


ARTICLE

A Note on the Āl-i Burhān of Bukhara and the Author of the *Laṭāʾif al-aḏkār*

Seyed Ahmadreza Qaemmaqami 
E-mail: qaemmaqami56@yahoo.com

(Received 2 November 2023; revised 5 June 2024; accepted 18 June 2024; first published online 4 November 2024)

The Āl-i Burhān, who held the religious leadership (*ṣadāra*) of Bukhara from the end of the fifth to the middle of the seventh century A.H. (eleventh to thirteenth century CE) and were the religious and secular leaders of the city, are known to us through a number of studies by Bartold, Qazvīnī, and Pritsak.¹ However, at least two other pieces of information about this family's background are available in two recently published books that were not available to these scholars. The first book is *al-Qand fī ḏikr 'ulamā' Samarqand* (henceforth *al-Qand*) by 'Umar ibn Muḥammad al-Nasafī (461–537 A.H./1069–1142 CE), and the other is *Laṭāʾif al-aḏkār li-l-ḥuẓār wa-l-suffār fī al-manāsik wa-l-ādāb* (henceforth *Laṭāʾif*) by Muḥammad ibn 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz (511–566 A.H./1117–1170 CE), the greatest religious leader (*ṣadr*) of this family in the sixth century A.H. (twelfth century CE).² The latter, precisely because it was written by the greatest and most powerful member of the family, contains some first-hand information about the family itself and the scholars of Bukhara that appears to be unique, and the former provides the most detailed extant information about the scholars who lived in Samarqand or visited that city until the mid-sixth century A.H. (twelfth century CE). *Al-Qand* also incidentally contains some information about the first *ṣadr* of the Burhān family, which has neither been seen elsewhere nor noticed by scholars since the publication of the text in 1999.

Among the scholars who have the name 'Abd al-'Azīz in *al-Qand*, there is a certain "Abū Muḥammad 'Abd al-'Azīz ibn 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz Māza," who died in 518 A.H./1124 CE. in Bukhara, as strictly mentioned by al-Nasafī: "He died on the ninth day of *Ḍi al-qa'da* of 518."³ Although the editor of the *Laṭāʾif* is neither certain about this person's identity nor about the date of his death,⁴ he is none other than 'Abd al-'Azīz the elder, who was the first among the Āl-i Burhān to have reached the position of religious leadership (*ṣadāra*) of Bukhara. He was appointed to the office by a royal decree after he married a sister of the Seljuk ruler Sanjar (d. 552 A.H./1157 CE).⁵ According to earlier studies, 'Abd al-'Azīz's son, Ḥusām al-Dīn 'Umar, was killed in 536 A.H./1141 CE. Therefore, the only notable personage of the Āl-i Burhān who may have died in 518 A.H./1124 CE is 'Abd al-'Azīz the elder. In addition, 'Ali ibn Zayd-i Bayhaqī (490–565 A.H./1097–1170 CE), the famous author

¹ A list of important studies on the Āl-i Burhān can be found in Pritsak's article, and there is no need to repeat them here. See Pritsak, "Āl-i Burhān," 81, n. 2.

² It is important for our purpose to quote the genealogy of this *ṣadr* after previous studies: Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ḥusām al-Dīn 'Umar ibn Burhān al-Dīn 'Abd al-'Azīz ibn 'Umar. Burhān al-dīn 'Abd al-'Azīz is mentioned here as 'Abd al-'Azīz the elder.

³ al-Nasafī, *al-Qand*, 431, no. 746. This 'Abd al-'Azīz ibn 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz is not the namesake great-grandson of the founder (d. 593 A.H./1197 CE) because al-Nasafī died in 537 A.H./1142 CE.

⁴ Muḥammad ibn 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz, *Laṭāʾif al-aḏkār*, editor's introduction, 14.

