

The Development and Educational Significance of Tazkira Traditions in Timurid Transoxiana and Khorasan

Makhbuba Sattorovna Shamsiyeva

Bukhara International University

Received: 2026-10-10 | Accepted: 2026-10-11

Abstract

This article examines the development of tazkira writing in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Transoxiana and Khorasan and considers its relevance to contemporary education. It presents a critical comparative review of Dawlatshah Samarqandi's *Tazkirat al-Shu'ara* and Alisher Navoi's *Majolis un-Nafois*, drawing on published texts, textual scholarship, and historical studies. The comparison addresses language, organization, biographical selection, literary judgment, and representations of learning and conduct. Dawlatshah's work preserves a historically ordered account of Persian literary achievement, whereas Navoi's eight assemblies place greater emphasis on the author's literary community and distinguish different relationships between the compiler and the people described. Both works preserve cultural memory through selective biography and poetic examples, but their judgments require contextual interpretation rather than acceptance as neutral records. Their educational value lies in opportunities to investigate intellectual relationships, evaluate evidence, and discuss the interaction of literary skill and ethical reputation. The article proposes classroom activities combining biographical comparison, source criticism, and reflective writing for literature, history, and teacher education courses. These activities are recommendations derived from the review; their effects on student learning have not been tested. The study concludes that Timurid tazkiras can support the study of Central Asian educational heritage when historical context, textual variation, and the limits of biographical evidence remain explicit.

Keywords: tazkira; Timurid cultural history; Alisher Navoi; Dawlatshah Samarqandi; history of education; historical thinking

Introduction

Tazkiras bring together accounts of individual lives, judgments about literary achievement, and examples of poetry. They therefore offer evidence about the social settings in which knowledge and literary reputation were produced. In Transoxiana and Khorasan, the cultural developments of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries provided the setting for important late Timurid examples of the genre. This article focuses on Dawlatshah Samarqandi's Persian *Tazkirat al-Shu'ara* and Alisher Navoi's Chagatai Turkic *Majolis un-Nafois*, while treating the wider Timurid period as their historical context.

The expression Timurid Renaissance describes a period of extensive cultural activity, but it should not imply uninterrupted political stability or a single coordinated educational policy. Subtelny (1988) explicitly examines cultural flourishing alongside political decline. Manz (2007) likewise situates Timurid government within relationships among rulers, military groups, urban elites, and religious communities. These approaches provide a more careful basis for interpreting literary production than attributing every cultural achievement to centralized rule.

The educational question is how a record of poets' lives can be used to study learning, intellectual authority, and conduct. A *tazkira* is not a school register or a systematic account of educational institutions. Nevertheless, its references to learning, personal association, and reputation can help students investigate how an intellectual community represented itself. The purpose of this article is to connect the historical comparison of the two works with practical approaches to teaching Central Asian literary and educational heritage.

The review addresses three questions. How did the Timurid cultural setting support the development of literary biography? How do Dawlatshah and Navoi differ in their organization and representation of literary achievement? What classroom uses follow from those differences, and what limits should govern educational interpretation?

Literature Review and Background

The Timurid contribution should be understood as a development of an existing biographical tradition. Safa (1994) identifies Dawlatshah's work as the second surviving full-length Persian *tazkira* devoted to poets, following Muhammad Awfi's *Lubab al-Albab*. The genre thus predates Timurid rule. Here, *tazkira* tradition refers to practices of selecting biographies, preserving poetic specimens, and evaluating reputation. The term school is used cautiously because these shared practices do not, by themselves, establish the existence of a formal institution or a uniform research method.

Samarkand and Herat provide important points of reference within this regional history. The periods of Amir Temur, Shah Rukh, Ulugh Beg, and Sultan Husayn Bayqara shaped different political and intellectual settings. However, the two *tazkiras* at the center of the comparison belong to the late fifteenth century. They cannot represent every institution or stage of cultural development across the preceding century. The distinction between a broad historical setting and the dates of the selected works is essential to the argument.

