

Babadjanov Baxtiyor, Muminov Ashirbek and Paul Jürgen,
Schaibanidische Grabinschriften.
 (Title page also in Uzbek :
 B. Bobozhonov, A. Muminov, Iu. Paul',
Shaiboniilar kabrtoshlaridagi bitiklar)

Wiesbaden, Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 1997.
 28.5 × 20.5 cm, 190 p. + 40 p. & plates + 67 p.

This publication, the result of a joint German-Uzbek project between the Academy of Sciences of Uzbekistan and the Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, is an edition and translation of all the extant tomb inscriptions of the Shibanid (or Abū l-Khairid) Uzbek dynasty which ruled Central Asia during the 16th and 17th centuries. Somewhat maligned by Soviet historiography, which heavily favoured the Timurids, the Shibanids are being accorded more attention in the post-independence period, and are being increasingly recognized as having played an important role in the political and cultural history of Uzbekistan, and even in the ethnogenesis of the modern Uzbek people.

The funerary epigraphy of the Shibanids is very rich, richer perhaps than for most medieval Islamic dynasties. The information contained in the tomb inscriptions – the titles and full name of an individual, as well as the date of death, and sometimes even the place and circumstances of death – is an important supplement to the narrative sources, and it helps to fill the gaps in the dynasty's genealogical history. The inscriptions are a particularly valuable source of information about female members of the dynasty, whose names, dates, and most importantly, relationships to male family members, are rarely mentioned in the historical sources. A genealogical table or chart of the Shibanid dynasty, which would have incorporated the new information that the authors had gleaned from the inscriptions, including newly identified female members, would have been a most welcome addition to the book.

Because most of the tombs of Shibanid family members were concentrated in mausolea or other funerary complexes, the inscriptions have been grouped according to their locations :

1. The sarcophagus or funerary platform (referred to variously as *dakhma*, *şuffa*, *takht*) of the Shibanids proper, *i. e.*, Muḥammad Shibāni Khān (907-16/1501-10) and his descendants, in Samarqand.

2. The mausoleum of the Kūchkūnjid sub-clan, *i. e.*, Kūchkūnji (Kūchūm) Khān (918-37/1512-30) and his descendants, popularly known as the shrine of Chihil Dukhtarān, also in Samarqand ⁽¹⁾.

3. The shrine of Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī in the town of Turkestan in south-western Kazakhstan.

4. The shrine of the Naqshbandi shaikh, Khwāja 'Ubaidullāh Aḥrār, outside Samarqand, where the tombs of

Baraq (Nawrūz Aḥmad) Khān (959-63/1552-56) and his descendants are located.

5. The mausoleum of Yūnus Khān (the former site of the shrine of Shaikh Khawānd Ṭahūr) in Tashkent.

It is unfortunate that none of the inscriptions from Bukhara, which was a chief political and cultural centre of the Shibanids, were included in the volume. Apparently, the inscriptions on the tombs located at the shrine complex of Bahā' al-Dīn naqshband outside Bukhara, which was an important burial site of the Jāni-Begid sub-clan in particular, have become illegible. Almost illegible too are the inscriptions on the tombs located in the Mir-i 'Arab madrasa in Bukhara, but they apparently do not relate to the Shibanids anyway, as the attempt to decipher their few remaining fragments has demonstrated.

The book is organized into three parts :

1. A brief historical introduction on the Shibanids, and a translation of the texts of 84 inscriptions, with commentary, into Uzbek, German, and Russian, with the three separate versions corresponding very closely to each other ⁽²⁾.

2. Photo facsimiles, and/or drawings of the inscriptions, based on impressions which were taken during the course of an expedition conducted in 1989-90 under the auspices of the Ministry of Culture of Uzbekistan ⁽³⁾.

3. An edition of the original texts in Arabic script. Almost all the inscriptions are in Arabic, with only a few in Persian. An index of proper names occurring in the inscriptions is provided in Latin script.

