

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE EARLY ŞAFAWID STATE

UNDER ISMA'ĪL AND ṬAHMĀSP, AS STUDIED IN

THE 16TH CENTURY PERSIAN SOURCES



Thesis for the Degree of Ph. D., 1958

submitted by

Roger Mervyn Savory

ProQuest Number: 10731210

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10731210

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

Abstract of a thesis for the degree of Ph.D., 1958.

Subject:- The development of the early Ṣafawid state under Isma'īl and Ṭahmāsp, as studied in the 16th century Persian sources.

The object of this thesis is, from a study of the contemporary Persian sources, to determine the broad outlines of the development of the early Ṣafawid state, and in particular to describe the evolution of the principal offices of state. As the reforms of 'Abbās I (1587-1629) had a profound effect on the structure and organization of the Ṣafawid state, the accession of 'Abbās I forms a convenient point at which to terminate this thesis, which therefore relates in the main to the reigns of Isma'īl I (1501/2-1524) and Ṭahmāsp I (1524-76). An attempt has been made to show how the fundamental dichotomy between Turk and Persian, the lack of any precise definition of the functions of the chief dignitaries, and the absence of any clear differentiation between the classes, affected the development of the Ṣafawid state during this period. It should be noted that this thesis deals only with the most important offices of state, and does not purport to be in any way a complete description of the early Ṣafawid administrative system. An attempt has also been made to determine the factors which enabled the Ṣafawids to impose Shī'ism as the orthodox religion of the Ṣafawid state. In writing the historical background to this thesis, I have endeavoured, on the one hand, to give the shortest account of events consonant with a proper understanding of the period, and, on the other hand, to give a rather fuller picture of events in Khurāsān, 'Irāq-i 'Ajam and Fārs, during the hundred years between the death of Tīmūr and the accession of Isma'īl, than is to be found elsewhere.

C O N T E N T S

Acknowledgements	iv
Sources	v
Abbreviations	xii
Transliteration	xiv
I. The Historical Background:-	
(i) The Early History of the Şafawid Family	1
(ii) The Struggle for Supremacy in Persia after the death of <u>Timur</u>	27
(iii) The Consolidation of Şafawid power in Persia	67
<u>II.</u> The Transition to Shi'ism	88
<u>III.</u> The Political Institution	153
IV. The Şadārat	265
V. Conclusion	322
Bibliography	333

.....

A C K N O W L E D G E M E N T S

It gives me great pleasure to acknowledge my debt to Sir Hamilton Gibb, who, as my tutor at Oxford, first aroused my interest in Ṣafawid studies and encouraged me to undertake this work, and to my supervisor, Professor A. K. S. Lambton, not only for the time which she has ungrudgingly given to reading through the draft of this thesis, but also for her help, advice and guidance at all stages of its preparation.

I am also indebted to Professor V. Minorsky, for his numerous valuable suggestions, and for supplying me with quotations from the Tārīkh-i 'Ālam-Ārā-yi Amīnī, a MS. not available to me, to Professor Dr. Walther Hinz, who was kind enough to draw my attention to the unique MS. source Jawāhir al-Akhbār, and to the Librarian of the India Office Library, Mr. S. C. Sutton, who obtained for me from Leningrad, and generously placed at my disposal, a microfilm of the latter work.

My thanks are also due to Professor Fahir Iz of the University of Istanbul, for his help in reading Turkish sources, and to Mr. N. J. Coulson, Dr. P. Hardy, Dr. D. M. Lang, Mr. V. L. Ménage, and Miss Eva Takacs, for their help and advice on various occasions.

SOURCES

(A). Primary Sources.

(I). Persian MSS. sources.

(1) Şafwat al-Şafa (British Museum MS. Add. 11,745). This is a recension made by Abu'l-Fath al-Husaynī during the reign of Tahmāsp (1524-76) of an earlier work by Darwīsh Tawakullī b. Isma'īl known as Ibn Bazzāz, who wrote probably about 750/1349-50, that is, only fifteen years after the death of Shaykh Şafī al-Dīn (735/1334), the founder of the Şafawid order. In view of the length of this work (over 800 folios), the amount of useful material contained in it is disappointingly small, the greater part of the work being devoted to an account of the supernatural powers, prophetic utterances and miraculous deeds of Shaykh Şafī al-Dīn and his murīds. No copy of the work in its original form exists, and "in the copies we possess (i. e., of the later recension) disciples of the Şafawid family have made all sorts of alterations" (1).

(2) Tārīkh-i İlchī-yi Nizāmshāh (British Museum MS. Add. 23,513). The author, Khwurshāh b. Qubād al-Husaynī, was sent as an ambassador to Shāh Tahmāsp in 952/1545-6 by Burhān Nizāmshāh I of Ahmadnagar, and remained at the Şafawid court for twenty years (until 971/1563-4). He is therefore not only an eye-witness of events during this period, but frequently gives information not found elsewhere; his point of view often differs from that of the qizilbāsh amīr Hasan Rūmlū, especially as regards events which do not

(1) Kasrawī, Nizhād wa Tabār-i Şafawiyya, in Āyanda ii/1927-8, 361.

TOGAN

reflect particular credit on the qizilbash. Khwushāh's history ends with the year 970/1562-3.

(3) Jāmi'-i Mufīdī (British Museum MS. Or. 210 and 211). This work was written in the reign of Shāh Sulaymān (1077-1105/1667-1694), and was completed in 1090/1679-80. In 1077/1667 the author, Mīrzā Muḥammad Mufīd, was appointed by Shāh Sulaymān mustawfī-yi mawqūfat at Yazd, and in 1080/1669 he was made in addition nā'ib and nāzīr of the awqāf of Yazd (1). Volume I of the work (British Museum MS. Or. 210), comprising two maqālas, consists entirely of biographical notices of various civil and religious officials who had held office at Yazd, and of prominent local men of learning and letters. Volume II (British Museum MS. Or. 211), contains a maqāla on imānzādas and shaykhs, a maqāla on mosques, madrasas, kānāqāhs, etc., villages, and ancient buildings, and concludes (fifth maqāla) with an autobiographical notice on the author. The Jāmi'-i Mufīdī thus has the characteristics both of a tadhkira and a local history, and contains much valuable and detailed information on Ṣafawid local administration.

Ed Ross
See at end (4) British Museum MS. Or. 3248. The full name of the author, which begins with Bījan..., is not known. Ghulām Sarwar has established that this work is not the lost Futūḥat-i Shāhī of Ṣadr al-Dīn Sulṭān Ibrāhīm Amīnī Harawī, a wazīr of the Tīmūrid ruler Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā, who later joined the Ṣafawid court (2). Ghulām Sarwar places the date of composition of Bījan's work between 947/1540 and 955/1548, during the reign of Shāh Tahmāsp, and states that "in the absence of Futūḥat-i Shāhī (or Futūḥat-i Amīnī) Bījan's history is very valuable, especially, for the early life of Shāh Ismā'īl. It also supplements the Ḥabību's-Siyar, and gives a complete,

(1) JM. 169a-170b; 174a-175a. (2) Ghulām Sarwar, 5-6.

Tabriz

exact and detailed account of the reign of Shāh Ismā'īl" (1). The Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh closely follows Bījan's history for the early part of Ismā'īl's life.

(5) Haft Iqlīm (British Museum MS. Add. 16,734; Vol. I fasc. 3 printed at Calcutta 1939). This work, by Amīn (b.) Aḥmad Rāzī, was completed in 1002/1593-4 during the reign of Shāh 'Abbās I. The author's father, Khwāja Mīrzā Aḥmad, had been kalāntar of Rayy for some years under Shāh Ṭahmāsp, and Khwāja Muḥammad Sharīf Rāzī, the author's paternal uncle, had been wazīr successively of Khurāsān, Yazd and Iṣfahān (2). The Haft Iqlīm contains some valuable and original material in its biographies of officials and eminent personalities.

(6) Nusakh-i Jahān-Ārā (British Museum MS. Or. 141). The author, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Qāḍī al-Ghaffārī, completed this general history, which is based on earlier works, in 972/1564-5. The third nuskha deals with the Safawids. The author is unusually meticulous in giving dates, and in this respect, as Ghulām Sarwar points out, his work is especially valuable (3).

(7) Jawāhir al-Akhbār, a general history by Budāq Munshī Qazwīnī, completed in 984/1576-7 and dedicated to Shāh Ismā'īl II (984-5/1576-7). The unique MS. of this history, the autograph of the author, exists in the Leningrad Library (Dorn 288). The Jawāhir al-Akhbār is an important and independent source for the history of the 16th century Safawids.

(8) Majma' al-Inshā, or Nuskha-yi Jāmi'a-yi Murāsālāt-i Ūlu'l-Albāb (British Museum MS. Add. 7,688), a collection of letters from Persian rulers to the rulers of neighbouring countries, compiled by Abu'l-Qāsim Iwāghlī Ḥaydar, who was a darbān of the royal haram and later Ishīk Āqāsī-bāshī under

(1) Ghulām Sarwar, 10-11. (2) Storey, 1169. (3) Ghulām Sarwar, 11.

Russian
Public
315
Sov. Vest
1956, No 1
Iw
Iwāghlī

Shāh Ṣafī (1629-42).

(II). Persian Printed Sources.

(1) Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh (ed. Seddon, Baroda 1931). The author, Ḥasan Rūmlū, was born at Qum in 938/1531-2, and, from 948/1541-2, when he accompanied Ṭahmāsp on an expedition to Dizfūl, took part in most of the Shāh's expeditions. He was thus in a position to give an eye-witness account of events from 948/1541-2 until 985/1577-8, the last year of the history. The Baroda printed text covers the period 900-85/1494-1577; another portion of the Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh, covering the period 807-99/1405-93, exists only in manuscript in the Leningrad Library. It is quoted by Professor Hinz among the sources for his Irans Aufstieg zum Nationalstaat.

(2) Maṭla'-i Sa'dayn (ed. Muḥammad Shafī'; Vol. II, Part 1 (2nd ed. Lahore 1941) covers the period 807-33/1405-29, Vol. II, Parts 2 and 3 (2nd ed. Lahore 1949) covers the period 833-75/1429-70). The author, Kamāl al-Dīn 'Abd al-Razzāq Samarqandī, was born at Harāt in 816/1413-4, and died in 887/1482-3. Down to 830/1426-7, the Maṭla'-i Sa'dayn is based on Ḥafīẓ Abrū's Zubdat al-Tawārīkh, but thereafter constitutes an independent and extremely valuable contemporary account of events in Khurāsān, 'Irāq-i 'Ajam and Fārs during the second half of the reign of Shāhrukh and down to the capture of Harāt by Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā in 875/1470.

(3) Ḥabīb al-Siyar (Bombay lithographed edition, 1273/1856-7). The author, Ghiyāth al-Dīn b. Humām al-Dīn Khwādamīr, was born c. 880/1475-6. His work, a general history from the earliest times down to 930/1524, was begun in 927/1521, and constitutes "one of the best histories on the reign of Shāh Isma'īl" (1). Khwādamīr was resident at Harāt, and is therefore an especially valuable authority for events in Khurāsān during the reign of Shāh

(1) Ghulam Sarwar, 8.

Isma'īl. Khwādamīr's contemporary account of these events gives a general impression of accuracy and careful compilation, is far more detailed than the accounts of other historians, and contains more material with a bearing on the Ṣafawid administrative institutions of the period.

(4) Sharafnāma of Sharaf al-Dīn Bitlīsī (ed. V. Veliāminof-Zernof, St. Petersburg 1860-2). The author, born in 949/1543 at Karahrud near Qum, was brought up in the royal household with the sons of Shāh Ṭahmāsp. In 975/1567-8 he was engaged in the subjugation of Gīlān, where he remained for seven years. Although primarily a history of the Kurds, the Sharafnāma not infrequently supplies information, especially dates, not found elsewhere.

(5) Silsilat al-Nasab-i Ṣafawiyya (Iranschāhr Publications No. 6, Berlin 1343/1924-5). This is a genealogical work on the Ṣafawid family by Shaykh Ḥusayn b. Abdāl Zāhidī, a descendant of Shaykh Zāhid-i Gīlānī, the spiritual guide (murshid) of Shaykh Ṣafī al-Dīn, the founder of the Ṣafawid order. The Silsilat al-Nasab is dedicated to Shāh Sulaymān (1077-1105/1667-1694), and, although not a contemporary source, is in fact a much more fruitful source of information on the ancestors of the Ṣafawids than the earlier sources.

(6) Tārīkh-i 'Ālam-Ārā of Iskandar Beg (Iskandar Munshī) (Tehran lithographed edition, 1314/1896-7). This celebrated history is not a 16th century work, as it was completed in 1038/1628-9 at the end of the reign of Shāh 'Abbās I. Its detailed and accurate nature, however, makes it a valuable source, and, for the period immediately prior to the accession of Shāh 'Abbās I, it supplements the material contained in the Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh.

(7) Munsha'āt-i Salāṭīn, a collection of state papers compiled by Farīdūn Bey in 982/1574 and published at Constantinople in two volumes (1848:

2nd ed. 1858). Ghulām Sarwar states that the historical value of this collection, and of the Majma' al-Inshā (see A/I/8 above), is "undoubtedly great, as they supply facts, which are rare, and are not found in historical works". He admits, however, that "some of them contain a most exaggerated and incorrect account of events" (1). In fact, the historical value of these documents is largely negated by the fact that most of them are undated, and they throw little light on Ṣafawid institutions. They are chiefly of interest as illustrating what Ghulām Sarwar calls "the royal spirit of these times" (2). The letters between Shāh Isma'īl and Sulṭān Salīm are mainly noteworthy as examples of invective.

(8) Tadhkirat al-Mulūk (E. J. W. Gibb Memorial Series, New Series XVI, London 1943). Professor V. Minorsky, in the Introduction and Appendices to his facsimile edition of the Tadhkirat al-Mulūk (British Museum MS. Or. 9,496), a manual of late Ṣafawid administration completed about 1726, has dealt with some aspects of the problems connected with the rise of the Ṣafawids.

(III). Non-Persian Sources.

(1) Irans Aufstieg zum Nationalstaat im fünfzehnten Jahrhundert (Berlin and Leipzig 1936). This sound and valuable work by Professor Dr. Walther Hinz gives a detailed account of the historical events which attended the rise of the Ṣafawid dynasty, and in particular of the relations between the Ṣafawids and the Qara Qoyunlu and Aq Qoyunlu rulers.

(2) The History of Shah Isma'īl Ṣafawī (Aligarh 1939). The author, Dr. Ghulām Sarwar, has painstakingly collated the historical data from various contemporary sources, and has produced a well-annotated narrative of

(1) Ghulām Sarwar, 15. (2) ibid., 15.

the events of Isma'īl's reign.

(3) quis custodiet custodes, Some Reflections on the Persian Theory of Government (in Studia Islamica, fasc. v. and vi., 1956). This article by Professor A. K. S. Lambton is invaluable for any study of Ṣafawid institutions. Professor Lambton discusses the political institution and the religious institution of the Ṣafawids in the general context of the Persian theory of government.

(B). Secondary Sources.

The secondary sources, both Persian and non-Persian, which have been utilised during the preparation of this thesis, are listed in the bibliography.

ABBREVIATIONS

- AT = A Chronicle of the Early Safawīs, being the Aḥsanu't-Tawārīkh of Ḥasan-i-Rūmlū, Vol. I (Persian Text), ed. C.N. Seddon, Baroda 1931.
- AT. ii = - ditto- , Vol. II (English Translation by C.N. Seddon), Baroda 1934.
- Bellan = L.-L. Bellan, Chah 'Abbās I, Paris 1932.
- BM. Or. 3248 = British Museum MS. Or. 3248.
- Browne = E.G. Browne, A Literary History of Persia, Cambridge 1902-1924.
- BSO(A)S = Bulletin of the School of Oriental (and African) Studies.
- Chardin = Sir J. Chardin, Voyages.....en Perse, et autres lieux de l'Orient.
3 Vols., Amsterdam 1711. *French edition*
- EI¹⁽²⁾ = Encyclopaedia of Islam, 1st edition, Leiden 1913-38 (New edition, Leiden 1954-).
- Éthé = H. Éthé, Catalogue of Persian MSS. in the Library of the India Office, 1903.
- Ghulam Sarwar = Dr. Ghulam Sarwar, A History of Shah Isma'īl Safawī, Aligarh 1939.
- Ḥasan Rūmlū = Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh, Leningrad MS. No. 287. *used?*
- HI = Amīn (b.) Aḥmad Rāzī, Haft Iqlīm, British Museum MS. Add. 16,734 (if folio numbers are quoted), or ibid., Vol. I fasc. 3, Calcutta 1939 (if page numbers are quoted).
- Hinz = W. Hinz, Irans Aufstieg zum Nationalstaat im fünfzehnten Jahrhundert, Berlin and Leipzig 1936.
- HS = Khwādamīr, Ḥabīb al-Siyar, Bombay lithographed edition, 1273/1856-7.

Russian author

JA = Budāq Munshī Qazwīnī, Jawāhir al-Akhbār, Leningrad MS. No. 288.

JM = Mīrzā Muḥammad Mufīd, Jāmi'-i Mufīdī, British Museum MS. Or. 210 and 211.

JRAS = Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.

LP = A. K. S. Lambton, Landlord and Peasant in Persia, O.U.P. 1953.

Marwārīd = 'Abd Allāh Marwārīd, Sharafnāma (Istanbul University MS. F.87), facsimile of Persian text in H. R. Roemer, Staatsschreiben der Timuridenzeit, Wiesbaden 1952.

MS = Kamāl al-Dīn 'Abd al-Razzaq Samarqandī, Maṭla'-i Sa'dayn (ed. Muḥammad Shafī'), Lahore 1941-9.

NJA = Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Qādī al-Ghaffārī, Nusakh-i Jahān-Ārā (British Museum MS. Or. 141).

Nuzhat al-Qulūb = Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī, Nuzhat al-Qulūb (E. J. W. Gibb Memorial Series Vol. XXIII), Leiden 1915.

Rabino = H. L. Rabino, Coins of the Jalā'ir, Kara Koyūnlū, Mūshā'sha' and Ak Koyūnlū Dynasties, in the Numismatic Chronicle, 6th Series, Vol. X, 1950.

Rieu = C. Rieu, Catalogue of the Persian MSS. in the British Museum, 1879-.

Roemer = H. R. Roemer, Staatsschreiben der Timuridenzeit, Wiesbaden 1952.

Safwat = Darwīsh Tawakullī b. Isma'īl Ibn Bazzāz, Safwat al-Ṣafā (British Museum MS. Add. 11, 745).

Shar. = Sharaf al-Dīn Bitlīsī, Sharafnāma (ed. Véliaminof-Zernof), St. Petersburg 1860-2.

SN = Shaykh Ḥusayn b. Abdāl Zahīdī, Silsilat al-Nasab-i Ṣafawiyya, Iranschāhr Publications No. 6, Berlin 1343/1924-5.

Storey = C. A. Storey, Persian Literature, a bio-bibliographical survey, London 1927-.

Sykes = Lieut.-Col. P. M. Sykes, A History of Persia, London 1915.

thesis

B. Ann - Ubbaka

review 2/1

TAA = Iskandar Beg (Iskandar Munshī), Tārīkh-i 'Ālam-Ārā-yi 'Abbāsī, Tehran lithographed edition, 1314/1896-7.

Tavernier = J.B. Tavernier, The Six Voyages of John Baptista Tavernier through Turkey into Persia and the East Indies, London 1678.

TIN = Khwārshāh b. Qubād al-Ḥusaynī, Tārīkh-i Īlchī-yi Nizāmshāh (British Museum MS. Add. 23,513).

TM = Tadhkirat al-Mulūk, Facsimile with Translation and Commentary by V. Minorsky (E. J. W. Gibb Memorial Series, New Series Vol. XVI), London 1943.

T R A N S L I T E R A T I O N

The system of transliteration used in this thesis is the same as that used in the new edition of the Encyclopaedia of Islam, except that I have used j instead of dj for ج, and q instead of k for ق. I have arbitrarily retained the "familiar" form of some Turkish words, e.g., soyūrghāl, Uzbek, Seljuq, Turkoman, and in the case of Aq Qoyunlu and Qara Qoyunlu I have in general omitted the long vowel signs.

I. THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

(i) The Early History of the Safawid Family

The Maṭlūb al-Ṭalibīn regards the Safawid order as the tenth family (khānawāda) of the great Chishtī order, and states that "this family takes its origin from Shaykh Ṣafī al-Dīn Ishāq Ardabilī, who was the disciple (murīd), successor (khalīfa), and son-in-law (dāmād) of Shaykh Zāhid Ibrāhīm Gīlānī (1). According to the earliest extant genealogy of the Safawid family, namely that contained in the Ṣafwat al-Ṣafa of Ibn Bazzāz, Shaykh Ṣafī al-Dīn Ishāq Ardabilī (650-735/1252-1334), under whom the Safawid house first achieved prominence, was a descendant in the male line from the seventh Shi'ī imām Mūsā al-Kāzīm, and thus from 'Alī himself. The Safawid claim to siyādat has been disputed by Sayyid Aḥmad Tabrīzī (Kasrawī) (2). Although he occasionally overstates his case, Kasrawī makes some extremely interesting points, and the validity of the Safawid claim to the title of sayyid must at least be considered open to doubt pending further research.

The genealogy of the Safawid family given in most copies of the Ṣafwat al-Ṣafa is as follows:- Ṣafī al-Dīn Ishāq b. Amīn al-Dīn Jibra'īl b. Ṣalīḥ b. Quṭb al-Dīn Aḥmad b. Ṣalah al-Dīn Rashīd b. Muḥammad al-Ḥafīz b. 'Iwāḍ ('Awāḍ?) b. Fīrūzshāh Zarrīnkulāh b. Muḥammad b. Sharafshāh b.

(1) f. 143a. (2) See Sayyid Aḥmad Tabrīzī (Kasrawī), Nizhād wa Tabār-i Ṣafawiyya, in Āyanda ii/1927-8, 357-65, 489-97, and Bāz ham Ṣafawiyya, ibid., 801-12.

Muḥammad b. Ḥasan b. Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm b. Ja'far b. Muḥammad b. Isma'īl b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-A'rābī b. Abī Muḥammad al-Qāsim b. Abi'l-Qāsim Ḥamza b. Mūsā al-Kāzim. According to this version, which is followed by most of the later histories, including the Ḥabīb al-Siyar, Lubb al-Tawārīkh, Tārīkh-i 'Ālam-ārā, and Silsilat al-Nasab, there are twenty links in the genealogical chain between Shaykh Ṣafī al-Dīn and the Imam Mūsā al-Kāzim. Kasrawī states that a MS. of the Ṣafwat al-Ṣafa in the Kitābkhānā-yi Madrasa-yi Nāṣir gives the variant Fīrūzshāh Zarrīnkulāh b. Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm b. Ja'far b. Isma'īl b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-A'rābī etc., which reduces the number of links to fifteen (1).

Kasrawī's thesis is that the "official" genealogy given in the Ṣafwat al-Ṣafa is artificial and unfounded, and must be divided into three parts: (a) Ṣafī al-Dīn to Fīrūzshāh Zarrīnkulāh (undisputed), (b) Isma'īl to Mūsā al-Kāzim (common to all versions), (c) the remainder, which is the disputed portion. Kasrawī alleges that (a) murīds of the Ṣafawid order have altered those portions of the Ṣafwat al-Ṣafa which indicated that Ṣafī al-Dīn was not a sayyid or a Shī'ī, and have added anecdotes and phrases to suit their own purpose, and (b) a passage in the Faṣl 2 Bāb 8 in the oldest MSS. of the Ṣafwat al-Ṣafa which suggests that Ṣafī al-Dīn was a Shāfi'ī, has been deleted from later copies of this work. On the basis of this evidence Kasrawī states that no passage in the Ṣafwat-al-Ṣafa which ascribes siyādat to Ṣafī al-Dīn can be trusted (2). The

(1) Kasrawī, op. cit., 359-60 and 359 n. Kasrawī also records that in one of the oldest extant MSS. of the Tārīkh-i 'Ālam-ārā, written in 1056 or 1059/1646-7 or 1649-50 in Kashmīr, and now in Mashhad, there is a radically different version of the genealogy, containing only 12 links (op. cit., 802).

(2) op. cit., 360-2.

reference in P.M. Zuhri

Şafawid claim to siyādat, he alleges, was first made in the time of Şadr al-Dīn Mūsā, who made the claim on the basis of what he had heard from his father. Şadr al-Dīn Mūsā was supported in this contention by a murīd, Sayyid Zayn al-Dīn, who related that he had heard Şafī al-Dīn say mārā nasab-i siyādat hast, but Şadr al-Dīn was uncertain whether his ancestors claimed to be 'Alawī or Sharīfī sayyids (i. e., whether they were descended from the Imāms in the male or the female line). When it was established, by means of a tradition (riwāyat) related by another murīd, Sayyid Hāshim b. Sayyid Ḥasan al-Makkī, that the Şafawids were 'Alawī sayyids, the further question arose, were they Ḥusaynī or Ḥasani sayyids? It was eventually established, through the medium of a dream experienced by the same murīd, Sayyid Hāshim b. Sayyid Ḥasan al-Makkī, that they were Ḥusaynī sayyids (1). According to another anecdote related in the Şafwat al-Şafā, even Şafī al-Dīn's own wife did not know that Şafī al-Dīn was a sayyid, and the claim of her son Khwāja Muḥyī al-Dīn to siyādat came as a surprise to her (2). In Kasrawī's view, the extraordinary uncertainty of members of Şafī al-Dīn's own family as to the exact nature of the Şafawid claim to siyādat clearly indicates that their claim was, in fact, baseless (3).

Kasrawī makes the further point that neither Şafī al-Dīn nor his successors are ever referred to in the histories as sayyid, although "prior to the time of Shaykh Şafī it was the usual practice to give sayyids, whether of the rank of 'urafa (gnostics) or of some other rank, the style of sayyid, or mīr, or shāh". Conversely, Kasrawī quotes the names of a

(1) op. cit., 489-90. (2) ibid., 364-5. (3) ibid., 489.

titles
in earlier
history

number of sayyids, all eminent Şūfīs and famous gnostics, who were never called shaykh or khwāja (1). There is no reference to the siyādat of the Şafawid family in the existing farmāns, title-deeds or waqfnāmas of the time of Şafī al-Dīn or Şadr al-Dīn. In a farman dated 717/1317 concerning the purchase of a village and its constitution into a waqf of the zāwiya of Şafī al-Dīn, the latter is referred to as sulṭān al-mashāyikh wa'l-muḥaqqiqīn quṭb al-ʿarīfīn sālik-i muḥajjat al-yaqīn. In a waqfnāma dated 798/1395-6, Şadr al-Dīn is styled afḍal al-mashāyikh al-muta'akhhirīn quṭb al-sālikīn fakhr al-nāsikīn shaykh şadr al-milla wa'l-ḥaqq wa'l-dunyā wa'l-dīn. Shāh Isma'īl never boasted of his siyādat; for instance, on the mosque at Sāwa, built in 924/1518-9, his titles are as follows:- al-sulṭān abū muẓaffar shāh isma'īl bahādur khān. Ṭahmāsp, on the other hand, took great pains to emphasize his siyādat, always styling himself al-şafawī al-ḥusaynī al-mūsawī, and calls the Imāms his ancestors (ajdād). It was Ṭahmāsp who ordered the recension of the Şafwat al-Şafa of Ibn Bazzāz al-Ardabīlī by Mīr Abu'l-Faṭḥ Ḥusaynī, and it is possible that copies of Ibn Bazzāz's original work were destroyed at his command. Abu'l-Faṭḥ Ḥusaynī states that the nasab-i siyādat of Shaykh Şafī is "given in detail in reliable works on genealogy" (dar kutub-i mu'tabira-yi ansāb bi-tafṣīl simat-i taḥrīr wa taqrīr yāfta), and Iskandar Beg in the Tārīkh-i 'Ālam-ārā states that "by the consensus of all the 'ulama-yi ansāb" the Şafawid genealogy is from the descendants of the Imām Mūsā al-Kāzīm. No extant work of this type, however, corroborates these statements, and Kasrawī considers, I

(1) ibid., 491. In a footnote Kasrawī allows that the title (laqab) shāh may not have become common usage (ma'mūl) until after the time of Şafī al-Dīn.

Shah Nizamulla

think with considerable justification, that the protestations of Abu'l-Fatḥ Ḥusaynī and Iskandar Beg are in themselves suspicious. Kasrawī suspects that the text of Ibn Bazzāz relating to Fīrūzshāh Zarrīnkulāh has been tampered with, and that the ancestors of Fīrūzshāh were from Kurdistan. Ibn Bazzāz states that Fīrūzshāh converted the inhabitants of Ādharbāyjan and Mughān, who were kāfirs, to Islam, but, Kasrawī says, this is patently false. On the basis of three generations to the century, Fīrūzshāh, the 7th ancestor of Ṣafī al-Dīn, must have lived at the beginning of the 5th/11th century, i. e. during the Seljuq period; the history of Ādharbāyjan and Arrān at that period is known, and the histories make no mention of the alleged march of Fīrūzshāh on Ādharbāyjan (from Kurdistan?). Moreover, the population of Mughān and Arrān had accepted Islam in the 1st and 2nd centuries A. H. At all events, whether the ancestors of Ṣafī al-Dīn migrated from Kurdistan or had for long been resident in Ādharbāyjan, Kasrawī thinks that they were indigenous inhabitants of Irān (az būmiyān-i bāstān-i Irān būda), and of pure Aryan stock (juz nizhād-i āryānī nadāshta and), i. e., they were of Tājīk, not Turkish, ancestry. Their language was Ādharī, the native language (zabān-i būmī) of Ādharbāyjan, and Ibn Bazzāz states that Ṣafī al-Dīn learnt Turkish and the Mongol tongue at school. Kasrawī sees the success of the Ṣafawid claim to siyādat as indicative of the strength of Ṣafawid influence, and as an important factor in the victories of Isma'īl, Ṭahmāsp and 'Abbās I which preserved Irān from the onslaught of its enemies in both east and west (1).

(1) op. cit., 492-7.

From a study of the Şarīḥ al-Mulk (1), a collection of waqfnāmas and title deeds of waqf lands relating to Jahānshāh Qara Qoyunlu and his wife Begum Khātūn, Kasrawī has deduced that up to the time of Shaykh Ja'far, a son of Khwāja 'Alī and a contemporary of Jahānshāh (d. 872/1467), the siyādat of the Şafawids had not been realized (ṣurat nagirifta), or at least had not become widely known, because there is no indication of the siyādat of Ja'far in the above-mentioned documents. In them, the alqāb of Ja'far consist of various combinations of al-'Alawī, al-Şadrī, al-Şafawī, and al-Shihabī. Kasrawī shows that these alqāb denote relationship with the various members of the Şafawid family, namely, Khwāja 'Alī, Şadr al-Dīn Mūsā, Şafī al-Dīn, and Shihāb al-Dīn b. Şadr al-Dīn Mūsā; al-'Alawī does not signify descent from 'Alī b. Abī Ṭalib, as is shown conclusively by the fact that, as one would expect, al-'Alawī does not appear among the alqāb of Khwāja 'Alī himself, or of Shihāb al-Dīn, who was Khwāja 'Alī's brother. Kasrawī thinks it probable that the alqāb al-'Alawī and al-Mūsawī, which actually referred to Khwāja 'Alī and Şadr al-Dīn Mūsā respectively, were eventually assumed to refer to 'Alī b. Abī Ṭalib and the Imām Mūsā al-Kāzim, and that the Şafawids encouraged this belief (2). While Kasrawī in some respects carries his argument too far, I think that his principal contentions are sound, and, pending further research, not only must the Şafawid claim to siyādat be regarded with suspicion, but the very origin of the Şafawid family itself must be considered unknown.

The first of Shaykh Şafī's ancestors of whom any details are given in the "traditional" account of the Silsilat al-Nasab is Firūzshāh Zarrīnkulāh,

(1) Kasrawī states that the principal MS. is in the Kitābkhāna-yi Salṭanatī. (2) op. cit., 808-10.

12

Compare with Fir

who is said to have been made governor of the province of Ardabīl and its dependencies by a son of Ibrāhīm b. Adham, described as padishāh-i Irān (1). Fīrūzshāh is described as a man of wealth and authority (mard-i mutamawwil wa ṣāhib-i tharwat wa miknat), owning a large portion of real-estate and live-stock (az ṣāmiṭ wa nāṭiq ḥazz-i 'aḡīm dāsht). His stock was so abundant and his household so numerous that he selected for his residence a place called Rāngīn, on the edge of the forests of Gīlān, where there were excellent pastures (ki ma'laf-i qawī ast) (2). The Ḥabīb al-Siyar says that he was famous for his great wealth (bi-wufūr-i tamawwul wa tharwat mashhūr); his flocks and herds were as numerous as the stars and the planets, and his servants and domestics were beyond computation. He was noted for the nobility of his character, the excellence of his manners, the felicity of his conversation, and the generosity of his behaviour. The lights of siyādat and sarwarī were visible on his auspicious brow, and men spoke always of his nobility and generosity (3). After his death his son 'Iwāḍ ('Awaḍ ?) moved to Isfaranjān, a village in the Ardabīl district (4).

According to the Sharafnāma, Fīrūzshāh was the first of Isma'īl's ancestors to come to Ardabīl; there, as a result of his abundant piety

(1) Ibrāhīm b. Adham, the early Ṣūfī teacher who died in 777-8/1375-6. He is said to have given up his position as ruler of Balkh to devote himself to a life of piety (See Browne iv, 36). It is the corresponding passage in Ibn Bazzāz which Kasrawī thinks has been altered in order to conceal the real origin of the ancestors of Fīrūzshāh (See p. 5 above).

(2) SN. 11. (3) HS. iii/4, 3. (4) SN. 11.

and zealous religious observance (wufūr-i taqwā wa kuthrat-i 'ibādat), the people of the region became his disciples (murīd wa mu'taqid-i ū gashta and) (1).

The son of 'Iwāḍ b. Fīrūzshāh, Muḥammad Ḥāfiẓ, disappeared at the age of seven, and the customary rites of mourning were performed for him. After seven years had elapsed, Muḥammad suddenly reappeared, wearing a jujube-coloured robe (jāma-yi 'unnābī), and with a white turban wound round the ordinary kulāh of the period. Round his neck was hung a copy of the Qur'ān. In answer to questions about his absence, he replied that he had been carried off by jinn, who had taught him the Qur'ān and instructed him in the necessary sciences (wājibāt-i 'ulūm), such as the precepts and laws (of God) (farā'id wa sunan). From then onwards Muḥammad Ḥāfiẓ lived a life of perfect piety and scrupulous religious observance.

Muḥammad's son, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Rashīd, was an agriculturalist (ṭarīqa-yi dihqanat wa zirā'at pīsh girift) at Kalkhurān, and devoted himself to reaping the profits of his labour (bi-kasb-i yadd mashghul mībūd). Kalkhurān was later the birthplace of Shaykh Ṣafī al-Dīn (2). Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's son, Quṭb al-Dīn Abu'l-Bāqī, was living at Kalkhurān at the time of the Georgian invasion of Persia and capture of Ardabīl (600/1203-4) (3). Several thousand Muslims were killed during this attack. Quṭb al-Dīn, with his month-old son Amīn al-Dīn Jibrā'īl, took refuge at Ardabīl with his family. There they concealed themselves in a cellar, with one of their number on guard above. The latter, discovered by a

(1) Shar. ii, 132. (2) SN. 11-12. (3) SN. 43.

Shadows
marauding Georgian, succeeded in overcoming him, but the Georgian's shouts brought further invaders to the spot. Before they arrived, the guard concealed the entrance to the cellar with a large grain bin (kandū). The Georgians killed the guard and left. The space in the cellar became too cramped for the number of people, mainly women and children, who were confined in it, and Quṭb al-Dīn was forced to seek another hiding place. He was caught by the Georgians, and left for dead with a wound in his neck. He was later recovered from among the corpses of other victims by a band of ruffians out for loot, and taken back to the cellar to be looked after by his relatives (1). Quṭb al-Dīn was still alive in 650/1252-3, when Shaykh Ṣafī al-Dīn was born, and the Shaykh used to say that when Quṭb al-Dīn put him on his shoulder, he could put four fingers into the gash left by the sword wound (2).

According to the "traditional" genealogy, however, Amīn al-Dīn Jibrā'īl was not the son, but the grandson, of Quṭb al-Dīn (3); Quṭb al-Dīn, when the time came for him to die (dar waqt-i ḥulūl-i ajal-i muqaddar), nominated as his heir (walī 'ahd) his son Ṣalīḥ, to whose education he had devoted all his energies when he emerged from hiding after the withdrawal of the Georgian forces. On the death of Ṣalīḥ, his son Amīn al-Dīn Jibrā'īl took his place (qāyim-maqam shud) (4). If we accept the traditional version, Quṭb al-Dīn was not still alive at the time of the birth of Shaykh Ṣafī al-Dīn, and the story related above is therefore apocryphal (5).

(1) SN. 12-14. (2) Cf. also Browne IV, 37. (3) See p.1 above.

(4) HS. iii/4, 4-5. (5) Hinz, 125, gives the "traditional" genealogy Ṣafī al-Dīn b. Amīn al-Dīn b. Ṣalīḥ b. Quṭb al-Dīn.

Amīn al-Dīn Jibrā'īl was the disciple (murīd) of Mawlānā Imām al-Rabbānī Khwāja Kamāl al-Dīn 'Arabshāh, a man described as being ṣāhib-i wilāyat (1). Amīn al-Dīn engaged in agriculture, and enjoyed great prosperity (az tamawwulī ḥaḡḡ-i wāfir dāsht). He did not mix at all with the common people (qaḡ'an bā mardum-i akhlāḡ ikhtilāḡ namīkard), but was always silent and at his devotions (paywasta khāmīsh wa bi-'ibādat būdī) (2). He married Dawlatī, the daughter of 'Umar Bārūqī, who bore him Shaykh Ṣafī al-Dīn (3). Six years later, in 656/1258, Amīn al-Dīn Jibrā'īl died (4).

Signs of future greatness were stamped upon the brow of Shaykh Ṣafī at an early age (5). He did not mix with other boys, but spent his time in prayer and fasting, "until God removed the veil from his heart". He experienced visions, seeing angels in the form of birds which in turn assumed human shape and conversed with him. Sometimes the awṭād and abdāl would approach him and comfort him with the assurance that he would reach the state of gnosis (ṣāhibdili) and become the focus for the hopes of the world (qibla-yi iqbāl wa ka'ba-yi āmal-i jahān) (6). Shaykh

(1) See A. A. A. Fyzee, A Shī'ite Creed, 97 n.: "Wilāya as a rank is superior to mubuwwa, for the light of mubuwwa is inferior to the light of wilāya". (2) SN. 15. (3) HS. iii/4, 5. (4) SN. 16. (5) ibid., 16. (6) The five awṭād, "stakes" or "pillars", and the abdāl, "substitutes" (their number is variously given as 7, 40 and 300), take the third and fifth place respectively in the hierarchy of the rijāl al-ghayb or ṣūfī hierarchy of saints who, "unknown by the masses, participate by means of their powerful influence in the preservation of the order of the universe" (I. Goldziher, article ABDĀL in ET², fasc. ii/1954, 94-5.).

Ṣafī sought a spiritual leader among the recluses (gūsha-nishīnān) of Ardabīl, but none could meet his needs. Shaykh Najīb al-Dīn Buzghūsh, at Shīrāz, was recommended to him. Shaykh Ṣafī decided to visit him. He failed to find a satisfactory pīr in any of the towns, such as Abhar and Qazwīn, through which he passed. At the time of this journey Shaykh Ṣafī was twenty years old (670/1271-2) (1). On arrival at Shīrāz, he learnt that Shaykh Najīb al-Dīn had died. Ṣafī remained in Shīrāz for some time, and many dervishes assembled round him and conversed with him. He visited Amīr 'Abd Allāh, and related to him his mystical state (ḥāl wa aḥwāl), his visions (wāqi'āt), and his spiritual stations or grades (maqāmāt). Amīr 'Abd Allāh was unable to help him, and advised the "Turkish pīr" that no one in the world could analyse his mystical state and vision except Shaykh Zāhid Gīlānī (ay turk-i pīr, az sharq-i 'ālam tā gharb-i 'ālam kasī ki ḥāl-i īn ḥāl wa wāqi'a-yi tū tawānad kardan hīchkas nīst ghayr az shaykh zāhid-i gīlānī). After a protracted search, and after suffering illness and hardship, Shaykh Ṣafī eventually found Shaykh Zāhid at the village of Ḥilya Kirān on the shores of the Caspian (675/1276-7) (2). In the course of his

(1) Shaykh Ṣafī obtained permission from his mother to travel to Shīrāz on the pretext of trying to persuade his brother Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn to return to Ardabīl. The latter had gone to Shīrāz on the death of his brother Muḥammad, a wealthy merchant who traded between Shīrāz and Hurmuz, and had taken over his assets. He had become a kadkhudā, and a man of wealth and position (tharwat wa miknat). When he heard of his brother's arrival, he sent a group of servants to welcome him and offer him hospitality, but Ṣafī rejected this offer, and took up his abode at the blessed tombs (mazarāt-i mutabarrīka). (2) SN. 24. See Minorsky, A Mongol Decree of 720/1320 to the Family of Shaykh Zāhid, in BSOAS, xvi/3, 1954, 520 ff.

was seeking
barkun
Shaykh Zāhid

travels Ṣafī had experienced visions in which Shaykh Zāhid was present. Shaykh Ṣafī reached Shaykh Zāhid's dwelling during Ramaḍān. Although it was the practice of Shaykh Zāhid not to interview any disciples until after the 'Īd, Shaykh Ṣafī was at once summoned to a private audience (khalwat-i rāz). That condition which he had experienced with other (spiritual guides), namely the averting of the face and the turning of the face away from him, did not materialize, and he remained face to face with Shaykh Zāhid (ān ḥalāt ki bā ghayrī wāqi' mīshud az inṣirāf-i rūy wa rūy az barābar-i way gardīdan nashud, wa rūy bā rūy-i shaykh zāhid bimānd); he knew that Shaykh Zāhid was the goal of his aspirations (maqṣad-i amānī), and he therefore announced his conversion (tawba) (1).

Shaykh Ṣafī was allotted a place in Shaykh Zāhid's private quarters (khalwat-i khāṣṣ), where he remained until the end of Ramaḍān. Again contrary to his usual practice, Shaykh Zāhid granted a further audience to Ṣafī during Ramaḍān, because Ṣafī was in doubt whether his mystical states (ḥalāt) and visionary powers (wāqi'āt) were inspired by God or by Satan (mutaraddid būd ki raḥmānīst yā shayṭānī). Shaykh Zāhid resolved his doubts and answered his questions, saying that there had been no more than one veil between Ṣafī and God, and that that had now been removed (miyān-i īn wa ḥaqq yak ḥijāb bīsh nabūd ki ān nīz murtafi' shud) (2).

(1) SN. 26-7. See A. J. Arberry, Sufism, 75: "The first station is stated to be conversion (tauba), a view commonly held by the Sufis, who mean by this term not of course the formal profession of Islam but the conscious resolve of the adult Muslim to abandon the worldly life and to devote himself to the service of God". (2) SN. 27-8.

Shaykh Ṣafī reached Shaykh Zāhid in 675/1276-7, when he himself was 25 years of age, and Shaykh Zāhid 60 (1). He continued to follow the direction of Shaykh Zāhid for 25 years, until the latter's death in Rajab 700/March-April 1301 (2). As Shaykh Zāhid grew older, he became more and more dependent on Ṣafī who, when Shaykh Zāhid's sight failed him, used to sit at his side, describe visitors to him, and conduct interviews for him (3). Shaykh Ṣafī allied himself closely to the family of Shaykh Zāhid by his own marriage to Bībī Fāṭima, the daughter of Shaykh Zāhid, and by giving his own daughter in marriage to Ḥājji Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Shaykh Zāhid. Ḥājji Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad thus became at once the son-in-law and the brother-in-law of Shaykh Ṣafī. Shaykh Ṣafī had three sons by Bībī Fāṭima, namely Muḥyī al-Dīn (d. 724/1323-4), Ṣadr al-Milla wa'l-Dīn Mūsā (d. 794/1391-2), and Abū Sa'īd (4).

Some of the disciples of Shaykh Zāhid grew jealous of Shaykh Ṣafī's position and influence with Shaykh Zāhid, who expressed his affection and esteem for Shaykh Ṣafī in the most forthright terms. "Ṣafī's hand", he said, "is my hand; whoever is a convert (tawbakār) of his is mine also; whoever is a convert of mine but not of his, is wanted neither by me nor by him (marā nabāyad wa ūrā nīz nabāyad). I am Ṣafī and Ṣafī is I". The Ardabīlīs present flung themselves into a joyful samā' at these words, and shouted ecstatically. Zāhid nodded and said, "You are indeed right to rejoice, because today is your day".

(1) Hinz, 13. (2) SN. 93. (3) SN. 82. (4) SN. 36.

Equally unequivocal was Shaykh Zāhid's nomination of Shaykh Ṣafī to succeed him as head of the order. When Shaykh Zāhid saw that Shaykh Ṣafī was competent to give spiritual direction (irshād), he granted him a prayer-mat and the authority to teach ('arḍ-i sajjāda wa talqīn dādan namūd). Ṣafī accepted humbly, but protested his inadequacy for the task. His only goal, he said, was the threshold of Zāhid. Zāhid replied, "Ṣafī! God has shown you to the people, and his command is that you obey his call. I have broken the polo-stick of all your adversaries, and cast the ball before you. Strike it where you will; the field is yours. I have been able to live the life of a recluse, but you cannot. Wherever you are summoned, you must go, to make converts and to give instruction. It is God who has given you this task of instruction and spiritual guidance (tarbiyat wa irshād) (1).

Although this passage may have been written in the light of future events, it is a fact that with the assumption by Shaykh Ṣafī of the leadership of the Zāhidiyya, henceforth termed the Ṣafawid order (700/1301), there commenced the period of active proselytism which transformed what had been a Ṣufī order of purely local significance into a religious movement whose influence was felt throughout Persia, Syria and Asia Minor. The succession of Shaykh Ṣafī was not undisputed. One of his principal rivals (ham-chashm) was Jamāl al-Dīn 'Alī, Shaykh Zāhid's son by his first wife, and some short-sighted people assumed that Shaykh Zāhid should appoint him as his successor; they were ignorant of the fact that in these matters blood relationship (pidar-farzandī) has

(1) SN. 86.

biased

no importance" (1).

During the time that Shaykh Ṣafī was head of the Ṣafawid order (700-35/1301-34), he treated the descendants of Shaykh Zāhid with love and affection (muḥabbat wa muwaddat). Every year he visited the tomb of his murshid, and took costly gifts for his children and the attendants of the shrine. Ḥājjī Shams al-Dīn, his wife's brother, was singled out for special honour (bi-naw'ī iḥtirām wa i'zāz dāshtī ki sharḥ natawān kardan) (2). At the time of his daughter's marriage to Ḥājjī Shams al-Dīn, Shaykh Ṣafī conferred on the latter goods (amta'a), lands (amlāk) and numerous possessions (khwāsta-yi farawān) (3). Year by year Shaykh increased his gifts to Ḥājjī Shams al-Dīn, and, in addition, paid any debts incurred by the latter (har qarḍī ki ḥājjī shams al-dīn bikardī ū adā farmūdī). He went to such lengths (tā ḥaddī mubālagha mīkard) that his wife Bībī Faṭīma raised with him the question of inheritance, and suggested that he should make over to Ḥājjī Shams al-Dīn four dāngs (2/3) of his property, and retain only two dāngs (1/3) for himself. Shaykh Ṣafī demurred at this, but agreed to send whatever accrued from his property to his brother-in-law (ammā harchi ḥāṣil shawad az bahr-i ū khwāham firistādan) (4).

Apparently Shaykh Ṣafī's beneficence did not extend to the descendants of Shaykh Zāhid's elder son, Jamāl al-Dīn 'Alī, who had challenged him for the position of head of the order. Professor Minorsky suggests that Shaykh Ṣafī al-Dīn was a party to the usurpation by Ḥājjī

(1) V. Minorsky, A Mongol Decree of 720/1320 to the Family of Shaykh Zāhid, in BSOAS, xvi/3, 1954, 517-19. (2) SN. 93. (3) ibid., 95. (4) ibid., 94.

Shams al-Dīn Muhammad of the revenue from certain waqfs which should have been under the control of Badr al-Dīn (Jamālān), the son of Jamāl al-Dīn 'Alī. A decree of the Ilkhān Abū Sa'īd dated 720/1320 orders the restoration of the rights of Badr al-Dīn. Professor Minorsky therefore concludes that "the rise of Shaykh Ṣafi al-Dīn, the ancestor of the famous dynasty of Persia, was a complicated affair and provoked the opposition and intervention of the Mongol rulers" (1). At the same time the descendants of Shaykh Zāhid themselves were not immune from acts of oppression on the part of the amīrs of Abū Sa'īd (regn. 1316-35). We hear of a certain Chīn Beg, one of the Qipchāq amīrs who had taken up their quarters at Khunbulī (now known as Ūranqād), and who had inflicted injury on the peasants of the descendants of Shaykh Zāhid. Shaykh Ṣafī remonstrated with Chīn Beg, saying that he must not make Khunbulī into a yurt (tribal pasture) (2), as it was the private property (milk) of the descendants of Shaykh Shams al-Dīn b. Shaykh Zāhid (3). There was also continual contention (ta'aṣṣubī) between Amīr Mubārak, one of Abū Sa'īd's amīrs, and the descendants of Shaykh Zāhid regarding the limits and boundaries (dar sar-i sāmān wa marz) of Nawshahr in the Khunbulī district. The dispute was protracted (nizā'-i īshān mumtadī shud) (4).

Towards the end of his life, Shaykh Ṣafī made a will in favour of his son Shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn, appointing him his successor and vicegerent

(1) V. Minorsky, A Mongol Decree of 720/1320 to the Family of Shaykh Zāhid, in BSOAS, xvi/3, 1954, 519-20. (2) See A. K. S. Lambton, LP, 77-8; 443 s. v. (3) SN. 98. (4) ibid., 99+100.

(khalīfa wa nā'ib-munāb), charging him with the administration of the votive offerings (mudhūrāt), effects (amta'a) and lands (amlāk), and making him responsible for the continuance, so far as was possible, of the practice of providing sustenance for the poor at God's gate (sufra-yi fuqarā-yi bāb-i ilāhī). Shaykh Ṣafī died on 12 Muḥarram 735/12 September 1334. As the other three brothers of Ṣadr al-Dīn (1) died soon after their father, and left no issue, Ṣadr al-Dīn acquired any waqf property and lands which they had possessed, and thus became not only the spiritual but also the sole material heir of Shaykh Ṣafī al-Dīn (2). Ṣadr al-Dīn had been born in 704/1304-5 (3), and was therefore thirty years of age when he succeeded his father as head of the Ṣafawid order in 735/1334.

It was under the direction of Shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn that the sacred enclosure (ḥaḏīra-yi mutabarrika) (4) of the Ṣafawid family was begun and completed in ten years. Ṣadr al-Dīn organized the establishment of the mausoleum (rawḏa) as regards caretakers (ḥuffāḡ) and attendants (khuddām), supplied candles and torches (shumū' wa masha'il), and provided a rash-khāna (5), rooms for private meditation (khalwatkhāna), and ancillary buildings (muta'allaqāt). The novices, both men and women, brought frequent offerings, which were used by Ṣadr al-Dīn to defray the expenses of these pious foundations (biqā'-i khayr) (6).

(1) namely, Abū Sa'īd, 'Alā' al-Dīn, and Sharaf al-Dīn; Muḥyī al-Dīn had predeceased his father in 724/1323-4. (2) SN. 36. (3) SN. 39. (4) The text has khaḏīra-yi mutabarrika; khaḏīra does not appear to have a suitable meaning, and is almost certainly a misreading for ḥaḏīra, in the sense of "enclosure", Τέμενος and hence "sacred enclosure". Ḥaḏīra occurs in the Maḏla'-i Sa'dayn, ii/2, 1394, and in the Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh, 4. Although the form khaḏīra appears again in SN. 43, the correct form ḥaḏīra is found in SN. 45, and the plural form ḥaḏā'ir in SN. 108. SN. 93 even has a form ḥaḏīra, which again would seem to be an error. (5) I have been unable to find a meaning for شخانه, which, like خطبه three lines above, is probably a misprint. I am indebted to Professor Minorsky for the suggestion that آشخانه "refectory" is the most likely emendation. (6) SN. 39.

Shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn, like his father, continued to aim at the extension of the Ṣafawid da'wa and the expansion of the Ṣafawid movement, and many of the Ilkhānid amirs and Mongol nobility became disciples of the Ṣafawid shaykhs (1). But the close connexions of the Ṣafawid shaykhs with the house of Ghūbān "did not prevent the tyrannous Ghobanid Malik-Ashraf from imprisoning Shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn." (2). Malik Ashraf's action does not, however, seem to have been part of a specific policy designed to suppress the Ṣafawid order, but rather occasioned by his antipathy to shaykhs, 'ulamā, and fuḍalā in general. "By fair and specious words" (laṭā'if-i ḥiyāl-āmīz), Malik Ashraf enticed Ṣadr al-Dīn to Tabrīz, detained him for three months in the Rashīdiyya building, and then released him with profuse apologies ('udhr-khwāhī bisyar namūda) as the result of a terrifying dream (khwāb-i muḥībī). At the suggestion of malevolent people (bi-ighwā-yi badgūyān), Malik Ashraf again strayed from the straight path (az jādā-yi mustaqīm bar gasht), and despatched men to seize the Shaykh by any means possible and bring him to Tabrīz. Ṣadr al-Dīn's spiritual insight forewarned him of the plot, and he fled to Gīlān, abandoning the seat of his authority (markaz-i wilāyat-rā khālī bigud-hāsht). Malik Ashraf pursued a similar policy towards all the shaykhs, 'ulamā and fuḍalā of Irān, with the result that the majority of them chose exile (jālā-yi waṭān), abandoning both their place of residence

(1) See The Transition to Shī'ism, p. 99. (2) TM 189, n. 5. Malik Ashraf besieged Shaykh Ḥasan Buzurg the Jālā'irid at Baghdād in 1347, and later laid siege to Iṣfahān; although unsuccessful in these attempts, he continued to rule tyrannically in Ādharbāyjan until his defeat and death at the hands of Jānī Beg, ruler of Dasht-i Qipchāq, in 1356-7. (van Loon, Ta'rīkh-i Shaikh Uwais, 11).

and their source of livelihood (dast az maskan wa ma'lūf-i khwud dāshtand).

(1). Jānī Beg, the khān of Qipchāq (regn. 741-58/1340-57) (2), benefited by the influx of these important men into his kingdom; "in the days of his government the great country prospered, for many of the prominent men of Tabrīz, Sarāh, Ardabīl, Bailaqān, Barda'a and Nakhchawān went there owing to the oppression of Malik Ashraf. The state became prosperous, his power increased" (3). After hearing the lament of one of these learned men, Jānī Beg Khān vowed to send an army to Irān to avenge those who had suffered from the tyranny of Malik Ashraf. Jānī Beg Khān led a force south through Shīrwān into Ādharbāyjan, captured Malik Ashraf near Tabrīz, and put him to death. Shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn was received in royal fashion at the camp of Jānī Beg Khān at Awjān. In the course of a private audience, Jānī Beg Khān said that he had heard that Ṣadr al-Dīn had been in exile for a long time, and that the condition of the dervishes living in the ancestral sanctuary (at Ardabīl) was inglorious (bī-rawnaq). He advised the Shaykh to return and comfort the poor, for he was the repository of their hopes and expectations. He himself, he said, did not intend to remain in Irān, and he instructed Ṣadr al-Dīn to draw up an inventory (tūmār) of all the lands (amlak), crafts (ṣanāyi') and estates (aqār) belonging to himself and his novices so that he (Jānī Beg) might allot them to the Shaykh as a soyurghal,

(Now Sarab)

(1) SN. 42. (2) This was Jānī Beg Maḥmūd, ruler of the Blue Horde of Western Qipchāq, and a descendant of Batu (Lane-Poole, Mohammedan Dynasties, 230). Rasht formed part of his territory (SN. 42). For details of Malik Ashraf's oppressive rule, see Van Loon, op. cit., 74 ff. (3) Van Loon, op. cit., 76.

ساراب

protected by a maledictory clause, and that over the ages the profit accruing from them might be assigned as a pension (to the Ṣafawids) (bi-rūzgārḥā naf' bar ān mutarattib shawad). Ṣadr al-Dīn then returned to Ardabīl, and gave his novices leave to disperse throughout the provinces of Ardabīl, Dār al-Marz, Mughānāt and other districts to draw up the documents (asnād), which were then to be embellished (muwashshah) with the name of the Shaykh and presented to the Khān. The novices prepared the lists and forwarded them to the attendants (khādīmān) of the lofty threshold ('ataba-yi 'ulyā), but the Shaykh was unable to meet the Khān before the latter left Īrān, and the decrees in the form of a soyūrghāl (aḥkām bi-'inwān-i soyūrghāl) promised by the Khān were never issued (1).

When the power of the Īlkhāns declined, Ardabīl passed from hand to hand as Jalā'irids, Chūbānids and Qara Qoyunlu fought for supremacy in Aharbāyjan. In 784/1382-3 the Jalā'irid sultan Aḥmad b. Uways killed his brother Ḥusayn and ruled at Tabrīz, but before that date he had held Ardabīl as a soyūrghāl from his father (2), who died in 776/1374 (3). Prior to 817/1414, the powerful amīr Bisṭām Jāgīr was in the habit of quartering his cavalry, retinue and servants for the summer in the Ardabīl area, up to the borders of Gīlān, Arrān and Mughān (4). Muḥammad b. Manṣūr, nephew of Amīr Bisṭām Jāgīr, who had been

(1) SN. 42-3. (2) A. K. S. Lambton, LP. 104 n. 2. (3) Van Loon, op. cit., 13, q. Khwāndamīr iii/1, 82, gives the date of the death of Uways as October 9, 1374. (4) MS. ii/1, 290. The Jāgīrlū were a Turkomān tribe: see TM. 16.

given Ardabīl and Khalkhāl as a soyūrghāl by Qarā Yūsuf Qara Qoyunlu, rebelled against Qarā Yūsuf in 816/1413, and on 1 Jumādā I 816/30 July 1413 seized Khwāja Jamāl al-Dīn Ṣafawī in Ardabīl, looted his horses and livestock (dawabb), appropriated his cash, and imprisoned the Khwāja in Qal'a-yi Farrukh, which was on the borders of Ardabīl (1). After the death of Tīmūr, the Qara Qoyunlu and the Tīmūrīds were the principal contestants for the control of Ādharbāyjan. In 823/1420, when the Qara Qoyunlu chiefs dispersed after the death of Qarā Yūsuf, Zaynal Beg b. Yar 'Alī went to Ardabīl; this may imply that Zaynal Beg exercised some sort of control over the Ardabīl district (2).

The position of the Ṣafawid order was naturally affected by the political and military administration of the successive rulers of Ādharbāyjan. The Ṣafawid shaykhs were concerned to protect from usurpation the property belonging to the Ardabīl sanctuary, and the lands in the province of Ardabīl and surrounding districts which belonged to the Ṣafawid family, and more particularly to render the income from this property and land immune from the ad hoc exactions of local officials and military commanders. In 772/1372 Sulṭān Ahmad Jalā'ir issued a farmān forbidding governors and other officials to "make any demands or write drafts on the places in the hands of his (Shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn's) disciples". Apparently the property of the Ṣafawid order had enjoyed immunity from taxation for some time already, for the farmān

(1) MS. ii/1, 256. It is not clear who is meant by this Khwāja Jamāl al-Dīn Ṣafawī. (2) MS. ii/1, 411.

refers to "certain ancient tax exemptions enjoyed by the estates (amlāk) and ouqāf of his blessed retreat" (1). The descendants of Shaykh Zāhid, though they continued, after the death of Ḥājji Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad (2), to live under the protection of Shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn, experienced varied fortunes under his successors until the time of Sulṭān Ḥaydar (3).

v.i. 123

Shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn died in 794/1391-2, and, like his father, was buried in the Ardabīl sanctuary. Before his death he had nominated his son Khwāja 'Alī as his successor and vicegerent (khalīfa wa na'ib-munāb), and had entrusted to him the "prayer-mat of spiritual guidance" (sajjāda-yi irshād), and charged him with the nurture of God's servants (tarbiyat-i 'ibād). Khwāja 'Alī was head of the order from 794/1391-2 until his death on 18 Rajab 830/15 May 1427 (4). Under Khwāja 'Alī, the esoteric doctrine of the Ṣafawid order first assumed an unequivocally Shī'ite character (5). Khwāja 'Alī, inciting Tīmūr to take the field against the Yazīdī Kurds of Syria, attached the usual Shī'ī anathema of alayhi'l-la'na to the name of Mu'āwiya, and said, "We have donned black robes in mourning for all the immaculate Imāms" (6). Nevertheless Khwāja 'Alī was held in great respect both by Tīmūr and his son Shāhrukh. According to the Silsilat al-Nasab, Tīmūr's respect for Khwāja 'Alī derived from a miracle performed by the latter when Tīmūr, returning in 806/1404 from his campaign in Asia Minor (7), passed through Ardabīl. He summoned Khwāja 'Alī, and offered him a cup of poison, which he drank. A number of the dervishes present began rhythmically to chant the dhikr lā ilāha illa'llāhu. As their fervour increased, Khwāja

(1) A. K. S. Lambton, LP. 104. (2) see p. 15 above. (3) SN. 103. (4) SN. 45. (5) Hinz, 23. See also Professor Minorsky's review of Hinz's work in Deutsche Literaturzeitung, 1937, No. 23. (6) SN. 47. (7) See TM. 189 n. 6.

'Alī went into a trance (ḥālī paydā shud), and rose to join the dance. The heat engendered by this performance sweated the poison out of his body. Tīmūr was so overcome with wonder that he seized the hem of Khwāja 'Alī's robe, and became his disciple and convinced follower. He handed over to Khwāja 'Alī the prisoners taken in his campaign against the Ottomans. Khwāja 'Alī freed the men and settled them near the holy shrine of Ganja bi-Kūl. Their descendants became known as Şufiyan-i Rūmlū (1). The fuller account of the anonymous history of Shah Isma'īl (Cambridge Add. MS. 200 = British Museum Or. MS. 3248) is quoted by Professor Minorsky: "The Shaykh begged for the liberation of the prisoners of Rūm, and Tīmūr freed them all (majmī') and appointed them to the service of the family of Ardabīl. He also issued an order (raqam) to the rulers (salāṭīn) and governors of Rūm to the effect that the men whom he had freed 'and who are the Şufīs of the Şafawid family', wherever they be, should not be oppressed (dast-andāz) or prevented from visiting (āmad-u-shud) their Murshid; they must be exempted from payments to their masters (2), as well as from government taxes (wujūhāt-i ra'iyatī wa tahmīlāt-i dīwānī). Out of his own lawful money Tīmūr bought fields and villages in the neighbourhood of Ardabīl and allotted them as waqf (3) to the resting place (mazar) of Shaykh Şafī, which he recognised as a bast (asylum). He also made over to the Şafawid family the land taxes (kharāj) of the said wilāyat. To those of the prisoners who expressed the desire to return to Rūm permission was granted to do so. Shaykh Sulṭan-'Alī (janāb-i sulṭānī) appointed his representatives

(1) SN. 48. (2) or rather, "from payment of peasant dues." (3) or rather, "constituted them into a waqf."

(khalīfa wa pīra) to all the tribes (oymaqāt) and said: 'let your comings and goings be not infrequent, for the advent (khurūj) of the righteous Duodeciman religion is nigh and you must be ready to sacrifice your lives "' (1). According to the Silsilat al-Nasab, the lands purchased by Tīmūr were not in the Ardabīl district alone, but comprised villages and hamlets (dihāt wa mazāri') in the regions of Talwār, Qizil Uzun, Kamara of Iṣfahān, Hamadān etc.; he constituted them into a waqf to the male issue of Khwāja 'Alī, but as the lands thus donated had not been given into the possession (of the Ṣafawid family) in their entirety during the lifetime of Tīmūr (chūn mawqūfat tā ghāyat dar zamān-i tīmūr khān bi-taṣarruf nadāda būdand), the transaction did not come into operation (ma'mūl nashuda), and none of the lands are now (i.e., at the time of the compilation of the Silsilat al-Nasab, c. 1660) in the possession of the descendants of Khwāja 'Alī (2). The document relative to this waqf is said to have fallen into the hands of the ghāzīs (qizilbāsh) of 'Abbās I at Khwāja Dū Kūha near Balkh in 1011/1602-3. The latter did not take cognizance of the acquisition of the lands in question (multafit bi-ḡabṭ-i amlāk namīshawand). He said that it was a royal transaction (mu'amala-yi padishāhī ast); perhaps the title-deeds (qabālahā) had been written, but the landowner (ṣāhib-i milk) had not received payment; otherwise at least a portion of the land would be in the possession (of the beneficiary) (agar hamchūn namībūd mībayist ki az ān amlāk qalīlī dar taṣarruf mībūd) (3).

(1) TM. 189-90. (2) SN. 48. (3) ibid., 48-9. Kasrawī, op. cit., 803 ff., gives his reasons for regarding this document as a forgery; he also regards the account of Khwāja 'Alī's three meetings with Tīmūr (SN. 46 ff.) as legendary, as there is no mention of them in the Zafarnāma.

113.

As mentioned above, Khwāja 'Alī was also held in respect by Tīmūr's son Shāhrukh. On 28 Dhu'l-Qa'da 823/4 December 1420, in the course of his campaign against the Qara Qoyunlu, Shāhrukh entered Ardabil and visited the tomb of shaykh al-mashāyikh Shaykh Ṣafī al-Dīn, and derived help from the blessed company of Shaykh 'Alā' al-Dīn Khwāja 'Alī (bi-barakat-i ṣubbat-i.....istis'ād yaft) (1). This pilgrimage was in accordance with Shāhrukh's usual practice of showing veneration for the holy men and visiting the tombs of the celebrated shaykhs of the regions through which he passed, but his visit to Khwāja 'Alī is especially interesting; considerations of the favour shown to Khwāja 'Alī and the Ṣafawid order by Tīmūr seem to have outweighed any antipathy Shāhrukh may have felt towards the now manifestly Shī'ite tendencies of the order. Perhaps an even more potent consideration was Shāhrukh's desire to demonstrate his sympathy with popular religious sentiment; on several occasions, for instance, he visited the shrine of the Shī'ite Imām 'Alī al-Riḍā. (2).

Khwāja 'Alī died in 830/1427, leaving three sons: Shaykh Ja'far, whose learning and knowledge (faḍl wa dānish) were not equalled by any other shaykh of the Ṣafawid order; 'Abd al-Raḥmān, whose descendants lived either in Gaskar or Ardabil province; and Ibrāhīm, who was the vicegerent (nāyib-munāb) and successor (jānishīn) of his father (3). Nothing is recorded in the Silsilat al-Nasab of the progress of the order

(1) MS. ii/1, 408. Hinz, 22, q. Ḥasan Rūmlū ix, 24b, gives the date of the meeting as March 1421 (presumably 1412 is a typographical error).

(2) See The Transition to Shī'ism, p127. (3) SN. 49-50.

under Shaykh Ibrāhīm, known as Shaykh Shāh, who was head of the order from 830-51/1427-47. With the succession of the latter's son Shaykh Junayd, the Ṣafawid order, from being a militant, became a military organization. Professor Dr. Walther Hinz, in his Irans Aufstieg zum Nationalstaat, has described in detail the history and development of the Ṣafawid order under Junayd (d. 1460), Ḥaydar (d. 1488), and Sulṭān 'Alī (d. 1494) (1). Only a brief outline, therefore, will be given in this thesis of the activities of the Ṣafawids during this period, and of their relations with the Qara Qoyunlu and Aq Qoyunlu rulers of Diyar Bakr and Ādharbāyjān.

(1) 22-49; 72-96. TM. 190 gives some additional details from the Tārīkh-i Amīnī and 'Āshiqpāshā-zāda.

The most important period

v. 1 AC

(ii) The Struggle for Supremacy in Persia after the death of Tīmūr.

The campaigns of Tīmūr in Persia between the years 783-807/1381-1404 put an end to the minor dynasties which had sprung up in various parts of the country after the Mongol invasions and especially after the death of the Īlkhān Abū Sa'īd (736/1335), when Mongol power in Persia began rapidly to decline. The Kurts (643-791/1245-1389), semi-nomads who had established themselves on the north-eastern borders of Persia at Harāt; the Sarbidārids (737-783/1337-1381), whose centre was Sabzawār in Khurāsān; and the Muẓaffarids (713-795/1313-1392), rulers of Fārs and Kirman, were all overwhelmed. The reigning head of the Jalā'irid dynasty of 'Irāq-i 'Arab and Ādharbāyjan, Sulṭān Aḥmad, in 796/1393 fled from Tīmūr's armies into Turkey (1), and although the dynasty maintained a shadowy existence until 814/1411, its princes were never again in effective control of their territories for any considerable period (2).

After the death of Tīmūr (February 1405), his son Shāhrukh consolidated the Tīmūrid empire in 'Irāq-i 'Ajam, Fārs, Khurāsān and Transoxania. He rebuilt the cities of Marw and Harāt; Marw had been destroyed in 620/

(1) Van Loon, Ta'rīkh-i Shaikh Uwais, 17. (2) Certain members of the Jalā'irid family continued to rule after 814/1411 at Wasiṭ, Baṣra and Shūshtar, doing homage to the Tīmūrid Shāhrukh, until their extinction by the Qara Qoyunlu in 1432 (Howorth, History of the Mongols, iii, 654-79; Van Loon, op. cit., 18. For an account of the origins of the Jalā'irs, see Van Loon, op. cit., 6 ff.).

1223-4 by Tūlūy b. Changīz, and was restored by Shāhrukh in 812/1409-10 (1). Shāhrukh, and his son Bāysunqur, were patrons of the arts, and encouraged men of learning and science to congregate at the Tīmūrid court. In Ādharbāyjan, however, the Tīmūrids were unable permanently to maintain their authority. Despite a series of expeditions by Shāhrukh and his successors against Ādharbāyjan, control of that province passed into the hands first of the Qara Qoyunlu (Black Sheep) and then of the Aq Qoyunlu (White Sheep) Turkomāns. These nomadic tribesmen moved eastwards from Armenia, Upper Mesopotamia and Anatolia, where they had settled in Seljuq times, into west and north-west Persia (2).

The Qara Qoyunlu established themselves in the region of Lake Wan as dependants of the Jalā'irid rulers. The Qara Qoyunlu chief Bayrām Khwāja (d. 782/1380), head of the Bahārlū clan, held a position of importance at the court of the Jalā'irid ruler Sulṭān Uways (d. 776/1374), and Bayrām Khwāja's successor Qarā Muḥammad Tūrmush (d. 792/1390) entered the service of the Jalā'irid ruler Sulṭān Aḥmad b. Uways (3). Qarā Yūsuf b. Qarā Muḥammad, who succeeded his father in 792/1390, took possession of Tabrīz, the capital of the eastern half of the Jalā'irid dominions, and declared himself an independent ruler by minting his own coinage, on which he is styled amīr yūsuf bahādur nūyān, amīr-i a'ḡam, or

(1) Shar. ii, 78. (2) A. K. S. Lambton, LP. 106. (3) Rabino 113;

Bayrām Khwāja had been defeated by Uways in 767/1366 (Van Loon, op. cit., 12); cf. also the article KARĀ-KOYUNLU in EI¹.

al-nūyān al-a'ẓam (1). Sulṭān Aḥmad and Qarā Yūsuf were both repeatedly driven from their territories by the armies of Tīmūr (2), but within a few years of the death of Tīmūr (1405) they had regained control of 'Irāq-i 'Arab and Ādharbāyjan respectively. On 1 Jumādā 809/14 October 1406 Qarā Yūsuf defeated Abū Bakr b. Mīrānshāh b. Tīmūr near Nakhchiwān (3), and on 24 Dhu'l-Qa'da 810/21 April 1408 he defeated him again at Sardrūd near Tabrīz. In the second battle Mīrānshāh was killed. Qarā Yūsuf is said to have put to death the Turkoman who slew Mīrānshāh, saying that if Mīrānshāh had been brought before him alive, he would have treated him with fitting respect (4). In 810/1407-8 Qarā Yūsuf made his son Pīr Būdāq, born in captivity in Syria, joint-ruler, and royal orders commenced with the words sulṭān pīr būdāq yarligidan abu'l-naṣr yūsuf bahādur nūyān sözümliz: "By the decree of Sulṭān Pīr Būdāq we Abu'l-Naṣr Yūsuf Bahādur Nūyān ordain that....." (5). Having completed his reoccupation of Ādharbāyjan, Qarā Yūsuf sought to enlarge his territory. In 812/1410 he subjugated Diyār Bakr, held by the rival dynasty of the Aq Qoyunlu led by Qarā 'Uthmān; in the same year he raided Shakkī and parts of Shīrwān, but later concluded peace with Ibrāhīm Shīrwānshāh (6).

In 813/1410 Sulṭān Aḥmad Jalā'ir attempted to recover the province of Ādharbāyjan which he had lost to Qarā Yūsuf twenty years previously, but on 28 Rabī' II 813/31 August 1410 he was defeated outside Tabrīz and

(1) Rabino, 114. (2) Van Loon, op. cit., 17. (3) TIN. 43lb.

(4) MS. 115-6. (5) Rabino 113. (6) MS. ii/1, 172-3.

put to death by Qarā Yūsuf; Qarā Yūsuf also put to death Shāh Walad b. Shaykh 'Alī b. Uways and 'Alā' al-Dawla b. Ahmad (1). As a result of this victory, Qarā Yūsuf took possession of the rest of the Jalā'irid dominions in 'Irāq-i 'Arab, with the exception of a small area in southern 'Irāq (2), and gave 'Irāq-i 'Arab to his son Shāh Muḥammad (3) (Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad Shāh). Gayūmarth b. Ibrāhīm Shīrwānshāh, who had marched to the assistance of Sulṭān Ahmad Jalā'ir, was captured by Qarā Yūsuf, who imprisoned him in the fortress of Arjīsh and rejected all offers of ransom (4). In 815/1412-3 Qarā Yūsuf obtained the allegiance of Shams al-Dīn, the ruler of Bitlīs, and inflicted a further defeat on Qarā 'Uthmān Aq Qoyunlu near Āmid (5). In the autumn of 1412 Qarā Yūsuf launched an attack on Ibrāhīm Shīrwānshāh and his allies Amīr Sayyid Ahmad, the ruler of Shakkī, and Kustandīl, the ruler of Zagam in Georgia. Ibrāhīm and his brother Bahlūl were captured and sent to Tabrīz, but were later released for a ransom. Kustandīl was also captured, and was put to death together with 300 Georgian nobles (aznāwurān)(6).

In 822/1419 Qarā Yūsuf made further inroads into the Tīmūrid empire. He invaded 'Irāq-i 'Ajam, wrested from the officers of Shāhrukh Sulṭāniyya, Ṭarum, Qazwīn and Sāwa, and annexed them to his own empire (bā mamālik-i maḥrūsa munazzam gardānīd) (7). In the opinion of the Tīmūrids, Fārs and Iṣfahān prospered under the rule of Ibrāhīm b. Shāhrukh

(1) MS. ii/1, 195-7. (2) See p. 27, n.2 above. (3) ^{Heh} TIN. 432a. (4) MS. ii/1, 197-8. (5) ibid., ii/1, 241. (6) ibid., 242-3; TIN. 432a. It is interesting to note that the people of Tabrīz interceded with Qarā Yūsuf for the Shīrwānshāh, and that some of the landowners (arbābān) of Tabrīz acted as guarantors for the payment of his ransom. (7) TIN. 432b. The date given by this source, 826 A.H., is clearly wrong, since Qarā Yūsuf died in 823 A.H.

and Rustam b. 'Umar Shaykh respectively, but 'Irāq-i 'Arab, parts of 'Irāq-i 'Ajam, and Ādharbāyjan, had been laid waste by the oppression and sedition of Amīr Qarā Yūsuf Turkmān, and the people cried out for help against his tyranny and injustice (1). In 823/1420 Shāhrukh's ambassador Šiddīq returned from Ādharbāyjan and reported that Amīr Qarā Yūsuf aspired to the highest positions of authority and power, and considered himself an independent ruler in that kingdom. The amīrs of the neighbouring regions (aṭraf) were obedient to his commands, and his farman was obeyed in those provinces (mamalik); Qarā Yūsuf had built himself strong forts and impregnable castles; the practices of the religious law (rusūm-i shar'iyya) were in abeyance (mukhtall), and pious foundations were devoid of splendour (bī-rawnaq) and were disused (mu'aṭṭal); Qarā Yūsuf spent his days and nights in impiety and debauchery (fisq wa fujūr), and the fantasy of independence had disordered (mukhabbat) his mind (2).

At the time of the death of Tīmūr, Shāhrukh was governor of Khurāsān. During the next fifteen years he gradually extended his authority beyond the borders of Khurāsān, adding successively to his territories Gurgān and Māzandarān (809/1406-7) (3), Transoxania (811/1408-9) (4), Fārs (817/1414-5) (5), and Kirman (819/1416-7) (6). In addition, many rulers whose territories bordered on those of Shāhrukh hastened to proffer their allegiance to him. For instance, in 813/1410-11 ambassadors arrived at Harāt from "the territory of the Uzbegs and the Qipchāq steppe", from Shīrwān, from Hazārjarīb,

(1) MS. ii/1 393. (2) MS. ii/1, 395. (3) MS. ii/1, 77. (4) ibid., 132. (5) In this campaign Shāhrukh's nephew, Bāyqarā b. 'Umar Shaykh, who had rebelled against Shāhrukh's authority, was suppressed (Shar. ii, 81). (6) MS. ii/1, 334-6. Since 811/1408-9 Sulṭān Uways b. Amīr 'Idikū Barlās, who had succeeded his father and brother as ruler of Kirman, had been independent ruler (pādishāhī bi-istiqlāl) there. (MS. ii/1, 120-1).

from Sārī, from Fīrūzkūh, and from Garmsīr and Qandahār (1). By 823/1420-1 Shāhrukh had consolidated his position sufficiently to make the first of his attempts to reincorporate Ādharbāyjan into the Tīmūrid Empire (2). On arrival at Sulṭāniyya, he learnt that Qarā Yūsuf had died at Awjān on 7 Dhu'l-Qa'da 823/13 November 1420 (3) at the age of sixty-five. During his lifetime Qarā Yūsuf had raised the Qara Qoyunlu from the position of a group of tribes owing allegiance to the Jalā'irids and had made them the dominant power in western Persia, ruling over Ādharbāyjan, 'Irāq-i 'Arab, and parts of 'Irāq-i 'Ajam; in addition, the Shirwānshāh and the Aq Qoyunlu of Diyār Bakr paid allegiance to the Qara Qoyunlu.

The death of Qarā Yūsuf before the Tīmūrid forces reached Ādharbāyjan placed Shāhrukh in an extremely favourable position, since it threw the Qara Qoyunlu into confusion. None of the sons of Qarā Yūsuf was present to take command of the situation (Shāh Muḥammad was at Baghdād, Iskandar at Kirkūk, Ispand at 'Abd al-Jawz, Jahānshāh at Sulṭāniyya, and Abū Sa'īd somewhere in Ādharbāyjan). Qarā Yūsuf's forces dispersed; a nephew of Qarā Yūsuf absconded with the valuables from the treasury; and even Qarā Yūsuf's body was abandoned, and was looted before being accorded burial by the nobles of Tabrīz (4). Bāysunqur b. Shāhrukh entered Tabrīz in the middle of Dhu'l-Qa'da 823/third week in November 1420, and had the khuṭba

(1) MS. ii/1, 183. (2) For this expedition Shāhrukh mobilized 15,000 infantry and cavalry levied from all the regions of the empire except Transoxania and officered by Persians (bā sardār-i tāzīk), in addition to the regular contingents from each province (ghayr-i lashkarhā-yi muqarrarī-yi wilāyat) (MS. ii/1, 398). Qarā Yūsuf created a precedent by raising a force of infantry from the province of Tabrīz, but this innovation (bid'at) did not meet with success (barū mubāarak nayāmad) (MS. ii/1, 409). (3) MS. ii/1, 410. (4) MS. ii/1, 410-12.

read and coins minted in the name of Shāhrukh (1). Shāhrukh wintered in Qarābāgh (2), where he received ambassadors from many neighbouring rulers; Amīr Khalīl Allāh b. Amīr Shaykh Ibrāhīm Shirwānshāh, who had succeeded his father in 820/1417-8 (3), and Sayyidi Ahmad b. Sayyidī 'Alī from Shakkī, visited him in person. With Amīr Khalīl Allāh was his brother Amīr Manuchihr (4). Shāhrukh left his winter quarters on 19 Rabī' I 824/24 March 1421 (5), and spent the spring and summer of 1421 in overcoming the resistance of groups of Qarā Qoyunlu in the Armenian highlands round Lake Wan. Local chiefs and neighbouring rulers or their representatives continued to visit Shāhrukh's camp to tender their submission (6); among them were 'Alī b. Qarā 'Uthmān and the kalāntars of the Āq Qoyūnlū (7). The administration of Tabrīz was in the hands of the Tīmūrid amīr 'Alā' al-Dīn 'Alīkā Gōnūltāsh, who had been sent ahead to Tabrīz in November 1420 with Bāysunqur Mīrzā and Khwāja Quṭb al-Dīn Muḥammad Mushrif Simnānī to collect the dīwān revenues (barāyi dābṭ-i amwāl wa jihāt-i dīwānī) (8). Amīr 'Alā' al-Dīn administered the affairs of the people and matters of state in a proper manner (maṣāliḥ-i ra'īyyat wa muhimmāt-i mamlikat bi-wājibī sākht). He revoked the new practices (rusūm-i muḥdith) which Qarā Yūsuf had introduced (ikhtirā' karda būd), and devoted himself to ordering the affairs of the religious law (naẓm-i umūr-i shar'īyya) and to the administration of affairs in general (dābṭ-i maṣāliḥ-i kullīyya) (9).

By July 1421 two of Qarā Yūsuf's sons, Ispand (10) and Iskandar, had rallied the Qarā Qoyunlu, and on 27 Rajab 824/28 July 1421 Shāhrukh, after rejecting their peace overtures, fought the hardest battle of his career at

(1) MS. ii/1, 413. (2) ibid., 408. (3) TIN. 432b. (4) MS. ii/1, 430-1.

(5) ibid., 436. (6) ibid., 441-450. (7) ibid., 449. (8) ibid., 407.

(9) ibid., 415. (10) The form of this name is variously given; Hinz, 127, has Aspān.

Qurūq Qurqāq (1). After three days of fighting, the Qarā Qoyūnlū were defeated, and Shāhrukh entered Tabrīz in the middle of Sha'ban 824/middle of August 1421. Shortly afterwards he began his homeward march, and arrived at Harāt on 19 Shawwāl 824/17 October 1421 (2).