Historical scholarship on Timurid society helps situate literary biography within patronage and political relationships. Manz (2007) analyzes the interaction of government, society, and religious authority under Shah Rukh. Subtelny (1988) investigates the socioeconomic bases of cultural patronage under the later Timurids. These studies support an interpretation in which literary production depends on social relationships and material support as well as individual talent. They do not establish that patronage produced identical literary or educational outcomes throughout the region.

The two *tazkiras* also have different textual histories. Safa (1994) dates Dawlatshah's completion of *Tazkirat al-Shu'ara* to 892 AH, rendered in his account as 1486. The

University of Manchester Library (n.d.) describes approximately 150 poets in the work. For Majolis un-Nafois, Umarova (2009) discusses the research establishing an initial composition in 1490-1491 and authorial revision in 1498. She also distinguishes counts in earlier published versions from the 459 figures in the critical text. Sultanov (2022) likewise reports 459 figures across eight assemblies. These are source-reported descriptions, not the results of a new census undertaken in this review.

Navoi's preface is particularly relevant to the relationship between the works. He names Jami's Bahoriston and Dawlatshah's Tazkirat al-Shu'ara, then explains his wish to record poets of his own age and preserve examples of their verse (Navoi, n.d., pp. 1-2). This provides direct textual evidence of engagement with earlier biographical writing. It also suggests that the Persian and Turkic traditions should be examined as connected literary practices rather than isolated national traditions.

Methodology

This article uses a qualitative historical-comparative review. The source base consists of the accessible electronic text of Majolis un-Nafois, published scholarship on its textual history, scholarly descriptions of Dawlatshah's tazkira, a university manuscript catalogue, and historical research on Timurid society and patronage. The Navoi electronic text is identified separately from dated print editions because it does not provide an explicit publication date. Its page numbers refer to the electronic PDF. No archival manuscript inspection or new critical edition is claimed.

The comparison uses five questions applied consistently to both works: which literary language is used; how the collection is organized; which periods and communities are foregrounded; how biography is linked to literary judgment; and what the evidence permits a reader to infer about learning and conduct. Descriptions of Dawlatshah rely on published scholarship and catalogue information rather than an independent reading of every Persian entry. For Navoi, the preface, the assembly divisions, and the entry concerning Yahya Sebak provide selected textual anchors for interpretation.

Source criticism separates biographical information, the compiler's judgment, later editorial commentary, and the review's own interpretation. Dates and totals are attributed to the publications reporting them. The two collections are not added together to estimate a number of unique historical individuals, because overlapping entries have not been identified and reconciled. Nor are the numbers of rulers, cities, or disciplines discussed in a narrative treated as statistical evidence of cultural growth.

The pedagogical component develops teaching recommendations from the comparison. Wineburg's (1991) study of the evaluation of historical evidence provides a rationale for asking learners to consider the origin of documents and compare accounts. This review applies that concern to tazkira reading without assuming that findings from another historical setting automatically predict outcomes in Central Asian classrooms. No participants, classroom intervention, questionnaires, or measures of learning achievement form part of the present study.

Results

Two approaches to preserving literary memory

The principal difference concerns how literary memory is organized. Dawlatshah presents a largely chronological account of Persian poets, combining biographical notices with poetic specimens and historical information (Safa, 1994). Navoi organizes his collection into eight majlis, or assemblies. The first assembly concerns people whose lifetimes overlapped with his youth but whom he did not meet; the second concerns people he knew who had died; and the third concerns his living literary community (Navoi, n.d., first through third assemblies). The distinctions make the compiler's relationship to his subjects part of the structure of the book.

This organization is significant for evaluating evidence. A report about an earlier poet and a recollection of personal contact have different evidential conditions, even when both appear in the same collection. Navoi's distinctions do not guarantee accuracy, but they give readers a starting point for asking how information was acquired. Table 1 summarizes the comparison. The reported totals describe the collections and should not be interpreted as a measure of the productivity of one language or community relative to the other.