⁵ Pritsak, "Āl-i Burhān," 85, with references.

of *Tārīkh-i Bayhaq*, states that his father, Zayd ibn Muḥammad-i Bayhaqī, who died in 517 A.H./1123 CE, was ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz’s classmate.⁶ This information also supports the year 518/1124 as the date of the demise of the elder ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, namely, Bukhara’s first *ṣadr*.⁷

But we consider the second piece of knowledge, that is, the information in the *Laṭā’if*, to be more important. However, the evidence in the *Laṭā’if* has been somewhat concealed by an editorial error that has rendered the text fairly obscure. In the section of the book that deals with the “cemeteries” (*mazārāt*) of Bukhara, the information about a certain Imam Abū Bakr Faḏl reads as follows:

And the other [cemetery] is the cemetery of the Gate of the Pilgrims (Darvāza-yi Hājiyān) . . . and in that cemetery are found the tombs of many dignitaries, notably, Khwāja Imam Abū Bakr-i Faḏl . . . and his noble descendants . . . Khwāja Imam Abū Bakr-i Faḏl . . . in the abundance of knowledge and perfection of piety and observance of the rules of the religion and his resoluteness in the True Religion . . . and generosity and munificence and manliness and usefulness to creatures of God . . . is more manifest than the sun, and it would be inappropriate to speak of one’s limit [sic] more than this (*va dar ḥadd-i khwēshstan sukhan bēsh az īn guftan khūb na-bāshad*).⁸

The last sentence, “and it would be inappropriate to speak of one’s limit more than this,” is meaningless. Since the forms of letters *jīm* (ج) and *hā’* (ه) are virtually identical in Arabic and Persian scripts, I believe that the word *ḥadd* (limit) in this sentence is a corruption of *jadd* (ancestor), and propose to emend the text to read *dar jadd-i khwēshstan*, “regarding one’s own ancestor,” instead of *dar ḥadd-i khwēshstan*, “regarding one’s own limit.”⁹ The text would make better sense with this small correction, because it then means “and it would be inappropriate to speak of one’s own ancestor more than this.”

Now, let us see who this “Imam Abū Bakr-i Faḏl” is, and what his relationship with the author of the *Laṭā’if* might be.¹⁰ Imam Abū Bakr Muḥammad-i Faḏl, whom ‘Awfī (himself a native of Bukhara) mentions as “Bakr-i Faḏl” in a charming anecdote in his *Jawāmi‘ al-ḥikāyāt*, was a Hanafi scholar of the third and early fourth century A.H./tenth century CE, who died in 325 A.H./937 CE.¹¹ His descendants were known as the Faḏlis. According to the *History of Mullāzāda* (written in the first half of the ninth century A.H./mid of the sixteenth century), “he enjoyed the full fortunes of the spiritual and the secular [worlds], and thanks to his efforts no followers of other religions except for the religion of Muḥammad are left in Bukhara.”¹²

⁶ Ibn-i Funduq, *Tārīkh-i Bayhaq*, 106.

⁷ See also al-Nasafī, *al-Qand*, 431, with the footnote, and the editor’s introduction (32). The genealogy at the end of Pritsak’s article has ‘Abd Allāh after the name of ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn ‘Umar (i.e., ‘Abd al-‘Azīz the elder); see Pritsak, “Āl-i Burhān,” 94, n. 58; cf. 87, n. 34. This means that ‘Abd al-‘Azīz’s grandfather was ‘Abd Allāh, but it is clear from *al-Qand* and *Tārīkh-i Bayhaq* that the true lineage of the first *ṣadr* was as follows: “‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz.” ‘Abd Allāh was likely the father of this second ‘Abd al-‘Azīz.

⁸ Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, *Laṭā’if al-aḏkār*, 94 f.

⁹ There is only one extant manuscript of this text at our disposal, whose copyist was careless in dotting, as stated by the editor (33–38).

¹⁰ Abū Bakr-i Faḏl and Bakr-i Faḏl are the same people, as is clear from page 99 of the *Laṭā’if*. He is also mentioned as “Bakr-i Faḏl” in some poems of Sūzanī, which we have quoted in footnote 22.

¹¹ About this story, see ‘Awfī, *Jawāmi‘ al-ḥikāyāt wa-lawāmi‘ al-riwāyāt*, vol. 2, 503–4; and Golchīn-e Ma‘ānī’s commentary in Mu‘īn al-Fuqarā’³’s *Tārīkh-i Mullāzāda: dar ḏīkr-i mazārāt-i Bukhārā*, 78.

¹² Mu‘īn al-Fuqarā’³, *Tārīkh-i Mullāzāda*, 28–29. About the life of the author, Aḥmad ibn Maḥmud Mullāzāda-i Bukhārī, known as Mu‘īn al-Fuqarā’³, we have no exact information. However, we know that he was active in the first half of the ninth century A.H./mid of the sixteenth century CE (see editor’s introduction, iii). A section of his books deals with the Āl-i Burhān. The significance of the book and the accuracy of its information was briefly endorsed by Barthold (*Turkestan*, 58).