After this defeat, Iskandar continued to campaign on the borders of Adharbāyjan. Between 827-30/1423-6 he won several victories in Kurdistan; in 828/1425 he defeated Shams al-Dīn the ruler of Akhlāṭ, and in 830/1427 the Kurdish prince Sulṭān Ahmad. In 831/1427 he raided Shirwān, and in 832/1428 he recaptured Sulṭāniyya from Shāhrukh's officers (3). The recapture of Sulṭāniyya caused Shāhrukh to organize a second expedition to Adharbāyjan. Leaving Harāt on 5 Rajab 832/10 April 1429 (4), he reached the outskirts of Tabrīz on 1 Dhu'l-Qa'da 832/30 June 1429 (5), and on 17 Dhu'l-Hijja 832/17 September 1429 met Iskandar at Salmās; after the first day's fighting, Iskandar held the advantage, but was defeated the following day (6), and fled to Asia Minor. He was pursued as far as Erzerum by Muḥammad Jūkī b. Shāhrukh, but succeeded in eluding him (7). Shāhrukh installed Abū Sa'īd, another son of Qarā Yūsuf, as governor of Tabrīz (8). Hitherto the Qara Qoyunlu had been united in their resistance to the Tīmūrids, but first Abū Sa'īd, and later Jahānshāh, accepted Tīmūrid suzerainty in order to acquire the governorship of Tabrīz. In 835/1431 Iskandar returned to Adharbāyjan, occupied Tabrīz, and put to death Abū Sa'īd (9). In 838/1434-5, in answer to an appeal from Khalīl Allāh Shirwānshāh, who had been attacked by Iskandar, Shāhrukh made preparations for his third invasion of Adharbāyjan (10). Leaving Harāt on 2 Rabi' II, 838/5 November 1434, he

(1) Near Alishgird (MS. ii/1, 453). (2) MS. ii/1, 451-65. (3) TIN. 433a. Amīr Khwāja Yūsuf, governor of Sulṭāniyya, Abhar, Qazwīn and Zinjān, was captured by Iskandar. (MS. ii/1, 601). (4) MS. ii/1, 601. (5) *ibid.*, 606. (6) *ibid.*, 606 ff. (7) Shar. ii, 90. (8) MS. ii/2, 622; Hinz, 127. (9) MS. ii/2, 640; Shar. ii, 91; Hinz, 127. (10) MS. ii/2, 670-1.

wintered at Rayy (1); from there he marched on Tabrīz (1 Muḥarram 839/27 July 1435) (2). Mīrzā Muḥammad Jūkī, who had gone as far as Arzinjān in search of Iskandar, could find no trace of him (3). Meanwhile Iskandar's younger brother, Jahānshāh, deserted him and went to the Tīmūrid camp (4), and his example was followed by Amīrzāda Shāh 'Alī b. Amīrzāda Shāh Muḥammad b. Amīr Qarā Yūsuf (5). The khutba was read in the name of Shāhrukh throughout Ādharbāyjān, and coinage was minted in his name (6). Before leaving for Harāt on 2 Rabī' II, 840/14 October 1436, Shāhrukh conferred on Jahānshāh the governorship of Ādharbāyjān (7). In the same year Iskandar attacked Jahānshāh, but was defeated and took refuge in the fortress of Alanjaq near Nakhchiwān; there he was murdered by his son Shāh Qubād, who had fallen in love with a member of Iskandar's haram (8).

During the eighteen years of Iskandar's reign, the Qara Qoyunlu had been on the defensive, and had striven to keep control of the territories won by Qarā Yūsuf. The reign of Jahānshāh (d. 872/1467) is in several respects a significant one in the struggle for supremacy in Persia which followed the death of Tīmūr. At first, taking advantage of divisions in the Tīmūrid empire, Jahānshāh extended Qara Qoyunlu dominion over the whole of Persia, including for a time Khurāsān, the heart of the Tīmūrid empire; during the latter part of his reign, the balance of power between the rival Turkomān dynasties shifted in favour of the Aq Qoyunlu; finally, during the reign of Jahānshāh the Ṣafawids, under the leadership of Sulṭān Junayd, are for the first time mentioned in the sources as constituting a threat to the existing political power (9).

(1) MS. ii/2, 674. (2) Shar. ii, 93. (3) MS. ii/2, 685. (4) ibid., 675
 (5) ibid., 685. (6) ibid., 684. (7) ibid., 690. (8) Iskandar was murdered on 25 Shawwāl 841/21 April 1438; see Hinz, 128. For this crime Shāh Qubād was later put to death by Jahānshāh (TIN. 435b). (9) HS. iii/4, 12; BM Cr. 3248, 17a ff.

1/10/16

Jahānshāh made no attempt to encroach on Tīmūrid territory until after the death of Shāhrukh in 850/1447. In that year he seized control of Sulṭāniyya and Qazwīn, which formed part of the territory governed by Muḥammad b. Bāysunqur; the latter, in order to have his hands free to contest the succession to the Tīmūrid empire, married Jahānshāh's daughter Tutuq 'Ismat and ceded those districts to Jahānshāh as the bride's portion (shīrbahā) (1).

The period of stability and reconstruction represented by the reign of Shāhrukh came to an abrupt end on the death of that monarch in 850/1447. Throughout his reign Shāhrukh had tried to maintain peace within the Tīmūrid empire and to protect the frontiers of the empire by maintaining friendly relations with neighbouring rulers. His policy had failed only in the case of the Qara Qoyunlu, whom he had endeavoured to weaken and contain within the borders of Ādharbāyjān by maintaining alliances with the Aq Qoyunlu and the Shīrwānshāhs. From the time when Tīmūr first invaded Ādharbāyjān (787/1385-6), up to the time of Shāhrukh's expedition of 839/1435, Qarā 'Uthmān had manifested unswerving devotion and obedience to the Tīmūrids and had never transgressed the bonds of tribal allegiance and fealty (az ṭarīq-i ilī wa mutāba'at tajāwuz nanamūd) (2). Similarly, Amīr Khalīl Allāh Shīrwānī Turkman (the Shīrwānshāh) considered himself a personal servant (makhṣūṣ) of Tīmūr, and his family had always displayed

(1) Muḥammad had first ordered Jahānshāh to give back these districts to the officials of the dīwān-i a'lā, and to content himself with the territory (ulkā) which Shāhrukh had allotted to him, and not to enter the Tīmūrid empire (mamālik-i maḥrūsa); otherwise he must expect war. When Jahānshāh ignored this order, Muḥammad adopted the course of marrying his daughter (MS. ii/2, 900-2; TIN. 433b). (2) MS. ii/2, 685.

the utmost loyalty and personal devotion to the house of Tīmūr (1).

In 824/1421 Khalīl Allāh married the daughter of Abū Bakr b. Mīrānshāh

(2). In 838/1434 Muḥammad Jūkī b. Shāhrukh married the daughter of Qarā 'Uthmān Aq Qoyunlu (3).

The revolt of Muḥammad b. Bāysunqur, who took advantage of the failing health of Shāhrukh to rebel against his authority (849/1445-6) (4), portended the dynastic troubles which followed the death of Shāhrukh the following year. Muḥammad b. Bāysunqur imprisoned the dārūgha of Iṣfahān, distributed the revenue which had been collected in the province as largess to his troops, promising them double, and marched on Shīrāz (5). Despite his illness, Shāhrukh led a force to 'Irāq (6), and put to death all the sayyids and ru'asā who had supported Muḥammad (Ramaḍān 850/November 1446). Muḥammad retreated to Luristān (7). Four months later, Shāhrukh died, and "the dust of discord and tumult rose to the heavens" (8). Muḥammad b. Bāysunqur emerged from his retreat near Khurramābād (9), and drove 'Abd Allāh b. Ibrāhīm b. Shāhrukh from Fārs (10); of the three princes in the royal camp at the time of Shāhrukh's death, 'Abd al-Laṭīf b. Ulugh Beg took charge of the camp and "paid no heed to anyone" (parwā-yi kasī nadāsht): Abu'l-Qāsim Bābur b. Bāysunqur "considered himself firmly established on the throne of the world, and

(1) MS. ii/2, 644. (2) MS. ii/1, 438. This woman had formerly been the wife of Qarā Yūsuf Qara Qoyunlu (ibid., 437). (3) MS. ii/2, 685-6. (4) Shar. ii, 98. (5) MS. ii/2, 860-1. (6) ibid., 861-2. The historian Sharaf al-Dīn 'Alī Yazdī was implicated in this revolt, but escaped without punishment (ibid., 866-7). (7) ibid., 866. (8) ibid., 883. (9) ibid., 893. (10) ibid., 898.

put forth his utmost efforts to this end": and Khalīl b. Muḥammad Jahāngīr remained aloof from the struggle. 'Alā' al-Dawla b. Bāysunqur, who had been left at Harāt as Shāhrukh's qa'im-maqām when the latter marched to Iṣfahān to quell the revolt of Muḥammad b. Bāysunqur (1), took possession of the treasuries of the empire, and the ambition "I and no other" occupied the recesses of his mind (2). The legitimate heir to the empire, Shāhrukh's only surviving son Ulugh Beg, remained in Transoxania, being forced to postpone any attempt to assert his claim to the succession by the revolt of Abū Bakr b. Muḥammad Jūkī; the latter, whose soyūrghāl was Khatlānāt, Arhang and Salī Sarāy, had seized Balkh, Shuburghān (3), and Qunduz-i Buqlān up to the frontiers of Badakhshān (4).

After two years of fighting, the Tīmūrid empire had been resolved into three principal areas:- 'Irāq-i 'Ajam and Fārs, held by Muḥammad b. Bāysunqur; Khurāsān, held by Abu'l-Qāsim Bābur; and Transoxania, held by Ulugh Beg, who in 852/1448 had occupied Harāt but had failed to consolidate his victory. Possession of Khurāsān was recognized as the key to success in this struggle for mastery, and in 853/1449 Muḥammad b. Bāysunqur made an unsuccessful attempt to gain control of that province. In his view, the people of Khurāsān at heart wanted (his brother) 'Alā' al-Dawla as their ruler (5).

In Transoxania, 'Abd al-Laṭīf put to death his father Ulugh Beg and his brother 'Abd al-'Azīz (Ramadān 853/October-November 1449) (6),

(1) MS. ii/2, 863. (2) ibid., 882. (3) The name of this place is spelt in a variety of ways; see G. Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, 426. (4) MS. ii/2, 904. (5) ibid., 1001. (6) ibid., 991: 993.

and was himself assassinated by his amīrs on 25 Rabī' I 854/8 May 1450 (1). On 22 Jumādā I 855/22 June 1451 Abū Sa'id b. Muḥammad b. Mīrānshāh, supported by the troops of the Uzbek chief Abu'l-Khayr Khān, marched from Tāshkand and defeated and killed 'Abd Allāh b. Ibrāhīm at Samarqand, and was thus left without a rival in Transoxania (2).

Muḥammad b. Bāysunqur, after negotiating an ephemeral agreement with Abu'l-Qāsim Bābur whereby certain provinces (ba'dī wilāyat) of Khurāsān were to be incorporated in 'Irāq-i 'Ajam (dākhil-i dīwān-i 'irāq bāshad), and the coinage and khuṭba (in those provinces) were to be adorned (muzayyan wa muwashshāḥ) with the titles of Muḥammad (3), attacked Khurāsān for the second time (4), but was defeated at Chinārān by Abu'l-Qāsim and put to death (855/1451-2) (5). Abu'l-Qāsim then blinded his captive brother 'Alā' al-Dawla (6), who after the death of his other brother Muḥammad was the most serious threat to his position in Khurāsān, but 'Alā' al-Dawla later recovered his sight (7).

The death of Muḥammad b. Bāysunqur opened the way to Qara Qoyunlu expansion in 'Irāq-i 'Ajam and Fārs, and Abu'l-Qāsim Bābur marched from Harāt to attempt to reassert Tīmūrid authority in those provinces. He proceeded to Yazd via Tūn, and spent four months at Shīrāz, dealing with administrative matters; he appointed governors to Qum and Sāwa; then, hearing that Jahānshāh Qara Qoyunlu had occupied Sāwa and laid siege to Qum, he left Sanjar b. Aḥmad b. 'Umar Shaykh at Shīrāz and marched towards Iṣfahān (8).

(1) MS. ii/2, 1004-5. (2) ibid., 1019-22. (3) ibid., 1027-8. (4) ibid., 1028. (5) ibid., 1032. (6) ibid., 1033. (7) ibid., 1039; Shar. ii, 107. (8) MS. ii/2, 1036-9.

Two factors had convinced Jahānshāh of the weakness of the Tīmūrid position in Persia. The decision of Abu'l-Qāsim Bābur to approach 'Irāq-i 'Ajam by the desert route to Yazd, a decision based on the consideration that Muḥammad b. Bāysunqur had invaded Khurāsān via Ray and that consequently no supplies of grain would be available on that route, suggested rather to Jahānshāh that the Tīmūrid forces were not strong enough to march across territory threatened by his own troops. The manner in which Abu'l-Qāsim announced his victory over Muḥammad convinced Jahānshāh that his reasoning was correct (mu'akkid-i istidlāl-i mīrzā jahānshāh āmad). The news was conveyed in a letter (maktūb) with the royal seal (mahr-i humāyūn) on the reverse (bar pusht zada), whereas it would have been more in keeping with the pomp of sovereignty (munāsib-i tanṭana-yi salṭanat) to have issued the imperial decree (farman-i jahān-muṭā') in the form of a nishān addressed to Jahānshāh, requiring him to forward to the royal treasury the tribute (bāj) and taxes (kharāj) due from the province of Ādharbāyjān, in accordance with the assessment made in the time of the khāqān-i sa'īd (Shāhrukh), and stipulating that the khutba and coinage should be embellished with the royal style and title (of Abu'l-Qāsim Bābur) (1).

On 16 Rajab 856/2 August 1452 Abu'l-Qāsim Bābur, who was marching north from Shīrāz to relieve Qum from the Qara Qoyunlu blockade, turned north-east from Kūshk-i Zard, a point on the road between Shīrāz and Iṣfahān, and returned to Khurāsān; during his absence from Harāt, 'Alā' al-Dawla had attempted to seize possession of the city; he had been

(1) MS. ii/2, 1035-6.

repelled by Abu'l-Qāsim's amīrs (1), and had taken refuge with Jahānshāh (2), but the amīrs reported to Abu'l-Qāsim that they still felt some anxiety about him ('Alā al-Dawla) (khāṭir az ṭaraf-i ū tamām jam' nīst), and Abu'l-Qāsim decided to return to Harāt (3). In rapid succession Jahānshāh occupied Qum, Iṣfahān, Abarqūh and Shīrāz (4); thus the whole of 'Irāq-i 'Ajam and Fārs, which had been in Tīmūrid possession for nearly eighty years, was overrun by the Qara Qoyunlu forces under Jahānshāh and his son Pīr Būdāq in the space of a few months. Shortly afterwards, the province of Yazd too was abandoned to the Turkomāns (5).

In 858/1454 Abu'l-Qāsim Bābur invaded Transoxania, and in Shawwāl 858/October 1454 laid siege to Samarqand (6). Six weeks later, peace was concluded; both sides were to return their prisoners, and the Oxus was to be considered the dividing line between their respective dominions (7).

On 25 Rabī' II 861/22 March 1457 Abu'l-Qāsim Bābur died (8), and was succeeded by his son Maḥmūd (9); the latter was only eleven years of age, and Amīr Shīr Ḥājǰī was the real power in the kingdom (ṣāhib-i ikhtiyār-i mamlikat būd) (10). Two months later, on 7 Rajab 861/31 May

(1) MS. ii/2, 1039-41. (2) ibid., 1043. (3) ibid., 1041. The real reason for Abu'l-Qāsim's withdrawal to Khurāsān was probably simply his reluctance to face Pīr Būdāq (see J. Aubin, Deux sayyids de Bam au XVe siècle, 434). (4) ibid., 1044-5. (5) ibid., 1049. (6) ibid., 1061; Samarqand was the capital of Abū Sa'īd, ibid., 1062. (7) ibid., 1077; this truce merely restored the status quo ante; Abu'l-Qāsim gained nothing by this expedition, and lost heavily in men and material. (8) MS. ii/2, 1114-5. (9) In full, Jalāl al-Dīn Maḥmūd (ibid., 1119). (10) ibid., 1119; 1127.

1457, Ibrāhīm b. 'Alā' al-Dawla entered Harāt, and Maḥmūd fled to Mashhad (1).

Abū Sa'īd, from the time of his accession to the throne of Transoxania (855/1451), had never ceased to aspire to the conquest of Khurāsān (2). Ibrāhīm endeavoured to reach an understanding with him, but only received the reply, "When I reach Harāt, whatever is most expedient shall be done" (3). Abū Sa'īd entered Harāt on 26 Sha'bān 861/19 July 1457 (4), and Ibrāhīm retired to the region of Bākhārz and Khwāf. Having failed to take the citadel, Abū Sa'īd left Harāt on 9 Shawwāl 861/30 August 1457, and wintered at Balkh (5).

In the same year (861/1457), Jahānshāh Qara Qoyunlu took advantage of Tīmūrid disunity to attempt further conquests, and marched on Būrgān; he drove before him Maḥmūd b. Abu'l-Qāsim Bābur, and at the battle of Astarābād, 25 Muḥarram 862/13 December 1457 (6), he utterly defeated Ibrāhīm b. 'Alā' al-Dawla, who fell back to Harāt (7). There was no longer any central Tīmūrid authority in Khurāsān; each of the forts was in the hands of a Tīmūrid commander (sardār), who rendered allegiance to no one (8). On 7 Jumādā II 862/22 April 1458 his father 'Alā' al-Dawla returned to Harāt (9) after several years spent in the Qipchāq plain and Uzbek territory (10). Ibrāhīm viewed the arrival of his father with displeasure (amadan-i pidar bar khāṭir-i pīsar girān āmad), but greeted

(1) MS. ii/2, 1131. (2) ibid., 1137. (3) ibid., 1136. (4) ibid., 1140.
(5) ibid., 1145-6. (6) TIN. 433b. (7) Shar. ii, 110-11. (8) MS. ii/2,
1158. (9) ibid., 1161. (10) ibid., 1157.

him with apparent warmth (1). 'Alā' al-Dawla imposed a tax on slaves ('abīd) and flocks (mawashī), but before this money could be collected he was compelled by the approach of the Turkomān forces to evacuate Harāt (2), and he and Ibrāhīm withdrew to Ghūr-i Pā'in and Ghūr-i Bālā respectively (3). Jahānshāh entered Harāt on 15 Sha'bān 862/28 June 1458, and his name was inserted in the khuṭba and stamped on the coinage (4). His son Fīr Budāq arrived in Harāt from Fārs on 18 Dhu'l-Ḥijja 862/27 October 1458 (5), and shortly afterwards news arrived from Tabrīz that Jahānshāh's son Ḥusayn 'Alī had escaped from imprisonment and had collected an army (6). Jahānshāh was therefore forced to negotiate with Abū Sa'īd, who was advancing on Harāt from Balkh, at a disadvantage. Abū Sa'īd demanded the restitution of all the territories except those originally allotted to Jahānshāh by Shāhrukh, but eventually agreed that Jahānshāh should relinquish only Khurāsān, and a treaty was drawn up to that effect. Jahānshāh left Yaḥyā-abād at the beginning of Ṣafar 863/early December 1458 (7), and on the 15th Ṣafar/22 December Abū Sa'īd entered Harāt (8). In Jumādā II 863/April 1459 Abū Sa'īd defeated the combined forces of 'Alā' al-Dawla, his son Ibrāhīm, and Sanjar b. Ahmad b. 'Umar Shaykh, between Marw and Sarakhs. Sanjar was captured and put to death, and 'Alā' al-Dawla and Ibrāhīm fled to Sabzawār (9). Ibrāhīm died on 6 Shawwāl 863/6 August 1459 near Mashhad (10); Maḥmūd b. Abu'l-Qāsim Bābur was killed in Sīstān in Dhu'l-Ḥijja 863/October 1459 (11); and 'Alā' al-Dawla died the following year and was brought to Harāt for burial (21 Ṣafar 865/6 December 1460)(12).

(1) MS. ii/2, 1160. (2) ibid., 1163. (3) ibid. 1174. (4) ibid., 1166-7. (5) ibid., 1176. (6) ibid., 1182. (7) ibid., 1183-4. HS, quoted in MS ii/2, 1183 n.l., says that Jahānshāh agreed to give up Gurgān and Māzandarān in addition to Khurāsān. (8) MS. ii/2, 1187. (9) ibid., 1193. (10) ibid., 1205. (11) ibid., 1210-11. (12) ibid., 1231.

The death of so many of the rival Tīmūrid princes brought a measure of stability to Khurāsānī affairs. Mīrzā Sulṭān Ḥusayn b. Manṣūr b. Bāyqarā b. 'Umar Shaykh, who had been living in exile in Khwārazm, wrested Gurgān from the hands of the Qara Qoyunlu, but tendered his submission to Abū Sa'īd by including the latter's name in the khutba and on the coinage (1). Abū Sa'īd was ruler of Transoxania, Turkistān up to the frontiers of Kāshghar, Dasht-i Qipchāq, Kābul, Zawul, Mazandārān, and Khurāsān up to the borders of 'Irāq-i 'Ajam. Sīstān was given as a soyūrghāl to Malik Shāh Yahyā Sīstānī (2), who was the hereditary ruler of Sīstān (aban 'an .jadd dar mamlikat-i sīstān farmānrawān būd) (3). In Dhu'l-Qa'da 865/August 1461 Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn took advantage of the absence of Abū Sa'īd in Transoxania to invade Khurāsān, but his attack on Harāt was abortive (4).

Jahānshāh Qara Qoyunlu continued to rule over Adharbayjān, 'Irāq-i 'Ajam and 'Irāq-i 'Arab, Fārs, the shores of the 'Umān sea, Kirman, Sarīr, Armenia, Georgia, and all the land up to the borders of Syria and Rūm. There were, however, internal threats to the stability of his empire. After 863/1458 his eldest son Pīr Būdāq considered himself an independent ruler at Shīrāz, "on account of the aid which he had rendered his father in Khurāsān" (5). In 865/1460 Jahānshāh marched on Shīrāz to reassert his authority, and Pīr Būdāq agreed to terms negotiated by his mother whereby he was transferred to the governorship of Baghdād. Ḍiyā al-Dīn Yūsuf, who replaced him as governor of Shīrāz (6), is described as the

(1) MS. ii/2, 1195-8. (2) ibid., 1212-13. (3) ibid., 1228-9. (4) ibid., 1238 ff. (5) ibid., 1307. (6) ibid., 1273. J. Aubin, Deux sayyids de Bam au XVe siècle, 451, gives Yūsuf's laqab as Mu'izz al-Dīn.

most accomplished and the most perfect of Jahānshāh's sons; under him the province, which had fallen into a state of disorder as a result of the rebellion of Pīr Būdāq, was restored to prosperity (1). Pīr Būdāq, however, "never forgot Shīrāz", and in 869/1465 he again rebelled. Jahānshāh laid siege to the city, and rejected all overtures by Pīr Būdāq. When famine forced Pīr Būdāq to surrender, he was handed over to his brother Muḥammadī, who put him to death on Jahānshāh's orders (2). The execution of Pīr Būdāq (2 Dhu'l-Qa'da 870/15 June 1466 (3)) caused the people of Baghdād to regard Jahānshāh with aversion (4).

In addition to having to contend with his rebellious son, Jahānshāh was faced early in his reign by the problem of the growing power of the Ṣafawid order, which, he feared, would cause his own power to decline (jahānshāh az zawāl-i mulk-i khwud mutawahhim gardīd) (5). Junayd, who had succeeded to the leadership of the Ṣafawid order on the death of his father Khwāja 'Alī (851/1447-8) (6), not only actively devoted himself to the propagation of the Ṣafawid da'wa, but also aspired to material power in order to strengthen the strong and right religion and to walk on the straight path (az barāyi taqwīyat-i dīn-i qawī-yi qawīm wa tamshiyat-i širāṭ-i mustaqīm mayl-i salṭanat-i šūrī farmūdand) (7). Jahānshāh ordered Junayd to disperse his forces (8), depart from Ardabīl (9), and leave his (Jahānshāh's) dominions. Should he fail to comply

(1) TIN. 434b. (2) MS. ii/2, 1308-10. (3) TIN. 435a. (4) MS. ii/2, 1310. (5) HI. 516a. (6) SN. 65. (7) TIN. 445b. (8) BM. Or. 3248, 18a. (9) HS. iii/4, 12.

فردوس

Stoh
Case!

V.S. 96

with these demands, Ardabīl would be destroyed (1). Junayd fled, and after travelling for some years through Asia Minor and Syria, finally was invited by the Aq Qoyunlu ruler Uzun Ḥasan to Diyār Bakr, where he spent three whole years (1456-9) (2). He married Uzun Ḥasan's sister Khadīja Begum (3), and "when this news reached the farthest limits of Rūm and Syria, the khalīfas of the previous shaykhs became inclined to serve him" (4).

After Junayd had fled from Ardabīl, Jahānshāh installed Junayd's uncle, Ja'far b. Khwāja 'Alī, as guardian of the shrine of Ṣafī al-Dīn (5). When Junayd eventually returned to Ādharbāyjan from Diyār Bakr, Jahānshāh attempted to seize him, and Junayd, despairing of being able to recover his position at Ardabīl, led his forces against the Circassians. While crossing the territory of the Shīrwānshāh Khalīl Allāh b. Shaykh Ibrāhīm, he was attacked and killed at Ṭabarsarān on the banks of the River Kur, on 4 March 1460 (6).

Junayd's successor, Ḥaydar, maintained the close connexion with the Aq Qoyunlu established by his father, and married Ḥalīma Begī Āghā (7) (Ḥalīma Begum, known as 'Alamshāh Begum (8), Marta (9)), the daughter of Uzun Ḥasan and Despina Khātūn. In all, Ḥaydar had seven sons, but it was his three sons by Ḥalīma Begī Āghā, 'Alī, Ibrāhīm and Isma'īl (10), who achieved prominence.

(1) BM. Or. 3248, 19a. (2) TM. 190, which gives details of Junayd's movements prior to his arrival in Diyār Bakr; Hinz, 25 ff. (3) HS. iii/4, 12. (4) TM. 190, q. Tārīkh-i Amīnī, f. 123b. (5) Ghulam Sarwar, 23-4. (6) Hinz, 48. (7) HS. iii/4, 13. (8) BM. Or. 3248, 20b. (9) Ghulam Sarwar, 24 n. 22. (10) ibid., 24-5.

In 872/1468 Jahānshāh Qara Qoyunlu attempted to extend his empire still further by marching against Uzun Ḥasan. He rejected all peace overtures made by the latter (1). While the bulk of the Qara Qoyunlu forces were at Arjīsh and 'Abd al-Jawz, Jahānshāh at Mūsh with only three hundred men was surprised by Uzun Ḥasan and killed (2), and his head sent to Abū Sa'īd (3). (12 Rabī' II 872/10 November 1467) (4). Of the main Qara Qoyunlu force under Jahānshāh's sons Muḥammadī and Yūsuf, five thousand fell in battle, including Muḥammadī himself (5). The forces of the remaining sons of Jahānshāh were scattered and without effective leadership, and the Qara Qoyunlu empire was at an end (6). Its downfall upset the existing division of power in Persia between the Qara Qoyunlu and the Tīmūrīds, which had remained unchanged for ten years (863-872/1458-1467). Abū Sa'īd, who now saw himself as the true successor of Shāhrukh, if not of Tīmūr himself, for Shāhrukh had never succeeded in bringing Ādharbāyjān permanently under his control, left his winter quarters at the beginning of Sha'bān 872/end of February 1468 (7), and marched towards Ādharbāyjān. Fārs and 'Irāq-i 'Ajam were brought under Tīmūrīd control, and Abū Sa'īd appointed officers to administer the various districts (8). In Gīlān, the name of Abū Sa'īd was included in the khuṭba and stamped on the coinage (9). At Miyāna, Abū Sa'īd was

(1) TIN. 435b. (2) MS. ii/2, 1318-9. (3) Shar. ii, 115. (4) V. Minorsky, Jihānshāh Qarā Qoyūnlū and his poetry, in BSOAS xvi/2, 1954, p. 295, q. NJA, 189a. Hinz, 56, gives 11 November 1467. (5) Hinz, 57. (6) For the various and conflicting estimates of Jahānshāh's character to be found in the sources, see Minorsky, in BSOAS xvi/2, 1954, 276-9. (7) MS. ii/2, 1322. For the part played by Ḥasan 'Alī in this campaign, see Hinz, 58 ff. (8) MS. ii/2, 1326. (9) ibid., 1329.

Complex! His two systems

joined by Yūsuf b. Jahānshāh, many Qara Qoyunlu amīrs, and 50,000 Qara Qoyunlu troops; shortly afterwards, Ḥasan 'Alī b. Jahānshāh and his son Amīrzāda Sulṭān 'Alī joined Abū Sa'īd (1). Uzun Ḥasan installed on the throne of Ādharbāyjān, as pretender to the Tīmūrid empire, Yādīgār Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Bāysunqur b. Shāhrukh (2), whom Jahānshāh had brought from Harāt to Tabrīz in 863/1458 (3). Abū Sa'īd decided to winter in Qarābāgh, and await reinforcements from his ally the Shīrwānshāh. While Abū Sa'īd was in Qarābāgh, his supply position became critical; several consignments of food were brought by ²sea from Shīrwān. Uzun Ḥasan closed the roads to all reinforcements from 'Irāq-i 'Ajam and Fārs, and intercepted a supply train (jībakhāna) which was on its way from Khurāsān to join Abū Sa'īd (4); the Aq Qoyunlu garrisons of forts in the region of Rayy, which had not been subdued by Abū Sa'īd, constantly harassed the Tīmūrid lines of communication with Khurāsān (5). The Shīrwānshāh had joined the Tīmūrid camp on the Aras river, but the inclement weather and the shortage of supplies caused a steady decline in Tīmūrid morale; Aq Qoyunlu patrols continually harried the Tīmūrid camp.

In January 1469 Uzun Ḥasan succeeded in detaching the Shīrwānshāh from his allegiance to Abū Sa'īd by sending him the following message:- "the Chagatāy forces will eventually withdraw; let us see how your friendship with them will benefit you then". On 4 Rajab 873/18 January 1469 the Shīrwānshāh embarked his troops and withdrew, and the Tīmūrid army, now thoroughly demoralized, moved towards Ardabīl (6); on 13 Rajab 873/27 January 1469 the Tīmūrids lost 500 amīrs and amīrzādas killed or

(1) MS. ii/2, 1333, which gives Ḥusayn 'Alī vice Ḥasan 'Alī. (2) ibid., 1335. (3) Shar. ii, 11-12. (4) MS. ii/2, 1338-9. (5) ibid., 1342. (6) ibid., 1348-9.

perhaps confusion with
the name of the river

captured in a clash with the Aq Qoyunlu forces (1), and on 16 Rajab/30 January Abū Sa'īd, deserted by the Khurāsānī amīrs, was captured by the Aq Qoyunlu (2). According to the Maṭla'-i Sa'dayn, Uzun Ḥasan did not wish to harm Abū Sa'īd, and wanted to send him back to Khurāsān with regal pomp, but the amīrs resolved to put Abū Sa'īd to death, saying that as long as he was alive he would always be bent on revenge (3). According to the Ḥabīb al-Siyar, after much deliberation Uzun Ḥasan decided to put Abū Sa'īd to death at the instigation of Qādī Shīrwān and with the approval of the Turkomān amīrs (4). On 22 Rajab 873/5 February 1469 Abū Sa'īd was handed over to Yādīgār Muḥammad, who put him to death in revenge for the execution of Gawhar Shād by Abū Sa'īd in 861/1457 (5).

As a result of this victory, the Aq Qoyunlu occupied 'Irāq-i 'Ajam, Fārs and Kirman, and strengthened their hold on Ādharbāyjan; Uzun Ḥasan moved his capital from Diyār Bakr to Tabrīz, and, claiming that he was fighting on behalf of Yādīgār Muḥammad, "the rightful heir to mulk wa khilāfat in the Tīmūrid dominions in Khurāsān" (6), despatched Yādīgār Muḥammad with the Khurāsānī amīrs who had formed part of Abū Sa'īd's army to take possession of Khurāsān (7).

When the news of the defeat of Abū Sa'īd reached Harāt, Maḥmūd b. Abū Sa'īd left the city and eventually joined his brother Aḥmad at Samarqand; (8). Mīrzā Sulṭān Ḥusayn entered the city on 8 Ramaḡān 873/22 March 1469, and two days later the khutba was embellished with his name

(1) MS. ii/2, 1349-50. (2) ibid., 1352. (3) ibid., 1353. (4) q. in MS. ii/2, 1353 n. 3. (5) MS. ii/2, 1353 and n. 4. (6) MS. ii/2, 1395. (7) ibid., 1357; Shar. ii, 117-8; TIN. 437a. (8) MS. ii/2, 1364-5; 1377; 1383.

and titles (1). On 8 Rabī¹, I 874/15 September 1469 Mīrzā Sulṭān Ḥusayn⁽²⁾ met and defeated Yādīgār Muḥammad at Ohinārān; Uzun Ḥasan sent 2,000 cavalry to reinforce Yādīgār Muḥammad (3). Mīrzā Sulṭān Ḥusayn refused Uzun Ḥasan's request that the Qara Qoyunlu amīrs who had fled from Kirman to Harāt in November 1469 should be handed over to him (4); Zaynal b. Uzun Ḥasan, the governor of Kirman, made a sudden raid into Qūhistan with 1,000 men, and killed Shaykh Zāhid Ṭārūmī, the governor of that province (5), and Khalīl b. Uzun Ḥasan marched from Sarī to the aid of Yādīgār Muḥammad. The amīrs of Khurāsān were daily deserting Mīrzā Sulṭān Ḥusayn and joining Yādīgār Muḥammad (6); Mīrzā Sulṭān Ḥusayn had no confidence in the loyalty of his remaining troops (7), and, after Yādīgār Muḥammad had defeated the governor of Astarābād and enrolled him among his own amirs (8), Mīrzā Sulṭān Ḥusayn left Harāt on 19 Dhu'l-Ḥijja 874/19 June 1470 to recruit support among the Arlāt tribe near the Oxus (9). Yādīgār Muḥammad entered Harāt on 9 Muḥarram 875/8 July 1470 (10), and Uzun Ḥasan placed at his disposal, should he require them, the Aq Qoyunlu troops led by his own sons Zaynal and Khalīl, who were at that time at Mashhad and in Qūhistan respectively (11). The unruly conduct of the Aq Qoyunlu troops already attached to Yādīgār Muḥammad became a source of great embarrassment to him, and he was eventually obliged to send a contingent of them back to Uzun Ḥasan (12). He himself celebrated his victory by constant carousals, and allowed his troops to disperse (13). Two months later, on 23 Ṣafar 875/21 August 1470 (14),

(1) MS. ii/2, 1365-6. (2) ibid., 1400-2. (3) ibid., 1407. (4) ibid., 1405-6. (5) ibid., 1407-8. (6) ibid., 1409. (7) ibid., 1409-10. (8) ibid., 1409. (9) ibid., 1412-4. (10) ibid., 1416. (11) ibid., 1418-9. (12) ibid., 1417. (13) ibid., 1422-3. (14) ibid., 1425.

Mīrzā Sulṭān Ḥusayn, after defeating a coalition formed by three sons of Abū Sa'īd, Maḥmūd, Abū Bakr and Ulugh (1), entered Harāt without opposition; Yādigār Muḥammad was caught completely off his guard, and was seized and put to death (2). The Aq Qoyunlu troops still remaining in Harāt made off in the direction of Qūhistān (3). This second occupation of Harāt by Mīrzā Sulṭān Ḥusayn inaugurated a period of some thirty-five years of comparatively stable and prosperous Tīmūrid rule in Khurāsān. The whole of the rest of Persia, together with 'Irāq-i 'Arab, Armenia, and Diyār Bakr, formed the empire of the Aq Qoyunlu who, from 1468 until the death of Uzun Ḥasan on 6 January 1478 (4), were at the height of their power (5). The aspirations of Uzun Ḥasan to extend his empire further westwards were checked in 878/1473, when, after defeating the Ottomans near Malāṭiyya, he himself suffered a decisive defeat at their hands, and his son Zaynal was killed (6).

The death of Uzun Ḥasan (1 Shawwāl 882/6 January 1478) was followed by twenty-five years of constant warfare between rival princes of the Aq Qoyunlu house, who, in their struggle for the throne, were supported, and frequently dominated, by ambitious and powerful amīrs, themselves often linked by blood or marriage to the royal house. In 908/1503 the last of the Aq Qoyunlu sultans, Murād, was expelled from Persia by Shāh Isma'īl (7), and during the preceding quarter of a century the power of the Safawids steadily increased, despite such major setbacks as the death in battle

(1) MS. ii/2, 1422. (2) ibid., 1426-7. He was still only 19 years of age (ibid., 1428). (3) ibid., 1428. (4) Hinz, 68. (5) ibid., 61ff. (6) Ghulam Sarwar, 106. For an account of Uzun Ḥasan's earlier relations with the Mamlūk and Ottoman empires, and with Georgia, see Hinz, 41 ff.; 52-4. (7) AT. 73.

Uzun Hasan, EI'

of Ḥaydar (20 Rajab 893/1 July 1488) (1), and of Sulṭān 'Alī (899/1494) (2). Ḥaydar was defeated by a combined force of Aq Qoyunlu and Shīr-wānīs, Sulṭān 'Alī by an army composed solely of Aq Qoyunlu troops. These facts reflect a radical change in the relations between the Aq Qoyunlu and the Ṣafawids; it will be recalled that during the lifetime of Uzun Ḥasan the policy of the Aq Qoyunlu toward the Ṣafawids was one of protection and support based on the close marriage-ties linking the Aq Qoyunlu royal house and the Ṣafawid leaders Junayd and Ḥaydar (3). It seems likely that Uzun Ḥasan afforded protection to Junayd because the latter was fleeing from the Qara Qoyunlu, and might prove a useful ally, in the event of an Aq Qoyunlu drive eastwards into Persia, against the Qara Qoyunlu. The decision of the Ṣafawids to ally themselves with the orthodox Sunnī Aq Qoyunlu must similarly have been taken on the grounds of military and political expediency. At the time of Junayd, not only were the Qara Qoyunlu too powerful to admit of any successful Ṣafawid military coup in Ādharbāyjān, but, by "trying to unify their adepts on a shi'a platform", (4), they had become serious rivals to the Ṣafawids on the plane of religious da'wa. After the overthrow of the Qara Qoyunlu by the Aq Qoyunlu, it was only a matter of time before the political and military ambitions of the Ṣafawids came into conflict with those of the Aq Qoyunlu. When this happened, the reigning Aq Qoyunlu sultan, Ya'qūb, considered the threat to the Aq Qoyunlu empire so great that he despatched troops to aid the Shīrwānshāh against Ḥaydar.

(1) SN. 68. (2) See Ghulam Sarwar, 28 n. 4. (3) See p. 46 above.

(4) V. Minorsky, in BSOAS xvi/2, 1954, 274.

Uzun Ḥasan was succeeded by Khalīl, his son by Seljuq Shāh Begum, but when Khalīl attempted to weaken his mother's influence in administrative affairs, she induced a group of nobles to rise in favour of her younger son Ya'qūb (1), and Khalīl was defeated and killed at Marand on 14 Rabī II 883/15 July 1478 (2), after a reign of only six months. Ya'qūb, who came to the throne at the age of sixteen, suppressed a revolt by Alwand b. Khalīl (1479), defeated the rebel governor of Iṣfahān in 886/1481-2, and sent an expedition to Georgia (887/1482-3) (3). In 893/1487-8, Ḥaydar who, instructed in a dream by 'Alī, had devised for his followers the distinctive crimson hat with twelve gores (bi-dawāzdah tark) commemorating the twelve Shī'ī Imāms, led his qizilbash or "redheads" against the "infidels" of Charkas and Dāghistān (4). To reach their territory he had to cross the territory of the Shīrwānshāh Farrukhyasār, son of the Khalīl Allāh who had defeated and killed Ḥaydar's father Junayd in 1460 (5). When Ḥaydar entered his territory, Farrukhyasār at once appealed to Ya'qūb, who was his son-in-law (6). Ḥaydar had married 'Alamshāh bint Uzun Ḥasan, and was therefore Ya'qūb's brother-in-law (7). Farrukhyasār represented to Ya'qūb that if Ḥaydar conquered Shīrwān he

(1) See V. Minorsky, A Civil and Military Review in Fārs in 881/1476, in BSOS, x/1, 1939, 144-5. (2) Ghulam Sarwar, 106. (3) ibid., 106. Ghulam Sarwar gives Ahmad b. Khalīl, but Hinz, 143, Alwand b. Khalīl. (4) BM. Or. 3248, 21a-b. For the composition of his forces, see TM, 190 q. Tārīkh-i Amīnī. (5) AT, 55 states that Farrukhyasār had reigned for 37 years, which would place his accession in 869/1464-5; his father Khalīl died in 868/1463-4 (TIN, 432b). On the other hand, AT, 55 gives Shīrwānshāh as the chronogram of his death, which produces 867/1462-3. Seddon (AT, ii/24) wrongly gives 873/1468-9 as the date of his accession. (6) TAA, 15. (7) See p. 46 above.

he would aspire to other provinces also, and the pillars of the realm would be disturbed (ikhtilāl bi-arkān-i dawlat rāh yābad) (1). In response to his appeal, Ya'qūb sent troops which, in co-operation with those of the Shīrwānshāh, defeated and killed Ḥaydar at Ṭabarsarān near Darband (1 July 1488) (2). Ḥaydar was succeeded as head of the Ṣafawid movement by the eldest of his three sons by 'Alamshāh Begum, Sulṭān 'Alī Pādishāh (3). The use of the titles sulṭān and pādishāh shows quite clearly that the Ṣafawid leaders aspired to temporal power. Sulṭān 'Alī was the first Ṣafawid leader to assume the title of pādishāh. The first Ṣafawid leader to call himself sulṭān was probably Junayd (1447-60); this would fit in with the fact that Junayd was the first Ṣafawid leader to attempt to extend Ṣafawid influence by force of arms. Professor Minorsky, quoting the anonymous history of Shāh Isma'īl (4), refers to Shaykh Ṣafī's grandson as Sulṭān-'Alī, but the latter is called Shaykh Khwāja 'Alī by the Ḥabīb al-Siyar (5) and the Maṭla'-i Sa'dayn (6). On the other hand, the Ahsan al-Tawārīkh confers the title sulṭān not only on Khwāja 'Alī but on his predecessors Ṣadr al-Dīn and Shaykh Ṣafī as well (7), and the Tārīkh-i 'Alam-Ārā goes so far as to refer to Shaykh Ṣafī's father as Sulṭān Sayyid Jibrā'īl (8). It is more than probable that the ~~later~~ sources ascribed the title sulṭān to the early Ṣafawid shaykhs out of pietas, as neither Shaykh Ṣafī nor Shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn is ever referred to as sulṭān in the almost contemporary source Ṣafwat al-

(1) BM. Or. 3248, 22a. (2) See p. 51-2 above. (3) HS. iii/4, 17.

(4) BM. Or. 3248. See TM. 189-90. (5) iii/4, 11. (6) ii/1, 408.

(7) 181. (8). 8.

the taj
Asla Amin

Şafa.

According to the anonymous history of Şah Isma'îl, when Haydar first showed the "şufî tāj" (the name given to the distinctive qizilbaş headgear designed by Haydar) to Uzun Hasan, the latter kissed it and put it on his head. His son Ya'qūb, however, refused to wear it, and this was the origin of the enmity between Haydar and Ya'qūb (1). According to the same source, after the death of Sultān Haydar, Ya'qūb, because of his former enmity (kīna) against Haydar, forbade his subjects to wear the tāj-i sultān haydar, and moreover prohibited the disciples (murīdān) of Shaykh Şafī (i.e., the members of the Şafawid order) from wearing the tāj. These evil actions (af'al-i sayyi'a), comments the anonymous author of this history, led to the destruction of the Aq Qoyunlu dynasty (2).

Within a short time after the death of Haydar, a large number of Şufīs had gathered round Sultān 'Alī at Ardabīl, some to congratulate him on his accession to the leadership of the Şafawid order, and others to incite him to avenge his father (3). Ya'qūb became apprehensive of this throng (izdiḥām) of Şufīs, and despatched a force to Ardabīl to arrest Sultān 'Alī, his younger brothers Ibrāhīm and Isma'îl, and their mother Ḥalīma Begī Āghā. They were sent to Fārs and confined in the fortress of Iştakhr under the surveillance of the governor of Fārs, Manşūr Beg Purnāk (4). Apparently Ya'qūb considered putting Sultān 'Alī to death, but spared his life out of consideration for 'Alamshāh Begum (5), who was Sultān 'Alī's mother and his own sister. The three brothers were

(1) BM. Or. 3248, 21a. (2) ibid., 21a-b. (3) HS. iii/4, 17. (4) ibid., 17. (5) BM. Or. 3248, 24a.

imprisoned for four and a half years (1), from about February 1489 to August 1493 (2). At the time of his arrest, Isma'īl, the youngest of the three brothers, was less than two years old, having been born on 25 Rajab 892/17 July 1487 (3).

Sulṭān Ya'qūb died on 11 Ṣafar 896/24 December 1490 (4). His eldest son, Bāysunqur, who was still a minor at the time of his father's death, was put on the throne by the amīr Ṣūfī Khalīl Mawṣillū, the atābak (guardian) of Bāysunqur. Ṣūfī Khalīl eliminated rival claimants to the throne one by one; he defeated and killed Masīḥ b. Uzun Ḥasan, and at Burūjird (5) he defeated and killed Maḥmūd b. Ughūrlū Muḥammad, who had been proclaimed pādishāh at Hamadān by Shāh 'Alī Purnāk and had had his name included in the khutba and stamped on the coinage (6). Rustam b. Maqṣūd b. Uzun Ḥasan was imprisoned at Alanjaq (7); 'Alī b. Khalīl b. Uzun Ḥasan was put to death by Ṣūfī Khalīl (8); Ahmad b. Ughūrlū Muḥammad b. Uzun Ḥasan fled to Turkey (9). At the end of 896/about October 1491 Ṣūfī Khalīl was defeated and killed near Wān by the governor of Diyār Bakr, Sulaymān Beg Bizhan-ūghlī (10), who became the jumlat al-mulk of the young ruler Bāysunqur in succession to Ṣūfī Khalīl (11). A few months later Sulaymān Beg was overthrown in his turn by Ibrāhīm b. Danā Khalīl (12), another ambitious noble, who released

(1) Shar. ii, 134; TIN. 446a. (2) The date of their release was the end of Shawwāl 898/beginning of August 1493 (Ghulām Sarwar, 26, n. 11), so they must have been arrested about the end of Rabī' II 894/end of March 1489. (3) HS. iii/4, 13. (4) Ghulam Sarwar, 107. (5) Shar. ii, 128. (6) TIN., 439 b.; cf. also HS. iii/4, 18. (7) Rabino, 132. (8) ibid., 123, n. 26. (9) TIN. 439b. (10) Ghulām Sarwar, 107. (11) Shar. ii, 128. (12) Better known as Ayba Sulṭān. He was descended from Qarā 'Uthmān, the progenitor of the Aq Qoyunlu, through a side branch of the family.

Rustam from confinement at Alanjaq and entered Tabrīz at the end of Rajab 897/middle of May 1492 (1). Sulaymān Beg fled to Diyār Bakr, where he was put to death by Nūr 'Alī Beg b. Danā Khalīl (2). In Dhu'l-Qa'da 898/August 1493, Bāysunqur, who had fled to Shīrwān (3) (the Shīrwānshāh Farrukhyasār was his maternal grandfather) (4), invaded Ādharbāyjān with an army provided by the Shīrwānshāh (5).

Rustam consulted the Bāyandurī amīrs as to the best method of meeting this threat, and they unanimously recommended that he should release Sulṭān 'Alī and the princes and become a disciple of their holy race, for under the blessed auspices of that saintly person it would be an easy matter to repel the forces allied against them. Moreover, they added, the adherents and disciples of the Ṣafawī Ṣūfīs were numerous in all parts of the world, and when they heard of the release of the princes they would soon assemble in great numbers (6). Rustam accepted their advice; Sulṭān 'Alī entered Tabrīz in great pomp, and Rustam said to him, "What has been done to you is past, and with God's help I will make amends for it. You are as a brother to me, and at my death you shall become king of Irān" (7). Sulṭān 'Alī, at the head of a force composed of his own supporters and of Aq Qoy-unlu troops led by Ayba Sulṭān, defeated and killed Bāysunqur in the region of ~~Ahar~~ and Mishkīn (8) (Dhu'l-Qa'da 898/August 1493) (9). The anonymous history of Shāh Isma'īl states that Ayba Sulṭān was severely wounded and his troops thrown into confusion, but that 'Alī Sulṭān and his men turned the day in their favour (10).

(1) Shar. ii, 128; TIN. 440a. (2) Ghulam Sarwar, 107. (3) ibid., 107. (4) Shar. ii, 128. (5) Ghulam Sarwar, 26-7. (6) BM. Or. 3248, 25b. (7) JRAS 1896, 257. (8) HS. iii/4, 19. (9) Ghulam Sarwar, 27 n. 9. (10) BM. Or. 3248, 27a.

a

Ross

Among Sulṭān 'Alī's men were Ḥusayn Beg Lala Shāmlū and Dada Beg Ṭalish (Abdāl 'Alī Beg) (1), who later rose to high office under Shāh Isma'īl. At the same time Sulṭān 'Alī despatched a force under Qarā Pīrī Beg Qājār against Kūsa Ḥājji Bāyandur, the governor of Iṣfahān, who had rebelled in favour of Bāysunqur; Kūsa Ḥājji Bāyandur was defeated and killed (2). Sulṭān 'Alī returned to Tabrīz in triumph, and received Rustam's permission to return to Ardabīl with his mother and brothers in order to resume his work as head of the Ṣafawid order and "religious guide to the Ṣūfīs and devotees" (3). "The pious began to assemble in Ardabīl that they might benefit by attending upon that upholder of the faith, and the number of Ṣūfīs there collected together soon became very great (4).

Towards the end of 899/middle of 1494 (5), Rustam, like his uncle Ya'qūb before him, realized that the political aspirations of the Ṣafawids constituted a threat to his own position, and he arrested Sulṭān 'Alī and his brothers and conveyed them to his own camp at Khuy in order to cut them off from contact with their followers. Eventually he decided that his position would only be secure if Sulṭān 'Alī was put to death; he also planned to put to death Ṣafawid adherents at Tabrīz and Ardabīl (6). Sulṭān 'Alī was forewarned of Rustam's intentions, and, with his brothers and close companions (7), escaped from Rustam's camp and set off towards Ardabīl. Rustam at once sent Ayba Sulṭān in pursuit; "Should Sulṭān 'Alī once enter Ardabīl", he said, "(which God forbid), the deaths of 10,000 Turkomāns would be of no avail" (8). On the way to Ardabīl, Sulṭān 'Alī had a

(1) BM. Or. 3248, 27a. (2) Ghulam Sarwar, 27. (3) JRAS 1896, 260. (4) ibid., 261. (5) Ghulam Sarwar, 28 and n. 4. (6) BM. Or. 3248, 28a. (7) including Ḥusayn Beg Lala, Dada Beg Ṭalish, Qarā Pīrī Beg Qājār, and Ilyās Beg Ayghūr-ghlī. (8) See Hinz, 95-6.

premonition of his approaching death, and he nominated his younger brother Isma'īl as his successor as head of the Ṣafawid order, and invested him with his own Ṣūfī tāj (1). "I desire you", he said, "to avenge me and your father and your ancestors upon the children of Ḥasan Padishāh. For the die of Heaven's choice has been cast in your name, and before long you will come out of Gīlān like a burning sun, and with your sword sweep unbelief from the face of the earth" (2). Isma'īl, with seven picked men, went on ahead; shortly afterwards the Aq Qoyunlu forces overtook Sulṭān 'Alī at Shamāsī near Ardabīl, and Sulṭān 'Alī was killed; his body, on the instructions of his mother 'Alamshāh Begum, was taken to Ardabīl for burial (3). Isma'īl reached Ardabīl in safety, and took refuge first in the holy enclosure (ḥaḏīra-yi muqaddasa) of the Ṣafawids. Rustam ordered Ayba Sulṭān to institute a house to house search. Isma'īl was transferred successively from the house of Qādī Ahmad Kākulī to that of a woman named Khān Jān, and was then concealed by another woman, Uba-yi Jarrāpa of the Dhu'l-Qadar tribe, first in her own house in the maḥalla-yi rūmiyān, and then in a vault in the Jāmi' Mosque (4). Isma'īl's maternal aunt, Shāh Pashā Khātūn, alone knew Isma'īl's hiding place (5). His mother, 'Alamshāh Begum, was tortured by Ayba Sulṭān, but without avail (6). After eluding capture in Ardabīl for six weeks, Isma'īl was taken to the village of Kargān by Rustam Beg Qarāmānī, and stayed there in the house of the khaṭīb Farrukhzāda Gurgānī (7). From there, aided at every step by devotees and sympathisers, he was sent to Gīlān; sheltered successively

(1) BM. Or. 3248, 28b. (2) ibid., 28b. (3) ibid., 28b-29a. (4) Ghulam Sarwar, 30-l. (5) BM. Or. 3248, 29b. (6) ibid., 29b; Hinz, 97. (7) BM. Or. 3248, 30b; Hinz, 98.

by Amīra Muẓaffar, governor of Tūl and Nāw, Amīra Siyāwush, governor of Gaskar, and Amīra Ishāq, governor of Rasht, he was finally given sanctuary at Lāhījān by the ruler Kār Kiyā Mīrzā 'Alī (1). Meanwhile Ayba Sulṭān had seized Uba-yi Jarrāḥa at Ardabīl and had extracted from her full details of the route followed by the Ṣafawid princes (2). Rustam executed Uba, and made the most determined efforts to recapture Isma'īl; he sent spies into Gīlān dressed as Ṣūfīs of the Ṣafawid order (dar labās wa kiswat-i ṣūfiyān-i silsila-yi ṣafawī), and sent three successive envoys to Kār Kiyā Mīrzā 'Alī to demand the surrender of Isma'īl. These demands were refused, though with considerable trepidation, by Kār Kiyā Mīrzā 'Alī. Rustam then sent a force of 300 qurchīs to Lāhījān, and prepared to invade Gīlān with a large force, but internal feuds among the Aq Qoyunlu prevented him from doing so (3).

In Dhu'l-Qa'da 902/July 1497, Rustam's cousin Ahmad b. Ughurlū Muḥammad, who had fled to Turkey in 896/1490 during the dynastic feuds followed the death of Ya'qūb Sulṭān, and had been granted asylum by the Ottoman sultan Bāyazīd II, and had married his daughter (4), invaded Ādharbāyjān. In a battle on the Aras river, Rustam was defeated and killed, largely as a result of the treachery of Ayba Sulṭān (5). Rustam had ruled for five and a half years over Ādharbāyjān, the two 'Irāqs, Fārs

(1) Ghulām Sarwar, 31; Hinz, 98-9. (2) BM. Or. 3248, 32a; Hinz, 99.

(3) BM. Or. 3248, 32a-37b. (4) ibid., 38a. (5) ibid., 38a; AT. 14.

1. *ibid.*

and Diyār Bakr (1). Aḥmad was anthroned at Tabrīz. Five months later, Ayba Sulṭān rebelled against him, and was joined by Qāsīm Beg Purnāk, the governor of Shīrāz (2); the rebel forces met Aḥmad at Kaniz Ulang (3) near Iṣfahān on 18 Rabī' II 903/14 December 1497, and Aḥmad was defeated and killed (4). Ayba Sulṭān had the khutba read at Qum in the name of Murād b. Ya'qūb (5) who, like his brother Bāysunqur, was a cousin of Isma'īl and a grandson of the Shīrwānshāh Farrukhyasār. Murād returned to Persia from Shīrwān, but Ayba Sulṭān quarrelled with him and imprisoned him in the fort of Rūyindiz (6). Ayba Sulṭān married Murād's mother, who was a daughter of Sulṭān Khalīl Shīrwānshāh, and then summoned Alwand b. Yūsuf b. Uzun Ḥasan from Diyār Bakr and placed him on the throne at Tabrīz (7). At Yazd, the governor Murād Beg Bāyandur proclaimed Alwand's brother, Muḥammadi Mīrzā, king (pādishāh), and Muḥammadi rapidly extended his authority over 'Irāq-i 'Ajam and Fārs (8). In Shawwāl 904/May 1499 (9), Muḥammadi Mīrzā defeated Alwand and Ayba Sulṭān at 'Azīz Kindī (10). Ayba Sulṭān was killed (11), and Alwand fled back to Diyār Bakr (12). Muḥammadi Mīrzā entered Tabrīz and took over the government of Adharbāyjan (13). Sulṭān Murād was released from confinement by Gūzil Aḥmad, the brother of Ayba Sulṭān, and Farrukhshād Beg Bāyandur, and went to Fārs, where he was

(1) AT. 16. (2) HS. iii/4, 21 states that the Turkoman chief Ḥusayn Beg 'Alīkhānī had become the most powerful noble after the accession of Aḥmad, and had contrived the execution of Muḥaffar Beg Purnāk; Ayba Sulṭān therefore had little difficulty in persuading Qāsīm Beg to join him in order to avenge his brother's death. (3) HS. iii/4, 21; NJA. 194b gives "in the neighbourhood of Khwāja Ḥasan Maḍī". (4) NJA. 194b. (5) HS. iii/4, 21-2. (6) AT. 17; BM.Or. 3248, 39b-40a. (7) BM.Or. 3248, 40a; AT. 17. (8) AT. 20-1. (9) NJA. 195a. (10) BM.Or. 3248, 40a-b. (11) NJA. 195a. (12) Ghulam Sarwar, 108. (13) AT. 21; Shar. ii, 131.

joined by Qāsim Beg Purnāk (1). Alwand again advanced on Tabrīz from Diyār Bakr; Muḥammadī evacuated Tabrīz and marched to Sulṭāniyya (2) and then towards Iṣfahān, but was defeated and killed at Kar^v (Kār?)⁵¹ Ulang by Sulṭān Murād (3) (Dhu'l-Qa'da 905/May-June 1500) (4).

Alwand and Murād, the only two remaining claimants to the Aq Qoyunlu empire, decided on an amicable partition of Aq Qoyunlu territories; Alwand retained Ādharbāyjān, Arrān, Mughān and Diyār Bakr, and Murād took 'Irāq-i 'Ajam, Kirmān and Fārs. According to a story narrated in the anonymous history of Shāh Isma'īl, a darwīsh named Bābā Khayr Allāh from Abhar visited both Alwand and Murād, and told them that he had received an intimation from the hidden world that there would shortly come forth from Gīlān a person who would increase the dignity and honour of the religion of Muḥammad, establish the faith of the twelve Imāms, and restore law and order in the land of Irān. He therefore entreated the two princes to come to terms, and peace was concluded on the understanding that the Qizil Uzun river should form the boundary between their respective kingdoms (5).

Although this story is probably apocryphal, there is every likelihood that reports of Ṣafawid activity in Gīlān influenced Alwand and Murād in their decision to settle their differences.

Isma'īl spent nearly five years (1494-9) at Lāhījān. Kār Kiyā Mīrzā 'Alī allotted him fine buildings near the madrasa of Kiyā Farīdūn (6), and appointed Mawlānā Shams al-Dīn Lāhijī to be his teacher in Persian and Arabic; instruction in the Qur'ān formed a large part of his studies (7).

(1) BM. Or. 3248, 40b; AT. 24. (2) AT. 21. (3) ibid., 24. HS. iii/4, 22 gives Khwāja Ḥasan Mādī as the site of the battle. (4) TIN. 444a.
(5) BM. Or. 3248, 41b. (6) AT. 8. (7) BM. Or. 3248, 32a-b.

As the Aq Qoyunlu were preoccupied with their own feuds, Ṣūfīs and murīds of the Ṣafawid order were able to go to and fro freely (taraddud mīnamūdand); some of them remained in Gīlān, others returned to their own countries to continue propaganda for the Ṣafawids there. They called Isma'īl murshid-i kāmīl and pādīshāh (1), signifying that they accepted him both as a religious leader and as a temporal ruler. Disciples and single-minded Ṣūfīs flocked in from all sides, especially from the districts of Rūm, Qarāja-dāgh, and Ahār, bringing gifts and offerings for their murshid-i kāmīl (2). In the middle of Muḥarram 905/about 22 August 1499 (3) Isma'īl set out from Lāhījān for Ardabīl, accompanied by seven men (4), "to clear the rose-garden of religion of the rubbish deposited there by stubborn and contumacious people" (5). Kār Kiyā Mīrza 'Alī had tried to dissuade Isma'īl from his intention, in view of his extreme youth (he was still only 12), and had also reminded him of the fate of his father Ḥaydar (6). Isma'īl reached Ardabīl via Tārum and Khalkhāl; by then he had been joined by 1,500 men from Syria and Asia Minor (7). The Aq Qoyunlu governor of Ardabīl, Sulṭān 'Alī Beg Ghākīrlū (or rather Jāgīrlū; cf. below, 'Alī Beg Jāgīr) Turkmān, ordered him to leave Ardabīl (8); as his forces were not yet sufficiently numerous to enable him to resist, Isma'īl left Ardabīl, and spent the winter (1499-1500) at Arjuwān near Āstārā in Ṭālish (9).

During the winter, Alwand Aq Qoyunlu, the Shīrwānshāh Farrukhyasār, and 'Alī Beg Jāgīr, the governor of Ardabīl, made various unsuccessful

(1) BM. Or. 3248, 37b. (2) JRAS 1896, 268. (3) Ghulām Sarwar, 33. (4) ibid., 33. The names of his seven companions were:- Ḥusayn Beg Lala, Dada Beg Ṭālish, Khādīm Beg Khalīfa, Rustam Beg Qarāmānī, Bayrām Beg Qarāmānī, Ilyās Beg Ayghūr-ūghlī, and Qarā Pīrī Beg Qājār. (5) BM. Or. 3248, 42a. (6) TIN. 446b. (7) AT. 25-6. (8) Ghulām Sarwar, 33. (9) BM. Or. 3248, 46a.

attempts to capture or assassinate Isma'īl (1). In the spring of 1500 Isma'īl returned to Ardabīl for a reunion with his mother 'Alamshāh and the rest of his family. He despatched heralds (jārchiyān) to the various Ṣūfī bodies of Syria and Asia Minor, instructing them to send reinforcements to meet him at Arzinjān, and agreed to the suggestion that he should send couriers (musri'ān) to 'Irāq-i 'Ajam and Ādharbāyjān to summon his disciples and auspicious murīds (2). Isma'īl moved north-west into the Armenian highlands; in the region of Chukhūr Sa'd he was joined by Qarāja Ilyās with a force of Ṣūfīs from Asia Minor (3). At Arzinjān, in the late summer of 1500, Isma'īl was joined by a force of 7,000 Ṣūfīs from Turkey, composed of members of the Ustājlū, Shāmlū, Rūmlū, Takkalū, Dhu'l-Qadar, Afshār, Qājār and Warsāq tribes (4); such tribesmen, who came from tribes long converted to the Ṣafawid cause (az ṭawā'if-i murīdān wa mu'taqidān-i ṣūfiyya-yi qadīm) (5), formed the backbone of the Ṣafawid forces. According to the Jawāhir al-Akhbār, Ḥamza Beg Fath-ūghlī Ustājlū went among the (Ustājlū) tribe and gave the joyful tidings (khābar-i bihjat wa bashārat) and made the people eager to serve the pādishāh. This tribe with one accord came with their wives and children, and they were 1,000 families..... and when people from other districts (aṭrāf) heard that the Ustājlū tribe had come in this manner everyone became inclined (to follow their example); they came company by company (qushūn qushūn) until their numbers reached 7,000 (6).

(1) BM. Or. 3248, 46b-49a. (2) TIN. 446b; cf. BM. Or. 3248, 49b. (3) AT. 35. JA. 283a states that Qarāja Ilyās was of the Bāyburtlū tribe, and this is confirmed by AT. 59. (4) BM. Or. 3248, 53b. (5) TIN. 446b. (6) JA. 283a-b.

In Jumādā I 906/December 1500 Isma'īl crossed the river Kur and marched on Shamākhī, the capital of Shīrwān; in a battle near fort Gulistān, the Shīrwānshāh Farrukhyasār was defeated and killed (1). He had reigned for 32 years, from 873/1468. Isma'īl, after capturing Bākū (2), wintered at Maḥmūdābād (906/1500-1) (3).

Alwand, hearing of Isma'īl's victories in Shīrwān, and fearing that he would be the next to be attacked, decided to anticipate a Ṣafawid invasion of Ādharbāyjān by marching to Nakhchiwān. The Ṣafawid advance guard under Pīrī Beg Qājār defeated the Aq Qoyunlu advance guard near Nakhchiwān, and Isma'īl, following up with the main force, routed Alwand at Shurūr (4); Isma'īl is reported to have had only 7,000 men against Alwand's 30,000 (5), and of the latter, 8,000 fell in the battle (6). Alwand is said to have attempted to appease Isma'īl by offering him the governorship of Shīrwān (7). After the battle Isma'īl entered Tabrīz, and became ruler of Ādharbāyjān; coins were issued in his name, the khuṭba was read in the name of the twelve Imāms, and the Ja'farī rite was proclaimed the true religion (8). Ghulām Sarwar, after comparing the various sources, comes to the conclusion that the date of Isma'īl's accession was the beginning of 907/middle of 1501 (9), but Naṣr Allāh Falsafī thinks that Ramaḍān 907/March-April 1502 is the correct date (10). Although Alwand was collecting another force at Arzinjān (11), and Murād was still in possession of Fārs and 'Irāq-i 'Ajam, the battle of Shurūr was decisive; the Ṣafawids had captured the capital of the Aq

(1) BM. Or. 3248, 59a-b. (2) Ghulām Sarwar, 37. (3) Shar. ii, 135.

(4) Ghulām Sarwar, 38. (5) AT. 59. (6) Shar. ii, 135. (7) BM. Or.

3248, 67b-68a. (8) HS. iii/4, 34. (9) Ghulām Sarwar, 38 and n. 18. (10)

Naṣr Allāh Falsafī, Jang-i Chāldirān, in Majalla-yi Dānishkada-yi Adabiyāt-i Tihirān, vol. i/2, 1332/1953-4, 50. (11) BM. Or. 3248, 79b.

Qoyunlu empire, and, with the Tīmūrids concerned only to defend Khurāsān against the attacks of the Uzbegs, had in fact won the struggle for supremacy in Persia which had continued for nearly a century after the death of Tīmūr.

iii) The Consolidation of Safawid power in Persia

The reign of Shāh Isma'īl I has been the object of a detailed study by Dr. Ghulam Sarwar entitled History of Shāh Isma'īl Safawī. My object in giving this brief account of the establishment of the Safawid empire is to provide the necessary historical background to the reign of Isma'īl I in as small a compass as possible. Wherever possible, I have referred to the relevant pages of Dr. Ghulam Sarwar's work; additional material is given from sources not utilised by Dr. Ghulam Sarwar.

On 24 Shawwāl 907/2 May 1502 Isma'īl left Tabrīz for Arzinjān, where Alwand had collected a fresh army after his defeat the previous year at Shurūr; Alwand fled, without offering battle, to Baghdād; he then seized possession of Diyār Bakr from Qāsim Beg b. Jahāngīr, and continued to rule that province until his death in 910/1504 (1). Isma'īl returned to Tabrīz for the winter of 907-8/1502-3, and opened negotiations with Sulṭān Murād (2). According to the Tārīkh-i Ilchī-yi Nizāmshāh, Sulṭān Murād's authority over Fars in 908/1503 was slight, and most of the provincial governors ruled as they pleased. "In short the greatest imaginable turmoil and confusion reigned in 'Irāq and Fars" ... "the havoc and destruction wrought in the provinces of 'Irāq and Fars were extremely severe, and the position of the inhabitants of these regions became grievous, and many people died from hunger or the plague" (3). "Because of the appearance of discord and strife, and the occurrence of such calamities as famine and plague, and because of the seizure of power (istīlā) by evil and corrupt men, and the insecurity

(1) Ghulam Sarwar, 43-4. (2) BM.Or. 3248, 82a. (3) TIN. 445a.

of the highways, the provinces of 'Irāq and Fārs had fallen into confusion. Men died daily from starvation and plague. Furthermore the Aq Qoyunlu amīrs extended the hand of tyranny and oppression in all directions, and did not obey the commands of Sulṭān Murād" (1). Isma'īl recalled the bonds of kinship between the Ṣafawīs and the Āq Qoyunlu, and offered Murād part of 'Irāq-i 'Ajam in return for his submission; the alternative was war (2). Some of Murād's amīrs counselled peace, but those who urged him to fight prevailed (3). Murād marched north with an army of 70,000 men, and met Isma'īl, whose army numbered only 12,000, at ^{Planz?} Ulma Qulāghī (4) near Hamadān, on 24 Dhu'l-Hijja 908/21 June 1503 (5). Murād was defeated, with the loss of 10,000 men and his amīr al-umara, ^a Gulzāl Ahmad Bāyandurī (6). Later the same year (1503), Isma'īl invaded Fārs (7); Murād fled to Baghdād, where he was received by the governor, Bārīk Beg Purnāk; from Baghdād he went to Aleppo, where he was accorded protection by the Burjī Mamlūk ruler of Egypt and Syria, Sulṭān Ashraf Qānsū Ghūrī, and from Aleppo to Mar'ash, where he was given sanctuary by 'Alā' al-Dawla Dhu'l-Qadar (8). Like Alwand, Murād took no further part in events in Persia; he was eventually killed in Diyar Bakr by a detachment of Ṣafawid troops, twelve years later (end of 920/1515) (9). Isma'īl entered Shīrāz on 2 Rabī' II 909/24 September 1503, (10) he gave the governorship of Shīrāz to Ilyās Beg Dhu'l Qadar as an ujāqliq, (11) and this office remained in the possession of his family for nearly fifty years.

(1) TIN. 449a-b. (2) ibid., 449a-b. (3) ibid., 449b. (4) or Āla Qulāqī or Alma Qulāq. (5) Ghulam Sarwar, 44-5. (6) Shar., ii, 135. (7) According to A Narrative of Italian Travels, 199-200, the morale of the Aq Qoyunlu troops was extremely low, and many of them donned the "red caftan". (8) Ghulam Sarwar, 46. (9) TIN. 461b. (10) Ghulam Sarwar, 46. (11) Shar. ii, 136; under the Ottomans, the ocaklik was a type of holding partaking of the nature of a fief; see Gibb and Bowen, Islamic Society and the West, i, 48 n.l.

By the end of 1503 Isma'īl was master of Ādharbāyjan, Fārs and most of 'Irāq-i 'Ajam. The Tīmūrid ruler of Astarābād, Muḥammad Ḥusayn Mīrzā, had rebelled against Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā and allied himself to Isma'īl (1). Isma'īl's next task was to defeat Amīr Ḥusayn Kiyā Ghulāwī, ruler of Fīrūzkūh and Damāwand, who had taken advantage of the disintegration of the Aq Qoyunlu empire to seize possession of Khwār and Simnān, occupy Rayy (2), and raid the borders of 'Irāq-i 'Ajam (3); he had also inflicted a defeat on Muḥammad Ḥusayn Mīrzā (4). Not only was Amīr Ḥusayn Kiyā a formidable opponent militarily, but the fact that he was a Shī'ī made him a danger to the Ṣafawids on the religious plane; he always boasted of his devotion to the house of the immaculate Imāms and of the Prophet. After Isma'īl's defeat of Sulṭān Murād in Dhu'l-Hijja 908/June 1503, Amīr Ḥusayn Kiyā gave sanctuary to a large number of Aq Qoyunlu troops; he was seduced by the words of the Turkomāns and deviated from the path, and, displaying hostility towards Isma'īl, set out along the path of rebellion (5). Ilyās Beg Ayghūth-ūghlī, the governor of Ādharbāyjan (6), whom Isma'īl had ordered to proceed against Amīr Ḥusayn Kiyā (7), was besieged in Warāmīn, lured out of the fort, and put to death with his men. Isma'īl, who had wintered at Qum, set out on 9 Ramaḍān 909/25 February 1504. He stormed the fort of Gul-i Khandān, held by Kiyā Ashraf, on 29 Ramaḍān 909/17 March 1504; and reached Fīrūzkūh on 11 Shawwāl 909/29 March 1504. After heavy fighting the commander, Amīr Kiyā 'Alī Damāndār, surrendered; his life was spared at the request of Najm Beg, but the rest of the garrison was massacred (8).
When Amīr Ḥusayn Kiyā himself had taken refuge in the fort of Ustā, the largest

(1) AT. 75. (2) TIN. 450b. (3) BM. Or. 3248, 96b. (4) AT. 75. (5) TIN. 450b. (6) BM. Or. 3248, 90b. (7) Ghulam Sarwar, 45. (8) Cf. Ghulam Sarwar, 47-8.

of the forts under his command (1). Isma'īl cut off the fort's water supply (2), and the citadel surrendered, after a month's siege, on 27 Dhu'l-Qa'da 909/13 May 1504 (3). Amīr Ḥusayn Kiyā was captured and confined in an iron cage (4), which he had himself devised with the object of confining therein "any of the Sultans of Irān who might be taken prisoner by him in battle". On the return march, Amīr Ḥusayn Kiyā managed to commit suicide at Kābūd Gunbad; his corpse was burnt in the maydān at Isfahān (5). Two (6) of his officers, Murād Beg Jahānshāhī and Saylatmish Beg, were roasted alive and the remainder of the garrison, said to number 10,000, were put to the sword. Only a few learned men were pardoned at the request of the Shāh's officers (7). The ferocity of this campaign was such that the Ṣafawids killed in all 30,000 men (8). The burning of the body of Amīr Ḥusayn Kiyā recalls the practice of burning heretics in order to convince their followers of their death, and this together with the unusually savage treatment of prisoners, suggests that Isma'īl saw in Amīr Ḥusayn Kiyā a possible rival to his own position as leader of the Shī'īs in Persia. After the defeat of Amīr Ḥusayn Kiyā, the local princes of Māzandarān and Gurgān hastened to send embassies to Isma'īl's court (9).

Isma'īl left the region of Ustā on 3 Dhu'l-Hijja 909/19 May 1504, and marched to Yazd, which had been captured by Muḥammad Karra (10), the dārūgha of Abarqūh, a former Aq Qoyunlu official who had been confirmed in his post

(1) TIN. 450b. (2) BM. Or. 3248, 104a. (3) AT. 79. (4) BM. Or. 3248, 102a-b. (5) Ghulām Sarwar, 48-9. (6) BM. Or. 3248, 104b: "the ghāzis placed them on spits and roasted them"; Shar. ii, 136 states that they were eaten as kabāb by the Ṣūfīs as a warning to others; this is supported by TIN. 451a, which alleges that Isma'īl gave the order "whoever is a believer (az junla-yi mu' taqidān ast), let him eat a morsel of this kabāb". Such was the zeal of the ghāzis that neither flesh nor bones remained. (7) Ghulām Sarwar, 48. (8) TIN. 451a, q. Lubb al-Tawārīkh. (9) BM. Or. 3248, 105b. (10) Ghulām Sarwar 49.

by Isma'īl (1). Isma'īl recaptured Yazd after a two months' siege, but Muḥammad Karra held out in the citadel for a further month. Isma'īl sent a force to subdue Abarqūh, held by Muḥammad Karra's lieutenant Ra'īs Ghaybī, and both rebels were executed in the maydān at Iṣfahān (2). While at Yazd, Isma'īl received a letter from Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā, the Tīmūrid ruler of Khurāsān; since Isma'īl did not consider the tone of the letter sufficiently submissive he attacked Ṭabas, and put to death 7,000 people (3).

In 911/1505-6, having consolidated his position throughout 'Irāq-i 'Ajam, Isma'īl undertook the first of a series of campaigns designed to pacify and render secure the frontiers of Persia with Kurdistān and Diyar Bakr, which were being raided by Shīr Ṣarīm Kurd and 'Alā' al-Dawla Dhu'l-Qadar respectively. Isma'īl plundered Shīr Ṣarīm's camp near the Qizil Uzun river, but Shīr Ṣarīm escaped; Amīr Ḥusām al-Dīn, the ruler of Rasht, who had shown signs of disaffection, returned to his allegiance, and was pardoned through the intercession of the wakīl al-salṭana Amīr Najm (4). In 912/1506-7 a Ṣafawid force which had been despatched in pursuit of Ṣarīm Kurd fought a hard battle with the Kurds in which both sides suffered heavy casualties; two high-ranking qizilbāsh amīrs were killed, 'Abdī Beg Shāmlū, who was Isma'īl's brother-in-law (5) and one of the inner circle of his companions (ahl-i ikhtiṣāṣ) (6), and Sārū 'Alī Muhrdār Takkalū (7). Shīr Ṣarīm's son and brother were captured and taken to Khūy, where they were put to death (8).

'Alā' al-Dawla, the ruler of Mar'ash and Albistān, had granted asylum

(1) HS. iii/4, 40; he had been invested by Isma'īl with drum and banner (ṭabl wa 'alam) (TIN. 451b). (2) Ghulām Sarwar, 49-51. (3) AT. 84-5. Isma'īl is said to have repented of this massacre later (TIN. 452a). (4) TIN. 452b; cf. BM. Or. 3248, 118b and AT. 87. (5) AT. ii, 263. Ghulām Sarwar, 52, wrongly states that 'Abdī Beg Shāmlū was Isma'īl's father-in-law. (6) HS. iii/4, 24. (7) AT. 90. (8) Ghulām Sarwar, 52.

to the fugitive Sulṭān Murād in 909/1503. The latter had married 'Alā' al-Dawla's daughter, by whom he had two sons, Ḥasan and Ya'qūb (2). On the death of Alwand Aq Qoyunlu in Diyār Bakr in 910/1504 (3), Amīr Beg Mawṣillū had assumed control of the province (4); soon afterwards 'Alā' al-Dawla began a series of incursions into Diyār Bakr, and seized possession of some of the forts. At the beginning of 913/May 1507, Isma'īl marched against 'Alā' al-Dawla, who retreated to Albistān and Mt. Durna (5). Ḥusayn Beg Lala was surprised near Albistān by Qāsim Beg Sārū Qaplan ("the yellow panther") b. 'Alā' al-Dawla, and lost 300 men. Amīr Beg Mawṣillū tendered his submission to Isma'īl, and was appointed muhrdār, but his brother, Qāytmās Beg, commander of the fort Qarā Ḥamīd, resisted Muḥammad Beg Ustājlu, who had been sent to subjugate Diyār Bakr (6). Isma'īl defeated 'Alā' al-Dawla's troops near Albistān (7), and stormed Kharburṭ (8). Muḥammad Khān captured and put to death Sārū Qaplan; occupied Amīd and Mārdīn; defeated two other sons of 'Alā' al-Dawla, Kūr Shāhrukh Beg and Aḥmad Beg, who were on their way to relieve Qāytmās Beg at Qarā Ḥamīd (both were killed in the battle), and finally stormed Qarā Ḥamīd despite the harassing raids of the Kurds, and killed Qāytmās Beg (9). Diyār Bakr was annexed to the Ṣafawid empire (bā mamālik-i maḥrūsa muntaẓim gasht), and Muḥammad Khān Ustājlu was rewarded for his outstanding services in

Amīd

Amīd

(1) See p. 68 above. (2) BM. Or. 3248, 256a-b. (3) See p. 67 above. (4) His father, Gulabī Beg, had been a great amīr of Ya'qūb Aq Qoyunlu, and his grandfather, Amīr Beg, had been a trusted officer of Uzun Ḥasan (HS. iii/4, 94). (5) Ghulam Sarwar, 52. (6) ibid., 53. (7) ibid., 52. (8) Shar. ii, 143. (9) BM. Or. 3248, 130a-134a; AT. 94ff., 104ff. (10) TIN. 453a.

Diyār Bakr by being made independent (bi-istiqlāl) governor of that province. He held the post for seven years (1).

Isma'īl spent the winter of 913/1507-8 at Khūy, and received the submission of Sharaf al-Dīn Beg, the ruler of Bidlīs (2). In the spring of 914/1508 Isma'īl invaded 'Irāq-i 'Arab which, like Diyār Bekr, had continued to be ruled by Aq Qoyunlu amīrs after the capture of the Aq Qoyunlu capital by the Ṣafawids. Bārīk Beg Purnāk, the governor of 'Irāq-i 'Arab, fled at the approach of the Ṣafawid advance guard under Ḥusayn Beg Lala (3). The latter entered Baghdād, and minted coins and had the khutba read in Isma'īl's name (4). The troops of Dīw Sulṭān massacred those Turkomāns who, encumbered with families, had been unable to escape in time (5). Isma'īl entered Baghdād on 25 Jumādā II 914/21 October 1508; some of Bārīk Beg's followers were executed (6). Isma'īl visited the Shī'ī shrines at Karbalā and Najaf (7); Sayyid Muḥammad Kamūna was invested with "drum and banner" (ṭabl wa 'alam) (8), and made mutawallī of Najaf (9) and governor of certain towns in 'Irāq-i 'Arab. Khādīm Beg Ṭalish, an amīr of the dīwān, was made governor of Baghdād with the title of khalīfat al-khulafā (10). The occupation of 'Irāq-i 'Arab represented the final stage in the conquest of the former Aq Qoyunlu empire by the Ṣafawids.

After the capture of Baghdād, Isma'īl occupied Ḥawīza, Dizfūl and Shūshtar, which formed the territory of Sulṭān Fayyāḍ of the Musha'sha' dynasty, and received the submission of Hurmuz and Lār. While Isma'īl was

(1) TIN. 453a. (2) Ghulām Sarwar, 53. (3) ibid., 54. (4) Shar. ii, 144. (5) TIN. 453a. (6) Ghulām Sarwar, 55. (7) ibid., 55. (8) TIN. 453b. (9) Ghulām Sarwar, 55. (10) AT. 103.

in winter quarters at Shīrāz (914/1508-9), Malik Shāh Rustam, the ruler of Khurramābād, against whom he had sent a large force of 10,000 men under Husayn Beg Lala, Bayrām Beg Qaramānī, and Najm al-Dīn Mas'ūd, was brought before him as a captive; Isma'īl pardoned him, and reinstated him as ruler of Khurramābād(1).

Learning that Shāh Kaldī Āqā, the Ṣafawid governor of Shīrwan, had been expelled by Shaykh Shāh b. Farrukhyasār, Isma'īl crossed the River Kur by a bridge of boats early in the winter of 915/1509-10. Shaykh Shāh fled to Bīghurd, and Isma'īl reoccupied Darband and Shamākhī and restored Bakū and Shābīran to their allegiance. During this campaign Isma'īl recovered the body of his father Ḥaydar from Ṭabarsarān, and had it reinterred at Ardabil (2).

Within a period of ten years from the date of his accession at Tabrīz, Isma'īl had conquered the whole of Persia with the exception of Khurāsān, together with 'Irāq-i 'Arab and Diyār Bakr. The spirit of the qizilbash troops during the early years of Isma'īl's reign is vividly illustrated by an anecdote related by the author of the Jawāhir al-Akhbār on the authority of Shāhqulī Khalīfa the muhrdār. The farman of the pādīshāh (Isma'īl) was brought to the Dhu'l-Qadar tribe, stating that he needed their help and was marching against 'Alā' al-Qawla Dhu'l-Qadar (913/1507); if they wished to demonstrate true devotion (agar ikhlās mīwarzand), let them heed the order (ḥukm) the moment they received it. The ḥukm arrived in the late afternoon (waqt-i 'aṣr). By sunset 5,000 men of this tribe had mounted (3).

(1) Ghulām Sarwar, 55-6. (2) ibid., 56-7. (3) JA, 283b.

Isma'il spent the summer of 916/1510 organising an army to invade Khurāsān (1), which was no longer ruled by the Tīmūrīds. The Uzbegs, under their leader Muḥammad Shaybānī Khān, a descendant of Shaybān b. Jūjī b. Changīz, had brought to an end 130 years of Tīmūrīd rule in Transoxiana by capturing Samarqand and Bukhārā in 906/1500-1 (2), and the death of Mīrzā Sulṭān Ḥusayn on 11 Dhū'l-Ḥijja 911/5 May 1505 (3) opened the way for an Uzbek invasion of Khurāsān. Seven of Mīrzā Sulṭān Ḥusayn's fourteen sons survived him, and all were willing to give their allegiance to Badī' al-Zamān Mīrzā if the latter ruled independently (mustaqillan); but when Muḥaffar Ḥusayn Mīrzā became joint ruler through the influence of his mother Khadīja Beg Aqā, they did not consider that they were obliged to obey either of them (4). Consequently Khurāsān was split up into independent princedoms, and effective Tīmūrīd rule was at an end. On 1 Muḥarram 913/13 May 1507 Muḥammad Shaybānī Khān invaded Khurāsān (5). He defeated the army of Badī' al-Zamān Mīrzā and Muḥaffar Ḥusayn Mīrzā at Bādghīs, and entered Harāt unopposed (6). Another Uzbek force under his nephew 'Ubayd Khān b. Maḥmūd and Tīmūr Sulṭān defeated Kupuk Mīrzā and Abu'l-Muḥsin Mīrzā near Mashhad; the two Tīmūrīd princes were taken prisoner and put to death by 'Ubayd (7). Shortly afterwards Muḥammad Qāsim Mīrzā was defeated by 'Ubayd at Mashhad, and was also captured and put to death (8). The following year (914/1508-9) Badī' al-Zamān Mīrzā was driven out of Astarābād, and fled to India (9). In 915/1509-10 he went to Isma'il's court, where he was received with honour (10).