The extensive commentary on the translations of individual inscriptions provides references for Koranic

(1) The explanation given in the notes for Chihil Dukhtarān, lit., «forty maidens», as a name given to any place where more than three or four women were buried (p. 8, n. 1 ; p. 60, n. 14 ; and p. 126, n. 1), cannot be applied to the name of Chahār Bakr (also Chār or Chor Bakr), a well-known burial site in Bukhara, since Chahār Bakr means not «the four virgins (*bikr*)», but «the four Bakrs», *i. e.*, the four prominent scholar-saints of Bukhara, all of whom had the *kunya* Abū Bakr. Scholars (both medieval and modern) were of various opinions about exactly who the four were, but for the period in question, they must have been the four members of the prominent Jūybārī shaiḥly family who were buried here – see Khafiz-i Tanysh ibn Mir Mukhammad Bukhari (Ḥāfiẓ Tanish), *Sharaf-nama-i shakhi (Kniga shakhskoi slavy) (Sharaf-nāma-i shāhi)*, fac. ed. and trans. M. A. Salakhedinova, pt. 1 (Moscow, 1983), p. 269, n. 318 ; see also the recent article by Florian Schwarz, «From Scholars to Saints : The Bukharan Shaykhs of Ūybār and the *ziyārat* to the Four Bakhr» (forthcoming).

(2) It is my understanding that the original Arabic texts were first translated into Russian, then into German and simultaneously collated with the Russian, and finally translated into Uzbek. At the end of the German translation is a short Addendum (Nachtrag), which does not appear in either the Uzbek or Russian versions.

(3) It is not clear exactly what process was followed in obtaining the impressions. The Russian text simply refers to *èstampazhi*, and the Uzbek to *èstampazhlar*.

citations, elucidates honorific titles, explains chronograms, and presents information from historical and other narrative sources, which either complements, corroborates, or at times even contradicts the information in the inscriptions. The authors also refer to previous research that has been done or readings that have been made of individual inscriptions, and in so doing they have highlighted the important contributions of Russian scholars who worked on Central Asia at the end of the 19th and the first part of the 20th centuries.

In a few cases where inscriptions were in a poor state of preservation, it was even possible to reconstruct their texts from the narrative sources. To cite a brilliant example, the text of the inscription on the tombstone of Süyünj Khwāja Khān was also found in the *Badāyi' al-waqāyī'*, an early 16th-century work by Wāṣifi who, by his own account, was its author. In the case of the sarcophagus of the Shibanids, the information in some of the tomb inscriptions could be corroborated by references in the deed of endowment (*waqfiyya*) of Muḥammad Shibānī Khān's daughter-in-law, Mihr Sulṭān Khānim, for the paired royal madrasas in Samarqand, in one of which the sarcophagus had originally been housed.

In one instance, better use could have been made of the narrative and historical sources in providing background information, or in corroborating the information contained in the inscriptions. In inscription no. 6, the authors have read the name of Muḥammad Shibānī Khān's son as Timūr Muḥammad, but in the *waqfiyya* of his wife, Mihr Sulṭān Khānim, his name appears as Muḥammad Timūr Sulṭān⁽⁴⁾. The reading is therefore problematic, and a reexamination of the inscription does in fact yield the reading Muḥammad Timūr (see pl. II-6a, line 5), but no reference was made to the abovementioned narrative source, which is cited elsewhere.