It is not possible for this Abū Bakr-i Faḏl to have been the author's paternal ancestor, because the lineage of the Burhān clan, who claimed descent from the Caliph 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, is well-known.¹³ The ancestry of the Faḏl family is also clear and it reaches back to a tribe other than the one to which the Caliph 'Umar belonged.¹⁴ Therefore, Abū Bakr-i Faḏl must be the maternal ancestor of the author of the *Laṭā'if*, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ḥusām al-Dīn 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz. This may be easily ascertained from the author's own statements and from references in a number of verses in the *Dīvān* of the poet Sūzani.

At the beginning of the *Laṭā'if*, the author says that he composed the book at his mother's request, and adds that the lady must have previously learned more information than what this book contains from "those two religious grandees and leaders of Imams, the chief judge (*qāzī al-quḏāt*), Sayf al-Dīn, the imam of the two sanctuaries (*imām al-ḥaramayn*), and the great *ṣadr* and blessed martyred father."¹⁵ We already know one of these two persons: "the great *ṣadr*, and blessed martyred father" is the author's own father who was also his mother's husband, namely, Ḥusām al-Dīn 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz. He was this family's second *ṣadr*, and was killed in 536 A.H./1141 CE. during the war between Sanjar and Qara Khitai Gūrkhān. But the other imam, who was a chief judge bearing the title of Sayf al-Dīn, was probably his maternal grandfather. There are no other clues about this matter in the *Laṭā'if*. However, support for this interpretation exists in the verses of the famous poet of Samarqand, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Mas'ūd Sūzani (d. 569 A.H./1173 CE?).¹⁶ Here are some of these verses in praise of Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz:

زهى نبیره برهان و سیف، شمس حسام / حسام حجّت برهان سوال سیف جواب
از آن حسامی وارث که سیف حجّت او / به خصم حجّت بنمود و درنشد به قراب ...
بر آل برهان شاهی بر آل سیف ملک / تو را سزاست ملکشاہ اهل علم خطاب
عزیز آل دو عبدالعزیزی از دو طرف / یکی ز جانب مام و دگر ز جانب باب

Lo, the grandson of Burhān and Sayf, Shams son of Ḥusām / Who possesses proofs [that are sharp as] swords, reasonable questions [that are like those posed by his paternal grandfather] Burhān, and decisive responses [like those offered by his maternal grandfather] Sayf.¹⁷

¹³ Pritsak, quoting Mullāzāda ("Āl-i Burhān," 84), is somewhat doubtful about the genealogy. At the least he sees a problem with the number of generations between 'Abd al-'Azīz the elder and the Caliph 'Umar. We find, however, a similar claim in Ibn al-Fuwaṭī's *Majma' al-Ādāb* (apud Jafarian, Introduction to the *Laṭā'if*, 17) and Sūzani's poems (see footnote 22).

¹⁴ About the lineage of the Faḏl family, see al-Sam'ani, *al-Ansāb*, vol. 10, 229, under the title "Al-Faḏlī."

¹⁵ Muḥammad ibn 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz, *Laṭā'if al-aḏkār*, 62 ff.

¹⁶ Some of these verses were quoted by the editor of the *Laṭā'if*, mostly quoting other scholars. However, as far as I know, no one else has discovered the identity of this Sayf in Sūzani's verses. For the use of poetry in a historical perspective and the same period, see Tetley, *Ghaznavid and Seljuq Turks*, which is confined, however, to Farrukhī's and Mu'izzī's poems.

¹⁷ The text of the edition of Sūzani's *Dīvān* is corrupt. It reads in the first hemistich:

زهى نبیره برهان و سیف و شمس و حسام

Lo, the grandson of Burhān, Sayf, Shams, and Ḥusām!

But Shams is the name of the person whom Sūzani extolls, not the name of the person's grandfather. Furthermore, Ḥusām is the name of Shams's father. Therefore, the correct form is "Shams-i Ḥusām," that is, "Shams, son of Ḥusām." Burhān is the man's paternal grandfather. In another ode, Sūzani writes (Sūzani-yi Samarqandī, *Dīvān*, 36):

در دل هرکه مهر ایمان است / مهر شمس حسام برهان است

Whoever's heart is filled with the love of faith

Is also filled with the love of Shams son of Ḥusām of the house of Burhān.