(1) Ghulam Sarwar, 57. (2) Shar. ii, 132. (3) AT. 88-9 (aet. 69). (4) ibid., 89. (5) Shar. ii, 142. (6) ibid., 142-3; AT. 98. (7) AT. 99. (8) AT. 100-1. (9) BM. Or. 3248, 176a. (10) Shar. ii, 146.

In the same year Muḥammad Shaybānī Khān raided Kirman, and killed the kalantar Shaykh Muḥammad (1). Isma'īl sent two embassies to the Uzbek leader to protest against this action, but the latter sent a derisive reply, bidding Isma'īl return to his ancestral calling of darwīsh (2). Shortly afterwards, however, Muḥammad Shaybānī Khān's position was weakened by the disastrous failure of two expeditions, one against Qāsim, the khān of the Qazāqs, and the other against the Hazāra (3).

Isma'īl advanced rapidly into Khurāsān. Aḥmad Sulṭān, the son-in-law of Shaybānī Khān, and Aḥmad Qunqurāt, the Uzbek governors of Dāmghān and Astarābād respectively, fell back as he approached, and he had almost reached Mashhad before Muḥammad Shaybānī Khān was aware of the fact. Muḥammad Shaybānī Khān withdrew to Marw to mobilize his forces, which had been dispersed at the end of the campaign against the Hazāra (4), and from Marw (end of Rajab 916/beginning of November 1510) (5), summoned aid from his nephew 'Ubayd Allāh at Bukhārā, and from Tīmūr Sulṭān at Samarqand.

Isma'īl commenced the siege of Marw on 20 Sha'bān 916/22 November 1510; a week later, hoping to tempt Muḥammad Shaybānī Khān to commit his forces to a pitched battle before the arrival of the reinforcements from Transoxania, Isma'īl feigned to withdraw from Marw. On 30 Sha'bān 916/2 December 1510 Muḥammad Shaybānī Khān, with 15,000 cavalry, marched out from Marw to attack Amīr Beg Maṣṣillū who, with 300 horse, had been stationed at Pul-i Maḥmūdī to cover Isma'īl's supposed retreat. Isma'īl swiftly brought up the main Ṣafawid army, and routed the Uzbegs. (6) Muḥammad Shaybānī Khān was

(1) BM. Or. 3248, 176b; Ghulām Sarwar, 58. (2) Ghulām Sarwar, 58 ff. (3) Tārīkh-i Rashīdī, 230-1. (4) Ghulām Sarwar, 60-1. (5) Shar. ii, 147. (6) Ghulām Sarwar, 61-2.

among the 10,000 Uzbek dead; Qanbar Bey, and Jān Wafā Mīrzā, the Uzbek governor of Harāt, were captured and put to death (1). Khwāja Maḥmūd Ṣagharchī, the wazīr of Muḥammad Shaybānī Khān and a Shī'ī by origin, handed over to Isma'īl the keys of Marw, and was enrolled in the ranks of the amīrs (2). Isma'īl sent the head of Muḥammad Shaybānī Khān to the Ottoman Emperor Bāyazīd. (3)

The Ṣafawid advance guard entered Harāt on 7 Ramaḍān 916/8 December 1510, and Isma'īl himself arrived there on 20 Ramaḍān/21 December. To consolidate the Ṣafawid conquest of Khurāsān, Isma'īl appointed Ḥusayn Beg Lala Shāmlū governor of Harāt, Bayrām Beg Qaramānlū governor of Balkh, Andikhūd, Shuburghān, Chichiktū, Maymana, Fāryāb, Murghāb and Gharjistan (4), and Dada Beg Ṭalish governor of Marw (5). After the death of Muḥammad Shaybānī Khān, the Uzbek confederacy for a time lacked an effective head, and various members of his family ruled independently at Bukhārā and Samarqand, and in other parts of the Uzbek empire. Isma'īl agreed not to

(1) Ghulām Sarwar, 62. (2) Shar. ii, 148; HS. iii/4, 60 states that he was mushrif-i dīwān at the court of Muḥammad Shaybānī Khān; after joining Isma'īl, he occupied the office of wazīr and ṣahib-dīwān, and acquired great power and dignity; he gained admission to Isma'īl's private audiences, and became more eminent than the other wazīrs. (3) BM. Or. 3248, 190a. The story goes that the head of Muḥammad Shaybānī Khān was sent to Āqā Rustam Rūz-Afzūn, the ruler of Sārī, and that the courier threw it into Rustam's lap with the grim jest: tā imrūz dast-i tū būd wa dāman-i ū; aknūn dast-i ūst wa dāman-i tū. The shock is said to have caused Rustam's illness and death (TIN. 457b). Isma'īl's treatment of Muḥammad Shaybānī Khān is said to have aroused a strong desire for revenge in Salīm b. Bāyazīd II (see Naṣr Allāh Falsafī, Jang-i Chaldirān, 58). (4) Ghulām Sarwar, 64-6. (5) ibid. 63.

invade Transoxiana on condition that the Uzbegs refrained from attacking Khurāsān (1). Less than a year later, however, Isma'īl was drawn into an attack on Samarqand through the ambition of the Tīmūrid Zahīr al-Dīn Bābur b. 'Umar Shaykh b. Abū Sa'īd to recover his Transoxanian dominions, from which he had been driven by Muḥammad Shaybānī Khān. In 917/1511-12 Bābur ^{where} marched on Ḥiṣār Shādman from Kābul, defeated the Uzbek governors Ḥamza Sulṭān and Mahdī Sulṭān, and put them to death. He appealed to Isma'īl to send him troops for an attack on Samarqand, promising in return to have coins struck and the khuṭba read in the name of Isma'īl. A qizilbāsh force ^{Develop} under Ahmad Beg Ṣūfī-ughlī and Shāhrukh Beg Afshār was despatched to Ḥiṣār Shādman, and Bābur, reinforced by these troops, captured Samarqand in Rajab 917/October 1511 (2). Bābur had Isma'īl's name inserted in the khuṭba and the coinage was stamped with the names of the twelve Imāms (3). This was the first and last occasion on which a Ṣafawid force entered Samarqand. Bābur occupied Bukhārā, and sent the qizilbāsh troops home, but shortly afterwards, in Ṣafar 918/May 1512 the Uzbegs defeated him near Bukhārā and drove him back to Ḥiṣār Shādman, to which they laid siege. Bayrām Beg Qarāmānlū, the Ṣafawid governor of Balkh, sent a force to the support of Bābur, and the Uzbegs withdrew (4).

In the summer of 918/1512 Isma'īl despatched a large army to Khurāsān under the command of the wakīl Amīr Yār Ahmad Iṣfahānī, known as Amīr Najm, Najm Beg, or Najm-i Thānī (5). On his arrival in Khurāsān, Amīr Najm was joined by Ṣafawid contingents from Harāt, Marw and Balkh, and by a force led by Bābur. Amīr Najm captured the fort of Khuzār (6), where he put to death

(1) Ghulām Sarwar, 65. (2) ibid., 66-7. (3) AT. 127. (4) Ghulām Sarwar 67. (5) AT. 127-8; HS. iii/4, 52-3. (6) Ghulām Sarwar, 68.

the garrison after promising them quarter, stormed Qarshī, where a general massacre took place (1), and laid siege to Ghujduwān. Little progress was made with the siege, and Bābur and some of the qizilbāsh chiefs suggested that, as they were running short of supplies, they should retire to Qarshī for the winter and renew their offensive in the spring. Amīr Najm refused to agree to this (2). On 3 Ramaḍān 918/12 November 1512 a strong Uzbek force under 'Ubayd Khān and Jānī Beg Sulṭān reached Ghujduwān from Bukhārā, and at once gave battle to the Ṣafawids; the qizilbāsh amīrs, because of their hostility to Amīr Najm, struck camp and marched back to Khurāsān, and only Bayrām Beg Qarāmānī remained loyal to the wakīl; the Ṣafawid army was utterly routed, Bayrām Beg Qarāmānī was killed, and Amīr Najm was taken prisoner and executed by 'Ubayd (3).

After their victory, the Uzbeks swept into Khurāsān. Jānī Beg laid siege to Harāt in Dhu'l-Qa'da 918/January 1513, but two months later, as the result of a dispute with 'Ubayd, he returned to his ulkā at Karmīna (3 Muḥarram 919/11 March 1513) (4). 'Ubayd, however, was reinforced by Tīmūr Sulṭān. The Ṣafawid garrison of Harāt, commanded by Ḥusayn Beg Lala and Aḥmad Beg Sūfī-^oghlī, abandoned the city, and retreated. Tīmūr Sulṭān occupied Harāt, and put many Shī'īs to death (5). Tūs and Mashhad fell to the Uzbeks.

On receiving the news of the disaster at Ghujduwān, Isma'īl at once marched to Khurāsān. At Ulang-i Rādīkān near Mashhad he met Dada Beg Ṭālish,

(1) AT. 131-2. (2) ibid., 132-33. (3) AT. 133; HS. iii/4, 69 states that when Bayrām Beg Qaramani was killed in the first Uzbek charge, the qizilbāsh amīrs, because of their hostility to Amīr Najm, turned and fled without using their weapons. Bābur, who had been stationed in reserve, withdrew to Ḥiṣār Shādman "broken and crestfallen" (Tārīkh-i Rashīdī, 261, q. in Seddon AT. ii, 244 n. 9 and Ghulam Sarwar, 69 n. 2); this defeat meant the end of his hopes of reconquering Transoxania. (4) AT. 137-8. (5) ibid., 133.

and subjected him to public ignominy for his defection at Ghujduwān. The Uzbegs withdrew from Khurāsān without risking an engagement, and Isma'īl sent a series of punitive expeditions to restore order in the Bādghīs, Balkh, Qandahār, Nisā and Abīward regions (1). This campaign was followed by a lull of eight years in the unending struggle between the Šafawids and the Uzbegs on the eastern marches of Persia. During Isma'īl's absence in Khurāsān, his half brother Sulaymān rebelled at Tabrīz, but was captured and put to death by Mušṭafā Beg Ustājlū, who was rewarded by being made governor of Tabrīz with the title of Mantashā Sulṭān (919/1513) (2).

All of a sudden

In the spring of 920/1514 the Ottoman sultan Salīm I, who had succeeded his father Bāyazīd II on 7 Šafar 918/24 April 1512 (3), invaded Persia with an army of 200,000 men (4). Several factors had led Salīm to take this step (5). In the first place, Isma'īl had refused to recognize the legality of Salīm's accession, and supported first the legal heir of Bāyazīd, Ahmad, and then the latter's son Murād (6). Murād b. Ahmad, after his father had been killed by Salīm, contested the succession with the latter, but was defeated and fled to Persia. There, he was granted asylum by Isma'īl, who assigned to him lands in Fārs (7). According to the

(1) Ghulām Sarwar, 70-1. (2) ibid., 71. The populace of Tabrīz, variously referred to as tabrīziyān-i awbāsh, "ruffianly Tabrīzīs", chapāniyān, "knaves", and yatīmān-i tabrīz, "robbers of Tabrīz", seem to have been largely instrumental in Sulaymān's defeat (AT. 140). (3) Ghulām Sarwar, 73. (4) AT. 144. (5) According to Naṣr Allāh Falsafī, Isma'īl's action in sending the head of Muḥammad Shaybānī Khān to Bāyazīd in 916/1510 is regarded by many Ottoman historians as being one of the fundamental reasons for the battle of Chāldirān (Jang-i Chāldirān, 58). (6) Naṣr Allāh Falsafī, op. cit., 61: 66. (7) Ghulām Sarwar 73; Murād fell ill and died at Kāshān while on his way to Fārs, and was buried at Iṣfahān.

Tārīkh-i Ilchī-yi Niẓāmshāh, Isma'īl planned to use Murād to provoke a rebellion against Salīm; Dīw Sulṭān, accompanied by Muḥammad Khān Ustājlu, the governor of Diyār Bakr, escorted Murād to Sīwās, but no support for the Ottoman prince materialized, and the scheme was abandoned. ⁽¹⁾ Secondly, Isma'īl sent Nūr 'Alī Khalīfa Rūmlū, the governor of Arzinjān ⁽²⁾, into Ottoman territory "to gather together the faithful Ṣūfīs" (bi-wasiṭa-yi jam' āwardan-i ṣūfiyān-i iklāṣ-shi'ār). When Nūr 'Alī Khalīfa reached Qarā Ḥiṣār, some three or four thousand horsemen from amongst the Ṣūfīs of Rūm and the disciples (murīdān) of that region joined him with their families (bā khāna-kūch). Nūr 'Alī Khalīfa defeated Fā'iq Pāshā, the governor of Malāṭiyya, near Tūqāt, and the khutba was read at Tūqāt in the name of Isma'īl ^{Taqat} (3). At Qāz Chāyirī Nūr 'Alī Khalīfa met the fugitive Murād b. Aḥmad, who was on his way to the Persian court (4). The Ṣafawid troops set fire to Tūqāt, which had rebelled, and Nūr 'Alī Khalīfa defeated an army of 15,000 men under Sinān Pāshā at Ayūyazī; Sinān Pāshā and 1,500 Ottoman troops were killed in the battle. ^{"Qaz" - plain} Nūr 'Alī Khalīfa then returned to his fief ^{tiqul} (toyul) at Arzinjān (5). Thirdly, the success of Ṣafawid arms in Diyār Bakr, which brought the Ṣafawids into closer contact with their followers in Ottoman territory, made it strategically desirable that the Ottomans should annex that province (6).

(1) TIN. 460a-b. (2) Ghulām Sarwar, 73. (3) AT. 134. (4) ibid., 135. (5) ibid., 135. (6) Naṣr Allāh Falsafī, Jang-i Chāldirān, 64, states that Isma'īl had concluded a defensive alliance with Sulṭān al-Malik al-Ashraf Qānsū Ghūrī of Egypt, and even with his former enemy 'Alā' al-Dawla Dhu'l-Qadar; these alliances would only enhance the strategic importance of Diyār Bakr in Ottoman eyes.

These were the casus belli; the underlying cause of the outbreak of war between the Ottomans and the Şafawids was the establishment of the Şafawid state itself. "In 1502, only a few years before the battles of Chaldiran and Marj Dābiq, a new and vigorous state was set up in Persia, headed by a great leader (Isma'īl aş-Şafawī) and imbued with the ideal of promoting the cause of the Shī'a and fighting the Sunna both within and without its borders. Such a state in itself constituted a grave challenge to the Sunnī Ottoman Empire; and the menace was greatly increased by the fact that Eastern Anatolia was infested with Shī'a adherents. More than that: Isma'īl aş-Şafawī was himself not a Persian but a Turcoman, and he was very greatly venerated and even idolised amongst many Turcoman tribesmen who flocked in their thousands to his standard. Had the Ottomans not put an abrupt and decisive end to this process their hold on vast areas in the Eastern parts of their realm would have been greatly jeopardised, and the Shī'a doctrine would have registered one of its most resounding successes." (1). Some indication of the numbers of Şafawid adherents who were Ottoman subjects may be gained from the report that Salīm, before he set out for Persia, put to death 40,000 Shī'īs, the majority of whom were Şuffīs and Şafawid adherents, in Asia Minor (2). Those who were not put to death were branded and sent to the Ottoman dominions in Europe (3).

Salīm reached Sīwās on 8 Jumādā I 920/1 July 1514, and advanced slowly along the highroad to Arzinjān (4), a distance of some seven stages (5); the whole area had been systematically devastated by Muḥammad Khān Ustājilū (6).

(1) D. Ayalon, Gunpowder and Firearms in the Mamluk Kingdom. 109. (2) Ghulām Sarwar, 74. (3) Naşr Allāh Falsafī, op. cit., 66. (4) Ghulām Sarwar, 76. (5) Nuzhat al-qulūb, 161; 163; 164; 199. (6) Ghulām Sarwar, 76.

19	8	nowdays	nowadays
19	20	leaded	lead
20	3	viscosity	viscosity
20	4,18,19,22	"	"
23	4	they turn	turn
23	10	1.00 1.00	1.00 1.30
24	6	unfortunatelly	unfortunately
25	9	appropriately	appropriately
25	25	finesse	fineness
25	28	equations need	equations which need
26	8	being	
26	18	prohibitely	prohibitively
26	20	were	where
26	22	to disfavor	not to favor
26	27	consider	considered
27	11	coalescence neither	coalesce nor
27	21	casted	cast
28	29	ambiquous	ambiguous
29	4	recasted	recast
29	4	"	"
29	11	viscosity	viscosity
37	7	Gramer	Cramer
39	9	dispresion	dispersion
39	17	anavoidable	unavoidable
39	24	carefull	careful
40	4	dispresion	dispersion
40	15	is been	has been
40	31	to the	than the
41	14	dispresion	dispersion
42	9	shrinked	shrunk
42	9	not case	not the case
42	32	splitted	split
46	13	instantaneous velocity	magnitude of the velocity
46	20	hands	sides
47	2	$u_g(t)-u_p(t)$	$u_g(t)-u_p(t)$
50	27	retainment	retention
58	5	interpereted	interpreted
58	12	readjustement	readjustment
58	20	zeroth	zero
72	3	are been	are
72	6	undistructed	undisturbed
72	6	stagerred	staggered
75	5	interactively	interactively
76	14	"	"
81	2	particulat	particular
83	9	eneven	uneven
84	11	preprossecor	preprocessor
98	17	finesse	fineness
103	26	recasted	recast
106	18	by	
118	14	later	last
134	26	finesse	fineness
140	22	smallest	largest
141	27	respoviness	response
142	1	respoviness	response
142	7	exhastion	exhausts
142	24	choosed	chosen
150	9	reduntant	redundant
150	20	realy	really
155	15	extented	extended
155	15,16	modules	routines
169	10	Schlin	Schlien

On 1 Rajab 920/22 August 1514 Salīm reached Chāldirān (1), N. W. of Khūy, and on the following day the Şafawid army attacked (2). Conflicting accounts are given of the size of the opposing armies and the details of the actual battle. Isma'īl was not able to call upon such chiefs as Dīw Sulţān, Zaynal Khān Shāmlū, and Amīr Sulţān Mawşillū, who remained at their posts at Balkh, Harāt and Qāyin respectively lest the Uzbegs should seize the opportunity to invade Khurāsān while Isma'īl was engaging the Ottomans in the west. Salīm had detached various contingents from his main army to protect his lines of communication, and it is probable that the Ottoman army was roughly twice as large as that of the Şafawids (3). Isma'īl possessed two commanders, Muḥammad Khān Ustājlu and Nūr 'Alī Khalīfa, who had first-hand experience of Ottoman methods of warfare, but at Chāldirān their advice, namely to attack at once before the Ottomans had completed their dispositions, was disregarded by Isma'īl (4). The Ottomans were

(1) Ghulam Sarwar, 78-9. (2) ibid., 80. (3) Ḥakīm al-Dīn Idrīs Bitlīsī (Salīm-nāma, 84a) gives the Ottoman army as 100,000, the Şafawid as 40,000; Sykes ii, 245 gives 120,000 and 60,000; HS. iii/4, 77-8, BM. Or. 3248, 247a and TAA. 31 give other figures. Naşr Allāh Falsafī op. cit., 92-3, gives the size of the Ottoman army as 120,000 (including 80,000 cavalry) and that of the Şafawid army as 20,000. Ottoman historians place the numbers of the Şafawid forces as high as 150,000. (4) AT. 145 states that Dürmīsh Khān rudely rebuffed Muḥammad Khān Ustājlu with the words kadkhudā'ī-yi tū dar diyār bakr miḡudharad ("your authority operates in Diyār Bakr"), and made the extraordinary proposal that, instead of attacking immediately, they should wait until the Ottomans had done everything within their power to place themselves in a position of defence (makth mīkunīm tā waqtīki ānchi maqdūr-i īshān ast az quwwat bi-fi'l āwarand dar muḡafazat-i khwīsh). In later years Tahmāsp is said to have cursed the name of Dürmīsh Khān whenever the battle of Chāldirān was mentioned, and to have alleged that most of the Şafawid amīrs were drunk on the day of the battle - at a time when sobriety and full possession of one's faculties were particularly important (TIN. 473a). A drunken boast would indeed seem to be the only explanation of Dürmīsh Khān's proposal.

therefore able to follow their usual practice of stationing their musketeers behind a barrier of gun carriages (*arāba), linked together by chains, and of placing mortars of various sizes on the gun carriages. This barrier presented an insuperable obstacle to the Ṣafawid army, which was composed mainly or entirely of cavalry, and was the major factor in the Ṣafawid defeat. "At Chāldirān (August, 1514) Ottoman artillery and arquebuses wrought havoc among the ranks of the Ṣafawīs who had no similar arms with which to reply....."; "Had the Ottomans not employed firearms on such a large scale in the battle of Chāldirān and in the battles which followed it, it is reasonably certain that their victory - even if they had been able to win - would have been far less decisive. In other words, the Ottomans would have acquired far less Ṣafawid territory in that event and a much stronger Ṣafawid army would have been left intact to prepare for a war of revenge" (1). The muskets of the janissaries also caused considerable execution. The Ṣafawids, at the time of Isma'īl I, thought the use of firearms (asliḥa-yi ātishīn) unmanly and cowardly (khilāf-i jawānmardī wa dalīrī) (2). The Mamlūks of Egypt and Syria held similar views, and were similarly defeated by the Ottomans a few years later (3). Isma'īl's initial, and fatal, mistake of not attacking the Ottoman forces at once, before they had had time to position their artillery and station their musketeers, has already been noted. Isma'īl has also been criticized for selecting the plain of Chāldirān as the site of the battle, on the grounds that while the Ottomans were able to deploy all their forces in the wide

(1) D. Ayalon, Gunpowder and Firearms in the Mamluk Kingdom, 109-10. (2) Naṣr Allāh Falsafī, op.cit., 93. (3) D. Ayalon, op.cit., passim and especially 88 ff.

plain, the Şafawids had no protection from the Ottoman artillery. (1) On the other hand, Isma'īl needed just such a plain in order to use his cavalry to the best advantage; it was his delay in attacking the Ottomans which made the terrain advantageous to the latter instead of to himself.

As regards the actual course of the battle, the Şafawids gained an initial advantage on the Ottoman left, which was routed, and its commander, Ḥasan Pāshā, killed. Isma'īl, apparently carried away by this success, passed right through the Ottoman lines, leaving the Ottoman centre, composed principally of janissaries, intact. Sinān Pāshā, in command of the Ottoman right, held firm, and was able to bring the Ottoman artillery (2) into action, with devastating effect. Muḥammad Khān Ustājlū, commanding the Şafawid left, was killed, together with many of his men, and the Şafawid left wing fell back in disorder. Isma'īl rallied his men, and led them in repeated charges against the Ottoman guns, but was finally compelled to retreat. The Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh gives the number of casualties on both sides at Chāldirān as 5,000, of whom 3,000 were Ottomans (3); the Sharaf-nāma, however, gives the Şafawid losses alone as 5,000 cavalry, and this seems a much more probable figure (4). Many other figures are given by the Ottoman historians, for instance, Ottoman casualties alone 30-40,000, Şafawid losses double that number; total Ottoman casualties 8,216, of whom 2,933 were killed; etc. (5).

In addition to Muḥammad Khān Ustājlū, many other leading Şafawid amīrs were killed, including Ḥusayn Beg Lala Shāmlū, Sarū Pīra Ustājlū the qurchībāshī,

(1) Naṣr Allāh Falsafī, op.cit., 94. (2) idem, op.cit., 79, gives the strength of the Ottoman artillery as 200 cannon and 100 mortars. (3) AT. 149. (4) Shar. ii, 158. (5) Naṣr Allāh, op.cit., 105.

Walī Khān Beg Qazāqlū Turkman, Sulṭān 'Alī Mīrzā Afshār, Khulafā Beg, governor of Baghdād, Ḥamza Beg Kūsa, Sardār Beg, governor of Barda'a and Ganja, and Pīr 'Umar Beg shīrajībāshī; three prominent sayyids were killed, namely, Amīr Niẓām al-Dīn 'Abd al-Bāqī Yazdī the ṣadr, Sayyid Muḥammad Kamūna, warden of the shrine at Najaf, and Sayyid Sharīf Shīrāzī, a former ṣadr (1). Salīm, thinking that Isma'īl's withdrawal was a ruse, did not at once pursue the Ṣafawids; when he was assured that there were no Ṣafawid troops left in the area, he marched to Tabrīz (2), which he entered on 15 Rajab 920/5 September 1514 (3). At Tabrīz Salīm held a council of war; he himself wished to winter there and to advance further into Persia the following spring, but his officers rejected this proposal. Accordingly Salīm left Tabrīz on 23 Rajab 920/13 September 1514, only eight days after he had occupied the city, and wintered at Amāsiyya (4).

The immediate effect of the Ṣafawid defeat at Chāldirān was the loss of Diyār Bakr, which was annexed to the Ottoman empire after Muṣṭafā Pāshā had completed the subjugation of the province in 922/1516-7 (5). An Ottoman force under Sinān Pāshā defeated and killed 'Alā' al-Dawla near Mar'ash, thus putting an end to the Dhu'l-Qadar dynasty of Mar'ash and Albistān, and those regions also were annexed to the Ottoman empire (6). More far-reaching in its consequences was the effect of the defeat at Chāldirān - the first defeat Isma'īl had suffered - on Isma'īl himself. During the last ten years of his life (920-30/1514-24), Isma'īl never once

(1) For descriptions of the battle, see AT. 144 ff; HS. iii/4, 78-9; BM.Or. 3248, 250a-253a; Naṣr Allāh Falsafī, op.cit., 98 ff. (2) AT. 149. (3) Ghulam Sarwar, 82. (4) ibid., 83. (5) ibid., 84-5. (6) ibid., 83-4; 'Alā' al-Dawla had raided Salīm's supply trains during the Ottoman invasion of Persia in 920/1514.

led his troops into action in person, despite the fact that during that period the Ṣafawids lost Balkh (captured in 922/1516-7 by Muḥammad Zamān Mīrzā, and in 923/1517-8 by Bābur, who installed Muḥammad Zamān Mīrzā as governor (1)), and Qandahār, taken in 928/1522 after a three-year siege by Bābur, who made his son Kāmran Mīrzā governor (2), and that the Uzbegs twice besieged Harāt (in 927/1520 and 930/1523) (3). After Chāldirān, too, there are signs of a certain ^{see below} decline in Isma'īl's personal authority as the ruling institution, and of a corresponding increase in the power not only of the Turkoman tribal chiefs, but also of the wakīl Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn Iṣfahānī, a Persian, who held office from 920-929/1514-1523. Thus, although Isma'īl had by the time of his death on 19 Rajab 930/23 May 1524 (4) consolidated Ṣafawid power in Persia, the future stability of the Ṣafawid state depended on the ability of his son and successor Ṭahmāsp not only to protect the frontiers of Persia in the west and east from attack by the Ottomans and Uzbegs respectively, but also to deal with the internal stresses which, arising from the fundamental conflict in the Ṣafawid state between Turk and Persian, and between the religious institution and the political institution, threatened in the early years of Ṭahmāsp's reign to reduce Persia to a state of anarchy.

(1) AT. 162: 167-8. (2) ibid., 169-70. (3) ibid., 171: 185. (4) BM.Or. 3248, 304a. He was 37 years of age, and had reigned for 22 years.

II. THE TRANSITION TO SHĪ'ISM

Professor Lambton has pointed out that it seems probable that the Safawids imposed ShĪ'ism as the state religion "partially, if not primarily, in order to differentiate their domains from the Ottoman Empire and to create a sense of unity among their subjects" (1). The function of the religious institution in general, and of the ṣadr in particular, in the period immediately following the establishment of the Safawid state, was therefore of the utmost importance (2). The Ottomans themselves clearly understood that the propagation of ShĪ'ism by the Safawids was inspired by political motives. Sulṭān Bayazīd II, in a letter to Shāh Isma'īl, said that it was not proper that he (Isma'īl) should use the dissemination and propagation of a religious order (ṭarīqa) which was contrary to (the beliefs of) Muslims as a whole ('amma-yi muslimīn) as a means of promoting the affairs of the ephemeral sovereignty of this world, and (thereby) create discord among the Islamic community (ummat-i khayr al-bashar) (3).

The Persian sources give the following accounts of the actual proclamation of ShĪ'ism as the state religion by Isma'īl on his accession at Tabrīz in 907/1501-2 (4). The Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh states that when Isma'īl

(1) A. K. S. Lambton, Quis custodiet custodes, in Studia Islamica vi/1956, 126.

(2) For the vital part played by the ṣadr in the imposition of doctrinal uniformity, see A. K. S. Lambton, op. cit., 135 ff; cf. also the chapter on the ṣadārat below, p. 295 ff. (3) Naṣr Allāh Falsafī, Jang-i Chāldirān, in Majalla-yi Dānishkada-yi Adabiyāt-i Tih-rān, vol. i/2, 1332/1953-4, 54. (4) There is some doubt as to the exact date of Isma'īl's accession; see p. 65 above.

entered Tabrīz, one of his first acts was to order the khatībs to introduce into the khutba the names of the twelve imāms of the Ithnā 'Asharī rite, and to use the Shī'ī formulae inna 'aliyyan walī allāh and ḥayyā ilā khayri'l-'amal, which had not been employed in the lands of Islam since the coming of Tughril Beg (451/1059) (1). Isma'īl further ordained the cursing of the Caliphs Abū Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthmān in the bazaars (aswāq); the penalty for disobedience was death. But "at that time the people had no knowledge of the precepts (masā'il) of the true Ja'farī creed (i.e., which was the repository of truth) (madhhab-i ḥaqq-i ja'farī), or of the rules and observances of the Ithnā 'Asharī rite (millat), for no books of Shī'ī jurisprudence were available" (kutub-i fiqh-i imāmiyya chīzī dar miyān nabūd). Qādī Naṣr Allāh Zaytūnī produced a copy of the Qawā'id-i Islām of Jamāl al-Dīn (b. ?) Muṭṭahir Hillī, which served as a basis for instruction on religious problems, until the Ithnā 'Asharī faith was spread to all parts (2).

According to the Tārīkh-i Ilchī-yi Nizāmshāh, the sādāt, quḍāt, 'ulamā, and mashāyikh, together with the rest of the inhabitants of Tabrīz and the province of Adharbāyjān, from far and near, both Turk and Tājīk, flocked to the foot of (Isma'īl's) throne. The populace adopted the true religion of the immaculate imāms (mardum bi-madhhab-i ḥaqq-i a'imma-yi ma'sūmīn dar āmadand), and abandoned the false creeds of their ancestors (madhāhib-i baṭīla-yi abā wa ajdād-i khwīsh-rā bigudhashtand) (3). This source makes no mention of opposition from the people.

(1) AT. 61. In 451/1059 Tughril Beg had put to flight and slain al-Basāsīrī, the Commander-in-Chief of the Buwayhid al-Malik al-Rahīm. Al-Basāsīrī had supported the Fātimid Caliph al-Mustansir and attempted to depose the 'Abbāsīd Caliph al-Qā'im (Browne, iv, 54 and n. 2). (2) AT. 61. See Browne, iv, 54 n. 3. (3) f. 448b-449a.

The Habīb al-Siyar gives virtually the same account as the Ahsan al-Tawārīkh: the words ashhadu anna 'aliyyan walī allāh were to be incorporated in the idhān, and the ghāzīs (i.e., Ṣūfīs of the Ṣafawid order) were ordered summarily to execute anyone who committed any act against the pure religion (amrī mukhālīf-i millat-i bayḍā) (1). The anonymous history of Shāh Isma'īl states that the amīrs and the few Shī'ī 'ulamā who were with Isma'īl ('ulamā-yi shī'a yak dū nafar ki hamrikāb-i shāh-i wālā-guhar būdand) were worried about the possibility of a revolt in Tabrīz when the Shī'ī formula was pronounced: "of the 200-300,000 people in Tabrīz, two-thirds are Sunnīs; from the time of the ḥaḍarāt (i.e., the Imāms themselves) until now no one has publicly recited this khuṭba, and we fear that the people may say that they do not want a Shī'ī sovereign (pādīshāh-i shī'a), and if, which God forbid!, the people renounce (Shī'ism) (agar ra'iiyat bar gardand), to what remedy can recourse be had?" (chi tadārūk dar īn bāb tawān kard). Isma'īl replied that he had been commissioned to perform this task (marā bi-īn kār bāz dāshta and), that God and the immaculate Imāms were his companions, and that he feared no one; "by God's help, if the people utter one word of protest, I will draw the sword and leave not one of them alive. On Friday I will go and prescribe (the form of) the khuṭba, so that it may be read (in that form) (khuṭba muqarrar mīdāram tā bikhwānand)". But the Shāh himself was concerned about this, because he knew that the qizilbāsh were right. That night 'Alī appeared to him in a dream, and said, "O son, do not let anxiety trouble your mind.....let all the qizilbāsh be present in the mosque fully armed, and let them surround the people; if, when the khuṭba is read, the people make any movement, the qizilbāsh

(1) HS. iii/4, 34.

will be able to deal with (the situation), since they surround the people; then give the order for the khuṭba to be read". When the khuṭba was read, uproar (ghulqula) broke out, and one-third of the city gave thanks to Almighty God, and it was ordained that all the khaṭībs in the provinces (khuṭabā-yi mamālik) should read the khuṭba of the twelve imāms (1).

The Ṣafwat al-Ṣafā states that Isma'īl, while still a youth, came out of the province of Ġilān with a few followers, and, despite the depravity of the age and the strength of his enemies, he placed his trust in God's help and in the aid of Muḥammad and all the immaculate Imāms, and delivered us from the tyranny of the infidels of that time; within a short time he cleansed Ādharbāyjān, Shīrwān, Diyār Bakr, 'Irāq-i 'Arab, 'Irāq-i 'Ajam, Fārs and Khurāsān of the oppression and corruption of seditious and contumacious people, and from the minbars he read the khuṭba extolling the virtues of the immaculate Imāms and the pure family of the Prophet Muḥammad (bar sar-i manābir khuṭba-yi madā'ih wa manāqib-i a'imma-yi ma'ṣūmīn wa ahl-i bayt-i ṭāhirīn khwānd); after seven or eight hundred years during which the true Imāmī faith (madhhab-i ḥaqq-i imāmiyya) had lain in concealment (mukhtafī būd), he revealed and manifested it (iḡhār wa i'lā'-i ān namūd), and gave currency to and made effective the articles (of that faith) (tarwīj wa tanfīdh-i qawā'id farmūd), and published and made known to the people of the world the cursing and vilifying of the enemies of the Prophet's house (wa la'n wa ṭa'n-i a'dā-yi ahl al-bayt-rā dar miyān-i 'ālamiyān mashhūr wa ma'rūf gardānīd); it is also clear that ānḥadrat (Isma'īl) was the manifestation of the ḥadīth of the Prophet which is included in some of the (collections of) traditions (wa nīz ṭāhir chunān ast ki ānḥadrat maḡhar-i īn ḥadīth-i

(1) BM. Or. 3248, 73b-74b.

nabawī būd ki dar ba'ḍī riwayāt wārid shuda), namely, inna lanā kanzan fī ṭaliqān lā min dhahabin wa lā fiḍḍatin bali'thnā 'ashar alfa rajulin yaqūduhum shābbun min banī hāshimin 'alā baghlatin (ثني ودغل) 'alā ra'sihi 'iṣābatun, that is, in truth I have a treasure in the province of Ṭaliqān which is not of gold or silver but (consists of) twelve thousand men led by a youth, one of the sayyids of the Banī Hāshim, mounted on a black mule and with a red tāj on his head (1).

The imposition of Shī'ism in Persia was inevitably accompanied by a certain amount of religious persecution. Professor Lambton has noted that "the old assumption that the stability of the state was bound up with right religion was also taken over (by the Ṣafawids), and it was accompanied by the same uncompromising attitude towards unorthodoxy" (2). Unorthodoxy, as far as the Ṣafawids were concerned, ^{and other sects} was Sunnism, and Isma'īl's measures to impose Shī'ism on the people of Ādharbāyjān caused a considerable exodus of Sunnī 'ulamā from that province. Amīr 'Abd al-Wahhāb, an eminent sayyid of Ādharbāyjān and formerly the shaykh al-islām of Ya'qūb Aq Qoyunlu, fled to Harāt, where he was treated with honour by Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā; greater favour was shown to him than to most of the sayyids of Khurāsān, and he was given a worthy soyūrghāl (3). Khwāja Mawlānā ¹³ Iṣfahānī (author of a history of Ya'qūb Mīrzā), a bigoted Sunnī, migrated from Ādharbāyjān to Harāt at the time of the zuhūr (manifestation) of Isma'īl, and was honoured by Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā and his sons. He entered the service of Muḥammad Khān Shaybānī when the latter conquered Khurāsān in 1507, but the Uzbek leader, though he occasionally treated him with favour, more often accused

(1) Ṣafwat, 811a-b. I have been unable to determine the words in brackets.

(2) A. K. S. Lambton, quis custodiet custodes, in Studia Islamica vi/1956, 126.

(3) HS. iii/4, 113.

him of hostility towards the ahl-i bayt. When Isma'īl conquered Khurāsān in 1510, Khwāja Mawlānā Iṣfahānī again had to flee; he retreated to Transoxania, and died at Bukhārā on 5 Jumādā I 927/3 April 1521 (1).

After the Ṣafawid conquest of Khurāsān, great efforts were made to extend the practice of the Ithnā 'Asharī creed throughout Khurāsān. The khaṭībs throughout the province read the names of the twelve Imāms in the khuṭba, and were required to commence the ritual cursing of Abū Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthmān. The shaykh al-islām (2), who was the leader and exemplar of the Sunnīs, refused to comply with these orders, and was put to death as a warning to others. Those sayyids and 'ulamā who were known to be Shī'īs (bi-tashayyu' ma'rūf wa mashhūr būdand), were highly favoured by the Shāh and accorded a specially privileged status (bi-marāḥim-i khusrawāna sar-afraz gashta mazīd-i ikhtiṣāṣ yāftand)(3). Sayyid Qiwām al-Dīn Ḥusayn was sent to Balkh, and settled the sharī'a affairs of that region in accordance with the tenets of the Imāmī creed (muhāmm-i shar'iyya-yi ān khitṭa-rā bar nahj-i millat-i 'aliyya-yi imāmiyya qarār dād) (4).

Two years previously, in 914/1508, Isma'īl had led his army to 'Irāq-i 'Arab and Khūzistān, and, despite the dominant position of Sunnīs there (bā wujūd-i istīlā-yi sunniyān), had manifested the yadd-i baydā, in order to promote and magnify the creed of the twelve Imāms (5). Isma'īl visited Karbalā and Najaf, where he provided further charitable foundations for and augmented the pensions (idrārāt) of the sayyids, 'ulamā, mutawallīs and khadīmān (attendants) of the exalted thresholds ('atabāt-i 'aliyyāt). Gold

(1) HS. iii/4, 113. (2) His name was Mawlānā Sayf al-Dīn Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā b. Mawlānā Sa'd al-Milla wa'l--Dīn Mas'ūd al-Taftāzānī (Shar. ii, 148).

(3) TIN. 458a. (4) HS. iii/4, 113. (5) TIN. 453b.

and silver candlesticks, carpets, and chests (ṣanādīq) were provided for the adornment and embellishment of the shrines. Arrangements were made for the organization of the ḥuffāz, mu'adhḥins and attendants, and, in order to facilitate the orderly administration of the shrines (barāyi tarwīj wa tansīq-i muḥamm-i ānjā), Isma'īl assigned (musallam dāsht) to the illustrious and pure shrines certain places (ba'ḍī az maḥāll) in 'Irāq-i 'Arab. A canal was cut from the Euphrates to Najaf to supply the shrine with water, and Qāḍī Jahān (1) was placed in charge of this work. This canal, known as the nahr-i sharīf, provided an annual income of 2-3,000 tūmāns for the Imāms. 2,000 tūmāns were spent on the completion of the work, which had been begun by 'Aṭā Malik Isfarā'inī, brother of Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad the ṣāhib-dīwān (2). Before leaving 'Irāq-i 'Arab, Isma'īl destroyed the dome of the tomb of Abū Ḥanīfa (3), and desecrated his grave (4).

In 909/1503-4 Isma'īl, after occupying Shīrāz, put to death the khuṭabā of Kāzirūn because they were Sunnīs, and plundered their houses (5). In the same year he put to death Qāḍī Mīr Ḥusayn Yazdī (6). It is significant that in all the cases of persecution of Sunnīs by the Ṣafawids recorded in the sources, the victims of persecution were members of the religious classes, and in many instances holders of religious offices.

There is no evidence of any widespread religious persecution under Isma'īl.

(1) This is Qāḍī Jahān Qazwīnī, who became joint wazīr in 920/1514, and later was for many years wakīl of Ṭahmāsp. (2) JA. 287b. 'Aṭā Malik was appointed governor of Baghdād by Ḥūlagū in 657/1259, and held the post for 24 years (Browne i, 20 and n.). (3) At Baghdād: see Professor J. Schacht's article Abū Ḥanīfa, in EI², fasc. ii, 123. (4) TIN. 453b. (5) Shar. ii, 136. (6) AT. 82.

but the latter left the people in no doubt that he would use force if necessary to suppress opposition to his religious measures: "if the people utter a word, I will draw my sword and not leave one person alive" (agar ra'iiyat harfī bigūyand shamshīr mīkasham wa yak kas-rā zinda namīgudhā)

(1). A passage in the article Jang-i Chāldirān by Naṣr Allāh Falsafī presupposes that some force was, in fact, employed. Naṣr Allāh Falsafī states that after the battle of Chāldirān (920/1514), Isma'īl, with regard to the propagation of the Shī'ite religion (tarwīj-i madhhab-i shī'a), refrained from severity, harshness and killing (az sakhtgīrī wa khushūnat wa kushtār khwuddārī kard), and gave orders to the governors of the provinces that they should not molest God's people for abandoning or changing their religion (khalq-i khudā-rā barāyi tark wa tabdīl-i madhhab naranj-anand)(2). In a state in which loyalty to the ruling institution was construed as belief in the right religion, Isma'īl could not, in fact, have countenanced any apostasy from Shī'ism. It is possible that Isma'īl's tendency to leniency after Chāldirān may have reflected the fear that the defeat, the psychological effects of which were even greater than the material losses inflicted on the Ṣafawids, might cause unrest among the people, and the consideration that in view of this danger it might be wiser temporarily to relax the vigour of the campaign against Shī'ism. It may be objected, on the other hand, that after Chāldirān a reaffirmation of belief in Shī'ism, and hence of loyalty to the Shāh, was more than ever necessary. It seems, however, that the principal opposition to the establishment of Shī'ism as the state religion by the Ṣafawids came not from the people but

(1) BM. Or. 3248, 73b. (2) Naṣr Allāh Falsafī, Jang-i Chāldirān, 121.

from the religious and official classes. In other words, it seems likely that, as far as the majority of the ordinary people were concerned, the proclamation of Shī'ism as the orthodox religion of the Ṣafawid state reflected a religious climate which already existed (1), whereas the official classes, who were in general still staunchly Sunnī, were naturally hostile to the new régime. In order to test the validity of this theory, an attempt must be made to assess the effect of Ṣafawid propaganda in Persia, and to determine the part played by various other heterodox religious movements in preparing the ground for the Ṣafawids.

Of the various dynasties which assumed local sovereignty in different parts of Persia as the power of the Ilkhāns declined, the Sarbidārīds of Sabzawār held views of a markedly Shī'ite flavour, and the Jalā'irīds, who ruled over 'Irāq-i 'Arab from 736/1336 and in 759/1358 added Ādharbāyjan to their dominions, were imbued with Shī'ite beliefs. Dr. J.B. van Loon, in the foreword to his edition of the Ta'rīkh-i Shaikh Uwais (2), suggests that "the fact that Ḥasan (i.e., Shaykh Ḥasan Buzurg the Jalā'irīd, who died in 1356) chose the town (Najaf) with this sanctuary of the Shī'ites as his last resting-place, indicates that the Jalāyirs had been completely iranicised by this time and had taken the side of the religion that was prevalent in their domains, viz. the Shī'ite form of Islām. This is also evident from the choice of names, such as 'Alī, Ḥasan and Ḥusain, so common to the Shī'ites because they were borne by 'Alī and his sons". Dr. van Loon also asks, "Does the title 'Shaikh' perhaps imply leadership, nominal or real, of a dervish order? The combination of political and religious

(1) This does not ignore the passage from the anonymous history of Shāh Isma'īl quoted on p. 90 f. above. (2) The Hague, 1954.

power was not uncommon, as can be seen in the origin of the Safawid dynasty" (1). These, and other local dynasties, were destroyed by the tide of Tīmūrid invasion, but what evidence we have suggests that strong undercurrent of Shī'ism persisted, despite the official Sunnī orthodoxy of the Tīmūrid rulers, not only in 'Irāq-i 'Ajam, where there were strong Shī'ī groups at Qum and Iṣfahān, but also in Ādharbāyjan and Khurāsān.

Jean Aubin has indicated the existence at Qum of a family of Riḍawī sayyids who enjoyed various immunities from the time of Tīmūr down to the time of Ṭahmāsp, and cites documents to prove that dynastic changes did not interrupt their enjoyment of these privileges. In this family were vested the offices of naqīb al-sādāt and mutawallī of the awqāf of the shrine of Fāṭima at Qum, and a document of Ya'qūb Aq Qoyunlu refers to members of this family also holding the posts of khaṭīb, mutawallī, and imām of the mosque of the Imām Ḥasan 'Askarī (2).

Further evidence that families of Shī'ī dignitaries were able to continue relatively undisturbed in the possession of their hereditary offices and in the enjoyment of their hereditary privileges, despite the fact that they passed successively under the rule of Sunnī Tīmūrids, Shī'ī Qara Qoyunlu, and Sunnī Aq Qoyunlu, is provided by a series of documents relating to a waqf of the Buq'a-yi Ḥusayniyya at Iṣfahān, which have been studied by Jean Aubin (3). The Buq'a-yi Ḥusayniyya is the mausoleum of Shāh 'Alā' al-Dīn Muḥammad Naqīb Ḥusaynī, a supporter of Sulṭān Muḥammad b. Bāysunqur b. Shāhrukh, who in 849/1445-6 rebelled in 'Irāq-i 'Ajam against

(1) J.B. van Loon, op. cit., 11 and n. 51. (2) J. Aubin, Note sur quelques documents Aq Qoyunlu, in Mélanges Louis Massignon, 1956, 125 ff. (3) op. cit., 133 ff.

Shāhrukh' (1). Shāh 'Alā' al-Dīn Muḥammad was executed by Shāhrukh in 850/1446 for his part in the revolt at Iṣfahān. By the terms of the waqf, the office of mutawallī was vested in the descendants of Shāh 'Alā' al-Dīn Muḥammad, and the first mutawallī was his son, Shāh Quṭb al-Dīn. The existence of the waqf and the rights of the descendants of Shāh 'Alā' al-Dīn were recognized successively by the Tīmūrīd Abu'l-Qāsim Bābur, and by the Aq Qoyunlu rulers Uzun Ḥasan (document dated 879/1474), and Ya'qūb (document dated 884/1479), and Rustam Beg (farḡān dated 900/1495).

From this evidence Jean Aubin infers, I think rightly, that the problem confronting the Turkomān rulers of the Qara Qoyunlu and Aq Qoyunlu dynasties was not whether to adopt a hostile or a favourable attitude to Shī'ism, but how to "canalize this force" and follow a policy which would win them the support of large numbers of their subjects (2). For this reason, the Turkomān rulers avoided taking anti-Shī'ī measures unless they themselves felt threatened by the political activities of the Shī'īs under their rule. It was, for instance, the growing military strength and increasing political activity of Junayd which moved Jahānshāh Qara Qoyunlu to banish him from his dominions about the year 1448 (3). Similarly, Junayd's successor Ḥaydar lived on amicable terms with the Aq Qoyunlu ruler Uzun Ḥasan, but, after the death of Uzun Ḥasan, his son Ya'qūb was persuaded by the Shīrwānshāh to send troops against Ḥaydar, on the grounds that "if he (Ḥaydar) conquered Shīrwān, he would aspire to other provinces also" (4). In the words of J. Aubin, "the Aq Qoyunlu were soon troubled by the growing

(1) See p. 37 above. (2) J. Aubin, op.cit., 132. (3) See pp. 45-6 above. (4) See pp. 53-4 above.

theocratic claims of Ṣafawid Shī'ism; for this reason the relations of the shaykhs of Ardabīl with the Aq Qoyunlu were more strained than their relations with the Qara Qoyunlu had been"(1).

Tīmūrid rule continued in Persia, though over a steadily decreasing area, for exactly a century (1405-1505) after the death of Tīmūr. It is difficult to say to what extent Ṣafawid propaganda was successful in making converts in Persia during this period. Before the death of Shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn (794/1391), the Ṣafawids had secured a considerable number of adherents in 'Irāq-i 'Ajam and Khurāsān. The Silsilat al-Nasab states that large numbers of devotees travelled from the provinces of 'Irāq-i 'Ajam and Khurāsān in the time of Ṣadr al-Dīn (1334-91 A.D.), to visit his disciple Sayyid-i 'Ushshāq Qāsīm-i Anwār and to derive benefit from his inner grace (fayḍ-i bāṭin) (2). In Persia, support of heterodox religious movements often represented an expression of popular discontent. The adherents of the Ṣafawid shaykhs in the 14th century, however, derived not only from the mass of the people, but apparently included among their number high-ranking officers of state. The Sharafnāma states that during the time of the salāṭīn-i changīziyya (i.e., the Īlkhāns), the Mongol amīrs, and particularly Amīr Chūbān, became the disciples (murīd wa mu'taqid) of Shaykh Ṣafī. For this reason (the conversion of Amīr Chūbān) all the Mongol nobility became sincere devotees of the Shaykh (az ān jihat a'yan-i muḡhul bi'l-tamām murīd wa mukhlis-i shaykh gashta and) (3). Great numbers of disciples appeared, especially in Irān. One day, in the course of conversation with Shaykh Ṣafī, Amīr Chūbān asked him whether the royal army (lashkariyān-i pādishāh), or his disciples, were the more numerous. In reply Shaykh Ṣafī alleged

(1) op. cit., 133. (2) SN. 41. (3) For the great veneration paid to Shaykh Ṣafī by the minister Rashīd al-Dīn Faḍl Allāh, (d. 1318), see Browne, iv, 33-4.

that his disciples in Īrān were twice as numerous as the royal army (dar Īrān murīdān-i mā dū barābar-i 'askar-i pādishāh ast) (1).

According to another version, Ṣafī replied that in Īrān alone, for every soldier there were a hundred Ṣūfīs (dar Īrān tanhā barābar-i har yak az aṣḥāb-i jalādat ṣad nafar az arbāb-i irāda būda bāshand) (2). This follows the version of the Ṣafwat al-Ṣafā, which states that Amīr Chūbān, at the time when he was amīr al-umārā of Īrān, asked the Shaykh whether his disciples numbered more than the men in his own (i. e., the Ilkhānid) forces. The Shaykh replied that his disciples were more numerous, representing a hundred disciples for every Turk in the Amīr's army. Amīr Chūbān said, "You speak truly, for I have travelled from the Oxus to the frontiers of Egypt, and from the shores of Hurmuz to Bāb al-Abwāb (Darband), which are the furthest limits of this kingdom, and I have seen the disciples of the Shaykh embellished and adorned with the ornaments (ḥilya) and apparel (zī) of the Shaykh, and they have spread the sound of the dhikr to those parts"(3).

It seems clear that already in the 14th century there were considerable numbers of people in Īrān who accounted themselves disciples of the Ṣafawid shaykhs. It may reasonably be assumed that contact was maintained between Ardabīl and these Ṣafawid proselytes. Most of the available information deals with the way in which the Ṣafawid organization in Anatolia and Syria was steadily built up under Shaykh Ṣafī al-Dīn and his successors, and indicates that the devotees visited their spiritual leaders at Ardabīl at regular intervals. The statement of Mawlānā Shams al-Dīn Barnīqī, quoted in the Silsilat al-Nasab, affords evidence of this. In the

(1) Shar. ii, 132-3. (2) HI. 515b. (3) 745b-746a.

Mustafiz
Case?

space of three months, he says, the number of novices and devotees (ṭalibān wa mushtaḡān) who visited Shaykh Ṣafī al-Dīn via the Marāgha and Tabrīz road alone was 13,000. They were received by Shaykh Ṣafī al-Dīn and converted (tawba (1) kardand) (2). Browne remarks, "many if not most of these must have come from Asia Minor, so that even at this early date the Order was establishing and consolidating itself in regions where it was afterwards destined to cause the greatest anxiety to the Ottoman Sultans" (3). Professor Minorsky states that, "although the shaykhs of Ardabīl were supported by the local elements of Talish and Qarāja-dagh, their most fanatic supporters were recruited among the Turcomans of Rūm (Asia Minor) and Shām (Syria)"(4). The most significant part of Mawlānā Barnīqī's statement, however, is his assertion that "the number of novices (scil. who visited Shaykh Ṣafī al-Dīn) from other areas was on a comparable scale" (az barāyi baqī-yi aṭraf barīn qiyās) (5). The presence of considerable numbers of Ṣafawid converts in 'Irāq and Khurāsān must have facilitated the Ṣafawid occupation of those territories and, by familiarizing people with Ṣafawid religious and political ideas, have promoted the eventual acceptance of the new régime by the populace.

The transfer of large numbers of Turkomāns from Ādharbāyjan and 'Irāq to Khurāsān between the years 823/1420 and 870/1465 was a further factor which contributed to the introduction of Shī'ī beliefs into that area.

(1) See A. J. Arberry, Sufism, 75: "The first station is stated to be conversion (tauba), a view commonly held by the Sufis, who mean by this term not of course the formal profession of Islam but the conscious resolve of the adult Muslim to abandon the worldly life and to devote himself to the service of God". (2) SN. 38. (3) iv, 44. (4) TM. 190-1: the dialectal poems of Shaykh Ṣafī may be in mediaeval Talishī (ibid., 191, n.1). (5) SN. 38.

MS. Shāhrukh transferred at least 10,000 Turkomān families from Ādharbāyjan to Harāt before the year 836/1432-3 (1). As Shāhrukh was not in a position to invade Ādharbāyjan until 823/1420-1, this transfer must have taken place between 823 and 836 A.H. These tribesmen presumably belonged to the Qara Qoyunlu confederacy, and the transfer of so large a number can only have been dictated by the desire to weaken Qara Qoyunlu power in Ādharbāyjan. The presence of this large colony of Qara Qoyunlu at Harāt was a source of embarrassment to the Tīmūrid ruler. The Maṭla'-i Sa'dayn states, "Shāhrukh had transferred to Harāt many families (khāna-kūch) from the Turkomān tribes (īl wa ulūs) of Ādharbāyjan. At the same time (836/1432-3) Sayyid Ghiyāth al-Dīn Yazdī, at the royal command (bi-mūjib-i ḥukm), undertook a check (taḥqīq) of the government hostels (sarāhā-yi dīwānī) and other places where that community (an jama'at) was living. More than 10,000 households (khānawār) were registered (qalamī shud)" (2). Shāhrukh had reason to suspect revolt (maḥall-i taṣawwur-i fitna būd) on the part of these Turkomān tribesmen (3). As was frequently the case, the Shī'ite elements became the focal point for popular discontent, and in this case the presence of the Qara Qoyunlu prince Yār 'Alī b. Iskandar at Harāt rendered the position one of potential danger to the Tīmūrids.

Yār 'Alī had taken refuge from his father with Khalīl Allāh, the ruler of Shīrwān, and the latter had sent him to Harāt, where Shāhrukh gave him access to the princes' circle. But he frequented "scoundrels and riff-raff, both Turks and Persians" (ajāmira wa ajlāf wa runūd wa awbāsh-i turk wa tajīk), and thus fell from favour; eventually Shāhrukh banished him from Harāt to Samarqand because he feared that the Turkomān elements of the

(1) Shar. ii, 91. (2) MS. ii/2, 644. (3) ibid., 644-5.

population and the people generally might gather round him and stir up revolt (1). The event which finally caused Shāhrukh to take the step of exiling Yār 'Alī from Harāt is described by the Maṭla'-i Sa'dayn: "One day Shāhrukh rode off to inspect a cannon (kamān-i ra'd) which Ustād Faraj had cast, and which was claimed to be capable of firing a ball 400 man in weight. An enormous crowd had collected to the north of Kūh-i Bāwulī-gāh, which was the firing range (maḥall-i sang andākhtan būd), and Shāhrukh was watching from an eminence. Suddenly Amīrzāda Yār 'Alī appeared. He was a most handsome, graceful and elegant youth (dar kamāl-i ḥusn wa laṭāfat wa ḡhayat-i khūbī wa malāḡat). When the people saw him, with one accord, and involuntarily (bi-yak bār bī ikhtiyār), they ran towards him, and followed him so blindly (bi-naw'ī sar dar pay-i ū dāshtand) that the cannon was completely forgotten". Shāhrukh was enraged, and when he returned to the audience chamber (bārgāh) he ordered Yār 'Alī to be fettered; at daybreak he despatched him to Samarqand (2).

Sixteen years later, in 852/1448-9, Ulugh Beg b. Shāhrukh led an expedition to Khurāsān, and brought Amīrzāda Yār 'Alī to Harāt. As a result of observing signs of revolt on the part of Yār 'Alī, Ulugh Beg arrested him and confined him in the fortress of ^{Neretan} Nayra Tū, where he had a fellow-prisoner in Amīr Sulṭān Abū Sa'īd, the dārūgha, who had been arrested earlier (3). Ulugh pressed on towards Mashhad, but, later the same year, was forced to return to Harāt to deal with a revolt on the part of Yār 'Alī, who, with the aid of Amīr Sulṭān Abū Sa'īd, had escaped and had seized possession of the fort. Yār 'Alī made use of the large supplies of

(1) Shar. ii, 91-2. (2) MS. ii/2, 645. (3) ibid., 945-6. The name of the fort is also given as Nayza Tū.

provisions (dhakhīra) and money (nuqūd) in the fort for the purpose of enlisting an army; he gained possession of places in the vicinity of the fort, and then marched on Harāt. The governor of Harāt, Amīr Bāyazīd Parwānāchī, ordered everyone who had a horse (? or donkey? (ulāgh)) to go out and fight Yār 'Alī. "This ill-equipped force of Persians" (mardum-i tāzīk bī yarāq wa silāh) was routed by Yār 'Alī, and its equipment plundered; Yār 'Alī granted quarter to the peasants (ra'āyā), and advanced on Harāt. When he came in sight of the city, he was joined by riff-raff (jam'ī awbāsh wa li'am) and a body of retainers belonging to the great amīrs (fawjī nawkarān-i umarā-yi 'izām), who at that time were neither trusted nor respected (dar īn ayyām bī i'tibār wa ihtirām būdand). He commenced the siege of Harāt, and plundered the surrounding districts. The whole city turned to defence. All citizens of note (jumhūr-i nāmdārān), noteworthy artisans (mashhūr-i pīshakarān), and everyone from skilled men and craftsmen (muhtarifa wa arbāb-i sanāyi') to Sūfīs and recluses (mutasawwifa wa ashāb-i sawāmi'), rose in defence of the city (naffīr-i 'amm bar āwardand) (1), and held out until the arrival of Ulugh Beg from Mashhad. Yār 'Alī retreated into the fortress of Nayra Tū, and the riff-raff (awbāsh wa li'am) who had gathered round him dispersed in all directions (2).

Ulugh Beg instituted an inquiry into the circumstances of Yār 'Alī's revolt. Amīr Bāyazīd reported to him that those living outside the city (bīrūniyān) must have aided the rebel, otherwise he would not have had either the opportunity or ability (to rebel) (wa agar na ū-rā chi mahall wa yarā-yi ān būd). Ulugh at once ordered that the environs of the city should be devastated (bīrūn-i shahr ghārat kunand), and a considerable

(1) MS. ii/2, 954. (2) ibid., 957.

number of people who had stirred up revolt and slain Muslims without cause were put to death. For three days looting continued unchecked (ghārat-i 'āmmā kardand), and the troops acted with complete licence (lashkar az shīsha-yi dabṭ bīrūn jast) (1). Everyone who crossed their path was seized, and they were continually searching for gold and silver (2). They smashed the mosque candles, hanged the imāms, and insulted and humiliated illustrious men (āb-rū-yi 'azīzān bar khāk-i khwārī mīrīkhtand); madrasas became cavalry posts (madāris ribāṭ al-khayl), and in place of instruction (dars) and the recitation of the Qur'ān (tilāwat) was heard ribald (idle?) talk (kalam al-layl); instead of prayer and supplication came the sound of singing, and in the abode of learning and wisdom were heard the strains of musical instruments (3). Everyone was stripped of his clothes (4).

These events took place at the end of Ramaḍān 852/November 1448; after three days Ulugh Beg called a halt to the looting, and shortly afterwards an Uzbek raid on Samarqand caused him to leave Harāt (5). Abu'l-Qāsim Bābur at once emerged from Gurgān and marched on Harāt (6). 'Abd al-Laṭīf b. Ulugh Beg, who had been left in charge of Harāt by his father (7), was also uneasy about Yār 'Alī (az jānib-i amīrzāda yār 'alī nīz bi-ghāyat andīshanāk būd), evacuated Harāt without resistance and marched towards the Oxus (8). Yār 'Alī again left Nayra Tū and besieged Harāt. Three days previously, some of Abu'l-Qāsim Bābur's amīrs had entered Harāt,

(1) MS. ii/2, 957. (2) nargis-wār hama chashm bar zar dāshtand, wa sīm-rā qurrat al-'ayn mīpindāshtand. (3) zīr wa bam mīnawakhtand (lit. "they played both high and low notes"). (4) hama kas-rā chūn sīr pūst bāz kardand wa az libās tū-bar-tū chūn piyāz bī-niyāz sakhtand. (MS. ii/2, 958). (5) MS. ii/2, 959-60. (6) ibid., 961. (7) ibid., 960. (8) ibid., 964.

but they laid the foundations of oppression and injustice (asās-i zulm wa bīdād bunyād nihādand), and the leading men (akābir wa a'yān) of Harāt decided to admit Yār 'Alī to the city (1). Yār 'Alī blockaded the amīrs in the citadel of Ikhtiyār al-Dīn, and spent some twenty days in the abode of sovereignty (mustaqarr-i salṭanat); most of his time was devoted to carousal, and in truth no further injury was inflicted on the people by him (al-ḥaqq ra'āya-rā azū ziyādat asībī narasīd). Towards the end of Dhu'l-Ḥijja 852/February 1449, Abu'l-Qāsim Bābur entered Harāt, captured Yār 'Alī by a ruse, and put him to death (2). It is difficult not to suppose that the repeated successes of this Qara Qoyunlu prince in the heart of the Tīmūrid empire had been due, at least in part, to the support of the Turkomāns whom Shāhrukh had settled in Khurāsān.

In 870/1465-6 15,000 families of nomadic tribesmen (khāna-kūch-i aḥshām wa ṣaḥrā-nishīnān) migrated from various parts of 'Irāq (aṭrāf-i mamālik-i 'irāq) to Khurāsān, because they had been reduced to desperate straits by Turkomān (i.e., Qara Qoyunlu) tyranny (az zulm wa jawr-i tarākima bi-jān āmada būdand). They had seized the opportunity while Jahānshāh was besieging his rebel son Pīr Būdāq in Baghdād (1465-6) to take this step. Abū Sa'īd received them with great favour, and allotted them yurt in various parts of Khurāsān (dar aṭrāf-i mamālik-i khurāsān) (3). It is not clear whether these 15,000 families belonged to tribes which were members of the Qara Qoyunlu federation, or whether they were merely subject to Qara Qoyunlu rule. In either case, it is probable that they had been affected

(1) MS. ii/2, 964, and n. 5 quoting the Ḥabīb al-Siyar. (2) MS. ii/2, 964-5. (3) ibid., 1296.

by the heterodox opinions of the Qara Qoyunlu; their migration to Khurāsān thus increased the already considerable strength of the Shī'ī elements there, and the presence of these elements must in some degree have helped to prepare the ground for Safawid propaganda. Professor Minorsky states that "the evidence is clear that they (the Qara Qoyunlu) pretended to something more than domination based on sheer force and that, in trying to unify their adepts on a shī'a platform, they can be regarded as the forerunners of the Safawids" (1).

The contemporary sources also disclose the important fact that Hurūfī elements, and a prominent member of the Safawid order, Qāsim al-Anwār, were present at Harāt during the reign of Shāhrukh, and indicate that the latter was implicated with the former in an attempt on the life of Shāhrukh in 830/1426-7.

The Sharafnāma says briefly that a certain Lur named Ahmad, described as a disciple of Faql Allāh Astarābādī, made an unsuccessful attempt to assassinate Shāhrukh in the Masjid-i Jāmi' at Harāt. An inquiry which was held established a connexion between the Lur Ahmad and the drapers (bazzāzān) of Harāt. This fact caused the ruin of many of the latter. Amīr Qāsim al-Anwār also fell under suspicion, and was expelled from Harāt by Shāhrukh; his life was spared because of his intimacy with Mīrzā Bāysunqur (2). The latter was renowned for his patronage of the arts, and it was presumably as a poet that Qāsim al-Anwār had attracted his attention. In Browne's view, although his poetry contains unmistakable traces of Hurūfī influence, "it cannot on such evidence alone be proved that Qāsimu'l-Anwār was actually a

(1) V. Minorsky, Jihān-shāh Qara Qoyunlu and his poetry, in BSOAS 1954, xvi/2, 274. (2) Shar. ii, 88-9.

a member of that sect, though his association with an admitted disciple of Faḍlu'llāh of Astarābād and the suspicion which he thereby incurred afford strong corroboration of this conjecture⁽¹⁾.

A detailed account of the incident at Harāt is given by the Maṭla'-i Sa'dayn: - on 23 Rabī' II 830/21 February 1427, Shāhrukh, as he was leaving the Masjid-i Jāmi', was stabbed by a certain namad-pūsh named Ahmad the Lur, who had approached him on the pretext of presenting a petition (bi-ṣūrat-i dādkhwāhān), and had suddenly rushed at him and stabbed him in the stomach. The wound was not serious, and the household guards (īchikiyān) killed the Lur. Shāhrukh managed to ride back to his palace in the Bāgh-i Zaghān, and thus allayed rumours (that he had been assassinated). Mīrza Bāysunqur and the amīrs investigated the case, and regretted the killing of the Lur (az kushtan-i ū pashīmān shudand), who alone could have provided them with a clue to the motive for the attack. Among the Lur's belongings was a key. Three days elapsed before the night-watch ('asasān) discovered that this key belonged to a house in one of the bazaars (tīmcha'ī). The inmates of this house recognized the description of the Lur as corresponding to a ṭāqiya-dūz (a maker of the ṭāqiya, a cotton under-cap) resident in the bazaar, who had been frequented by numerous people, including, they asserted, Mawlānā Ma'rūf the khaṭṭāṭ (calligraphist) of Baghdād. The latter was a most distinguished and talented man (sarāmad-i musta'iddān-i jahān wa nādīra-yi dawrān), skilled in many arts in addition to calligraphy (ghayr az khaṭṭ anwā'-i funūn wa aṣnāf-i kamālāt ḥāsil dāsht). He had left the employment of Sulṭān Ahmad Jalā'ir, the ruler of Baghdād, and had gone to

(1) iii, 479; see ibid., 475-9 for extracts from the poetry of Qāsim al-Anwār.

Iskandar Mīrza b. 'Umar Shaykh, the Tīmūriid ruler of Iṣfahān, and obtained a post in the latter's library. Iskandar required him to transcribe 500 bayt (couplets) a day, but the Mawlānā's facility as a copyist was such that he used to write 1,500 bayt in one day, thus giving himself two days' leisure. This, however, was contrary to Iskandar's orders, and he inquired why the Mawlānā was not working. The calligraphist replied that he preferred to do three days' stint in one day. Having proved to his satisfaction that the Mawlānā was not making an idle boast, Iskandar gave him abundant in'ams. At the time of Shāhrukh's conquest of 'Irāq and Ādharbāy-jān (823/1420), the Mawlānā was transferred to Harāt, where he became kātib-i khāṣṣ. He was a good conversationalist (khwush-muḥāwara) and an eloquent speaker (shīrīn-kalām). He used to wear honey-coloured felt (namad-i ~~gall~~) with a tall ṭāqiya of the same material on his head and an alif (strip?) of felt twisted round the ṭāqiya. Talented young men of Harāt like Mawlānā Taj al-A'imma Khwārazmī frequently visited him - some for his calligraphy, others for his conversation. The Mawlānā was extremely reserved, and of a noble bearing (buzurg-manish). Mīrza Bāysunqur wanted him to write a copy of the Khamsa of Niẓāmī, and sent him good-quality paper for the purpose. The Mawlānā kept the paper for more than a year, and finally returned it without having written anything. Bāysunqur was highly annoyed. In 330/1427, on the basis of the evidence they had obtained, the commission of inquiry accused Mawlānā Ma'rūf of complicity in the attempted murder of Shāhrukh, and arrested him. Most of the talented young men who had enjoyed his society became alarmed, and blackmailers (aṣḥāb-i ṭama') extracted considerable sums from them (az īshān zarhā giriftand). The Mawlānā was several times taken to the foot of the scaffold, and was finally imprisoned in a dungeon (chāh) in the citadel of Harāt (Ikhtiyār al-Dīn).

Khawāja 'Aḍud al-Dīn, nephew of Mawlānā Faḍl Allāh, and others who had been connected (ittifaq kardā būdand) with Ahmad the Lur, were put to death and their bodies burned. Amīr Sayyid Qāsim Tabrīzī was expelled from Harāt because Bāysunqur had a personal grudge against him (sū' al-mizājī), and the Sayyid departed to Samarqand. (Some of his poetry contains complaints about his treatment on this occasion) (1).

The account given by the Zubdat al-Tawārīkh differs in certain respects:- (f. 434b) On Friday 23 Rabī I 830/22 January 1427 Shāhrukh set out for the Masjid-i Jāmi' at Harāt. His wife (mahd-i a'lā), as the result of divine inspiration and feminine intuition (tafarrus-i mu'mināt) had tried to dissuade him from going, on the grounds that he might be in some danger from the collapse of walls affected by the recent heavy rains. Shāhrukh replied that fate was unavoidable; one could only do one's duty and return humble thanks to the Maker for his Grace. (f. 435b) Shāhrukh, in view of the saying that "all believers are brethren" (al-mu'minūn ikhwatun), did not (as was the custom of former princes) debar the populace from the entrance to the mosque (az rahgudhar man' nafarmūda). The amīrs, ministers of state (arkān-i dawlat) and attendants (mulāzimān wa nawkarān), left the mosque quickly to avoid the throng, no one giving a thought to the possibility of an attempt on the monarch. Suddenly a reprobate (mardūdī), dagger in hand, ran forward, and without hesitation made for Shāhrukh and wounded him, though not severely. A page (chuhra) seized the attacker's collar from behind, and received a wound in the shoulder. A khawāja-sarā⁽¹⁾ (major-domo) seized his knife, and was also wounded. The guards (yasawulān) then

(1) MS. ii/1, 584-93.

(1) see note, p 114

arrived and despatched him with numerous blows, and Shāhrukh was treated by his surgeons. (436b) Shāhrukh then left the mosque and mounted. No one knew the identity of his assailant. By the time that Shāhrukh got outside the gateway (darwāza) his strength was insufficient to enable him to grip the reins, and he was taken back to the palace in a litter.

An inquiry was set on foot. (f. 437a) After three days' fruitless inquiry a proprietor of a caravanseray confessed that a man answering to the assailant's description had had a room (hujra) in his caravanseray, but that he had left on Friday and had not returned. Questioned as to the man's companions, he replied that Mawlānā Ma'rūf Khaṭṭāṭ frequently visited him (bidū taraddudī dāsht). Ma'rūf was summoned before a council of amīrs and leaders of the state. At first he denied all knowledge of the matter, but after torture confessed that the would-be assassin was named Ahmad Iur, and that the man behind the attack was 'Aqūd b. Mawlānā Majd al-Dīn Astarābādī, (who was in league) with a band of adherents to the religious principles of Mawlānā Faḍl Allāh Astarābādī (jam'ī dīgar ki madhhaban wa mashraban bi-irādat wa qawā'id wa maqā'id-i mawlānā faḍl allāh astarābādī... mashhūr wa madhkūr), who night and day engaged in private meetings (dar khalwat-khāna) and in impious and heretical discussion (mubāḥatha-yi kufr wa zandaqa). Those men accursed with devils (malā'īn bi-shayāṭīn) and those wrong-doing infidels (kafara-yi fajara) were summoned before the court of inquiry (majlis-tajassus wa dīwān-i tafahḥus) without delay. Questioning failed to elicit any reply except a denial, and they supported (taqwiyat wa tamshiyat mīdād-and) their much-embellished story (kalām-i mumawwah) and unacceptable answer (jawāb-i nā muwajjah) with a tissue of lies (takhlīqāt-i durūgh) and dark labyrinths of words (maghlabāt-i bī-furūgh). (f. 438a) When pressure was applied, they confessed to conspiracy against the life of

Shāhrukh, but said that Ahmad Tur had anticipated their design (dar in andīsha bar mā sabqat namūda). (f. 438b) After this confession they were all executed. Shāhrukh performed a general almsgiving in gratitude for his escape, and exempted the people from 1/3 of their taxes (dū dāng-i māl bar jumhūr-i ra'iiyat musallam dāsht) (1).

At least forty years before Qāsim al-Anwār was expelled from Harāt as a result of his alleged complicity with the Murūfīs in the attempt on the life of Shāhrukh (830/1427), he had been one of the novices of the Ṣafawid order who pursued their training with great zeal and enthusiasm (bā dhawq wa shawq-i tamām) under the guidance of Shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn (died 794/1391). The latter told Sayyid-i 'Ushshāq Qāsim al-Anwār that his spiritual cure ('ilāj) could only be effected by a fast of forty days, during which he was to remain standing (except for the obligatory tashahhud and sujūd) and constantly to recite the dhikr. Sayyid-i 'Ushshāq successfully performed this task, by dint of tying his long forelock to a rope secured to the roof of the khalwat; towards the end of his fast, he had a vision in which he saw himself standing in the Masjid-i Jāmi' at Ardabīl, holding a great candle in his hand from which the congregation lit their own candles, the light of which illumined the whole mosque. Shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn interpreted this vision to mean that Sayyid-i 'Ushshāq was destined to share out among the novices the divine light with which he was endowed, and he bestowed on him the laqab of Qāsim al-Anwār or "Distributor of the Lights" (2). It is clear that the Shaykh recognized the peculiar intensity of the devotional powers of Qāsim al-Anwār. It has already been noted that during the time of

(1) Dhayl-i Zubdat, q. in footnotes to MS. ii/1, 584-90: 592. (2) SN. 40-1. The Majālis al-'Ushshāq, f. 120a-b, has a detailed account of the vision of Qāsim al-Anwār.

Shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn large numbers of devotees travelled from 'Irāq-i 'Ajam and Khurāsān to visit his disciple Sayyid-i 'Ushshāq Qāsim-i Anwār and to derive benefit from his inner grace (1). This testifies not only to the high regard in which he was held by Shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn, who apparently allowed him virtually to act as a murshid at a time when he himself was head of the Ṣafawid order, but also to the extent of the penetration of Ṣafawid propaganda. This is important evidence to the effect that by the second half of the 14th century the adherents of the Ṣafawid order, far from being confined to north-west Persia, Syria and Asia Minor, were to be found in large numbers in 'Irāq-i 'Ajam and Khurāsān also. The presence of Qāsim al-Anwār at Harāt in 830/1427 is particularly significant, as it suggests that, after completing his period of spiritual training, he had proceeded to work among devotees with whom he had established personal contact at Ardabīl. It would naturally be of the utmost importance to the Ṣafawids to gain converts at Harāt, the capital of the Tīmūrid empire in Persia and, therefore, a stronghold of Sunnism.

The Ḥabīb al-Siyar has the following notice on Amīr Qāsim-i Anwār: the greatness of the rank ('azm-i sha'n) of that leader of the ahālī-yi naqābat wa 'irfān (i. e. sayyids and mystics) and that refuge of the possessors of miraculous powers and sure knowledge (aṣḥāb-i karāmat wa īqān) cannot adequately be described by the pen. In the beginning Amīr Qāsim-i Anwār became the disciple of Shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn Ardabīlī; after some time he entered the society of Shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn 'Alī Yamanī. for whom he demonstrated a sincere attachment. Amīr Qāsim, after perfecting (his) spiritual and material accomplishments (ba'd az takmīl-i kamālāt-i ṣūrī wa ma'nawī),

(1) See p. 99 above.

went from Ādharbāyjan, where he had been born and brought up (ki mawlid wa mansha'-i khuddām-i 'alīmaqāmash būd), to Harāt, and applied himself to giving spiritual guidance (irshād) to the sects of the servants of God (firaq-i 'ibād). Within a short time the majority of the nobles and great men of Khurāsān were numbered among the disciples of his threshold, the abode of guidance (akthar-i akābir wa a'yān-i khurāsān dar silk-i murīdān-i āstān-i hidāyat-āshiyānash intiẓām yaftand); they, considering his qibla-like court their retreat and refuge, morning and evening as suppliants (bi-iqdām-i niyāz) hastened diligently to serve his attendants (bi-mulāzamat-i khādīmānash mīshitāftand) (1). Since Amīr Qāsim used to meet Shāhrukh and his puissant sons (awlād-i 'izāmash) with complete freedom (dar ghāyat-i istighnā), and, because of the exalted nature of his position (az kamāl-i 'uluww-i sha'n), did not show them the honour and respect which they expected (chunānchi ṭama' mīdāshtand īshānrā ta'ẓīm wa ihtirām namīfarmūd), for this reason vexation entered the heart of Mīrzā Bāysunqur who, resolving to expel Amīr Qāsim, devoted his efforts to that end; but he could not reveal the secrets of his heart without grasping a pretext (namītawānist ki bī tamassuk-i bahāna maknūn-i ḍamīr-i khwud-rā bi-ẓuhūr rasānad). When in the year 830 Aḥmad the Lur stabbed His Majesty (Shāhrukh), it came to light (bi-wuḍūḥ paywast) that the former had sometimes waited upon that sun of the heaven of beneficence and star of the constellation of the imamate; Mīrzā Bāysunqur informed his father (Shāhrukh) of the circumstances, obtained permission to expel Amīr Qāsim-i Anwār, and communicated this decision to the latter (īnma-'nī-rā bi-khuddām-i 'ataba-yi 'aliyya-ash payghām dād); as a result, Amīr Qāsim set out for Transoxania. When he neared Samarqand, the umarā and

(1) For the office of khādīm-bāshī, see TM., 55.

sudūr of Mīrzā Ulugh Beg deliberated whether to beseech that sayyid (naqābat-manqabat) to go to the royal audience-hall (bārgāh-i salṭanat) to meet the King (pādishāh) of auspicious attribute (khujasta-ṣifāt), or whether to take Ulugh Beg to meet that exalted seat of the imāmate. Amīr Qāsim solved their problem by apprehending, as he passed by the citadel (arg) that Ulugh Beg was within, and by entering without ceremony (bī-takalluf) to meet him. Ulugh Beg, after hearing from the lips of Amīr Qāsim the words of a darwīsh and the speech of a muḥaqqiq (sukhanān-i darwīshāna wa kalamāt-i muḥaqqiqāna), at that same meeting (dar hamān majlis) became a devotee (lit., ḥalqa-yi irādat dar gūsh kashīd) and a loyal follower (lit., ghāshiya-i ḥusn-i 'aqīdat bar dūsh afkand). Amīr Qāsim lived for some years in those parts with the greatest honour and distinction (dar kamāl-i jāh wa jalāl), and towards the end of his life returned to Khurāsān; he died in 837/1433-4 in Kharjird in the province of Jām; among his poetical works are a dīwān of ghazals and a short mathnawī poem entitled Anīs al-'Āshiqīn

(1).

