

CODICOLOGY IN THE SERVICE  
OF CHRONOLOGY:  
The case of some Safavid manuscripts

Marianna S. SIMPSON

This paper concerns four poetic manuscripts illustrated in Iran in the second half of the 16th century and containing a series of dated colophons arranged in non-sequential order. These jumps in chronological sequence may be explained by the codicological structure of each manuscript. For two of the codices (Freer Gallery of Art, 46.12 and Bibliothèque Nationale, suppl. pers. 1956) the explanation lies in the construction of the folios and bifolios; for the other pair (Bibliothèque Nationale, suppl. pers. 547 and Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi, H. 1483) in the collation of the gatherings. In all four cases it is clear that the transcription of the text and the compilation of the codex were totally independent operations.

Cet article concerne quatre manuscrits poétiques illustrés en Iran au cours de la seconde moitié du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle et contenant une série de colophons datés disposés de manière non séquentielle. Ces solutions de continuité peuvent être expliquées par la structure codicologique de chaque manuscrit. Pour deux d'entre eux (Freer Gallery of Art, 46.12 et Bibliothèque Nationale, S.P. 1956), l'explication se situe au niveau de la construction des feuillets et des diplômes, pour les deux autres (Bibliothèque Nationale, SP 547 et Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi, H. 1483) au niveau de la collation des cahiers. Dans les quatre cas, il est clair que la copie du texte et la constitution du manuscrit furent deux opérations totalement indépendantes.

This paper is based on an unabashedly technical examination of four Iranian illustrated manuscripts of the second half of the sixteenth century. Each comprises a collection of poetic works, and each contains a series of dated colophons arranged in non-sequential order. It was the need to reconcile the chronological disparities of the colophons that prompted an investigation into the material structure of each codex. The immediate aim here, as suggested by the title, is to demonstrate how codicology can explicate chronology. As it turns out, to reach this point is to pass beyond the world of physical form into the far more complicated - and compelling - realm of artistic process where things are not always as they traditionally have seemed to be.

This foray into the archaeology and history of book production begins with the celebrated copy of the *Haft Aurang* of Jami made for the Safavid prince Sultan Ibrahim Mirza (Freer Gallery of Art, 46.12). Although recently considered, certain salient facts about the Freer Jami may bear repetition here, since they highlight circumstances which previously seemed peculiar to the production of this one codex and now appear to have been much more common at the time that Sultan Ibrahim Mirza commissioned his masterpiece<sup>1</sup>.

Each of the main divisions in this copy of Jami's text ends with a dated colophon<sup>2</sup>. As a group these scribal notes provide a wealth of information about the transcription of Jami's seven *masnavis*, which was undertaken by five calligraphers working in three cities over nine years. The order of hijra years is as follows: 963, 964, 966, 964, 963, 968, 963, 972. The overall time

period covered by these years, 963-972 corresponding to 1556-1565, is that usually cited in the scholarly literature for the date of the manuscript, although, of course, the individual, dated colophons document only those moments when the scribes completed their portions of the text. To say the manuscript is dated 1556-1565 is also to ignore the jumps in chronology between various sequential sections of the text. To give but two examples, the volume's third colophon at the end of the *Silsilat al-Dhabab* was written by Malik al-Dailami working in Qazvin in Ramadan 966/June-July 1559 (Pl. XVIII B), while the fourth colophon, marking the end of *Yusuf u Zulaikha*, was completed by Muhibb 'Ali in Mashhad on the 12th of Rajab 964/11 May 1557. Between the fourth and fifth poems in the manuscript, there is an even greater difference in dates, with *Salaman u Absal* (the fourth poem) completed by 'Aishi ibn 'Ishrati in 968/1560-1561 and *Tuhfat al-Abrar* completed by Rustam 'Ali at the beginning of Shawwal 963/8 August 1556-that is, five to six years earlier than the preceding poem in the manuscript.