The inheritor of that sword (ḥusām/Ḥusām), of which/whom the sharp reasoning / Impresses the proof upon the contender, never retreating into the sheath. . . .

You are the king (*shāh*) of the house of Burhān and the prince (*malik*) of the house of Sayf / You truly deserve to be addressed as the princely king (*malik-shāh*) of scholars.¹⁸

You are the beloved of the clans of two ‘Abd al-‘Azīzes on both sides / From your mother’s side and also the side of your sire.¹⁹

It is clear from these verses that Ḥusām al-Dīn is the father of Shams al-Dīn (the author of the *Laṭā’if*) and Burhān is his grandfather. It is also clear that both of his grandfathers were called ‘Abd al-‘Azīz. This was partially confirmed in earlier studies, especially in Qazvīnī’s annotations on ‘Awfī’s *Lubāb al-albāb* and Niẓāmī-yi ‘Arūzī’s *Chahār Maqāla*.²⁰ Therefore, the meaning of “‘Abd al-‘Azīz of the father’s side” in the last verse is clear, as is the sense of “‘Abd al-‘Azīz of the mother’s side” indicating that he is none other than “Sayf,” who was mentioned in the first verse. This last point has not been noticed by previous scholars.

In what follows, we will explain that the name of the maternal ancestor of the author of the *Laṭā’if* was Sayf al-Dīn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz. However, before doing that, we will quote a few more verses from Sūzani’s *Dīvān*, which help clarify the identity of Shams al-Dīn, the author of the *Laṭā’if*, more clearly:

شمس حسام برهان آن سیف گوهری / کو را سری ز گوهر سیف زمان رسید . . .
برهان و سیف و تاج و حسام از گذشته اند / از هر یکی به مدرسه او روان رسید

Shams son of Ḥusām, son of Burhān, he who descends from Sayf
Who inherited lordship from the sword (*sayf/Sayf*) of the age
Though, Burhān, Sayf, Tāj, and Ḥusām have passed on
[The soul of] every one of them has enlivened his *madrassa*.²¹

The poet uses the words *sayf* and *gawhar* ambiguously; *sayf* meaning “sword” as well as alluding to the name of the ancestor of the person who is eulogized. The word *gawhar* means both “house/family” and “the shimmering of a fine blade.” Ambiguities aside, the poet means to say Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ḥusām al-Dīn ‘Umar’s greatness and lordship are due to the fact that he descends from *Sayf-i zamān*, and he goes on to mention a number of the notables of his clan in the second verse. The poet has used the same strategy in another verse with greater clarity:

هست چون برهان و سیف و چون حسام الدین و تاج / بر ره نعمان ثابت راسخ و ثابت قدم

¹⁸ The poet plays with the words *shāh* and *malik*, which together were the name of the powerful Seljuq ruler, Malik-Shāh I (r. 465–485/1073–1092). One finds similar puns in the words *ḥusām* (“sword” and the name of Shams al-Dīn’s father), *tāj* (“crown” and the name of Shams al-Dīn’s uncle), *sayf* (“sword” and the name of Shams al-Dīn’s grandfather), etc. We tried to convey these double meanings for the sake of brevity simultaneously.

¹⁹ Sūzani-yi Samarqandī, *Dīvān*, 19.

²⁰ Qazvīnī, *Ta’liqāt-e Chahār Māqāla*, 59–65.

²¹ The edited text of the *Dīvān* reads:

برهان و سیف تاج و حسام از گذشته اند
Burhān and Sayf-i Tāj and Ḥusām are from the past.

But the preposition *az* (از) is simply an error for *ar* (ار) meaning “if.” Moreover, as we already know from Qazvīnī’s studies, Tāj is Shams al-Dīn’s uncle and must be coordinated with Sayf; the *izāfa* between Sayf and Tāj is therefore an editorial error in the printed version of the text. Sūzani-yi Samarqandī, *Dīvān*, 68.