The above account in the Ḥabīb al-Siyar is based on the Nafaḥāt al-Uns, which gives the following additional information: Shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn Yamānī, to whom Qāsim al-Anwār turned for guidance after Shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn Ardabīlī, was a companion (az aṣḥāb-i) Shaykh Awḥad al-Dīn Kirmanī. Jāmī states that he saw the "devotional lineage" (nisbat-i irādat) of Amīr Qāsim in the handwriting of some of the latter's followers (bi-khaṭṭ-i ba'd-i mu'taqidān-i way), and that Shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn 'Alī Yamānī was mentioned in it, not Shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn Ardabīlī. Jāmī goes on to say that Amīr Qāsim is reputed to have thought highly of Shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn Yamānī, and to have displayed great devotion towards him. People, says Jāmī, are divided on the question of accepting or rejecting Amīr Qāsim (ahl-i rūz-

(1) HS. iii/3, 145.

gār dar qabūl wa inkār-i way du firqa and); his legacy is twofold: a diwān of poetry, consisting of eternal truths and mysteries, in which are visible the lights of revelation and knowledge (anwār-i kashf wa 'irfān) and vestiges of divine grace and ecstasy (āthār-i dhawq wa wajdān), and a community (jamā'ati) of people who consider themselves connected to him (khud-rā mansūb bi-way mīdārānd) and account themselves his disciples (murīd). "I have seen some of them", says Jāmī, "and have heard of their affairs (aḥwāl-i ba'dī-rā shānīda); most of them were beyond the pale of the Islamic faith (az rabqa-yi dīn-i islam khārij būdānd), and had entered the orbit of communism, and contempt for the shar' and sunna (dar dāyira-yi ibāḥat wa tanāwun bi-shar' wa sunnat dākhil); it is possible that the origin of this was that the nature of the Divine Unity dominated the Sayyid (Amīr Qāsim) (mīshā-yad ki manshā-yi īn ān būda bāshad ki mashrab-i tawḥīd bar khidmat-i sayyid ghālib būda), and that in his consideration of all matters he went back to original principles (wa naẓar dar jamī'-i umūr bar mabda' dāshta), and the whole field of dissent and criticism was covered (bisāṭ-i i'raḍ wa i'tirāḍ-rā bi'l-kulliyya ṭay kardā būdānd), and as a result of his natural generosity he spent on the hospice all the donations and votive offerings which were received (bi-muqtaḍā-yi karam-i dhātī ki dāshta ast futūḥāt wa nudhūrī ki mīrasīda hama sarf-i langar mībuda); therein men of carnal passions achieved their object, and there was no obstacle (to this) (aṣḥāb-i nafs wa hawas-rā maqṣūd ānjā ḥāsil būda wa mānī'-i na); a group of men of genius (jamā'ati az ahl-i ṭab') had come together (mujtami' shuda būda and) and, having heard instances of his esoteric knowledge (az ma'ārif-i way sukhanān mīshānīda and), on account of their carnal passions made use of it (for their own ends) (az sar-i nafs wa hawā darān taṣarruf mīkarda), and made it the preliminary to preoccupation with the appetites of the carnal soul and

the avoidance of opposition to carnal desires (ān-rā muqaddima-yi ishtighāl bi-mushtahhiyyāt-i nafs wa i'rāq̄ az mukhālafat-i hawā mīsakhta); they lapsed into communism and contempt for the sharī'a and the sunna (dar wādī-yi ibāhat wa tahawwun bi-sharī'at wa sunnat uftāda), but he (i. e., Amīr Qāsim) was undefiled by all this (wa way azīn hama pāk). I saw one of his dervishes an old, wise man, who performed the duties of obedience and was constant in (the performance of) dhikr and in vigilance, and asked him about Amīr Qāsim. He replied, "I met him twice, at Harāt and Balkh, and on each occasion, when I had been with him for a few days, he told me to go back to my native province, and not to remain among those people, because their company would corrupt me" (dar miyān-i īnān mabāsh ki ṣuḥbat-i īnān tū-rā qarar mīkunad). Certain pious men used to recount how they had met the Sayyid (Amīr Qāsim) in Samarqand; in the course of his mystical discourse (dar athnā-yi ān ma'arifi ki mīguft) he (Amīr Qāsim) used to speak at length of Ṣiddīq-i Akbar (Abū Bakr); every time he said "Ṣiddīq-i Akbar" he felt great compassion (riqqat-i bisyar mīkard), and tears fell in great white drops from his eyes (qaṭarāt-i ashk-i buzurg-i safīd az chashm-i way mīrīkht); his disciples and followers used to say, "He is now in the station of Abū Bakr" (way aknūn dar maqām-i abū bakrīst) (1). Other pious men who had enjoyed his society used to say that they had never seen his equal in natural generosity (karam-i dhātī). Some of the people of Kharjird (in the province of) Jām, who were

(1) A. J. Arberry, Sufism, 75, states that " a fundamental distinction is drawn between maqām (station) and ḥāl (state); briefly, the maqām is a stage of spiritual attainment on the pilgrim's progress to God which is the result of the mystic's personal effort and endeavour, whereas the ḥāl is a spiritual mood depending not upon the mystic but upon God. "The states", says al-qushairī, "are gifts; the stations are earnings".

on the whole free from bigotry in their acceptance or rejection (of a shaykh) (dar qabūl wa inkār ghaliban az ta'assub khālī), used to recount certain miracles appertaining to this party (ba'ḥalī karamathā ki in ḥa'ifa-rā mībāshad naql mīkard). A pious man ('azīzī) whose word is trusted by all, relates on the authority of certain trustworthy travellers that, as they were on their way from the holy tomb (turbat) at Jām to the sacred shrine at Tūs, travelling between midnight and dawn (shabgīr pagāh kard), in the direction of Kharjird they saw a light rising from the ground and reaching the sky; amazed, they wondered what light it was. The same night they reached Kharjird, and saw that the light was in the direction of the hospice (langar) of the Sayyid (Amīr Qāsim); when they came to the hospice and prepared to make the pilgrimage to his tomb (qaṣd-i ziyārat-i way karda and), it became apparent that the light was shining from the building housing his illuminated tomb (marqad-i munawwar-i way), and I have heard from certain dervishes that turning towards his illuminated tomb brings complete tranquillity (tawajjuh bi-marqad-i munawwar-i way mūjib-i jam'iyyat-i tamām ast), and God knoweth best! Khwāja Nāṣir al-Dīn 'Ubayd Allāh said that Sayyid Qāsim saw Khwāja Bahā al-Dīn near Abīward and associated with him (ṣuḥbat dāshta) and was a follower of his ṭarīqa (ṣūfī order), and (Sayyid Qāsim) himself was understood to consider himself (a follower) of that ṭarīqa (wa az way fahm mīshud ki khwud-rā barān ṭarīqa mī dāsht) (1). Khwāja Nāṣir al-Dīn 'Ubayd Allāh also reported that Sayyid Qāsim used to say that whenever he arrived at a place, he enquired about the mystics (majdhūbān) (2) (who

(1) The reference is to the Naqshbandī order, founded by Muḥammad b. Muḥammad Bahā al-Dīn al-Bukhārī (717-9/1317-89). Khwāja 'Ubayd Allāh (Khwāja Abār), the great Naqshbandī shaykh, died in 893/1488 (see article Naqshband in EI¹). (2) Majdhūb: "Chez les Soufis, celui que Dieu a élu et qui obtient sans aucune peine tous les bienfaits" (Dozy, Supp. ar., s. v.).

lived there), and joined their society; when he arrived at Constantinople, he asked whether there was a majdhūb there: (they replied), a certain Mawlānā Jānī. Sayyid Qāsim said that when he went to see him, he recognized him, as he had met him during his (Sayyid Qāsim's) period of study (taḥṣīl) at Tabrīz. Sayyid Qāsim asked him what had happened to him. He replied in Turkish (zabān-i rūmī) that every morning when he arose, he was a man distracted (dar tafraqa uftāda), pulled alternately this way and that; one morning when he arose, something seized hold of him, with the result that he obtained deliverance from everything (that had been troubling him) (marā chīzī furū girift ki az hama khalāṣ shudam). (Khwāja Naṣir al-Dīn 'Ubayd Allāh) said that he had heard this story several times from Sayyid Qāsim, and each time he heard it, he was considerably disturbed (mutaghay-yir); tears would fall from the Sayyid's eyes, and it was clear that the recital of that story greatly affected the Sayyid.....In 830/1428 someone wounded the king of the age (pādishāh-i waqt) in the Masjid-i Jami' at Harāt, and it became known that he (the assailant) had a locked (muqaffal) house in the hospice (langar) of the Sayyid (Amīr Qāsim); on the suspicion that it was with his (Amīr Qāsim's) knowledge (bi-tawahhum-i ānki bi-wuqūf-i way būda), they expelled him from the city (i.e., Amīr Qāsim) (1); Amīr Qāsim went towards Samarqand and Balkh, and returned from there and lived at Kharjird-i Jām; he died in 837/1433-4, and his tomb is situated there (2).

The Haft Iqlīm also has a notice on Qāsim al-Anwār:- "Qādī Ahmad Ghaffārī in the Tārīkh-i Jahān-Arā relates that he (Qāsim-i Anwār) was the

(1) Taking the alternative (and clearly correct) reading az shahr ikhrāj kardand instead of az shahr 'udhr khwāstand. (2) Nafahat al-Uns of Jami (ed. Nassau Lees, Calcutta 1858), 689-693.

lic
2/11

disciple (murīd) of quṭb al-awliyā Ṣadr al-Dīn Mūsā b. Shaykh Ṣafī al-Dīn, and that his original name (nām-i aṣl-i ū) was Mu'īn al-Dīn 'Alī. Jāmī in the Nafahāt describes him as a disciple (murīd) of Shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn 'Alī Yamanī; at all events (har taqdīr), in the reign of Mīrza Shāhrukh he devoted some years to the guidance (irshād) of the sects of God's servants (firaq-i 'ibād) at Harāt, and, as a result of the hostility of Mīrza Baysunqur, went to Transoxiana and spent some time at Samarqand; after his return he settled in Kharkhiz and Jām and died in 837 A.H. (1433-4)(1).

Although the above accounts are fairly detailed, they do not present a clear picture of events. The reference to bazzāzan (2) and ṭāqiya-dūz (3) is interesting as an indication of the class of society in which Ḥurūfī propaganda was active in Persia. The Ḥurūfīs were clearly heretics holding antinomian views; they were accused of kufr and zandaqa (4). The connexion of Ahmad the Lur with the Ḥurūfīs is not proved; Mawlānā Ma'rūf only implicated the Ḥurūfīs under torture, and the members of the Ḥurūfī sect who were arrested, although under torture they admitted to conspiring against the life of Shāhrukh, asserted that Ahmad Lur had anticipated their design (5). The position of Mawlānā Ma'rūf himself is obscure. According to the Majālis al-'Ushshāq, however, three years after the attack on Shāhrukh (i.e., in 823/1429), Mīrza Jūkī and Mīr Fīrūzshāh were sent to Kharjird to tender an apology to Qāsim al-Anwār, as it had been discovered that the disciples of Mawlānā Faḍl Allāh Ḥurūfī had been responsible for

(1) BM. Add. 16734, 502a-b. Kharkhiz is apparently an error for Kharjird.

(2) p. 107 above. (3) p. 108 above. (4) For a discussion of the significance of these terms see B. Lewis, Some observations on the significance of Heresy in the History of Islam, in Studia Islamica 1953, i, 54 ff.

(5) p. 112 above.

the attempt on Shāhrukh's life (chūn ma'lūm shud ki kārđ zadan az pīsh-i murīdān-i mawlānā faḍl allāh ḥurūfī būda) (1).

As regards Qāsim-i Anwār, it has been established with some certainty that he obtained his early spiritual training first at the hands of the Ṣafawid shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn Mūsā b. Ṣafī al-Dīn, and then under Shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn Yamanī; he then went from Ādharbāyjan to Harāt, where he engaged in irshād (the spiritual guidance of his disciples); his disciples included "the majority of the nobles and great men of Khurāsān" (2), and the great power which he rapidly acquired was undoubtedly the principal cause of the hostility of Mīrzā Bāysunqur b. Shāhrukh, who welcomed the events of 830 A.H. as an opportunity to expel him from Harāt (3). According to the Majālis al-'Ushshāq, when Qāsim al-Anwār left Harāt for Samarqand, people lined the route all the way from the Darb-i 'Irāq to the end of the khiyābān (4). Qāsim al-Anwār was received with great honour at Samarqand by Ulugh Beg b. Shāhrukh, who professed himself to be his disciple, and he held a position of great honour and influence during his stay in that region (5).

The nature of his religious teaching is less clear. Browne observes that "there is therefore good reason to suspect that Qāsim al-Anwār was at any rate something of an antinomian, even if he had not some quasi-political relation with the Shī'ite partisans of the still uncrowned Ṣafawīs, or with the still more irreconcilable ḥurūfī heretics" (6). It is difficult to believe, however, that if Qāsim al-Anwār had openly preached "communism and contempt for the Holy Law and the Sunna" (7), he would have been held in

(1) f. 123a. (2) See p. 114 above. (3) See p. 114 above. (4) f. 122b.

(5) See pp. 114-5 above. (6) Browne, iii, 475. (7) See pp. 115-6 above.

such high esteem by Shāhrukh and Ulugh Beg. For a professing Muslim to hold beliefs contrary to the central dogmas of Islam would be to place himself beyond the pale of Islam and to lay himself open to a charge of zandaqa (1). To follow communistic practices (ibāḥat) would, moreover, be a threat to the existing political institution, and would invite repression (2). Professor B. Lewis, referring to Ottoman Turkey and Ṣafawid Persia, states, "the followers of the doctrines and practices which threatened the state, the dynasty or the fabric of society were outlawed and repressed.

Others - be they as remote from Islam as the Nusairis, Druzes and Yazidis - were accorded tolerance, and even allowed the name and status of Muslims"

(3). On the other hand, we have Jāmī's statement that most of the people he had met who professed to be disciples of Qāsim al-Anwār "were beyond the pale of the Islamic faith" (4). In explanation of this, Jāmī expresses the opinion that Qāsim al-Anwār's excessive absorption with the nature of the Divine Unity, and his readiness to range over the field of speculation and enquiry, enabled unscrupulous people to pervert his esoteric teachings for their own purposes and to lapse into communistic practices and contempt for the sharī'a and the sunna. Qāsim al-Anwār himself was not only innocent of these practices, but was aware of the corrupting influence exercised by his

(1) See Professor B. Lewis, op. cit., 56 (2) cf. in pre-Islamic times the history of the Mazdakite movement during the reigns of Qubād b. Fīrūz (487-98 and 501-31) and Anūshīrwān (531-78). The movement was savagely suppressed not only because Mazdak was a zindīq, i. e., a heretic who disavowed the basic tenets of the orthodox religion, but more particularly because he preached the doctrine of ibāḥat, and therefore constituted a threat to the security of the state (see the Fārsnāma of Ibn al-Balkhī (G. M. S.), 23: 84ff. (3) op. cit., 61-2. (4) See p. 116 above.

Chruskman

followers on "orthodox" ṣūfīs (1).

In addition to being suspected of having a connexion with the Hurūfīs, Qāsim al-Anwār is also alleged to have been a follower of the Naqshbandī tariqa or ṣūfī order (2). It appears to have been a regular practice of Qāsim al-Anwār to establish contact with ṣūfī circles in any town which he happened to be visiting (3). *عاشق پروردگار، برکنار شد از سنی و اجماعی*

*As a
Dizful*

back to 22

During the same period that Qāsim al-Anwār was actively engaged in irshād at Harāt, Khwāja 'Alī, head of the Ṣafawid order from 1391 to 1427, visited Dizfūl and converted the people of that town to Shī'ite beliefs. Khwāja 'Alī was advised in a dream by the Imām Muḥammad Taqī that the congregation of Dizfūl had fallen into error (jama'at-i dizfūl az rah-i hidayat munḥarif gashta bi-dalalat uftāda and), and was ordered to direct them on to the path of divine guidance (tū-rā farman dādam ki īshān-rā bi-rah-i hidayat dalalat kun). At first the people of Dizfūl scoffed at Khwāja 'Alī's direction (az dalalat-i man bāzīcha āmad), but the latter again saw the Imām in a dream, and was empowered by God and by the prayers of dervishes (bi-farman-i ilāhī wa bi-du'ā-yi darwīshān) to cause a miraculous stoppage of the source of Dizfūl's water supply. The water remained cut off for eleven days, and the people of Dizfūl then believed in the Shaykh (Khwāja 'Alī) (īmān āwardand) and accepted the precepts of the sharī'at and, being absolved from their unbelief and heresy (az kufr wa zandaqa tabarrā namāda), affirmed their belief in the wilāyat, khilāfat wa wiṣāyat of 'Alī (4).

The visit of Khwāja 'Alī to Dizfūl appears to have been an isolated instance of Ṣafawid propaganda in southern Persia; Fārs was traditionally a stronghold of Sunnism. In Khūzistān, however, on the borders of 'Irāq-i

(The footnotes to this page will be found on p. 124).

Footnotes to p. 123.

(1) See p. 117 above. (2) See p. 118 and n. 1. (3) See pp. 118-9 above.
(4) SN. 46. The Nizārī Isma'īlīs hold that "wilāya as a rank, is superior to nubuwwa, for the light of nubuwwa, is inferior to the light of wilāya" (A. A. A. Fyzee, A Shī'ite Creed, 97 n.). "The word waṣī is untranslatable in English, except in a legal context, where "executor" is an exact rendering. "Plenipotentiary" or "vicegerent" may also be used in certain cases. It has in Shī'itic works the following chief attributes: (1) waṣī is a person who is, by the command of Allāh, specially instructed and authorized by the nabī to perform certain acts. These are considered to be the commands of the nabī and the duties of the waṣī. (2) During the lifetime of the nabī, the waṣī holds a position next after him as vicegerent (W. Iwanow: A Creed of the Fatimids, Bombay 1936, para 31); and for particular religious and political functions, he acts as his plenipotentiary. (3) After the death of the nabī, the waṣī is his khalīfa (successor), his executor and the leader of the community, being the most excellent of men after the prophet (Iwanow, op. cit., para 31). The distinction between him and the Imām is that the latter has not had the advantage of personal intimacy and direct instruction from the nabī (Kalām-i Pīr (ed. Iwanow), Bombay 1935, 20); although in the absence of the nabī, the waṣī and the Imām have similar powers. Thus waṣī is superior to imām, 'Alī being superior to all Imāms (Iwanow, A Creed of the Fatimids, paras. 35-6". (Fyzee, A Shī'ite Creed, 92 n.).

'Arab, the Arab sayyids of Ḥawīza held beliefs of a Shī'ite - even an extreme Shī'ite - flavour. The Ḥabīb al-Siyar states that a community (jama'atī) of the Arabs of Jazīra, known as Musha'sha', assert the divinity (ulūhiyyat) of 'Alī (shāh-i wilāyat); it is related that, after the rapid performance of a form of religious worship which is usual to them (ba'd az mubādarat bi-'ibādatī ki ma'hūd-i ān qawm ast), they enter such an (ecstatic) state that in that condition swords and arrows have absolutely no effect on them, so that they bury the hilt of a sword in the ground, place the point against their stomach, and press forcibly upon it, uttering the words 'Alī Allāh, until the sword is either bent like a bow or breaks. The governor (ḥakim) of that tribe (ṭayifa) is generally a sayyid (1). At the time of the conquest of Baghdād by Isma'īl I (914/1508), Ḥawīza was the capital (dār al-mulk) of the Musha'sha' rulers (2). "Their activities can be traced from A. D. 1436 down to our own times" (3). Thus the establishment of the Musha'sha' family at Ḥawīza occurred during the period when Khwāja 'Alī was head of the Ṣafawid order (1427-47).

The founder of the dynasty, Sayyid Muḥammad b. Falāḥ, was the author of a book entitled Kalām-i Mahdī, which "confirms his Mahdism, and uses the regular terminology of the esoteric sects. The ideas of Sayyid 'Alī were more extreme than those of his father. According to the Madjālis he claimed to be the incarnation of 'Alī and the Divinity himself (da'wā-yi khudā'ī). After the capture of Baghdād by Isma'īl in 914/1508-9, the Musha'sha' sayyids presented themselves before him, but Isma'īl had them executed on the denunciation of their rivals of Dizfūl (the Ra'nāshī shaykhs), who accused them of following the heresy of their uncle 'Alī. Falāḥ b. Muḥsin

(1) HS. iii/4, 50. (2) ibid., 50. (3) TM. 112.

regained Ḥawīza after the departure of Isma'īl, and he and his successors remained loyal to the Ṣafawids during the reigns of Isma'īl and Ṭahmāsp. Sayyid Mubārak, who succeeded at Ḥawīza in 999/1590, introduced Ithnā 'Asharī teaching, and assumed the rank of khān, with the title of walī-yi 'arabistān-i ḥawīza. "The part played by Ḥawīza in the south of Persia is like that of Ardabīl in the north. The Ṣafawids reduced this rival centre and reaped the benefit of its earlier successes." (1). Professor Minorsky also states that Musha'sha' coins (called ḥawīza) play an important part in the rites of the Ahl-i Ḥaqq, and this indirectly suggests bonds linking the esoteric mystic sects. It is possible, he says, that the old heresy of the Musha'sha', though officially condemned, persisted among the limited circle of the 'faithful' (2).

Timurids The Tīmūrid rulers were accounted champions of orthodox Islam. Under Shāhrukh there was an attempt to return to orthodoxy after the period of Turco-Mongol occupation, during which the yasā and customary laws contrary to Qur'ānic practice had been superimposed on Islamic law. An attempt was made to exalt Shāhrukh as an "Islamic ruler", and to subordinate the secular power to the dictates of the religious class (3). In 844/1440-1 Shāhrukh placed an interdict on the drinking of wine by princes of the royal house, and personally superintended the destruction of taverns (sūjī-khāna), the pouring away of wine and all kinds of intoxicating liquor (aqsām-i khamr), and the demolition of places of entertainment prohibited by divine law (4). In 850/1446 Shaykh 'Abd al-Wahhāb Siddīqī arrived at Shāhrukh's camp to claim the revenue of the awqāf of those blessed abodes (Mecca and Medina) (muṭalaba-yi wujūh-i awqāf-i ān biqā'-i mubārak mīnamūd) (5). In 825/1421 Ibrāhīm b. Shāhrukh invaded Khūzistān, after the rulers

(1) See Article MUSHA'SHA' by Professor Minorsky in EI l. (2) Minorsky, loc. cit. (3) J. Aubin, Deux sayyids de Bam au XVe siècle, 483-4. (4) Shar. ii, 95-6. (5) MS. ii/2, 868.

(hukkām) of that province had failed to discharge their obligation to pay taxes and furnish contingents to the army of Fārs. Ibrāhīm conquered the province, and the practices of (religious) innovation (rusūm-i bid'at) and evil institutions (qawā'id-i fasād) ceased (bar uftād), and Ibrāhīm strengthened the foundations of religion and the state (asās-i dīn wa dawlat istihkām dād) (1). This points to the existence of heterodox elements in Khūzistān even before the Musha'sha' rulers established themselves there.

Of the Tīmūrid rulers, Shāhrukh particularly took great pains to be in accord with popular sentiment in matters of religion. Before every campaign he communed with local holy men throughout Khurāsān, and visited the tombs of saints to invoke their blessings on his actions. On several occasions he made the pilgrimage to the shrine of the Shī'ite Imām Riḍā at Mashhad (2). Gawhar Shād, the wife of Shāhrukh, "provided the money for building adjacent to the shrine a magnificent mosque, which is known by her name still, the Masjid-i Gawhar Shād, and has been called 'the noblest mosque in Central Asia'" (3). At Harāt Shāhrukh constructed a splendid building over the tomb (marqad) of the "pīr of Harāt", Khwaja 'Abd Allāh Anṣārī (4).

Abu'l-Qāsim Bābur b. Bāysunqur b. Shāhrukh, although professing to be a follower of the orthodox Sunnī school of Abū Ḥanīfa (5), showed great interest in Sūfī teaching and practice. In 861/1456-7, while Abu'l-Qāsim Bābur was at Mashhad, he was visited from Sabzawār by Bābā 'Alī Khwush Mardān, who was a darwish clothed in piety (taqwā-shi'ār), versed in the stages

(1) MS. ii/1, 471. (2) His pilgrimage from Harāt to Mashhad in 842/1438-9 was one such occasion (Shar. ii, 95). (3) Donaldson, The Shī'ite Religion, 175. (4) Shar. ii, 87. (5) MS. ii/2, 1118: man bar ṭarīq-i sunnat wa jamā'at bāsham, wa madhhab-i imām-i a'zam abū ḥanīfa dāram.

of gnosis (wāqif-i mawāqif-i 'irfān), a traveller on the path of certitude (sālik-i masālik-i īqān); Abu'l-Qāsim Bābur treated him with great favour and respect, and granted all his requests (janāb-i multamasāt-i urā bar waqf-i dilkhwah hukm farmūd). Abu'l-Qāsim Bābur was also visited by Shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Rawwāsī (1), and from Khwārazm by Uzun Ṣūfī, who for years had lived in the society (ṣuḥbat) of Khwāja Abu'l-Wafā. Abu'l-Qāsim bestowed on the latter his patronage, favour, and protection, and granted him an in'am. Uzun Ṣūfī was included among the guests at a banquet given by Amīr Shaykh Abū Sa'īd for Abu'l-Qāsim Bābur; the latter seated Uzun Ṣūfī near the royal seat (masnad), and questioned him on various topics (sukhanān pursīd); he perceived him to be well-versed (ṣāhib-i wuqūf) in the esoteric discourse and anecdotes (lit., kalamāt-i shawq-angīz wa hikāyat-i muwaddat-amīz) of the men of God (ahl Allāh), and his belief (i'tiqād) in him was increased (2). That year mystics from all parts of the world (az aṭrāf-i 'ālam) were assembled at Mashhad, and the ṣadr-i mu'az-ṣam Shaykhzāda Pīr Qiwām had full and privileged access to the royal presence (dar haḍrat-i salṭanat rāh wa rasm-i tamām dāsht), manifested a desire for the company of the mystics (majdhūbān), and urged Abu'l Qāsim Bābur (janāb-i pādishahī) (to follow suit); on several occasions he presented this community (jama'at) in the royal assembly (dar majlis-i humāyūn), and Abu'l-Qāsim (haḍrat-i salṭanat) took a proper part in their religious exercises (chunā-nchi bāyad bi-ḥāl-i īshān pardākht); but as king and beggar are as one in the eyes of that community (jama'at), what can they know of the etiquette governing intercourse with princes, and how can they carry out its formalities? Although Shaykhzāda Pīr Qiwām was anxious that the candle of the illuminated intellect of those (devotees) consumed by their intimacy (with God)

(1) Died 871/1466-7; see HS. iii/3, 197. (2) MS. ii/2, 1110-11.

(sūkhtagāh-i ṣuḥbat) should be kindled (dar gīrad), and that the tone of the meeting should become more agreeable (ṣurat-i ān majlis naqsh-i mulāyimī padhīrad), he was not successful (1). Abu'l-Qāsim's interest in Ṣufism did not cause him to deviate from the strict path of Sunnism. Although he had received into his heart and soul the heart-soothing words of dervishes, he did not depart one iota from the fundamental beliefs and essential law of the faith of his exalted ancestors (bā ānki sukhanān-i dil-nishān-i darwishān-rā bi-janān qabūl karda būd aṣlan wa qaṭ'an az 'aqīda-yi fiṭrī wa rawish-i jibillī wa madhhab-i abā'-i 'iḡām wa ajdād-i kirām 'udūl nanamūd) (2).

There seems to have been marked Ṣūfī activity in Khurāsān during the reign of Abu'l-Qāsim Bābur; in addition to the events at Mashhad recounted above, there was also religious ferment at Harāt. At Mashhad the Ṣūfīs seem to have tried to acquire a position of influence over Abu'l-Qāsim Bābur through the medium of the ṣadr, who was sympathetic towards the Ṣūfīs; at Harāt Ṣūfīs engaged in activities which were even more clearly of a political nature. In 860/1455-6 Mawlānā Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad 'Arab was expelled from Harāt; he was a dervish of excellent character, who kept his reputation relatively unsullied by worldly interests, but he was ambitious for power (riyāsāt-jūy), and had a seductive tongue (sukhan-i farībānda dāsht). The people of Harāt had considerable faith in him (dar bāra-yi ū i'tiqādī dāsht-and); he was constantly walking round the streets and bazaars; he asked questions of and made himself agreeable to everyone whom he met (bi-har kas mīrasīd dar maqām-i pursish wa dil-jū'ī mībūd), and his ambition was to make

(1) MS. ii/2, llll. (2) ibid., llll8.

the great men of the world and the eminent men of the age his followers and obedient to him (khwāhān-i ānki akābir-i jahān wa mafākhir-i zamān mu'taqid wa munqad-i ū bāshand); he followed this course for some time during the reign of Shāhrukh, and continued to do so under the princes (i.e., the various Tīmūriid princes who disputed with one another about the succession to Shāhrukh's empire), and made day alternate with night (rūzī bi-shab mī āward). When Mīrzā Abu'l-Qāsim Bābur became established on the throne, the Mawlānā thought that that monarch would turn his attention to his (the Mawlānā's) affairs to an ever increasing degree (ziyādat az ziyādat multafit-ahwāl-i ū khwāhad būd), but he (Abu'l-Qāsim) did not show the slightest desire for the Mawlānā's company (aşlan wa qaṭ'an mayl-i şubhat-i mawlawī nafarmūd). The Mawlānā, moved by the evil suggestions of Satan, and prompted by the lusts of the flesh, determined to make great efforts to bring about a change of ruler (dar taghyīr-i dawlat sa'y-i balīgh namāyad) and to make people averse (to the existing ruler) (mardum-rā mutanaffir sāzad), in the hopes that 'Alā' al-Dawla would return to Khurāsān. He called men towards Mīrzā 'Alā' al-Dawla, and instilled in them a desire for his rule, and turned them away from the dominion of Abu'l-Qāsim (mardum-rā bi-jānib-i mīrzā 'alā' al-dawla da'wat mīnamūd wa bi-salṭanat-i ū targhīb mīfarmūd wa az dawlat-i abu'l-qāsim mutanaffir mīsakht), and spread lying rumours in every direction (az har ṭaraf āwāza-yi durūghī dar mī andakht). Meanwhile a certain Sayyid 'Abd Allāh arrived in Khurāsān from Luristān in the guise of a soldier (dar shīwa-yi sipāhiyān), and became an accomplice (hamdastān) of the Mawlānā. At this juncture a man who had come as a spy from Mīrzā 'Alā' al-Dawla, with letters for the Sayyid and the Mawlānā, was seized; when an account of these events reached Mīrzā Abu'l-Qāsim, and he ascertained the true position after investigation and inquiry, Mawlānā Muḥammad

'Arab was sent to Sīstān, Sayyid 'Abd Allāh to Andikhūd, and the spy was hanged (1).

Despite the Sunnism of the Tīmūrid rulers themselves, the growth of Shī'ism in Khurāsān, particularly at Harat, during the 14th and 15th centuries, has already been noted (2). The principal factors contributing to this growth were the activities of Ṣafawid propagandists in Khurāsān, and the transfer to Khurāsān by the Tīmūrids themselves of Turkomān tribesmen who were probably imbued with the Shī'ite beliefs of the Qara Qoyunlu. On several occasions the fervour of individual Shī'īs provoked reprisals on the part of the Tīmūrid rulers. For instance, in 860/1455-6 a certain Ḥasan Siparbāf, who was actually an Isma'īlī (sab'ī shī'ī), was executed at Harāt for reviling the caliphs Abū Bakr and 'Umar (sabb-i shaykhayn) (3). A person wishing to settle a personal grudge could secure the discomfiture or removal of his enemy by accusing him of Shī'ite practices. For instance, in 842/1438 Khwāja Sayyid 'Alī Mihna'ī, who was at enmity with Sayyid Zayn al-'Abidīn, got the latter scourged on a charge of having openly (bar sabīl-i 'alāniyya) cursed Abū Bakr and 'Umar (4). In 873/1468-9 Mīrzā Sulṭān Ḥusayn established himself firmly on the throne of Khurāsān; since he had for some time moved around in the outlying districts of the kingdom (i.e., Khurāsān) (chūn... chandgāh dar aṭrāf-i mamlikat ṭawāf namūd), and the excellence of his faith was not apparent to the people, a group of persons of distorted vision (kaj-nazarān) came to believe that he would have a strong predilection and excessive inclination for Shī'ism (mayl wa ghuluww-i 'aṣīm dar madhhab-i rafī wa tashayyu' khwahad dāsht), and would wholly abandon the approved path of the ahl-i sunna and the jama'at. To begin with, they made

(1) MS. ii/2, 1098-9. (2) See p. 99 ff. above. (3) MS. ii/2, 1101.

(4) ibid., 715-6.

great efforts (sa'y-i baligh namūdand) to have the khutba (read) from the pulpits of Islam embellished with the names of the twelve Imāms, and the revered names of the "orthodox" caliphs (khulafā-yi rashidīn) omitted. When Mīrzā Sulṭān Ḥusayn became aware of this desire (dā'iya), and this subject was one of the greatest religious importance (īn ma'nī az 'azāyim-i umūr-i dīnī būd), he sent a group of amīrs and sadrs to the assembly (majlis) of Mawlānā Nūr al-Milla wa'l-Dīn 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Jāmī (1) to discover the truth of it (jihāt-i istikhāf-i ḥaqīqat-i ān), because he (Mīrzā Sulṭān Ḥusayn) did not have the same devoted attachment to and faith in any of the distinguished noblemen (khawāṣṣ-i kummāl) and muhāqqiqs of the age that he had in that exemplar of men of knowledge (arbāb-i dānish) and people of insight (aṣḥāb-i bīnish). Jāmī emphatically (bi-mubālagha) forbade the alteration of the ancient rite (taghyīr-i qā'ida-yi qadīm) or contravention of the former (religious) path (mukhālafat-i ṭarīqa-yi salaf). Mīrzā Sulṭān Ḥusayn showed his displeasure towards that community which was endeavouring (to secure the introduction of Shī'ī practices) (bar ān jamā'at ki sa'ī būdand qahr karda), and instituted the khutba in accordance with the usual practice (khutba-rā bi-dastūr-i ma'hūd ta'yīn namūd). Sayyid 'Alī Wāḥid al-'Ayn from Qāyīn in Qūhīstān, who used to engage in preaching (bi-wa'z ishtighāl mīnamūd), and was an extreme Shī'ī (dar jānīb-i rafḍ bi-ghāyat ghālī būd), entered the pulpit of Islam in the oratory (namāzghāh) on the 'Īd-i Aḥḥā, and began to speak in support of the Shī'ī creed and to abuse the ahl-i sunnat (dar taqwīyat-i madhhab-i shī'a wa manqāṣat-i ahl-i sunnat sukhanān āghāz kard). Zealots (muta'aṣṣibān) among the ahl-i sunnat and jamā'at, seething with anger (dar jūsh āmada), shouted out, and rushed out

(1) Browne, iii, 507, quotes Bābur's observation that "in exoteric and esoteric learning there was none equal to him in that time".

of the oratory to inform Mīrza Sulṭān Ḥusayn. The latter flew into a rage, and despatched men to pull Sayyid 'Alī down from the pulpit with the greatest ignominy (bi-khwarī-yi harchi tamāntar) (1).

The Habīb al-Siyar states that after his accession to the throne on 10 Ramaḍān 873/24 March 1469, Mīrza Sulṭān Ḥusayn^{Bayazid} caused to be put into effect orders, which were of necessity obeyed, concerning the strengthening of the pillars of the luminous sharī'at and the canons of the pure faith (dar taqwiyat-i arkān-i sharī'at-i gharrā wa istiḥkām-i qawā'id-i aḥkām-i millat-i bayḍā farāmīn-i muṭā'a bi-nifādh anjāmīd), and made great efforts and displayed great zeal in the matter of the welfare of sādāt, quḍāt, fuḍalā, and arbāb-i dars wa fatwā; and since the victorious khāḡān (Mīrza Sulṭān Ḥusayn) always committed himself unreservedly to love of the ahl-i bayt of the Lord of Mankind (i. e., Muḡammad) and of the chosen ones of, "Surely Allāh's wish is but to remove uncleanness far from you, O Folk of the Household, and cleanse you with a thorough cleansing" (2), and no other thought but love and affection for the pure family of the Seal of the Prophets ever imprinted itself upon his mind, at the time when he became established on the throne of Khurāsān, and the light of his religious zeal shone over the confines of the kingdom, his sharī'at-illuminating judgement decreed that the khutba and the coinage should be embellished with the names and titles of the immaculate Imāms; he published the report and fame of this to the farthest horizons, and caused the rumour of the renewal of the institutions of the law of the Banī Hāshim (awāza-yi tajdīd-i qawā'id-i sharī'at-i banī hāshimī) to surpass the seventh heaven; but a group of Ḥanafī zealots, who at that time at Harāt were the subject of great honour

(1) MS. ii/2, 1391-2. (2) Qur'an 33, 33.

and respect (bi-ghāyat mu'tabar wa muwaqqar), hastened to the foot of the throne and spoke (to Mīrzā Sulṭān Ḥusayn) on the subject of attaching greater weight to the practices of the ahl-i sunnat (dar bāb-i tarjīḥ-i rusūm-i ahl-i sunnat sukhanān gufta), and forbade him to make changes in the khuṭba. Since the occasion did not permit of a rejection of their request (chūn maḥall muqtaḍā-yi 'adam-qabūl-i iltimās-i ānjamā'at nabūd), on the day of the 'Īd-i Fiṭr the khaṭīb read the khuṭba in the old way (khaṭīb bi-dastūr-i pīshtar zaban bi-qarā'at-i khuṭba gushūd). (1).

NB These incidents at Harāt are of the utmost significance; according to the account of the Maṭla'-i Sa'dayn, Mīrzā Sulṭān Ḥusayn was suspected of Shī'ite sympathies, and this alone is an indication of the religious climate then prevailing in Khurāsān. The fact that he did not at once refuse to entertain the idea of including the names of the twelve Imāms in the khuṭba, but thought it necessary to take advice on the subject, shows that there was some justification for the belief that he was sympathetic towards the Shī'īs, and probably indicates a desire on the part of Mīrzā Sulṭān Ḥusayn to accommodate popular religious opinion. According to the Ḥabīb al-Siyar, Mīrzā Sulṭān Ḥusayn actually issued the decrees requiring the inclusion of the names of the Imāms in the khuṭba, and only reversed his decision in face of the opposition of the Sunnī (Ḥanafī) 'ulamā.

The available evidence suggests that the conflict between Sunnī and Shī'ī at Harāt during the Tīmūrid period was more bitter than in other towns in Persia (2), and the continuance of this conflict under the early Ṣafawids found expression in persecution and counter-persecution. On the establishment of the Ṣafawid regime in Ādharbāyjan, many irreconcilable Sunnī 'ulamā

(1) HS. iii/3, 216. (2) See p. 131 above.

found refuge at Harāt (1), and the survival of an active Sunnī opposition at Harāt a quarter of a century after the Safawid occupation of Khurāsān was no doubt due in considerable measure to the support and encouragement given to the Sunnīs by the Uzbegs, who on numerous occasions occupied the city. During the persecution of Shī'īs which attended Uzbek occupation, not only do Sunnīs seem frequently to have preferred a charge of Shī'ism as a means of securing the downfall of a personal enemy, but many of the Sunnīs themselves fell victim to the Uzbek greed for loot and were put to death after being falsely accused of Shī'ism. For instance, in 935/1528-9 the wicked Uzbegs and Samarqandī exiles (ashrār-i uzbekiyya wa khawārij-i samarqandiyya) stretched forth the hand of oppression and tyranny against Turk and Persian, against (men) both far and near, and (an example of) the acts committed at that time by that imperfect body of men (qawm-i nātamām) is that if they suspected any of the people of Harāt of possessing a little wealth (andak jihatī), they seized him and hauled him before a qādī, and said, "this man in the time of the qizilbāsh cursed the Companions of the Prophet", and that wretch (badbakht) (i.e., the qādī), without investigating the case, as soon as he heard the ṣiḡha-yi shahādāt (formula used in the attestation of evidence) from those two lying miscreants, gave the command for his execution, and the muhtasibs dragged him, though innocent, to the maydān of Harāt, and put him to death after the manner of thieves; many zealous Sunnīs, who on account of their money were declared to be Shī'īs, were put to death at that time, and many indigent Shī'īs and hatless mullās (mawāliyan-i bi-tāj) were saved by their lack of riches (2). Again, in 942/1535-6, 'Ubayd Khān conquered Khurāsān, and killed any ghāzīs and tabarrā'iyān whom he found;

(1) See p. 92 above. (2) AT. 222.

after the capture of Harāt, at the command of that irreligious khān (khān-i bī-īmān). every-day in the market-place at Harāt five or six people were put to death for Shī'ism on the word of ignorant men (bi-aqwal-i juhhal), and impious villagers (rustā'iyān-i bī-diyānat) and treacherous townsmen seized anyone with whom they were at enmity, and took him before a qādī, saying, "this man in the time of the qizilbāsh cursed Abū Bakr and 'Umar and 'Uthmān". On the word of two ignorant witnesses, the qādī gave the command for the execution of that victim of persecution (maḡlūm), and the latter was dragged to the market-place and put to death (1).

In 934/1527-8, when 'Ubayd Allāh Khān laid siege to Harāt, Ḥusayn Khān (who commanded the qizilbāsh garrison) and the arbāb and kalāntars (of Harāt) had no course but to expel from the city, without their families and children, and without money or food ('arī az jihāt wa ghallāt), members of the middle classes (awsaḡ al-nās) and persons who were not publicly known to be Shī'īs (ānānī ki bi tashayyu' shuhrat nadārand), and to add their supplies of food to the (general) store of provisions (ādhūq-i īshān-rā ḡamīma-yi dhakhīra sāzand); for this purpose stern ghāzīs were appointed, and they expelled them all; the result was that the interior of the city was so emptied of its population that in the bazaar no member of the populace was to be seen (az ra'āyā wa shahrī kasī bi-naḡar dar namī āmad) (2).

The proclamation at Tabrīz in 907/1501-2 of the Shī'ī formula wa 'alī walī allāh, which at first sight seemed to constitute an abrupt and revolutionary transition from Sunnism to Shī'ism, may in fact not have been the arbitrary action it is generally supposed to have been. On the contrary, in areas in which Ṣafawid propagandists had been active for over a century, and in which the presence of Qara Qoyunlu Turkomāns had ensured the

(1) AT. 272. (2) ibid., 207.

131

circulation of Shī'ī beliefs, the promulgation of Shī'ism as the "orthodox" creed may to some extent have represented a formal recognition of a situation which already existed. At Harāt, the presence of Qāsim al-Anwār is an indication of the dissemination of antinomian ideas, whether or not these were related to the establishment of the Ṣafawid dynasty; the activity of the disciples of Faḍl Allāh Astarābādī is evidence of the propagation of the even more unorthodox Hurūfī doctrines. Sūfī organizations flourished in Khurāsān under the Tīmūrīds, and in 861/1457 Sūfīs from all parts assembled at Mashhad. Here again is evidence of the prevalence of heterodoxy, though not necessarily tinged with Shī'ism. It has already been noted that the ṣadr of Abu'l-Qāsim Bābur was a Sūfī (1). There is evidence that Shī'īs were active at Harāt under Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā, but the most illuminating indication of the religious climate prevailing in Khurāsān is contained in the account of that ruler's struggle with Yādīgār Muḥammad for control of the province. In spite of the fact that the Tīmūrīd rulers were renowned as champions of orthodoxy - even Abu'l-Qāsim Bābur, who dabbled in mysticism, was not deflected from the path of orthodoxy - it was apparently possible for a group of Shī'īs at Harāt to command credence for their assertion that Mīrzā Sulṭān Ḥusayn was not only sympathetic towards the Shī'a but would be found to be deeply committed to their doctrines. Further, according to one source, Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā actually introduced the names of the Imams into the khuṭba (2).

The religious climate of Persia in 1500, though doubtless still predominantly Sunnī as far as the official religious classes were concerned, must as regards the bulk of the population have been affected to a considerable degree by the heterodox influences mentioned above. Hence the

(1) See pp. 128-9 above. (2) See p. 133 above.

introduction of Shī'ism as the official state religion probably did not necessitate, as regards a considerable proportion of the population, a radical change in religious outlook. If this contention is correct, the statement by Ḥasan Rūmlū that "at that time the people had no knowledge of the precepts of the Ja'farī creed", clearly requires considerable qualification. His further observation, that there was a dearth of books on Shī'ī jurisprudence, is more understandable. The Ṣafawid da'wa, like the propaganda of other heterodox movements, was doubtless to a large extent disseminated orally, and, in territory in which Sunnism was still the official creed, it would have been rash to have harboured or distributed books or other material of a Shī'ite flavour. On the other hand, it is impossible to believe that the people of Adharbāyjān "had no knowledge" of the Ithnā 'Asharī creed. Professor Minorsky quotes Sulṭān Qulī, the grandson of Alwand b. Iskandar Qara Qoyunlu, who went to India and founded the Shī'ī dynasty of the Quṭbshāhs of the Golconda (1), as saying that "the Duodeciman creed was not inaugurated by the Ṣafawids, but that his family had professed it even at the time of Qarā-Muḥammad and Qarā Yūsuf". Professor Minorsky goes so far as to say that "even if the Ahl-i Ḥaqq doctrines were not a kind of state-religion under the Qarā Qoyūnlū, they may have developed in the favourable climate of unorthodoxy which prevailed under the sultans of the Black Sheep (2). On the other hand, Rabino, commenting on the religious formulae found on Qara Qoyunlu coins, states:- "on the obverse appear, as a rule, the kalima (rarely the Shī'a formula, which is found only on the coins of Jahānshāh struck at Damāvand, Shīrāz and Kazvīn, and always with

(1) Tavernier, 161. (2) Jihān-shāh Qara Qoyunlu and his poetry, in BSOAS, xvi/1954, 276.

the names of the caliphs) and the names of the caliphs with or without titles: (for instance)

ابوبكر الصديق عمر الفاروق عثمان ذى النورين على المرتضى

(or)

.(1)

ابوبكر عمر عثمان على

It is clear, however, that the Qara Qoyunlu at least sympathised with the Shī'a, and Shī'ī doctrines, therefore, could not have been completely unknown in Ādharbāyjan, which was the seat of Qara Qoyunlu power. Perhaps Ḥasan Rūmlū's statement should be understood to mean that the people, though familiar with the general ideas of the Ithnā 'Ashariyya and other heterodox sects, had no knowledge of the formal doctrines of "orthodox" Shī'ism as expounded by the mujtahids of the later Safawid period. As far as Isma'īl was concerned, the devotion of his followers to him as their murshid was simply extended to embrace reverence for him as their ruler and imām.

In 856/1452-3, Jahānshāh opened his campaign for the conquest of 'Irāq and Fārs by occupying Sāwa, "which is the key to 'Irāq-i 'Ajam", and Qum; there is evidence that the Qara Qoyunlu were welcomed by some elements at least of the population of 'Irāq-i 'Ajam, and that the Tīmūrids were unpopular governors. At Sāwa, the Tīmūrid governor Shaykh 'Alī Bahādur had extorted large sums (muṭālabāt-i 'anīf) from the people, and the latter appealed for help to the Qara Qoyunlu forces which were in the district (2). Similarly, at Qum, the Tīmūrid governor Darwīsh 'Alī had abused his position and had not conducted himself in a proper manner (ma'āsh bi-qā'ida nanamūd), although he had been born and brought up at Qum (3). At Qum, certain

(1) Rabino, 110. (2) Sāwa was taken by Amīr Shāhsawār, the Qara Qoyunlu governor of Sulṭāniyya (J. Aubin, Deux sayyids etc. , 451 and n. 3). (3) MS. ii/2, 1038.

elements of the population assisted the Qara Qoyunlu; after the latter had met with some resistance, a "group of traitors" (jam'ī ghaddār) sided with the Turkomāns (bā tarākima yār shuda) and admitted them to the city (1). Qum was handed over to the Turkomāns by Khwāja Niẓām al-Dīn Yaḥyā Qumī on 1 Jumādā II 856/19 June 1452. Jurbādaqān fell on 25th July (2). At Iṣfahān, two citizens of note, Ra'īs Quṭb al-Dīn Warzana'ī and Khwāja Maḥmūd Ḥaydar, together with certain notables (akābir) of Chahār Dānga and Dū Dānga, handed over the city to Jahānshāh, "thereby opening upon themselves the gates of affliction and calamity" (4). Abu'l-Qāsim Bābur had apparently tried, without success, to render himself persona grata with the Shī'ite nobility of Iṣfahān by confirming an order of Sulṭān Muḥammad b. Bāysunqur in favour of the Ḥusaynī sayyids of Iṣfahān, who constituted one of the leading Shī'ite families there (5). Abarqūh had to be taken by siege, but the whole of 'Irāq-i 'Ajam and Fārs, which had been in Tīmūrid possession for nearly eighty years, was overrun in the space of a few months by the Qara Qoyunlu forces under Jahānshāh and his son Pīr Būdāq. Certain hostile elements at Iṣfahān were executed by Jahānshāh (6), but in general the Tīmūrids received virtually no support from the local population, and the sympathy of the people for the Qara Qoyunlu, noticed also at Harāt, may well have sprung from sympathy with their Shī'ī views. Jean Aubin points out that the Tīmūrid Abu'l-Qāsim Bābur was ill-advised to instal in the key positions of Qum and Sāwa governors of local origin, in view of the fact that there was a trend of opinion, favourable to Jahānshāh and the Qara Qoyunlu, in 'Irāq among certain amīrs and in the urban centres (7).

(1) MS. ii/2, 1044. (2) J. Aubin, op. cit., 432. (3) He had taken part in the abortive revolt at Iṣfahān against Shāhrukh in 1446, and had later become the wazīr of Sulṭān Muḥammad b. Bāysunqur (Aubin, op. cit., 432). (4) MS. ii/2, 1044. (5) J. Aubin, op. cit., 433. (6) TIN. 433b. (7) J. Aubin, op. cit., 430.

During the 14th and early 15th centuries the Ṣūfī orders throughout the Muslim world were at the height of their influence, and in Anatolia, the teachings of the Ṣūfī shaykhs, which, often imbued with heterodox ideas, permeated large sections of the population, must clearly have assisted the spread of the Ṣafawid da'wa there. Further, there is an undoubted inter-relation, which still cannot be defined in precise terms, between the Ṣafawid order and the Ṣūfī orders of Asia Minor. In the view of Dr. H. J. Kissling, the Badr al-Dīniyya, the Khalwatiyya, the Bayrāmiyya and the Ṣafawiyya are Ṣūfī communities obviously forming a homogeneous group. Ard-abiḷ was the focal point of the Shī'ite world, and the most important dervish movements in the Ottoman empire in the 15th-17th centuries derived their spiritual impulses from there (1) The Badr al-Dīniyya assimilated Ḥurūfī elements, representing the survivors of Ottoman persecution, and various Ḥurūfī doctrines thus became incorporated in the teachings of the Badr al-Dīniyya (2). After the execution of Badr al-Dīn b. Qaḍī Samāwnā on 18 December 1416, "many of his followers turned to the by now politically active Ṣafawiyya, while others merged into sundry sects, especially the Bektāshiyya" (3). By this means Ḥurūfī doctrines were transmitted to the Bektāshiyya also. Dr. Kissling gives further evidence of the inter-connexion between the Badr al-Dīniyya and the Ṣafawiyya. Badr al-Dīn, who was originally an orthodox theologian, was converted to Ṣūfism and became a wandering preacher in Anatolia and Rumelia. At Āq Sarāy he converted the aged Ḥamid b. Mūsā al-Qayṣarī, the principal Anatolian disciple of the Ṣafawid shaykh Khwāja 'Alī, and the teacher of the founder of the Bayrāmiyya,

(1) H. J. Kissling, Zur Geschichte des Derwischordens der Bajrāmiyya, in Süd-ostforschungen xv/1956, 249. (2) ibid., 242. (3) idem, article Badr al-Dīn due to appear in 1958 in EI².

Hajjī Bayrām Walī. The prince of Qarāman became a follower of both Badr al-Dīn and Ḥamid, which was only possible because of the close ideological affinity between the two shaykhs. On the basis of this evidence, states Dr. Kissling, the close esoteric association between the Badr al-Dīniyya and the Ṣafawiyya can no longer be doubted (1). Similarly, Dr. Kissling deduces the existence of close links between the Ṣafawiyya and the Khalwatiyya. Shaykh Ibrāhīm Zahid-i Gīlānī, the pīr or spiritual guide of Shaykh Ṣafī al-Dīn, the founder of the Ṣafawid order, appears in the Khalwatī silsila as the second fore-runner of the patron saint of the order 'Umar Khalwatī, who lived an ascetic's life in the region from which the Ṣafawids arose. The Ṣafawids thus had, up to a point, blood-ties with the Khalwatīs, and a spiritual affinity also probably existed between them. The Ṣafawid sphere of influence was a favourite refuge of the Khalwatī shaykhs who were expelled from Ottoman territory (2). It is perhaps worth noting that in 779/1377-8, when the Ṣafawid murīd Sayyid Qāsim al-Anwār was living in a new hospice (khānaqāh), his khalwat was close to that of Mawlānā Zahīr al-Dīn Khalwatī. (3).

In Persia the most important of the Ṣūfī orders, apart, of course, from the Ṣafawids themselves, were the Naqshbandīs, the Ni'mat Allāhīs, and the Nūrbakhshīs. The Ni'mat Allāhīs in particular were closely connected with the Ṣafawid dynasty. Founded by Shāh Nūr al-Dīn Ni'mat Allāh Walī (730-834/1329-1431), who was born at Aleppo but spent the last twenty-five years of his life in the Kirmān district, the order had numerous adherents in all parts of Persia. For much of his life Shāh Nūr al-Dīn Ni'mat Allāh travelled extensively in Persia, 'Irāq-i 'Arab, Arabia, Egypt, and Transoxania. He was received by Tīmūr at Samarqand, and founded a khānaqāh

(1) H. J. Kissling, op. cit., 243-5. (2) ibid., 247-8. (3) Nafahāt al-Uns, 693.

there. He was subsequently expelled from Transoxania by Tīmūr, who feared that his influence with the nomads then in the process of being converted to Islam might adversely affect his own position. Tīmūr also relied on the support of the Naqshbandī ṭarīqa, and did not wish to alienate the Naqshbandīs by showing undue favour to Shāh Ni'mat Allāh (1). In 790/1388, at the age of 60 (lunar), Shāh Ni'mat Allāh arrived at Harāt, and held converse with the ahl-i ḥal and gūsha-nishīnān; from Harāt he went to Murghāb. After a year at Murghāb, he moved to the Kirmān district, where he spent seven years. During that time many dervishes from all parts of Irān (az aṭrāf-i bilād-i Irān) came to enter the service of that humā of the highest angelic heaven, and placed the hand of discipleship on the hem of obedience to him, and bounds their souls to his service (bi-'aqd-i mulāzamat-i ān humā-yi awj-i malakūt āmada dast-i murīdī dar dāman-i mutāba'atash zada ḥalqa-yi farmānbardārī dar gūsh-i jān kashīdand). Among these new murīds were Mawlānā Sa'd al-Dīn 'Alī and Sayyid Niẓām al-Dīn Aḥmad, a mudarris and faqīh respectively of Shīrāz, who had come from Shīrāz to see him, and desired to submit to his authority and receive instruction in dhikr (iltimās-i bay'at wa talqīn-i dhikr namūdand) (2). From Kirmān, Shāh Nūr al-Dīn Ni'mat Allāh went to Yazd, where he was welcomed by the sādāt, quḍāt, akābir, and ahālī, who observed the rite of devotion and discipleship (ṭarīqa-yi ikhlāṣ wa murīdī mar'ī dāshtand); here, too, he founded a khānaqāh, and, on his return to Māhān, he founded the khānaqāh-i khayrābād (3). The Tīmūrid Iskandar b. 'Umar Shaykh b. Tīmūr was on excellent terms with Shāh Ni'mat Allāh Walī, and allowed four years' revenue of the Taft district for the construction of the Ni'mat Allāhī khānaqāh there (4). His next visit

(1) See J. Aubin, Matériaux pour la biographie de Shāh Ni'matullāh Walī Kermānī, Introduction, 11 ff. (2) JM, 5a-22b. (3) ibid., 23a-25b. (4) J. Aubin, Matériaux etc., Intro., 18 and text, 48.

was to Shīrāz (1), where he was welcomed by the sādāt, 'ulamā, and the populace. A local pīr, Sayyid Sharīf, who numbered among his disciples (shāgird) Ḥāfiḡ Rāzī, the ṣadr (and wazīr) (2) of the ruler of Shīrāz Iskandar b. 'Umar Shaykh b. Tīmūr, was nearly trampled to death by the throng of people trying to reach the sajjāda of Shāh Nūr al-Dīn Ni'mat Allāh. Some 30,000 people in Shīrāz gave their allegiance (bay'at) to Shāh Ni'mat Allāh. Fakhr al-Dīn, a disciple of Khwāja 'Abd Allāh Imāmī Isfahānī, a Naqshbandī murshid, was among the converts, and, through him, Khwāja 'Abd Allāh himself elected to become a murīd of Shāh Ni'mat Allāh (murīdī-yi ānjanāb ikhtiyār namūda). On leaving Shīrāz, Shāh Ni'mat Allāh returned to Kirman; there, or at neighbouring Māhān, he lived for twenty-five years, giving spiritual guidance to seekers (after religious truth) (irshād-i ṭalībīn) (3). Among his converts was Bābā Ḥājjī Niṣām al-Dīn Kījī, who was engaged in a raid on the Māhān area. The latter disbanded his men, and Shāh Ni'mat Allāh exalted him by converting him, instructing him in dhikr, and investing him with the sūfī taj (tāj-i faqr), and conferred on him the position of khalīfat al-khulafa of the Ni'mat Allāhī order (mansab-i khalīfat al-khulafa'ī-yi silsila-yi khwud-rā bi-ū rujū' namūd). 12,000 sayyids of pure descent (ṣahīḡ al-nasab) are said to have sworn allegiance to him (bi-sharaf-i bay'at -i ānḥadrat rasīda), and innumerable people, young and old, from all parts of the world (haft iqlīm), followed their example. Rulers and nobles used to send him presents, and when his devoted followers in India sent him gifts, the official who governed Kirman on behalf of Shāhrukh became worried (andāsh-amand), because if he remitted the amount of the tamghā (import and customs duty) on the gifts, the pādishāh (i. e., Shāhrukh) might still demand it from

(1) The visit of Shāh Ni'mat Allāh Walī to Shīrāz took place between 1409 and 1414 (J. Aubin, Matériaux etc., Intro., 18.). (2) ibid., 128a. (3) JM, 26a-27b. One of the poems contained in the dīwān of Shāh Ni'mat Allāh is said to foretell the advent of Shāh Isma'īl (Aubin, op. cit., 6-7; 8 n. 27).

him, whereas if he demanded the tamghā from the Sayyid, the latter would feel resentment (ghubārī bi-khāṭir-i ānāḡrat khwāhad rasīd). The governor decided to report the matter to Shāhrukh, who deliberated at length whether to collect the money or not. His wife Gawhar Shād eventually persuaded him not to collect it, and he sent an order to that effect to the governor of Kirmān. Another and more valuable consignment arrived from India. Ni'mat Allāh divided the gifts into three equal portions; one he sent to Shāhrukh to be spent on the army; one to Khalīl Allāh; and one he set towards the expenses of the Māhān astāna. Towards the end of his life he summoned his khulafā, darwīshān and mukhlisān, and conferred on his son Shāh Khalīl Allāh the position of walī of the age and murshid of the families of God's servants (mangab-i wilāyat-i 'ahd wa irshād-i ṭawā'if-i 'ibād); "whoever", he said, "washes my body after my death, will be numbered among the awtād, and whoever prays for me, among the aqṭab" (1).

Shāh Ni'mat Allāh died on 22 Rajab 834/5 April 1431, and was buried at Māhān (2). His son Khalīl Allāh succeeded him and devoted himself to giving spiritual direction and guidance (hidāyat wa irshād) (3). He was summoned to Harāt from Māhān by Shāhrukh, who treated him with such distinction that the envy of Amīr Fīrūzshāh was aroused (4). Amīr Fīrūzshāh complained of the presumption of Shāh Khalīl Allāh in sitting at Shāhrukh's side, and alleged that he did not pay to the agents (wukalā) of Shāhrukh the dīwān taxes and dues. Shāh Khalīl Allāh said that he guaranteed (musallam dāshtam) whatever amount might be demanded by Amīr Fīrūzshāh by way of taxes (5). While Shāh Khalīl Allāh was at Harāt, he was constantly visited by Bāysunqur b. Shāhrukh (6). Shāh Khalīl Allāh returned to Kirmān, but shortly afterwards

(1) JM, 28a-33a. (2) ibid., 33a-b. (3) ibid., 36b. (4) ibid., 37a.
(5) ibid., 37b. (6) ibid., 38a.

went to the Deccan, where he established a branch of the Ni'mat Allāhī silsila; the āstāna at Māhān was left in charge of his son Shāh Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad (1).

The fame of the great-grandson of Shāh Khalīl Allāh, Shāh Na'im al-Dīn Ni'mat Allāh Thānī, reached the ears of Jahānshāh Qara Qoyunlu, the ruler of Ādharbāyjan, the two 'Irāqs, Fārs and Kirman, and Jahānshāh wished to give his daughter Khānum in marriage to Shāh Ni'mat Allāh and to become his disciple. Shāh Ni'mat Allāh, on his return from the pilgrimage, visited Jahānshāh and married his daughter (2). The Aq Qoyunlu ruler Uzun Ḥasan, after his defeat of Jahānshāh, summoned Shāh Ni'mat Allāh to Shīrāz, ostensibly to show him honour but in reality to ascertain the whereabouts of Jahānshāh's treasuries and to wrest them from Shāh Ni'mat Allāh's possession (bāṭinan dar maqām-i tafahḥuṣ wa tajassus-i khaza'in-i jahānshāh wa intiza' namūdan az yadd-i taṣarruf-i shāh-i karamat-dastgah mībūd). Uzun Ḥasan was dissuaded from this action by a vision in which he was upbraided by Shāh Ni'mat Allāh Walī, the founder of the Ni'mat Allāhī order (3). The Qara Qoyunlu seem definitely to have accepted Shāh Ni'mat Allāh Thānī as their murshid. One of the sons of Qarā Yūsuf, some time after the victory of the Aq Qoyunlu, visited Shāh Ni'mat Allāh Thānī at Yazd, as there was both a pīr/murīd relationship and kinship between them (ṭarīqa-yi pīr murīdī wa khwīshī dar miyān būd) (4).

After the Ṣafawid conquest of Persia, the Ni'mat Allāhīs were held in the highest respect. Shāh Nūr al-Dīn Ni'mat Allāh Bāqī, the son of Amīr 'Abd al-Bāqī the sadr, married Khānish Begum, the sister (hamshīra) of Shāh Ṭahmāsp. Ṭahmāsp placed full authority over the province of Yazd in the

(1) JM. 38b-39b. (2) ibid., 43a-b. (3) ibid., 44b-45a. (4) ibid., 46a.

hands of the agents of Shāh Nūr al-Dīn (zimām-i ikhtiyār-i wilāyat-i yazd bi-kaff-i kifāyat-i wukalā-yi ān dawḡa-yi chaman-i risālat nihād), and the amīrs, wazīrs, sayvids and people were ordered to obey him (1). His son, Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad Mīrmīrān, was appointed by Shāh Ṭahmāsp to the rank of niqābat wa sarwarī-yi mamālik-i maḡrūsa, and later became sadr (2). One of his sons, Shāh Ni'mat Allāh, married a daughter of Shāh Ṭahmāsp (3), and another, Shāh Khalīl Allāh, married a daughter of Shāh Isma'īl II (4). The daughter of Shāh Ni'mat Allāh eventually married Isma'īl Mīrzā (later Shāh Isma'īl II (5). After the death of Ṭahmāsp, Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn was honoured by Sulṭān Muḥammad Shāh (6). Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn's power became so great that it surpassed that of all the sadrs and high-ranking amīrs, and even that of the majority of sultans of effective command (jamī'-i sudūr wa umarā-yi 'aẓīm al-sha'n balki akthar-i salātīn-i nafidh-farman); the abundance of his wealth and lands and villages was so great that it could not be calculated (7). His descendants continued to be honoured by the later Safawids. His fourth son Shāh Sulaymān Mīrzā, and the latter's sons Shāh Abu'l-Baqā and Shāh Abu'l-Mahdī, were granted soyūrghāls and allowances (musallamī, muqarrarī) by both Shāh Ṣafī and Shāh 'Abbās II, and were variously appointed kalāntars of Yazd or promoted to the rank of naqīb and sarwar. Mīrzā Shāh Abu'l-Walī, the son of Shāh Abu'l-Mahdī, was appointed kalāntar of Yazd in succession to his uncle Shāh Abu'l-Baqā, and discharged the duties of niqābat wa sarwarī as his father's deputy (bi-niyābat-i walīd-i

(1) JM. 49b. (2) A. K. S. Lambton, Quis custodiet custodes, in Studia Islamica, vi/1956, 130, and 131 n.1; cf. JM. 52b-53a. (3) A. K. S. Lambton, Op. cit., 130. (4) JM. 54a. (5) A. K. S. Lambton, Quis custodiet custodes, in Studia Islamica, vi/1956, 130. (6) JM. 53b. (7) ibid., 55a-b.

V. 151
a descendant
at Chaldun

'alīsha'n)(1).

The close and continuing relationship between the Safawids and the Ni'mat Allāhīs is of the utmost significance; it suggests that the Ni'mat Allāhīs were at least in sympathy with Shī'ī views, and this is also implied by their former connexion, in the role of murshids, with the heterodox Qara Qoyunlu, and by the fact that Shāh Ni'mat Allāh Walī was a friend of Qāsim al-Anwār (2). The descendants of Shāh Ni'mat Allāh Walī were not only treated with the greatest honour and respect throughout the Safawid period, but the concrete expression of this esteem, in the form of grants, allowances, and appointments to various offices, was on a scale rivalling that accorded to the descendants of the murshid of the Safawids themselves, namely Shaykh Zāhid Gīlānī.

Nurbakhsh

The Shī'ī proclivities of the Nūrbakhshī order are even more certain. The founder of the order, Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh Nūrbakhsh (795-869/1392-1464), claimed descent from the Imām Mūsā al-Kāzīm, and was twice arrested by the Tīmūrid authorities for proclaiming himself caliph. Extracts from his treatise on law, al-Fiqh al-Aḥwāṭ, quoted in the Majālis al-Mu'minīn, are Shī'ī in character. He had two khalīfas, one of whom was his son Shāh Qāsim Fayḍbakhsh. The latter was allowed to go from 'Irāq to Khurāsān by Ya'qūb Aq Qoyunlu to cure the ruler, Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā, by virtue of his barakat. Shāh Qāsim's religious opinions won him the favour of Shāh Isma'īl I, who distinguished him from all other sayyids by his favour and munificence (3). His elder brother, Sayyid Ja'far, also went to Harāt during the reign of Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā, and was received with honour; the amīrs and noble ṣadrs made him an annual allowance of 5,000 kopeki dinars as

(1) JM. 60b. ff. (2) J. Aubin, Matériaux pour la Biographie de Shāh Ni'mat-ullāh Walī Kermānī, Introduction, 15-16. (3) Article Nūrbakhshīyya in FI¹; HI. 436a-b.

a madad-i ma'āsh, together with 200 kharwārs of corn. Sayyid Ja'far, because of his overweening ambition, was not satisfied with that sum, and departed in anger to 'Arabistān (az ghāyat-i 'uluww-i himmat sar bidān mablagh wa miqdār furūd nayāward wa dar khashm shuda 'azīmat-i diyār-i 'arabistān kard) (1). A son of Shāh Qāsim b. Sayyid Muḥammad Nūrbakhsh, Shāh Bahā al-Dawla, went to Harāt towards the end of the reign of Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā; after the death of the latter, Shāh Bahā al-Dawla returned to 'Irāq and Ādharbāyjan and joined the court of Isma'īl I (2). Shāh Qāsim Nūrbakhsh was revered by Shāh Ṭahmāsp, and was the refuge of the murīds of the exalted order of the Nūrbakhshiyya; he possessed a large number of excellent estates (ḡiyā' wa mazāri'-i marghūb-i bī-shumar) in the Rayy and Shahryār districts (3). Shāh Qiwām al-Dīn Nūrbakhsh b. Shāh Shams al-Dīn b. Shāh Qāsim, who in 929/1522-3 had arranged the murder of the poet Umīdī (4), was arrested by Ṭahmāsp in 944/1537 because he had abandoned the ragged garments of a darwīsh and had risen above his station (pā az ḥadd-i khwud bīrūn nihāda), and was living in the manner of a high-born king or a powerful khān; night and day he hunted with dogs and cheetahs; after the manner of the Khosroes and the Caesars he placed a curtain before the doors of his apartments, and no one was allowed to enter his assemblies; if anyone did anything in the least displeasing to him, he would execute him, sending a number of people by night to put him to death. At this moment, when the royal camp was in the neighbourhood of the hallowed shrine of 'Abd al-'Aḡīm, Shāh Qiwām al-Dīn Nūrbakhsh entered the court, and took precedence over all the amīrs, sayyids, mullās and people; and the people of Rayy, since for years they had been the victims of his oppression, and were at the end of

(1) JM. 87a. (2) ibid., 88a-b. (3) ibid., 89a. (4) For a full account of the incident, see HL. 436b-437a.

their endurance, laid a complaint against him. Shāh Qiwām al-Dīn Nūrbakhsh was addressed first by Qāḍī Muḥammad b. Qāḍī Shukr Allāh, who said, "O Shāh Qiwām al-Dīn, are you a king or a dervish?" He replied, "Dervish". "What then", said the Qāḍī, "is the reason for your building forts and amassing armour (juba wa jawshan)?" He remained silent. "You", said the Qāḍī, have shed so much blood that people have forgotten 'Ubayd Khān Uzbek and Qāsim the executioner", and he began to enumerate the names of those who had been slain by his sword. When he came to the name of Mawlānā (Umīdī), he (Qiwām al-Dīn Nūrbakhsh) denied (the charge). Shāh Ṭahmāsp said, "If you did not kill him, why have you appropriated his estates?" At this juncture Mīr Fayḍī, the court chamberlain, (mu'arrif-i urdū-yi humāyūn), said, "What right have you to take precedence over the son of Sayyid Muḥammad Kamūna?" Shāh Ṭahmāsp said, "He speaks truly. Rise, for it is not your place". After much debate and dispute it became abundantly clear to the Shāh that his (Qiwām al-Dīn Nūrbakhsh's) pretensions were false, and his claim to be a sayyid unfounded (da'wā-yi ū kādhib wa siyādatash ghayr-i waqī'). Ṭahmāsp therefore issued the order for his arrest, and he was confined for several days in the house of Qāḍī Jahān, (1), and after that was taken to the fort of Alanjaq (2).

Although the evidence is as yet insufficient for any precise idea to be formed of the nature of the relationship between the Ṣafawids and the other major Ṣūfī orders in Persia like the Ni'mat Allāhīs and Nūrbakhshīs, it is clear that the Ṣafawids treated the murshids of both orders with the

(1) It will be recalled that there was a hereditary enmity between Qāḍī Jahān and the Nūrbakhshīs. Muḥaffar Sulṭān, the ruler of western Gīlān, accounted himself a disciple of the Nūrbakhshīyya, and consequently, when Qāḍī Jahān fell into his hands during the civil war between the qizilbāsh tribes which followed the death of Ismā'īl, he treated him with contumely (See AT. 374-5). (2)
AT. 279-80.

greatest respect, and the numerous marriage alliances contracted between members of the Safawid royal house and the Ni'mat Allāhī family indicate the importance attached by the Safawids to the maintenance of good relations with the Ni'mat Allāhī order. According to the Haft Iqlīm, Amīr Niẓām al-Dīn 'Abd al-Bāqī, himself a descendant of Shāh Ni'mat Allāh, was nominated by the wakīl Amīr Najm-i Thānī as his deputy (bi-niyābat-i khwīsh), as a result of the abundant faith which Amīr Najm-i Thānī had in that exalted order (i.e., the Ni'mat Allāhīs) (banābar-i wufūr-i i'tiqādī ki amīr najm-i thānī-rā bidān silsila-yi 'aliyya būd) (1).

ISMAILI

It is difficult to judge to what extent the Sūfī orders of Persia may have prepared the ground for the transition to Shī'ism under the Safawids, by the transmission of Shī'ī ideas. Some authorities assert that Isma'īlī propaganda continued to be disseminated in Persia, after the destruction of the Isma'īlī organization there by the Mongols, under the cloak of Sūfism (2). Sūfī works were adopted by the Isma'īlīs, and the Sūfī poet Farīd al-Dīn 'Attār was regarded by them as one of their own number. "Moreover, throughout Persian Sūfī literature and also in the great Shī'ite philosophical works produced during the Safawid era, Isma'īlī philosophical ideas are discovered" (3). On the same theme, W. Ivanow states that the new, popular version of Isma'īlism evolved at Alamut at the time of the "Great Resurrection" (559/1164), "instead of following the policy of compromise with orthodoxy, tended rather to join hands with a popular development, the darwish movements" (4); the Alamut period, from the beginning of the 6th/12th century to the end of the

(1) 1939 Calcutta edition, 175-6. (2) See H. Corbin, Introduction to the Jami'-i Hikmatayn of Nāṣir-i Khusraw, 7. (3) ibid., 13. (4) W. Ivanow, Brief Survey of the Evolution of Isma'īlism, 36.

9th/15th century, was a period of struggle, "during which great concessions were made to the popular tendencies, and to some extent coalescence with ṣūfism was achieved" (1); Isma'īlism, by the time of the rise of the Ṣafawids, had recovered to some extent from the disasters of the Mongol period; "the (Isma'īlī) da'wat itself, with regard to its methods, most probably assumed the darwish garb, as did to a great extent the doctrine itself. It is therefore quite possible that the Isma'īlī dignitaries and missionaries, no longer bearing the title da'ī but known as pīrs, adopted a considerable proportion of practice developed by the less educated strata of the ṣūfis, now brought under Shī'ite influence. It may be possible that the ṣūfic-like tone which pervaded Persian Isma'īlī poetry under the Ṣafawids, and later, was not merely the result of the new fashion, but an expression of the sweeping process of ṣūfī-fication which spread in sectarian circles. If we possess no definite, documental, references to the da'wat in its new ṣūfic-like garb, it may be attributed to the fact of the loss or destruction of the meagre literature which could arise among predominantly illiterate peasants" (2). For precisely the same reasons, it is difficult accurately to assess the extent to which Ṣafawid or "Twelver" Shī'ī da'wat was disseminated under the guise of ṣūfism.

(1) W. Ivanow, op. cit., 29. (2) ibid., 69-70.

153-264

III. THE POLITICAL INSTITUTION

During the early Şafawid period, there was no clear definition of the functions and powers of the principal officers of state, namely the wakīl, the wazīr, the amīr al-umara, the şadr (1), and the qurchībāshī. Consequently, there was considerable overlapping of authority, and the relative importance of these offices constantly varied. The religious institution and the political institution were not rigidly separated compartments. On the contrary, there was no formal boundary between the two, or any precise definition of the function of either. In dealing with the early Şafawid period, therefore, such terms as "civil", "military", "religious" and "political" cannot be regarded as absolute, but must be construed within the context of the actual powers, so far as these can be determined, of the official concerned. This confusion of function was due partly to the circumstances attending the rise of the Şafawids to power, and partly to the predominantly military character of the newly-established Şafawid state.

The wakīl, under Isma'īl I, was termed wakīl-i nafs-i nafs-i humayūn (2), that is, the vicegerent, deputy, or representative of the Shāh (3). Isma'īl I, like the early caliphs, was in his own person both

(1) The şadārat is discussed separately in the following chapter. (2) See TM 114. (3) It is interesting to note that under the Ottoman sultan Muḥammad II (1451-81), the chief minister was referred to as the sultan's "absolute representative" (Vekīli Muṭlaq) (Gibb and Bowen, 108-9 and 109, n. 1.).

the religious institution and the political institution; as shāh, he was the temporal ruler of the state; as murshid-i kāmīl, he was the spiritual father of his ṣūfī followers in Persia, Syria and Anatolia. It would seem, therefore, that the wakīl represented the Shāh both in his religious and in his political capacity. He was, in fact, the alter ego of the Shāh, and was responsible for the orderly arrangement of the affairs of religion and the state (nāẓim-i manāẓim-i dīn wa dawlat) (1).

The term wakīl had previously been in use under the Aq Qoyunlu. In 903/1497-8 Qāsim Beg Purnāk, the governor of Shīrāz, conspired with Ayba Sultān to summon Sultān Murād from Shīrwān, so that they might put him on the throne and jointly be his wakīls (bidān qarār dādand ki sultān murād b. ya'qūb pādishāh-rā az shīrwān āwarda bi-saltānat binishānand wa har dū bi-ittifaq wakīl bāshand) (2). In 900/1494-5 Manṣūr Beg Purnāk, the governor of Fārs, fell ill and was unable to perform his duties; (during his illness) Shāh qulī Beg the wakīl managed affairs (shāh qulī beg wakīl muhimmāt-rā fayṣal mīdād) (3). This seems to suggest that the wakīl existed under the Aq Qoyunlu at the provincial level also, as the deputy or representative of the provincial governor. The Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh also refers to Sayyid 'Alī Beg Purnāk as rukn al-saltāna (4), and this probably refers to the central wakīl, i.e., the wakīl who was an organ of the central administration. In 904/1498-9 Alwand Mīrza occupied Tabrīz, and made Laṭīf Beg his wakīl (5).

Although the Tīmūrīds do not appear to have used the term wakīl, other rulers apart from the Aq Qoyunlu sultans possessed wakīls. For example,

(1) HS. iii/4, 107. (2) AT. 16. (3) ibid., 11. (4) ibid., 11.
(5) ibid., 21.

in 945/1538-9 the Shīrwānshāh Shāhrukh sent his wakīl Ḥusayn Beg with an army against the Ṣafawid invaders (1). Among the great amīrs of the Uzbek ruler 'Ubayd captured by Dīn Muḥammad in 945/1538-9 was Qarāja Bahādur wakīl (2). The Kār Kiyā dynasty of Gīlān had wakīls. In 943/1536-7 Kār Kiyā Sulṭān Ḥasan, the wālī of Gīlān, died, and his wakīl, Kiyā Khwūr Kiyā Ṭāliqānī, visited the Persian court and instilled in Ṭahmāsp the desire to rule Gīlān (3). In 997/1588 Khān Aḥmad, the son of Kār Kiyā Sulṭān Ḥasan, sent his wakīl Khwāja Ḥusām al-Dīn on a mission to the Ottoman sultan Murād III (4).

In India, the term wakīl was used by the Nizāmshāhs of Aḥmadnagar (1490-1595), and later by the Mughals. For instance, Qaḍī Beg b. Qaḍī Mas'ūd, who had been honoured by Ṭahmāsp, later went to Aḥmadnagar in the Deccan and became wakīl (bi-manṣab-i wikalat rasīda) (5). A certain Shāh Ṭāhir, who came from a well-known family at Sulṭāniyya, after completing his objective and subjective studies at Kāshān, attracted the notice of Shāh Isma'īl I, who wished to appoint him ṣadr; the detractors of Shāh Ṭāhir, however, succeeded in influencing Isma'īl against him to such an extent that the wakīl al-salṭana, Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn, advised him for his own safety to go elsewhere, with the result that in 923/1517 Shāh Ṭāhir went to Hindūstān. There, he made rapid progress in the service of the Nizāmshāh, and was appointed wakīl, entrusted with the management of all important affairs (manṣab-i wikalat yāfta ṣāhib-i ratq wa fatq-i jamī'-i muhimmāt gardīd); "and it is apparent to all that the propagation of the Imāmī faith in the Deccan was due to his spiritual guidance" (wa bar hama kas ṣāhir gashta ki shuyū'-i madhhab-i imāmiyya dar dakan bi-irshād-i way būda) (6). It is

(1) AT. 287. (2) ibid., 292. (3) JA. 314a. (4) Bellan, 44. (5) HL. 442a-b. (6) ibid., 496b-497a.

13
worth noting that in both the instances quoted above, members of the Persian religious classes were appointed to political offices in India, which suggests that in the administrative systems of the Muslim dynasties of India, as in the Safawid administration of the same period, there was no clear demarcation between the function of the religious institution and that of the political institution.

Under the Mughal emperors, the office of wakīl was an organ of the central administration. According to Ibn Hasan, the wikālat was established during the reign of Akbar (1556-1605), and the first holder of this office, Bayrām Khān, "acted as a tutor (atālīq) of the minor king and the prime minister of the kingdom (wakīl-i saltanat). He exercised sovereign powers in the name of the king, and controlled the affairs of the state. The king was 'behind the veil', and the rule was that of the wakīl" (1). Akbar later took steps to curtail the powers of the wakīl (2), and under Akbar's successors Jahāngīr (1605-28), and Shāh Jahān (1628-59), none of the wakīls acquired the power and influence of their predecessors who held office during the early part of Akbar's reign (3). In fact, during the reigns of Akbar, Jahāngīr, and Shāh Jahān, the post of wakīl of the central administration remained vacant for long periods (4). Under Jahāngīr and Shāh Jahān, the wakīl, though remaining in theory the highest officer of state, was deprived of effective power and was supplanted to an increasing degree by an official called the dīwān (5) or wazīr (6). There is, however, no suggestion that the wakīls of these rulers were anything more

(1) Ibn Hasan, The Central Structure of the Mughal Empire, 121. (2) ibid., 124 ff. (3) ibid., 132. (4) ibid., 130-4. (5) ibid., 137-9. (6) See C. Collin Davies, article Akbar in EI², vol. I, fasc. v/1956, 316.

than the representatives or vicegerents of their masters in the political and military sphere. It is with the Ṣafawids that there appears the conception of the wakīl-i nafs-i nafīs-i humāyūn as a person exercising delegated power in both the temporal and the spiritual sphere, a conception arising from the intimate association between the murshid-i kāmīl and his closest companions (ahl-i ikhtisāṣ) in the Ṣafawid order from which the Ṣafawid state developed.

During the reigns of Isma'īl I and Ṭahmāsp I, the wazīr, traditionally, the first minister of state and head of the bureaucracy, was in general of lesser importance than the wakīl. Under the early Ṣafawids, the post of wazīr was often filled by members of the religious classes, especially qādīs. This had previously been the case under the ³Timūrids also. For instance, in 819/1416 Amīr Sayyid Fakhr al-Dīn was sole ṣāhib-dīwān and without a partner in the administration of affairs (amīr sayyid fakhr al-dīn bi-infirād ṣāhib-dīwān būd wa dar akhdh wa radd wa ḥall wa 'aqd mutafarrid) (1). In 852/1448 Amīr Sayyid 'Imād al-Dīn was nominated to the wizārat-i dīwān-i a'lā by Ulugh Beg, at Harāt (2). There is also evidence that dīwān posts under the Qara Qoyunlu were sometimes held by members of the religious classes. For example, in 862/1458 Amīr Niẓām al-Dīn Sayyid 'Ashūr, who was entrusted with the prerogatives of the wizārat in the dīwān-i a'lā (ki rāh wa rasm-i wizārat dar dīwān-i a'lā bi-jānib-i ū mufawwaḍ būd), was sent on a mission by Jahānshāh to Abū Sa'īd (3). The term ṣāhib-dīwān was used by the Ilkhāns as the equivalent of wazīr. Under the Timūrids both terms are found, and are apparently synonymous; mīr-dīwān also seems to have the same meaning. The term ṣāhib-dīwān is used

(1) MS. ii/1, 346. (2) MS. ii/2, 945. (3) ibid., 1177.

in connexion with the appointment of the first Ṣafawid wazīr, Amīr Muḥammad Zakariyyā Tabrīzī, in 907/1501-2 (1); in this case its use seems to be an echo of the past, and a further indication of the affinity between certain Ṣafawid practices and institutions and those of the earlier Turkomān dynasties; its use by the Ṣafawids is rare.

In Seljuq times the wazīr had been the deputy (na'ib) of the sultan (2). In the political theory of Niẓām al-Mulk, Najm al-Dīn Rāzī, and others, the wazīr was considered the keystone of the administration (3). In her work, Contributions to the Study of Seljuq Institutions (4), Professor Lambton has stressed the immense importance of the personal factor in the wazīrate during the Seljuq period; when the wazīr was strong, the administrative system worked fairly well. The wazīr was "in charge of virtually all aspects of the administration over which the central government had control, including finance and justice. He was also paymaster of the army in so far as this was paid in cash, and took part himself in military campaigns. He was in addition a court official, and lastly, to some extent, he was charged with the supervision of religious matters" (5). Owing to the decline in the powers of the sharī'a courts, the wazīr's jurisdiction "as a judicial official extended over an extremely wide field" (6). "Lastly the wazīr exercised a general supervision over the religious institution. In so far as he was concerned with religious matters, it was firstly no doubt to prevent any tendency towards

(1) See p.182 below. (2) A. K. S. Lambton, Quis custodiet custodes, in Studia Islamica v/1956, 135. (3) A. K. S. Lambton, op. cit., 144. (4) Thesis, London 1939. (5) A. K. S. Lambton, Contributions to the Study of Seljuq Institutions, 54. (6) ibid., 63.

unorthodoxy, and secondly to supervise practical matters such as the administration of endowments" (1). Under the early Ṣafawids, the creation of the office of wakīl, and the part played in political affairs by the amīr al-umara, greatly reduced the political importance of the wazīr, and the creation of the office of ṣadr deprived the wazīr of the power, which he had exercised under the Seljuqs, of general supervision over the religious institution.

Under the Turkoman rulers, as formerly under the Tīmūrīds and later under the Ṣafawids, Persians continued to fill the ranks of the bureaucracy. For instance, in 1478 'Imād al-Dīn Salman Daylamī was the wazīr of the Aq Qoyunlu sultan Khalīl (2). The Ḥabīb al-Siyar states that Khwāja Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Khwāja Sayyid Aḥmad, Khwāja Burhān al-Dīn 'Abd al-Ḥamīd Kirmanī, and Khwāja Majd al-Dīn Isma'īl Shirāzī were numbered among the wazīrs of Amīr Ḥasan Beg (dar silk-i wuzarā-yi amīr ḥasan beg intizām dāshṭand), and in accordance with the dictates of that great man constantly sowed the seeds of justice and beneficence in the hearts of the nations of mankind (3).

LESSER VAZIRI

In addition to the wazīr who was an organ of the central administration, wazīrs of lesser rank were appointed to the courts of the provincial governors. The Tīmūrīds, the Qara Qoyunlu, the Aq Qoyunlu, and the Ṣafawids, all followed the practice of appointing provincial wazīrs. The fact that most, if not all, of these wazīrs were Persians, points to the continuity of the Persian bureaucratic tradition under a succession of Turkish and Turkoman rulers. The Jāmi'-i Mufīdī gives numerous instances

(1) K. S. Lambton, Contributions to the Study of Seljuq Institutions, 71.

(2) Hinz, 101, q. Tārīkh-i 'Ālam-Ārā-yi Amīnī, 64a. (3) HS. iii/4, 14. Amīr Ḥasan Beg died in 882/1477-8.

دسته اولی

of the appointment of such wazīrs to Yazd, the province with which the author was principally concerned (1).