Table 1

Selected characteristics of the two Timurid tazkiras

Characteristic	Tazkirat al-Shu'ara	Majolis un-Nafois
Literary language	Persian	Chagatai Turkic
Temporal emphasis	Earlier Persian poets and later literary generations	Mainly the fifteenth-century literary community
Organization	Largely chronological biographical arrangement	Eight assemblies with distinct categories of subjects
Reported coverage	Approximately 150 poets	459 figures in the critical text
Comparative reading focus	Literary continuity and historical reputation	Personal association and contemporary literary judgment

Note. Sources: Safa (1994), University of Manchester Library (n.d.), Navoi (n.d.), Umarova (2009), and Sultanov (2022). Coverage figures are reported by these sources; no new entry count was conducted.

Learning and conduct in biographical representation

Navoi's account of Yahya Sebak offers a specific example of the educational evidence within a literary biography. The entry identifies Sebak's command of several fields and his reputation in poetics and prosody. Navoi then describes himself as Sebak's student in prosody through an intermediary (Navoi, n.d., p. 7). The statement records an intellectual relationship while also qualifying its directness. It supports discussion of how knowledge could pass through a chain of teachers; it does not establish that the two men shared a classroom or met personally.

The same entry associates Sebak with a modest way of life and limited public recognition. In this context, technical expertise and ethical reputation appear together in the description of a learned person. The review interprets that combination as

evidence of the compiler's evaluative priorities. It is not proof that every reader accepted the judgment or that all Timurid educational institutions used the same criteria.

Religious and Sufi associations form part of the text's intellectual setting. The opening account of Qasim Anvar links biography, spiritual authority, and remembered verse (Navoi, n.d., pp. 3-4). Such material can help learners investigate how different kinds of authority intersected. However, references to piety or conduct should not automatically be attributed to the Naqshbandiyya order. A claim about a particular affiliation requires evidence about the person or passage concerned.

Limits of historical and educational inference

Both works select people and examples according to their compilers' interests. Inclusion is evidence that a person mattered within the compiler's literary account; omission cannot, by itself, establish a person's absence from intellectual life. Praise, criticism, patronage, and personal association may shape the record. The review therefore treats tazkiras as situated sources for cultural memory rather than comprehensive directories of educational activity.

Textual variation adds a further limitation. Umarova (2009) describes differences between earlier published versions of Majolis un-Nafois and the critical text, including their coverage. A count is meaningful only when linked to the version and counting rule used. This is why numerical descriptions are retained only where a source reports them, and why the comparison rests primarily on organization and literary purpose.

Discussion

Connecting historical interpretation with educational practice

The comparison suggests a practical role for tazkiras in literature, history, and teacher education courses. Their compact biographies allow students to work with identifiable claims, evaluative language, and examples of intellectual relationships. An instructor can ask what a passage records, how the compiler knows it, and which conclusions remain uncertain. These questions make cultural heritage material part of an exercise in historical reasoning.

The Sebak entry provides a manageable starting point. Students can distinguish the statements about scholarly expertise from Navoi's qualified account of his own intellectual connection. They can then explain why indirect learning does not establish direct personal contact. The aim is a reasoned interpretation supported by a specific passage. Wineburg (1991) helps frame the broader educational concern with evaluating documentary evidence, while the content and tasks proposed here remain specific to tazkira study.

Table 2 presents possible activities. They are designed for adaptation to the learners' language proficiency and background knowledge. The assessed products are proposed forms of student work, not outcomes observed in this study.

Table 2

Proposed classroom uses of Timurid tazkiras

Reading focus	Classroom task	Assessed product
Compiler and evidence	Distinguish recollection, report, and evaluation in one entry.	A paragraph with cited evidence and an explicit uncertainty.
Intellectual relationships	Examine Navoi's qualified statement about learning prosody.	An explanation distinguishing direct and indirect instruction.
Literary and ethical judgment	Separate comments on poetic skill from comments on conduct.	A comparison explaining the basis of each judgment.
Text and cultural memory	Compare the purposes of the two collections and their selection of subjects.	A short argument about what the collections preserve and omit.

Note. These activities are teaching proposals derived from the review. Classroom effectiveness requires separate empirical evaluation.

Conditions for responsible classroom use

Teaching requires a readable text, contextual information, and clear separation of the original passage from translation and editorial notes. If students cannot read Chagatai Turkic or Persian, an instructor should supply a carefully checked translation and identify its source. Modern paraphrase can assist comprehension, but it should remain distinguishable from the historical wording. Students should also know which textual version they are using.