کیست اندر ملک شرع از نسبت برهان جز او / شمس‌نام و اب‌حسام و سیف جدّ و تاج عم؟ ...
ای سرِ بُرهانیان و فضلیان از فضل حق / گشت بُرهان تو پیدا در عرب و اندر عجم

Like Burhān, Sayf, and also Ḥusām al-Dīn and Tāj / He steadily and steadfastly follows the path of Abū Ḥanīfa (= Nu‘mān son of Thābit)

Who else is there from the house of Burhān in the realm of religion but him / Who has Ḥusām/sword for father, Sayf/sword for grandfather, and Tāj/crown for uncle?

O’ Lord of both Burhanid and Faʿzlid clans by the grace of God! / The proof [of your nobility?] is apparent to Arabs and to non-Arabs.²²

Sūzani has composed these verses in praise of Shams-al-Dīn Muḥammad, and in them he says that the name of Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad’s grandfather is Sayf. But since there is no person named Sayf in Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad’s paternal line, it is certain that Sayf was the name of his maternal grandfather, namely, the same “qāzī al-quzāt, Sayf al-Dīn,” who, according to Shams al-Dīn at the beginning of the *Laṭāʾif*, was also his mother’s mentor. Furthermore, it turns out that Shams al-Dīn’s maternal family belonged to the house of Faʿz (Faʿziyān, ‘Āl-i Faʿzī’), just as his father’s family was from the house of Burhān (Burhāniyān, ‘Āl-i Burhān’). In other words, Shams al-Dīn descended from the Sayf family on his mother’s side, and because Sayf was his grandfather and Faʿz his great-grandfather, Sūzani calls him “the lord of Faʿziyān.”

Let us summarize our arguments: from a comparison of what Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad writes at the beginning of his *Laṭāʾif* and a number of Sūzani’s poems in praise of him, we can deduce that the chief judge, Sayf al-Dīn, was the maternal grandfather of Shams al-Dīn and was also descendant from the Faʿz family. Two individuals who belonged to the Faʿz family were more famous than the rest. These were a father and his son.²³ The father’s name and honorifics were: “Al-Shaykh al-Islām Abū ‘Amr ‘Uthmān ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn al-Shaykh al-Imām al-Ajall Abī Bakr Muḥammad ibn al-Faʿzī,” and his title was “Al-Faʿzī al-Bukhārī” (Ramadan 426–508, or after 508 A.H./1035–1115, or after 1115 CE). He was the author of *Al-Fatāwā al-Faʿzī*.²⁴ His son’s name and honorifics are: “Al-Qāzī al-imām Sayf al-Dīn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn ‘Uthmān ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Al-Shaykh al-Imām Abī Bakr Muḥammad ibn al-Faʿzī.” His title was also “Al-Faʿzī al-Bukhārī” and he was also known as “Qāzī Sayf” and “Qāzī-yi Bukhārī.” He died in Rabī‘ al-awwal of 533 A.H./1138 CE, three years before the death of Ḥusām al-Dīn ‘Umar, the father of Shams al-Dīn. This evidence shows why the author of the *Laṭāʾif* refers to Abū Bakr

²² Sūzani-yi Samarqandī, *Dīvān*, 188–89. Note also the following verses in praise of Shams al-Dīn, whose son was also named ‘Abd al-‘Azīz after his grandfather. These verses are from a newly discovered corpus of Sūzani’s verses, which is being prepared for publication by F. Qūchī, one of my students at the University of Tehran (Qūchī, *Ḍaylī bar Dīvān-i Ḥakīm Sūzani-yi Samarqandī*). I am grateful to her for making them available to me.

وارث صاحب شریعت صاحب درس و سبق / خسرو بُرهانیان صاحب قران روزگار
یادگار سیف دین از بکر فضل / چون ز فاروق نقی بُرهان ز بُرهان یادگار
از نژاد سیف دین میان دین شرع / نیست در عالم به از وی یادگاری یاد دار ...
ای عزیز مصر دین از نسل دو عبدالعزیز / از تو یک عبدالعزیز است اصل عز و افتخار

The devout inheritor, endowed with learning and lineage / The prince of the Burhānids, the most fortunate of this era

Sayf al-Dīn’s memorial from Bakr son of Faʿz / And Burhān’s memorial from the pure Fārūq (= ‘Umar)

Descended from Sayf al-Dīn, there is no proof in the canon / such as him in the world, remember this! . . .

O’ Ruler of the country of religion, descended from two ‘Abd al-‘Azīzes / One ‘Abd al-‘Azīz has been born from you, who is the root of dignity and glory.