When the provincial governor ruled more than one province, his wazīr was naturally a person of considerable importance. For instance, under Iskandar b. 'Umar Shaykh b. Timūr, the ruler of 'Irāq, Fārs and Kirman, Khwāja Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad Ḥāfiz Rāzī was entrusted with the control of dīwān affairs and the conduct of matters of state; he progressed to the highest stage of trust and authority, and entered upon the wizārat-i dīwān-i a'lā, and his authority in the administration of affairs throughout the territories of Iskandar became great (dast-i taṣaddī-yi ū dar ratq wa fatq wa qabḍ wa baṣṭ wa ḥall wa 'aqd-i muhimmāt-i mamālik-i iskandar qawī gardīd). He displayed great goodwill and sincere friendship towards shaykhs and 'ulamā, and devoted his energies to the welfare of all the people (2). In 817/1414 Iskandar rebelled against Shāhrukh and was put to death (3), and Khwāja Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad said farewell (wadā' namūd) to the wizārat-i kull (4). The term wizārat-i kull suggests that where, as in this case, the provincial governor ruled over several provinces, the provincial wazīr in his turn became an organ of the provincial governor's central administration, with additional wazīrs of lesser importance again in the large provincial centres which were not the seat of the governor.

The provincial wazīrs were in general appointed directly by the central ruler, and were therefore responsible directly to him and not to the central wazīr. The Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh twice mentions the wazīr of the Aq Qoyunlu governor of Fārs, Qāsim Beg Purnāk, during the reign of Rustam Beg b. Maqṣūd b. Uzun Ḥasan (1492-97). In 900/1494-5 the agents (wukalā) of

(1) JM. f. 132a ff. (2) ibid., 127b-128a. (3) MS. ii/1, 250 ff. (4) JM. 128b.

Qāsim Beg stretched out the hand of oppression, particularly Khwāja Rūḡ Allāh Qazwīnī, who was wazīr (1). The following year, after disturbances at Shīrāz, Qāsim Beg visited Rustam's court and succeeded in getting himself reappointed governor, through the influence of the Purnāk chiefs in the dīwān; Khwāja Rūḡ Allāh, however, was put to death by Rustam (2).

Although under the Tīmūrīds there are instances of provincial wazīrs being appointed on a hereditary basis (3), the hereditary tendency in such appointments does not seem to have been as strong as in the case of the provincial qāḡīs (4). Under the Ṣafawīds, there is evidence that the provincial wazīrs were transferred freely from one provincial centre to another. For instance, Khwāja Muḥammad Sharīf Ṭihirānī was wazīr to Muḥammad Takkalū the governor of Khurāsān under Ṭahmāsp, and later became wazīr of Yazd, and finally wazīr at Iṣfahān (5).

In the Jawāhir al-Akhbār there is abundant evidence of the existence of the provincial wazīr under the early Ṣafawīds. In 937/1530-1 Ḥusayn Khān Shāmlū, governor of Harāt, sent a mission (risālat) to court consisting of his wazīr, Aḥmad Beg Nūr Kamāl Iṣfahānī, his wakīl (6), Ḥusayn Qulī Beg, and Khwāja Ṣa'idī and Āqā Kamālī Kirmānī, the wazīrs of Aḥmad Sulṭān (probably Aḥmad Sulṭān Ṣūfī-ūghlī Ustājlū, governor of Kirmān (7)) (8). In 940/1533-4 the pleasure-loving governor of Ādharbāyjan, Mūsā Sulṭān, had left the management of affairs to his wazīr Khwāja Shāh qulī (9). Shaykh

(1) AT. 11. (2) ibid., 13. (3) See JM. 134a. (4) See A. K. S. Lambton, quis custodiet custodes, in Studia Islamica, vi/1956, 139. (5) JM. 138a. (6) See p. 237 below. (7) JA. 299b. (8) ibid., 302b. (9) ibid., 307a; AT. 247 also refers to Khwāja Shāh qulī as wazīr-i mūsā sulṭān. Khwāja Shāh qulī had formerly been wazīr-i qurchiyan. In addition to the provincial wazīrs, wazīrs existed at all levels of the Ṣafawīd administrative system (see TM., index, s. v.). Under the later Ṣafawīds each of the principal corps of the army (qurchīs, ghulāms, tufangchīs and tūpchīs) had its own wazīr (see TM. 91; 142), and there are many references in the sources to the wazīr-i qurchiyan under the early Ṣafawīds.

Majd Kirmanī was the wazīr of the governor of Baghdād, Muḥammad Khān Takkalū (1), who evacuated the city in 941/1534-5 in face of the Ottoman advance. There is a reference to Āqā Kamālī during the reign of Ṭahmāsp as wazīr-i kull-i khurāsān - a term which recalls the wizārat-i kull mentioned above in connexion with the Tīmūrīds (2). In 966/1558-9 Āqā Mullā, the wazīr of Qazwīn, was sent on an embassy to Bāyazīd b. Sulaymān (3). Provincial wazīrs were occasionally appointed to the post of central wazīr. For example, Mīr Ja'far, the wazīr of Shāh Ṭahmāsp, who was executed in 937/1530-1 (4), had formerly been the wazīr of Zayn al-Dīn Sulṭān Shāmlū at Baghdād (5). Aḥmad Beg Nūr Kamāl Iṣfahānī, referred to above as the wazīr of the governor of Harāt, Ḥusayn Khān Shāmlū, afterwards became wazīr-i dīwān-i a'la (6). In 942/1535-6 Kachal 'Ināyat Iṣfahānī Khūzānī, who had formerly been the wazīr of Kupuk Sulṭān (7), was appointed wazīr of the central administration jointly with Qaḍī Jahān Qazwīnī (8).

There appear also to have been wazīrs who were attached to the wakīl or the amīr al-umarā, even though these officials were not at the time governors of any specific province. For example, the Jawāhir al-Akhbār refers to Āqā Mullā Qazwīnī as the wazīr of Dīw Sulṭān, and to Khwāja Ārūḥ Sāwajī as the wazīr of Chūha Sulṭān, in 931/1524-5 (9). At that time Dīw Sulṭān was amīr al-umarā and wakīl, and Chūha Sulṭān was also wakīl, and amīr al-umarā either then or shortly afterwards (10). Finally, in addition to the classes of wazīr mentioned in the Tadhkirat al-Mulūk, the dawātdār (11) seems to have had a wazīr; the Jawāhir al-Akhbār refers to a

(1) JA. 310b. (2) ibid., 315b. Āqā Kamālī is probably the Āqā Kamālī mentioned above as being wazīr at Kirman. (3) JA. 327a. (4) See below p. 224; 231. (5) JA. 303b. (6) AT. 244. (7) JA. 312a. (8) See p. 235 below. (9) 298b. (10) See below, p. 213 ff. (11) For the various grades of dawātdār, see TM. 63.

certain Mullā Beg, who had formerly been the wazīr of 'Alī Beg Takkalū dawātdār and of Ahmad Beg dawātdār (1).

امير الامرا

The post of amīr al-umarā was created in the 4th/10th century by the 'Abbāsīd caliphs; "this title, apparently intended to assert the primacy of the military commander of Baghdād over his colleagues elsewhere, served at the time to give formal recognition to the existence of a supreme temporal authority, exercising effective political and military power, and leaving the caliph only as formal head of the state and the faith and representative of the religious unity of Islam" (2). Later, the title sultān was used to signify the supreme temporal ruler, and under the Ṣafawīds the amīr al-umarā was primarily the commander-in-chief of the qizilbāsh tribal forces which formed the military basis of Ṣafawīd power. Under the Ṣafawīds, however, as previously under the Tīmūrīds and Aq Qoyunlu, the amīr al-umarā exercised political authority in addition to his authority as a military commander.

The sources contain many instances of the exercise of political as well as military authority by the amīr al-umarās of the Tīmūrīds and the Aq Qoyunlu. For instance, in 808/1405 Amīr Sayyid Khwāja was honoured by Shāhrukh for his victories against Pīrak Pādīshāh and the Sarbidārīds, for his administration of Khurāsānāt, and for his services at fort Kalāt. Amīr Sayyid Khwāja, the son of Amīr Shaykh 'Alī Bahādur, whose bravery and valour need no description, acquired absolute authority in all administrative and financial matters and became amīr al-umarā (dar kulliyāt-i muhimmāt-
mulkī wa māli ṣāhib-i ikhtiyār-i muṭlaq wa amīr al-umarā shud) (3). When he had gained access to the amīr al-umarā'ī, all matters, both important and trivial, were dependent on his word and pen, and he considered himself

(1) JA. 307a. (2) See Professor B. Lewis's article 'Abbāsīds in EI², vol. I fasc. i/1954, 19. (3) MS. ii/1, 57.

independent (of other authority) (rāh-i amīr al-umara'ī yafta majmū'-i muhimmāt-i kullī wa juzwī bi-qawl-i ū marbūṭ būd wa ū khwud-rā mustaghni dīda) (1). The career of Amīr Sayyid Khwāja is also interesting as evidence that under the Tīmūrīds, as later under the Ṣafawīds, members of the religious classes could hold important administrative positions and rise to the highest political and military offices.

The Maṭla'-i Sa'dayn records a further instance of the intrusion of the amīr al-umara into matters falling within the province of the civil administration. In 845/1441-2 the amīr al-umara, Amīr Jalāl al-Dīn Fīrūzshāh, was appointed by Shāhrukh to investigate the cause of serious errors which had been discovered concerning the revenues of the province of Jam. The amīr al-umara was a personal enemy of the wazīr Khwāja Ghiyāth al-Dīn Fīr Ahmad, who was always making difficulties over trivial matters (hamīsha dar juzwiyyāt muḍāyaqa mīnamūd) and boasting about it at court (in ma'nī-rā bi-iftikhār dar majālis iḡhār mīfarmūd), and forcefully rejecting the opinions of Amīr Fīrūzshāh, which were extremely sound on administrative and financial matters (nisbat bā tadbīrāt-i amīr ki dar muhimmāt-i mulkī wa māli dar ghāyat-i matānat būd khidmat-i khwāja inkār-i balīgh namūd) (2).

Jean Aubin mentions that under Tīmūr the office of amīr al-umara was vested in the Barlās family on a hereditary basis, and was held successively by Chākū Barlās, his son Jahānshāh (3), Jahānshāh's brother Amīr Miḡrāb, (4) and Ibrāhīm Sulṭān b. Jahānshāh, at one time governor of Iṣfahān. After the accession of Shāhrukh, the Barlās family lost favour, and its members

(1) MS. ii/1, 63. (2) ibid., ii/2, 754-5. (3) Jahānshāh was in Ādharbāy-jān and Qarābāgh with 'Umar b. Mīrānshāh; on receiving the news of the death of Tīmūr, he put to death certain of 'Umar's officers, but was pursued by other amīrs of 'Umar and put to death (MS. ii/1, 22-3). (4) Amīr Miḡrāb died soon after his appointment as governor of Fārs in 817/1414 (MS. ii/1, 285).

were gradually removed from important posts; the office of amīr al-umarā was transferred to the Tarkhān family, to which Gawhar Shād belonged (1). Referring to Chākū Barlās, Jean Aubin says, "According to the Mu'izzu-'l-Ansāb he was the holder of the title, apparently a purely honorary one, of amīru-'l-umarā" (2). Jean Aubin does not say why he thinks the title was a purely honorary one. On the other hand, Amīr Miqrāb would presumably have succeeded to the title after the death of Jahānshāh in 807/1405, whereas, from the passage in the Maṭla'-i Sa'dayn quoted above, we know that in 808/1405 Shāhrukh appointed Amīr Sayyid Khwāja amīr al-umarā, and it is clear that in the case of the latter at least, the title was not an honorary one.

Under the Tīmūrids, the office of amīr al-umarā, like that of wazīr, existed at the provincial level also. Qaydū b. Pīr Muḥammad had been appointed governor of Qandahār, Kābul and Ghazna by Shāhrukh in 812/1409-10 (3). When Shāhrukh made the provinces of Qandahār and Afghānistān up to the borders of Hindūstān the soyūrghāl of Mīrzā Qaydū Bahādur, he nominated Amīr Bahlūl Barlās as his attendant (mulāzim) in the administration of the affairs of those provinces (bi-ḡabṭ-i maṣāliḥ-i ān mamālik) (4). The Zubdat al-Tawārīkh states that Amīr Bahlūl Barlās was made the attendant, companion and deputy (mulāzim wa muṣāḥib wa nā'ib) of Qaydū (5); he became his amīr al-umarā, but the intoxication of government (mastī-yi ḥukūmat) caused him to forget his obligations and tread the path of disloyalty. In 819/1416-7 he conspired against Qaydū, but was later pardoned by Shāhrukh (6). In 819/1416-7 Amīr Shaykh Ḥasan was amīr al-umarā of Kirmān under Sulṭān Uways b. Amīr Īdikū Barlās, who had succeeded his father and brother

(1) J. Aubin, Deux sayyids de Bam au XVe siècle, 391-2 and 392 n. 2. (2) op. cit., 391. (3) MS. ii/1, 149. (4) ibid., 340. (5) q. in MS. ii/1, 340, n. 2. (6) ibid., 340-1.

as governor of Kirmān (1). The Maṭla'-i Sa'dayn refers to Amīr Shaykh Ḥasan as jumlat al-mulk-i ān mamlikat (Kirmān), and quotes the Zubdat al-Tawārīkh as adding wa ṣāhib-i ikhtiyār-i kullī wa juzwī wa amīr al-umarā-yi darkhāna-yi ūst (2). Jean Aubin, quoting Ḥāfiẓ Abrū's Geography, calls Amīr Shaykh Ḥasan "amīru-'l-umarā and de facto absolute master of Kirmān" (3).

I have not met any evidence of the use of the title amīr al-umarā under the Qara Qoyunlu, with the exception of a reference to a certain Jalāl al-Dīn Niẓām Beg Khān, who appears to have been amīr al-umarā to the Qara Qoyunlu prince Yūsuf b. Jahānshāh when the latter was governor of Kirmān in 858/1454 (4).

Under the Aq Qoyunlu, the term amīr al-umarā occurs frequently. In 886/1481-2 Bāyandur Beg, the amīr al-umarā of Ya'qūb b. Ḥasan Beg, rebelled, and expelled all Ya'qūb's officers from 'Irāq (5). Sulaymān Beg Bījanlū was the amīr al-umarā and lala of Ya'qūb (6), and later held the office of wakīl for nine months under Bāysunqur b. Ya'qūb (7), who reigned only from Ṣafar 896 to Rajab 897/December 1490-January 1491 to May-June 1491. The Sharafnāma states that Sulaymān Beg Bījanlū (Bīzhan-ūghlī) defeated ṣūfī Khalīl and became jumlat al-mulk of Bāysunqur in his place (8). In view of the passage from the Maṭla'-i Sa'dayn quoted above with reference to Amīr Shaykh Ḥasan, jumlat al-mulk may well have been a title of the amīr al-umarā rather than of the wakīl. When Qāsim Beg Purnāk returned to Shīrāz after the defeat of Aḥmad b. Ughūrlū Muḥammad in Jumādā I 903/December 1497-January 1498, he took with him the mīrmīrān Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn Mīrzā (9). The title mīrmīrān is presumably equivalent to amīr al-

(1) MS. ii/1, 120. (2) ibid., 336 and n. 2. (3) J. Aubin, Deux sayyids etc., 417 and n. 4. (4) ibid., 457. (5) TIN. 439a. (6) ibid., 439b. (7) ibid., 440a. (8) Shar. ii, 128. (9) TIN. 442b.

umara. Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn returned to Iṣfahān in 903/1497-8 with Muḥammadī Mīrza. After the defeat of the latter by Ayba Sulṭān, the mīrmīrān seems to have been attached to Ayba Sulṭān's brother ^aGūzil Aḥmad. He returned to Muḥammadī Mīrza in the spring of 904/1499, and held Iṣfahān for four months against Gūzil Aḥmad and Sulṭān Murād b. Ya'qūb. Gūzil Aḥmad was the amīr al-umara of Sulṭān Murād (1). In Shawwāl 898/August 1493, when Rustam b. Maqṣūd b. Ḥasan Beg released Sulṭān 'Alī b. Ḥaydar to aid him against Bāysunqur Mīrza, he gave him the title, in addition to that of pādishāh, of amīr al-juyūsh (2), (presumably to distinguish him from his own amīr al-umara).

It is clear that the Ṣafawids inherited many administrative practices and institutions from the various Turkish and Turkomān dynasties which had ruled in Persia before them, namely, the Tīmūrīds, the Qara Qoyunlu, and the Aq Qoyunlu (3). Such institutions as were taken over by the Ṣafawids were, in general, affected by the lack of clear demarcation between the various offices of state which existed during the early Ṣafawid period, and which was largely due to the theocratic and primarily military character of the Ṣafawid state. In the early Ṣafawid state there was, in practice, a rigid separation between the Turkish military aristocracy (qizilbāsh) and the Tājīk elements, and the qizilbāsh were constantly concerned to prevent the infiltration of Tājīks into positions which they considered their own prerogative, particularly the wikālat and amīr al-umara'l.

Under the Tīmūrīds, on the other hand, there was no clear frontier between the Turkish and Tājīk elements in the administration. Persians

(1) Shar. ii, 135. (2) TIN. 440b. (3) In the field of financial administration and practice the dastūr-i Ḥasan-beg or qāmūn-i Ḥasan pādshāh was still applied "at least down to the time of Shah Tahmasp Ṣafawī". (See V. Minorsky, The Aq Qoyunlu and Land Reforms, in BSOAS xvii/1955, 449-50.

were frequently raised to the imārat, and held positions of great influence and responsibility. The highest officials of the dīwān were regularly Persians, and often members of the religious classes. For instance, during the reign of Shāhrukh, Khwāja Mu'izz al-Dīn Malik Simnānī was one of the great amīrs of the dīwān (dar jarga-yi umarā-yi 'uzām-i dīwān būd) at Shīrāz. On the death of the Khwāja in 847/1443-4, Shaykh Muhibb al-Dīn Abu'l-Khayr was nominated to replace him. The latter became so powerful that Shāhrukh, in orders (aḥkām wa amthala) which he despatched to Fārs, mentioned by name no one but the governor of the province, Mīrzā Sulṭān 'Abd Allāh, and Shaykh Abu'l-Khayr. The other amīrs were referred to as muwwāb-i shīrāz (1). The post of chief qāḍī was of the greatest importance, and the authority of the qāḍīs was far greater than under the early Safawids, when they were subordinate to the ṣadr. Like the ṣadr under the early Safawids, the qāḍī under the Tīmūrīds frequently played a military role. For instance, Mawlānā Quṭb al-Dīn Aḥmad al-Imāmī, who was made qāḍī of Harāt by Ulugh Beg in 852/1448 (manṣab-i a'lā-yi qaḍā) (2), on numerous occasions took part in the defence of the city (3).

Under the Tīmūrīds, the authority of the wazīr was much greater than was the authority of the Safawid wazīrs during the reign of Isma'īl I. The Tīmūrīd rulers often appointed more than one wazīr; for instance, in 861/1457 Ibrāhīm b. 'Alā' al-Dawla appointed Khwāja Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad Bukhārī ṣāhib-dīwān jointly with (bi-shirkat-i) Khwāja Sa'd al-Dīn Muḥammad (4). In 865/1460-1 Abū Sa'īd appointed Khwāja Muḥaffar (b.) Khwāja Mukhtār Sabzawārī, Mawlānā Na'im al-Dīn Ni'mat Allāh Quhistānī, and Khwāja Kamāl al-

(1) MS. ii/2, 795-6. (2) ibid., 945. (3) In 861/1457 against Ibrāhīm (MS. ii/2, 1130); in 864/1460 against the rebel amīr Khalīl (ibid., 1222-3) in 861/1457 he was among those placed in charge of Harāt by Abū Sa'īd (ibid. 1145). (4) MS. ii/2, 1133.

Dīn Mawlānā Amīr Samarqandī ṣāhib-dīwān; on 4 Rabī' II 865/17 January 1461 Khwāja Mu'izz al-Dīn Shīrāzī and Khwāja Mawlānā Amīr were sent to administer the provinces (bi-jihat-i dābt-i mamālik) of Transoxania. (1).

Again!
Under the later Ṣafawids, the wazīr had final responsibility in all financial matters: "without his (i.e., the 'alī-jāh Grand Vazīr of the Supreme Divan's) ta'līqa no operation is possible with any Divan revenues (māliyāt-i dīwān) or with the sums sent to the Treasury and other Buyūtāt (vujūhāt-i infādihī-yi khazāna va ghayra-yi (sic) buyūtāt) from the whole of the provinces of Iran or from the capital, Isfahan" (2). Under the Tīmūrids, too, final responsibility for the collection and administration of the revenue had rested with the wazīr, as is shown by the charges of misappropriation of the dīwān revenue which were from time to time levelled at the wazīr. The Maṭla'-'i Sa'dayn gives several instances of such charge. One involved Khwāja Ghiyāth al-Dīn Pīr Aḥmad al-Khwāfī, who was wazīr "with full independence" (bi-kamāl-i istiqlāl) for 30 years. Although he did deal with important affairs (of state) in partnership with others, in the (public) imagination there was no other wazīr but he (har chand bi-mushārah at-i dīgarān ḥall wa 'aqd-i muhimmāt mīfarmūd amma bā wujūd-i ū ṣūrat-i wazīr-i dīgar dar āyina-yi khiyāl rūy namīnamūd) (3). In 845/1441, Khwāja Shams al-Dīn 'Alī, who stood high in Shāhrukh's favour, accused Amīr 'Alā' al-Dīn 'Alī Shaqqānī, for some years a colleague of Khwāja Ghiyāth al-Dīn Aḥmad in the wizārat (chand sāl bar masnad-i wizārat bā ū hamnashīn būd), of complicity in embezzling part of the revenue of the province of Jām, as serious errors had occurred in that province in regard to the dīwān revenues (dar ān wilāyat nisbat bi-amwāl-i dīwān khabṭ-i 'aẓīm waqī' būd). The nomination of Amīr Jalāl al-Dīn Fīrūzshāh, who was a personal enemy of

(1) MS. ii/2, 1234. (2) TM. 44. (3) MS. ii/2, 752-3.

Khawāja Ghiyāth al-Dīn Ahmad (1), to head the court of inquiry, threw the latter into a state of panic (bisyar muḍḍarr wa muḍḍarib shud wa az su'ub-at-i ān ḥālat bī-ṭāqat gasht). His consternation was increased when the first few sittings of the court revealed grave irregularities in the conduct of the dīwān (bi-yak dū majlis anwā'-i quṣūr wa futūr ki dar umūr-i dīwān wāqi' būd wāḡih shud). As a result of these disclosures, his colleague Amīr 'Alā' al-Dīn 'Alī Shaqqānī was dismissed, and replaced by Khawāja Shams al-Dīn 'Alī, who had initiated the proceedings against him. Khawāja Ghiyāth al-Dīn Ahmad absented himself from the dīwān for three days, but when Khawāja Shams al-Dīn 'Alī sent some documents to him which required his seal fear of Shāhrukh's wrath overcame his personal mortification, and he resumed his work in the dīwān (2).

A similar inquiry into the conduct of high officials of the dīwān was ordered by Abū Sa'īd in 869/1464-5, because the statement of the transactions in Khurāsān (ṣūrat-i mu'amalāt-i khurāsānāt) carried out during his absence in Transoxania was not clear to his luminous mind (bar ra'y-i anwar rawshan nabūd). The great lords (ṣawāhib-i 'izām) Khawāja Quṭb al-Dīn Ṭā'ūs Simnānī, Khawāja Shihāb al-Dīn Isma'īl, Khawāja Na'im al-Dīn Mi'mat Allāh, and Khawāja Kamāl al-Dīn Mawlānā Amīr Samarqandī, closed the account books and presented them to Abū Sa'īd (daftar mukammal karda bi-mūqif-i 'arḡ rasānīdand). Khawāja Ṭā'ūs resigned at his own wish (bi-iltimās-i khwud

(1) See p. 164 above. (2) MS. ii/2, 753-5. Khawāja Ghiyāth al-Dīn left Harāt after the death of Shāhrukh, and joined Muḥammad Mīrzā in 'Irāq; he was made amīr-i dīwān-i a'lā (853/1449). After Muḥammad's death, he joined Abū'l-Qāsim Babur, but incurred the latter's displeasure, was fined, and died soon afterwards.

mu'af shud) (1); Khwāja Isma'īl was found guilty and arrested (bi-taqṣīr muqayyad gasht). When the case of Khwāja Ni'mat Allāh was under consideration, he made certain allegations against Khwāja Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad (taqrīr gūna'ī kard). Abū Sa'īd investigated the matter. Khwāja Shams al-Dīn stated that he had accepted many gifts (khidmatī bisyār) from people (2), but not in money (az māl nabūda), and that he had not been responsible for any loss in the dīwān revenue (wa nīz māl-i dīwān fawt nakarda-am). For the rest, he said, the matter lay in the hands of Abū Sa'īd (bāqī mīrza ḥākim ast). Abū Sa'īd replied that he freely granted to Khwāja Muḥammad what he had taken and consumed. He then exempted him from attendance in the dīwān (tū-rā az dīwān mu'af dashtam), saying that he was a good servant of his, and that his anger was kindled against the dīwān officials; he did not want any harm to befall him (Khwāja Shams al-Dīn) (nawkar-i nīk-i manī wa marā bar dīwān qahr wāqī' shud namīkhwāham ki asībī bi-tū rasad). The Khwāja bowed, took out a ring, and, going forward, placed it on a corner of the throne. He then returned and stood in the jargā (3). "Never had a ṣāhib-dīwān been pardoned with greater magnanimity" (chunīn bi-'ināyat mu'af dādand) (4).

Religion

The fact that members of the religious classes frequently held the post of wazīr under the ṭīmūrīds has already been noted. One such official Amīr Sayyid Fakhr al-Dīn, acquired great power in the wizārat. Shāhrukh, through the endeavours of Mīrza Bāysunghur, placed Khwāja Niẓām al-Dīn Aḥmad b. Khwāja Da'ūd in the dīwān as colleague to the Sayyid (bi-shirkat-i

(1) The Ḥabīb al-Siyar, q. in MS. ii/2, 1279 n. 5, says that Khwāja Ṭā'ūs was dismissed (raqm-i 'azl bar waraq-i ḥal-i ū kashīd). (2) MS., q. in MS. ii/2, 1279 n. 8, has man az ra'aya wa ashraf wa a'yan-i khurāsan bi-rasm-i khidmatāna chīzī girifta-am. (3) See MS. ii/2, 1536-7 s.v. jargā: "mutlaqan bi-ma'nī-yi ṣaff wa ḥalqa ast; guruh; zumra; dhayl; qīṭar; ja'ī ki dar darbār-i pādīshāh muqarrar bāshad". (4) MS. ii/2, 1278-9.

sayyid dar dīwān nishānd). The Sayyid resented this (bi-tang mī āmad), but had no option but to accept the position (juz taḥammul chāra nadāsht). In 810/1407-8 Khwāja Ghiyāth al-Dīn Sālār Simnānī made a deposition to the effect that the Sayyid owed money to the dīwān (bar sayyid taqrīr kard). The Sayyid was dismissed, and Khwāja Ghiyāth al-Dīn became mīr-dīwān for a year in his place. Then the Sayyid in his turn imputed a debt to the dīwān of 300 tūmans to Khwāja Ghiyāth al-Dīn. The latter devoted himself to the welfare of the people (ri'āyat-i ra'iyat mīnamūd), but did not conduct the affairs of the amīrs in a satisfactory manner (muhimmāt-i umarā bi-mūjib-i dilkhwāh saranjām namīfarmūd). Khwāja Ghiyāth al-Dīn, together with his tax-collectors ('ummāl), was summoned to a court of inquiry ('ardgāh-i ḥisāb), and their errors and misappropriations were confirmed (khabṭ wa takhlīṭ-i īshān bi-taḥqīq paywast). They were all imprisoned, and Amīr Sayyid Fakhr al-Dīn again became ṣāhib-dīwān with independent authority (bi-istiqlāl). By constraint (bi-taklīf-i 'anīf) he extracted (bar kār nishānd) from those who had slandered him (az ān jamā'at ki dar bāra-yi ū sa'y kardā būdand) the sum of 300 tūmans, and he behaved with the utmost depravity in his efforts to destroy them (dar istihlāk wa istīṣāl-i ān ṭā'ifa ghāyat-i sharārat bijā āward). The Sayyid was at the height of his power, and his orders were obeyed throughout the empire "like the bidding of fate" (farmān-i ū dar aṭrāf-i jahān chūn qaḍā wa qadar nāfidh shud). But pride and arrogance caused him to "place his foot on the necks of the officials of the dīwān and the nobles". No one, whoever he might be, was granted audience when he first presented himself (dar wahla-yi ulā hīch āfarīda-rā bār nabūd); when, through several intermediaries, permission was granted (chūn bi-chand wasiṭa rukṣat shudī),

and the visitor passed through barriers (az chand darband gudhashtī), admittance was denied to all but a few illustrious men (ghayr az ma'dūdī nāmburda digarī-rā majāl-i dukhūl muḥāl būd); the majority went away without an audience (akthar mulāqāt nākarda bāz gashtī).

In 819/1416, when Amīr Sayyid Fakhr al-Dīn was sole ṣāhib-dīwān, and was alone in the conduct and management (of affairs) (bi-infirād ṣāhib-dīwān būd wa dar akhdh wa radd wa ḥall wa 'aqd mutafarrid), Mīrzā Bāysunghur b. Shāhrukh took over control of the dīwān (masnad-i dīwān-rā bi-sharaf-i julūs biyārast). The Sayyid's unseemly conduct and improper behaviour, his greed to acquire the property of Muslims, his appropriation of dīwān funds, and his perfidy and guilt, soon became apparent. Although the tax-collectors ('ummāl) had been aware of these activities, they had considered any opposition or resistance to the Sayyid impracticable in view of his severity (siyāsāt). When Bāysunghur showed that he was displeased with the Sayyid, Amīr 'Alī Shaqqānī, whom the Sayyid had disgraced (ū-rā mankūb sākhta būd), proposed that the Sayyid should be asked to account for the sum of 200 tūmans ('arḍa dāsht ki mablagh-i diwānist tūman rawshan sāzad). Bāysunghur ordered an inquiry into the Sayyid's transactions. Amīr 'Alī first made a deposition regarding the taking possession of the treasury (sukhan-i taṣarruf-i khazāna guft), and Bāysunghur ordered a review of the treasuries ('arḍ-i khazā'in kunand). The treasurer (khazāna-dār) advised those who had taken sums on behalf of the Sayyid (jam'ī-rā ki mablaghā barāyi sayyid burda būdand) to return the treasury funds (wujūh-i khazāna bāz arīd). One of these was Khwāja Pīr 'Alī b. Muḥammad Bāyazīd, the confidant of the Sayyid, who had knowledge of all confidential matters (bar qaḍāyā-yi nihānī iṭṭilā' dāsht). The khazāna-dār held promissory notes (tamassukat) signed by the Khwāja and by the Khwāja's father. These two

dunned (mutaqaql) the Sayyid, but the Sayyid procrastinated (har ruz daf'i miguft), until hard words were used, negotiations were indefinitely protracted, and an open breach occurred between the Sayyid and Khwaja Pīr 'Alī. Shāhrukh summoned the parties concerned, and conducted an inquiry in their presence (bi-muwajaha tafahhus namud). The khazāna-dār stated that Pīr 'Alī had taken gold from the treasury; Pīr 'Alī asserted that he had given the money to the Sayyid; the Sayyid denied this. Shāhrukh showed leniency towards the Sayyid, and ordered that all sums which had been taken from the treasury, and for which liability had been acknowledged, should be returned (anchi az khazāna burda and wa muqirr and bi-khazāna furud awarand), and that anything due from anyone should be paid back (bar har kas chizi rawshan shawad baz dihad). Shāhrukh further ordered the arrest, as a result of this breach of trust (bidin khiyanat), of all those who had had a hand in the affair (har ki-ra dar miyan-i an mu'amala bud). The Sayyid, however, retained his seat and his authority in the diwan (bar masnad-i diwan nafidh-farman bud), and the restitution (istirdad) of the treasury funds (wujuh-i khazāna) was left to his discretion (mufawwad bi-ra'y-i u bud).

Although informers did not dare to say anything aloud even to themselves (harchi az wahm ba khud niz namitawanistand guft bi-awaz-i buland), they privately spread rumours around (dil-parwas mikardand), with the result that Shāhrukh ordered a further inquiry into the Sayyid's transactions. Statements (khajtha) were taken from the majority of those who had given money to the Sayyid, and the Sayyid realized that whether he liked it or not (sha'a 'am aba), he was confronted with a difficult situation and an alarming position (waqi'a-yi mushkil wa mahlaka-yi ha'il). He considered his best plan was to undertake to pay the amount claimed by his enemies (mudda'a-yi khasman qabul karda), so that that sum should be his protection

(ān mablagh ḥiṣār-i ū bāshād), and for the moment to escape from interrogation by use of cash (ḥalā bi-naqd az su'al wa jawāb khalāṣ yābad). He undertook to answer for the sum of 200 kopeki tūmans within a year; this sum represented a daily instalment of 3,333 dīnārs and 2 dāngs of 'Irāqī gold. The Sayyid was arrested and handed over to the mūḥaṣṣil (tax-collector). Bāysunghur rejected an appeal; a second appeal, to Bāysunghur's mother Gawhar Shād, was successful, and the Sayyid was released, but he was still required to pay the daily instalment (amma furūd āwardan-i qisṭ-i har rūza bar qarār būd).

The Sayyid, however, still coveted the wizārat, and his ambition to hold this office gave him no rest night or day. He obtained most of the money which he repaid to the dīwān from ṭayyarāt (1) (akthar-i wujūh ki bi-dīwān furūd mī āward az ṭayyarāt mī angīkht); from some he took cash, from others, title deeds (qabāla), and he was constantly collecting a few tūmans here and there by plausible talk and specious promises (dahān-gushāda wa zabān bi-kām nihāda), even when he was confined to his bed. But the strain proved too much for him, and he died (2).

Under the Tīmūrīds, the wazīr was also responsible for the organization of supplies for military expeditions. In 810/1408 Shāhrukh, who was in Māzandarān (3), had given orders for the organization of an expedition to Sīstān, and for a levy of troops (iḥḍār-i lashkarhā) for that purpose. The ṣāhib-i dīwān-i mamālik, Khwāja Ghiyāth al-Dīn Sālār, had been fitting out an equipage (?) (maḍradī pardākhta), and preparing a register (daftari sākhta), and had repeatedly collected goods (daf'a daf'a jam' kardā) in the

(1) "Extraordinary levies" (see A. K. S. Lambton, LP. 441 s. v.). (2) MS. ii/1, 346-51. (3) Shāhrukh annexed Māzandarān to his original territory of Khurāsān in 809/1406-7.

names of the amīrs and chief officers of state (arkan-i dawlat); he had written down on his inventory (bar nuska-yi taqrīr) a hen for every egg, a sheep for every man of meat, 10 man for every man of barley, a kharwar for every nose-bag (tūbra) of straw. Prices were high that year (ajnas qaymatī tamām dāsht). Khwāja Ghiyāth al-Dīn entered this artificially inflated list of items in his register at cost price (in hashwiyyāt-rā dar daftar-i khwud bi-arz kard), and depreciated the toyūls of the Turks by 25% by manipulating the conversion rate (toyūlāt-i atrāk-rā yakī dar chahār bi-tas'īr girift); by these means he caused offence to all (hama-rā az khwud ranjānīd), and indeed provoked them to rebel against those in authority (balki bā ulu'l-amr 'aṣī gardānīd), for the result of this account would be (fadhālik-i in hisāb bi-ān muḥdī shud) that when the register was presented to Shāhrukh, and the Court had drafts to issue and no money to back them (ḥaḍrat ḥawāla dārād wa māl nabāshad), it would inevitably be disgraced (bī-'irdī bāyad kashīd) (1).

The above detailed accounts of the working of the Tīmūrid dīwān are of the greatest value. The bureaucratic system does not appear to have functioned particularly smoothly under the Tīmūrids. If a sole wazīr was in office, he tended to become over-powerful and to abuse this power by indulging in corrupt practices. If two or more wazīrs shared the office jointly, there existed between them an atmosphere of distrust and of plot and counter-plot. Of especial interest are the indications that there was a measure of conflict between the Turkish and Persian elements in the state, as when the ṣāhib-i dīwān-i mamālik Khwāja Ghiyāth al-Dīn Sālār deliberately depreciated the value of the toyūls of the Turks in 810/1408, and between

(1) MS. ii/1, 107-8.

the civil officials and the amīrs, as witness the fact that the mīr-dīwān Khwāja Ghiyāth al-Dīn Sālār Simnānī fell from power because, although "he devoted himself to the welfare of the people, he did not conduct the affairs of the amīrs in a satisfactory manner" (1), the implication being that he was not sufficiently sympathetic towards the interests of the amīrs.

The other point of particular interest in the above account of the wizārat under Shāhrukh is Bāysunghur b. Shāhrukh's personal intervention in dīwān affairs in 819/1416 (2), apparently in order to discover the irregularities committed by the ṣāhib-dīwān. This supervision of the day to day affairs of the dīwān by a member of the royal house in person seems to have been sufficiently unprecedented to call for particular comment on the part of the author of the Maṭla'-i Sa'dāyn, and clearly implies a much greater measure of control over the conduct of dīwān affairs than would be achieved by the ordinary routine attendances of the monarch at meetings of the dīwān. It is for this reason that I have taken the liberty of rendering masnad-i dīwān-rā bi-sharaf-i julūs biyārāst, lit., "graced the seat of the dīwān by his presence", as "took control of the dīwān". Bāysunghur seems actually to have taken over the functions of the ṣāhib-dīwān (i. e., wazīr) for a period.

Isma'il The early years of the reign of Isma'īl I witnessed the first steps in the establishment of the Ṣafawid political institution, and the development of the organization of the militant Ṣūfī order of which he was the head into the administrative system of the Ṣafawid state. When Isma'īl became head of the Ṣafawid order in 1494, his closest companions were the officers who had served his brother Sulṭān 'Alī with such devotion. They formed the

(1) See p. 172 above. (2) See p. 173 above.

"nucleus staff of the order", a khalīfat al-khulafā, an abdāl, a dada, a khādim, and a lala (1), and they constituted the "little court" which was in attendance on Isma'īl during his period of concealment in Gīlān (1494-1499), and through which he kept in touch with the members of the order at Ardabīl (2). These men, together with a few others, made up the inner circle of his trusted companions, and were known as the ahl-i ikhtiṣāṣ. Their names are given as Ḥusayn Beg Lala (Shāmlū), Abdāl 'Alī Beg Dada (Dhu'l-Qadar) = Dada Beg Ṭalish, Khādim Beg Khalīfa (-t al-Khulafā), Rustam Beg Qarāmanlū, Bayrām Beg Qarāmanlū, Ilyās Beg Ayghūth (Ayghūr, Ayghūt) -ūghlī (Ustājilū, or Khinislū), Qarā Pīrī Beg Qājār (3), and 'Abdī Beg Shāmlū tawāchī (4). It was through the efforts of these ahl-i ikhtiṣāṣ that Isma'īl avoided capture by the officers of Rustam Beg Aq Qoyunlu; at the time of his flight to Gīlān, Isma'īl was only seven years of age, and his death, even if it had not led to the disruption of the Ṣafawid organization throughout Syria and Asia Minor, would inevitably have postponed and perhaps destroyed the chances of Ṣafawid success in Persia. It is natural, therefore, that Isma'īl, after his accession at Tabrīz in 907/1501-2, should have conferred the highest honours on one of the ahl-i ikhtiṣāṣ, namely, Ḥusayn Beg Lala Shāmlū. The latter had fought at the battle of Ṭabarsarān in 893/1488, when Ḥaydar was killed by a combined force of Aq Qoyunlu and Shīrwānīs (5), and had fought on the right wing of Sulṭān 'Alī's army at the

(1) TM. 125, and n. 4. (2) ibid., 191. (3) BM. Or. 3248, 44b. (4) HS. iii/4, 24. For the Khinislū (Khunūslū), connected with the town of Khinis (Khnus) in Armenia, see TM. 14, n. 3. The tawāchīs, according to the glossary of the Maṭla'-i Sa'dayn (ii/2, 1535-6), were a local infantry force (piyāda-yi qaṣabat), liable for service under the command of the local governor and for employment on duties of any kind (ki dar khidmat-i ḥukkām ḥādir bāshad wa barāyi har kār ta'ayyun karda shawad). (5) TAA. 15.

battle of Āhar against Bāysunqur b. Ya'qūb in 898/1493 (1); with Qarā Pīrī Beg Qājār and Dada Beg Ṭalish, he had taken Isma'īl to Ardabīl in 899/1494 (2), and had later remained with Isma'īl in Gīlān.

Husayn Beg Shāmlū was the lala of Isma'īl. The term lala, signifying "mentor, tutor, guardian", seems to have been adopted from the Aq Qoyunlu; the latter, in addition to the word lala, used the term atabeg, and it is clear that there are marked similarities between the lala of the Ṣafawids and Aq Qoyunlu and the atabeg of the Seljuq Turks. Under the Aq Qoyunlu and the Ṣafawids, as formerly under the Seljuqs, the guardians of the young princes acquired great power, and used their wards without scruple to further their own ambitions. For instance Bāysunqur b. Ya'qūb ascended the throne in 896/1490 through the efforts of Ṣūfī Khalīl Mawṣillū; the latter held the rank of atabeg to Bāysunqur, who was still a minor (3). Ya'qūb himself, who had ascended the throne at the age of sixteen (4), had a lala, Sulaymān Beg (5). The infant Ḥasan b. Ya'qūb was put to death in 898/1493 by the lala of Rustam Beg (6). Ṭahmāsp Mīrza, appointed governor of Khurāsān from the borders of Simnān to the banks of the Oxus in 922/1516, (when he was only two years old), was placed in the care of a lala, Amīr Khān Turkman (7). Sām Mīrza, born in 923/1517, was committed to the care of the lala Dūrmīsh Khān Shāmlū (8). In 927/1521 Sām Mīrza replaced his brother Ṭahmāsp as governor of Khurāsān; Dūrmīsh Khān at once proceeded to Harāt to take over the administration of the province, and arrived there in Dhu'l-Ḥijja 927/November 1521 (9); Sām Mīrza himself did not reach Harāt

(1) Ghulām Sarwar, 27. (2) BM. Or. 3248, 28b. (3) TIN. 439b. (4) ibid., 438b. (5) ibid., 439b. (6) ibid., 440b. (7) AT. 154. (8) HS. iii/4, 83. (9) ibid., 100-1.

until the end of Sha'bān 928/1522 (1). On the accession of Tahmāsp (930/1524), Dīw Sulṭān Rūmlū became his atabeg by virtue of a testamentary disposition of the late Shāh (bi-ḥukm-i waṣiyyat-i shāh-i firdaws-makān) (2). Bahrām Mīrzā was appointed governor of Khurāsān in 936/1529-30, with Ghāzī Khān Takkalū as his lala (3). In 939/1532 Sām Mīrzā was reinstated at Harāt, with Aghziwār Khān Shāmlū as his lala (4). In 942/1536, after the rebellion of Aghziwār Khān and Sām Mīrzā, Muḥammad Khudābanda was appointed governor of Khurāsān, with Muḥammad Khān Sharaf al-Dīn-ūghlī Takkalū as his lala (5); the latter retained this post until 963/1555-6, when he became lala to Isma'īl b. Tahmāsp (6). In 931/1524-5 Husayn Khān Shāmlū succeeded his brother Dūrmīsh Khān as governor of Harāt and atabeg to Sām Mīrzā (7); he later became amīr al-umarā and lala of Muḥammad Mīrzā Khudābanda, who was born in 938/1531 (8). Manṭashā Sulṭān Ustājilū succeeded him as lala to Muḥammad Khudābanda (9). Muḥammad Khudābanda was again ruler of Khurāsān in 974/1566, this time with Shāhquī Sulṭān Yakān Ustājilū as his lala (10). The latter later became amīr al-umarā of Khurāsān (11). In 991/1583 'Abbās Mīrzā was captured by a rival amīr, Murshid Qulī Khān Ustājilū, during the course of a battle between the latter and 'Alī Qulī Khān Shāmlū, who had been the lala of 'Abbās Mīrzā since 985/1577 (12). Murshid Qulī Khān, having seized possession of 'Abbās Mīrzā, "reclined on the throne of wikālat and lalagī in complete independence" (min ḥayth al-istiqlāl bar masnad-i wikālat wa lalagī tikya zada) (13). Tenure of the

(1) TIN. 463a; HS. iii/4, 104. (2) TIN. 465a. (3) Shar. ii, 178. (4) AT. 246. (5) ibid., 496. (6) Shar. ii/208. (7) AT. 220; TIN. 469a. (8) AT. 496. (9) ibid., 496. (10) Shar. ii, 232. (11) AT. 485. (12) Bellan 4; 12. (13) TAA. 223.

11/20

office of lala had always given an amīr increased status; during the disturbed period between the death of Ṭahmāsp and the accession of 'Abbās I, when the Shāh was ruler in name only, and the country was rent by the intrigues of the qizilbāsh amīrs, the political importance of the lala became even greater (1). For instance, Murtada Qulī Khān Purnak, governor of Mashhad, joined the faction hostile to 'Alī Qulī Khān Shāmlū, the governor of Harāt, because he did not wish tenure of the office of lala by 'Alī Qulī Khān Shāmlū to be the cause of his (the latter's) taking precedence over and assuming a position of ascendancy and superiority with regard to the rest of the amīrs of Khurāsān (mūjib-i taqaddum wa buzurgī wa i'tilā-yi shān wa tafawwuq wa bartarī-yi ū nisbat bi-sāyir-i umarā'-i khurāsān (2).

The office of lala seems to have been distinct from that of mu'allim; the lala, who was usually a qizilbāsh amīr, controlled the political and military activities of the prince committed to his care, whereas the mu'allim was responsible for the prince's education, and moral and spiritual welfare. The mu'allim was usually a Persian, and sometimes the ṣadr was appointed to this post. For instance, in 924/1518 the ṣadr Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad was appointed mu'allim to Ṭahmāsp Mīrza in succession to Mawlānā Aḥmad Ṭabasī (3).

The evidence regarding the early appointments made by Isma'īl is

(1) Under 'Abbās I and his successors, the term lala was also used for the tutors of the ghulāms of the Private Household; these lalas were "officers of considerable standing" (See TM. 127-8, and also 57). (2) TAA. 178.

(3) HS. iii/4, 96. Cf. the Tīmūrid practice:- Mawlānā 'Iṣām al-Dīn Dā'ūd Khwāfī was the ṣadr and ustād of Sulṭān Maḥmūd Mīrza (HS. iii/3, 348), and Mawlānā Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad Ghūriyānī was for some years the ṣadr and ustād of Abū Turāb Mīrza (ibid., 349). Hinz, 102, states that Qaḍī Ṣafī al-Dīn 'Īsā, the tutor of Ya'qūb Aq Qoyunlu, was promoted to the ṣadarat after the accession of Ya'qūb.

confused and conflicting, except as regards Qāḍī Shams al-Dīn Gīlānī, who was appointed ṣadr (1). In the same year (907/1501-2), Ḥusayn Beg Lala Shāmlū became the first holder of the office of wakīl (manṣab-i wikalat-i nafs-i nafīs-i humāyūn bar ḥusayn beg lala qarār girift) (2). We have already seen that the Shāh, in his dual role of murshid and pādishāh, embodied in his own person both the religious and the political institution, and that the wakīl, by virtue of being his vicegerent, represented both aspects of the Shāh's authority. Hence there was from the beginning an inherent source of friction between the wakīl and the ṣadr, who supervised the religious institution on behalf of the political institution. This friction soon became manifest, and continued to exist under Tahmāsp.

At the same time that Ḥusayn Beg Lala was appointed wakīl, Amīr Muḥammad Zakariyyā Tabrīzī was entrusted with the important office of the wizārat and ṣahib-dīwānī (3). The latter had for years been wazīr to the Aq Qoyunlu rulers; he joined Isma'īl at Maḥmūdābād in 906/1500, after the Safawid victory over the Shīrwānshāh (4), and the following year was raised to the office of wizārat-i dīwān-i a'la (5). The Tārīkh-i Ilchī-yi Nizāmshāh states that he was a former wazīr of the Qara Qoyunlu and Aq Qoyunlu sultans; he was appointed to the wizārat-i dīwān-i a'la, and Isma'īl dubbed him "the key of Ādharbayjān" (6). In 909/1503-4 Maḥmūd Khān Daylamī Qazwīnī was appointed to hold the post of wazīr jointly with Amīr (Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad) Zakariyyā (dar wizārat sharīk-i amīr zakariyyā kūjchī gardānīd) (7). Maḥmūd Khān Daylamī (8) came from one of the noble families (buzurgzādahā) of Qazwīn, and had formerly been wazīr under the

(1) HS. iii/4, 35. (2) ibid., 35. (3) ibid., 35. See pp. 157-8 above. (4) NJA. 200b. (5) AT. 54. He died in 918/1512 (AT. 136). (6) TIN. 448a. (7) AT. 81. (8) AT. 81 gives Maḥmūd Khān Daylamī Qazwīnī; AT. 152 gives Malik Maḥmūd Jān Daylamī. Jān appears to be an error.

Aq Qoyunlu ruler Ya'qūb (1478-1490) (1). The Majālis al-Mu'minīn, in its list of Shī'ī tribes, has the following notice under the heading Daylamīya this eminent tribe are nobles of Qazwīn, and consider themselves to be of the lineage of Mālik Ashtar (may God be pleased with him^s); among their great men of recent times (az akābir-i muta'akkirān-i īshān) is Maḥmūd Khān Daylamī, who was at first employed as the wazīr of Sulṭān Ya'qūb Bāyandurī, and later was honoured by being admitted to the service of Isma'īl, and was invested with the priceless robe of the above-mentioned lofty office (2). Thus both wazīrs appointed by Isma'īl were former Aq Qoyunlu officials. It is especially interesting to note that one of them, Maḥmūd Khān Daylamī, was appointed to the wizārat by a Sunnī ruler (Sulṭān Ya'qūb), although springing from a reputedly Shī'ī family.

At this stage, during the early years of Isma'īl's reign, the wazīr was definitely of secondary importance compared with the wakīl, and was almost certainly less important than the ṣadr also. The wazīr was the head of the bureaucracy, and had no immediate connexion with the religious institution. The early Ṣafawid state was a theocracy, and it is therefore natural that the wakīl, as the vicegerent of the Shāh, who was the religious institution, and the ṣadr, as the head of the religious classes, should have had precedence over the wazīr. Later, under 'Abbās I, when the religious institution was dominated by the political institution, the term wakīl gradually fell into disuse, and the wazīr became the most powerful official in the state. Minorsky states that "under 'Abbās I, the title of wakīl is no longer recorded, and the promotion of the wazīr to the first place indicates the tendency of the Kings to eliminate any reference to the excessive prerogatives of a Vice-Roy" (3). The promotion of the wazīr was

(1) AT. 152. (2) 64b. (3) TM. 115.

even more, perhaps, the natural outcome of the process of secularization to which 'Abbās I gave definitive expression. Under the successors of 'Abbās I, the wazīr became even more powerful. Chardin, referring to the position under Shāh Sulaymān (1667-1694), states that "nul acte du roi, a quelque sceau qu'il soit passé, n'est valide qu'avec le contre scel du visir" (1). He further asserts that "the kings of Persia are only for show, whereas the real kings are the Grand Vazirs" (2). This suggests that the wazīr of the later Ṣafawid period wielded as much power as the wakīl of earlier times.

From the first, the wizārat was in the hands of Persians, as was the ṣadārat. The Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh states that in 909/1503-4 Qaḍī Muḥammad Kāshī was appointed wazīr (3). If this statement is correct, it means that not only was a third wazīr appointed in 909 A.H., in addition to Amīr Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad Zakariyyā, (who had been wazīr since 907 A.H.) and Maḥmūd Khān Daylamī (appointed joint wazīr in 909 A.H.), but also that Qaḍī Muḥammad Kāshī was at the same time wazīr, ṣadr, and an amīr of the dīwān-i 'alī, for the Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh also states that in the dīwān-i 'alī Qaḍī Muḥammad had combined the position of ṣadr with that of amīr (dar dīwān-i 'alī ṣadārat bi-imārat jam' karda būd) (4). On the other hand, none of the other sources mentions the appointment of Qaḍī Muḥammad to the wizārat. It is possible that wizārat in the Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh, 81, is an error for ṣadārat, although the British Museum MS. of the Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh (Or. 4134) confirms the reading wizārat.

In 913-4/1508 Isma'īl took a very significant step; he dismissed Husayn Beg Lala Shāmlū from the wikālat, and appointed in his place a

(1) Quoted by Minorsky, in TM, 115, n. 4. (2) Quoted by Minorsky, in TM, 115. (3) AT, 81. (4) AT, 110. HS, iii/4, 38, confirms that Qaḍī Muḥammad was appointed ṣadr. TIN, 450b asserts that he became joint ṣadr with Qaḍī Shams al-Dīn Gilānī, but this is not corroborated by any other source.

Persian, Amīr Najm al-Dīn Mas'ūd Gīlānī. Amīr Najm, a goldsmith, was a noble of Rasht (1). He had attended Isma'īl when the latter was a fugitive in the White Mosque at Rasht under the protection of Amīra Ishāq, the ruler of Bīya Pas, in 899/1494 (2). He had visited Isma'īl during his stay at Lāhījān (3). Later, because of the hostility of Kūsa 'Abbās, the sipahsālār of Amīra Ishāq, he had fled from Rasht and had joined Isma'īl's Shīrwān expedition of 906/1500-1 (4).

The appointment of a Persian to the wikālat suggests that Isma'īl had already begun to be apprehensive of the power of the qizilbāsh amīrs who had raised him to the throne only six years previously. The fact that Ḥusayn Beg Lala apparently had not committed any action which would justify his dismissal, and that in 914/1508 he led the vanguard of the Safawid army in the successful campaign which culminated in the capture of Baghdād, suggests even more strongly that his replacement was simply a question of policy. If an official was dismissed for some ^{crime} demeanour, or as the result of hostile intrigue, the circumstances are usually stated in the sources; none of the sources gives a reason for the dismissal of Ḥusayn Beg Lala Shāmlū.

The dismissal of Ḥusayn Beg Lala Shāmlū, and the appointment of Amīr Najm al-Dīn Mas'ūd Gīlānī raises the whole question of the function and position of the wakīl and the amīr al-umara in the early Safawid state. The difficulties arise from the different terminology employed by the various sources. For instance, the Ḥabīb al-Siyar states that within a short time Amīr Najm al-Dīn acquired a position of trust and authority, and that during the above-mentioned events (i. e., of 913-4/1508), he was promoted to the

(1) HS. iii/4, 47: dar silk-i ashraf wa a'yan-i rasht....muntazam bud. (2) BM. Or. 3248, 31b. (3) ibid., 32b. (4) HS. iii/4, 47.

office of wikālat-i nafs-i nafīs-i humāyūn, and undertook the conduct of administrative and financial affairs with full independence; his power and position surpassed that of all the great amīrs and muqarrabs (1) of the court of heavenly magnificence (bi-andak zamānī i'tibār wa ikhtiyār-i bisyār paydā kard wa dar khilāl-i aḥwāl-i madhkūra bi-manṣab-i wikālat-i nafs-i nafs-i humāyūn sarafrāz gashta min ḥayth al-istiqlāl rūy bi-tamshiyat-i muhimmāt-i mulk wa māl āward pāya-yi qadr wa manzilatash az tamāmī-yi umarā-yi 'izām wa muqarrabān-i bārgāh-i falak-iḥtishām dar gudhasht). That pure-minded amīr devoted all his efforts to remedying the disorders which had occurred in some provinces at the beginning of Isma'īl's reign (an amīr-i ṣāfi-damīr dar tadārūk-i ikhtilālī ki dar awāyil-i ayyām-i jahangīrī dar ba'ḍī az wilāyat wuḡū' yafta būd bi-qadr-i imkān sa'y namūd), and, striving to promote the welfare of men of learning and excellence, he opened the gates of generosity with the fingers of justice (dar tarfīh-i ḥāl-i a aṣḥāb-i faḍl wa kamāl kūshīda bi-anāmīl-i ma'dalat abwāb-i makramat bar gushūd) (2).

دوران
The Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh states that in 914/1508-9 Isma'īl conferred the office of amīr al-umarā on Shaykh Najm Zargar, and that his seal in the dīwān-i a'lā was placed above all other seals (3). The Tārīkh-i Ilchī-yi Niẓāmshāh gives a similar account (manṣab-i amīr al-umarā'ī wa ratq wa fatq-i jamī'-i muhimmāt-i mamālik-i maḥrūsa bar shaykh najm al-dīn gīlānī muqarrar shud wa muhr-i ū dar dīwān bar bālā-yi muhr-i jamī'-i ahl-i dīwān zadand), and adds the following statement: he (Shaykh Najm al-Dīn) rendered impotent the Turks, and caused affairs to be conducted in an orderly manner (anjanāb dast-i turkān bar chūb-i 'ajz basta madār-i kārḥā

(1) For the various muqarrabs of the court, see Minorsky, TM, 55 ff. (2) HS. iii/4, 47. (3) AT. 107.

bar ḥisāb nihād) (1). This suggests that although Shaykh Najm al-Dīn held office for only a short period, he did enough to arouse the hostility of the qizilbāsh; their resentment was increased by the appointment of another Persian to the wikālat in succession to Shaykh Najm al-Dīn, and found its expression in the revolt against the authority of the wakīl at Ghujduwān (918/1512). The Jawāhir al-Akhbār, although it introduces a further difficulty by stating that Mīr Najm Zargar became wazīr and wakīl in 914/1508-9, corroborates the account of the Tārīkh-i Ilchī-yi Niẓāmshāh by stating clearly that (during Mīr Najm's period of office) the amīrs were totally excluded from dīwān affairs (umarā-rā dar muhimmāt-i dīwānī muṭlaqan dakhil nabūd) (2).

The Sharafnāma states that the office of wakīl was conferred on Amīr Najm, but goes on to say that in 915/1509-10 Ḥusayn Beg Lala Shāmlū, who was the foremost of the qizilbāsh amīrs, was dismissed, and his post given to Muḥammad Beg Sufrachī Ustājlu, who was later known as Chāyān Sulṭān (ḥusayn beg lala shāmlū ki muqaddam-i umarā-yi qizilbāshiyya būd ma'zūl gashta manṣab-i urā bi-muḥammad beg sufrachī ustājlu ki ākhir bi-chāyān sulṭān mulaqqab būd rujū' namūd) (3). The Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh confirms this, under the year 915/1509-10: at Tabrīz Isma'īl dismissed Ḥusayn Beg Lala, who was amīr al-umarā, and gave his post to Muḥammad Beg Sufrachī Ustājlu, who assumed the title of Chāyān Sulṭān (dar tabrīz ḥusayn beg lala-rā ki amīr al-umarā būd 'azl farmūda manṣab-i urā bi-muḥammad beg sufrachī ustājlu arzānī farmūd wa mulaqqab bi-chāyān sulṭān gardīd) (4). The Tārīkh-i Ilchī-yi Niẓāmshāh also states that Ḥusayn Beg, who held the office of mīr-i dīwān, was dismissed from the amirate, and that his office, district (ulka) and retainers (nawkarān) were given to Muḥammad Beg Sufrachī Ustājlu, who

(1) TIN. 453b. (2) JA. 287b. (3) Shar. ii, 145. (4) AT. 110.

assumed the title of Chāyān Sulṭān (ḥusayn beg lala-rā ki manṣab-i mīr-i dīwānī dāsht az imārat 'azl karda manṣab wa ulkā wa nawkarān-i ū-rā bi-muḥammad beg sufrachī ustājlu arzānī dāshtand) (1). Chāyān Sulṭān was also made an amīr of the dīwān (2).

In 915/1509-10 Najm al-Dīn Mas'ūd, who was the wakīl of Isma'īl, died of pleurisy (marāḍ-i dhāt al-janb) at Khamna near Tabrīz, and his body was taken to Najaf; his office was conferred on Amīr Yār Muḥammad from Khūzān, a district of Iṣfahān, who received the title of Najm-i Thānī (3). The latter had been appointed wazīr the previous year (914/1508-9) (4). The Ḥabīb al-Siyar confirms that Isma'īl conferred on Najm-i Thānī the office of wakīl, raised the banner of his esteem and authority to the height of the farqadān (the two bright stars in the constellation Ursa Minor), made all the amīrs, wazīrs and arkan-i dawlat obey him, entrusted the conduct of administrative and financial affairs to his unerring judgement, and treated him with the greatest favour and esteem; Najm Beg Thānī was a shrewd and zealous amīr, and during his period of authority he treated both high and low with justice (5). The Haft Iqlīm describes his power and authority in the most extravagant terms (6).

The picture presented by the sources is not entirely clear. For instance, all the sources are agreed that in 915/1509-10 Ḥusayn Beg Lala Shāmlū was dismissed from the amīr al-umara'ī and replaced by Chāyān Sulṭān, yet neither the Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh nor the Ḥabīb al-Siyar records his appointment to this important office. We know that Ḥusayn Beg Lala was made wakīl in 907/1501-2, on the accession of Isma'īl, and dismissed from

(1) TIN. 454a. (2) JA. 288a. (3) AT. 110-11. Yār Muḥammad appears to be an error, as HS. iii/4, followed by most of the sources, has Yār Aḥmad.
(4) Shar. ii, 145. (5) HS. iii/4, 53. (6) 359a.

that post in 1508; but it is not clear whether he was appointed amīr al-umarā simultaneously with his nomination to the wikālat, or later. A passage in the Tārīkh-i Ilchī-yi Nizāmshāh, which is in itself somewhat obscure, suggests the former; referring to the year 907/1501-2, it states: husayn beg lala wa abdal beg (wa) dada beg amīr al-umarā wa ṣāhib-i ikhtiyār shudand) (1). This statement, if taken at its face value, establishes the fact that Husayn Beg Lala was made amīr al-umarā in 1501-2, and a passage in the anonymous history of Shāh Isma'īl states clearly that Isma'īl made Husayn Beg Lala wakīl-i nafs-i nafs-i khwud and amīr al-umarā in 907/1501-2. (2). It seems likely, therefore, that Husayn Beg Lala was appointed both wakīl and amīr al-umarā in 907/1501-2. The passage quoted above from the Tārīkh-i Ilchī-yi Nizāmshāh, by coupling the name of Abdāl Beg Dada with that of Husayn Beg Lala, introduces a further complication. Abdāl 'Alī Beg, known as Dada Beg, was one of the ahl-i ikhtisāṣ, and his record of service to the Ṣafawid cause was as meritorious as that of Husayn Beg Lala (3). He was an obvious candidate for office at the time of Isma'īl's first administrative appointments, but none of the other sources mentions him in 907/1501-2. He is referred to in 911/1505-6 as holding the rank of qurchibāshī. Isma'īl gave orders that all those who had fought on the side of the enemy against Sulṭān Ḥaydar should be put to death; the investigation was placed in the hands of Abdāl Beg Dada, who was the qurchibāshī, and many people were put to death for this reason (khāqān-i iskandar-shān hukm kard ki harki bā mukhālifān bi-jang-i sulṭān haydar rafta bāshand bi-qatl āwarand wa pursish-i ān-rā bi-abdal beg dada ki

(1) TIN. 448a. (2) BM. Or. 3248, 76b. (3) See BM. Or. 3248, 119a, which describes him as sūfī pak-i'tiqād. He had been present at the battle of Tabarsarān in which Ḥaydar was killed (893/1488).

qurchī-bāshī būd ruju' farmūd wa bidīn sabab bisyār kas bi-qatl āmadand)

(1). The anonymous history of Shāh Isma'īl states that Abdāl Beg Dada put to death a large number of the Turkomāns and people of Ṭabarsarān and Shīrwān who had leagued themselves with the enemy in the martyrdom of Sulṭān Ḥaydar (2).

QURCHI

v.i
319

Professor Minorsky says that "in earlier times, when Persia possessed no regular troops, the qurchī-bāshī was practically the Minister of War in Persia, and his usual title seems to have been amīr al-umarā" (3). It seems clear, however, that the office of qurchībāshī was in fact distinct from that of amīr al-umarā, and I have been unable to find any evidence that the qurchībāshī was ever styled amīr al-umarā. In 915/1509-10 Yakān Beg Takkalū was qurchībāshī (4), while Chāyān Sulṭān was amīr al-umarā (5). In 940/1533-4 Ūghlan Khalīfa was qurchībāshī (6), but was certainly not amīr al-umarā (7). In 920/1514-15 Sarū Pīra Ustājlū was qurchībāshī (8), when Chāyān Sulṭān was probably still amīr al-umarā. According to the Sharafnāma Chāyān Sulṭān died in 929/1522-3 (9), and was succeeded as amīr al-umarā by his son Bāyazīd Sulṭān; the latter died after the death of Shāh Isma'īl (930/1524), and his paternal uncle Muṣṭafā Beg, known as Kupuk Sulṭān, managed the affairs of the wikālat jointly with Dīw Sulṭān Rūmlū (ba'd az fawt-i shāh isma'īl bāyazīd sulṭān b. chāyān sulṭān ki bi-jā-yi pidar amīr al-umarā būd wafāt karda 'ammash muṣṭafā beg ki bi-kupuk sulṭān ishtihār dārad dar amr-i wikālat bā dīw sulṭān rūmlū sharīk kardand) (10).

Another passage from the Sharafnāma asserts that Amīr 'Abd al-Bāqī became

(1) AT. 88. (2) BM. Or. 3248, 119a. This is the earliest mention of the office of qurchībāshī. (3) TM. 116-7. (4) Shar. i, 411. (5) AT. 110. (6) AT. 248; JA. 308a. (7) See p.230 ff. below. (8) Shar. ii, 158; AT. 149. See TM. 125, n. 6, for a note on pīra. (9) Shar. ii, 167. (10) ibid., 169.

both wakīl and amīr al-umara in 919/1513 (manṣab-i wikalat wa amīr al-umara'ī-rā bi-khuddām-i amīr 'abd al-bāqī mufawwad namūd) (1). If this is so, though none of the other sources mentions his appointment to the amīr al-umara'ī, he must either have held the post of amīr al-umara jointly with Chāyān Sulṭān, or the latter must have been temporarily superseded, and restored to office in 920/1514, after the death of 'Abd al-Bāqī at Chāldīrān. In either event, it is clear that in 920/1514 the holder of the office of amīr al-umara was distinct from the holder of the office of qurchībāshī.

but in
other
sources

The passage already quoted from the Tarīkh-i Ilohī-yi Nizāmshāh suggests that Abdāl Beg Dada became joint amīr al-umara with Ḥusayn Beg Lala in 1501-2, and he may therefore have still held this position in 911/1505 when he was qurchībāshī, but too much reliance should not be placed on this rather loosely-worded passage. It is, of course, possible that the offices of amīr al-umara and qurchībāshī were originally one, but if so, it seems clear that they had become distinct by 915/1509-10, if not before. There is no other evidence to suggest that there was ever any connexion between the amīr al-umara'ī and the office of qurchībāshī, whereas there is abundant evidence of the close connexion between the wikalat and the amīr al-umara'ī. In general, as the importance of the amīr al-umara declined, during the second half of the reign of Ṭahmāsp, that of the qurchībāshī increased. It is perhaps significant that little is heard of the amīr al-umara during the first decade of Isma'īl's reign (1501-10), when relations between the qizilbāsh and the Shāh were harmonious; during the civil war between the qizilbāsh tribes at the beginning of the reign of Ṭahmāsp, the amīr al-umara was prominent not only by virtue of his military

(1) Shar. ii, 157.

office, but also because he played an active part in political affairs.

A further difficulty arises from the statement by the Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh already quoted, which is supported by the Tārīkh-i Ilchī-yi Nizāmshāh, to the effect that Shaykh Najm Zargar was made amīr al-umara in 914/1508-9. Professor Minorsky considers this statement of the Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh to be a mistake, as the same source also refers to Shaykh Najm al-Dīn as wakīl (1). In view of the apparent confusion in other sources between the terms amīr al-umara and wakīl, it is probable that this is so. On the other hand, as the date of Shaykh Najm al-Dīn's appointment to the wikālat is not absolutely certain - the Ḥabīb al-Siyar only says that Isma'īl spent that spring and summer (i. e., of 913-4/1508) at Hamadan, and that dar khilāl-i ān aḥwāl Amīr Najm al-Dīn Zargar raised the banner of honour and authority (2) - the question may perhaps be left open until the precise significance of the terms wakīl and amīr al-umara can be more clearly established.

We have seen that Najm-i Thānī was made wakīl in succession to Amīr Najm al-Dīn in 915/1509-10 (3). On this occasion all the sources agree that Najm-i Thānī was appointed wakīl and none asserts that he was made amīr al-umara; Professor Minorsky's statement that "Najm-i Thānī united the ranks of wakīl and amīr al-umara" appears to be based on a confusion between the two "Najms" (4). It is interesting to note that one source (5) refers to Najm-i Thānī as wakīl al-saltāna, "vicegerent of the realm", instead of the intensely personal wakīl-i nafs-i nafs-i humāyūn, or "viceroy". As the Ṣafawid state became less theocratic and the status of the Ṣūfīs declined, what Minorsky calls "the excessive prerogatives of a Vice-Roy" were modified (6). 'Abd al-Bāqī, appointed wakīl in 918/1513,

(1) See TM. 115 n. 1. (2) HS. iii/4, 47. (3) AT. 111. (4) TM. 115.

(5) TIN. 452b. (6) TM. 115.

is still termed wakīl-i nafs-i nafīs-i humāyūn (1), but Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn, appointed in 920/1514, is termed wakīl al-salṭana and i'timād al-dawla (2).

It has been suggested above that Isma'īl dismissed Ḥusayn Beg Lala Shāmlū from the wikalat (913-4/1508), and replaced him by a Persian, because he was apprehensive of the power of the qizilbash. Certain other facts tend to support this contention; for instance, on the death of Najm al-Dīn Mas'ūd in 915/1509-10, Isma'īl again appointed a Persian, namely Najm-i Thānī, to the wikalat. In the same year, when Isma'īl dismissed Ḥusayn Beg Lala Shāmlū from his other important post, that of amīr al-umarā, he did not replace him by one of the other leading qizilbash amīrs, but by an unknown officer, Muḥammad Beg Ustājlū, who held the comparatively lowly rank of sufrachī ("sewer"), and who was promoted to the rank of sulṭān to give him the status befitting the holder of the rank of amīr al-umarā; although he was amīr al-umarā from 915/1509-10 until his death in 929/1522-3, he does not figure largely in the events of that period, and it is probable that Isma'īl deliberately selected a man who was not a chief of one of the principal qizilbash tribes, backed by a powerful military force drawn from the tribes in his ulkā, in order to prevent the amīr al-umarā from acquiring excessive power. The fact that Chāyān Sulṭān was apparently given not only the manṣab but also the ulkā and nawkarān of Ḥusayn Beg Shāmlū, does not invalidate this theory, for the loyalty of the qizilbash to their own officers was such that an Ustājlū would not

(1) HS. iii/4, 71. (2) ibid., 106. Thus Minorsky, TM. 114, although right in saying that "under the early Ṣafawids the highest dignitary of state is usually called wakīl," is wrong in stating that these titles (viz., wazīr-i a'zam-i dīwan-i a'la and i'timād al-dawla) do not occur.

command from Shāmlū tribesmen support in any way comparable to that which he would receive from members of his own tribe.

In the same year that Husayn Beg Lala Shāmlū was deprived of his ulkā (915/1509), another powerful qizilbāsh amīr suffered a similar experience. In Safar 915/May-June 1509, Isma'īl dismissed Abdāl Beg Dada, who possessed the ulkā of Qazwīn, Sawj Būlāgh and Rayy, and conferred his ulkā on Zaynal Beg Shāmlū, who was given the title of khan (1). In this case too, the ulkā was transferred to an amīr of another tribe, for Abdāl Beg Dada was a Dhu'l-Qadar. As in the case of Husayn Beg Lala Shāmlū, no reason is given for the dismissal. Both men were members of the ahl-i ikhtisāṣ and had long records of loyal service to Isma'īl himself and to his father Haydar; neither seems to have been disgraced, for Husayn Beg Lala went with the expedition to Shīrwan (915/1509-10), and was appointed governor of Bākū and Shābirān (2). The following year he was made governor of Harāt after its recapture from the Uzbegs in December 1510. At the same time Abdāl Beg Dada was made governor of Marw (3).

It seems, therefore, that Isma'īl took these measures in order to reduce the power of two of the principal qizilbāsh amīrs. This is suggested also by a significant remark in the Jawāhir al-Akhbār, which, after stating that Qazwīn, Sawj Būlāgh and Rayy were given to Zaynal Khān Shāmlū, continues, wa lala beg wa dada beg-rā i'tibār namānd, "confidence was no longer placed in Lala Beg and Dada Beg" (4). The action taken by Isma'īl in regard to Husayn Beg Lala Shāmlū and Abdāl Beg Dada thus foreshadows the methods later employed by 'Abbās I to restrict the power of the

(1) AT. 110. HS. iii/4, 74, says that Zaynal Beg Shāmlū was made khan on his appointment to the governorship of Harāt in 918/1512-13. JA. 288a states that Zaynal Khān Shāmlū became amīr buzurg. Shar. ii, 145 adds Khwār to the territories governed by Abdāl Beg Dada. (2) Shar. ii, 146. (3) ibid., 148. (4) JA. 288a.

amīrs. Whereas Ṭahmāsp was unable, for the greater part of his reign, to keep the amīrs in check, 'Abbās adopted and extended the policy initiated by Isma'īl; he separated the tribal chiefs from their own tribe by appointing them to governorships remote from their own ulkā, and weakened the solidarity of the qizilbāsh by transferring groups of tribesmen from their own ulkā to another district (1) The serious losses suffered by the qizilbāsh, and the heavy casualties among the high-ranking amīrs, at Chāldirān (920/1514), made it unnecessary for Isma'īl to take further measures against the amīrs for some years; when, in the latter years of his reign, there was an open revolt against his authority, he had so far withdrawn from active participation in military operations, and from the direction of administrative affairs, that the steps necessary to restore the authority of the ruling institution were not taken.

Before the battle of Chāldirān, however, there occurred a revolt by the qizilbāsh amīrs against the authority of the Persian wakīl Najm-i Thānī. Professor Minorsky has pointed out that "they (the Turkomāns) were no party to the national Persian tradition. Like oil and water, the Turcomans and Persians did not mix freely and the dual character of the population profoundly affected the military and civil administration of Persia. It is true that the Ṣafawids had converted their Turcoman adherents to their creed, but with their help, Persia as a whole had to be conquered. For some time to come the Shāh's henchmen formed the privileged class of aristocracy and the long and painful process of their assimilation and absorption is the very nerve of the political evolution from Isma'īl I to 'Abbās I" (2). In 918/1512 Najm-i Thānī, at his own suggestion, was placed in command of an expedition against

(1) In addition, 'Abbās I appointed non-Turkomān ghulāms to be amīrs of qizilbāsh tribes; cf. TM. 17. (2) TM. 188.

the Uzbegs (1). It was the first major campaign in which Isma'īl personally took no part, and, without his controlling influence, Turkomān resentment against the wakīl, which was inflamed by the arrogant behaviour of the wakīl himself, resulted in open friction between the wakīl and the amīrs.

v. 5 87
Muzam
Sis

According to the Tārīkh-i Ilchī-yi Niẓāmshāh, Najm-i Thānī wielded greater power as wakīl than any of his predecessors. When Najm-i Thānī left for Khurāsān, Isma'īl sent farmāns to the governors (ḥukkām) and darughas of that province instructing them to obey Najm-i Thānī as they would himself (2). The wakīl was accordingly joined by Ḥusayn Beg Lala, governor of Harāt, Bayrām Beg Qarāmānī, governor of Balkh, and Abdāl Beg Dada, governor of Marw; in addition, Bābur Pādishāh was requested to join the amīrs from Ḥiṣār Shādman, so that they might follow his advice in the conduct of the campaign (dar saranjām-i muḥamm-i kishwargushā'ī bi-mūjib-i iqtidā-yi ra'y-i ṣawābnamā-yi way 'amal kunīm) (3). The Ṣafawid army captured Khuzār and Qarshī, and laid siege to Ghujduwān; supplies began to get short, and Bābur Pādishāh proposed that the Ṣafawid army should retire to Qarshī for the winter, replenish its supplies from Balkh, and resume the offensive against the Uzbegs the following spring. Najm-i Thānī refused to accept this advice, saying, "tomorrow we shall fight a royal battle" (fardā jang-i sulṭānī mī andāzīm). On 3 Ramaḍān 918/12 November 1512 Tīmūr Sulṭān b. Shaybak Khān and Abū Sa'īd Sulṭān b. Kuchum Khān, the defenders of Ghujduwān, were joined by the main Uzbek army from Bukhārā, led by 'Ubayd Khān and Jānī Beg Sulṭān, and the combined Uzbek forces made

(1) AT. 127: najm-i thānī ki wakīl būd tadbīr angīkht ki ū-rā rawāna-yi māwara'l-nahr gardānad khaqān-i iskandar-shā'n iltimās-i ū-rā qabūl kardā...

(2) TIN. 458b. (3) AT. 131.

their preparations for battle. At that juncture the qizilbāsh amīrs, because of their hostility towards Amīr Najm, decamped in the direction of Khurāsān (umarā-yi qizilbāsh banābar-i 'adāwatī ki bi-amīr najm dāshtand hamānrūz kūch kardā mutawajjih-i khurāsān shudand). Bayrām Beg Qarāmānī, who remained loyal, and the wakīl Najm-i Thānī, faced the Uzbegs with the few men left to them (bā mardum-i andak), but were defeated; the wakīl was captured, taken before 'Ubayd, and put to death. Bayrām Beg Qarāmānī was killed in battle (1), as was Zayn al-'Abidīn Beg Ṣafawī (2). Large numbers of qizilbāsh troops were drowned in trying to cross the Oxus (3). Ḥusayn Beg Lala and Aḥmad Beg Ṣūfī-ūghlī took refuge at Harāt, but evacuated the city in 919/March 1513, and marched back to 'Irāq and Ādhar-bāyjan via Ṭabas (4). Abdāl Beg Dada abandoned Marw without a fight (5), and was subsequently treated with ignominy by Isma'īl (6). Bābur Pādishāh retired again to Ḥiṣār Shādman. Slightly different versions are given by other sources, which allege that the qizilbāsh amīrs fled from the battlefield after Bayrām Beg Qarāmānī had fallen (7); the amīrs considered it a dishonour to serve under Amīr Najm (az mutāba'at-i amīr najm nang dāshtand) (8).

It is clear that the defection of the qizilbāsh amīrs was the primary cause of the disastrous defeat at Ghujduwān and of the death of the wakīl, Najm-i Thānī. Isma'īl does not seem to have meted out any punishment to

(1) AT. 133. (2) HS. iii/4, 69. (3) AT. 133. (4) AT. 138. (5) AT. 138; Shar. ii, 157. (6) AT. 138-9: Dada Beg had his beard shaved off, a woman's veil (mi'jar) placed on his head, and his face smeared with cosmetics, and was paraded round the camp seated backwards (mun'akas) on an ass. (7) BM.Or. 3248, 216b; Shar. ii, 153. (8) Shar. ii, 153.

the amīrs for their treachery; Abdāl Beg Dada seems to have been disgraced for abandoning Marw rather than for his defection at Ghujduwān. It is interesting to note that, unlike his successors, Isma'īl seems to have been averse to putting to death members of the Turkomān aristocracy; the only high-ranking amīrs to have been so punished seem to have been Ilyās Beg Dhu'l-Qadar (Kachal Beg), the governor of Shīrāz, who was executed c. 910/1504-5 (1), Khalīl Sulṭān Dhu'l-Qadar, another governor of Shīrāz, who was executed in 920/1514 for failing in his duty during the war against the Ottomans (2), and ^{Chulbān} Julbān Beg Khalkhālī, governor of Tārum, who was put to death in 911/1505-6 (3). Ilyās Beg and Julbān Beg were put to death for oppressing their subjects (4). In view of the external threats to the Ṣafawid state in its early years, Isma'īl naturally wished to avoid internal unrest, and his severity in these cases may have reflected this desire. His disinclination to put qizilbash amīrs to death for other offences may also have been due in part to his attachment to them, and even more perhaps to considerations of expediency. He needed all his available officers to defend Persia's north-western and north-eastern frontiers. But although he was lenient to the amīrs after their defection at Ghujduwān, he persevered in his attempt to restrict their power, by appointing another Persian to the wikālat in succession to Najm-i Thānī. Amīr Niẓām al-Dīn 'Abd al-Baqī had been appointed deputy-wakīl when Najm-i Thānī led the Ṣafawid army to Transoxania, and it had been arranged that he should devote himself to the conduct of affairs with full independence; when the news of the death of Najm-i Thānī was confirmed, Isma'īl placed the wikālat-i nafs-i nafīs-i

(1) Ghulām Sarwar, 50. (2) AT. 152. (3) BM. Or. 3248, 119a. (4) Cf. the execution of Qādī Muḥammad Kāshānī on similar grounds in 915/1509-10.

humāyūn in the hands of Amīr 'Abd al-Bāqī, and exalted his rank and station to the seventh heaven (1).

The battle of Chāldirān in 920/1514 decimated the ranks of the qizilbāsh amīrs; Ḥusayn Beg Lala Shāmlū, the former wakīl and amīr al-umārā, and Sārū Pīra Ustājlū the qurchībāshī, were among the killed. Three eminent sayyids lost their lives, including Amīr 'Abd al-Bāqī the wakīl, and Amīr Sayyid Sharīf Shīrāzī the ṣadr (2). Most of the highest offices of state thus became vacant. Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn Iṣfahānī was appointed wakīl (3), and Qādī Jahān Qazwīnī and Khwāja Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Tabrīzī were jointly his wazīrs (4).

The year 920/1514 is in many ways a significant one. The defeat at Chāldirān was a severe blow to Isma'īl's personal prestige, and destroyed the faith of the qizilbāsh in him as an invincible leader. According to Naṣr Allāh Falsafī, Isma'īl went into mourning for the defeat at Chāldirān. He wore black clothes and a black turban, and ordered all sayyids to do the same. The military standards were dyed black, and on them was written in white the word al-qīṣāṣ ("retribution"). Some have even seen a connexion between al-qīṣāṣ and the name Alqāṣ which Isma'īl gave to his second son, who was born not long after the battle of Chāldirān. Chāldirān was Isma'īl's first defeat. Since in his experience he had always been victorious, and his enemies defeated and conquered, he considered no adversary his equal, and thought himself invincible (shikast nā-padhīr);

(1) HS. iii/4, 71. (2) AT. 149. Other notable qizilbāsh amīrs who were killed were: Muḥammad Khān Ustājlū, governor of Diyār Bakr, Walī Khān Beg Qazāqlū Turkman, Sulṭān 'Alī Mīrzā Afshār (who was taken prisoner by the Ottomans under the impression that he was the Shāh, and was put to death when the mistake was discovered), and Pīr 'Umar Beg Shīrajībāshī. (3) HS. iii/4, 79-80. (4) AT. 374.

the defeat at Chāldirān had a marked effect on Isma'īl's character and behaviour (dar akhlāq wa raftār-i ū ta'thīr-i farawān kard); his egotism and arrogance were changed to despair and dejection (khwud-khwahī wa ghurūrash bi-nawmīdī wa malāl mubaddal shud (1)).

Isma'īl's loss of prestige was reflected in a deterioration in his relations with the qizilbāsh, and powerful amīrs, such as Amīr Khān Turkmān, the governor of Khurāsān, openly defied his authority. Isma'īl himself seems to have spent much of his time in drunken debauches, and the effective control of affairs passed more and more into the hands of the wakīl, Mīrzā Shāh Husayn. For some five or six years in succession, Isma'īl wintered at Tabrīz or Nakhchiwān; most of his time was spent in hunting, or in the company of rosy-cheeked youths, quaffing goblets of purple wine, and listening to the strains of music and song. Affairs of state and of finance were in the hands and at the discretion of Mīrzā Shāh Husayn Isfahānī; the latter acquitted himself of these duties in a fitting manner, and the people were satisfied with and grateful for his impeccable conduct (husn-i ma'āsh). The Shāh too made every effort to gratify him (tarāḡī-yi khaṭīr-i ū), and placed the management of affairs so completely in his hands that he was envied by all the amīrs and officers of state (2).

