tafsir*), and 374–80, 383–86, nos. 603–7, 610–11 (copies of Kashifi’s works).
60. Arslanova, *Opisanie*, 1: 194–97, nos. 103–4; 2: 236–37, no. 521 (dated 1857 [1274]), of less certain provenance).
61. S. M. Giliuztdinov, *Opisanie rukopisei na persidskom iazyke iz khranilishcha Instituta iazyka, literatury i iskusstva* [Akademii nauk Respubliki Tatarstan] (Kazan: Fiker, 2002); the second and third volumes appeared in 2006 and 2007, respectively, but have not been available to me. See also S. M. Giliuztdinov, *Persidsko-tatarskie literaturnye svyazi (X–nachalo XX v.)* (Kazan: Akademiia nauk Respubliki Tatarstan, Institut iazyka, literatury i iskusstva im. G. Ibragimova, 2011); the author surveys the development and holdings of manuscript collections in Kazan, elsewhere in Tatarstan, and Saint Petersburg (but not Bashqortostan), with attention to the dates and places of copying (pp. 19–59), with the bulk of the work devoted to the presumed impact of various classics of Persian literature on “Tatar” literature, and literary figures, of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.
62. Giliuztdinov, *Opisanie*, 100–107, nos. 156–71. Here the popular commentary is ascribed to ‘Abdullah ibn Aq-Muhammad, of whom nothing is known; but the work is said to have been popular already in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries as the chief “textbook” on Arabic in use in “Tatar” madrasas.
63. Giliuztdinov, *Opisanie*, no. 156, copied in Khan-Kirman, Kasimov, in 1811 (1226); no. 159, copied in the village of ‘Abdullah in 1870 (1287); no. 162, copied in Nurkaev in 1888.
64. Giliuztdinov, *Opisanie*, 80–87, nos. 112–32.
65. Giliuztdinov, *Opisanie*, no. 117, copied in the village of Torna in 1756; no. 112, copied in the village of Ayman in 1847; no. 130, copied in Tegermen in 1855; no. 114, copied in the village of Bikbau, in

Ufa *guberniia*, in 1858; no. 128, copied in Tashkichu (northeast of Kazan) in 1864; no. 119, copied in the village of Taulyk in 1867; no. 132, copied in village of Salaush (Agryz *raion*), n.d.

66. A. M. Mukhtarov, "Dvuiazychnaia nadpis' XII v. iz Novosibirsk," *Istoriia, filologiia i filosofiia*, no. 1 (Novosibirsk, 1991), 68–70.

67. N. Uno, H. Muraoka, and K. Matsuda, "Gencho kouki karakorumujyoushi hankaa kensetsukin-nen perushagohibun-no kenkyu" (Persian Inscription in Memory of the Establishment of a Khanqah at Qara-qorum) (in Japanese, with Persian text and English translation of the inscription), in *Studies on the Inner Asian Languages*, 14 (1999): 1–64 + plates I–V.

68. M. G. Gosmanov, *Kauriy kalām ezennän: Arkheograf yazmaları* (Kazan, 1994), 35–36.

69. Al'frid Bustanov, *Knizhnaia kul'tura sibirskikh musul'man* (Moscow: Izdatel'skii dom Mardzhani, 2013).

70. *Ibid.*, 27.

71. *Ibid.*, 31, and facsimiles of 14b–19a as *Faksimile* 2 at the end.

72. *Ibid.*, 45–52.

73. *Ibid.*, 88–91.

74. *Ibid.*, 95, 97, 99.

75. *Ibid.*, 171.

76. *Ibid.*, 159, 165.

77. *Ibid.*, 103–5.