To make up for the omission of Shibanid funerary inscriptions from Bukhara, it would have been advisable to at least mention the historical references to Shibanid burials at the Naqshbandi shrine, as well as descriptions (or photos) of tombs, and readings of inscriptions made by earlier scholars or travellers. Both Ḥāfiẓ Tanish's *Sharaf-nāma-i shāhī*, which is cited in the bibliography, and Ḥasan Niṭāri Bukhārī's *Muzakkiri aḥbāb*, which is not, contain information on Shibanid burials in the city. An invaluable source that should have been consulted is Sharaf al-Din A'lam's *Tārīkh-i Rāqimī*, which contains long lists of chronograms, many of them on the dates of death of Shibanid family members. Thus, for example, it gives the exact date of death of 'Ubadullāh Khān's son, 'Abd al-'Aziz (957/1550), cites a chronogram on the date of his death, and states that he was buried at the shrine of Bahā' al-Din Naqshband in Bukhara⁽⁵⁾.

Further to the topic of primary source materials, it would have been preferable to use more recent or more accessible editions of some of the sources cited, such as

Abū Ṭāhir Khwāja's *Samariyya*, which is cited in the bibliography only in Viatkin's extremely rare 19th-century Russian translation, rather than in the more recent edition of the Persian original.

On the whole, the authors and their sponsors are to be commended on this volume, which is handsomely produced and relatively easy to use. It is hoped that will be just the first in a series of comprehensive publications on the epigraphy of medieval Central Asia.

There is, regrettably, a final note of criticism that must be voiced. It is somewhat surprising that the form «Shaibanid» was adopted by the authors of the volume for the name of the dynasty, rather than the more correct form, «Shibanid», which has become current in recent Western scholarship on Central Asia⁽⁶⁾. Moreover, the brief explanation given for this choice is disappointing, and one would have expected a more thorough treatment of such an important element of the dynasty's epigraphic record. According to the authors, the name of the dynasty's founder, Muḥammad Shibānī, was intentionally Arabized into «Shaibānī» by the contemporary sources⁽⁷⁾. No further explanation is given for this assertion, but it clearly derives from the mistaken notion that the Shibanids (or their descendants) tried to create a fictitious connection between themselves and the ancient Arab tribe of Banū Shaibān⁽⁸⁾. There is, however, no evidence in the contemporary sources that the Shibanids ever tried to connect themselves to the Arab tribe of Shaibān. Nor did they need to do so, since they were Chingizids, direct descendants of the most charismatic of nomadic clans in the history of the steppe.

A more likely explanation for the misnomer, «Shaibanid», is that, in rendering into Arabic script the Turko-Mongolian name Shibān – from which Muḥammad

(4) See R.G. Mukminova, *Kistorii agrarnykh otnoshenii v Uzbekistane XVI v. : Po materialam 'Vakf-name'* (Tashkent, 1966), p. 109 (Per. text) and p. 228 (Russ. trans.).

(5) Sharaf al-Din A'lam, *Tārīkh-i Rāqimī*, Ms., London, Royal Asiatic Society, 163, fol. 138a. For a detailed index to this work, see Baron Victor Rosen, *Les manuscrits persans*, vol. 3 of *Collections scientifiques de l'Institut des langues orientales du Ministère des Affaires Étrangères* (St Petersburg, 1886; reprint ed. Amsterdam: C. E. J. Brill, 1971), p. 118 ff.

(6) See R.D. McChesney, «Shibānī Khān», and «Shibānids», in *El*, 2^e éd., vol. 9, p. 426 ff. and 428 ff.; also C.E. Bosworth, *The «new» Islamic Dynasties: A Chronological and Genealogical Manual* (New York: Columbia University press, 1996), p. 288. See also my article, «Art and Politics in Early 16th Century Central Asia», *Central Asiatic Journal*, vol. 27, n° 1-2 (1983), p. 121, n. 1.

(7) See p. 53 and n. 4; and p. 119 and 120, n. 1.