The Jawāhir al-Akhbār states that this "Khusraw of religion" (i. e., Isma'īl) had absolutely no knowledge of his own affairs and for a considerable period was in the hands of the wakīls and wazīrs (muṭlaq az muhimmāt-i khwud khabar nadāsht wa muddatī bi-dast-i wukalā wa wuzarā būd) (3).

Although this can refer only to the period after Chāldirān, the statement is none the less uncompromising in its severity. It is clear that both Khwurshāh and Budāq Munshī Qazwīnī, who completed their chronicles in 970/

(1) Naṣr Allāh Falsafī, Jang-i Chāldirān, 121. (2) TIN. 462a. (3) JA. 294a.

On Page
255
زندگانی شاه عباس
نوشته شده است
در
زندگانی
شاه عباس
اموال
در کتاب ۱۰۱۰

1562-3 and 984/1576-7 respectively, considered that the authority of the Shāh had been profoundly weakened during the latter part of Isma'īl's reign. It is also clear that, although the fundamental dichotomy between Turk and Persian had been a source of friction in the Ṣafawid state since its establishment, the fact that it so soon constituted a serious threat to the very existence of the Ṣafawid state must be attributed to the decline in the authority of the ruling institution during the second half of Isma'īl's reign - a decline for which Isma'īl himself was responsible. Tahmāsp, in fact, inherited a situation which was the product of Isma'īl's indifference to state affairs from Chāldirān onwards.

Turkomān resentment at the appointment of Persians to the wikālat, already manifested during the wikālat of Najm-i Thānī, was increased by the fact that Mīrzā Shāh Husayn exercised undue influence over the Shāh. "When the sun of the dignity and grandeur of the wakīl al-salṭana and i'timād al-dawla Mīrzā Shāh Husayn reached the zenith of perfection, and the authority of the amīrs and pillars of the state in the conduct of the affairs of state was reduced (dast-i ikhtiyār-i sāyir-i umarā wa arkān-i dawlat az saranjām-i muhāmm-i salṭanat kūtah gardīd), the flames of envy, (an emotion) which is inherent in amīr and wazīr, great and small, consumed the minds of those who stood close to the throne which is the repository of the caliphate, and, the fire of jealousy being kindled by the breeze of fanaticism in the hearts of most of the nobles of the court (a'yan-i haḍrat), the sparks of guile and deceit glowed on the cheeks of their fortunes; but through awe of the king, who protects his servants (az shukūh-i pādishāh-i banda-nawāz), they did not have the temerity to offer any opposition to the wakīl" (qudrat nadāshtand ki dast-i ta'arruḍ bi-dāman-i 'arḍ-i ānjanāb rasānand) (1).

(1) HS. iii/4, 106.

According to Naṣr Allāh Falsafī, two members of Isma'īl's ḥaram, Tājlu Khānum, his inamorata (ma'shūqa), and Bihruza Khānum, his wife by legal contract (zan-i 'aqdī), were captured by Salīm at the battle of Chāldirān and taken to Istanbul. Tājlu Khānum obtained her ransom with a pair of ruby ear-rings which she gave to her captor Masīḥ Pāshā, and set off in the direction of Tabrīz. Naṣr Allāh Falsafī quotes the Tārīkh-i 'Ālam-Ārā as saying that Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn, then the wazīr of Dūrmīsh Khān, came across Tājlu Khānum as she wandered blindly through Ādharbāyjan, ignorant of the whereabouts of the Shāh's camp, and took her to Isma'īl; for this action he was rewarded by being appointed to the wizārat wa niẓārat-i dīwān-i shāhī. Naṣr Allāh Falsafī further quotes the Tārīkh-i Jahān-Ārā, attributed to Mullā Abū Bakr Tīhrānī (MS. in the Kitābkhāna-yi Millī), which states that Isma'īl conferred the manṣab-i wizārat wa niẓārat-i dīwān-i a'lā on Mīrzā Ḥusayn Mi'mār Iṣfahānī, who was one of the retainers (mulāzimān) of Dūrmīsh Khān, for his devotion (jānsipārī) in conveying one or two of the virtuous women of the pavilion of magnificence and glory (mukhaddarāt-i surādiq-i jāh wa jalāl) to Darguzīn, and it was decreed that that eminent person (Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn) should undertake the conduct of the affairs of state (muta'abhid-i saranjām-i umūr-i salṭanat gashta), and that all the amīrs and pillars of the state should undertake to obey him and not enter into any affair, large or small, without his prior knowledge (bī wuqūf-i ū dar hīch muhimmī az muhimmāt-i juz'ī wa kullī dakhil nanamāyand) (1).

The terminology employed by the sources throws some light on the way in which the original conception of the wikālat was changing as the original organization of the Ṣūfī order developed into the administrative system of

(1) Naṣr Allāh Falsafī, Jang-i Chāldirān, 106-9.

v.s.
192

the Safawid state. The emphasis is no longer on the wakīl as the representative of the person of the Shāh, wakīl-i nafs-i nafs-i humāyūn; this title was used in respect of Amīr 'Abd al-Bāqī on his appointment to the wikālat in 918/1512, but does not seem to have been used again after that date. The emphasis is rather on the wakīl as head of the bureaucracy, as the representative of the temporal administration, and as the trustworthy support of the state; hence Mīrza Shāh Husayn's office is termed, not only wikālat (1), but the niẓārat-i dīwān-i a'lā (2), and niẓārat-i dīwān (3), and he is entitled wakīl al-salṭana and i'timād al-dawla (4). The Ḥabīb al-Siyar does not use the term wakīl-i nafs-i nafs-i humāyūn in respect of Mīrza Shāh not m, but, after stating that Isma'īl wished to place the administration of affairs and matters of state and kingship in the skilful and competent hands of a knowledgeable person (mutawwajih-i ān gasht ki zimām-i ratq wa fatq wa qabḍ wa bast wa ḥall wa 'aqd wa dād wa sitad-i umūr wa muhimmāt-i sarkār-i salṭanat wa pādishāhī-rā dar qabḍa-yi dirāyat wa kaff-i kifāyat-i ṣāhib-i kiyāsati nihad), goes on to say that after consultation and questioning (istishāra wa istikhāra), the khal'at of this exalted office (manṣab-i jalīlat al-marātib) fitted the figure (bar qāmat.....chust āmad) of Mīrza Shāh Husayn, who was formerly enrolled in the ranks of the great nā'ibs of Dūrmīsh Khān (5).

Dūrmīsh Khān b. 'Abdī Beg Shāmlū, who was the īshik-āqāsī of the dīwān-i a'lā, had been appointed governor of Iṣfahān in 909/1503-4; he had appointed Mīrza Shāh Husayn Iṣfahānī the architect (mi'mār) his wazīr and nā'ib, and had entrusted to him all the duties appertaining to himself (bi-khadamātī ki bi-ū muta'alliq būd bi-ū rujū' namūd), and had himself

(1) AT. 374. (2) ibid., 150. (3) Shar. ii, 159. (4) HS. iii/4, 88: 106. (5) ibid., 79-80.

remained in the royal retinue (1). Dürmīsh Khān had been appointed lala to Sām Mīrzā on the latter's birth in 923/1517. Dürmīsh Khān was distinguished among all the loyal amīrs by his close relationship and intimacy (with the Shāh) (az jamī'-i umarā'-i dhawī'l-ikhlas bi-mazīd-i taqarrub wa ikhtisās imtiyāz dāsht) (2). He had conducted a successful campaign in Māzandarān in 924/1518 (3).

Who's who
By virtue of his appointment to the wikālat, Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn had risen above his former superior; all the amīrs and pillars of the state, and all the wazīrs and nobles of the court, were ordered to obey him (i. e., Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn), and, putting the saddle-cloth of obedience on their shoulders, not to enter upon any affair, whether important or trivial, without informing him and obtaining his advice (4). Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn was nevertheless embarrassed by the continued presence of Dürmīsh Khān at court, and irritated by his intervention in important state affairs, and in 927/1521 the wakīl was instrumental in getting Dürmīsh Khān appointed governor of Harāt and despatched to Khurāsān (5).

When Dürmīsh Khān arrived at Harāt in November 1521, he learnt that the retiring governor, Amīr Khān Turkman, who had been recalled by Isma'īl to account for his execution of Amīr Sayyid Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad, the ṣadr of Tahmāsp Mīrzā, had left Harāt and gone to Sabzawār. Dürmīsh Khān followed Amīr Khān Turkman there, but was persuaded, by means of liberal hospitality, to neglect to carry out his orders, and Amīr Khān returned to Harāt convinced that he would retain the governorship of Harāt (yaqīn gasht ki bi-dastūr-i sābiq iyālat-i harāt muta'alliq bi-ū khwāhad būd) (6). At

(1) BM. Or. 3248, 92a. (2) HS. iii/4, 83. (3) AT. 167-8. (4) HS. iii/4, 80. (5) TIN. 462b. (6) AT. 174-5.

this juncture Khwāja Ḥabīb Allāh arrived from the Court and informed Dūrmīsh that he had brought several dossiers (parwāncha) concerning the punishment (mu'akhadha) of the wazīrs and muqarrabs of Amīr Khān in respect of the murder of Amīr Muḥammad b. Yūsuf (i.e. Amīr Sayyid Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad); if he (Dūrmīsh Khān) thought fit, he (Khwāja Ḥabīb Allāh) would meet Amīr Khān and show him the orders (aḥkām) mentioned above. Dūrmīsh Khān replied that he did not wish Amīr Khān to receive injury at his hands, and instructed the Khwāja to conceal the orders (man radī nīstam ki amīr khān az man āzar yabād aḥkām-i ma'hūd-rā ikhfā kun). The next day Khwāja Ḥabīb Allāh intercepted Amīr Khān, who asked with acerbity (az rūyi i'rad wa i'tirād) what injury he had done to Khwāja Shāh Ḥusayn (i.e., the wakīl) to make the latter want to harm him. The Khwāja replied that Amīr Khān had killed without cause Amīr Muḥammad b. Amīr Yūsuf, a descendant of the Prophet, and that Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn was devoted to the Prophet's house (az muḥibbān-i ān khānadān ast). Amīr Khān turned away his face, and the Khwāja returned to Harāt (1). From this account it appears that it was in fact the wakīl, Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn, who had been principally concerned to bring to justice those responsible for the death of Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad.

The position held by Khwāja Ḥabīb Allāh is not clear. Dūrmīsh Khān was the governor of Khurāsān, with Sām Mīrzā as his ward; Dūrmīsh Khān received Khwāja Ḥabīb Allāh and in the customary manner (bi-dastūr ma'hūd) entrusted to him the great seal (muhr-i 'ālī), and gave him full and absolute authority (sarpanja-yi iqtidarash-rā qawī wa muṭlaq gardānīd) in the management and conduct of administrative and financial affairs, both

(1) AT. 175.

general and particular, throughout the province of Khurāsān (dar qabḍ wa bast wa ḥall wa 'aqd wa dād wa sitad wa tamshiyat-i umūr-i juz'ī wa kulli wa mulkī wa malī-yi tamām-i wilāyat-i khurāsān), and Khwāja Ḥabīb Allāh reclined on the seat of government and authority in full independence (min hayth al-istiqlāl wa'l-infirād bar masnad-i hukūmat wa dārā'ī tikya zada). He devoted himself to the interests of justice and of the people, and enquired diligently into cases of oppression. He was the support of sayyids, qādīs, 'ulamā and muftīs, and the patron of poets and writers (arbāb-i inshā'). Agriculturalists (dahāqīn) and cultivators (muzārī'an), upon the proper regulation of whose affairs depends the orderly disposition of the world and its inhabitants (ki nizām-i ḥāl-i 'ālam wa 'ālamīyān bi-intizām-i muḥamm-i Iṣhān muta'alliq ast), rested secure in the shadow of his favour and beneficence. Merchants were the recipients of his favour. He made (considerable) reductions (mablaghā takhfiif namūda) in the tanghā (dues on merchandise) and in taxes (bāj wa kharāj). He exempted (mu'āf dāsht) the artisans (muḥtarifāt) and tradespeople (ahl-i aswāq), who were burdened with all kinds of difficulties (mutaḥammilān-i anwā'-i mashāqq) and charged with matters beyond their endurance (mutakaffilān-i umūr-i mā-lā-yaṭāq), from levies (taḥmilāt) and extraordinary taxes (ikhrajāt)⁽¹⁾, and fixed their regular subventions (muqarrariyyāt) to the best of his ability (ḥasb al-maqdūr)⁽²⁾. Although the fact that Dürmīsh Khān gave Khwāja Ḥabīb Allāh the great seal suggests that the latter was muhrdār, the above account of his activities suggests rather that he was the wazīr of Dürmīsh Khān. As has already been stated, the wazīr, like the amīr al-umarā and the ṣadr, had a provincial counterpart.

(1) see TM. 183. (2) HS. iii/4, 102.

Khawāja Ḥabīb Allāh was murdered in 932/1525 by a mutinous body of Shāmlū troops, who apparently went unpunished. He was playing backgammon, when a group of Shāmlū troops, who had not received their pay (marsūm), entered. They shouted (āwāz buland kardand) that the Khawāja should release them from their engagement, since they were not receiving their pay. (chūn mawājib bi-dast-i mā namī āyad az nawkarī marā ikhrāj kun). The Khawāja thereupon discharged them (shumā-rā rukhsat dādam). They then demanded a laissez-passer (khatt-i rāh), and the Khawāja, with great presumption (az kamāl-i ghurūr), procured pen and ink and wrote the permit with his own hand, sealed it, and handed it to them. The Shāmlūs at once went to their commanding officer (sardār), Yār Ahmad Khalīfa, and repeated the Khawāja's words to him. Yār Ahmad and the Shāmlūs surrounded the Khawāja's house, overcame the resistance of his servants (mulāzimān), and killed his son and all his relations and servants, some 100 persons in all. Darwīsh Beg Rūmlū seized the Khawāja himself; the latter asked his captor to take him to Sām Mīrza so that the prince might pronounce him deserving of death or not. Darwīsh Beg Rūmlū tried to smuggle him away with a cloak over his head, but the Khawāja was recognised by some of the Shāmlūs and killed. The Khawāja was noted for his efforts on behalf of the poor and sick (1).

The friction between the wakīl Mīrza Shāh Ḥusayn and the qizilbāsh continued, and the jealousy and frustration of the amīrs finally induced them to assassinate the wakīl. Their opportunity occurred as a result of a dispute between the wakīl and the rikābdār. The wakīl had cleared (ifrāgh) the accounts of the rikābdār Mihtar Shāh Qulī, who handled large sums in connexion with the expenditure of the royal household (jihat-i

(1) AT. 197-8.

ikhrajāt-i kārkhāna-yi humāyūn), and had declared a deficit of 7,000 tūmans to be due from that fraudulent official (mablagh-i haft hazār tūmān barān khāyin baqī kashīda); Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn demanded that sum (ṭalīb-i ānwajh būd), but Mihtar Shāh Qulī, relying on his rise to a position of intimacy with the Shah (bi-wāsiṭa-yi ṣu'ūd bar darajāt-i taqarrub-i padishāhī), paid little attention to this demand, and continued to discharge his duties at Court in the usual way, without attempting to produce the sum required (dar saranjām-i ānwajh ihmāl warzīda bi-dastūr-i shara'it mulāzamat-i sudda-yi amānat wa karāmat bi-jāy mī āward). Towards the end of the winter (929/1523), the wakīl reported the situation to the Shāh, who gave orders for the collection (taḥṣīl) of the sum due. But although the wakīl showed courtesy and consideration (muḍārā wa muwāsā) towards the rikābdār, and did not press him for payment, the rikābdār planned to kill him.

On 28 Jumada I, 929/14 April 1523 Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn left a convivial gathering in a state of considerable intoxication; the Shāh had retired previously. Mihtar Shāh Qulī came up behind the wakīl and stabbed him in the back, and shouted to the qurchīs on guard at the entrance to the palace (āstāna-yi 'aliyya) that the Shāh had ordered them to kill that man; the qurchīs at once drew their swords and killed the wakīl (1). The Tārīkh-i Ilchī-yi Niẓāmshāh asserts that the Turkomāns, jealous of the power of Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn, had several times tried to murder him. According to this source, Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn was drinking, when Mihtar Shāh Qulī the rikābdār entered with the message that Isma'īl wanted him. The wakīl, inebriated, was slow to obey, and, when the rikābdār urged him to hurry, Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn struck him. The rikābdār reported the incident to

(1) HS. iii/4, 106.

Isma'īl who, also drunk, said "had you no hands with which to defend yourself?" The rikābdār interpreted this as an order to kill the wakīl, and proceeded to do so, with the willing help of a group of Turkomāns who were present. The rikābdār and his accomplices fled to Shīrwān, but were caught and put to death by Isma'īl, who was grieved at the death of the wakīl (1). The Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh states that the rikābdār was extradited by the Shīrwānshāh, and was handed over by Isma'īl to the ghulamās of the late wakīl to be put to death (2). The Ḥabīb al-Siyar confirms that Isma'īl executed some of the qūrchīs involved in the attack on the wakīl, including Kūr Sulaymān (3). The Haft Iqlīm states that Isma'īl visited retribution upon many qūrchīs and amīrs (kas-i bisyarī az qūrchī wa umarā-rā bi-pādāsh rasanīd) (4).

Hasan Rūmlū, in his obituary notice on the wakīl, Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn, emphasizes the immense power wielded by him, and describes his rise from the comparatively humble position of a mason and architect (amr-i mi'mārī wa bannā'ī) at Iṣfahān. At first, he held a series of minor posts, including the position of wazīr to the dārūgha of Iṣfahān, who was a retainer (mulāzim) of Dūrmīsh Khān (ba'd az ān mutaṣaddī-yi umūr-i juzwiyya khuṣūṣan wizārat-i dārūgha-yi ānjā ki mulāzim-i dūrmīsh khān būd gasht), and then by means of every kind of worthy service (bi-wāsiṭa-yi har gūna khadamāt-i lāyiqa), he rose to the most illustrious and exalted position of wakīl (amr-i jalīl al-qadr-i 'aẓīm al-sha'n-i wikalat). Since the Supreme Architect fashioned the world, no man of rank and position had acquired such power in the office of the dīwān-i wizārat (ṣahīb-i jāhī

(1) TIN. 463a-b. (2) AT. 178. (3) HS. iii/4, 107. (4) HI. 360a.

chūn ū dar amr-i dīwān-i wizārat mutamakkin nagashta) (1). The significant use of the term dīwān-i wizārat to describe the wakīl's office clearly suggests that there was a tendency to forget the unique position of the wakīl as nafs-i nafs-i humāyūn, and to regard him simply as the head of the bureaucracy, and therefore tantamount to wazīr. The highest officer of state, however, was still termed wakīl, and the wazīr or wazīrs were still subordinate to him (2).

In the case of Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn, as previously in the case of Najm-i Thānī, the arrogance of the wakīl did not make for better relations with the qizilbāsh. Such was his arrogance that, trusting in royal favour, he acknowledged the existence of no one, and treated the pillars of the victorious state as though they did not exist (az kamāl-i ghurūr tikya bar alṭāf-i khusrawāna karda hīchkas-rā wujūdī namīgudhāsht arkan-i dawlat-i qāhira-rā ma'dūm mī angāsht). The result was that everyone nursed a grievance against him (khāṭir-i hamagī azū āzurda gashta), and conspired to assassinate him (3).

After the death of Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn, the wazīr Khwāja Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Tabrīzī took his place (qāyim-maqām-i ū gardīd) (4). The Shāh raised him to the exalted rank of wakīl, and made him the successor of Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn (bi-rujū'-i manṣab-i jalīlat al-marātib-i wikālat sarafrāz sākhta qāyim-maqām-i mīrzā shāh ḥusayn gardānīd) (5). The Tārīkh-i Ilchī-yi Nizāmshāh, referring to the appointment, also uses the phrase manṣab-i wikālat (6). On the other hand, it is clear that the trend towards the use of the term wizārat to denote the highest office of state is maintained,

(1) AT. 177-8. (2) During the wikālat of Shāh Ḥusayn Mīrzā, Qāqī Jahān Qazwīnī and Khwāja Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Tabrīzī were joint wazīrs (AT. 374). (3) AT. 178. (4) ibid., 180. (5) HS. iii/4, 107. (6) TIN. 463b.

because the Sharafnāma refers to the appointment of Khwāja Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad to the manṣab-i wizarat (1), and the Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh refers to Khwāja Amīr Tabrīzī, "who became wazīr after Shāh Ḥusayn Mīrzā" (ki ba'd az mīrzā shāh ḥusayn wazīr gashta būd), and states that while Isma'īl was still alive, the Khwāja was the "independent wazīr of His Majesty" (wazīr-i mustaqill-i anḥadrat), and that after the death of Isma'īl "he undertook the duties of wazīr" (mutaqabbil-i wizarat....gashta) to Ṭahmāsp (2). Khwāja Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad, following the precedent of Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn (bi-dastūr-i mīrzā shāh ḥusayn), strove to strengthen the edifice of the state, and laid the foundations of the people's welfare (3). Ten months after the appointment of Khwāja Jalāl al-Dīn, Shāh Isma'īl died (19 Rajab 930/23 May 1524) (4), and his eldest son Ṭahmāsp succeeded him at the age of ten years and six months (5).

To sum up, the reign of Shāh Isma'īl I was a period of change and adjustment, during which the ṣūfī organization of the Ṣafawid order developed into the Ṣafawid state, and during which the new and still largely "experimental" administrative system endeavoured to overcome the problems posed by the conflict of authority between many of the principal officers of state, and by the more fundamental conflict between the Turkish and Persian elements in the state. This formative process continued under Isma'īl's successor Ṭahmāsp, but already by the time of the death of Isma'īl certain significant changes had occurred. The imposition of doctrinal uniformity, which had largely been achieved by the time of the death of Isma'īl, resulted in the energies of the ṣadr henceforward being devoted mainly to the

(1) Shar. ii, 167. (2) AT. 184. (3) HS. iii/4, 108. (4) AT. 181; Shar. ii, 168. (5) AT. 184.

115
the preservation of the existing religious institution, and especially to the administration of waqf property. The abandonment of the term wakīl-i nafs-i nafs-i humāyūn, and the tendency to use the word wazīr instead of wakīl, noticeable before the death of Isma'īl, indicate that the movement away from the theocratic state and towards the separation of the religious institution and the political institution had begun before the end of Isma'īl's reign. As in the early caliphate, during the first period of Ṣafawid dominion the religious institution and the political institution were one. In the Ṣafawid state, the religious institution was from the first subordinated to the political institution (1). Professor Lambton has noted that under the later Tīmūrids there appears to have been a renewed attempt to re-incorporate more fully the religious institution into the bureaucratic administration by means of the creation of the office of ṣadr (2). It seems likely that the creation of the office of wikalat-i nafs-i nafs-i humāyūn by the Ṣafawids had a similar motive. As the Ṣafawid state developed, the temporal arm became progressively more powerful, and the authority of the ṣadr declined once the paramount task of achieving doctrinal unity had been accomplished. The title of wakīl, which reflected both the religious and temporal authority of the Shāh, fell into disuse, and the chief officer of state, as his function gradually ceased to have any religious significance and he became almost exclusively concerned with the affairs of the bureaucracy, tended increasingly to be referred to by the traditional title of the head of the bureaucracy, namely, wazīr. The disappearance of the wakīl under the later Ṣafawids suggests that by then the separation of the religious institution and the political institution

(1) A. K. S. Lambton, Quis custodiet custodes, in Studia Islamica, vi/1956, 127. (2) A. K. S. Lambton, ibid., in Studia Islamica, v/1956, 147.

TAMMASP

had become an accomplished fact.

As already stated, Ṭahmāsp I came to the throne at the age of ten and a half. As he was a minor, he was helpless in the hands of the qizilbāsh amīrs, who proceeded to assume control of the state. During the first ten years of his reign (930-40/1524-33), Ṭahmāsp took little part in the actual government of the state. The supremacy of the Turko-mān military chiefs resulted in the temporary revival of the post of amīr al-umara; it has been suggested above that the appointment of Chāyan Sulṭān to the amīr al-umara'ī in 915/1509-10 was part of a deliberate attempt by Isma'īl to curb the power of the qizilbāsh amīrs (1). During the first decade of the reign of Ṭahmāsp, the amīr al-umara again became one of the most important officials in the state, and, in addition to his pre-eminent military position, exercised full authority in the political and administrative field. The dominant position of the Turkish element in the state during this period meant a corresponding decline in the power of the Persian element. The wakīl Khwāja Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Tabrīzī (2) was at variance with the amīr al-umara Dīw Sulṭān Rūmlū, with the eventual result that the latter had the wakīl put to death by burning (3) (930/1524). The Tārīkh-i Ilchī-yi Nizāmshāh states that Khwāja Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Tabrīzī, who in the time of Shāh Isma'īl held the post of wakīl, at this juncture, because the amīrs and wazirs were hostile to him, was fettered (muqayyad) and 7,000 tūmans were extorted from him and his followers (tābi'anash), eventually he was burnt with pitch (naft) and reeds (būriyā) (4).

The confusing and often contradictory terminology of the sources indicates that under Isma'īl there was no clear demarcation of function

(1) See p. 187 ff. (2) See p. 211 above. (3) AT. 184. (4) TIN. 465a.

as regards the high offices of state, and under Ṭahmāsp the same confusion persists. The Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh states that Dīw Sulṭān succeeded Chāyān Sulṭān as amīr al-umara in 930/1523-4 (1), confirms that Dīw Sulṭān was amīr al-umara after the accession of Ṭahmāsp (2), and states that Ṭahmāsp entrusted the control of the affairs of the kingdom to him (zimān-i umūr-i mamlikat-rā bi-dīw sulṭān rūmlū rujū' namūd). The supervision of the dīwān-i a'lā, after the burning of Khwāja Jalāl al-Dīn, was entrusted by Ṭahmāsp to Qādī Jahān Qazwīnī (niẓārat-i dīwān-i a'lā ba'd az iḥrāq-i jalāl al-dīn bi-qādī jahān qazwīnī tafwīd kard) (3). On the other hand, it is stated that Dīw Sulṭān and Kupuk Sulṭān Ustājlu became joint wakīls (4), that in 931/1524-5 there occurred a dispute between Dīw Sulṭān and Kupuk Sulṭān about the wikālat (bi wazīṭa-yi wikālat ghubār-i niqār irtifa' yāft) (5), and that Dīw Sulṭān proceeded to rally to his side the non-Ustājlu amīrs in order to wrest the wikālat from Kupuk Sulṭān (tā mansab-i wikālat az way intizā', namāyam) (6). A passage from the Jawāhir al-Akhbār, already quoted, states that Kupuk Sulṭān succeeded Bāyazīd Sulṭān and Chāyān Sulṭān as amīr al-umara (7). According to the same text, the position in dispute between Kupuk Sulṭān and Dīw Sulṭān

(1) AT. 181. Shar. ii, 169 says that Bāyazīd Sulṭān b. Chāyān Sulṭān succeeded his father as amīr al-umara in 929/1522-3, and that Dīw Sulṭān became amīr al-umara after the death of Bāyazīd Sulṭān in 930/1523-4. JA. 293b., on the other hand, states "and Chāyān Sulṭān died in this year and his place was given to Bāyazīd Sulṭān, and he, too, soon died and Kupuk Sulṭān became his successor". (2) AT. 184. (3) ibid., 185. (4) Shar. ii, 169. Kupuk Sulṭān was the paternal uncle of Bāyazīd Sulṭān b. Chāyān Sulṭān the former amīr al-umara. (5) AT. 187. (6) ibid., 188. (7) See above.

was the amīr al-umarā'ī. Dīw Sulṭān became amīr al-umarā by virtue of a testamentary disposition of Isma'īl, "and affixed the seal of amīr-i dīwānī above the (other) amīrs, and Kupuk Sulṭān Ustājlu, who was the successor of Chāyān Sulṭān and considered himself his equal, affixed his seal after him" (wa muhr-i amīr-i dīwānī bar balā-yi umarā zad wa kupuk sulṭān ustājlu ki bar jā-yi chāyān sulṭān būd wa khwud-rā qarīna mīdānist ba'd azū muhr kard) (1).

The Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh gives the following account of the dispute: as the retainers (mulāzimān) of Dīw Sulṭān were in Chukhūr Sa'd, he gave way to the Ustājlu amīrs (az umarā-yi ustājlu tanazzul karda) and went to Lār on the pretext of organizing an expedition against the Uzbegs. From Lār he sent messages to Chūha Sulṭān, the walī of Kalhur, 'Alī Sulṭān Dhu'l-Qadar, the governor of Shīrāz, and Qarāja Sulṭān Takkalu, the toyūldār of Hamadān, and to the other great amīrs (2), to the effect that at the Shāh's command he was proceeding against the Uzbegs, and that they must join him with their troops. Dīw Sulṭān spent the summer (931/1525) at Lār, and the governors of Hazārjarīb and Māzandarān and Rustamdār sent their retainers (mulāzimān) with countless gifts to the court of that noble amīr, and the amīrs also joined him with their troops. Dīw Sulṭān gave lavish hospitality to the amīrs; he wrote documents (nishānhā), sealed them with the Shāh's seal which he had brought with him, and despatched them to Qum and other places in 'Irāq, and, having brought quilted jerkins and breastplates (jubba wa jawshan) he distributed them among the retainers of the amīrs, and won them over by gifts and favours (in'am wa iḥsān), and they all became his followers (majmū' tabī'-i ū gardīdand). Dīw Sulṭān

(1) JA, 297b. (2) JA, 298b mentions also Burūn Sulṭān (Takkalū), governor of Mashhad.

said to the amīrs: "Shāh Ṭahmāsp was concerned to give me his patronage and to see to my welfare (shāh-i dīn-panāh mutawajjih-i tarbiyat wa ri'āyat-i man būd); Kupuk Sulṭān has stirred up discord (ifsād kard); therefore I have come away from those regions; I desire that you in the sincerity of your hearts should gird on the belt of assistance, so that I may wrest the wikālat from him. The amīrs leagued themselves with him (bā way muwāfaqat kardand), and they marched in the direction of Tabrīz".

Qarānja Beg advised Kupuk Sulṭān to resist Dīw Sulṭān by force, but Kupuk Sulṭān rejected this advice, saying: "We are both slaves of the Shāh, and devotees (muḥibbān) of the same threshold; we will not contend with each other." Kupuk Sulṭān went to meet Dīw Sulṭān as he advanced on Tabrīz, and together the two amīrs visited Ṭahmāsp at Jarandāb. There Dīw Sulṭān put to death Qarānja Beg Ustājlū and Nārīn Beg Qājār, who were the authors (khamīr-māya) of this discord, seized Qaḍī Jahān and despatched him to the fortress of Nūrī, and sent Kupuk Sulṭān and all the Ustājlūs to raid Georgia. After their departure Dīw Sulṭān cancelled the toyūls which belonged to the Ustājlūs (toyūl ki muta'alliq-i ustājlū būd qaṭ' gardānīdand). Kupuk Sulṭān had hoped that if he ceased to oppose Dīw Sulṭān the latter would make him joint wakīl with himself (bi-wasiṭa-yi tark-i mukhālafat chashm-i ān mīdasht ki dīw sulṭān ū-rā dar wikālat sharīk-i khwud gardānad). Instead, Chūha Sulṭān affixed his seal in the place of Kupuk Sulṭān; the nizārat-i dīwān-i a'lā was conferred by the Shāh on Amīr Ja'far Sāwajī (in place of Qaḍī Jahān, whom Dīw Sulṭān had imprisoned (1)). These events took place in 931/1524-5, the year following the accession of Ṭahmāsp.

(1) AT. 187-9.

During the last few months of 931 and the first few months of 932 (autumn 1525-spring 1526), when Dīw Sulṭān, Kupuk Sulṭān and Chūha Sulṭān seem jointly to have managed the affairs of state before Dīw Sulṭān and Chūha Sulṭān succeeded in ousting Kupuk Sulṭān and the Ustājlūs from power, they apparently set up a sort of advisory council of three wazīrs. It was ordained that Mīr Ja'far, who was formerly wazīr of Zayn al-Dīn Sulṭān Shāmlū (and who) became wazīr in place of Qādī Jahān but did not enjoy the same confidence as former wazīrs (i'tibar-i wuzarā-yi sābiq nadāsht), and Āqā Mullā, the wazīr of Dīw Sulṭān, and Khwāja Ārūḡ (1) Sāwa'ī, the wazīr of Chūha Sulṭān, all three of whom came from Sāwa, should in conjunction with one another daily report to Dīw Sulṭān, Kupuk Sulṭān and Chūha Sulṭān all matters whether important or trivial, and should act in the interest of one another (bi-ṣalāḡ-i yakdīgar 'amal kunand), and orders (ḡukm) were based on the documents (parwāna) of the amīrs (wa madār-i ḡukm bar parwāna shud) (2).

646
 014
 The Tārīkh-i Ilchī-yi Nizāmshāh gives some interesting additional information: after Ṭahmāsp had been raised to the throne with the consensus of the amīrs and the army (19 Rajab 930/13 February 1524), Qādī Jahān was appointed to the wikālat with the approval of the Ustājlū amīrs (bi-istiṣwāb-i umarā-yi ustājlū rutba-yi wikālat-rā yaft) (3). Qādī Jahān's association with the Ustājlūs makes it clear why Dīw Sulṭān dismissed him in 931/1524-5. Further information on this point is given by the Jawāhir al-Akhbār, which states that when Dīw Sulṭān moved from his camp at Lār towards Tabrīz, he sent Mantashā Sulṭān, the governor of Qazwīn, on ahead to admonish his own tribe (the Ustājlūs); when Mantashā Sulṭān met them,

(1) or Ārūkh; TIN. 471a has Ārūq. (2) JA. 298b-299a. (3) TIN. 464b-465a.

he upbraided them (zajr wa man' namūd) and seized Qādī Jahān and plundered (his possessions), because he had been the cause of the discord and turmoil (ki bā'ith-i fitna wa shūr azū shuda), and wanted to put him to death; Begum Mawṣillū supported Qādī Jahān and enabled him to escape. Later, when Qāranja Beg and Nārīn Beg were executed at Jarandāb, Qādī Jahān was only saved from becoming the third victim by the further intervention of Begum Mawṣillū (1).

As Ṭahmāsp was still a minor, he took little part in the government of the state, and Dīw Sulṭān, who was the atābeg (lala) of Ṭahmāsp and amīr al-umārā by virtue of a testamentary disposition of the late Shāh (bi-ḥukm-i waṣiyyat-i shāh-i firdaws-makān) (2), took over control of state affairs and the administration of the country (dakhl dar umūr-i salṭanat wa dabṭ-i mamlikat mīnamūd). But the Ustājlu amīrs, led by Kupuk Sulṭān, the brother of Chāyān Sulṭān (the late amīr al-umārā), 'Ubayd Allāh Khān, a nephew of Isma'īl, Badr Khān, and Qilij Khān, who surpassed the other Turkish tribes in power and the number of their tribesmen (kuthrat-i qabā'il), refused to tolerate Dīw Sulṭān's excessive pride and arrogant assumption of greatness (ghāyat-i istinkāf wa istikbār-i buzurgī-yi dīw sulṭān-rā qabūl nakardand) (3). When the Rūmlū and Takkalū amīrs rallied to Dīw Sulṭān at Lār, Dūrmīsh Khān, the governor of Harāt, and Zaynal Khān, governor of Astarābād, who were both Shāmlūs, did not join Dīw Sulṭān in person, but they still obeyed the ḥukm of the late

(1) JA. 298a. (2) The Jawāhir al-Akhbār states: "As a result of the testamentary disposition of the murshid (Isma'īl) they (the amīrs assembled at Lār) considered him (Dīw Sulṭān) their leader and chief" (ū-rā muqaddam wa rīsh-safīd-i khwūd dānista) (298b). (3) TIN. 465a-b.

- 219 -

Shāh and considered themselves obliged to aid Dīw Sulṭān (is'ād wa imdād); and they further urged (taḥrīṣ) the other amīrs to support him. As a result, a Shāmlū amīr and even certain Ustājlu amīrs joined Dīw Sulṭān.

In the autumn of 931/1525, when Dīw Sulṭān marched on Tabrīz from Lār, his officers sent a message to Kupuk Sulṭān and the Ustājlu faction at Tabrīz to the effect that as Isma'īl at his death had entrusted Ṭahmāsp to the care of Dīw Sulṭān, who was one of the veteran Ṣūfīs of the Ṣafawid house (az ṣūfiyān-i qadīm-i īn dūdmanast), and had taken solemn oaths ('ahd wa paymān girifta) from the other amīrs that they would not act contrary to his (Dīw Sulṭān's) judgement, it was incumbent on them all to obey Isma'īl's injunction (waṣiyyat), and they (the Ustājlu) should therefore come out from Tabrīz to welcome Dīw Sulṭān; otherwise civil war would ensue, and the enemies of Persia would get the chance for which they had been waiting for years. The amīrs at Tabrīz, reflecting on the dishonour which would attach to their name if they refused this request, decided to comply. Dīw Sulṭān retained the post of atābeg to Ṭahmāsp on the same terms as before (bi-qā'ida-yi ma'hūd). Within a short time (bi-andak rūzī) Dīw Sulṭān and Chūha Sulṭān Takkalū jointly occupied the post of amīr al-umarā, and the Ustājlu amīrs were excluded from all part in state affairs (dar jamī'-i muhimmāt-i dīwānī bī dakhil būdand). Dīw Sulṭān and Chūha Sulṭān aimed at the complete dispersal of the Ustājlu (himmat bar tafraqa wa parīshānī-yi umarā-yi madhkūr dashtand), and despatched them each to an iqṭā'.

Kupuk Sulṭān realized that his position was untenable (1), and withdrew to his provinces of Erivan and Nakhchiwān. Dīw Sulṭān and Chūha

(1) lit. "the piece (muhra) of his destiny was trapped in the shishdar of confusion and turmoil", a metaphor from backgammon.

Sulṭān took advantage of his absence (ghaybat-i ū-rā ghanīmat dānista) to alienate and transfer most of the territory forming the iqṭā' of the Ustājlu tribe (akbhar-i wilāyat ki iqṭā'-i ān ṭayifa būd taghyīr wa tabdīl dādand) (1). This action provoked the Ustājlu to armed retaliation; in 932/1525-6, "as a result of the cancellation of their ulkā" (bi-wasiṭa-yi qaṭ'-i ulkā), the Ustājlu amīrs commenced hostilities (aghāz-i mukhālafat karda) (2). Qāsim Khalīfa Warsāq was delegated to negotiate with the Ustājlu amīrs, and made great efforts to effect an agreement between the two parties, but "the heavenly decree prevailed, and the thread of hostility could not be cut save by the sword" (3). In the first battle fought between the rival qizilbash factions, in the region of Sulṭāniyya, the Ustājlu gained an initial advantage by routing the Takkalū contingent, but were eventually put to flight; they suffered a further defeat at Kharzawīl near Ṭarum (4), and took refuge in the forests of Gilān (5). Kupuk Sulṭān pondered night and day how to wrest the wikalat from Dīw Sulṭān (rūz wa shab dar fikr-i ān būd ki bi-chi ṭarīq manṣab-i wikalat-rā az dast-i dīw sulṭān bīrūn āwarad) (6). The following year (933/1526-7), Kupuk Sulṭān led the Ustājlu against Ardabīl, defeated and killed the aged governor of Ardabīl Bādinjān Sulṭān Rūmlū, and marched on Tabrīz. He met Dīw Sulṭān and Chūha Sulṭān near Shurūr^a, but was defeated and killed (7). Darwīsh Beg and Muḥammadi Mīrza Qaramānlū were also killed, and the surviving Ustājlu amīrs fled back to Rasht (8).

(1) TIN. 465b-466a. Shar. ii, 171 uses a similar phrase: ulkā-yi ū-rā taghyīr dada. (2) AT. 191. TIN. 466a states that they assembled on the plain of Sulṭāniyya in the spring of 932/1526, and began to behave with considerable licence (bī-hifāzī). (3) ibid., 191-2. (4) in the latter battle they were reinforced by 7,000 infantry sent by Muḥaffar Sulṭān the governor of Rasht. (5) AT. 192-4. (6) ibid., 198. (7) ibid., 199-200. (8) JA. 300a.

- 221 -

As a result of the conflict between the amīrs, the body politic was destitute of administration and order (wujūd-i mamlikat az ḡabṭ wa nasaq 'arī būd), and confusion rent the country (harj wa marj bi-ḡal-i wilāyat rāh yāfta); many of the qizilbāsh troops from Khurāsān were drawn into the civil war, and the Uzbegs were allowed to seize Ṭūs and Astarābād and roam at will in Khurāsān (1).

The struggle for supreme power in the state was not settled by the death of Kūpuk Sulṭān. Discord arose between the leaders of the coalition which had defeated him, and on 5 Shawwāl 933/5 July 1527 Dīw Sulṭān Rūmlū was killed at the instigation of Chūha Sulṭān, and his army (qushūn) given to one of his retainers named Sulaymān Beg Rūmlū; Chūha Sulṭān became wakīl (2). Apparently Chūha Sulṭān Takkalū had represented to Ṭahmāsp that it would be advisable to get rid of Dīw Sulṭān, as he was the author (khamīr-maya) of the discord among the qizilbāsh tribes (3). When Dīw Sulṭān entered the dīwān, Ṭahmāsp shot an arrow at him which, despite the Shāh's lack of strength ('adam-tawānā'ī-yi shāhī), struck Dīw Sulṭān in the chest. At a signal from Ṭahmāsp, Dīw Sulṭān was then dispatched by the guards (muwakillān) (4). Chūha Sulṭān followed up this success by inducing some of the Ustājilū amīrs who had taken refuge in Gīlān after the death of Kūpuk Sulṭān to return to their allegiance. They were received by Ṭahmāsp at Qazwīn; each of them was treated as befitted his position, and assigned to an ulkā and an office (manṣab) (5).

As the wakīl of the still youthful Ṭahmāsp, Chūha Sulṭān was the

(1) TIN. 466b states that most of the Ṣafawid governors in Khurāsān had left their iqṭā's and gone to the Rayy and Khwār district of 'Irāq-i 'Ajam; they included the governors of Nīshāpūr, Sabzawār, Astarābād, and Dāmghān and Bisṭām. (2) AT. 205. (3) Shar. ii, 172. (4) ibid., ii, 172-3. (5) ibid., ii, 178. Jawāhir al-Akhbār 302b mentions Mantashā Sulṭān, Ḥamza Sulṭān, and Badr Khān.

virtual ruler of the state; the administration was entirely in his hands (ratq wa fatq-i salṭanat-i shāh ṭahmāsp dar qabḍa-yi iqtidār-i chūha sulṭān takkalū būd) (1). This Chūha, although outwardly somewhat mad, was nevertheless unequalled in administrative procedure (īn chūha agarchi ḡahiran junūnī dāsht amma dar qawā'id-i mamlikatdārī bī qarīna būd) (2). The confusion between the terms wakīl and amīr al-umarā is still apparent. According to the Tārīkh-i Ilchī-yi Nizāmshāh, Dīw Sulṭān and Chūha Sulṭān quarrelled over the amīr al-umarā'ī; Chūha Sulṭān succeeded in getting Dīw Sulṭān put to death, and himself assumed the function of sole wakīl (khwad dar amr-i wikālat bī mushārakat shurū' namūd), and became so powerful that only the name of kingship was left to Ṭahmāsp. He distributed most of the provinces to members of his own tribe, the Takkalūs, and raised them all to the rank of amīr al-umarā, khān or sulṭān (har yakī-rā bi-martaba-yi amīr al-umarā'ī wa khānī wa daraja-yi sulṭānī rasānīd) (3).

file
The amīr al-umarā'ī referred to above is presumably the post of provincial amīr al-umarā. Just as the wazīr and the ṣadr, who were organs of the central administration, had their provincial equivalents, in the same way amīr al-umarās were from time to time appointed to the strategically most important provinces, especially in times of military crisis. For instance, Ulama Sulṭān is referred to as the amīr al-umarā of Ādharbāy-jān (4), and as late as 984/1576 Shāh Qulī Sulṭān Ustājlū is referred to as the amīr al-umarā of Khurāsān (5). This Shāh Qulī Sulṭān, known as Yakān Shāh Qulī, had been appointed lala to Muḥammad Khudābanda in 974/1566, and had accompanied Muḥammad Khudābanda to Harāt when the latter took up his post as governor there the same year (6), and had been the virtual ruler of

(1) Shar. i, 418. (2) JA. 502b. (3) TIN. 466b. (4) ibid., 471a.
(5) AT. 485. (6) ibid., 430.

Khurāsān (1). In 975/1567-8 his homonym Shāh Qulī Sulṭān Ustājlu was sent by Ṭahmāsp on an embassy to Salīm II (2). The Jawāhir al-Akhbār states that they Shāh sent Shāh Qulī Sulṭān Ustājlu, the governor of the marches of Ādharbāyjān (ḥākim-i sarḥadd-i ādharbāyjān), who was amīr al-umarā, to accompany the returning Ottoman ambassador (3). The context seems to suggest that Shāh Qulī Sulṭān Ustājlu was in fact amīr al-umarā of Ādharbāyjān, that is, a provincial amīr al-umarā, and not the supreme amīr al-umarā of the central administration, who was normally attached to the court, and not appointed governor of any specific area.

11
Local
wakil
There are indications that, during the reign of Ṭahmāsp, the term wakīl was also used, in the sense of "representative, deputy, vice-", without any suggestion of the religious significance attached, at any rate originally, to the wakīl who was the organ of the central administration, to denote persons who were simply representatives or deputies of provincial governors. In this sense, the wakīl is usually coupled with the wazīr in a manner which suggests that in this context the two terms were synonymous or at least complementary. For instance, the author of the Jawāhir al-Akhbār, Budāq Munshī Qazwīnī, refers to his uncle, Amīr Beg Shālkānī (?) Qazwīnī, who held the post of wazīr and wakīl of Muḥammad Khān Takkalū Sharaf al-Dīn-ūghlī (4). This was before Muḥammad Khān's appointment to the governorship of Baghdād (935/1528-9); he was presumably therefore still governor of Qazwīn, a post to which he had succeeded on the death of Akhī Sulṭān Takkalū at the battle of Bisṭām against the Uzbegs (933/1526-7). Some years later, Budāq Munshī was himself appointed to the wizārat wa wikālat of Muṣṭafā Sulṭān Warsāq, who was at that time governor of Sabzawār and Turshīz and later governor of Isfarā'in. Budāq Munshī was ten years with Muṣṭafā

(1) See Bellan, l. (2) AT. 440. (3) JA. 333a. (4) ibid., 315a.

13

Sultān, and comments, "in reality I was not his attendant; I was the master, and he the servant" (fi'l-wāqi' mulāzim-i ū nabūdam āqā būdam wa ū nawkar) (1). The fact that in both these examples the word wizārat precedes the word wikālat suggests that the former is the more important. It seems probable that Budāq Munshī was in fact the wazīr of Muṣṭafā Sultān (the existence of the provincial wazīr attached to provincial governors has already been noted (2)), and that the word wakīl has been added simply in the sense of "representative" or "deputy". On the other hand, in 937/1530-1 Ḥusayn Khān Shāmlū, governor of Harāt, sent to court an embassy which included among its members his wazīr Ahmad Beg Nūr Kamāl Isfahānī, and Ḥusayn Qulī Beg, who is simply described as wakīl (3). In this case, too, the fact that the wazīr is mentioned first seems to indicate that the provincial wazīr was more important than the wakīl who was the deputy of the provincial governor. In another passage in the Jawāhir al-Akhbār, a certain Ishīk Ahmad is referred to simply as "the wakīl of Badr Khān (Ustājlu)" (4). The passage in the Tārīkh-i Ilchī-yi Niẓāmshāh which refers to Amīr Ja'far Sāwajī as the wakīl of the late Chūha Sultān, clearly does so because at that time Chūha was the de facto ruler of the state (5). We know that Amīr Ja'far Sāwajī had been appointed to the niẓarat-i dīwān-i a'lā by the Shāh in place of Qādī Jahān in 931/1524-5 (6), and he is later referred to as the "wazīr-i shāh-i dīn-panāh (Ṭahmāsp)" (7). He was, therefore, the wazīr (or wakīl) of the central administration, and was not a wazīr (or wakīl) attached to Chūha Sultān in the manner of the provincial wazīrs described above. The complete confusion of the terminology used in the sources to denote the highest offices of state, even in the case of

Amir
Sawaji

(1) JA. 316a. (2) See p. 159 ff. above. (3) JA. 302b. (4) ibid., 323b.
(5) See p. 221-2 above; p. 228 below. (6) AT. 189. (7) ibid., 244.

contemporary historians and those writing shortly after the events they describe, can only mean that no clear demarcation between these offices existed in the minds of contemporary chroniclers, and that therefore at that period none existed in fact.

The case of Ḥasan Āqā, appointed lala and wakīl to Bahrām Mīrzā in 940/1533-4, is rather different. In 940/1533-4, Ṭahmāsp's position was desperate. The Ottomans had invaded Ādharbāyjan, and their vanguard, under Ibrāhīm Pāshā, consisted of 90,000 men (1). Against this army, because of the sedition which was rife among the qizilbāsh amīrs and the desertion of many of their number to the Ottomans, Ṭahmāsp could only muster at the most 7,000 men (2). The Jawāhir al-Akhbār puts the figure as low as 5,000; these men had been serving for three years (si sal yasāq kashīda) (3), and the majority were disloyal, demoralized and hostile (akthar khāyin wa khāsir wa khāṣim) (4). Still further defections followed, and as a result Ṭahmāsp had no confidence in the remaining amīrs and arkān-i dawlat (5). At this juncture, Ḥasan Āqā, a qurchī-yi tīr wa kamān and a retainer of Ḥusayn Khān Shāmlū, and Shu'bān Āqā Dhu'l-Qadar, an ishk-āqāsī (usher) (6), went to Ṭahmāsp and informed him that Ḥusayn Khān Shāmlū, together with Ghāzī Khān Takkalū, Muḥammad Khān Dhu'l-Qadar, and Malik Beg Khūy, had conspired to go over to the Ottomans (7). Ṭahmāsp executed Ḥusayn Khān Shāmlū, who was wakīl and amīr al-umarā (8), gave his army to Bahrām Mīrzā, and made Ḥasan Āqā qurchī-yi tīr wa kamān, who had

(1) AT. 247. (2) ibid., 249. (3) Yasāq (Yāsāq) was a "call to arms, a levy for service". Troops holding themselves in readiness to answer such a call were termed yāsāqchī, and probably supplied their own equipment (see TM 34-5). (4) JA. 308a. (5) AT. 249. (6) See TM., passim, but especially p. 47. (7) JA. 308b. (8) See pp.230 - 33 below.

acted in this devoted manner (ki in ikhlāṣ warzīda būd), lala and wakīl of Bahrām Mīrzā, and conferred the post of dārūgha of Iṣfahān on Shu'ban Āqā Dhu'l-Qadar (1). The conferment of offices of such importance on two such junior officers is indicative of the extent of Tahmāsp's distrust of his chief amīrs and senior officers. In 943/1536-7, when Bahrām Mīrzā made his unsuccessful attempt to annex Gīlān, Ḥasan Āqā accompanied him as his wakīl (2). The term wakīl here is clearly not used in the same way as in the examples quoted above in which it was associated with the post of wazīr to an amīr who was a provincial governor. In the first place, in 940/1533-4, when Ḥasan Āqā was appointed wakīl of Bahrām Mīrzā, Bahrām Mīrzā did not hold a provincial governorship, as he had been relieved of the governorship of Harāt the previous year (3). Secondly, when Bahrām marched into Gīlān in 943/1536-7, Ḥasan Āqā was wakīl and Khwāja 'Ināyat Allāh wazīr (4), which suggests that in this instance the two posts were separate and distinct. It would appear that the significance of the term wakīl here is closer to the original conception of the wikālat, but with one fundamental difference, in that Ḥasan Āqā was the wakīl, not of the Shāh, but of the Shāh's brother, Bahrām Mīrzā. I have only met one other instance of the term wakīl in its original sense being applied to a person other than the wakīl of the Shāh. In 991/1583 Murshid Qulī Khān Ustājilū, after capturing the person of 'Abbās Mīrzā, provided the apparatus of his ('Abbās Mīrzā's) authority and kingship, and appointed officials for him, and reclined on the throne of wikālat and lalagī in complete independence (asbāb-i salṭanat wa pādishāhī-yi ḥaḍrat-i a'lā-rā saranjām dāda arbāb-i manāṣib jihat-i ān ḥaḍrat ta'yīn namūd wa min ḥayth al-istiqlāl bar masnad-i wikālat wa lalagī tikya zada) (5). 'Abbās Mīrzā did not come to the throne

(1) JA. 308b. (2) ibid., 314a. (3) AT. 246. (4) JA. 314a. (5) TAA.
See p. 180 above.

until 1587, but he had already been proclaimed Shāh in Khurāsān in 1580 by his former lala 'Alī qulī Khān Shāmlū, and continued to style himself thus until 1585 when, by virtue of a temporary settlement negotiated with his father Sulṭān Muḥammad Shāh (Muḥammad Khudābanda), he reverted to the title 'Abbās Mīrzā (1). The fact that 'Abbās was Shāh in all but name would explain why Murshid qulī Khān was styled his wakīl. Tahmasp

In 934/1527-8 'Ubayd Khān Uzbek laid siege to Harāt for seven months (2). In the spring of 935 Ṭahmāsp marched to Khurāsān, and met a vastly superior Uzbek force near Mashhad (3). According to one report, some of the amīrs, including the amīr al-umara Chūha Sulṭān, who was in command of the Ṣafawid right wing, were overawed by the Uzbek superiority in numbers, and left the battlefield (4). The Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh states that the Takkalūs were shattered by Jānī Beg Sulṭān and fled (5), followed by the amīrs on the Ṣafawid left; Ṭahmasp in the centre stood firm, until, in a counter attack by the Shāmlūs and Dhu'l-ḡadars, 'Ubayd was wounded, with the result that many of the Uzbeks withdrew in disorder; meanwhile, Jānī Beg Sulṭān, who had been engaged in looting the Ṣafawid rear, approached Ṭahmāsp's camp under the impression that it was that of 'Ubayd; Ṭahmāsp at once prepared to attack him, but Chūha Sulṭān, kneeling in a most unmanly fashion (az kamāl-i nāmardī zānū zada), urged that they should await the return of the qizilbāsh who had fled from the battle (6). Both these

(1) See my article 'Abbās I, in EI², Vol. I, Fasc. i/1954, 7-8. (2) AT. 205-7. (3) TIN. 468b. gives the relative strength of the armies as more than 100,000 versus at the most 30,000; AT. 215 says that the Uzbek army was the largest force to cross the Oxus since the invasion of Changīz Khān. (4) TIN. 468b. (5) AT. 216. (6) ibid., 217-9. JA. 300b. states that Chūha Sulṭān, who was amīr al-umara of the army (lashkar), fled for ten farsakhs.

sources represent Chūha Sulṭān in an unfavourable light.

Chūha Sulṭān, however, continued to hold the position of wakīl and still dictated Ṭahmāsp's actions (zimām-i ikhtiyār-i shāh-i khilāfat-panāh dar ān zamān dar kaff-i iqtidār-i jūha (1) sulṭān būd). The Shāmlū leader Ḥusayn Khān was rewarded for his valour against the Uzbegs by being confirmed as governor of Harāt on the former terms (bi-dastūr-i sābiq) (2). Eventually, after having disposed favourably towards himself (bā khwud muwāfiq sakhta) the provincial amīrs (umarā-yi aṭrāf) and the Ustajlū amīrs who remained in concealment in Gilān, not daring to come to court, Chūha Sulṭān began to organize an expedition for the relief of Harāt, which, a few months after Ṭahmāsp had left Khurāsān, had again been besieged by the Uzbegs (3). Ḥusayn Khān Shāmlū at Harāt, despairing of receiving aid, and realizing that Chūha's sole aim was to allow him to fall into Uzbek hands, was forced to negotiate with the Uzbegs. Harāt had not recovered from the effects of the previous siege (az ranj wa ta'b-i muḥāṣara wa darbandānī-yi zamān-i sābiq āsūda nashuda) (4), and there was an acute shortage of supplies (5); Ḥusayn Khān, with his ward Sām Mīrzā, the qizilbāsh garrison, and Shī'īs of Harāt, was allowed to evacuate Harāt and retreat unmolested to Shīrāz via Sīstān (6). Their presence there was a source of anxiety to Ṭahmāsp (az jānib-i sām mīrzā wa ḥusayn khān ki dar shīrāz budand jam' nabūd), and on his return from Harāt (7), where he had installed his favourite brother Bahrām Mīrzā as governor with Ghāzī Khān Takkalū as his atābeg, he summoned Ḥusayn Khān to court. The latter, through fear of

(1) Jūha is a variant for the more usual Chūha or Chūhā. (2) AT. 220.

(3) AT. 220-1. (4) TIN. 469b. (5) AT. 221. (6) ibid., 221-2. (7) Ṭahmāsp recaptured Harāt in the summer of 1530, and left for 'Irāq on 16 Rabī' I 937/7 November 1530.

Chūha Sulṭān, delayed his departure, but after receiving a pledge of safe conduct he joined the royal camp near Iṣfahān (1), and was distinguished among his peers and equals by the abundance of royal favour and affection (937/1531) (2).

Chūha Sulṭān displayed hostility towards Ḥusayn Khān (nisbat bi-ḥusayn khān dar maqām-i nifāq dar āmada), and planned to murder him at a banquet. Some of the Shāh's men (mulāzimān) informed Ḥusayn Khān of the plot, and at nightfall the latter made his way with a band of Shāmlūs to Chūha Sulṭān's tent. Chūha Sulṭān fled, and took refuge in the dīwān-khāna. Ḥusayn Khān pursued him there, and a struggle took place in the royal tent (khayma-yi shāh) itself. During the fighting, two arrows fired by Shāmlūs actually struck the royal crown (tāj-i shāh). The Dhu'l-Qadars, who were on guard duty (dar kishīk būdand), sided with the Shāmlūs, and one of their number mortally wounded Chūha Sulṭān, but the Takkalūs concealed the fact of his death (3). Takkalū reinforcements arrived under Ḥusayn Khān Takkalū, and the Shāmlūs were eventually forced to retreat; 300 of their number were taken prisoner by the Takkalūs and put to death. The Takkalū amīrs made Chūha Sulṭān's son, Shāh Qubād, wakīl in his father's place (umarā-yi takkalū shāh qubād pīsar-i buzurg-i chūha sulṭān-rā bi-jā-yi way wakīl gardānīdand). The Takkalūs remained in a rebellious mood, and a few days later there was a battle between them and the combined forces of the Ustājlūs, Rūmlūs, Dhu'l-Qadars and Afshārs at the imāmzāda of Sahl 'Alī (4). Meanwhile a certain partisan (az hawākhwāhān) of the Takkalūs, Yaḥyā-ūghlī, rushed into the dawlatkhāna and tried to abduct the Shāh, with the intention of taking him to the Takkalū camp. Tahmāsp had him put to

(1) TIN. 470a. (2) AT. 235. (3) ibid., 235. (4) Near Hamadān; see AT. ii, 262.

death, and then gave the order for the execution of that misguided tribe (bi-qatl-i anṭāyifa-yi gumrah farman dād). The Takkalū amīrs mounted and approached the dawlatkhāna, but were met with a hail of arrows from the qurchīs, and fled; many were killed, including Dūra (1) Beg the qurchī-bāshī, and the remainder escaped to Baghdād via Kurdistan. There, some of them, including quḍūr (quḍūz) Sulṭān, were put to death by the Ṣafawid governor, Muḥammad Sharaf al-Dīn-ūghlī Takkalū, who sent their heads to Ṭahmāsp as proof of his loyalty (2).

Summary
The above events have been given in some detail in order to show that during the early years of Ṭahmāsp the virtual usurpation of the kingly function by a succession of Turkomān wakīls had resulted in anarchy. The two powerful enemies of the Ṣafawid state, the Ottomans and the Uzbegs, were encouraged to take advantage of Persia's weakness. The attempt to abduct the Shāh shows that the Shāh's person was no longer sacrosanct, and the fact that the qizilbāsh were prepared to settle their personal differences by fighting in the royal palace and even in the royal tent itself, shows a complete disregard for the authority of the Shāh.

After the death of Chūha Sulṭān, the Takkalūs made his son Shāh Qubād wakīl in his place, as has already been stated. Another Takkalū, Ulama (3), who was governor of Ādharbāyjān, usurped authority (salṭanat wa istiqlāl bi-khwud rāh dāda) and aspired to the position of wakīl (irāda kard bi-ānki bi-jā-yi chūha sulṭān wakīl gardad) (4). The actual successor of Chūha Sulṭān, however, was Ḥusayn Khān Shāmlū b. 'Abdī Beg Shāmlū, brother of Dūrmīsh Khān, who became wakīl-i shāh-i dīn-panāh (5). Ḥusayn Khān was also apparently amīr al-umarā; in 938/1531-2 Ṭahmāsp conferred the rank of

(1) In NJA, Dāra. (2) AT. 236. (3) Or Ūlāma. (4) AT. 237. (5) ibid., 253.

amīr al-umarā (manṣab-i amīr al-umarā'i) on Ḥusayn Khān and 'Abd Allāh Khān Ustājilū, who were both nephews of the late Shāh (1). This may mean that these two chiefs held the office jointly; in practice, Ḥusayn Khān seems to have been much the more powerful of the two. The Tārīkh-i Ilchī-yi Nizāmshāh states that Ḥusayn Khān was appointed amīr al-umarā, with the consensus of the amīrs and chief officers (arkān) of the state, who only later informed the Shāh of the position (majmū' muttāfiq shuda sūrat-i ḥal-rā ma'rūḍ-i dargāh gardānīdand) (2). The wizārat-i dīwān-i a'la devolved upon Aḥmad Beg Nūr Kamāl; Amīr Qiwām al-Dīn Ja'far Sāwajī, the wazīr of Ṭahmāsp, was executed at Ribāṭ-i Nīk Pay (3). According to the Tārīkh-i Ilchī-yi Nizāmshāh, Ḥusayn Khān at once arrested Amīr Ja'far Sāwajī and Khwāja Ārūq, who are described as the wakīl and wazīr respectively of the late Chūha Sulṭān, and proceeded to extract from them the large sums which they had accumulated during their term of office. Amīr Ja'far was then executed, and Khwāja Ārūq died under torture. Aḥmad Beg Nūrī Kamāl Iṣfahānī was made wakīl in place of Amīr Ja'far; the execution of the latter (by Ḥusayn Khān Shāmlū) had angered Ṭahmāsp. Just as Chūha Sulṭān, during his period of office, had appointed Takkalūs to office in preference to men from other tribes, in the same way Ḥusayn Khān Shāmlū proceeded to strengthen the position of his own tribe (dar ṣadad-i tarbiyat wa taqwiyat-i ṭa'ifa-yi khwud); the pick (khulāṣa) of the provincial posts went to Shāmlūs. He allowed the Shāh little or no say in either religious or political affairs (ḥaḍrat-i shāh-rā dar amr-i khilāfat wa salṭanat chandān dakhil mamīdād) (5). The same source attributes the rebellion of Ulama to

(1) AT. 238. They were the sons of a sister of Isma'il. (2) TIN. 471a.
(3) AT. 244. (4) See p. 224 above. (5) TIN. 471a.

the appointment of Ḥusayn Khān Shāmlū as amīr al-umara. Ulama was a protégé (tarbiyat karda) of Chūha Sulṭān, and was consequently afraid of Ḥusayn Khān. After attempting to seize the dārūgha of Tabrīz, Ulama appropriated the royal horses (asbhā-yi khāṣṣa-yi shāhī), and distributed among his own retainers the maids belonging to the royal household (kanīzakān-i khāṣṣa-yi sharīfa) who had been placed with brocade makers (ṭalādūzān) to make brocade (bi-jihat-i ṭalādūzī); he further erected for his own use the royal tent, and seized the effects belonging to the royal camp (amwāl-i urdū) which were in Tabrīz(1).

Ḥusayn Khān Shāmlū was evidently extremely powerful; in 939/1532 Āghziwār Khān Shāmlū was appointed governor of Harāt through his support; "at that time the reins of authority were in the hands of Ḥusayn Khān" (2). The following year, however, he suddenly fell from power (940/1533-4). The attempt of a certain Shāmlū retainer named Bāshdan Qarā to poison Ṭahmāsp implicated the wakīl; Bāshdan Qarā was a relative of Ḥusayn Khān. The wakīl had been tempted by ambition to work for the overthrow of the Shāh by instilling in men the desire for the rule of Sām Mīrzā ('azim-i an shud ki dar taghyīr-i dawlat sa'y-i balīgh namāyad wa mardum-rā bi-salṭanat-
sām mīrzā targhīb namāyad) (3). Above all, the wakīl was suspected of intending to desert to the Ottomans. In 940/1533-4, during the Ottoman invasion of Ādharbāyjan, Ṭahmāsp had sent him on a reconnaissance patrol (bi-qarāwulī); one of his own retainers reported to the Shāh that Ḥusayn Khān was contemplating rebellion and desertion to the Ottoman camp ('anqarīb ḥusayn khān sālik-i ṭarīq-i 'inād gashta rawāna-yi urdū-yi rūmiyān khwāhad shud). Ṭahmāsp summoned the wakīl, and gave the signal for his execution;

(1) TIN. 471a. (2) ibid., 472a. (3) AT. 253.

his army (qushūn) was given to Bahrām Mīrzā, the Shāh's brother (1). The Tārākh-i Ilchī-yi Niẓāmshāh also accuses Ḥusayn Khān of collaboration with the Ottomans: "at that time it had become apparent from all sorts of signs and indications that Ḥusayn Khān had leagued himself with the Ottomans and was the instigator of that discord and strife" (dar ān wilā az hargūna 'alamāt wa dalā'il ẓāhir shuda būd ki ḥusayn khān bā rūmiyān zabān yakī karda wa muḥarrīk-i ān fitna wa fisād ast) (2). The treachery of Sām Mīrzā is alleged by the Sharafnāma, which states that Sām Mīrzā had indicated his allegiance to the Ottoman sultan Sulaymān I, who had addressed him as a son and had committed the sovereign power in Persia to him (sulṭān ū-rā farzand-i khwud khwānda salṭanat-i īrān-rā bidū arzānī dāshta) (3).

The execution of the wakīl Ḥusayn Khān Shāmlū marks the end of the first decade of Ṭahmāsp's reign (930-940/1523-1533), and also a turning-point in the relations between Ṭahmāsp and the succession of Turkomān wakīls who had usurped the kingly authority since his accession at the age of ten and a half. Ḥusayn Khān Shāmlū was not only the lala of Ṭahmāsp's son Muḥammad Mīrzā, who had been born in 938/1531 (4), but was a cousin of Ṭahmāsp himself (5); his execution therefore had the utmost effect on the other amīrs. The fact that Ṭahmāsp did not allow another Shāmlū amīr to assume the leadership of the Shāmlū qurchīs, but placed them under the direct command of Bahrām Mīrzā, taken in conjunction with the appointment of a Persian to be wakīl in succession to Ḥusayn Khān Shāmlū, points to the Shāh's determination to curb the power of the amīrs and to check the seditious which was prevalent among the qizilbāsh. The fact that Ṭahmāsp apparently initiated the appointment of Qaḍī Jahān Qazwīnī to the wikālat, instead of

(1) AT. 254. (2) TIN. 474a. (3) Shar. ii, 185. (4) AT. 496. (5) His father 'Abdī Beg Shāmlū had married a sister of Isma'īl I.

again
686
62

merely approving an appointment which had already been decided by the amīrs, shows that Ṭahmāsp, after having been for ten years subject to the power of the amīrs, was at last able to exercise a measure of royal authority.

The Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh has the following obituary notice on Qāḍī Jahān Qazwīnī:- "Qāḍī Jahān the wakīl was a Sayfī sayyid of Qazwīn. In truth in this mighty empire (dawlat-i 'uzmā) there has been no wazīr who like him possessed every ability and talent. The eminence of his position was beyond description.....his intelligence, shrewdness, liberality, understanding, acuteness of perception, and loftiness of nature were such that, whatever branch of knowledge formed the subject for debate and discussion in the royal assemblies, he was able to intervene with pertinent remarks (dakhlhā-yi muwajjah dar ān mubāḥatha mīnamīd) and expound fine points with an agreeable elegance". He was a master of composition (inshā'), elegant writing (taḥrīr), calligraphy (ḥusn-i khaṭṭ), refinement of style (tahdhīb-i 'ibārat) and elegance of statement (laṭāfat-i taqrīr). No eloquent munshī or fluent rhetorician was his equal, as is witnessed by the draft orders (musawwadāt-i aḥkām) executed by him on any subject (dar har bāb namūda) which are in people's possession (mardum dar dast dārand). Everyone accepted his authority (hamagī ū-rā musallam mīdāshtand); in the execution of important affairs concerning justice or the welfare of the people, he made fear of God his ornament, and never omitted the finest point of good conduct and excellent behaviour; despite his exalted rank, he preserved a humble and modest demeanour towards all men, and maintained an attitude of the greatest courtesy and humility in both his verbal and written declarations (taqrīr wa taḥrīr); excellence of conduct, and humility, were so ingrained in his nature and implanted in his disposition, that the proof of the Qur'ānic verse (lacuna in text) is demonstrated in him. In the royal

assemblies there was not always sufficient opportunity to state one's case (hamīsha dar majlis-i ashraf furṣat-i muqtaḍā-yi 'arḍ kardan nabūd), and His Majesty used to give conflicting promises to people (ānḥaḍrat wa'dahā-yi khilāf bi-mardum mīdād), and people were harmed by this behaviour and felt resentment at it (az ān rahgudhar mardum mutaḍarrar wa āzurda-khaṭīr būdand). In the beginning Qāḍī Jahān was in the service of Qāḍī Muḥammad Kāshī (1); later, during the wikālat of Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn (2), he was wazīr to Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn together with Khwāja Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Tabrīzī. After the burning of Khwāja Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad (3), the post of independent wazīr (manṣab-i wizārat bi-istiqlāl) was conferred on siyādat-panāh Qāḍī Jahān. At the time when the dispute occurred between the Takkalū and Ustājlu tribes and ended in strife (bi-qital anjāmīd), Qāḍī Jahān arrived in Gīlān and was for long in confinement and fetters (4) (maḥbūs wa muqayyad) in the charge of Muḥaffar Sulṭān b. Amīr Ḥusām al-Dīn; because of a long-standing enmity against Qāḍī Jahān, Muḥaffar Sulṭān treated him with every kind of outrage and contumely; and since there was a hereditary antagonism between Qāḍī Jahān and the Nūrbakhshīyya order, and Muḥaffar Sulṭān considered himself an adherent (murīd) of that order, on that account also certain acts of provocation occurred (taḥrīkātī mīshud) which resulted in Qāḍī Jahān being subjected to additional molestation and (5) contumely. After the death of Muḥaffar Sulṭān, Qāḍī Jahān left Gīlān, and once again the post of wazīr to Ṭahmāsp was conferred on him, this time jointly with Amīr Sa'd al-Dīn 'Ināyat Allāh Khūzānī. The latter was

(1) ḡadr from 909-15/1503-9; wazīr 909/1503. (2) Wakīl from 920-9/1514-23. (3) He was put to death by the amīr al-umarā Dīw Sulṭān in 930/1524. (4) Ruler of Rasht (Bīya Pas). (5) Executed by Ṭahmāsp in 942/1535-6.

constantly trying to disgrace Qāḍī Jahān and bring ignominy on him, until he obtained immunity from the hands and tongues of meddlers (az dast wa zabān-i mutakallifān amān yaft) (1).

After the death of Amīr Sa'd al-Dīn, Qāḍī Jahān was independent (2) wazīr for fifteen years. Towards the end of his life, at the age of seventy or eighty (ki sanīn az sittīn dar gudhashta dar ḥudūd-i sab'īn wa thamanīn qarār girifta būd), his physical powers began to fail, and he did not enjoy the same independence in the wizārat (an istiqlāl dar wizārat nadāsht); he gave up attending to dīwān affairs, and requested permission to retire from public life. Although he later regretted his action, it was of no avail, and he took up his abode in Qazwīn. He had only resided there for a short time when it was brought to Ṭahmāsp's notice that Qāḍī Jahān had appropriated as his private property (bi-milkiyyat bi-taḥt-i taṣarruf dar āwarda) certain waqf villages (qurā-yi waqfī) which had for long been in his possession (muddat-i madīd ast ki dar taṣarruf-i ūst). Ṭahmāsp gave orders that the places in question should be taken from him with ignominy (bi-aqbaḥ wujūh), and that an amount equivalent to the arrears (of waqf revenue), which represented a large sum, should be obtained from him (ujrat al-mathal-i ayyām-i gudhashta-rā ki mablagghā mīshud bāz yaft namāyand). Before this order could be carried out, Qāḍī Jahān went to court; Ṭahmāsp took pity on his age and weakness, and waived those proceedings (an muqaddimāt-rā ṭayy farmūd), and even gave him a sum as a soyūrghāl (mablaghī nīz bi-rasm-i soyūrghāl bidū arzānī dāsht); Qāḍī Jahān retired to Qazwīn, and died in 960/1552-3 near the Zanjān river (3).

(1) Amīr Sa'd al-Dīn was executed in Tabrīz in 942/1535 (AT. 274). (2) So also JA. 313b: ba'd az qatl-i mīr 'ināyat khuzānī qaḍī jahān istiqlāl yaft.

(3) AT. 373-6. According to TIN. 479b., he died on 12 Muḥarram 959/9 Jan. 1552. According to JA. 324a, he died on 17 Dhu'l-Ḥijja 960/25 Nov. 1553.

The Tārīkh-i Ilchī-yi Nizāmshāh gives a substantially similar account of the sequence of events, with a few additional details. For instance, after the execution of Ḥusayn Khān Shāmlū, his protégé (tarbiyat kardā) Aḥmad Beg Nūrī Kamāl Iṣfahānī was dismissed from the wikālat; his property was seized, and he was subjected to torture by the tax-collectors (akhdh-i amwāl wa 'idhāb-i muḥaṣṣilān) (1). After everything possible had been extracted from him, he was imprisoned at Alānⁱjaq, but was eventually released, and lived peaceably at Iṣfahān, his native town (2). Khwāja 'Ināyat Khūzānī was made wakīl in his place, and administered dīwān affairs (bar masnad-i wikālat tikya zādā rātiq wa fātiq-i muhimmāt-i dīwānī gasht) (3). Shortly afterwards, Qādī Jahān was appointed to the wikālat, and the former wakīl Khwāja 'Ināyat Kachal ("the hairless") was suspended from the minaret in the Maydān-i Ṣāhibābād, because of his evil ways (sharārat) and depravity (badnafsī) (4). The same source later mentions Qādī Jahān, who "for years reclined on the position of wazīr" (sālḥā dar maṣab-i wizārat tikya zādā būd) (5). The Sharafnāma states that Qādī Jahān made the eminent post of wizārat-i dīwān-i shāhī his special attribute (bi-maṣab-i jalīl al-qadr-i wizārat-i dīwān-i shāhī ikhtiṣāṣ yaft) (6). The Jawāhir al-Akḥbār states that Qādī Jahān Qazwīnī, who had formerly held the wizārat and wikālat, returned from imprisonment at Rasht and was appointed to the wizārat, and that Kachal 'Ināyat Iṣfahānī Khūzānī, who had formerly been the wazīr of Kupuk Sulṭān, and who had also gone with the Ustājⁱlūs to Rasht and come back, was wazīr, and that Khwāja Mu'īn Yazdī was also styled wazīr (ism-i wizārat dāsht) (7).

(1) TIN. 474a. (2) ibid., 476a. (3) ibid., 474a. (4) ibid., 475b-476a. (5) ibid., 479b. (6) Shar. ii, 187. (7) JA. 311b-312a.

It has been noted that, during the last decade of the reign of Isma'īl, certain changes became apparent in both the style and title, and the function, of the wakīl. For example, with reference to that period, the sources frequently use the term wazīr instead of wakīl, suggesting that the wakīl had already lost much of his influence as wakīl-i nafs-i nafs-i humāyūn, and was tending to be regarded solely as the head of the bureaucracy, his function being styled wizārat (or niḡārat)-i dīwān-i a'la (1). The accession of Ṭahmāsp while still a minor arrested this process, and for a time there was a reversion to something approaching the original conception of the wakīl as the personal lieutenant, but with two important differences; first, the successive Turkoman wakīls during the first decade of Ṭahmāsp's reign took advantage of Ṭahmāsp's youth to assume quasi-royal authority, and second, they are referred to in the sources simply as wakīl, usually without further embellishment (2). When, as in the case of Dīw Sulṭān Rūmlū, the wakīl was also the lala of the ruler, naturally his prestige became greater still. The post of lala, a survival from the organization of the Ṣafawid order, was considered by the qizilbāsh to be one of their prerogatives. No Persian ever held the position of lala. When, again as in the case of Dīw Sulṭān Rūmlū, the wakīl was lala and also held the post of amīr al-Umarā, only the name of kingship was left to Ṭahmāsp.

It has also been noted that during the latter part of the reign of Isma'īl I the amīr al-umarā figured less prominently in affairs because it was at that time the policy of Isma'īl to attempt to restrict the power of the amīrs. The amīrs assumed control of the state on the accession of

(1) See p. 203 above. (2) Ḥusayn Khān Shāmlū, referred to as wakīl-i shāh-i dīn-panāh, (AT. 253), is an exception.

Ṭahmāsp, and, as a result, the amīr al-umarā returned to prominence. The civil war which broke out between the qizilbash tribes in 932/1525-6, and the series of armed clashes between rival tribes which took place in succeeding years, gave the amīr al-umarā a peculiar importance. During the second half of the reign of Isma'īl, there was considerable confusion in the use of the terms wakīl and wazīr, for reasons already noticed. During the period when the amīrs exercised military control over the political institution at the beginning of the reign of Ṭahmāsp, the confusion is rather between the terms wakīl and amīr al-umarā, and the wazīr, as a primarily non-military official, is pushed into the background. All the wakīls of Isma'īl's reign had acted as military commanders in the field (cf. Ḥusayn Beg Lala, Najm al-Dīn Mas'ūd, Najm-i Thānī, 'Abd al-Bāqī), with the notable exception of Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn, who was wakīl from 920-9/1514-23; and it is precisely during the latter's term of office that the tendency to refer to the wakīl as wazīr is first noticeable. Military duties seem therefore to have been as essential part of the function of the wakīl. Conversely, the amīr al-umarā seems always to have played a part in political affairs; the principal amīrs, as befitting "pillars of the state", took their place in the dīwān-i 'alī, and affixed their seal to state documents in due order of precedence. The amīr al-umarā, as the leading amīr, affixed his seal before the other amīrs (1); Ḥusayn Beg Lala, who was amīr al-umarā, was naturally also a mīr-i dīwān (2). It is clear therefore that the functions of the wakīl and the amīr al-umarā overlapped to a certain extent.

(1) See AT. 107, q. on p.186 above. (2) See p.187 above.

The execution of Husayn Khān Shāmlū in 940/1533 ended for the time being the military control of the political institution by the Turkomān amīrs, and, with the re-appointment of Qāḍī Jahān Qazwīnī in 942/1535, the process of change in the character of the wikālat, a process which had been interrupted by the period of supremacy of the amīr al-umarā, was resumed. The military aspect of the wikālat again ceased to be emphasized, and there was again a tendency for the wakīl to become identified with the wazīr. This is clearly shown by the obituary notice in the Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh quoted above (1). Qāḍī Jahān is only once termed wakīl, as opposed to five references to him as wazīr (in two instances, "independent wazīr").

*فصل
سوم*

The same confusion between the terms wakīl and wazīr is apparent in the case of Ma'sūm Beg Ṣafawī, a qizilbāsh officer who was descended from a side branch of the Ṣafawī family (2). He is first mentioned in the Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh as mutawallī of Ardabīl in 953/1546-7. In that year he was one of the high-ranking amīrs (umarā-yi 'ālīmiqdār) sent to Shīrwān by Tahmāsp to recall Alqāṣ Mīrzā to his allegiance (3). In 959/1551-2 he was leader of an expedition to Arjīsh. (4). These facts clearly illustrate the continuing close connexion during the early Ṣafawid period between religious, and political and military, functions. Qāḍī Jahān's successor is nowhere explicitly mentioned; Qāḍī Jahān retired from public life some time before his death in 960/1552-3, and it may be that Ma'sūm Beg succeeded him, either immediately, or after an interval. There are three references in the Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh to Ma'sūm Beg as wakīl: - ma'sūm beg ṣafawī ki

۵۳۲

(1) See pp. 234-6 above. (2) AT. ii, 278, quoting the Silsilat al-Nasab, says that he was the grandson of the brother of Sulṭān Ḥaydar. (3) AT. 315. (4) AT. 357.

wikālat-i shāh-i dīn-panāh dāsht (1) (in 967/1559-60); ma'sūm beg şafawī wakīl-i shāh-i dīn-panāh (2); Shāh Ṭahmāsp made Ma'sūm Beg Şafawī, who was wakīl, his (i.e., Sulṭān Ḥaydar Mīrzā's) lala (3). The Sharafnāma states that in 976/1568-9 Ma'sūm Beg, who was wazīr and amīr-i dīwān, resigned from amr-i wizārat, and the manşab-i wizārat was given to Amīr Sayyid Sharīf Thānī (4). The Tārīkh-i İlchī-yi Niṣāmshāh refers to Ma'sūm Beg Şafawī as i'timād al-dawla and amīr-i dīwān (5).

The whole period covered by the reigns of Isma'īl and Ṭahmāsp, as far as the office of wakīl is concerned, is a period of continual change and adjustment, and it is clear that, as the Şafawid state developed, the wakīl gradually became redundant and ultimately disappeared. When the military arm controlled the political institution, as during the reign of Isma'īl prior to 920/1514, and during the first decade of the reign of Ṭahmāsp (930-940/1524-1533), the wakīl was often also the amīr al-umara', and tended to become identified with him. On the other hand, when the qizilbash amīrs were subordinate in fact as well as in theory to the Shāh's authority (e.g., from 920-929/1514-1523, and from 940-980/1533-1572), the wakīl tended to be identified with the wazīr. Thus one arrives at a position in which it is possible to have two officials simultaneously termed wakīl. In the one, the military aspect of the wakīl's function is predominant, and he therefore simultaneously holds the office of, or is confused with the, amīr al-umara'; in the other, the administrative aspect of the wakīl's function is predominant, and he therefore is at the same time termed wazīr, with whom he tends to be identified. For instance, in 930/1524 Dīw Sulṭān Rūmlū, who was

(1) AT. 411. (2) ibid., 443. (3) ibid., 490. (4) Shar. ii, 239. (5) TIN. 480a.

amīr al-umarā, put to death Khwāja Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Tabrīzī, who was wakīl/wazīr (1), and Qāḍī Jahān Qazwīnī became wakīl/wazīr (2). At the same time Kupuk Sulṭān was also wakīl (3). In 931/1524-5 Amīr Ja'far Sāwajī became wakīl/wazīr (4); Dīw Sulṭān was amīr al-umarā (5), but was still (932/1526) wakīl (6); Chuha Sulṭān was wakīl in 933/1527 (7), and amīr al-umarā (935/1528) (8); in 938/1531-2 Husayn Khān Shāmlū was amīr al-umarā/wakīl; he put to death Amīr Ja'far Sāwajī who was wakīl/wazīr, and Ahmad Beg Nūrī Kamāl Iṣfahānī became wakīl/wazīr in his place (9). As the development of the Ṣafawid state proceeds, it becomes plain that the attempt to reincorporate the religious institution in the political institution, an attempt represented by the creation of the wikālat and the ṣadārat, has failed, and that the religious institution is steadily becoming divorced from the political institution. The ṣadr is deprived of his political authority and influence, and the wakīl, no longer wakīl-i nafs-i nafs-i humāyūn, his military duties performed by the amīr al-umarā (later, by the qurchībāshī), and his administrative duties by the wazīr, eventually ceases to exist.

The power of the amīr al-umarā declined after the first decade of Ṭahmāsp's reign. This important office, denoting the supreme command of all the qizilbāsh troops, was naturally a prerogative of the qizilbāsh amīrs. On two occasions, however, a Persian is referred to as being amīr al-umarā; Shaykh Najm-i Zargar in 914/1508 (10), and Amīr 'Abd al-Fāqī in 920/1514 (11). For the first years of Ṭahmāsp's reign (930-940/1524-

(1) See pp. 210-11; 213 above. (2) See pp. 214; 216. (3) See p. 214. (4) See p. 216-7; 224. (5) See p. 219. (6) See p. 220. (7) See p. 221. (8) See p. 227. (9) See pp. 230-1. (10) AT. 107. (11) BM. Or. 3248, 247a.