The explanation for these chronological disjunctions may be found in the layout of the codex and the structure of its component parts. In its original state the Freer Jami probably consisted of something like 308 or 310 folios<sup>3</sup>. These were gathered into forty quires, with all but the first and last gatherings composed of eight leaves, or four bifolios, a typical arrangement for medieval Iranian manuscripts. The bifolios reveal a less standard, although by no means unique, construction. Rather than resulting from the successive folding and trimming of a

I am grateful to Dr. Rita Öffer for assistance in the preparation of this paper.

1. M. S. Simpson, "The Production and Patronage of the *Haft Aurang* by Jami in the Freer Gallery of Art", *Ars Orientalis* 13 (1982): 93-119.

2. The Freer Jami contains a total of eight colophons. The first poem - the *Silsilat al-Dhabab* - has three colophons, one at the end of each of its three *daftars*. There probably would have been a ninth colophon at the end of the last poem - the *Khirdnama-i Iskandari* - on the now-missing final folio of the manuscript.

3. In addition to its final folio, which presumably included a colophon, the manuscript now lacks an illustrated bifolio from the *Laila u Majnun* poem. The volume also may have had a frontispiece or dedicatory rosette similar to those found at the beginning of other deluxe Safavid manuscripts such as the *Shahnama* made for Shah Tahmasp. S. C. Welch, *A King's Book of Kings: The Shah-Nameh of Shah Tahmasp* (New York, 1972), p. 78.

large sheet of paper into pairs of naturally conjoined leaves, each bifolio in this manuscript is composed of two leaves which overlap at the gutter, forming what might be called artificial bifolios. The individual leaves are also made up of a montage of several separate parts. All the text folios, for instance, consist of two kinds of paper: a piece of thin, single-ply ivory paper in the center and a piece of thicker double-ply colored paper for the margins<sup>4</sup>. Many different operations took place before these two separate sets were joined into folios and before the folios were joined into bifolios<sup>5</sup>. It is not necessary, however, to go through the various stages in the transformation of the folios to understand how it was possible for the dates in the bound codex to appear in non-sequential order. It is clear that the scribes were provided not with gatherings of leaves or even sheets folded in half, but with stacks (or reams) of small, single pieces of paper. The illuminators received the same, although their stacks would have consisted of text sheets joined to colored borders, that is, full-size folios. The artists also painted on full-size folios, except that their sheets were laminates with separately-constructed rectos and versos. It is entirely possible that the manuscript remained in this proto-codex state until every bit of work was accomplished, at which point the beautifully calligraphed and decorated folios were joined into bifolios and these in turn gathered into quires and stitched together as an actual codex.

It was at that moment, and that moment only, that some decision had to be made, presumably by the head of Sultan Ibrahim Mirza's *kitabkhana* for which the manuscript had been commissioned, about the order in which Jami's seven poems were going to be arranged. How that decision was reached remains unclear; certainly the resulting arrangement does not correspond to the order in which the poet is said to have composed his *masnavis*<sup>6</sup>. On the other hand, a preliminary examination of other sixteenth-century copies of the *Haft Aurang* suggests the lack of any fixed or canonical sequence of Jami's *masnavis*, a situation which seems to be true for other Iranian poetic texts. In any case, even if the poems in the Freer Jami had been arranged in Jami's designated order, their chronological order would still have been non-sequential.

The point here is really very simple and quickly made. No one part of the manuscript physically depend-

ed on any other. So the scribes, and perhaps also the artists, could work wherever and whenever they wanted. Similarly, Jami's seven *masnavis* could be arranged in any order whatsoever, regardless of their individual completion dates, when the separate folios were conjoined, the bifolios compiled into gatherings, and the gatherings collated in the final stage of production. It may be an accident that the order of dates ended up the way it did. But this fluke was the result of a highly sophisticated method of book production - apparently a kind of peripatetic process - which allowed individual artisans a great deal of autonomy in their work and which used as its basic element a sheet of thin, ivory paper measuring slightly over 22 × 13 centimeters.