Ethical discussion should begin with what the compiler actually praises or criticizes. Learners may compare those judgments with present-day expectations, provided they account for the historical setting and explain the comparison. Treating every positive anecdote as a universal pedagogical rule would obscure the conditions under which the text was written. Equally, dismissing the work as merely subjective would overlook the evidence it preserves about intellectual relationships and cultural values.

The review does not demonstrate that tazkira-based instruction improves achievement, motivation, or moral conduct. A subsequent classroom study could examine students' written interpretations before and after a defined sequence of source-reading activities, using explicit criteria for evidence use and recognition of uncertainty. Translation quality, prior subject knowledge, and access to a comparison group would need consideration in any evaluation.

Conclusion

Tazkira writing in Timurid Transoxiana and Khorasan developed within an older biographical tradition and a changing environment of literary patronage. Dawlatshah's Tazkirat al-Shu'ara and Navoi's Majolis un-Nafois preserve different but connected forms of literary memory. The former emphasizes a historical sequence of Persian poetic achievement; the latter organizes a largely contemporary community through eight assemblies and makes the compiler's relationship to many subjects explicit.

Their relevance to education lies in the questions they make possible about learning, literary authority, personal conduct, and the reliability of biographical evidence. Navoi's qualified account of learning prosody through an intermediary illustrates how a brief entry can support careful interpretation of an intellectual relationship.

Comparative reading can connect Central Asian cultural heritage with source evaluation and reflective writing. These pedagogical uses remain proposals whose effectiveness must be tested separately. Historical context, identified textual versions, and appropriately limited claims are necessary for making that connection credible.

Declarations

Funding: This work received no external funding.

Competing interests: The author declares no competing interests.

Generative AI assistance: ChatGPT (OpenAI) assisted with manuscript restructuring, language editing, reference checking, and drafting educational applications. The author is responsible for verifying the final text, its interpretations, and its sources before submission.

References

- Manz, B. F. (2007). *Power, politics and religion in Timurid Iran*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511497483>
- Navoi, A. (n.d.). *Majolis un-nafois* [Electronic text in Uzbek Cyrillic]. Ziyouz Electronic Library. https://n.ziyouz.com/books/alisher_navoiy_asarlari/Alisher%20Navoiy.%20Majolisun-nafois.pdf
- Safa, Z. (1994). Dawlatšāh Samarqandī. In *Encyclopaedia Iranica* (Vol. 7, pp. 149-150). <https://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/dawlatsah/>
- Subtelny, M. E. (1988). Socioeconomic bases of cultural patronage under the later Timurids. *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 20(4), 479-505. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020743800053861>
- Sultanov, T. I. (2022). Sopostavitel'nyi analiz pervykh tiurkskikh tazkir [Comparative analysis of the first Turkic tazkiras]. *Mezhdunarodnyi zhurnal Alishera Navoi*, 2(2). <https://tadqiqot.uz/index.php/navoi/article/view/4794>
- Umarova, S. (2009). "Majolis un-nafois" nashrining yetuk namunasi [An accomplished edition of Majolis un-nafois]. *Filologiya masalalari*, 2(22), 10-14. https://tsuull.uz/sites/default/files/umarova_s._2009_majolis_un_nafoisning_yetuk_namunasi_0.pdf
- University of Manchester Library. (n.d.). *Tazkirat al-shu'ara* [Manuscript catalogue record, Persian MS 838]. Manchester Digital Collections. <https://www.digitalcollections.manchester.ac.uk/view/MS-PERSIAN-00838>
- Wineburg, S. S. (1991). Historical problem solving: A study of the cognitive processes used in the evaluation of documentary and pictorial evidence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83(1), 73-87. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.83.1.73>

How to cite: Makhbuba Sattorovna Shamsiyeva. (2026). The Development and Educational Significance of Tazkira Traditions in Timurid Transoxiana and Khorasan. *Central Asian Journal of Integrative Innovation*, Vol. 1, No. 3, 2026, 7-13.

Makhbuba Sattorovna Shamsiyeva © 2026 · <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>