1533, a succession of powerful Turkomān amīr al-umarās governed the state, leaving Ṭahmāsp with only the semblance of kingship. In 937/1530-1 Ḥusayn Khān Shāmlū and ‘Abd Allāh Khān Ustājlū, who were both nephews of Isma‘īl and therefore cousins of Ṭahmāsp, were appointed jointly to the amīr al-umarā‘ī (1), but ‘Abd Allāh Khān Ustājlū seems to have played a very minor role compared with his colleague. Ḥusayn Khān Shāmlū was executed in 940/1533-4, an act which enabled Ṭahmāsp gradually to assert his authority over the amīrs. ‘Abd Allāh Ustājlū lived until 974/1566-7 (2), but it is not clear whether he retained his title until his death. At all events, he did not figure prominently in political affairs, but spent most of his life in the region of Shīrwān, of which he was governor from 956/1549-50 probably until his death. In 975/1567-8 Shāh Qulī Sulṭān Ustājlū, who is referred to as amīr al-umarā, was sent on an important embassy to the Ottoman sultan Salīm II: "(Ṭahmāsp) sent with (the returning Ottoman ambassador) Shāh Qulī Sulṭān Ustājlū, governor of the marches of Ādharbāyjān, who was amīr al-umarā, with a wealth of equipment and great pomp" (3).

In 984/1576 Isma‘īl II appointed Musīb Beg amīr al-umarā, and gave him the rank of khān, and exalted him by giving him his own sister in marriage (bi-dāmādī-yi hamshīra-ash sar buland gardānīd). Musīb Beg had incurred Ṭahmāsp's displeasure and had been expelled (ikhraj) from Qazwīn, and at the time of his appointment by Isma‘īl II his fortunes were at such a low ebb that he did not even possess a horse. Isma‘īl II in the

(1) AT. 238. (2) ibid., 433. (3) JA. 333a. Cf. also AT. 440-1. This Shāh Qulī Sulṭān Ustājlū should not be confused with the homonymous Shāh Qulī Sulṭān Yakan Lala Ustājlū, governor of Harāt from 974/1566-7 until his assassination in 984/1576, and lala of Muḥammad Khudābanda (cf. AT. 430: 485-6).

twinkling of an eye raised his (Musīb Beg's) head to the heavens, and granted him an assignment on Qazwīn (toyūl az qazwīn) (1). The provincial amīr al-umarā also still existed at that date. In 984/1576 Shāh Qulī Sulṭān Ustājlū, the amīr al-umarā of Khurāsān, was assassinated by a group of qizilbāsh officers (2).

As the political and military importance of the amīr al-umarā declined, that of the formerly subordinate qurchībāshī increased. Sevindūk Beg Afshār the qurchībāshī was prominent from about 945/1538-9 until his death in 969/1561-2 (3). In 945/1538-9 Ṭahmāsp ordered Alqāṣ Mīrza, Mantashā Sulṭān Ustājlū, Sevindūk Beg qurchībāshī, Badr Khān Ustājlū, Ya'qūb Sulṭān Qājār, Qarāwulī 'Arabgīrlū, and Muḥammad Beg Ṭalish, with the army of Qarābāgh and Mughān and 20,000 men of the royal army, in concord with (bi-muwāfaqat-i) qurchībāshī-yi pādār who at that time had come from Shīrwān and was fully conversant with the ways of entering and leaving that region, to set out to conquer Shīrwān (4). I fail to understand the meaning of qurchībāshī-yi pādār (5). Seddon (6) treats Pādār as a proper name, but this is improbable; in all other cases where the qurchībāshī is mentioned, the title follows the name, as one would expect from normal grammatical usage. There is no record of the office of qurchībāshī ever being held jointly, so qurchībāshī-yi pādār must refer to some officer of lesser rank (7). We know from the Ṭadhkirat al-Mulūk that there existed various

(1) JA. 338b. (2) AT. 485. (3) Shar. ii, 218. (4) AT. 286. (5) BM. Or. 4134, 110b, confirms the reading pādār. (6) AT. ii, 130. (7) I am indebted to Professor Lambton for a suggestion regarding the term pādār, which she thinks might possibly be connected with the term pādarāna used in Qājār times to denote "the sum paid month by month by a man whose name was entered in the list of those who formed the military contingent provided by a village to someone whom he sent as his substitute" (A. K. S. Lambton, L. P., 436, s. v. pādarāneh). qurchībāshī-yi pādār might therefore denote an officer in charge of men raised locally in the provinces.

specialized corps of qurchīs, for instance the qurchiyān-i yarāq (1), the commander of which would have been termed qurchībāshī. The commanders of local units of qurchīs were also termed qurchībāshī; for instance, in 984/1576-7 (Ḥusayn qulī) Khulafā (Rūmlū) was appointed qurchībāshī of the qurchīs of Mashhad (2). In 974/1566-7 the Ṣafawids, after many setbacks, finally annexed Gīlān, and the ruler of Gīlān, Khān Aḥmad, was eventually hunted down and captured by Amīr Ḥusām Beg b. Bayrām Beg Qarāmanlū, who was the qurchībāshī of Imām qulī Mīrzā (3). This again must be a specialized use of the term, and presumably indicates that Amīr Ḥusām Beg was in command of a detachment of qurchīs at the disposal of Imām qulī Mīrzā.

qulī Beg Afshār qurchībāshī was a member of the Council of Amīrs set up in 985/1578 to rule the country for Muḥammad Khudābanda (4). qulī Beg Afshār, governor of Kirmān, had been appointed qurchībāshī by Isma'īl II in 984/1576-7, so that no one could interfere in qurchī affairs (ki hīch kas-rā dar muhimm-i qurchī dakhī nabāshad), and any qurchī who had a petition to make should make it to him (har qurchī ki 'arḍ-i ḥāl dāshta bāshad bidū gūyad), and if he had acted in an improper manner, he (the qurchībāshī) should report the matter to the king himself, and he (the qurchī) would be dismissed (wa agar bī-adabī karda bi-pādishāh khwud 'arḍ kunad ikhrāj bāshad) (5). The career of qulī Beg Afshār shows the importance of the qurchībāshī under Isma'īl II and Muḥammad Khudābanda. Even when 'Abbās I created new non-Turkomān units, which did not come under the command of the qurchībāshī, that officer nevertheless "carried great weight in public affairs" (6).

(1) TM. 117. Cf. also qurchī-yi ajrlū, ibid., 51, although the ajrlū were only a small corps commanded by a yuzbāshī. (2) JA. 338b-339a. (3) ibid. 331b. (4) Shar. ii, 255-6. (5) JA. 339a. (6) TM. 117.

It is possible that the formation of Georgian units may have hastened the disappearance of the amīr al-umarā. The formation of a corps of qullār, or ghulamān-i khāṣṣa-yi sharīfa, was one of the major reforms of 'Abbās I. "This cavalry corps was recruited among the natives of northern countries (Georgia, Caucasus, and even Muscovy), either brought to Persia at an early age, or born of parents established in Persia. Being mostly of Christian origin, they were converted to Islam in the first or second generation" (1). Whereas the Turkomān units "were paid in assignments on lands administered by the governors under the Dīvān-i mamālik", the new non-Turkomān units raised by Shāh 'Abbās were "paid by the King, i. e., apparently from the Khāṣṣa" (2). Professor Minorsky states that the infiltration of Caucasians into Persia was "a highly important phenomenon which profoundly modified the social basis of the ruling classes", and that the campaigns of Shāh 'Abbās in Transcaucasia, especially that of 1025/1616, in which some 100-130,000 "young captives of both sexes" were taken prisoner to Persia, were the decisive factor in this process (3). Not only were the actual numbers of the qurchīs (qizilbāsh) reduced by a half or even three-quarters (4), but "when some of the qizil-bash amirs and of the governors of the State provinces (mamālik) passed away, while among their oymāqs there was nobody worthy to hold the high office of amirship, one of the ghulamāns of the Private Household (khāṣṣa-yi sharīfa) distinguished among his colleagues by his justice, experience, valour and devotion to His Majesty, was appointed to be the amir of the said tribe and military force, and the governor of that region" (5).

While it is true that these changes occurred under 'Abbās I, "the

(1) TM. 33. (2) ibid., 32. (3) ibid., 18. (4) ibid., 32 and n. 4.
(5) ibid., 17.

infiltration of Caucasians into Persiaⁿ had been going on for nearly half a century before his accession. The Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh describes four expeditions into Georgia led by Ṭahmāsp. In 947/1540-1 he sacked Tiflīs, and took captive children and families (aṭṭāl wa 'iyāl) (1). In 958/1551-2

*Muḥarrir
Tiflīs*
Ṭahmāsp led his third expedition to Georgia; households and effects were transferred from the slain to their slayers, as their lawful heirs (ahl wa 'iyāl wa amwāl wa asbāb bi-irth-i shar'ī az maqtulān bi-qātilān intiqāl namūd). Georgian women (khubrūyān-i gurjī-nizhād), through force of circumstances, became prisoners of slavery and servitude (muqayyad-i 'ubūdiyyat wa parastārī shudand) (2). Ṭahmāsp's fourth expedition to Georgia took place in 961/1553-4; the ghāzīs slew the men, and took their wives and children prisoner (zanān wa farzandān-i īshān-rā asīr namūdand); in the region of Gūrī, the capital of Lawāsān b. Dā'ūd (3), the royal army obtained much booty, including beautiful girls and handsome youths (4). After the capture of Aydīn, the mother of Lawāsān and a number of Georgian nobles (aznāwurān) were captured and taken to court; in the course of this campaign more than thirty thousand prisoners were taken (5).

Before the end of Ṭahmāsp's reign, the offspring of unions with these Georgian prisoners constituted a new and not inconsiderable element in the Ṣafawid state, but it was not only prisoners who entered the Ṣafawid ranks. A significant passage in the Jāmi'-i Mufīdī states that during the reign of Ṭahmāsp, 'Alī Qulī Beg, known as Qizil 'Alī Khān, came to the Ṣafawid court as ambassador from the ruler of Georgia, and was enrolled among the mugarrabs and ghulāms of the court along with his muta'alliqān and khuddām. Although

(1) AT. 296-7. (2) ibid., 352. (3) Ruler of the Kartlī district of Georgia. (4) AT. 380. (5) ibid., 382.

Kennedy

he was closely related (qarābat-i qarīna) to the King (pādishāh) of Georgia, and governed certain provinces there, he severed his connexion (qaṭ'-i ta'alluq kardā) and became a servant of the Ṣafawid dynasty (ḥalqabandagī-yi silsila-yi 'aliyya-yi ṣafawīyya dar gūsh-i jān jāy dāda būd), and eventually became governor of Shakkī, a province of Shīrwān (1). Qizil 'Alī Khān's younger son, 'Alī Beg Chahāryāz, became beglerbeg of Erivan and governor of Lār, with the title of khān, under Shāh Ṣafī (2).

These new elements cut across the old division between Turk and Persian. The presence of Georgian and Circassian chiefs at court, and above all the influence of Caucasian women in the royal ḥaram, made the Caucasian elements an important factor in political affairs. Dynastic quarrels of a type hitherto unknown in the Ṣafawid state were precipitated by the efforts of mothers of different nationalities to press the claims of their respective offspring. It has been stated above that Ṭahmāsp was unable to exercise sovereign authority during the first decade of his reign owing to the dominant position in the state held by the Turkomān amīrs (3). For nearly the next forty years, from about 942-980/1535-1572, Ṭahmāsp managed to avoid any major outbreak between the qizilbāsh tribes, but, at end of that time, there was a recrudescence of inter-tribal rivalry. In 931/1524 and the following years the question at stake was, which tribe was to gain supremacy over its rivals and hence a dominant position in the state; in 981/1573 and subsequent years the struggle was rather to determine which of the sons of Ṭahmāsp should succeed him. The qizilbāsh failed to present a united front on this issue, and do not seem immediately

(1) JM. 169a-b. (2) ibid., 170b. (3) See p. 213 ff. above.

to have realized that they were thereby seriously weakening their own position in the Ṣafawid state.

In 982/1574-5 Ṭahmāsp fell ill; his illness provided an opportunity for the amīrs and pillars of the state to quarrel openly (miyān-i umarā wa arkan-i dawlat khuṣūmat wa niza' chand nawbat wuqū' shud) (1). One centre of intrigue was Sulaymān Mīrzā, the khādim-bāshī of the shrine of Imām Riḍā at Mashhad(2), who was then at court. Sulaymān's mother was the sister of the Circassian chief Shamkhāl (3). Ṭahmāsp recovered (4), but although he felt great resentment (kudūrat-i khāṭir) against the seditious amīrs, and although the position did not call for leniency (maḥall taqāḍā-yi mulāyamat namīkard), he hesitated to take retaliatory measures (dar intiqām muta'ammil mībūd), with the result that sedition amongst the qizilbāsh increased daily (5).

By the following year (983/1575-6), the qizilbāsh had split into two factions ('ashāyir wa ūymāqāt-i qizilbāshiyya dū ṭarafa shuda), the one supporting Isma'īl Mīrzā and the other Ḥaydar Mīrzā. Isma'īl, whose mother was the daughter of Turkman 'Īsā Beg, was the representative of the old qizilbāsh aristocracy; Ḥaydar's mother, on the other hand, was a Georgian slave (6), and the prominence of the Georgian chiefs Zāl, Farrukh, and 'Alī Khān in the struggle for power which followed the death of Ṭahmāsp in 984/1576 (7) shows that the Caucasian element already wielded great power. In general the events of 984-5/1576-7 point to the conclusion that the changes in the basis of Ṣafawid power associated with 'Abbās I were foreshadowed by

(1) AT. 458. (2) AT. 490; for khādim-bāshī, see TM. 55. (3) Shar. ii, 245. (4) AT. 458. (5) Shar. ii, 245-6. (6) ibid., 252. (7) AT. 463 ff.

the growing influence of the Circassians and Georgians under Ṭahmāsp - an influence reflected not only in the presence at court of Caucasian chiefs and their armed retainers, but by the ascendancy of Circassian and Georgian women in the royal ḥaram. Of the nine sons of Ṭahmāsp who reached adolescence, seven were the offspring of Circassian or Georgian mothers (1). The Georgian faction failed in their attempt (in which they were supported by the Ustāj-lūs) to place Ḥaydar Mīrzā on the throne in 1576, and the qizilbāsh ultimately rallied sufficiently to bring to the throne first Isma'īl Mīrzā (Isma'īl II) and then Muḥammad Khudābanda (Sulṭān Muḥammad Shāh), the only sons of Ṭahmāsp by a Turkomān mother.

The intrigues of the Circassian and Georgian factions in the ḥaram also portend another feature of the later Ṣafawid period, namely, "the irresponsible character of the 'shadow government' represented by the harem, the Queen Mother and the eunuchs", which Professor Minorsky considers as one of the major factors in the decline of the Ṣafawid dynasty (2). For instance, in the activities of Parī Khān Khānum, the daughter of Ṭahmāsp and niece of Shamkhāl Charkas (3), we have clear evidence of intervention in political affairs. By contrast, it is interesting to note the social rather than political activity of Ṭahmāsp's sister Mahīn Bānū, who died in 969/1561-2. From her childhood she had eschewed marriage and lived with her brother (az zamān-i šibā tark-i izdiwāj namūda bā barādarash bi-sar mīburd), and she had an excellent record in regard to strengthening the foundations of the realm and kingly authority (dar istiḥkām-i bunyān-i shāhī wa asās-i salṭanat-i pādishāhī azū āthār-i nīk bi-ḡuhūr āmada būd).

(1) Shar. ii, 252. (2) TM. 23. (3) See AT. ii, 295 n; this does not appear to be the Parī Khān Khānum who was the daughter of Isma'īl I (AT. 183).

She was noted for her pious works (anwā'-i khayrāt wa aṣnāf-i mabarrāt), and for her public works (biqā'-i khayr), which included hospices, hosteleries (ribāṭ), and bridges; all classes of men and women benefited from her munificence (1).

The position of the principal officers of state during this turbulent period is obscure. The wakīl/wazīr Ma'ṣūm Beg Ṣafawī was killed in 976/1568-9, and the manṣab-i wizārat was conferred on Amīr Sayyid Sharīf Thānī (2). In 981/1573-4, the wizārat-i dīwān-i a'lā was given by Ṭahmāsp to Sayyid Ḥusayn Farāhānī and Khwāja Jamāl al-Dīn 'Alī Tabrīzī, and the post of mustawfī of the dīwān-i a'lā to Mīrzā Shukr Allāh Iṣfahānī; 500 Tabrīz tūmans were allocated to each as his salary (marṣūm) (3). The Jawāhir al-Akhbār, after recording the appointment to the wizārat of Sayyid Ḥasan Farāhānī and Khwāja Jamāl al-Dīn 'Alī Tabrīzī, continues, "Khurāsān, Gīlān, 'Irāq, Fārs and Kirman in the name of (bi-ism-i) Sayyid Ḥasan, and Ādharbā-yjān, Shīrwān and Shakkī in the name of Jamāl al-Dīn 'Alī. The office of mustawfī-yi mamālik-i maḥrūsa was assigned to Mīrzā Shukr Allāh, and the baqāyā (4) in the name of Shāh Qāḍī, and the salary (mawājib) of each of the wazīrs was 500 tūmans, and 200 tūmans were allotted (muqarrar) to the baqāyā-niwīs (4), and they were sworn to collect the dūshullukāt (fees) (5)

(1) Shar. ii, 217-8. (2) See p. 241. (3) AT. 458: for marṣūm, "salary and allowances payable in cash", see TM. 88 para. 95; 93, para. 127; 152, n. 2, as opposed to rusūm, "customary levies, perquisites", see TM. 155, n. 2. (4) V. Minorsky in TM, 123 n. 1 quotes TAA to the effect that under Ṭahmāsp I there were two separate officers, mustawfī al-mamālik and mustawfī al-baqāyā ("mustawfī of the arrears"). Minorsky also (op.cit., 122-3) comments on the niwīsanda-yi baqāyā ("scribe of the arrears"), who was an official in the department of the mustawfī al-mamālik and is presumably the same as the baqāyā-niwīs mentioned above. (5) Minorsky, op.cit., 157, states that the word dūshulluk is "undoubtedly of Turkish origin but the etymology is not quite certain". He mentions that it is used in TM. as an equivalent of rusūm, "fees" of various types, and also in the special sense of fees levied on salaries on the occasion of first appointment to an office, payable to the keeper of the "small seal" (cf. TM. 157 and n. 2; 62-3).

دوشلک
دوشلک

for the khāṣṣa (wa qasam dādand ki dūshullukāt-rā jihat-i khāṣṣa qabṭ kunand); but the wazīrs achieved nothing in their office (dar muhimm-i khwud kārī nasakhtand). Although Sayyid Ḥasan was a good and eloquent speaker (dar taqrīr wa sukhan-rawānī nīkū), and before (his appointment to) the wizārat was in high esteem, when he assumed that office (chūn bidīn amr dakhil kard), in the period of one year he was not able to report one single affair of importance (dar muddat-i yak sāl yak muhimm natawānist ki 'arḍ kunad). As for Jamāl al-Dīn 'Alī, whenever he started to speak Ṭahmāsp used to say, "the Khwāja is gargling his words" (khwāja sukhan-rā qarqara mīkunad). They both became a laughing-stock (har dū muḍhika shudand), and after a year were dismissed and obliged to refund their salaries (mustaradd-i mawājib shud). The position of the mustawfīs was not affected (mustawfiyān bi-hāl-i khwud būdand), and Mīrza Shukr Allāh performed the function of mustawfī (and was held) in the highest esteem and respect, so that no one was able to raise the finger of criticism against him, and he daily increased in maturity (rushd-i ū rūz bi-rūz ziyāda gasht) (1). From this passage it appears that Sayyid Ḥasan Farāhānī and Khwāja Jamāl al-Dīn 'Alī Tabrīzī were dismissed from the wizārat after they had held office for a year, namely, in 982/1574-5. Mīrza Shukr Allāh was appointed wazīr by Isma'īl II in 984/1576, and Shāh Qāḍī became mustawfī (2).

The passages from the Jawāhir al-Akhbār quoted above contain information which is not recorded by the Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh, and the statement that the wizārat was in in 981/1573-4 divided on a territorial basis is of the greatest interest. The wizārat was frequently during the early Ṣafawid period held jointly by two wazīrs, with joint jurisdiction throughout the

(1) JA, 334a-b. (2) ibid., 339b.

Şafawid empire, but this is the first occasion on which the wizārat was divided between two wazīrs, each with authority over a specified part of the empire. The Jawāhir al-Akhbār also states that in 967/1559-60 Mīrzā 'Aṭā Allāh Khūzānī Işfahānī was wazīr-i bā i'tibār-i kull-i ādharbāyjān wa shīrwānāt wa shakkī wa gurjī (1). This would seem definitely to point to some earlier territorial division of the wizārat, although it is just possible that Mīrzā 'Aṭā Allāh may have been a provincial wazīr with jurisdiction over an unusually large amount of territory. Unfortunately it is not clear from the sources who the central wazīr at that date was. Ma'şūm Beg Şafawī, who seems to have succeeded Qādī Jahān c. 960/1552-3, and resigned in 976/1568-9, was termed not only wazīr but also wakīl (2); as he acted as wakīl, there may well have been another official or officials who held the rank of wazīr-i dīwān-i a'lā.

below { It should be noted at this point that the şadārat was divided on a territorial basis in 970/1562-3, but neither in the case of the wizārat nor the şadārat does this territorial division appear to have had any permanence. In the case of the şadārat, there was a reversion, by 985/1577-8 if not before, to the practice of appointing one şadr with sole authority, and the territorial division of the wizārat appears from the above passage in the Jawāhir al-Akhbār to have lasted only for a year. A comparison of the way in which the provinces were divided reveals certain similarities; for instance, in each case 'Irāq and Fārs appear in one group of provinces, and Shīrwān and Ādharbāyjān in the other; Khurāsān, however, is bracketed with 'Irāq and Fārs in the case of the wizārat, and with Shīrwān and Ādharbāyjān in the case of the şadārat (3). It does not seem that the territorial

(1) JA. 327a. (2) See above, pp. 240-1. (3) See chapter on the şadārat, p. 316 f.;

9
 division of the ṣadārat in 970/1562-3 and the wizārat in 981/1573-4 can be regarded as in any way portending the eventual division of the Ṣafawid empire into mamālik and khāṣṣa provinces (1). This process began during the reign of Shāh Ṣafī (1038-1052/1629-1642), when Fārs was made a khāṣṣa province (2), and was continued and extended under 'Abbās II (1052-1077/1642-1667). The division of the ṣadārat and wizārat during the reign of Tahmāsp I is much more likely to have been an ad hoc arrangement for the specific purpose of limiting the powers of the ṣadr and wazīr at a particular moment.

On 26 Rabī' I 985/13 June 1577 Mīrzā Shukr Allāh Iṣfahānī was dismissed from the wizārat by Isma'īl II, and Mīrzā Salmān was appointed to manṣab-i dīwān-i a'lā wa wizāratgarī; the conduct of affairs and the task of displaying diligence and care in (the management of) the affairs and interests of the people were placed within his authority (zimām-i ḥall wa 'aqd-i umūr wa ihtimām dar muhimmāt wa maṣāliḥ-i jumbūr bi-kaff-i iqtidār bāz dāda āmad), and the administration of the realm (ḡabṭ-i mamālik) and the guardianship of the roads and the keys to the gateways of the kingdom and state (ḥifẓ-i mamālik wa mafātīḥ-i abwāb-i mulk wa dawlat), and the ordering of the affairs of religion and the faith (manāẓim-i asbāb-i dīn wa millat), were entrusted to his integrity, uprightness, zeal and effort (bi-qabḍa-yi sadād wa rashād wa anāmīl-i ihtimām wa ijtihād-i ū mawkūl gasht) (3).

32
 (1) See TM, 24 ff. (2) ibid., 26. Professor Lambton is of the opinion that "although Chardin states that the distinction between provinces and crown lands had been unknown before the reign of Shāh Ṣafī (A. D. 1629-42), it seems that in fact some broad general distinction was made between dīwānī (i.e. state) land and khāṣṣ (i.e. crown) land, though the division may have become sharper under Shāh Ṣafī (LP, 108). Professor Lambton also notes that as a result of the creation of new non-tribal regiments by 'Abbās I, "in so far as the military forces under the direct control of the ruler increased relative to the contingents provided by the provincial governors, it was a necessary corollary that the extent of the land under the direct control of the ruler should increase to enable him to pay them" (LP, 108). (3) AT, 491.

Mīrzā Salmān was confirmed in his post on the accession of Sulṭān Muḥammad Shāh in February 1578 (manṣab-i wizārat bi-mīrzā salmān rujū' namūda); that celebrated and noble wazīr guarded the kingdom through the abundance of his intelligence and knowledge (az wufūr-i kiyāsāt wa dānā'ī hirāsāt-i mulk mīnamūd), and removed the rust from (men's) hearts with the paint of reconciliation and the polish of beneficence (1), and, giving his full attention to the requirements of this high office and delicate task, and keeping always before his eyes, from among all the commands and prohibitions, the fear and awe of God, he treated the common people, as regards the observance of the rules of justice and the execution of the laws of transaction, in a way which one cannot imagine being surpassed (bi-lawāzim-i īn amr-i buzurg wa muhim-i nāzūk qiyām wa iqdām namūda az jamī'-i awāmīr wa nawāhī khawf wa khashyat-i ḥaḍrat-i ilāhī-rā naṣb al-'ayn dāshta 'umūm-i khalāyiq wa kāffa-yi anām dar iqāmat-i qawā'id-i ḥikmat wa ijrā-yi aḥkām-i mu'amala bar wajhī namūd ki mazīdī bar ān mutaṣawwar nabūd); he strove to punish wrong-doers and comfort the oppressed, and would not tolerate partiality or negligence (dar ta'dīb-i ḡalimān wa tarfīh-i maḡlūmān kūshīda wa mayl wa muḥabā wa ihmāl wa ighfāl jāyiz nadāsht); he made great efforts to increase the revenue of the dīwān and to conciliate the dihqāns and cultivators (muzāri'ān) to the greatest possible extent (dar tawfīr-i māl-i dīwān wa istimalāt-i dahāqīn wa muzāri'ān ghāyat al-imkān sa'y-i bisyār namūd); he did not neglect the smallest part of his duties as regards collection of the 'ulūfa (2) for the troops and the provision of pensions for

(1) The text has az dilhā zang-i ta'līf wa rang bi-ṣayqal-i iḥsān mīzidūd, which does not seem to make sense; perhaps, az dilhā zang bi-rang-i ta'līf wa bi-ṣayqal-i iḥsān mīzidūd? (2) 'ulūfa = "levy of fodder for the horses of officials as they travelled through the country" (A. K. S. Lambton, LP., 442 s. v.); the word is probably used here in the Ottoman sense of "pay" in general (see Gibb and Bowen, op. cit., 42 n. 2).

the deserving (dar wuṣūl-i 'ulūfāt-i lashkariyān wa maḥṣūl-i idrārāt-i mustahaqqān daqīqa'ī nā mar'ī nagudhāsht) (1).

Apart from the interest of these passages as representing an account of the administrative duties of the wazīr shortly before the accession of 'Abbās I, the statement that the wazīr was also responsible for "ordering the affairs of religion and the faith" is significant. It will be recalled that the wakīl, as the representative of the Shāh both in his religious and in his political capacity, was responsible for the orderly arrangement of matters of religion and the state. It is possible that as the wakīl ceased to be regarded as occupying a position of peculiar eminence as the vicegerent and personal representative of the Shāh, and his identity tended to be merged with that of the wazīr, the wazīr acquired some of the attributes of the wakīl, in particular the latter's overriding authority, under the Shāh, over both the political and the religious institutions. It has been noted, too, that the wakīl was frequently an army commander conducting operations in the field, whereas it was the exception rather than the rule for the wazīr to take part in military operations. Mīrzā Salmān, however, played a notable part in the campaign of Ḥamza Mīrzā in Qarābāgh and Shīrwān in 987/1579-80 against the Ottomans under 'Uthmān Pasha and the Tatars under 'Ādil Girāy Khān, the brother of Muḥammad Girāy II, Khān of the Crimea (2). Mīrzā Salmān also accompanied Sulṭān Muḥammad Shāh and Ḥamza Mīrzā to Khurāsān in 990/1582; the object of the expedition was to suppress the revolt of 'Abbās Mīrzā, who had been proclaimed Shāh the previous year by 'Alī Qulī Khān Shāmlū, the governor of Harāt.

Mīrzā Salmān, who had married his daughter to Ḥamza Mīrzā, and whose

(1) AT. 502-3. (2) TAA. 170 ff.

eldest son Mīrzā 'Abd Allāh was the wazīr of Ḥamza Mīrzā, accounted himself one of the most devoted supporters (fidawiyān) of Ḥamza Mīrzā. He was constantly accusing some of the principal amīrs, in particular Qulī Beg the qurchibāshī, Shāhrukh Khān the muhrdār, and Muḥammad Khān Turkmān, of dereliction of duty (taqsīrāt) and sedition (nifāq wa shiqāq). After the battle of Ghūriyān (991/1583), between the royal army and the Shāmlū rebels, Mīrzā Salmān openly (ṣarīḥan) accused them of sedition (nifāq), and the amīrs, realizing that the wazīr's words would soon produce some result (mu'aththir khwāhad būd), decided to kill him. The wazīr became aware of the plot, and went to the dawlatkhāna to inform the Shāh and Ḥamza Mīrzā; the amīrs at first denied that there was a plot against the wazīr, but one of the qizilbāsh whom they had detailed to murder Mīrzā Salmān entered, and uttered a violent diatribe against the wazīr. Mīrzā Salmān, he said, was the destroyer of the state and the enemy of the qizilbāsh (mukharrib-i dawlat wa dushman-i qizilbāsh), and his evil conduct (bad-sulūkī) had been and still was the cause of the discord among the qizilbāsh and the revolt of the Khurāsān amīrs; until he was removed (tā ū raf' nashawad), this schism between the qizilbāsh would continue (īn dū-gurūhī az miyāna-yi qizilbāsh bar ṭaraf nakhwāhad shud). The amīrs were then unable to maintain their denial. Mīrzā Salmān, they said, was a Persian (mard-i tājīkī ast); he was only expected to look after the accounts and dīwān business (juz ratq wa fatq-i umūr-i ḥisāb wa mu'āmalāt-i dīwānī azū mutawaqqi' nabūd) (1); it did not lie within his province to assume command of an army, to intervene in state affairs on his own behalf, and become the cause of discord and rebellion (bi-ū nisbat nadāsht ki ṣāhib-i jaysh wa

(1) According to HI. 360b, Mīrzā Salmān first achieved distinction as nāzir-i khānajāt-i shāh ṭahmāsp.

lashkar gashta barāyi khwud dakhil dar umūr-i salṭanat karda bā'ith-i fitna wa fisād gardad); now that the qizilbāsh had brought matters out into the open (parda az rū-yi kār bar dāshta), and their relations with him had reached this position (bā ū dar īn maqām dar āmada and), it was better that he should withdraw from the post of wazīr and retire from affairs (of state) (awlā īn ast ki ū dāman az manṣab-i wizārat dar chīda tark-i muhimmāt namāyad) (1).

From this remarkable passage several things emerge quite clearly. First, the fundamental dichotomy in the Ṣafawid state between Turk and Persian was as sharp, and the hostility of the one towards the other was as strong, as at the beginning of the Ṣafawid period. Second, the qizilbāsh amīrs, as the military aristocracy, felt the utmost resentment at being forced to serve under a Persian commander. It will be recalled that the expression of a similar resentment by the qizilbāsh troops under the command of the Persian wakīl Najm-i Thānī in 918/1512 had resulted in the defeat and death of the wakīl (2). Even more important is the revelation that in the view of the qizilbāsh, the function of the wazīr was solely to "look after the accounts and dīwān business". They had no objection to a "Tājīk" (3) performing this function. Mīrzā Salmān, however, by assuming the role of a military commander, and by intervening in affairs of state from interested motives, was clearly, in their view, arrogating to himself the authority of a wakīl. It is equally clear by implication that the qizilbāsh were not in favour of a "Tājīk" holding the post of wakīl. The office of wakīl was closely associated with the Ṣūfī organization of the

(1) TAA. 209-10. (2) See p. 195 ff. above. (3) See TM. 15-16.

Safawid movement at the beginning of the reign of Isma'īl I, and was therefore considered by the qizilbāsh as their prerogative. Mīrzā Salmān, who looked in vain for royal support, in consideration of the fact that Ḥamza Mīrzā was his son-in-law, was surrendered by the Shāh and Ḥamza Mīrzā to the amīrs, who kept him in custody in the house of the qurchibāshī until they had appropriated all his possessions, and then put him to death (1).

Mīrzā Salmān came from a family of nobles (a'yān wa ashraf) of Iṣfahān who traced their descent to Jābir b. 'Abd Allāh Anṣārī. According to the Jāmi'-i Mufīdī, Mīrzā Salmān held the post of nizārat-i buyūtāt-i sarkār-i khāṣṣa-yi sharīfa (2) under Isma'īl II, and was later raised to the wizārat-i a'zam with the title of i'timād al-dawla. A royal edict was issued absolving him from the obligation of standing as a mark of respect to the great amīrs (ḥukm-i shahryār-i jahān nifādh yāft ki ān 'alīmaqām dar majlis-i dīwān bi-jihat-i ta'zīm-i umarā'-i 'alīsha'n qiyām nanamāyad). During the time of Sulṭām Muḥammad Shāh, he held the post of wazīr on the same terms as before (bi-hamān dastūr), reached the rank of walī (bi-martaba-yi iyālat rasīd), and became "master of drum and banner" (ṣāhib-i ṭabl wa 'alam). There was hostility between Mīrzā Salmān and some of the high-ranking amīrs, whose existence he considered "thorns in the rose-garden of his felicity" (wujūd-i ba'dī az umarā'-yi 'alīsha'n-rā khār-i gulzār-i dawlat-i khwud mīdānist); he did not behave acceptably towards the amīrs (bā umarā sulūk-i pasandīda namīkard), and considered how to remove them. The qurchibāshī and the other amīrs similarly sought an opportunity to get rid of Mīrzā Salmān. They stated that the revolt of the Khurāsān amīrs was due to the arbitrary decisions (tahakkumāt) of the I'timād al-Dawla, and

(1) TAA. 210. (2) See TM. 134.

demanded his dismissal from the wizārat, now that the qizilbāsh had brought the matter into the open (ḥalā qizilbāsh parda az rū-yi kār bar dāshta). Mīrzā Salmān was arrested and imprisoned, together with his sons Mīrzā 'Abd Allāh and Mīrzā Nizām al-Mulk, and their property and known belongings were taken over by the dīwān (asbāb wa mā yu'raf-i īshān bi-taṣarruf-i dīwān dar amad). Mīrzā Salmān was executed a few days later, but Mīrzā 'Abd Allāh was released after the death of Sulṭān Ḥamza Mīrzā (994/1586) (1).

To sum up, the general picture of the political institution under Isma'īl and Tahmāsp is one of gradual change and evolution. When Isma'īl came to power, the majority of his subjects differed from his Turkomān followers both in race and creed. His primary need, therefore, was strong and effective government based on the military power of his militant Sūfīs. To this end he appointed a wakīl, who was also amīr al-umara, with the widest political and military powers and with ex officio authority over the religious institution as well (2). As the Ṣafawid order was fundamentally a military and religious organization, and as the immediate needs of the Ṣafawid state were the imposition of military control and religious orthodoxy, the wazīr, who represented the Persian bureaucratic tradition, was to begin with a subordinate figure. By 920/1514, the whole of Persia had been brought under Ṣafawid dominion, and the burdens of the administration were correspondingly heavier; the importance of the wazīr increased. At the same time, various factors contributed to a reduction in the power of the wakīl, and with the appointment of Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn (920/1514),

(1) JM. 142a-144a. (2) The actual official through whom Isma'īl controlled the religious institution was the ṣadr. For instances of conflict between the wakīl and the ṣadr, as the natural outcome of the overlapping of their spheres of authority, see p. 291 ff.; 302 ff.

some sort of compromise seems to have been reached, and Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn appears to have been an official who performed the function of wazīr but is sometimes referred to as wakīl, though not, it should be noted, as wakīl-i nafs-i nafs-i humāyūn.

With the accession of Ṭahmāsp and the domination of the ruling institution by the qizilbāsh amīrs, the title of wakīl is again used freely but somewhat haphazardly by the sources. The term wakīl-i nafs-i nafs-i is no longer recorded; indeed, the idea of a joint wakīl (1), first heard of at this time, was a negation of the original conception of the wikālat. The office was shared only as a means of achieving a balance of power between rival qizilbāsh tribes. During this confused period the term wakīl is sometimes used with reference to an official who is primarily amīr al-umārā, and sometimes to denote an official who clearly is performing the function of wazīr. The wakīl/wazīr is at all events subordinate to the wakīl/amīr al-umārā. During the middle period of Ṭahmāsp's reign, the Shāh succeeded in asserting his authority, and the licence of the amīrs was checked. Qādī Jahān Qazwīnī became wakīl, but is usually referred to as "independent wazīr". After him, Ma'sūm Beg Ṣafawī was wakīl, though his office is also referred to as amr-i wizārat. Amīr Sharīf Thānī, who succeeded Ma'sūm Beg Ṣafawī, is referred to as wazīr (2). In general, from the time of Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn (920-929/1514-1523), until the accession of 'Abbās I (995/1587), the sources tend to employ the title wakīl in regard to a Turkomān, wazīr or "independent wazīr" in the case of a Persian, official. This is due in part to the fact that when a Turkomān held the office of wakīl, he was often also amīr al-umārā, and the emphasis on his

(1) See pp. 214; 216 above. (2) See pp. 234 ff.; 240-1 above.

military function caused him more readily to be termed wakīl than wazīr, and in part to the origins of the two offices.

According to Professor Minorsky, the title of wakīl is no longer recorded under 'Abbās I (1). The Tārīkh-i 'Ālam-Ārā, however, states that on the accession of 'Abbās I (995/1587), Murshid Qulī Khān, being reassured in regard to the amīrs of 'Irāq, reclined on the seat of the wikālat in full independence, and undertook the management of dīwān affairs; His Majesty, the Shadow of God, in order to strengthen the foundations of sovereignty and the welfare of the state, gave him full and absolute responsibility in ordering the affairs of government, and his grandeur and power increased daily (murshid qulī khān khāṭir az umarā'-i 'irāq jam' namūda min ḥayth al-istiqlāl tikya bar masnad-i wikālat zada qaṭ' wa faṣl-i muhimmāt-i dīwān pīsh girift wa ḥadrat-i a'lā-yi shāhī ḡill allāhī bi-jihat-i istipkām-i qawā'id-i qaṣr-i saltānat wa ṣalāḥ-i dawlat dast-i takafful-i ū-rā dar intiḡām-i umūr-i jahāndārī qawī wa muṭlaq dāshta rūz bi-rūz 'aḡamat wa iqtidārash mīafzūd) (2). The wikālat once again appears to be distinct from the wizārat:- the wizārat-i dīwān-i a'lā had been promised to Mīrzā 'Abd Allāh b. Mīrzā b. Mīrzā Salmān (3), and a raqm had been issued, but 'Abbās overlooked this (taghāful warzīda) in the interests of (bi-mulāḥaḡa-yi khāṭir-i) Mīrzā Shāh Walī b. Mīrzā Aḡmad, the wazīr of Murshid Qulī Khān, and the duties of wazīr were discharged by Mīrzā Shāh Walī (khidmat-i wizārat az mīrzā shāh walī mutamashshī mīshud) (4). According to the Jāmi'-i Mufīdī, after the accession of 'Abbās I at Qazwīn, Mīrzā 'Abd Allāh went to court, but was ignored by Murshid Qulī Khān, who

(1) TM. 115. (2) TAA. ii, 251. (3) Mīrzā Salmān was the wazīr of Isma'īl II and Sultān Muḡammad Shāh. (4) JM. 144b.

planned to give the wizārat-i a'zam to Mīrzā Shāh Walī b. Mīrzā Aḥmad, one of his wazīrs (ki dar silk-i wuzarā-yi ū intiḡām dāsht) (1). The amīrs who were hostile to Murshid Qulī Khān conspired with Mīrzā 'Abd Allāh against Murshid Qulī Khān, but without success; the amīrs and muqarrabs of the court were executed, and Mīrzā 'Abd Allāh and his brother Mīrzā Niḡām al-Mulk were seized and their goods appropriated by officials of the state (2). The following year (996/1588), Murshid Qulī Khān was assassinated at 'Abbās's orders at Shāhrūd, and the same night Mīrzā Muḥammad, who had been promised the wizārat (nawīd-i wizārat yafta būd), was summoned, and, as promised, was elevated to the manṣab-i wizārat-i dīwān-i a'lā (3). These quotations make it clear that not only did the wikālat still exist after the accession of 'Abbās I, but that the confusion between the terms wakīl and wazīr also continued.

Simultaneously with the decline in the importance of the wakīl during the latter part of the reign of Ṭahmāsp, the office of amīr al-umarā fell into disuse (4). The office is not recorded among the appointments made by 'Abbās I on his accession (5). It has been suggested above that the introduction of Caucasian elements into the Ṣafawid state under Ṭahmāsp, and the presence of Georgian units under Isma'īl II and Sulṭān Muḥammad Shāh, may possibly have contributed to the decline of the amīr al-umarā (6). An indication of the extent to which these Georgian elements had infiltrated into important positions even before the accession of 'Abbās I can be gained from the fact that in 994/1585-6 a Georgian, Kaykhusraw Beg, was lala to Ṭahmāsp Mīrzā b. Muḥammad Khudābanda (7). The post of lala to a Ṣafawid

(1) JM. 144b. (2) ibid., 144b-145a. (3) TAA. ii, 267. (4) See p. 242 ff. (5) TAA. ii, 252. (6) See p. 246 ff. above.

Not an
army
corps

prince had hitherto been considered a qizilbāsh prerogative. With the decline of the power of the amīr al-umārā, the qurchībāshī became the chief military officer in the state (1). In addition, from the second half of the 10th/16th century onwards, the qurchībāshī played an increasingly important part in political affairs, and remained one of the principal officers of state during the early years of 'Abbās I. The Tārīkh-i 'Ālam-Ārā, referring to the appointment of Walī Khān Afshār, governor of Kirmān, to the post of qurchībāshī in 996/1588, describes the post as "the major part of the offices of the dīwān-i 'alī" (manṣab-i qurchībāshīgarī ki mu'ṣam-i manāṣib-i dīwān-i 'alī ast) (2).

(1) It is interesting to note that, over a period of forty years from about 955-995/1548-1587, the majority of the qurchībāshīs were drawn from the ranks of the Afshār tribe. (2) TAA, ii, 268.

IV. THE ṢADĀRĀT

Professor Roemer, in his commentary on the Sharafnāma of 'Abd Allāh Marwārīd, has traced the development of the use of the word ṣadr. From its basic meaning of "breast, front, place of honour," is derived the use of the word as a title of honour (1). In the Dastūr al-Kātib, dated 1356-7, the terms ṣadr-i mu'azzam or ṣadr-i anām are used to denote individual members of the ashraf al-nās, or non-Mongol upper classes, e.g., arbāb-i futuwwa, muhtasibs, ustādān (master craftsmen) and merchants. The plural ṣudūr appears in pairs of terms such as ṣudūr u a'yān, ṣudūr u akābir, in which it implies nothing more than "notables". No nishān-i ṣadārat is found among the diplomas of investiture to religious posts contained in the second part (qism-i duwwum) of the Dastūr al-Kātib.

Professor Roemer concludes that, as the ṣadārat is not mentioned among the important offices represented in the Dastūr al-Kātib, it is probable that the office of ṣadr had not yet been created (2).

Under the Tīmūrīds, however, the ṣadārat was a well-established office, and it also existed in the contemporary Turkomān kingdoms of western Irān. The Ḥabīb al-Siyar gives the names of four men who held the rank of ṣadr during the reign of Shāhrukh b. Tīmūr (807-850/1404-1447), and

(1) The use of the title ṣadr-i a'zam by the Ottomans and, later, by the Persians, in the sense of Prime Minister, is derived from this meaning of the word ṣadr. It is interesting to note that, in prosody, the first hemistich of a qaṣīda is termed al-ṣadr (see G. Weil, article 'Arūḍ, in EI², Vol. I, fasc. 11/1958, 668.) (2) Roemer, 143.

A summary
of ṣadr
in Persian
1141

states that one of them, Mawlānā Kamāl al-Dīn 'Abd al-Ḥamīd, was the son of Mawlānā Quṭb al-Dīn Qurūmī, who for some time during the reign of Amīr Tīmūr Gūrakān carried out the duties of the office of ṣadr (ki muddatī dar ayyām-i dawlat-i amīr tīmūr gūrakān bi-lawāzim-i manṣab-i ṣadārat qiyām mīnamūd).

It is apparent from this that the office of ṣadr was in existence before the beginning of the 15th century, and that from the first there was a tendency towards the hereditary tenure of the office. It is also clear that from the first there was a tendency to appoint two ṣadrs to hold the office jointly; for example, Mawlānā 'Abd al-Ḥamīd was for some years during the reign of Shāhrukh in joint possession of that office with Mawlānā Jalāl al-Dīn Luṭf Allāh (mawlānā 'abd al-ḥamīd dar zamān-i salṭanat-i ḥadrat-i khāqān-i sa'īd chand sāl bi-shirkat-i mawlānā jalāl al-dīn luṭf allāh dar an amr dakhil mīkard). The appointment of Mawlānā Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad Amīn further illustrates the tendency towards the hereditary tenure of the ṣadārat; after the death of Mawlānā Jalāl al-Dīn Luṭf Allāh (842/1438), Mawlānā Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad Amīn was made ṣadr in place of his distinguished father Mawlānā Ṣadr al-Dīn Ibrāhīm, who had died in 832/1428. On the death of Shāhrukh (1447), Mawlānā Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad Amīn retired from public life, and all attempts by Mīrzā Abu'l-Qāsim and Mīrzā Sulṭān Abū Sa'īd to persuade him to take up again his ancestral office were unsuccessful (har chand mīrzā abu'l-qāsim wa mīrzā sulṭān abū sa'īd anjanāb-rā taklīf-i qabūl-i manṣab-i mawrūthī namūdand bi-ja'ī narasīd). He eventually died in 887/1482 at the age of 77 (1).

From the evidence of this passage in the Ḥabīb al-Siyar, it appears that the function of the ṣadr under Shāhrukh was to promote the affairs of

(1) HS. iii/3, 140.

the religious classes, to administer the waqf, and to maintain in good order pious and charitable foundations. Mawlānā Jalāl al-Dīn Luṭf Allāh, who had precedence over his colleagues, constantly devoted his efforts to increasing the mawqūfāt and to giving patronage to men of learning (tarbiyat-i afāḍil). Mawlānā Ṣadr al-Dīn Ibrāhīm, who was distinguished among the great men of Samarqand, was ṣadr during the early years of Shāhrukh's reign, he devoted himself to the welfare of the 'ulamā and afāḍil, and to the patronage of great and eminent men (tarbiyat-i akābir wa amāthil), and in spending money derived from mawqūfāt he was careful to observe the conditions laid down by the benefactors (wāqifān), and he did not digress in the smallest degree from the requirements of the holy sharī'a. Mawlānā Kamāl al-Dīn 'Abd al-Ḥamīd was zealous in conducting the affairs of the religious classes of both high and low degree (saranjām-i muḥamm-i arbāb-i 'amayim az aḡāghir wa a'āzim). In general, the ṣadrs of this period devoted themselves to promoting the affairs of the sādāt, 'ulamā, and fuḍalā, and to ensuring the prosperity of pious foundations and charitable buildings (biqā'-i khayr wa abwāb-al-birr) (1).

The Ḥabīb al-Siyar also gives some particulars of the ṣadārat under Abū Sa'īd (d. 873/1468-9). Mawlānā Faṭḥ Allāh Tabrīzī was for a long time ṣadr of Abū Sa'īd; despite his preoccupation with that office, he sometimes engaged in teaching and instruction (gāhī bi-marāsīm-i dars wa ifāda mīpardākht), and seekers after knowledge (ṭālib-i 'ilmān) derived benefit from his critical nature (ṭab'-i naqqād). He died on 3 Rabī' II 867/26 December 1462 (2). Another ṣadr, Mawlānā 'Iṣām al-Dīn Da'ūd Khwāfī, was appointed tutor (ustād) to Sulṭān Maḥmūd Mīrza b. Abū Sa'īd, and remained in

(1) HS. iii/3, 140. (2) ibid., 196-7.

the latter's service until his own death (1). Mawlānā Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad Ghūriyānī was for some years ṣadr and ustād to Abū Turāb Mīrzā b. Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā Bāyqarā (2). It is interesting to note that a comparable practice existed under the Ṣafawids, who sometimes appointed a ṣadr to the post of mu'allim to a prince. For instance, Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad was both ṣadr and mu'allim to Ṭahmāsp Mīrzā, and Isma'īl's own tutor, Qādī Shams al-Dīn Lahijī, was appointed ṣadr on Isma'īl's accession.

An outline of the function and duties of the ṣadr under the later Tīmūrids may be derived from the documents contained in the Sharafnāma of Mawlānā 'Abd Allāh Marwārīd, himself a ṣadr of repute. As a young man he had entered the service of the Tīmūrid ruler Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā; he rose to the rank of ṣadr, and was eventually admitted to the circle of the great amīrs (dar jarga-yi umarā-yi 'uṣām dar āmada), and affixed his seal in place of Mīr 'Alī Shīr (3). The latter had been made an amīr of the dīwān-i 'alī by Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā in 876/1471-2, and his signature on ahkām and amthala had been given precedence over that of the other amīrs (4). After the death of Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā (911/1505), 'Abd Allāh Marwārīd lived in retirement until his own death in 922/1516 (5).

In the nishān-i ṣadārat conferred on Mawlānā Jalāl al-Dīn Qāsim by Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā in 898/1493 (6), the office of ṣadr is described as the distinguished office of the exalted ṣadārat (mansab-i arjumand-i ṣadārat-i 'alī), one of the most important affairs of state and one of the greatest concerns of the caliphate (az ummahāt-i muhinmāt-i kārkhāna-yi salṭanat wa

(1) HS. iii/3, 197. (2) ibid., 348. (3) AT. 163. (4) Shar. ii, 119.
(5) AT. 163. (6) HS. iii/3, 329.

a'āzim-i umūr-i kārgāh-i khilāfat) (1). Similarly, in the nishān-i ṣadārat conferred on Mawlānā Zahr al-Dīn Muḥammad Ṭabīb, the high-ranking office of the ṣadārat is referred to as one of the greatest matters of religion and the state (az a'āzim-i umūr-i dīn wa dawlat), and one of the most important affairs of the caliphate (ummahāt-i muhimmāt-i kārkhāna-yi khilāfat) (2).

Certain conditions governed appointments to the ṣadārat. Candidates had to be of noble birth, sayyids, endowed with exceptional spiritual gifts, and of great erudition and culture. They had either to have to their credit a period of trustworthy service in royal employ, or to come from a family with a long tradition of public service. To these requirements were added a reputation for impeccable conduct, and high standing among the religious classes (3).

It is clear from the Sharafnāma of 'Abd Allāh Marwārīd that the ṣadr was the head of the religious institution. He was the head, chief, exemplar, and leader of all the religious classes of the Tīmūrīd empire (ra's wa ra'īs wa muqtadā wa muqaddam-i tamāmī-yi ahl-i 'imāma-yi mamālik-i mahrūsa) (4). He was required to investigate the affairs (taḥqīq-i ḥāl) of the muqabā, sadāt, quḡāt, muḥtasibān, khūṭabā, a'imma, mudarrisān, ashāb-i fatwā, mutawalliyan, and mutaṣaddiyan-i umūr-i awqāf (5). He was responsible for the appointment and dismissal of these officials, who were to consider themselves appointed and dismissed by him (6).

(1) Marwārīd, 4a. The use of the terms salṭanat and khilāfat reflects the position of the Tīmūrīd ruler as temporal sultan and the Shadow of God upon earth; cf. A. K. S. Lambton, Quis custodiet custodes, in Studia Islamica, v/1956, 145 ff. (2) Marwārīd, 26a. (3) Roemer, 144. (4) Marwārīd, 4b. (5) ibid., 4b. (6) ibid., 4b-5a. Cf. also 26b; 40b.

As head of the religious institution, the ṣadr was in charge of the administration of the awqāf (1). The waqf officials (mutaṣaddiyān-i umūr-i awqāf) were to bring to the attention of the secretaries (niwīsandagān) and officials (kārkunān) of the ṣadr, all family and charitable waqfs (mawqūfāt-i awlādī wa khayrātī), whether of long standing or of recent origin (qadīm wa jadīd), and were not to conceal anything in this respect (2). Again as head of the religious institution, the ṣadr was responsible for the upkeep of pious foundations, including the repair of buildings left for pious uses and endowed property (istihkām-i mabānī-yi khayrāt az 'imārat-i mawqūfāt wa mawqūf 'alayha), for the clearing of the account books (takmil-i muḥāsabāt), for the collection of the crops (?) (ḡabṭ-i maḥsulāt), for the conclusion of contracts of lease ('uqūd-i ijārāt), and for the appointment of reliable officials to carry out these duties (jihat-i saranjām-i muḥamm mardum-i kārgudhār-i bi-i'tibār ta'yīn namāyad). The ṣadr was to strive to maintain the splendour of mosques, sanctuaries, madrasas and holy tombs (3). He was to ascertain the rank and merit of the "classes of the bountiful table of charity", namely, sayyids and 'ulamā from the outlying provinces, indigent shaykhs and needy foreigners who arrived from distant parts and foreign lands, and to gratify them according to their circumstances with a pension from waqf funds (aṣnāf-i khwān-i in'ām-i bī-darīgh-rā az sādāt-i aṣrāf wa 'ulamā'-i aknāf mashayikh-i fuqarā wa masākīn-i ghurabā ki az akmina-yi ba'īd wa diyār-i gharība mīrasand har yak-rā rutba wa istihqāq taftīsh namūda bi-qadr-i ḡal az waqf-i idrār maḥzūz gardānad) (4). The ṣadr was to lay down an order of

(1) At the end of the Ilkhānid period this function had belonged to the ḡakim-i awqāf-i mamālik-i maḥrūsa (Roemer, 145, n. 1). (2) Marwārīd, 5a.

(3) Marwārīd, 40b-41a. (4) ibid., 40b.

precedence among the great sharīfs, and to allocate a definite place in royal assemblies to every person in accordance with his position and aspirations (tashkhiṣ-i marātib-i akābir-i ashraf namūda dar majlis-i rafi'-i mani'-i humāyūn jā-yi har kasī munāsib-i ḥāl wa āmal-i ū yaqīn kunad) (1). In addition to controlling the appointment of the officials already mentioned, the ṣadr controlled the appointment and transfer of mutawalliyan-i khāṣṣ wa 'amm: - "the appointment and exchange of mutawalliyan-i khāṣṣ wa 'amm was to be at his (i. e., the ṣadr's) discretion, which was in any case in conformity with the requirements of the religious law (ta'yīn wa taghyīr wa tabdīl-i mutawalliyan-i khāṣṣ wa 'amm bi-irāda-yi ū ki har āyina muwāfiq-i shar' wa ḥukm khwāhad marbūṭ, bashad) (2).

If the ṣadr performed his duties satisfactorily (chūn bi-wājibī bidīn amr qiyām namāyand), then let them take the prescribed allowance ('ulūfa-yi dastūrī) from its (proper) place (az maḥall-i khwud), and hand it over to him (bidū rasanand)⁽³⁾. He should also receive the prescribed ṣadr dues (rasm al-ṣadarat-i dastūrī), which should be handed over to him without deduction (bidū bi-tamām-i kamāl rasanand) (4). Orders were issued to temporal officials to give the ṣadr whatever help he needed in the performance of his duties. Princes of the blood royal, amīrs, wazīrs, nā'ibs, and the rest of the officers of state should regard his authority as strong and absolute (dast-i ū-rā qawī wa muṭlaq dāshta), and should consider it their duty to help him (imdad-i ū-rā lāzim shumurand) (5).

The plural form ṣudūr is used in the preamble to some Tīmūriid documents, not in the sense, already noted, of "nobles, great men", but to

(1) Marwārīd 40b. The MS. has munāsib, apparently a mistake. (2) ibid., 26b. (3) ibid., 26b. (4) ibid., 5a. (5) ibid., 5a; cf. also 26b.

denote all the sadrs in the Tīmūrid administration. The sadr who was the head of the religious institution and an organ of the central Tīmūrid administration was represented in the provinces of the Tīmūrid empire by sadrs attached to the administration of the provincial governors. The practice of appointing sadrs to the provincial governments was later followed by the Qara Qoyunlu, the Aq Qoyunlu, and the Şafawids. "One of the purposes of the appointment of the provincial sadr was presumably to remove the control of the religious institution from the provincial governor" (1). The provincial sadrs were appointed directly by the ruler, and not by the central sadr. Their function and duties corresponded to those of the central sadr. For instance, Sayyid Niẓām al-Dīn Abu'l-Ṭayyib, who was appointed sadr to Abu'l-Faṭḥ Ḥaydar Muḥammad Mīrzā b. Bāysunqur, was to be considered responsible for exalting the word of religion and adding dignity to the perspicuous shar' (ū-rā ṣāhib-i 'uhda-yi i'lā'-i kalāma-yi dīn wa irtifa'-i shar'-i mubīn dānand); he was responsible for the repair of pious foundations (ta'mīr-i biqā'-i khayr), the promotion of waqf affairs (tarbiyat-i manāhij-i umūr-i waqf), the appointment and dismissal of officials in the territories then belonging to the above-mentioned prince or thereafter added to his dominions; in co-operation (bi-mushārahāt) with Sayyid Shāh Rustam he was to conduct these affairs in a proper manner (bi-wājibī taqāṣṣī-yi ān umūr namāyad). The officials and amīrs of the above-mentioned prince were to recognize his appointment to that post, and were to support him and facilitate his affairs (ū-rā bidīn amr maṣṣub dānista taqwiyat wa tamshiyat-i ū lāzim dārand), and to display praiseworthy zeal in encouraging him (dar tahyīj-i ū masā'ī-yi mashkūra bi-zuhūr rasānand).

(1) A. K. S. Lambton, quis custodiet custodes, in Studia Islamica, vi/1956, 137.

The ṣadr should apply himself loyally and with the utmost diligence to his duties, and if he discharged them in a proper manner, the prescribed allowance should be paid to him ('ulūfa-yi dastūrī...bidū rasānand) from the (proper) place (az maḥall-i khwud) (1).

A similar nishān was conferred on Sayyid Zayn al-'Ābidīn 'Alī, who was appointed ṣadr to Abu'l-Manṣūr Muẓaffar Ḥusayn Bahādur b. Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā. The ancestors of Sayyid Zayn al-'Ābidīn had been from the time of the establishment of the Tīmūrīd dynasty adorned with the highest offices and most exalted ranks. It was ordained that whatever was the custom and practice of this exalted office should be considered to appertain to him (ḥukm shud ki ānchi az rāh wa rasm-i īn maṅṣab-i walā bāshad bidū ta'alluq dānista), and that no one should be recognized as his colleague (ghayr-rā bā ū sharīk wa sahīm nashināsand); whatever appertained to this office, such as the appointment and dismissal of holders of religious offices (arbāb-i manāṣib-i shar'iyya), etc., in the territories under the dominion of the above-mentioned prince, should be considered as appertaining to him (i.e., the ṣadr); the ṣadr was to strive to promote the faith of the Prophet and to exalt the dignity of the shar', to the best of his ability, and was not to be remiss in any part of his duties (2).

The Ḥabīb al-Siyar has the following important passage on the ṣadārat during the reign of Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā b. Manṣūr b. Bāyqarā (d. 911/1505):-
"as the mawqūfāt of Khurāsān in the time of Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā had

(1) Marwārīd 7a. For 'ulūfa, see Minorsky, A Soyūrghāl of Qāsim b. Jahāngīr Aq Qoyunlu (903/1498), in BSOS, ix/4, p. 948 (j); cf. A. K. S. Lambton, LP. 442 s.v. (2) Marwārīd 19b.

increased to such a degree that one person was insufficient to perform the administrative task involved, that monarch of exalted rank always elevated two or three persons from the ranks of the eminent sayyids and learned men to hold the office of şadr. Consequently, during the reign of that great man a large number of people from the religious classes were occupied in carrying out the important affairs of that office" (chūn...mawqūfāt-i bilād-i khurāsān bi-martaba'ī rasīda būd ki yak kas az 'uhda-yi qabṭ-i ān bīrūn namītawānist āmad paywasta ān pādishāh-i 'alījah dū si kas az a'āzīm-i sādāt wa fuḍalā-rā bi-ta'ahhud-i manşab-i şadārat sarafrāz mīsākht banābarīn dar awān-i salṭanat-i ānşadrāt jam'ī kathīr az arbāb-i 'ama'im bi-saranjām-i muḥamm-i ān manşab mashghulī namūdand) (1). Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā was the last effective Tīmūrid ruler, and it appears that by the time of his reign the administration of the awqāf had become the most important duty of the şadr. Under the Şafawids, too, after doctrinal unity had been achieved, the administration of the awqāf became the most important part of the şadr's function.

The Ḥabīb al-Siyar gives particulars of fourteen of the şadrs appointed during the reign of Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā (873-911/1469-1505). Of this number, Sayyid Jalāl al-Dīn Ḥamza Andikhūdī Makkī was appointed şadr at the beginning of his reign, and affixed his seal before all the şudūr-i 'izām.

Mawlānā Quṭb al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Khwāfī had been deputy (na'ib) to the şadr Mawlānā 'Abd al-Raḥīm during the reign of Abū Sa'īd. After the death of Abū Sa'īd he went to Harāt and was appointed şadr by Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā;

(1) HS. iii/3, 327.

"in taking decisions concerning waqf transactions he raised the banner of superiority over his peers and equals (dar fayṣal-i mu'āmalāt-i mawqūfāt bar anthāl wa aqrān rāyat-i tafawwuq mīafrāsht). On 23 Muḥarram 874/2 August 1469 he was arrested "as a result of the evil activities of corrupt people" (bi-sabab-i ifṣād-i ahl-i fiṣād), and within twenty days he disgorged (furūd āward) 150,000 kopeki dīnārs. On 10 Ṣafar he was again received into royal favour (nawbat-i digar tarbiyat yafta), and donned the khal'at-i ṣadārat; for some years in complete independence he satisfactorily managed waqf affairs and fulfilled the needs of the religious classes (arbāb-i 'ama'im).

Khawāja Kamāl al-Dīn Ḥusayn (1) performed the duties of ṣadr with full powers and authority (dar ghāyat-i ikhtiyār wa iqtidār), and, during his period of office did not covet one dīnār or one man of the ṣadr dues, (but) raised the banner of good repute (dar ān awqāt yakdīnār wa yakman az rasm-i ṣadārat ṭama' nakarda rāyat-i nīknāmī bar afrāsht). Nevertheless, he was accused of embezzlement and appropriation (taghallub wa taṣarruf), was dismissed, and paid a large sum into the dīwān.

Sayyid Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad Andījanī (2), known as "Mīr sar-barahna", for twenty years held the post of shaykh and mutawallī of the shrine of Shaykh Luḡmān at Harāt. Every year he expended (bi-maṣraf rasānīd) 150,000 kopeki dīnārs accruing from the mawqūfāt of the shrine; he was accused of extravagance and waste (isrāf wa itlāf) and dismissed. Eventually he was restored to favour and appointed ṣadr through the good offices of Mīr 'Alī Shīr. There was a dispute between him and his colleague Khawāja Kamāl al-Dīn Ḥusayn Gīrangī over the question of precedence; the dispute was

(1) Died Ramaḍān 899/March 1494. (2) Died 898/1493.

resolved in favour of "Mīr sar-barahna", who was allowed to affix his seal before Khwāja Kamāl al-Dīn.

In 898/1493 Mīrak Jalāl al-Dīn Qāsim (1) took the place of his forefathers (qāyim-maqām-i abā wa ajdād-i khwīsh gashta) and for three or four years was ṣadr with full authority and independence (kamāl-i ikhtiyār wa istiqlāl).

Qāḍī Burhān al-Dīn Muḥammad Marwī was at first qāḍī of Marw and ṣadr to Abu'l-Muḥsin Mīrzā b. Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā; he fell from favour, and went to Harāt, where he was made ṣadr by Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā. In 909/1503 at his own wish he returned to Marw; Abu'l-Muḥsin seized him and exacted money from him, and as a result of this ill-treatment Qāḍī Burhān al-Dīn Muḥammad fell ill and died in 910/1504.

Sayyid Ghiyāth al-Dīn Mashhadī was "devoid of spiritual virtues and human perfections" (az faḍā'il-i nafsānī wa kamālāt-i insānī bi-ghāyat 'arī būd), but he was appointed ṣadr after the death of Mīrak Qāsim (901/1496) through the efforts of Khwāja Qiwām al-Dīn Niẓām al-Mulk, and held the post as long as the latter "raised the banner of authority over the court of the victorious khaqān (Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā)". In 903/1497, when the fortunes of Khwāja Niẓām al-Mulk were on the decline, Sayyid Ghiyāth al-Dīn was nominated to accompany the great shaykhs on a mission to Badī' al-Zamān Mīrzā and Amīr Dhu'l-Nūn; before his return from this mission, his patron Khwāja Niẓām al-Mulk was put to death; the sayyid did not find favour with Badī' al-Zamān Mīrzā on account of his strange appearance and depraved conduct (gharābat-i ṣūrat wa radā'at-i sīrat), and was sent as an envoy to Marw. With him Badī' al-Zamān Mīrzā sent a letter to Abu'l-Muḥsin Mīrzā telling him not to allow Sayyid Ghiyāth al-Dīn to return to Balkh. Sayyid

(1) Died mid-Sha'bān 901/beginning of May 1496.

Ghiyāth al-Dīn was joined at Marw by his sons, and lived in retirement. In 918/1512 he went to the camp of the Uzbek chiefs Tīmūr and 'Ubayd at Mashhad, and incited them to march on Harāt; as a punishment for this, he was seized by Isma'īl when the latter entered Harāt for the second time *Summa* (918/1512), and a large sum was exacted from him and his family. After escaping from the clutches of the tax-collectors, he fled to Māwarā' al-nahr, where he died the same year.

Mawlānā Ghiyāth al-Dīn Jamshīd Qāyini was an expert in drafting deeds (ṣukūk) and court minutes (sijillāt); he acquired the soubriquet of "Ḥalālī" because on several occasions, by a legal quibble, he freed Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā's food from the suspicion of doubt and unlawfulness and conveyed it to the frontier of legality (chandgāh ma'kulāt-i khāṣṣa-yi ānḥadrāt-rā az shāyiba-yi shubhat wa ḥirmat bi-sarḥadd-i ḥalliyyat mīrasān-īd). He was eventually appointed ṣadr, but was arrested for slandering Khwāja Qiwām al-Dīn Niẓām al-Mulk in a majlis of Mīr 'Alī Shīr, and lived in retirement until the death of Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā; he was then again appointed ṣadr by Badī' al-Zamān Mīrzā, but was dismissed after seven or eight months, and died in Qāyin province on 8 Rajab 919/9 September 1513.

Khwāja Shihāb al-Dīn Iṣḥāq was the nephew and son-in-law of Mawlānā Quṭb al-Dīn Khwāfī, the former ṣadr. For some years he took the place of his uncle and was the ṣadr of Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā; he was arrested on the day of his uncle's death (895/1489), and a large sum was exacted from him. After being released by the tax-collectors, he lived in retirement.

Amīr Kamāl al-Dīn Ḥusayn went from Ṭabas to Adharbāyjan during the reign of Ya'qūb Aq Qoyunlu, under whose patronage he lived for a time; later, he went to Harāt, where he was appointed shaykh and mutawallī of the mawqūfāt of the shrine of Khwāja 'Abd Allāh Anṣārī; in 904/1498 he was

appointed to the ṣadārat and pursīdan-i muḥamm-i dādkhwāhān (inquiry into the affairs of plaintiffs).

Khawāja Shihāb al-Dīn 'Abd Allāh al-Bayānī was appointed ṣadr, while still a young man, by Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā; he affixed his seal before most of the other ṣadrs (muqaddam bar akthar-i ṣudūr tawqī' kashīda), and performed the duties of that office for some years with full authority (dar ghāyat-i ikhtiyār). Realizing that Khawāja Qiwām al-Dīn Niẓām al-Mulk had an antipathy towards him, he resigned, and for two or three years was out of office. After the fall of Khawāja Qiwām al-Dīn, his own fortunes revived, and he was appointed to mangab-i risālat wa parwāna, which under the Tīmūrīds was one of the highest offices of state (az jalāyil-i manāḡib-i sarkār-i salṭanat būd). He was promoted from that rank, and affixed his seal in the circle of the great amīrs (dar jaḡga-yi umarā-yi 'uẓām muhr zada), and adorned the place of Amīr 'Alī Shīr with the imprint of the khātim-ā'in seal (jā-yi amīr 'alīshīr-rā bi-naqsh-i khātim-i khātim-ā'in tazyīn dād). He retired after the death of Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā (911/1505), and died in Rajab 922/August 1516.

The maternal grandfather of Amīr Ṣadr al-Dīn Sulṭān Ibrāhīm al-Amīnī was Mawlānā Jalāl al-Dīn 'Abd al-Raḡmān, who for years was ṣadr to Mīrzā Bāysunqur and Mīrzā 'Alā al-Dawla. As a young man Amīr Ṣadr al-Dīn Sulṭān Ibrāhīm served Abu'l-Manṣūr Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā, and in 910/1504 he was made ṣadr; he held the post until the death of Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā, and was then made ṣadr by Muẓaffar Ḥusayn Mīrzā. When Muḥammad Shaybānī conquered Khurāsān, Amīr Ṣadr al-Dīn Sulṭān Ibrāhīm, like the rest of the ṣadrs, was for some days involved in the punishment of Mawlānā 'Abd al-Raḡīm the ṣadr (mānand-i sāyir-i ṣudūr rūzī chand bi-mu'akhadha-yi mawlānā 'abd al-raḡīm ṣadr giriftār būda), and, after being released, he lived in retirement.

In 916/1510, when Isma'īl conquered Khurāsān, Amīr Sulṭān was honoured, and received in'ams and soyūrghāls. In 926/1519-20 he left Harāt and joined Isma'īl's court, and was commissioned to write the Futūḥāt-i Shāhī (1).

The account of the ṣadārat given so far omits two important aspects of the ṣadr's function, namely, his close connexion with the political institution, and his role as a military officer. The fact that the ṣadr Mawlānā 'Abd Allāh Marwārīd entered the ranks of the amīrs, the Turkish military élite, has already been mentioned. As early as 811/1408 we hear of a ṣadr acting as an actual commander in the field; Mawlānā Ibrāhīm the ṣadr and two amīrs were entrusted with part of the mining operations at the siege of the fort of Farāh (2). Mawlānā Jalāl al-Dīn 'Abd al-Raḥīm, who was appointed ṣadr to Mīrzā Bāysunqur b. Shāhrukh (d. 837/1433-4) and his son Mīrzā 'Alā' al-Dawla (d. 865/1460-1), apparently regularly wore military uniform and lived in the greatest pomp and magnificence (chūn mawlānā jalāl al-dīn.....sharṭ-i mulāzamat-i mīrzā bāysunqur wa mīrzā 'alā' al-dawla bi-jay mī āward wa dar kiswat-i sipāhiyān bi-sar burda dar ghāyat-i tajammul wa ḥashamat sulūk mīkard) (3). A ṣadr of the Tīmūrid ruler Abū Sa'īd, Mīrak 'Abd al-Raḥīm (or, according to the Maṭla'-i Sa'dayn, 'Abd al-Karīm), was among the prisoners taken by Uzun Ḥasan when he defeated Abū Sa'īd in 874/1469, and he was put to death by Uzun Ḥasan on account of certain seditious remarks which he had made (bi-wāsiṭa-yi ba'ḍī az sukhanān-i fitna-angīz ki gufta būd) (4). Under the early Ṣafawids, the ṣadr continued to play a prominent part in military operations.

(1) HS. iii/3, 327-331. For the Futūḥāt-i Shāhī, see Ghulām Sarwar, 3 ff.
(2) MS. ii/1, 123. (3) HS. iii/3, 148-9. (4) ibid., 191-2; cf. MS. ii/2, 1357, which states that the ṣadr was an extremely retiring and mild man (bi-ghāyat khwīsh-tan-dār wa kam-azar būd), and was constantly serving the poor and God's people (ahl allah).

It seems that under the Tīmūrīds, as later under the early Ṣafawīds, there was no clear demarcation between the religious institution and the political institution. Members of the religious classes filled many posts in the bureaucracy, and performed duties which would normally fall outside the province of officials of the religious institution. For instance, in 817/1414-5 the qaḍī of Yazd, Mawlānā Imām al-Dīn 'Alī (N. dūsh.nī ?) was the abode of trust in the post of deputy of the wazīr of Iskandar b. 'Umar Shaykh, Khwāja Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad Ḥāfiẓ Rāzī (dar amr-i wikalat-i wizarat-panāhī maḥall-i i'timād būd) (1). In 857/1453, during the ephemeral governorate of the tyrannical Tīmūrīd amīr Sayyid Shīrwānī at Kirmān, a certain functionary combined in his own person the offices of ṣadr, parwānachī and dārūgha-yi khān-u-mān (2). In 867/1462-3, when Abū Sa'īd marched to attack Shāhrukhiyya, he retained (bāz dāsht) Mawlānā Fatḥ Allāh Ṭabrīzī the ṣadr to "fix the assessment of troops required from the province of Harāt-rūd" (bi-bastan-i bunīcha-yi wilāyat-i harāt-rūd), and the ṣadr, having duly settled that important matter (kamā yanbaghī an muhimm-rā fayṣal dāda), hastened to Harāt (3).

Members of the religious classes frequently held the rank of wazīr, and played a considerable part in political and financial affairs. A notable example is that of the divine Khwāja Nāṣir al-Dīn 'Ubayd Allāh, who had great influence over Abū Sa'īd. In 858/1454, when Abū Sa'īd returned to Samarqand after his abortive expedition to Balkh, he learnt that Abū'l-Qāsim Bābur had returned to Khurāsān and was marching on Samarqand. Abū Sa'īd consulted Khwāja Nāṣir al-Dīn, who instilled in him the ambition to

(1) JM. 128a. (2) J. Aubin, Deux sayyids de Bam au XVe siècle, 440.
(3) HS. iii/3, 197.

become ruler of the Tīmūrid empire (da'īya-yi salṭanat-i jahān dar khaṭīr-i humāyūn nishānd). Abū Sa'īd always considered himself obliged to obey the Khwāja's injunctions (khwud-rā ma'mūr-i anḥadrat mīdanist), and although he was free to disregard his advice, in practice he did not do so. In this instance the divine, who had the rank of spiritual leadership (irshād) and the dignity of wilāya (1), advised him to defend Samarqand against Abu'l-Qāsim Bābur, and he did so with success (2). In 865/1460 Khwāja 'Ubayd Allāh, then shaykh al-islām, visited Harāt from Bukhārā, and, at his request, Abū Sa'īd abolished the tamghā at Bukhārā and Samarqand, and promised to abrogate it throughout the Tīmūrid empire (3). In 872/1467, before taking the important (and in this case, fatal (4)) decision to invade Ādharbāyjān, Abū Sa'īd sent the ṣadr Amīr Jamāl al-Dīn 'Abd al-Raḥīm to Samarqand to request the Khwāja to come to Khurāsān, "as he (Abū Sa'īd) always consulted him in all important matters and administrative affairs (hamīsha dar muhimmāt-i kullī wa maṣālih-i mulkī bā anḥadrat... mashwarat mīfarmūd), and never deviated from what he had said (az farmūda... 'udūl namīfarmūd). The outcome of their conference, which took place at Marw, was the decision to invade Ādharbāyjān (5).

The close connexion of the ṣadrs with the political institution under the Tīmūrids is further shown by the fact that the latter frequently employed them as ambassadors (6). For instance, in 809/1406 Mawlānā Ṣadr

(1) In Isma'īlī doctrine, "wilāya as a rank is superior to nubuwwa"; (Fyze, A Shī'ite Creed, 97 n.). (2) MS. ii/2, 1063 ff. (3) ibid., 1232-3. (4) wa nadanistand ki an rah bi-pā-yi khwud bi-qatlgah mīrawand. (5) MS. ii/2, 1321; cf. HS. iii/3, 200-1, which describes an occasion on which the presence of Khwāja Nāṣir al-Dīn 'Ubayd Allāh prevented conflict between 'Umar Shaykh Mīrzā and Sulṭān Maḥmūd Mīrzā, and Sulṭān Aḥmad Mīrzā. (6) In earlier times the Seljuqs and others had used qaḡīs in a similar capacity. The shaykh al-islām was also often used as an ambassador by the Tīmūrids.

al-Dīn Ibrāhīm was sent by Shāhrukh on a mission to Sayyid 'Izz al-Dīn, the ruler of Hazārajārīb, to secure his allegiance to the Tīmūrid ruler. The mission was successful (īshān nīz adāb-i ilī wa inqiyād bi-jāy āwardand) (1). In the same year Mawlānā Jalāl al-Dīn Luṭf Allāh, who was at that time the foremost of the ṣadrs of the world (ki dar ān zamān sarāmad-i ṣudūr-i jahān būd), was sent to Sārī on an embassy (2). It is not clear whether the ṣadārat was held jointly by these two ṣadrs, or whether one succeeded the other. In 820/1417 Mawlānā Ṣadr al-Dīn Ibrāhīm, who was entrusted with the exalted office of the ṣadārat, was again sent by Shāhrukh on a mission to the Hazāra, with orders to admonish their headmen (kalāntarān) and to bring them back to Harāt. On his return to Harāt he reported that the Hazāra chiefs (sardārān) were on their way to Harāt (3). In 851/1447 Ulugh Beg sent his ṣadr Mawlānā Niẓām al-Dīn Mīrak Maḥmūd as an ambassador to 'Alā al-Dawla at Harāt (4). In 873/1468-9 the ṣadr Mawlānā Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Bukhārī was despatched by Abū Sa'īd to Fārs, to convey the news of the latter's occupation of Ādharbāyjan to the Tīmūrid governor of Fārs. On arrival at Iṣfahān, the ṣadr was advised by the governor, Khwāja Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad, not to proceed further, as Fārs was still in the hands of the Qara Qoyunlu amīr Sayyid 'Alī (5). On his way back to rejoin the Tīmūrid army, the ṣadr was captured by Aq Qoyunlu troops (6). According to the Ḥabīb al-Siyar, Mawlānā Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Bukhārī had formerly been ṣadr to Mīrzā Bābur (i. e., Abu'l-Qāsim Bābur b. Bāysunqur b. Shāhrukh), with full authority (dar ghāyat-i ikhtiyār); he later served Abū Sa'īd and enjoyed his full confidence (dar mulāzamat-i mīrzā sulṭān abū sa'īd nīz i'tibār-i tamām dāsht) (7). In 873/1468-9, as

(1) MS. ii/1, 78. (2) ibid., 78. (3) ibid., 358-9. (4) MS. ii/2, '908-7.
(5) ibid., 1341. (6) ibid., 1339. (7) HS. iii/3, 199.

already mentioned, he was sent to take a message (jihat-i tablīgh-i risālat) to the governor of Shīrāz, who threatened to rebel (dam az mukhālafat mīzād). En route, Mawlānā Muḥammad was captured by some of Amīr Ḥasan Beg's men; his life was spared at the intercession of Mawlānā Ṣadr al-Dīn Muḥammad Ṭabīb, but he was kept in confinement (muqayyad). He was released after the death of Abū Sa'īd, and returned to Harāt, where he associated (muṣāḥabat kard) with Amīr Niẓām al-Dīn 'Alī Shīr and other pillars of the state of Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā. He died on his return from a pilgrimage to the Ḥijāz, on which he accompanied Muḥammad Sulṭān Mīrzā, the nephew of Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā (1). The Maṭla'-i Sa'dayn states that during the time he was in the hands of Uzun Ḥasan, he was allowed to sit in the latter's private assemblies (majlis-i khāṣṣ) (2). In 910/1504-5 the ṣadr Kamāl al-Dīn Ṭabasī was sent by Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā from Harāt as an ambassador to Isma'īl at Iṣfahān (3). Under the Ṣafawids, the ṣadrs seem to have been used less frequently in this role, although they still occasionally play the part of ambassadors or negotiators. For example, in 929/1523 the ṣadr of Isma'īl, Amīr Jamāl al-Dīn Astarābādī, was sent with a tawājī to Shīrwān to ask for the hand of the daughter of the ruler of Shīrwān, Shaykh Shāh (4).

Under the Tīmūrīds, qāḍīs were sometimes appointed to the ṣadārat; for instance, in 857/1453 Mawlānā Kamāl al-Dīn Ḥusayn was the ṣadr and qāḍī of the Tīmūrīd governor of Kirmān, Shujā' al-Dīn Yār Aḥmad (5). Under the Qara Qoyunlu and Aq Qoyunlu rulers of Diyār Bakr and Ādharbāyjān, qāḍīs were frequently appointed to the ṣadārat. For example, in 1459-60, when Jahānshāh Qara Qoyunlu marched from Ādharbāyjān to Fārs to reassert his authority over his rebellious son Pīr Būdāq, he was met at Shīrāz by the ṣadr Qāḍī

(1) HS. iii/3, 200. (2) MS. ii/2, 1339. (3) TIN. 452a. (4) HS. iii/4, 108-9. (5) J. Aubin, Deux sayyids de Bam au XVe siècle, 444 n. 3.

Nizām al-Dīn 'Abd Allāh Shīrwānī (1). Hasan Beg Aq Qoyunlu, at the beginning of his reign, had two şadrs, both of whom were qādīs: Qādī 'Alā al-Dīn and Qādī Hasan. Mawlānā Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Dawwānī (2) was şadr under Yūsuf b. Jahānshāh, who was ruling at Kirman in 862/1458 (3), and was later qādī of Fārs under the Aq Qoyunlu rulers (4). When Khalīl sent his brother Ya'qūb, who was governor of Qazwīn, to Diyār Bakr, he sent with him Ya'qūb's tutor (mu'allim) and şadr Qādī Şafī al-Dīn (5) 'Isā, who had formerly been one of Hasan Beg's principal counsellors. From these examples it is clear that the Turkomān rulers followed the Tīmūrid practice of nominating şadrs to the courts of the provincial governors, and this practice was later adopted by the Şafawids. It has been noted that Hasan Beg Aq Qoyunlu divided the central şadārat between two şadrs with joint authority, and there are numerous instance of this practice also under the early Şafawids. Moreover, the hereditary tendency in appointments to the şadārat and other offices, so noticeable under the Şafawids, occurs also under the Aq Qoyunlu. For instance, Mawlānā Şah Maḥmūd, appointed to the şadārat by Muḥammadī Mīrzā jointly with Khwāja Mullā Işfahānī (904/1499) (6), was the son of Abū Bakr Barānī, one of Hasan Beg's closest companions (7).

Under the Turkomān rulers, the şadrs appear less frequently in the role of military commanders. Nevertheless, as appears from the interesting

(1) TIN. 434b. (2) Author of the Akhlāq-i Jalālī, composed between A. D. 1467 and 1477. (3) MS. ii/2, 1173. (4) AT. 71; HS. iii/4, 111. (5) TIN. 438a has, I think wrongly, Masīḥ al-Dīn. Qādī Şafī al-Dīn 'Isā was put to death on a charge of ilhād c. 896/1490 by Şūfī Khalīl, the regent of Bāysunqur b. Ya'qūb (TIN. 439b). (6) TIN. 443b. (7) ibid., 438a, q. Lubb al-Tawārīkh.

and important material in the 'Arḡ-nāma-yi Dawwānī (1), the ṣadr and other members of the religious classes occupied privileged positions at military gatherings such as the review (isti'raḡ) of troops held by the Aq Qoyunlu ruler Khalīl b. Ḥasan Beg in 881/1476 in Fārs (2). The ṣadr Mawlānā 'Alā al-Dīn 'Alī Bayhaqī was ordered to convene the 'ulamā, who were to parade with "the symbols (āthār) of the imams and the great shaykhs, such as standards, drums, etc." (3). Over 4,000 members of the religious classes assembled for the review, and the ṣadr was ordered to see to the accommodation of the "noble visitors from the provinces, according to their rank" (4). Among the retinue of the ṣadr at the actual march past was a detachment of troops, consisting of 100 sipāhī archers; he was also accompanied by 100 servants (5).