The same materials, same codicological structure and same working method is found in a *Khamsa* of Nizami, made for the *khazana* of a certain Qasim 'Ali Sultan Dughat Oghlu and copied by the scribe Khairallah ibn Husein Golabi Shustari (Bibliothèque Nationale, suppl.pers.1956)<sup>7</sup>. This volume has four colophons dated 26 Sha'ban 967/22 May 1560, Muharram 968/22 September-21 October 1560, 20 Jumada I 967/17 February 1560, and 22 Jumada II 968/10 March 1561. Here it is the third colophon which is out of order, so to speak, dated as it is three months before the first colophon and seven months before the second colophon.

As with the Freer Jami, and as revealed through a codicological examination, the process used to produce the manuscript is perfectly obvious and explains the mixed sequence of dates in the colophons. Here too the text is written on very thin, cream-colored paper measuring roughly 22.6 × 12.3 centimeters. These small sheets are set into borders consisting of paper which is either tinted in various colors or marbled in a variety of patterns<sup>8</sup>. The volume's sixty-seven illustrated folios are also composed in the same manner, although in many cases the distinction between the two sets of paper is masked by compositions which pass well beyond the cream-colored text paper onto the colored or marbled borders. It is clear that none of the illustrations could have been painted until the text had been copied and the folios had been formed. Throughout the manuscript it is possible to see the overlap where two folios were joined to make "artificial" bifolios. The joint is even visible between two folios whose borders have the same marbled pattern. So the production of Qasim 'Ali Sultan Dughat

Oghlu's manuscript involved the same series of steps used for Sultan Ibrahim Mirza's commission: the book began as a stack of small sheets of paper on which the text was written; these sheets were then joined to their borders and formed into full folios which then were ready for illumination and illustration, and finally joined as bifolios and grouped into quires. Again it is clear that this last step did not necessarily have to be dictated by the order in which the first step was accomplished. That is to say, the transcription of the text and the collation of the codex were two totally independent operations.

The other pair of manuscripts to be considered here present a different - and even more complex - codicological profile. Both are copies of texts by Jami: a *Khamsa* (which actually contains six rather than five of the poet's major works; Bibliothèque Nationale, suppl. pers. 547), and a *Haft Aurang* (which also contains six rather than seven works; Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi, H. 1483)<sup>9</sup>. In both cases the text and margin areas of the folios consist of a continuous surface of fine, white paper, rather than separate text and margin papers, and the bifolios were formed from folded sheets, rather than artificially-joined folios.

The Paris manuscript was copied by Muhammad ibn 'Ala al-Din Raze who records that he was working in the village of Raze in the district of Bakharz<sup>10</sup>. He has also provided four dated colophons through which it is possible to trace the progress of his work. The first, on folio 25 at the end of the *Tuhfat al-Ahrrar* poem, gives only the year of 974, corresponding to July 1566-July 1567. The next three give the month and year as follows: Muharram 973/29 July-27 August 1565, mid-Rabi' II 973/early November 1565, and mid - Jumada II 973/beginning January 1566. Thus the first dated section of the text was completed at least seven and perhaps as much as nineteen months after the last dated section - perhaps not exactly what one might expect.

The Jami volume in the Topkapı Saray was copied by Muhibb 'Ali, who was also responsible for two sec-

tions of the *Haft Aurang* in Washington<sup>11</sup>. Muhibb 'Ali documented his work on the Istanbul manuscript with eight colophons, whose dates range from Muharram 978 to Dhu'l Hijja 979/July 1570 to April 1572, or almost two full years. The latest date appears in colophon four (folio 151) and the earliest date appears right after this in colophon five (folio 170v). What is perhaps more disorienting is that colophon five comes at the end of the second *daftar* of the *Silsilat al-Dhabab* and colophon four at the end of the first *daftar* of that same poem. Here at least one might have expected a continuous sequence of dates. Be that as it may, Muhibb 'Ali apparently chose or was obliged to work in reverse.