(8) This idea appears to have been first suggested by Pelliot (who then partially retracted it in his own notes), see Paul Pelliot, *Notes sur l'histoire de la Horde d'Or* (Paris, 1949), p. 47 and n. 3. Iu. Bregel' pointed out, although without elaborating, that «Muslim tradition» had transformed the name into Shaibān, see V.V. Bartol'd, *Sochineniia*, vol. 2, pt. 2, ed. Iu. È. Bregel' (Moscow, 1964), p. 545, n. 1. See also most recently Bosworth, *The «New» Islamic Dynasties*, p. 288; and 'Alā al-Din 'Ata-Malik Juvaini, *Genghis Khan: The History of the World Conqueror*, trans. J. A. Boyle, ed. David O. Morgan (Manchester: Manchester University Press and UNESCO Publishing, 1997), p. 184, n. 15.

Shibāni Khān's name and that of his dynasty derived ⁽⁹⁾ – the authors of the contemporary Chaghatay and Persian sources indicated the initial vowel “i”, which was read short in Turkish, by means of the letter *yā’*, as was customary in Chaghatay Turkish orthography ⁽¹⁰⁾, but which in Persian (and Arabic) could be interpreted as indicating either the long vowel “i” or the diphthong “ai/ay” ⁽¹¹⁾. Since the contemporary Persian and Chaghatay sources provide absolutely no evidence that the name was ever pronounced Shaibāni, the transformation in Persian pronunciation from

Shibāni to Shaibāni must have occurred quite late, as Paul Pelliot had once surmised ⁽¹²⁾. In my view, it took place extremely late – in the 19th century in fact, at the hands of Orientalists who unwittingly interpreted it on the analogy with the well-known Arabic name which it resembled, but with which it had nothing in common ⁽¹³⁾. It is disappointing that the authors of the present volume did not use the opportunity of the publication of the epigraphic evidence of the Shibānid dynasty to set the record straight, or at least to explain it to this reviewer's satisfaction.

Maria Eva Subtelny

Department of Near Middle Eastern Civilizations
University of Toronto

(9) Shibān was the fifth son of Chingiz Khān's son, Jöchi, and Muḥammad Shibāni Khān's direct ancestor. As was frequently the case with Turko-Mongolian names, the form and spelling of Shibān in the Persian sources was not stable. It also appears as Sibān, Shibāqān, and Sibāqān (and also contracted to Shibāq) in Juvaini, see Juvaini, *Genghis Khan*, trans. Boyle, p. 181 and 184; also Bertold Spuler, *Die Goldene Horde: Die Mongolen in Russland 1223-1502*, 2nd ed. (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1965), p. 25, n. 70. According to Pelliot, the name actually went back to Sibān, which he hypothesized was the Turkish form of the Christian name, Stephen, see Pelliot, *Notes sur l'histoire de la Horde d'Or*, p. 46-47. Muḥammad Shibāni Khān was sometimes also referred in the contemporary Turkish sources as Shibāq Khān, a use which reflected the same alternation of Shibān(i) and Shibāq that is attested in Persian sources on the Mongols, such as Juvaini, see, for example, Zahir al-Din Muḥammad Bābur, *Bābur-nāma*, ed. Eiji Mano, 2 vols. (Tokyo: Syokado, 1995-96), vol. 2 (index), p. 214. He had been given the sobriquet (*laqab*), Shāh Bakht (« Royal Fortune »), by his father, Shāh Budāgh Sultān, see Binā'i (Bannā'i), *Shaybāni-nāma*, ed. Kazuyuki Kubo, in *A Synthetical Study on Central Asian Culture in the Turco-Islamic Period* (Kyoto, 1997), p. 7 (Per text); and Petr I. Desmaisons, ed. and trans., *Histoire des Mongols et des Tatares par Aboul-Ghāzi Béhador Khān* (St. Petersburg, 1871-74; reprint ed., St. Leonards-Amsterdam: Ad Orientem Ltd. and Philo Press, 1970), p. 183 (Turk. text) and p. 192 (Fr. trans.). Shāhi Beg (Commander Royal) was apparently another one of his *laqab*-s, see Mirza Haydar Dughlat, *Tarikh-i-Rashidi*, ed. and trans. W.M. Thackston, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass.), Harvard University, Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, 1996, vol. 2, p. 63.