²³ See al-Sam‘ānī, *al-Ansāb*, vol. 10, 229–230; and al-Nasafī, *al-Qand*, 432, 496, no. 747, 864.

²⁴ Cf. Mu‘in al-Fuqarāʾ, *Tārīkh-i Mullāzāda*, 29.

Muḥammad ibn Faḍl, the head of the Hanafi family of Āl-i Faẓl, as his ancestor. It also shows that the “*qāẓi al-quẓāt, Sayf al-Dīn*”, who has been mentioned at the beginning of the *Laṭāʾif*, is none other than “Qāẓi Sayf al-Dīn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz Faẓlī-yi Bukhārī,” to whom Sūzanī refers as Sayf and sometimes as ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, saying that he is Shams al-Dīn’s ancestor. Therefore, Shams al-Dīn’s maternal family could be justifiably called both “Āl-i Sayf” and “Āl-i Faẓl” (or Faẓliyān), which is what Sūzanī has done. Therefore, the author of the *Laṭāʾif*, who was the greatest and most powerful *ṣadr* of the Burhān family, was born from the union of two famous Hanafi families of Bukhara, namely the Burhān family and the Faẓl family. I would argue that his power and influence, surpassing those of his predecessors and successors, were, at least partially, the result of this union. This perspective may provide a new starting point for further study on his family. We hope this modest contribution aids scholars of Central Asian history in contextualizing these new findings within the historical framework of the Āl-i Burhān and the broader history of Bukhara.

Acknowledgments. I thank Dr. Mahmoud Omidasalar for his editorial help in preparing this paper for publication.

Bibliography

- ‘Awfī, Sadīd al-Dīn Muḥammad. *Jawāmi‘ al-ḥikāyāt wa-lawāmi‘ al-riwāyāt*. Vol. 2. Edited by M. Moṣaffā and A. Karīmī. Tehran: Institute for Humanities and Cultural Studies, 1386/2007.
- Barthold, Wilhelm. *Turkestan Down to the Mongol Invasion*. 2nd ed. London: 1928.
- Ibn-i Funduq, ‘Alī b. Zayd. *Tārīkh-i Bayhaq*. Edited by A. Bahmanyār. Tehran: Furūḡī, 1317/1938.
- Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz. *Laṭāʾif al-aḍkār li-l-ḥuẓẓār wa-l-suffār fī al-manāsik wa-l-ādāb*. Edited by R. Jafarian. Tehran: ‘Elm, 1392/2013.
- Mu‘īn al-Fuqarāʾ, Aḥmad ibn Maḥmūd. *Tārīkh-i Mullāzāda: dar ḍikr-i mazārat-i Bukhārā*. Edited by A. Golchīn-e Ma‘āni. Markaz-e Moṭāle‘āt-e Īrāni, 1370/1991.
- al-Nasafī, Najm al-Dīn ‘Umar. *Al-Qand fī ḍikr ‘ulamā’ Samarqand*. Edited by Yūsuf al-Hādī. Tehran: Mīrās-e Maktūb, 1378/1999.
- Pritsak, Omeljan. “Āl-i Burhān.” *Der Islam* 30, no. 1 (1952): 81–96.
- Qazvīnī, Moḥammad. *Ta’līqāt-e Chahār Māqāla*. Edited by M. Mo‘īn. Tehran: Zavvār, 1333/1954.
- Qūchī, Fā’ēze, ed. *Daylī bar Dīvān-i Ḥakīm Sūzanī-yi Samarqandī*, Tehran: Bonyād-e Mowqūfāte Afshār, forthcoming.
- al-Sam‘ānī, Abū Sa‘d ‘Abd al-Karīm. *Al-Ansāb*. 13 vols. Edited by ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Yahyā al-Yamānī et al. Hyderabad, India: Dā’irat al-Ma‘ārif al-‘Uthmāniya, 1977.
- Sūzanī-yi Samarqandī. *Dīvān*. Edited by N. Shāh-ḥosaynī. Tehran: Amīr-Kabīr, 1344/1965.
- Tetley, Gillies. *The Ghaznavid and Seljuq Turks. Poetry as a Source for Iranian History*. London: Routledge, 2009.

Seyed Ahmadrza Qaemmaqami is an assistant professor in the department of Ancient Iranian Languages and Culture at the University of Tehran, where he works on Middle West Iranian and classical Persian.