The backwards and forwards shifts in time documented by the colophons in these two Jami manuscripts can be explained by looking at the collation of their quires (Tables 1 and 2)<sup>12</sup>. In the Paris manuscript, the first poem, the *Tuhfat al-Ahrrar*, is also the one with the latest date. More precisely, it occupies folios 1v to 25r. Folios 1 through 24 constitute the first three gatherings of the manuscript. The fourth gathering begins with folio 26 which has on its verso the unwan and opening verses of the *Subhat al-Abrar*, the next Jami poem in the manuscript. Between folio 24, the end of gathering three, and folio 26, the beginning of gathering four, comes folio 25 which appears to be tipped in. Its recto contains the colophon with the late date of 974 and its verso is blank. The facing recto of the next leaf, folio 26, is also blank.

The following scenario may account for what happened here. The scribe, Muhammad ibn 'Ala al-Din Raze, had at hand a whole group of quires when he started the task of transcribing the Jami text. He began with the *Subhat al-Abrar*, on the verso of a folio, and continued through the *Yusuf u Zulaikha*, the *Laila u Majnun* and the *Khiradnama-i Iskandari*. As he did not date the last poem, we can not calculate the total number of months spent in this phase of the work. But because of the way these poems overlap in the quires, with, for in-

9. Actually the number of poems in a *Khamsa* or *Haft Aurang* is not fixed. See *Encyclopedia of Islam* 2, s.v. "Khamsa" by J.T.P. de Bruijn.

10. Blochet, *Le catalogue des manuscrits Persans*, cat. no. 1679 (with additional references); B. Robinson, *Descriptive Catalogue of the Persian Paintings in the Bodleian Library*. (Oxford, 1958), p. 151; N. M. Titley, *Persian Miniature Painting* (London, 1983), p. 109. There is a village called Raze in the *dehestan* of Tabas (Khorasan) in the *bakhsh* Dar Mian, *sharestan* Birjand. See Setad Joghrafiya-ye Artesh, *Farhange Joghrafiya-ye Iran* (Tehran, 1949-1954), vol. 9, s.v. راز. Despite the fact that this source locates Raze in the district of Dar Mian instead of Bakharz, as specified in B. N. suppl. pers. 547, the village may be one and the same, especially since *The Times Atlas* shows Tabas as adjacent to the region of Bakharz (boundaries unmarked). There are, however, other alternatives. According to the *Historical Gazetteer of Iran 2: Meshed and Northeastern Iran* (Graz, 1981), the *bakhsh* of Bakharz in Turbat-i Jam *sharestan* (northeastern Khorasan) is divided into three *dehestans* of which the Mian Vilayat *dehestan* contains a village called Riza and another called Meshed-i Riza. It has been suggested that the name of the village given in the Paris manuscript could be read as Zari; I have been able to find no reference to a village by this name in any atlas, map or gazetteer.

11. F. E. Karatay, *Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi. Farsça Yazmalar Kataloğu*, (Istanbul, 1961), cat. no. 360; F. Çağman and Z. Tanındı, *Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi. Islamic Miniature Painting* (Istanbul, 1979). For Muhibb 'Ali's contributions to the Freer Jami, see Simpson, appendix A.

12. The tables may be supplemented by the following formulae of quires, prepared according to the method described in J. J. Witkam, *A General Introduction to the Catalogue of Arabic Manuscripts in the University of Leiden and Other Collections in the Netherlands* (Leiden, 1982), p. 14.

Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi, H. 1483: I(1), 4 IV (33), II (37), 2 IV (53), III (59), 5 IV (99), 2 III (111), I (113), III (119), IV (127), III (133), I (135), III (141), I (142), 5 IV (182), I (184), 5 IV (224), III (229 + 1).

Bibliothèque Nationale, suppl. pers. 547: 3 IV (24), I (25), 18 IV (169), III (175), 2 IV (191), II (194 + 1).

4. The folios with miniatures are laminates with the illustrated sides consisting of full sheets of cream-colored paper (that is, the painted surface and the marginal surface are the same), and the unillustrated sides made up of the standard thin ivory paper in the center joined to a separate border.