Muḥammad Shibāni Khān was also a poet who composed several works in Chaghatay Turkish, see H.F. Hofman, *Turkish Literature: A Bio-Bibliographical Survey*, section 3, pt. 1, vol. 5 (Utrecht: Library of the University of Utrecht, 1969), p. 222 ff. His poetical pen-name (*takhalluṣ*) was Shibāni, which he chose on account of his descent from Shibān Khān, according to Abū l-Ghāzi Bahādur Khān, a 17th-century authority on Turko-Mongol history, see Desmaisons, *Histoire des Mongols*, p. 183 (Turk. text) and p. 192 (Fr. trans.); also Annemarie Schimmel, « Some Notes on the Cultural Activity of the First Uzbek Rulers », *Journal of the Pakistan Historical Society*, vol. 8, pt. 3 (1960), p. 152. The suggestion made by A. Bodrogligeti, that his pen-name was Shabān(i), meaning

« shepherd », and that previous scholarly readings of his name as Shibāni and Shibān are « misreadings », is patently misinformed, as it is clear from the narrative sources that he explicitly connected his pen-name, and that of his dynasty, with his Chingizid ancestor. See A.J.E. Bodrogligeti, « Muḥammad Shaybāni's *Baḥr al-hudā*: An Early Sixteenth Century Didactic Qasida in Chaghatay », *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher*, vol. 54 (1982), p. 1 and n. 4.

(10) Thus, for example, in the Chaghatay Turkish *Shibāni-nāma* by Muḥammad Šālih, see Mukhammed Salikh, *Sheibani-name*, ed. P.M. Melioranskii (St. Petersburg, 1908), p. 12 (Turk. text). That the first vowel of the name Shibān was read short in Turkish is abundantly clear from Muḥammad Shibāni Khān's own Turkish poetry. In his didactic *qasida*, entitled *Baḥr al-hudā*, it scans short, see Bodrogligeti, « Muḥammad Shaybāni's *Baḥr al-hudā* », p. 21 (2v: 2), 25 (6r: 10), 27 (11r: 10), 30 (16r: 6), etc. This was also the conclusion of Annemarie Schimmel, who studied his *Divān*, see Schimmel, « Some Notes on the Cultural Activity », p. 155.

(11) Thus, the first vowel of his name is almost always scanned long in Persian poetry, because this is the way it was written in Chaghatay, see, for example, Faḫrullāh b. Rūzbihān Khunji, *Mihmān-nāma-i Bukhārā*, ed. Manūchihr Sūtūda (Tehran, 1341/1962), p. 221, 246, 281, etc. There is nothing to indicate that it was pronounced as a diphthong, however.

(12) P. Pelliot, *Notes sur l'histoire de la Horde d'Or*, p. 47, n. 3.

(13) See Th. Bianquis, « Shaybān », in *El*, 2^e ed., vol. 9, p. 392. The earliest evidence I have been able to find for the use of the form « Shaibāni » is I. Berezin's translation of Muḥammad Šālih's *Shaibāni-nāma*, see I. Berezin, *Sheibaniada: Istoriia mongolo-tiurkov* (Kazan, 1849). He was followed by Hermann Vambéry in his edition and German translation of the work, *Die Scheibaniade: Ein özbekisches Heldengedicht* (Budapest, 1885); who was followed by P. Melioranskii in his (posthumously published) edition of the same work, *Sheibani-name* (St. Petersburg, 1908); and by Annette Beveridge in her English translation of the *Bābur-nāma* (*Memoirs of Bābur*) (London, 1922; reprint ed., New Delhi: Oriental Books Reprint Corp. 1979), p. 12, n. 2 and p. 811, n. 1. It was accepted in Russian and, following it, modern Uzbek scholarly usage, and it now appears to have been universally accepted, with the exception of recent North American scholarship, as indicated in n. 6 above.