5. Simpson, 94-96.

6. The poet's presumed order is followed in the critical edition used here: M. Gilani, ed., *Masnavi-i Haft Aurang* (Tehran, 1337/1958).

7. E. Blochet, *Le catalogue des manuscrits Persans...* III (Paris, 1928), cat. no. 1252 (with additional references); I. Stchoukine, *Les peintures des manuscrits Safavis de 1502 à 1587* (Paris, 1959), no. 127; R. Patris, *La Guirlande de l'Iran* (Paris, 1948), pp. 34, 35, 38, 51, 56, 60-61, 65.

8. The tinted borders are always the same color on the recto and verso and include tones of blue, green, salmon, and purple as well as beige and cream. The patterns on the marbled borders are in shades of grey, blue, and pink and appear on only one side of the border; the other side is cream-colored.

stance, the *Yusuf u Zulaikha* and the *Laila u Majnun* ending and beginning respectively on the recto and verso of the same folio (117) in the middle of a quire, it seems safe to assume that Muhammad ibn 'Ala al-Din Raze copied them in sequence. Indeed, this is exactly what the dated colophons at the end of the *Subhat al-Abrar*, the *Yusuf u Zulaikha* and the *Laila u Majnun* document. At this point, the scribe seems to have taken a break, perhaps for only a few months, perhaps for as long as a year. Perhaps he even turned over the completed poems for illumination and illustration. When he began again, it was with the *Tuhfat al-Ahrar* and with a new gathering of folios. Confirmation that this was conceived as the first section of the codex is given by the beautifully illuminated *sarlah* on folios 1v-2 containing the opening lines of the poem. Confirmation that it was conceived in a separate phase of work is given by the additional folio, number 25, that falls between the third and fourth gatherings. Had Muhammad ibn 'Ala al-Din Raze begun in 973 with the *Tuhfat al-Ahrar*, then presumably he could have ended that poem and begun the next one on the recto and verso of the same folio, as he did elsewhere in his transcription, and not need to leave a set of blank facing pages (25v-26r) in between<sup>13</sup>.

If the arrangement of colophons in the Paris manuscript makes Muhammad al-Din's approach appear additive, that in the Istanbul volume makes Muhibb 'Ali's seem circular. According to his own account as given in the colophons, the scribe began with the second *daftar* of the *Silsilat al-Dhahab* and ended it on the last day of Muharram 978/beginning of July 1570. The third *daftar* is dated only with the year 978, but it probably came next since it begins on the page facing the end of second *daftar* and these two facing folios form the middle bifolio of a gathering. The *Salaman u Absal* poem occupies two separate gatherings and therefore could have been transcribed at any moment. Yet the colophon is dated the last day of Jumada II 978/the end of November 1570, six months after the second part of the *Silsilat al-Dhahab*, so it obviously followed the latter in the sequence of transcription. The *Khiradnama-i Iskandari* which follows is also a codicologically self-contained entity, and with the year of 978 given in the colophon, we can only suppose that Muhibb 'Ali did it after the *Salaman u Absal*. The next secure point is the *Subhat al-Abrar*, completed on Thursday, 28 Shawwal 978/25 March 1571. This is the first poem in the manuscript, occupying gatherings 1 through 5. The double illustrated frontispiece on folios 1v-2 which precedes the text on 2v suggests that the *Subhat al-Abrar* was always intended to be the first poem. The *Tuhfat al-Ahrar*, another section with only the date 978, follows, beginning on the first folio of the sixth gat-

hering. It ends on folio 59v, the sixth folio of a quire. As the *Laila u Majnun* begins on the next folio (which means these two sequential poems share a quire), it seems that the Muhibb 'Ali copied the *Tuhfat al-Ahrar* before the *Laila u Majnun* which he completed at the beginning of Rabi I 979/end July 1571. Then, at last, he returned to the *Silsilat al-Dhahab* which he started copying on the verso of the folio on which he ended the *Laila u Majnun*, and finished at the beginning of Dhu'l-Hijja 979/mid-April 1572, adding his final colophon on the recto of the folio where he had begun the entire project approximately two years previously.

The use, and then, re-use of this critical folio (number 151, about two-thirds the way through the manuscript) means that Muhibb 'Ali probably kept the full set of gatherings throughout the two years or more that he worked on the manuscript. In theory, he no longer needed the three parts of the text whose quires do not overlap those of preceding and succeeding poems. Yet two of these independent sections (*Subhat al-Abrar* and *Salaman u Absal*) bear dates in the overall sequence of transcription that would suggest they were set aside as completed. (This, however, is by no means certain.) In any event, it is obvious once again that the order of collation was not - and did not have to be - the same as the order of transcription.

Thus archaeological investigation leads inevitably to art historical interpretation. Besides clarifying apparent chronological discrepancies or anomalies, the codicology of these four manuscripts reveals much about the materials and methods of manuscript production in sixteenth-century Iran, or at least, about certain phases of the operation. This enterprise long has been associated with the institution of the *kitabkhana*, a combination of library-cum-studio attached to an imperial or princely court. Current scholarship regards the *kitabkhana* less as a fixed establishment, and more as a series of functions ranging from the equivalent of mail-order house to artistic academy to printing shop<sup>14</sup>. Scribes and other artists working for a *kitabkhana* such as that owned by Sultan Ibrahim Mirza did not necessarily have to be in residence while they carried out their assignments. Furthermore, they seemed to have been bound by no hard and fast rules governing their work schedules or procedures. At the very least, work does not always seem to have been accomplished in what might be considered (at least today) a predictable or logical fashion. Otherwise, how can we explain why Muhibb 'Ali would start copying a Jami text with the second *daftar* of the *Silsilat al-Dhahab* and end two years later with the first *daftar* of the same *masnavi*, or why a deluxe manuscript like the *Kham-*

*sa* ordered by Qasim 'Ali Sultan, would be bound with the individual sections out of chronological order.

The case of that particular book is telling because it demonstrates that even an unknown, albeit wealthy, patron could marshal the talents of several artists in the service of his *khazana*<sup>15</sup>. In such an instance, perhaps ever more than with a royal *kitabkhana* at a major metropolitan center where the number of projects underway simultaneously might have justified retaining a whole stable of artisans and artists, a flexible bookmaking process would have offered considerable advantages to a patron in a provincial center. Since the entire struc-

ture of Qasim 'Ali Sultan's *Khamsa* was composed of folios, bifolios and quires fabricated and embellished as separate elements, the work could be done piecemeal, with perhaps wages being paid for piecemeal. And when all the separate tasks were completed, perhaps all that was required was to send the gatherings to a commercial bindery for collation. And it may have been there that the manuscript was bound in the chronological disorder we find it today. Be that as it may, a codicological examination leads us to understand how such a chronology was achieved, even if we can still only speculate as to why the process operated the way it did.

13. This assumption is problematic, however, since folios 165v-166 are also blank and fall in the middle of a quire between two chronologically-segregated poems. In other words, a pair of facing blank folios does not automatically signal a break in quires or in dates.

14. G. Lowry and M. Brandt, *Akbar's India: Art from the Mughal City of Victory* (New York, 1985); also Simpson, 98-99.

15. *Khazana* is the term used in the final colophon and here seems to signify *kitabkhana*.

lv-beg. <u>Tuhfat al-Ahrar</u>	58	114	170
2	59	115	171
3	60	116	172
4	61	117r-end <u>Yusuf u Zulaikha</u>	173
5	62	v-beg. <u>Laila u Majnun</u>	174
6	63		175
7	64		176
8	65r-end <u>Subhat al-Abrar</u>		177
9	v-beg. <u>Yusuf u Zulaikha</u>		178
10	66		179
11	67		180
12	68		181
13	69		182
14	70		183
15	71		184
16	72		185
17	73		186
18	74		187
19	75		188
20	76		189
21	77		190
22	78		191
23	79		192
24	80		193 <u>Khiradnama-i</u>
25r-end <u>Tuhfat al-Ahrar</u>	81		194r-end <u>Iskandari</u>
v-blank	82		v-blank
26r-blank	83		fly leaf-blank
v-beg. <u>Subhat al-Abrar</u>	84		
27	85		
28	86		
29	87		
30	88		
31	89		
32	90		
33	91		
34	92		
35	93		
36	94		
37	95		
38	96		
39	97		
40	98		
41	99		
42	100		
43	101		
44	102		
45	103		
46	104		
47	105		
48	106		
49	107		
50	108		
51	109		
52	110		
53	111		
54	112		
55	113		
		165r-end <u>Laila u Majnun</u>	
		v-blank	
		166r-blank	
		v-beg. <u>Khiradnama-i Iskandari</u>	
		167	
		168	
		169	

1	114	175
2-beg. <u>Subhat al-Abrar</u>	115	176
3	116	177
4	117	178
5	118	179
6	119	180
7	120	181
8	121	182
9	122	183 <u>Silsilat al-Dhahab</u>
10	123	184r-end III
11	124	v-blank
12	125	185-beg. <u>Salaman u Absal</u>
13	126	186
14	127	187
15	128	188
16	129	189
17	130	190
18	131	191
19	132	192
20	133	193
21	134	194
22	135	195
23	136	196
24	137	197
25	138	198
26	139	199
27	140	200r-end <u>Salaman u Absal</u>
28	141	v-blank
29	142	201r-blank
30	143	v-beg. <u>Khiradnama-i Iskandari</u>
31	144	202
32	145	203
33	146	204
34	147	205
35	148	206
36	149	207
37v-end <u>Subhat al-Abrar</u>	93	208
38r-blank	94	209
v-beg. <u>Tuhfat al-Ahrar</u>	95	210
39	96	211
40	97	212
41	98	213
42	99	214
43	100	215
44	101	216
45	102	217
46	103	218
47	104	219
48	105r-end <u>Laila u Majnun</u>	220
49	v-beg. <u>Silsilat al-Dhahab I</u>	221
50	106	222
51	107	223
52	108	224
53	109	225
54	110	226
55	111	227
56	112	228 <u>Khiradnama-i</u>
57	113	229r-end <u>Iskandari</u>
58		v-blank
59v-end <u>Tuhfat al-Ahrar</u>		---fly leaf (hypothesized)
	60r-blank	
	v-beg. <u>Laila u Majnun</u>	
	61	
	62	
	63	
	64	
	65	
	66	
	67	
	68	
	69	
	70	
	71	
	72	
	73	
	74	
	75	
	76	
	77	
	78	
	79	
	80	
	81	
	82	
	83	
	84	
	85	
	86	
	87	
	88	
	89	
	90	
	91	
	92	
	93	
	94	
	95	
	96	
	97	
	98	
	99	
	100	
	101	
	102	
	103	
	104	
	105r-end <u>Laila u Majnun</u>	
	v-beg. <u>Silsilat al-Dhahab I</u>	
	106	
	107	
	108	
	109	
	110	
	111	
	112	
	113	
	114	
	115	
	116	
	117	
	118	
	119	
	120	
	121	
	122	
	123	
	124	
	125	
	126	
	127	
	128	
	129	
	130	
	131	
	132	
	133	
	134	
	135	
	136	
	137	
	138	
	139	
	140	
	141	
	142	
	143	
	144	
	145	
	146	
	147	
	148	
	149	
	150	
	151r-end <u>Silsilat al-Dhahab I</u>	
	v-beg. <u>Silsilat al-Dhahab II</u>	
	152	
	153	
	154	
	155	
	156	
	157	
	158	
	159	
	160	
	161	
	162	
	163	
	164	
	165	
	166	
	167	
	168	
	169	
	170v-end <u>Silsilat al-Dhahab II</u>	
	171-beg. <u>Silsilat al-Dhahab III</u>	
	172	
	173	
	174	