There is evidence that under the Aq Qoyunlu, as formerly under the Tīmūrīds, the ṣadrs were closely connected with the political institution. For instance, when Ya'qūb Mīrzā Aq Qoyunlu came to the throne in 884/1479, his ṣadr and mu'allim Qaḏī Ṣafī al-Dīn 'Isā was, according to Professor Hinz, also appointed wakīl (6). This, if correct, is of the utmost importance. Hinz considers that wakīl here should probably be understood in the sense of "chancellor" (Reichshofkanzler), as opposed to its usual meaning of "vice-gerent" (Reichsverweser), but in view of the close association of the ṣadr with the political institution (7), already noted, it is not improbable that wakīl here should be taken in its usual sense.

(1) See V. Minorsky, A Civil and Military Review in Fārs in 881/1476, in BSOS x/1939, 141 ff. (2) ibid., 153. (3) ibid., 150. (4) ibid., 152. (5) ibid., 158. (6) Hinz, 102. (7) Professor A. K. S. Lambton points out that "the ṣadr in early Ṣafawid times was in effect the personal representative of the ruler", and, quoting the case of Qaḏī Ṣafī al-Dīn 'Isā, suggests that this position was perhaps inherited from the Aq Qoyunlu (quis custodiet custodes, in Studia Islamica vi/1956, 135 and n. 5.

back
to
wakil

9

minn

Professor Hinz informs me that he is unfortunately no longer in possession of the notes on which his Irans Aufstieg was based. As Professor Hinz does not give the source of his statement in his Irans Aufstieg concerning Qāḍī Ṣafī al-Dīn 'Īsā, the fact that Qāḍī Ṣafī al-Dīn 'Īsā was wakīl as well as ṣadr cannot as yet finally be established. Professor Minorsky has been kind enough to furnish me with some references to Qāḍī Ṣafī al-Dīn 'Īsā in the Tārīkh-i 'Ālam-Ārā-yi Amīnī of Faḍl Allāh b. Rūzbihān Khunjī. Professor Minorsky has recently published an abridged translation of this work (1). He states that there are several references to Qāḍī Ṣafī al-Dīn as wizārat-panāh, but he is usually referred to as qāḍī or ṣadr; for instance, f. 169b has dar khidmat-i qāḍī al-quḍāt ṣafī al-islām wa'l-dīn qāḍī 'īsā ṣadr, and f. 177b, ṣadārat-panāhī.... qāḍī al-quḍāt-i aqṭār-i 'ālam mu'assis-i asās al-dawla wa'l-iqbāl qāḍī 'īsā ṣadr. On f. 182b, on the other hand, an official subordinate to the qāḍī is referred to as 'alījanāb āṣaf-i dawrān shāh sharaf al-dīn maḥmūd daylamī ki wazīr-i 'alī-makān wa mushrif-i ṣāhib-i miknat-i dīwān būd. On f. 211, Qāḍī 'Īsā is referred to as wazīr-i a'zam. These references seem to indicate that Qāḍī Ṣafī al-Dīn 'Īsā was, if not wakīl, at least wazīr as well as ṣadr, but it is not possible to say at this stage whether his position was in any way analogous to that of Amīr 'Abd al-Bāqī under Isma'īl I; Amīr 'Abd al-Bāqī was both wakīl and ṣadr, and was specifically charged with the supervision of the religious institution on behalf of the political institution (2). If Qāḍī Ṣafī al-Dīn 'Īsā combined the offices of wazīr and ṣadr, his position would rather be analogous to that of Qāḍī Muḥammad Kāshī under Isma'īl I; Qāḍī Muḥammad Kāshī appears to

(1) Persia in A. D. 1478--1490 (Royal Asiatic Society Monographs Vol. XXVI), London 1957. (2) See p. 300 ff. below; for further details about Qāḍī Ṣafī al-Dīn 'Īsā, see V. Minorsky, The Aq Qoyunlu and Land Reforms, in BSOAS, xvii/1955, 451 ff.

have been appointed wazīr as well as ṣadr in 909/1503-4 (1).

Further evidence of the close connexion between the ṣadr and the political institution under the Aq Qoyunlu is afforded by the fact that under the latter, as formerly under the Tīmūrids, the ṣadrs were frequently employed as ambassadors. For instance, in 874/1469 Ḥasan Beg Aq Qoyunlu sent Qādī 'Alī (2), who was one of his muqarrabs (3), as ambassador to Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā at Harāt (4). Qādī 'Alā' al-Dīn was sent by Ḥasan Beg on a mission (bi-rasm-i risālat) to the descendants of Sulṭān Abū Sa'īd at Samarqand (5), and was later sent as ambassador to the Ottoman sultan Muḥammad II by Khalīl b. Ḥasan Beg (6).

Under Aḥmad (902-3/1496-7), Uzun Ḥasan's grandson, the ṣudūr and 'ummāl' are reported to have been eclipsed by the influence of a certain shaykh whom Aḥmad had brought with him from Turkey. "All religious and secular administrative affairs were settled as he (the shaykh) thought fit, and the ṣadrs and other officials remained without employment in their various offices" (jamī'-i muhimmāt-i shar'ī wa dīwānī bi-istiṣwāb-i ū intiḡām miyāft ṣudūr wa sāyir-i 'ummāl dar kār-i khwud bī-shughl būdand) (7).

A curious position existed for a time in 903/1497-8, when there appear to have been two ṣadrs, one acting on behalf of the nominal ruler, Alwand

(1) AT. 81: 110. (2) Qādī 'Alī is probably identical with the ṣadr Qādī 'Alā' al-Dīn ('Alī) (see p. 284 above) mentioned below. (3) For the significance of the term muqarrab under the Ṣafawids, see TM. 55 ff. (4) MS. ii/2, 1405. (5) TIN. 437a-b. (6) ibid., 438a. (7) TIN. 441b. For further details, see V. Minorsky, The Aq Qoyunlu and Land Reforms, in BSOAS, xvii/1955, 459-60.

Mīrzā, another grandson of Ḥasan Beg, and the other on behalf of the actual ruler, the Qājār chief Ayba Sulṭān, who had usurped most of the kingly power (ba'd az inhizām-i muḥammadī mīrzā ayba sulṭān istiqlāl-i tamām yaft chunānchi az pādishāhī bar alwand ziyāda az nāmī nabūd). The two sadrs were respectively Qādī Ni'mat Allāh Daylamī, sadr and shaykh al-islām on behalf of Alwand, and Mawlānā Ni'mat Allāh Kāshī, sadr on behalf of Ayba Sulṭān (1). Professor Lambton has noted that "the sadr in early Ṣafawid times was in effect the personal representative of the ruler" (2), and it would appear that there exists here evidence of a similar position obtaining under the Aq Qoyunlu. "The creation of the office of sadr reduced the importance of the qādīs. This development began under the later Tīmūrīds. It was natural that it should continue under the Ṣafawīds" (3). Qādīs, however, frequently held the post of sadr under the Aq Qoyunlu, and continued to be appointed to this post under the Ṣafawīds. The apparent ease with which the qādīs survived the transition from the Shī'ism of the Qara Qoyunlu to the Sunnism of the Aq Qoyunlu, and from the Sunnism of the Aq Qoyunlu to the Shī'ism of the Ṣafawīds, suggests that the qādīs were primarily the exponents of religious orthodoxy, whatever the prevailing orthodoxy might be. Professor Lambton has pointed out that there is a fundamental difference between the basis of the authority of the qādī and that of the sadr. The qādīs were regarded as "heirs of the Prophet" (4), that is, their power had a religious basis. The sadr, although admittedly head of the religious institution from the time of the creation of his office, derived his authority from the political institution. This is clearly

(1) TIN. 443a. (2) A. K. S. Lambton, quis custodiet custodes, in Studia Islamica vi/1956, 135. (3) ibid., 138 ff. (4) ibid., 138.

demonstrated by the classification of society in the Jāmi'-i Mufīdī (written in 1082/1671-2), in which the şadrs are listed, not with the religious classes, but with the temporal officials, the sultāns, amīrs, and wazīrs (1). In another passage in the Jāmi'-i Mufīdī şadrs are bracketed with amīrs. Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad Mīrmīrān, who was appointed by Ṭahmāsp to the niqābat wa sarwarī of the empire, acquired such power that his authority surpassed that of all the high-ranking şadrs and amīrs, if not that of the majority of sultāns whose orders are obeyed (jāmi'-i şudūr wa umarā'-i 'aẓīm al-sha'n balki akthar-i salāṭīn-i nāfidh-farman) (2).

Safawids Theoretically, the position of the şadr changed little with the establishment of the Şafawid state. The Tārīkh-i 'Ālam-Ārā defines the function of şadrs under the Şafawids as "to present the sayyids and members of the religious classes, to make themselves responsible for their affairs, to collect the revenue of the awqāf, and to expend it in accordance with the provisions of the religious law (manşab-i şadārat ki 'ibārat az taqdīm-i sādāt wa arbāb-i 'amayim wa takafful-i muhimmāt-i īshān wa dabṭ-i awqāf wa rasānīdan-i wujūh bar ma'ārif-i shar'īyya ast), and states that this being so, the office of şadr was only conferred on eminent, learned, and righteous sayyids (3). In fact, as Professor Lambton has pointed out, the position had changed radically. The creation of the office of şadr was an attempt to reincorporate the religious institution in the political institution as in the conception of the ideal Islamic state (4). Even before the advent of the Şafawids, the power of the şadr had tended to reduce the authority of the religious classes and notably the qaḏīs, but there was still some measure of separation between the religious institution and the political

(1) A. K. S. Lambton, quis custodiet custodes, in Studia Islamica vi/1956, 137-8, q. JM. 332b. (2) JM. 55a. (3) TAA. 107; See A. K. S. Lambton, op. cit., 135. (4) Cf. A. K. S. Lambton, op. cit., 147.

institution, because the authority of the qāḍī and of the temporal ruler, the sultān, derived from different sources. Under the Ṣafawids, in theory there was no question of such a separation, because the Ṣafawid ruler was both the religious and the political institution. In practice, however, since the ṣadr, who was the head of the religious institution, derived his authority from the political institution, the spiritual arm was from the beginning subordinate to the temporal, and became increasingly so under the the later Ṣafawids (1).

Under the early Ṣafawids, the ṣadrs, and other members of the religious classes, held military commands, or at least military rank, as had formerly been the case under the Tīmūrīds. The ṣadr Sayyid Sharīf Shīrāzī, and the former ṣadr Amīr 'Abd al-Bāqī (it seems probable that he had relinquished the ṣadarat before the date of the battle) were both killed at Chāldirān (920/1514). Sayyid Muḥammad Kamīna, warden of the shrine at Najaf, was also killed in this battle (2). Other sayyids and qāḍīs were stationed in the Ṣafawid centre at Chāldirān (3). As early as 909/1503-4 the ṣadr Qāḍī Muḥammad Kāshānī was made an amīr of the dīwān-i 'alī by Isma'īl I: "his power increased daily until he combined the imārat with the ṣadarat (4)". This qāḍī had been formerly an Aq Qoyunlu official, and with a certain mullā had acquired temporal and quasi-military authority at Kāshān during the chaotic conditions accompanying the disintegration of the Aq Qoyunlu empire. By early 1503 the Aq Qoyunlu power was everywhere on the decline. Alwand Mīrza had been evicted from Ādharbāyjān, and Sultān Murād's grasp on 'Irāq and Fārs was rapidly weakening. Aq Qoyunlu provincial officials seized control of their provinces and declared their independence

(1) A. K. S. Lambton, quis custodiet custodes, in Studia Islamica vi/1956, 134 ff. (2) See p. 86 above. (3) BM. Or. 3248, 247a-b. (4) TIN. 450b; cf. AT. 110.

Aq
afgan

(har kas wilāyatī-rā mutaṣarrif shuda da'wā-yi anā wa lā ghayrī kardand).

Murād Beg Jahānshāh was in nominal control of Kāshān, Rayy and Shahryār, but at Kāshān Qādī Muḥammad Kāshī and Mullā Mas'ūd Bīdgulī enjoyed complete independence (istiqlāl-i tamām dāshta wa andak iṭā'atī mīkardand) (1).

*Bezdin
Qadi*

After throwing in his lot with the Ṣafawids, Qādī Muḥammad Kāshānī "made great progress in a short time, acquiring wide administrative and financial powers, and becoming the close companion and lieutenant (of Isma'īl) so that his power and rank surpassed those of the majority of the high officers of state" (dar andak zamānī taraqqī-yi bisyār karda ṣāhib-i ikhtiyār-i mulk wa māl gasht wa bi-darajat-i taqarrub wa niyābat ṣu'ūd farmūda pāya-yi qadr wa wa manzilatash az akthar-i arkān-i dawlat wa a'yān-i ḥaḍrat dar gudhasht) (2).

1506 250

The wide powers enjoyed by Qādī Muḥammad Kāshānī soon led to abuse, and in 915/1509-10 he was put to death by the Shāh (3). At a time when most provincial governorships were in the hands of the qizilbāsh amīrs, Qādī Muḥammad had acquired extraordinary powers. By the time of his fall he held the governorships of Yazd, Kirman and many districts in 'Irāq-i 'Ajam (khaylī az maḥall-i 'irāq-i 'ajam), and the governorship of Shīrāz too belonged to him (dar ān awqāt ḥukūmat-i shīrāz nīz bidū ta'alluq girifta būd) (4). It was, however, the hostility of the wakīl Amīr Najm, and not of the qizilbāsh, which led to Qādī Muḥammad being put to death. He was executed on charges of having put people to death unjustly (khūnhā-yi nāpaqq rīkhta), and for various fraudulent activities (bi-anwā'-i fusūn iqdām

(1) TIN. 444b. (2) HS. iii/4, 38. (3) AT. 110. (4) The governorship of Shīrāz had been granted by Isma'īl to Ilyās Beg Dhu'l-Qadar (Kachal Beg) in 909/1503-4, as an ojāqliq (Shar. ii, 136), but Ilyās Beg had been executed the following year because of his oppressive rule (Ghulam Sarwar, 50). The governorship of Shīrāz remained in the hands of his descendants for fifty years (Shar. ii, 136), but the ṣadr must have taken advantage of the execution of Ilyās Beg to assume control over the province.

namūda) (1). The Sharafnāma says that the iniquitous deeds of the ṣadr had now become manifest to the Shāh, but adds that "nevertheless the enmity of Amīr Najm (the wakīl) was an additional factor in the case" (ma'dhālik 'idāwat-i amīr najm 'alāwa-yi ān gardīd) (2). According to the Habīb al-Siyar, Qāḍī Muḥammad was hostile to Amīr Najm, and in his absence accused him of possessing 20,000 tūmans from royal funds (ma'rūḍ dāsht ki amīr najm al-dīn mablagh-i bīst hazār tūmān az amwāl-i shāhī taṣarruf dārad). Qāḍī Muḥammad undertook to recover that great sum for the royal treasury if Najm al-Dīn were handed over to him (agar ū-rā bi-banda sipārand bi-andak zamānī ān māl-i bisyār-rā bi-khazāna-yi 'āmira mīrasānam). Isma'īl ignored this request (bi-ān sukhan iltifāt nakard), but discussed the matter with Amīr Najm (kayfiyyat-i ḥāl-rā bi-amīr najm al-dīn dar miyān nihāda), and handed over Qāḍī Muḥammad to him. The wakīl forcibly extracted money from him (ū-rā muṣādara wa mu'akhadha namūd), and it was then that the corrupt practices of the ṣadr came to light (3). The Jawāhir al-Akhbār states categorically that Qāḍī Muḥammad Kāshī was put to death through the efforts and at the order of the wakīl (bi-sa'y wa farmūda-yi najm-i wakīl bi-qatl rasīd) (4).

This is one of the earliest instances under the Ṣafawids of a member of the religious classes acquiring wealth and position, and is also of importance as the earliest example of conflict between the ṣadr and the wakīl in the Ṣafawid state. This conflict, which arose from the fact that neither the powers of the ṣadr nor those of the wakīl were clearly defined, and that their functions to some extent overlapped, became even more marked during the latter part of the reign of Isma'īl I and under Ṭahmāsp I. Professor Lambton has pointed out that "so far as there was a tendency for the

(1) AT. 110. (2) Shar. ii, 145. (3) HS. iii/4, 52. (4) JA. 288a.

ecc
monna
1

religious classes to join the bureaucracy and also to acquire extensive estates and thereby to become assimilated to the landowning class their function as spokesmen of the people was weakened" (1). The religious classes in Persia were traditionally the protectors of the people against the rapacity of the ruling class, but in so far as they tended to identify themselves with that class they were forced to reach a compromise with the secular authority. The actions of the sayyids and ru'asā of Iṣfahān who supported the abortive revolt of Muḥammad b. Bāysunqur against the Tīmūrid ruler Shāhrukh in 850/1446 (2) afford a clear illustration of this. J. Aubin has emphasized that the essential point about this rebellion is that it was a revolt of the (religious) aristocracy - the akābir and a'yan. "Members of the urban religious aristocracy and dervish leaders", he says, "saw in material wealth, especially landed property, the necessary condition of their independence vis-à-vis the secular authority, which they distrusted from spiritual tradition as much as from experience of its practices. The compromises to which they were obliged to resort because of their worldly interests did not disturb their consciences. By maintaining an equivocal position on the legitimacy of force, and on the question of power being derived from God, these compromise solutions, in Aubin's view, had destructive effects which, if not aggravated, were at least confirmed by the triumph of Safawid Shī'ism. "The sayyids and notables of Iṣfahān who, when their property was threatened (3), rebelled against Shāhrukh, were not prepared, ideologically, to offer more than protests against the Tīmūrid régime. The defence of their interests in no way made them ready to establish the foundations of a new authority the lawful basis of which was not conceivable

(1) A.K.S. Lambton, quis custodiet custodes, in Studia Islamica vi/1956, 131.

(2) See p. 37 above. (3) See J. Aubin, Notes sur quelques documents Aq Qoyunlu, in Mélanges Louis Massignon, 144.

to them; they chose as their leader a prince of the ruling house (i.e., Muḥammad b. Bāysunqur). They desired only to give the body politic a more religious character, and, if they failed to bring about a profound reformation, to assure themselves of increased influence within it". "It would be vain," continues Aubin, "to look for any programme of reform from these large landowners. Despite periodic measures to alleviate the burdens of the people, the processes of government were not changed. Extraordinary taxes continued to be levied, and arbitrary exactions were frequent.... The "aristocrat-inspired" Iṣfahān movement did not seem disposed to turn to account popular discontent, even if it could have engaged it. Rather the impression is that the nobles sought to forestall its manifestations..... The aristocratic revolt of 1446, as far as present documentation permits one to judge, was not accompanied by any rising of the masses. Even, therefore, if it had not been crushed at the outset, the final result would in all probability have been the same.....By contrast, the following year (1447) the artisans of Shīrāz resisted Muḥammad b. Bāysunqur with great courage* (1).

Under the later Ṣafawids, the ṣadr was still nominally the head of the religious institution (2); he was the chief judge in matters of religious law, and in all civil cases in which there were spiritual considerations (3). He was also in charge of the administration of waqf (4), and in this capacity was head of the "Chambre des Comptes de L'Église" (daftar-i mawqūfāt) (5). The administration of the awqāf appears to have been the

(1) J. Aubin, Deux sayyids de Bam au XVe siècle, 485-6. (2) With the increasing secularization of the Ṣafawid state, the power of the ṣadr declined, and the shaykh al-islām became the chief religious dignitary; see A. K. S. Lambton, Quis custodiet custodes, in Studia Islamica vi/1956, 140 ff. (3) Chardin (Amst. 1711), ii, 285. (4) TM. lll. (5) Chardin, loc. cit.

the last function remaining to the ṣadr by the time of Nādir Shāh, who abolished the dues of the ṣadr and allotted him a small pension instead (1).

Under the early Ṣafawids the precise functions of the chief religious dignitaries were not always clearly defined, and consequently there was to some extent a conflict of jurisdiction between the shaykh al-islām and the qādī, and between the shaykh al-islām and the ṣadr (2). The main outlines of the ṣadr's function, however, are clear. The military aspect of the ṣadārat has already been mentioned. This represented a reflection of the original militant ṣūfī organization of the Ṣafawid order, and the ṣadrs frequently held the rank of amīr. As late as 955/1548 we hear of a ṣadr actually taking part in military operations; the ṣadr Mīr Shams al-Dīn Asad Allāh, assisted by his son and successor as ṣadr Mīr Zayn al-Dīn 'Alī and by Mīr Wajīh al-Dīn 'Abd al-Wahhāb, conducted the defence of Dizful against the rebel Alqāṣ Mīrzā b. Isma'īl I (3). Professor Lambton has suggested that the conferment of the rank of amīr on ṣadrs is a case of a military term being transferred to the spiritual plane, with reference to the fight against unbelief and heresy.

The main function of the ṣadr under the early Ṣafawids was to impose doctrinal unity by directing and accelerating the propagation of the Shī'ī faith. Upon the successful imposition of doctrinal uniformity depended the smooth operation of the temporal arm of government, and the ability of the state to survive hostile attacks from its Sunnī neighbours. Sayyid Sharīf Shīrāzī, ṣadr from 915-17/1509-11 and from 918-20/1512-14, "made praiseworthy efforts and took infinite pains in the propagation of the true religion

(1) A. K. S. Lambton, Quis custodiet custodes, in Studia Islamica vi/1956, 142.
(2) idem, op. cit., 139. (3) TIN, 479a.

(madhhab-i ḥaqq)....so that the credit due to him for his services in propagating the faith and religion is recorded on the pages of time" (1). Hasan Rūmlū, in his obituary on the ṣadr of Isma'īl, Amīr Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Shīrangī Astarābādī (ṣadr from 920-31/1514-25), says that he was second only to the muḥaqqiq Khwāja Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī in his zeal in spreading the Shī'ī faith (madhāhib-i ja'farī wa millat-i a'imma-yi ithnā 'asharī) (2). As a corollary, the ṣadr was responsible for the rooting out of heresy. Of the ṣadr Amīr Mu'izz al-Dīn Muḥammad Iṣfahānī (ṣadr from 938-43/1531-36) Hasan Rūmlū says:- "no ṣadr did as much to root out innovations as he, especially as regards pulling down opium dens and drinking saloons, destroying apparatus used in gambling and other forms of recreation, and chastising the wicked, impious, and heretics (dar raf'-i bida' hīchkudām az ṣudūr ān miqdār jahd wa sa'y nanamūdand ki ān ḥadrat khuṣūṣan dar takhrīb-i shīrakhānahā wa dār al-fasaqa-yi khumūr wa muskirāt wa kasr-i ālāt-i lahw wa qumār wa zajr-i fasaqa wa fajara wa mulāpida) (3). Sayyid Sharīf Shīrāzī, ṣadr 915-17/1509-11 and 918-20/1512-14, made great efforts to humiliate a number of people who were treading the path of error (dar iḥānat-i jam'ī ki salīk-i ṭarīq-i ḍalāl būdand kūshish bisyar kard) (4). The practice of regarding belief in the right religion as equivalent to loyalty to the state led to intolerance towards Sunnīs, who were viewed by the Shī'īs as heretics. The qaḍī Mīr Ḥusayn Yazdī was put to death by Isma'īl in 909/1503-4 (5), and in the same year the khaṭībs of Kāzīrūn were put to death because they were Sunnīs, and their houses were plundered (6).

(1) AT. 152; cf. A. K. S. Lambton, quis custodiet custodes, in Studia Islamica vi/1956, 135. (2) A. K. S. Lambton, op.cit., 134-5; cf. AT. 190. (3) A. K. S. Lambton, op.cit., 135; cf. AT. 313. (4) AT. 152. (5) AT. 82. (6) Shar. ii, 136.

cf. according to sources

In 916/1510-11 Farīd al-Dīn (or Sayf al-Dīn) Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā b. Muḥammad b. Sa'd al-Dīn Taftāzānī, who had been shaykh al-islām in Khurāsān for nearly thirty years under Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā the Tīmūrid, was put to death at Isma'īl's order on the grounds of his Sunnism (bi-wāsiṭa-yi tasannun) (1). In 909/1503 Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad, a former mīrmīrān of the Aq Qoyunlu, was put to death at Iṣfahān, together with his three sons, on a charge of hostility to the Ṣafawid régime (bi-mukhālafat-i dawlat-i qāhira muttāhim gashta); he may have opposed the régime on religious grounds, as he is described as naqīb wa 'umda-yi ān diyār, but naqīb may only be used here in the sense of "chief, leader". At all events, large sums of money and quantities of effects from his department (sarkār) fell into the hands of the Ṣafawid army (2).

estur... Isma'īl himself devoted all his energies to promoting the Ithnā 'Asharī creed (dar rawāj wa rawnaq-i millat-i 'aṭhar wa madhhab-i ḥaqq-i a'imma-yi ithnā 'ashar sa'y-i mawfūr wa jadd-i balīgh bi-zuhūr rasānīd). The khaṭībs were ordered to omit the names of Abū Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthmān from the khuṭba, and not to mention any names except those of the twelve Imāms. The fanatical Shī'īs (tabarrāyān) (3) were ordered to curse in the streets and bazaars those who opposed these measures, and they took no heed of the power and predominance of the Sunnīs (az ghalaba wa tasalluṭ-i sunniyān hīch andīsha namīnamūdand); hence Shī'ism increased in strength

(1) AT. 124, and see Seddon's note in AT. ii, 241, n. 15. (2) TIN. 450a.
(3) See Seddon, AT., Notes on the Text, 11; tabarra'ī - one who separates himself from and curses the first three Khalifas, a fanatical Shī'a. tabarra'a minhu = bīzār shud az ān (Muntaha'l-'arab). In the Qur'ān, ii, 166, and ix, 114, tabarra'a is used in the sense of "disown, shun".

daily, and Sunnism declined, until no one dared openly profess Sunnism in Persia (tā ānki dar bilād-i 'ajam kas-rā zahra wa yārā-yi ān nabūd ki izhār-i tasannun namāyad). The order concerning the omission of the names of the orthodox Caliphs from the khuṭba was still in force at the time when the Tārīkh-i Ilchī-yi Niẓāmshāh was written (971/1563), and had "even taken effect in other regions too" (balki bi-wilāyat-i digar nīz sarāyat karda ast) (1). This account is interesting in that it affords an idea of the strength of Sunnism in Persia at the time of Isma'īl's accession.

Despite the overriding importance of the imposition of doctrinal unity, the ṣadrs of the early Ṣafawid period did not neglect the administration of the awqāf. The first holder of the office of ṣadr was Qāḍī Shams al-Dīn Lāhijī (Gīlānī), who had been Isma'īl's tutor in Persian and Arabic at Lāhījān (1494-99). Qāḍī Shams al-Dīn, who was appointed ṣadr in 907/1501-2, took over control of the waqf administration (mawqūfāt-i mamālik-rā bi-hīṭa-dabṭ dar āwarda), and opened the gates of religious zeal (abwāb-i dīn-parwarī bar gushād) (2).

Under the early Ṣafawids there was no clear demarcation between the religious and the political institutions. As we have already seen, the ṣadr, though head of the religious institution, derived his authority from the political institution, and we find instances of ṣadrs aspiring to posts such as the wikālat. In 915/1509 Amīr Sayyid Sharīf al-Dīn 'Alī Shīrāzī was appointed sole (bilā mushārahāt) ṣadr in place of Qāḍī Muḥammad Kāshānī, who had been executed for various misdemeanours. Because of the hostility of the wakīl, Najm-i Thānī, Sayyid Sharīf felt unable to remain in Isma'īl's winter quarters at Qum (917/1511-12), and made the desire to visit the Shī'ī

(1) TIN. 449a. (2) HS. iii/4, 35.

shrines at Karbalā and Najaf the excuse to leave the royal camp. After his departure from Qum, Najm-i Thānī at first intended to appoint Mīr Jamāl al-Dīn Astarābādī to the ṣadārat, but quarrelled with him and appointed instead Amīr 'Abd al-Bāqī Yazdī (2) (early in Dhu'l-Hijja 917/February 1512) (3). As a result of the great favour shown to him by the wakīl, the star of ('Abd al-Bāqī's) rank and dignity reached the zenith of good fortune and prosperity. When Najm-i Thānī led the Ṣafawid army to Khurāsān in 918/1512, he appointed Amīr 'Abd al-Bāqī to act as his deputy during his absence, and arranged that he should conduct the affairs of the administration of the state in complete independence (dar ān awān ki amīr najm 'āzim-i māwarā'l-nahr gardīd ānjanāb-rā bi-niyābat-i khwīsh ta'ayyūn namūda muqarrar farmūd ki min ḥayth al-istiqlāl bi-saranjām-i muḥamm-i sarkār-i salṭanat qiyām namāyad) (4). Najm-i Thānī was killed at the battle of Ghujduwān in November 1512, and Amīr 'Abd al-Bāqī was appointed wakīl-i nafs-i nafs-i humāyūn (5). According to the anonymous history of Shāh Isma'īl, Amīr 'Abd al-Bāqī had been honoured and exalted with the rank of wazīr of the Shāh (manṣab-i wizārat-i shāhī), and through the favourable regard of Amīr Najm the star of his position and greatness reached the zenith of felicity and fortune; when Amīr Najm set out for Transoxania, he made Amīr 'Abd al-Bāqī his deputy (ānjanāb-rā bi-niyābat-i khwud yaqīn namūd), and the latter undertook the duties of Amīr Najm's deputy with full independence (wa ū min ḥayth al-istiqlāl bi-saranjām-i muḥamm-i wikālat-i mushār ilayh pardākht). At that place (dar ān manzil) Isma'īl made Amīr Niẓām al-Dīn 'Abd al-Bāqī the object of his favour (lit., manẓūr-i nazar-i kimiya-athar gardānīda) and placed the wikālat-i nafs-i nafs-i humāyūn in the care of (dar 'uhda-yi) that great man (6). Another passage in the same

(1) TIN. 454a. (2) BM. Or. 3248, 208a. (3) AT. 128; dar awayīl-i dhu'l-hijja. (4) HS. iii/4, 71. (5) ibid., 71. (6) BM. Or. 3248, 221b.

source refers to 'Abd al-Bāqī as amīr al-umarā in 920/1514 (1).

There is no doubt that at the time when Najm-i Thānī appointed Amīr 'Abd al-Bāqī his deputy (nayib), the latter still held the office of şadr. "Mīr Najm conferred the post of deputy wakīl on Amīr Zahir (2) al-Dīn 'Abd al-Bāqī who at that time was şadr" (mīr najm manşab-i wikalat-rā bar sabīl-i niyābat bi-amīr şahir al-dīn 'abd al-bāqī ki dar ān ayyām şadr būd rujū' namūda) (3). Further, it would appear that the reappointment of Sayyid Sharīf Shīrāzī to the şadārat took place after Amīr 'Abd al-Bāqī's appointment to the wikalat by the Shāh; therefore there must have been (a) a period of at least six months during which Amīr 'Abd al-Bāqī was deputy wakīl and şadr, and (b) a short period, prior to the reappointment of Sayyid Sharīf Shīrāzī to the şadārat, when Amīr 'Abd al-Bāqī was both wakīl and şadr. The only previous example, and one which is not fully authenticated, of an official holding the posts of şadr and wakīl simultaneously, is that of Qādī Şafī al-Dīn 'Isā, the şadr and wakīl of Ya'qūb Aq Qoyunlu (4). The Ahsan al-Tawārīkh states that Amīr 'Abd al-Bāqī was şadr during the early years of Isma'īl's reign; later, the management of financial and administrative affairs came into his hands, and he had full independence in the conduct of affairs (dar awā'il-i zaman-i khaqān-i iskandar-sha'n şadr būd ba'd az ān zimān-i ḥall wa 'aqd wa qabḍ wa başt-i umūr-i malī wa mulkī min ḥayth al-istiqlāl bi-qabḍa-yi ānḥadrāt dar āmad) (5).

An important passage in the Jami'-i Mufīdī gives more details. This states that Isma'īl decided to place the conduct of affairs of state and the

(1) BM. Or. 3248, 247a. (2) According to J. Aubin, Matériaux pour la Biographie de Shah Ni'matullah Walī Kermānī, 4 n. 13, the laqab Zahir al-Dīn is correct, and Nizām al-Dīn, given by some of the sources, including the Ḥabīb al-Siyar, is incorrect. (3) TIN. 458b. (4) See p. 285 ff. above.

(5) AT. 152.

wikalat of the Shāh's royal person, and the management of awqāf transactions in the hands of a skilful, capable and shrewd person (ki zimām-i ratq wa fatq wa qabḍ wa bast wa ḥall wa 'aqd-i muhimmāt-i sarkār-i salṭanat wa wikalat-i nafs-i humāyūn-i shāhī-yi ḡill-allāhī wa dād wa sitad-i umūr wa mu'amalat-i awqāf-i mamālik-i maḥrūsa dar qabḍa-yi dirāyat wa kaff-i kifāyat-i ṣāhib-i kiyāsati nihad) (1). After consultation and inquiry (istishāra wa istikhāra), the khal'at of these high-ranking offices (manāṣib-i jalīlat al-marātib) was conferred on Amīr Niḡām al-Dīn 'Abd al-Bāqī. A royal order (ḥukm) was issued to the effect that 'Abd al-Bāqī was in charge of the conduct of affairs of state and of the government of the empire with sole and independent authority (min ḥayth al-istiqlāl wa'l-infirād muta'ahhid-i saranjām-i umūr-i salṭanat wa jahānbānī būda), and that the amīrs and pillars of the state, together with all wazīrs and nobles of the court, should not embark on any affair, whether great or small, without informing and consulting him ('Abd al-Bāqī). Therefore his ('Abd al-Bāqī's) exalted threshold became the refuge of amīrs and wazīrs. At that time also the monarch whose majesty equals that of the sun (pādishāh-i āftāb-i ḥtishām) again turned his attention to strengthening the pillars of the sharī'a and to furthering the affairs of sayyids, qāḍīs, 'ulamā and fuḡalā, and he conferred the office of ṣadr of the empire on that great man (i.e., 'Abd al-Bāqī). The rose-garden of the kingdom was watered and made fruitful by the drops shed by the clouds, that is, by the zeal and efforts (ihtimām wa ijtiḥād) of that wakīl and ṣadr. These exalted offices were adorned by the presence of that sulṭān-i nuqabā ('Abd al-Bāqī) for some

(1) JM. 47b.

years, until he was killed at the battle of Chāldirān (920/1514); in that battle he was stationed in the centre as deputy of the Shāh (dar qūl bi-wikālat-i pādishāh-i haft kishwar qarār dāsht) (1).

9
! The above passage clearly suggests that Isma'īl intended to control the religious institution through the ṣadr, and is therefore of great value as confirmation of the connexion of the ṣadr with the political institution, and of the subordination of the spiritual arm to the temporal. From the evidence of the other sources we know that Amīr 'Abd al-Bāqī became ṣadr in 917/1512, and wakīl in or after November 1512; he had been appointed deputy wakīl some time during the spring of that year. If we accept the statement of the Jāmi'-i Mufīdī that he held both offices until his death in 920/1514, then from the end of 917 or the beginning of 918 he must have held the ṣadārat jointly with Amīr Sayyid Sharīf, for we know that the latter was reappointed ṣadr about that time.

After being appointed wakīl, Amīr 'Abd al-Bāqī tried to get his own nominee, Qāḍī Shaykh Kabīr Ardabīlī, appointed ṣadr, but there was a rival candidate in Amīr Jamāl al-Dīn Astarābādī, who had made an unsuccessful bid for the post the previous year, and whose candidature was supported by Mawlānā 'Alā' al-Dīn Ḥakīm. Isma'īl, however, intervened, saying that his ṣadr was in Shīrāz (ṣadr-i man dar shīrāz ast) - a reference to Sayyid Sharīf Shīrāzī, who had just returned from his pilgrimage to the shrines of 'Irāq-i 'Arab. When 'Abd al-Bāqī saw Isma'īl's regard for Mīr Sayyid Sharīf, he too concurred (dar muwāfaqat dar āmad) and despatched one of his men to Shīrāz to effect a reconciliation with the sayyid and to strengthen the ties between them (az barāyi ta'kīd-i rabṭ wa iltiyām) (2). The Ḥabīb

(1) JM. 48a-b; cf. A. K. S. Lambton, quis custodiet custodes, in Studia Islamica vi/1956, 134. (2) TIN. 459a-b. BM.Or. 3248, 221b, states that Sayyid Sharīf married one of 'Abd al-Bāqī's daughters in order to remove the enmity between them (bi-wāsiṭa-yi raf'-i ghubarī ki dar miyāna-yi In dū buzurg dar hayajan būd).

520
wwwf
al-Siyar agrees that Amīr Sayyid Sharīf was reappointed to the ṣadārat on his return from Baghdād (bār-i dīgar mashmūl-i 'awāṭif-i khusrawāna sakht wa bi-takafful-i umūr-i sarkār-i ṣadārat ḥasb farmūd) (1).

Amīr Jamāl al-Dīn Astarābādī still aspired to the post of ṣadr, and the wakīl 'Abd al-Bāqī and the ṣadr Mīr Sayyid Sharīf conspired to disgrace him. Amīr Jamāl al-Dīn had had the title (nishān) to the soyūrghāl of Astarābād registered in the registers of the dīwān-i a'lā, and had submitted it to the ṣadr for his seal (nishān-i soyūrghāl-i astarābād-rā dar ān ayyām thabt-i dafātir-i dīwān-i a'lā namūda bi-tawqī'-i ṣadr rasānīda); the ṣadr refused to seal it for three months, and was grudging in his praise of Amīr Jamāl al-Dīn, who had been called the most learned of the 'ulamā, and disputed with him regarding the amount of the soyūrghāl (dar ta'rīf-i mīr jamāl al-dīn ki 'allāma al-'ulamā niwishta būdand wa dar mablagh-i soyūrghāl muḍāyāqa wa munāqasha dāsht); Amīr Jamāl al-Dīn, through the help of Shāh Ṭāhir, eventually got the nishān sealed, and retired to Sīstān (2).

Both the wakīl Amīr 'Abd al-Bāqī and the ṣadr Mīr Sayyid Sharīf were killed at the battle of Ghāldirān (920/1514) (3). Sayyid 'Abd Allāh Lāla, a sayyid of Ādharbāyjān, was appointed ṣadr, but failed to carry out his duties in a satisfactory manner (kamā yanbaghī az 'uhda-yi saranjām-i umūr-i ān mansab bīrūn natawānist āmad) (4), and was soon replaced by Amīr Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Astarābādī, who held the post until his death in 931/1524-5. Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn Iṣfahānī was appointed wakīl, and held the post until his assassination in 929/1523. Once again there was conflict between the ṣadr and the wakīl. Amīr Jamāl al-Dīn owed his appointment to the support of Mawlānā 'Alā' al-Dīn Muḥammad Ṭabīb Ḥakīm (5). The latter, who died in

(1) HS. iii/4, 71. (2) TIN. 459b-460a. (3) AT. 149. (4) HS. iii/4, 80.
(5) TIN. 461b.

924/1518, had precedence over all the amīrs (bar jumhūr-i umarā wa arkan-i dawlat simat-i taqaddum dāsht), and was referred to by the leaders of religion and the state alike (marja' ilayh-i arbāb-i dīn wa dawlat būd) (1), and had greater access to the Shāh than the majority of the court officials (az akthar-i nuwwāb-i bārgāh-i 'alam-panāh bi-mazīd-i taqarrub mumtāz būd) (2).

Both Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn and Amīr Jamāl al-Dīn acquired great power in their respective offices, and in most matters were at variance with each other (har yak dar manṣab-i khwud bi-ghāyat mustawlī shudand wa dar akthar-i umūr bā yakdīgar mukhālif būdand) (3). The Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh says that Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn was hostile to Amīr Jamāl al-Dīn (bā way dar maqām-i kudūrat sulūk mīnamūd), and accordingly summoned Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn Manṣūr to the foot of the exalted throne, with the object of getting him appointed joint ṣadr (banābar-i ān amīr ghiyāth al-dīn manṣūr-rā bi-pāya-yi sarīr-i a'la ṭalab kard tā ū-rā bā way sharīk gardānad), but failed to achieve his purpose (bi-wuqū' maqrūn nashud). There were repeated disputes between them (i. e., the wakīl and the ṣadr), but as Amīr Jamāl al-Dīn was of a witty and humorous disposition he always managed to end the argument with some humorous sally (mukarraran miyāna-yi īshān mubāḥatha waqi' shud wa chūn muṭāyaba wa hazl bar mazāj-i amīr jamāl al-dīn muḥammad ghālib būd mubāḥatha-rā bi-ṣarāfat munjarr mīsakht) (4).

Rivalry between ṣadr and wakīl is still apparent under Ṭahmāsp. In 931/1524-5 the wakīl Khwāja Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Tabrīzī was put to death, and the ṣadr, Amīr Jamāl al-Dīn Astarābādī, aspired to the wikālat. Amīr Jamāl al-Dīn entrusted (rujū' namūd) the affairs of the ṣadarat to his son

(1) TIN. 462a. (2) HS. iii/4, 86. (3) TIN. 461b. (4) AT. 190.

Amīr Ṣafī al-Dīn Muḥammad; he had arranged (muqarrar kardā būd) that Amīr Ṣafī al-Dīn should deal with (iktifa farmāyand) matters concerning soyūrghāls (muhimm-i soyūrghāl) and with sharī'a affairs (muhimmāt-i shar'ī) throughout the Ṣafawid empire in accordance with the decrees of (bi-mithāl-i) the dīwān-i ṣadārat. The authority (dast) of Dīw Sulṭān and Muṣṭafā Sulṭān (1), who held the rank of amīr al-umara, and of Qāḍī Jahān, the wakīl and nāzir-i dīwān, did not extend (namīrasīd) to religious soyūrghāls and offices. Qāḍī Jahān informed the amīrs of Amīr Jamāl al-Dīn's aspirations, and it was decided to make Shāh Qiwām al-Dīn Iṣfahānī joint ṣadr. Amīr Ṣafī al-Dīn was expelled (bi-dar kardand) from the ṣadārat, and Shāh Qiwām al-Dīn was given precedence over him in the dīwān. Amīr Jamāl al-Dīn abandoned his pretensions to the wikālat, but died soon afterwards at Tabrīz (Rabī' I 931/January 1525). His son Ṣafī al-Dīn was appointed to the ṣadārat-i khurāsān and sent to Harāt (2). Shāh Qiwām al-Dīn assumed the duties of ṣadr with sole authority (bī mushārakat) (3).

The above examples are evidence of the friction between the ṣadr and the wakīl, which was the natural outcome of the lack of any clear definition of their respective functions. Another instance of members of the religious classes aspiring to play a part in political affairs occurred in 948/1541. Four sayyids of Askūya near Tabrīz had risen high in Ṭahmāsp's favour through the patronage of the wakīl, Qāḍī Jahān Qazwīnī (4). They were respected by the most exalted personages, and the Shāh granted their every wish (har irāda'ī ki dar khidmat-i ānḥadrat mīnamūdand bilā tawaqquf

(1) Known as Kupuk Sulṭān. (2) Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad held this post from 922-7/1516-21. See below, p. 307 ff. (3) TIN. 465a. TM. III states that "under Ṭahmāsp there were always two ṣadrs", but on four occasions during the reign of Ṭahmāsp a ṣadr held sole and independent authority. (4) Their names were Amīr Ṣadr al-Dīn Muḥammad, Amīr Nizām al-Dīn Aḥmad, Amīr Qamar al-Dīn Muḥammad, and Amīr Abu'l-Maḥamid Luṭf Allāh (AT. 301).

u
wa ta'allul ba'd az 'arḍ bi-ḥuṣūl iqrān yāfta). The Shāh repeatedly visited them at Askūya, and joined them at banquets. They incurred Ṭahmāsp's displeasure by interfering in dīwān affairs, which were no concern of theirs (īshān dar muhāmm-i dīwānī shurū'ī nadāshtand ba'ḍī umūr ki munāsabat bidīshān nadāsht murtakib mīshudand az ān mamarr kudūrat bi-khāṭir-i ashraf-i a'lā rasīda); the officers of state seized this opportunity to speak (to the Shāh), and eventually poisoned Ṭahmāsp's mind against them (arkān-i dawlat rāh-i sukhan yāfta bi-murūr-i ayyām khāṭir-i ashraf-rā azīshān bar gardānīdand). Qādī Jahān thought it prudent to disavow his protégés, and adopted a hostile attitude towards them (dar maqām-i nifāq bā īshān mībūd). The sayyids went so far as to hold private quasi-political gatherings, and to make recommendations about the wikālat, ṣadārat, wizārat, and other important offices of the Shāh's administration, to their relatives, intimates and close associates (ānhā dar khalawāt bā jam'ī az maḥramān dar umūr-i mulkī tadbīrāt andīshīdand wa jihat-i wikālat wa ṣadārat wa wizārat wa sāyir-i muhimmāt-i sarkār-i shāh-i dīn-panāh bi-aqwām wa makhṣūṣān wa nazdīkān-i khwud ṣalah dīdand). They were eventually forbidden to come to court, but were allowed to retain their soyūrghāls, which represented a large sum (1). The Tārīkh-i 'Ālam-Ārā states that the sayyids had wanted to make changes in matters (concerning) the administration of the state, such as the appointment of the wakīl, the wazīr and the ṣadrs (mīkhwāstand taghyīr wa tabdīl dar muhimmāt-i kārkhāna-yi salṭanat mithl-i ta'yīn-i wakīl wa wazīr wa ṣudūr wa ghayrahā namāyand) (2).

Examples have been given to show that both the Tīmūrid and the Turkomān rulers appointed ṣadrs to the courts of provincial governors to take

(1) AT. 301-2. (2) TAA. 107.

charge of the religious institution in the province concerned; these provincial şadrs seem to have been appointed directly by the sovereign and not by the şadr who was an organ of the central administration. The Şafawids, in their turn, adopted this practice. For instance, during the reign of Ṭahmāsp, Mawlānā Yaḥyā Khān for many years performed the duties of of the exalted office of şadr of Gīlān (sālḥā bi-tamshiyat-i manşab-i jalīl al-martabat-i şadārat-i gīlān qiyām wa iqdām mīnamūda) (1). Under 'Abbās II (1642-67), the provincial şadr seems to have had a deputy; we hear of a Mīrza 'Abd al-Ḥā' who, after holding the office of muḥtasib at Yazd, was charged with taqsīm-i wujūh-i mustaḥaqqīn-i.....yazd, "which is one of the exalted offices (manşabīst az manāşib-i 'aliyya), and, eventually, in 1073/1662, was appointed to the manşab-i niyābat-i şadārat; he showed the greatest integrity (diyanat) and forbearance (parhīzkārī) in taking decisions in sharī'a affairs (dar fayşal-i qaḍāyā-yi shar'iyya), and undertook the management of the affairs of religion with full freedom of action (dar kamāl-i istiqlāl) (2). Mawlānā Shāh Taqī twice held the position of nāyib al-şadāra at Yazd during the reign of 'Abbās II (3).

The sources give a detailed account of the career of Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad, who was a provincial şadr during the reign of Isma'īl I.

Chyhan Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad was appointed şadr to the infant prince Ṭahmāsp when the latter was made governor-general of Khurāsān in 922/1516 with Amīr Khān Turkmān as his lala (4). Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad had authority over all members of the religious classes (arbab-i 'ama'im) and sayyids (ashraf), and was responsible for the administration of the awqāf

(1) HI. 474a. This source mentions two other officials who at some stage in their career were appointed to the şadārat-i gīlān (ibid., 474b). (2) JM. 280b-282a. (3) ibid., 284a-b. (4) HS. iii/4, 82.

and the conduct of all transactions connected with them (1). He acquired great influence over Amīr Khān Turkman (the lala of Ṭahmāsp and actual governor of Khurāsān), who made decisions in other administrative and financial matters only after consulting Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn (sāyir-i muhimmāt-i mulkī wa malī-rā bi-istiṣwāb-i ān 'alījanāb fayṣal dāda), and allotted (bāz gudhārd) to Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn the revenues (mal-u-jihāt) of the province of Harāt-rūd in respect of his retainers' pay (dar wajh-i mawājib-i mulāzimānash). In 924/1518 Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad was sent to Tabrīz as a representative of Amīr Khān Turkman, who had been summoned to court but had pleaded his inability to go. Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn was exalted by the Shāh with an increase of honour and favour, and the flag of his authority and rank was raised to the highest heavens by the grant of "drum and banner" (ṭabl wa 'alam). He was confirmed in his appointment as ṣadr to Ṭahmāsp, and the administration of the awqāf in Khurāsān, from the borders of 'Irāq and Ādharbāyjan to the furthest limits of Tukhāristān, was committed to his impartial judgement. He thus held the rank of amīr as well as that of ṣadr. On his return to Harāt in October 1518, Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn was met at the Fūshanj bridge by the sayyids, mullās, ashraf, fuḍalā and ahālī of Harāt, who congratulated him on his promotion to the imārat. Amīr Khān Turkman, jealous of the honours conferred on Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn, treated him with considerable coolness; further, he aimed to lay his hands on a large sum of waqf money (mablagh-i kullī az mawqūfāt ṭama' karda), and he settled the rest of the administrative affairs in a manner contrary to the impartial judgement of Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn (sāyir-i muhimmāt-rā bi-khilāf-i ra'y-i ṣawābnamā-yi ānḥadrāt fayṣal

(1) TIN. 462a.

mīdād). The conflict between the ṣadr and the governor continued; when Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn complained to Amīr Khān Turkman about the corrupt practices of the latter's officials, Amīr Khān Turkman dismissed his remarks as prejudiced (ḥaml bar gharāḥ namūda bi-sam'-i riḍā namīshawad) (1).

Matters came to a head when Isma'īl received a report to the effect that the tutor (mu'allim) of Ṭahmāsp Mīrzā, Mawlānā Niḡam al-Dīn Aḥmad Ṭabasī, a confidant of Amīr Khān Turkman, was seeking to secure the leadership of the religious classes in Khurāsān (pīshwā'ī-yi arbāb-i 'amā'im), and that to that end he was constantly placing the actions of the ṣadr Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn in an unfavourable light, accusing him of appropriating money from waqf funds (bi-taṣarruf dar amwāl-i awqāf muttahim dāshta) and slandering him in private audiences with Amīr Khān Turkman (dar khalawāt zabān-i ghībatash mīgushāyad). The result had been, the report continued, that Amīr Khān Turkman paid little regard to the ṣadr (ṭarīq-i kam iltifātī maslūk mīdād), going contrary to his opinion in most matters, and placing no reliance on his advice (sukhanash-rā mu'tabar namīshumarad). Isma'īl issued an order (ḥukm) that Amīr Khān Turkman should settle all administrative, financial, dīwān, and waqf affairs with the approval (bi-istiṣwāb) of Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn. He further ordained that the ṣadr should take over from Mawlānā Niḡam al-Dīn Aḥmad Ṭabasī the post of tutor (mu'allimī) to Ṭahmāsp Mīrzā. Mawlānā Shaykh Abū Sa'īd was instructed to proceed to Harāt to acquaint Amīr Khān Turkman with the contents of the royal order, and to charge him to treat the ṣadr with due respect (ū-rā bi-ri'āyat-i amīr ghiyāth al-dīn muḥammad ma'mūr gardānad). Mawlānā Shaykh

(1) HS. iii/4, 95.

Abū Sa'īd reached Harāt on 21 Dhu'l-Qa'da 926/2 November 1520. Amīr Khān outwardly complied with the terms of the royal order, and as long as the royal envoy was in the city Amīr Khān displayed excessive cordiality towards Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn, and dispensed with the services of Mawlānā Nizām al-Dīn Ahmad Ṭabasī as mu'allim of Ṭahmāsp Mīrzā (mawlānā nizām al-dīn ahmad-rā az ta'līm-i shāhzāda mu'af dāsht); after the departure of the envoy, however, Amīr Khān reverted to his former disobedience (bāz bi-dastūr-i sābiq sālīk-i ṭarīq-i nāfarmānī gashta) (1).

Six months later (14 Jumādā II 927/22 May 1521), 'Ubayd Khān Uzbek crossed the frontier of Khurāsān and laid siege to Harāt; about a fortnight later, he abandoned the siege (2). The ṣadr Amīr Sayyid Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad had played his part both in organizing resistance to the Uzbeks and in the actual fighting. On one occasion the ṣadr had appealed for aid to Amīr Khān Turkman, who was stationed in reserve; contrary to his expectations (bi-khilāf-i mutaṣawwar), he received a harsh (durusht) reply. This incident made him determine to return to court after the siege was over (3). Amīr Khān Turkman, however, saw in this campaign an opportunity to rid himself of the ṣadr, and he arrested Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn on the charge of having conspired to summon Bābur to Harāt (da'iya namūda būd ki muḥammad bābur mīrzā bi-harāt ṭalab dārad); the following day (7 Rajab 927/13 June 1521), the ṣadr was put to death in the fort of Ikhtiyār al-Dīn (4).

The career of Amīr Sayyid Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad is important in that it throws light on many of the principal features of the ṣadārat under Isma'īl I. In his youth, Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad had studied the customary religious sciences, and had attracted the notice of the Tīmūrid ruler Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā, who had appointed him to a post in a madrasa at Harāt. After the death of Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā (911/1505), his sons Badī'

(1) HS. iii/4, 96. (2) AT. 171. (3) HS. iii/4, 97. (4) ibid., 99-100.

al-Zamān Mīrzā and Muẓaffar Ḥusayn Mīrzā continued to hold Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad in great esteem. When the Uzbegs captured Harāt in 913/1507, Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad found favour with the Uzbek leader Muḥammad Khān Shaybānī, and when Isma'īl brought Khurāsān under Ṣafawid dominion (916/1510), he appointed Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn qāḍī of Khurāsān, with sole and independent authority in all sharī'a matters ('inān-i qabḍ wa baṣṭ wa ratq wa fatq-i jamī'-i umūr wa muhimmāt-i shar'iyya-rā min ḥayth al-istiqlāl wa'l-infirād bi-kaff-i dirāyatash dād) (1). In 922/1516 Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn was appointed ṣadr to Ṭahmāsp Mīrzā (2), and in 924/1518 was raised to the imārat and made ṣāhib-i ṭūq wa ṭabl. It is also asserted that he had for years been shaykh al-islām of Harāt (3).

The appointment of the qāḍī Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn to the ṣadārat is further proof that the practice, common under the Aq Qoyunlu, of nominating qāḍīs to the ṣadārat, was continued under the Ṣafawids. The career of Amīr Sayyid Ghiyāth al-Dīn illustrates the ability of a member of the religious classes successively to enjoy the esteem of Sunnī and Shī'ī rulers, and suggests once again that the religious classes were the exponents of religious orthodoxy in general rather than of any particular orthodoxy. Many features of the career of Amīr Sayyid Ghiyāth al-Dīn are characteristic of the ṣadārat during the early Ṣafawid period. For example, he was appointed to the imārat, and equipped with the full panoply of an amīr (drum, banner, plume, etc.); he held military command, and participated in military actions; and in the administration of financial and dīwān affairs he tended to encroach on the authority of temporal officials.

The ṣadrs were not the only members of the religious classes to be invested with military distinctions and temporal rank. Among the staunch

(1) HS. iii/4, 98. (2) ibid., 82. (3) TIN. 462b.

Shī'īs at Harāt who were favoured by Isma'īl in 916/1510 was Sayyid Muḥammad Mīr Yūsuf, who was appointed to the imārat and made master of plume and military band (ṣāhib-i ṣūq wa naqqāra) (1).

Qadi Like the sadrs, qādīs took part in military operations. In 942/1535-6 Amīr Ḥasan Qādī played a leading part in strengthening the defences of Harāt against 'Ubayd Khān Uzbek (bi-istiḥkām-i shahr kūshīdand) (2). With Khidr Chalabī, Amīr Ḥasan Qādī resisted the Uzbek siege for a month, during which fighting went on from dawn to dusk (3). In 964/1556-7, Tahmāsp arrested Qādī Muḥammad b. Qādī Musāfir, who for some years had been responsible for the defence of Adharbāyjan and the city of Tabrīz. The Sharafnāma says that Qādī Muḥammad had displayed such zeal and energy in the administration and defence of the province that he had excited the jealousy of his peers and contemporaries, and that he was arrested with Ḥaydar Beg Anīs b. Ustād Shaykhī Tūbchī as the result of the animosity of malevolent people (4). The Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh, on the other hand, says that Qādī Muḥammad had molested both Turk and Tājīk, and that his rule had been notorious for its harshness and licence. Ḥaydar Beg, the "protector" (ḥāmī) of this wicked man (khabīth), was arrested with him (5), and after large sums of money had been extorted from them both by torture, they ended their days in Alamut (kār-u-bār-i īshān dar ānjā anjāmīd) (6). According to the Haft Iqlīm, Qādī Muḥammad had acted as wazīr of Tabrīz with the help and support (i'ānat wa taqwīyat) of Ḥaydar Beg Anīs (7).

Mujtahids In addition to the instances, already noted, of a conflict of authority between sadr and wakīl, there are indications of a similar conflict between the sadr and the mujtahids. The authority of the the mujtahids,

(1) TIN. 458a. (2) AT. 269. (3) ibid., 270. (4) Shar. ii, 210. (5) AT. 399-400. (6) Shar. ii, 210. (7) HI. 509a.

as exponents of the Shī'ī orthodoxy which had been achieved through the efforts of the şadrs of the early Şafawid period, did not become a factor of much importance in the Şafawid state until the time of 'Abbās I. On two occasions during the reign of Ṭahmāsp, however, the mujtahid al-zamānī was able to secure the dismissal of a şadr to whom he was hostile, and on two other occasions the appointment of a şadr was due to the influence of the mujtahid. The Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh describes the protracted feud between the şadr Amīr Ni'mat Allāh Ḥillī and the "seal of mujtahids" (khātim al-mujtahidīn) 'Alī b. 'Abd al-'Ālī. Amīr Ni'mat Allāh Ḥillī was appointed şadr in 935/1528-9; after his dismissal, Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn became sole şadr (1). Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn was himself dismissed in 938/1531-2 (2), so Amīr Ni'mat Allāh's term of office must have come to an end before then, probably in 937/1530-1. Amīr Ni'mat Allāh Ḥillī had been one of the mujtahids students (az tilāmīdha-yi ḥadrat-i... 'alī b. 'abd al-'ālī būd). The mujtahid had a personal enemy in Shaykh Ibrāhīm Qāṭifī of Baghdād, and Amīr Ni'mat Allāh annoyed the mujtahid by corresponding with the shaykh on questions of jurisprudence, and by inciting the shaykh to lose no opportunity of damaging the mujtahid. In the event, however, the reputation of the mujtahid was not affected, whereas Amīr Ni'mat Allāh suffered injury both materially and in his religious capacity (anwā'-i āzār wa adrār-i dīnī wa duniyāwī bar way 'āyid mīshud). On one occasion in a royal assembly Amīr Ni'mat Allāh disagreed with the mujtahid on the question of the validity of Friday prayers conducted without the presence of the imām or nāyib-i imām. But although various religious officials who were hostile to the mujtahid, and some of the temporal officers of state including Maḥmūd Beg the muhrdār, sided with Amīr Ni'mat Allāh, the discussion was inconclusive, and Amīr

(1) TAA. 107. (2) AT. 244.

Ni'mat Allāh did not attain his object (presumably to discredit the mujtahid), Finally, an anonymous document was found behind the mujtahid's house in Tabriz containing libellous statements about the mujtahid. Tahmāsp ordered an inquiry, and eventually Amīr Ni'mat Allāh was discovered to have some knowledge of the matter. The mujtahid was so incensed that Amīr Ni'mat Allāh was forced into exile at Baghdād. Muḥammad Khān Takkalū, the governor of Baghdād (1), was enjoined not to let Amīr Ni'mat Allāh have any contact with Shaykh Ibrāhīm Qāṭifī or with the other enemies of the mujtahid, and was instructed to keep a close watch on his (Amīr Ni'mat Allāh's) activities. The fundamental reason for this feud seems to have been that "Amīr Ni'mat Allāh was thought by some to be a mujtahid, and he himself had pretensions to this title" (jam'ī gumān-i ijtihād bidū dāshtand wa khwud nīz da'wā-yi ijtihād mīnamūd) (2).

In 938/1531-2 the mujtahid al-zamānī caused the dismissal of the ṣadr Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn Manṣūr, who had been sole ṣadr after the dismissal of Amīr Ni'mat Allāh Ḥillī, as mentioned above. The mujtahid then made strong representations to Tahmāsp that Mīr Mu'izz al-Dīn Muḥammad Iṣfahānī should be nominated to the ṣadārat, for which post, he said, no sayyid was more fitted than Mīr Mu'izz al-Dīn. Accordingly Mīr Mu'izz al-Dīn was summoned from Iṣfahān, and, pending his arrival, the mujtahid al-zamānī appointed deputies (nuwwāb wa wukalā) to act in his place in the matter of sealing and stamping documents. Like Amīr Ni'mat Allāh Ḥillī, Mīr Mu'izz al-Dīn Muḥammad received his early training in religious jurisprudence from the mujtahid al-zamānī (akthar-i masā'il-i fiqh-rā az ḥadrat-i mujtahid al-zamānī farā girifta būd). (3).

(1) Appointed 935/1528-9. He was forced to evacuate Baghdād when the Ottomans, under Sulaymān I, advanced on the city in the winter of 941/1534-5.
(2) AT. 254-5. Amīr Ni'mat Allāh died in Dhū'l-Ḥijja 940/June-July 1534.
(3) AT. 313.

In 943/1536-7 or 944/1567-8 (1), Mīr Mu'izz al-Dīn was dismissed from the ṣadārat as the result of the intrigues of Mawlānā Rukn al-Dīn Mas'ūd Kāzirūnī, who was the most learned of the 'ulamā of the age and the most accomplished doctor of the time; he sometimes used unorthodox but successful methods in his treatment of illness. The ṣadr had an ambition which he could only achieve by submitting a petition to the Shāh (irāda'ī dar khāṭir gudharānīd ki ḥuṣūl-i ān mawqūf bi-'arḍ-i ashraf-i a'la būd); Mawlānā Rukn al-Dīn, who was always interfering in political affairs (paywasta dar umūr-i mulkī dakhil mīkard), privately communicated the ṣadr's ambition to the Shāh. Ṭahmāsp, angered by the whole affair, had the doctor executed and dismissed the ṣadr (2). He then consulted the learned men and chief officers of state (afāḍil wa arkan-i dawlat) regarding the choice of a new ṣadr from among a number of suitable candidates; on the strong recommendation of the mujtahid al-zamānī, Mīr Asad Allāh Shūshtarī was selected. The latter had spent most of his life at Mashhad in attendance on the mujtahid al-zamānī, and the mujtahid had continually presented at court a glowing picture of his talents (ḥadrat-i mujtahid al-zamānī paywasta dar majlis-i bihisht-āyīn izhār-i manaqib wa faḍā'il wa kamālāt-i īshān mīnamūdand). Mīr Asad Allāh was summoned from Shūshtar and appointed ṣadr (3).

Sadr The hereditary tendency in appointments to the ṣadārat became more marked during the latter part of the reign of Ṭahmāsp, and continued to be a distinctive feature of such appointments under 'Abbās I and his successors. On the death of the ṣadr Mīr Shams al-Dīn Asad Allāh Shūshtarī in 963/1555-6 (4), his son Mīr Sayyid Zayn al-Dīn 'Alī succeeded him (5). Owing to his

(1) AT. 278 states that he was dismissed in A.H. 943, but AT. 282 gives A.H. 944. (2) AT. 282-3. (3) ibid., 398. (4) AT. 398. (5) AT. ii, 282, n. 8.

father's ill-health, Mīr Zayn al-Dīn 'Alī had in fact acted for him for some time before his death (1). In 964/1556-7 Mīr Taqī al-Dīn Muḥammad became ṣadr; he was the son of the former ṣadr Amīr Mu'izz al-Dīn Muḥammad Iṣfahānī (ṣadr 938-943/4) (2).

In 970/1562-3 Amīr Taqī al-Dīn Muḥammad was allowed to retire (mu'āf gashta) from the ṣadārat, and the ṣadārat was divided. There was, however, a radical departure from previous practice. Instead of the two ṣadrs holding joint authority throughout the Ṣafawid empire, the ṣadārat was subjected to territorial limitation; each ṣadr had jurisdiction over half the empire, and there is no evidence to suggest that the two appointments were in any way different or that the two ṣadrs did not perform precisely the same function in their respective areas of jurisdiction. In Dhu'l-Qa'da 970/June-July 1563 the ṣadārat of 'Irāq, Fārs and Khūzistān was conferred on Amīr Muḥammad b. Yūsuf, a learned sayyid of Astarābād, and in the middle of the month of Dhu'l-Ḥijja 970/August 1563, the ṣadārat of Shīrwān, Khurāsān and Ādharbāyjān was bestowed on Amīr Amīr Zayn al-Dīn 'Alī, the son of Amīr Asad Allāh Mar'ashī (3). The Sharafnāma gives Kirman instead of Khūzistān, but as this is not supported by any of the other texts it is probably a mistake. The Jawāhir al-Akhbār gives yet another version. It states that in 970/1562-3 Mīr Taqī al-Dīn Muḥammad was dismissed from the ṣadārat, and retired to Ardabil, where he died. The office of ṣadr (amr-i ṣadārat) was divided (bi-dū ḥiṣṣa shud); 'Irāq, Fārs, Khūzistān and

(1) TIN. 480a. 'Alījanāb-i ṣadārat-panāh-i mīr shams al-dīn asad allāh ki bi-wasiṭa-yi du'f-i mizaj dar tabriz manda bud wa pīsar-i khwud-ra mīr sayyid zayn al-dīn-ra bi-khidmat-i urdū bi-wikalat-i khwud bāz dashta dar in sal dar tabriz wafat yaft. (2) ibid., 480a. (3) AT. 419; TIN. 481b gives the same division of provinces. Amīr Zayn al-Dīn 'Alī had been appointed ṣadr in 963/1555-6.

Shīrwan were given to Mīr Muḥammad b. Yūsuf Astarābādī, and Adharbāyjan and Khurāsān to Mīr Sayyid 'Alī Shūshtarī. (1) There was no official differentiation of function between the ṣadrs until the division of the ṣadārat into khāṣṣa and 'amma by Shāh Sulaymān in 1077/1666-7, a century later (2). It is interesting to note that to the author of the Tadhkirat al-Mulūk, a work completed about 1726 A.D., the division of the ṣadārat into khāṣṣa and 'amma seems to be the normal practice. He writes, "At some periods of the Ṣafavī monarchs, the office of the ṣadr-i khāṣṣa and 'amma was entrusted to one single person" (3).

To sum up, during the early Ṣafawid period there was in general no clear line dividing the religious institution from the political institution and the predominantly military character of the state had an influence on the functions of non-military officials. Both ṣadrs and qādīs held military rank, and commanded troops in action; both were frequently used in an ambassadorial capacity; qādīs became wazīrs (one, qādī Jahān Qazwīnī, became a wakīl), and ṣadrs aspired to, and on several occasions were appointed to, the wikalat. There was also rivalry between the various classes in the religious institution itself; qādīs strove to regain the authority which they had lost as a result of the creation of the ṣadārat; there was a conflict of jurisdiction between the ṣadr and the qādī, and, later, between the ṣadr and the shaykh al-islām.

Professor Lambton has noted that the importance of the ṣadārat declined under 'Abbās I, although the ṣadr still held an honoured position as administrator of the awqāf, and that the ṣadr's importance continued to

(1) JA. 329b. (2) Chardin (Amst.) ii, 286. (3) TM. 42 (Minorsky's translation).

decline under the later Ṣafawids, until the office eventually disappeared (1). Professor Minorsky has noted the deliberate diminution of the power of the ṣadr by 'Abbās II (1629-42) (2), and there is reason to suppose that the decline in the power of the ṣadr began some time before the accession of 'Abbās I, in fact during the latter part of the reign of Ṭahmāsp (d. 984/1576), or even earlier. The territorial division of the ṣadārat in 970/1562-3 clearly reduced the power of the ṣadrs, but there is no evidence that this system was perpetuated. By the time of the accession of Isma'īl II, if not before, it had been abandoned. For instance, on 6 Rabī' I 985/24 May 1577, Isma'īl II conferred the manṣab-i ṣadārat-i a'la on Mawlānā Shāh 'Ināyat Allāh, an eminent sayyid of Iṣfahān, and entrusted to him the administration and control of the affairs of this weighty office (ḥall wa 'aqd wa qabḍ wa baṣṭ wa naẓm wa nasq-i īn amr-i khaṭīr bidū tafwīḍ namūd), and it was stipulated (muqarrar shud) that he should display praiseworthy zeal in giving currency to the laws of religion, and in promoting the affairs of the shar' (dar rawāj-i awāmir-i dīn wa tamshiyat-i umūr-i shar'), in the maintenance of pious foundations (ta'mīr-i biqā'-i khayrāt), and in increasing the number of sown fields and houses and the amount of waqf property (tawfīr-i zurū' wa rubū' wa mawqūfāt) (3).

The principal reason for the decline in the power of the ṣadr was the completion of the specific task for which the Ṣafawids had first appointed a ṣadr, namely, the imposition of doctrinal unity. It is noticeable that, in the obituary notices on ṣadrs in the Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh, after 931/1524-5 there is no mention of the zeal of ṣadrs in propagating Shī'ism; the emphasis is rather on their learning and scholarship. This seems to

(1) A. K. S. Lambton, quis custodiet custodes, in Studia Islamica vi/1956, 135 ff: 142. (2) TM. 111. (3) AT. 491-2.

suggest that the major part of the task of imposing Shī'ism on Persia had been accomplished by the end of Isma'īl's reign, and that from then on the need was for consolidation rather than for conversion.

During the second half of the reign of Tahmāsp, as a result of the decline in the ṣadr's authority, the political influence of the ṣadr markedly decreased, and little is recorded in the sources of any political activity on the part of the ṣadr. Occasionally, however, there are indications, admittedly slight, that the ṣadr still played some part in political affairs. For instance, in 975/1567-8, Mawlānā 'Abd al-Razzāq the ṣadr, who was in prison (muḡayyad) in Qazwīn, was sent to Qal'a-yi Khirsak (1). No reason for his imprisonment is given, but it is at least possible that it was for a political offence. More definite is the evidence the association between the ṣadr of 'Irāq Fārs and Khūzistān mentioned above, Mīr Muḡammad b. Mīr Yūsuf, and the wakīl Ma'ṣūm Beg Ṣafawī. In 976/1568-9, when Ma'ṣūm Beg Ṣafawī resigned his post, and, announcing that he intended to perform the ḡajj, departed for Syria, Mīr Muḡammad accompanied him, as also did Bashārat Beg, dārūgha of the daftarkhāna (2). When Ma'ṣūm Beg reached Aleppo and Damascus, Ottoman officials reported to Salīm II that Ma'ṣūm Beg aimed to rouse the Ṣūfīs living in Ottoman territory (ṣūfiyān-i rūm) and make himself master of Syria. They alleged that Ma'ṣūm Beg considered himself inadequately rewarded for his services in Khurāsān and Gīlān (3), and that his pilgrimage was merely a pretext to conceal his other designs. Acting on Salīm's orders, Darwīsh Pāshā, mīrmīrān of Syria, sent 200 men in the guise of Arab brigands to attack the pilgrims' caravan (4).

(1) AT. 440. (2) See TM. 71-2: 122. The dārūgha of the daftarkhāna was an important official under the mustawfī al-mamalīk. (3) He had played a leading part in the capture of Khan Ahmad, the ruler of Gīlān, in 975/1567-8 (Shar. ii, 236 ff.). (4) Shar. ii, 239-40.

Salīm II sent envoys to Ṭahmāsp to express his regret at the incident (1).

The Jawāhir al-Akhbār gives a fuller account of these events. Shāh Qulī Sulṭān Ustājilū, who had been on a mission to the Ottoman court, brought back permission for Ma'sūm Beg to circumambulate the Ka'ba. Ṭahmāsp did not in the least wish him to go, but could not prevent him from going without violating the religious law (shāh-i zamān-rā muṭlaqan riḍā bi-raftan-i ū nabūd chūn man' hasb al-shar' wizr wa gunāh ast murakhkhaṣ gasht). Ma'sūm Beg set out with his family and children. When he had obtained permission to go, many people associated themselves with him, and a large following (urdu) assembled. Everywhere he stopped, the leading men (ashraf wa a'yan) of the district addressed themselves to him and flocked around him (ruju' mikardand wa hujum mi'awardand), and he too made disbursements on a grand scale, and bestowed presents and gifts (wa ū niz nafaqat-i buzurgāna mikard wa in'am wa aṭā mi'farmud), and spread the many-coloured carpet with things to eat and drink, and summoned the people (to believe) and gave them of God's bounty (khalāyiq-rā da'wat wa ni'mat-i khudā midad), and the Ṣūfīs who were adherents of the Ṣafawid house came loyally forward, and he devoted himself to their welfare to such an extent and made such gifts to them that the people of those regions became suspicious, (badgumān), and reported that Ma'sūm Beg had not come on pilgrimage but had some other plan (khiyal-i digar darad). Since the people of Rūm are deceitful and suspicious (muzawwir wa mukhayyil), a significance which is far (from the truth) is wont to become fixed in their ill-omened minds (maḡmūnhā-yi dūr bi-khaṭir-i shum-i khwud qarār midihand). Eventually they decided to take action against (daf') that immaculate sayyid (an sayyid-i ma'sūm); the latter was ignorant of these preliminaries (muqaddamiyyat).

(1) AT. 443.

At a time when he and his party had (already) donned the pilgrim garb, at daybreak a group (of men) came out, seized that unjustly treated (maḡlūm) sayyid and put him to death, and a number of his retainers who lifted a hand (to help him) were also killed, as was his son Khān Mīrza, Bashārat Beg, dārūgha of the daftarkhāna, was slain while praying (tasbīḥ kunān) and uttering the dhikr. The Ottomans despatched an ambassador to Ṭahmāsp blaming the Arabs for this crime (1). It seems impossible to ascertain, even from this fuller account, what the intentions of Ma'ṣūm Beg actually were. It seems hardly credible that, as the Ottomans alleged, he should have aspired to make himself master of Syria by instigating an uprising among the Ṣūfīs of Syria who were still supporters of the Ṣafawids, even though the presence of the ṣadr in his party might lend colour to this allegation. The great days of the Ṣafawid da'wa were over, and it was no longer the potent force within the Ottoman frontiers which it had been in the time of Bāyazīd II and Salīm I. Yet the Ottomans considered, or affected to consider, the threat sufficiently great to merit the despatch of a force to annihilate Ma'ṣūm Beg's party.

(1) JA. 333b-334a.

C O N C L U S I O N

What has preceded can only be regarded as a preliminary study of some aspects of the organization of the early Ṣafawid state. No administrative manual comparable to the Tadhkirat al-Mulūk, which deals with the "more permanent and solid facts of state organization" (1) under the later Ṣafawids, has yet been discovered for the early Ṣafawid period prior to the accession of 'Abbās I. In the absence of positive information of this type concerning administrative procedure and political institutions, "the only method of ascertaining the institutions of a period of Persian history is to set up a mosaic of stray references scattered through the contemporary sources" (2). Any conclusions reached by this method must necessarily be tentative. As regards the development of the early Ṣafawid state, certain general conclusions, however, may be drawn on the basis of the evidence at present available.

When Isma'īl became head of the Ṣafawid order (899/1494), he derived his support in part from the local populations of Ardabīl, Ṭālish and Qarāja-dāgh, but more especially from the Turkoman tribes of Asia Minor and Syria, and later from those of the Armenian highlands (3). Using simple language, and addressing them in their own tongue, Isma'īl fostered in these often

(1) TM. 1. (2) ibid., 6. (3) ibid., 191: 193. It is noteworthy that although some of the Turkoman tribes previously affiliated to the Aq Qoyunlu confederacy, such as the Qājārs and the Afshārs, later joined the Ṣafawid movement, it was the tribes originating from Syria and Asia Minor, namely the Shāmlūs, Ustāj'lūs, Takkalūs, Rūmlūs, and Dhu'l-Qadars, which filled the highest offices of state under Isma'īl I. The Afshārs only rose to prominence under Ṭahmāsp I.

illiterate tribesmen (1) the belief that he was the manifestation of God himself. They believed in the invincibility of their leader, and in his power to protect them in battle, and afforded him prompt and unquestioning obedience. It was these Turkomān tribesmen who constituted the élite of his fighting men, and who were the most fanatical supporters of the Şafawid cause; after the establishment of the Şafawid state, they continued to form the backbone of the Şafawid military forces.

On his accession to the throne of Ādharbāyjān in 907/1501-2, Isma'īl became master of a country of which the religious classes at least, as a result of the policy of the Seljuqs and to a lesser degree of the Īlkhāns and the Tīmūrids, were still predominantly Sunnī. Isma'īl decreed that Shi'ism should be the orthodox religion of the Şafawid state, and, with the object of imposing doctrinal uniformity, he appointed a şadr, who was the head of the religious institution, but derived his authority from the political institution. To bring the rest of Persia under Şafawid dominion, and, when this had been accomplished, to maintain the security of the Şafawid state, Isma'īl relied on his Turkomān troops or qizilbāsh. The qizilbāsh amīrs acted as military governors of the provinces, enforced the temporal authority of the ruler, and defended the frontiers of the new state against the Ottomans in the West and the Uzbegs in the East. The qizilbāsh remained grouped in tribal units under their amīrs, who were obliged to furnish troops to the ruler in time of war, and detachments for the royal bodyguard (qurchīs) in time of peace. The power of the qizilbāsh amīrs, who formed the military aristocracy of the Şafawid state, soon threatened not only to jeopardize the effective functioning of an administrative organization in which the presence of both Turkish and Persian elements constituted a constant source of

(1) "Le Turk était le plus souvent illettré et incapable d'être plus qu'un soldat" (Bellan, vi).

friction, but also to encroach on the authority of Isma'īl himself. The oppressive rule of Amīr Khān Turkman in Khurāsān from 922-8/1516-22, and his open disobedience to Isma'īl's express commands, constituted a challenge to Isma'īl's authority which he seemed reluctant or unable to meet. His failure to do so resulted in his son Ṭahmāsp, who succeeded him in 930/1524 at the age of ten, being confronted at the beginning of his reign by a civil war between rival groups of qizilbāsh tribes, followed by the defection of certain prominent qizilbāsh amīrs to the Ottomans.

In my opinion, the battle of Chāldirān (920/1514) is one of the most important events in the history of the early Ṣafawid period (1). The immediate loss to the Ṣafawid empire in terms of territory was small, though not insignificant, and other territorial losses were incurred on Persia's eastern frontier as a result of Isma'īl's refusal to take the field in person after his defeat at Chāldirān. Much more important, however, than loss of territory, was the diminution of Isma'īl's personal prestige and authority. The qizilbāsh lost faith in Isma'īl's invincibility and supernatural powers, and the fundamental relationship between Isma'īl and the qizilbāsh was impaired. Although in theory Isma'īl was still the murshid-i kāmīl, and the qizilbāsh were his murīds, there was a change in the attitude of the qizilbāsh towards their leader. If they still accorded him the same devotion as during the early years of his reign, it is not apparent from their actions. In 1518 a Venetian merchant wrote, "This Sophy is loved and revered by his people as a God, and especially by his soldiers, many of whom enter into battle without armour, expecting their master Ismael to watch over them in the fight. There are also others to go into battle without armour, being willing to die for their monarch, rushing on with naked breasts, crying "Shiac, Shiac". The name of God is forgotten throughout Persia and only that

(1) See pp. 86-7: 199 ff. above.

of Ismael remembered; if any one fall when riding or dismounted he appeals to no other God but Shiac, using the name in two ways; first as God Shiac; secondly as prophet; as the Mussulmans say "Laylla, laylla Mahamet resuralla", the Persians say "Laylla yllala Ismael velialla"; besides this, everyone, and particularly his soldiers, consider him immortal"(1) (my italics). After Isma'il's defeat at Chāldirān, the qizilbāsh no longer accorded him the same unquestioning devotion, and Isma'il's authority was further reduced as a result of his ceasing personally to supervise the conduct of state affairs and personally to lead his troops into battle. In proportion as Isma'il's authority decreased, the power of the wakīl and the qizilbāsh amīrs increased, and, as the result of the appointment of a Persian to the wikālat after the battle of Chāldirān, during the last decade of Isma'il's reign there was constant hostility and friction between the wakīl and the amīrs, culminating in the murder of the wakīl by the qizilbāsh in 929/1523, the year before Isma'il's death (2). Ṭahmāsp, therefore, on his accession in 930/1524, far from being able to rely on the loyalty and devotion of the qizilbāsh amīrs, was at once faced by the revolt of a powerful group of amīrs, and it soon became clear that those amīrs who ostensibly remained loyal to the Shāh only did so in order that, by taking advantage of the extreme youth of the Shāh and his inability to impose his authority upon them, they might take the reins of government into their own hands. The ensuing civil war between the rival groups of qizilbāsh is an indication of the extent of the decline not only of the authority of the Shāh, but of the Sūfī spirit which originally inspired the qizilbāsh. Qizilbāsh

(1) Travels of Venetians in Persia, 206. (2) See p. 201 ff. above.

was a soubriquet first applied to the Ṣūfīs of the Ṣafawid order in the time of Shaykh Ḥaydar (d. 1488), and from then on, in the terminology of the Ṣafawid order, the terms Ṣūfī and qizilbāsh were synonymous. The force of 15,000 Takkalūs from Mantashā and Ḥarmiyan in Turkey who joined Isma'īl in 917/1511-12 were still referred to as Ṣūfīs (1), and their leader bore the Ṣūfī title of khalīfa (2). The office of khalīfa, and other traces of the old Ṣūfī organization, continued to exist up to and after the reign of 'Abbās I, but the militant Ṣūfī spirit, or, in Professor Minorsky's words, "the dynamic ideology", of the early Ṣafawid movement had, I suggest, lost much of its original force by the time of the death of Isma'īl, and its decline can be said to date from Isma'īl's defeat at Chāldirān. If the belief of the qizilbāsh in the quasi-divine status of their ruler was, in fact, shaken by this defeat, then the subsequent actions of the qizilbāsh amīrs become intelligible. The realization that their murshid, if not perhaps an ordinary mortal, was yet not infallible, may not necessarily have found concrete expression, but even if it was only admitted unconsciously, it would go far towards explaining the changed attitude of the qizilbāsh amīrs towards the Shāh. The term Ṣūfī, implying a relationship between murshid and murīd which the qizilbāsh in practice repudiated after the battle of Chāldirān, soon became an echo of the old order. As a result, the status of the Ṣūfīs declined so rapidly that Du Mans, writing in 1071/1660, states that Ṣūfīs were employed as sweepers outside the royal palace, and that they wore the Ṣūfī tāj in order to obtain scraps of bread and rice from the royal kitchens; a current proverb ran as follows: "He is like a Ṣūfī - show him an onion, and he will not leave even the skin" (3). The mujtahid Muḥammad Bāqir Majlisī (d. 1700) denied that his father was a Ṣūfī, and referred to

(1) AT. 125-6. (2) See TM. 125-6. (3) R. du Mans, Estat de la Perse en 1660, 16. See also Sanson's statement q. in TM. 13-14.

- 321 -

Ṣūfism as "this foul and hellish growth" (1).

The qizilbāsh amīrs, during the last decade of the reign of Isma'īl I, and during the reigns of his successors Ṭahmāsp I, Isma'īl II and Sulṭān Muḥammad Shāh, conducted themselves in their relations with the Shāh like feudal lords paying grudging homage to an autocratic ruler, an attitude far removed from the devotion of the murīd to his murshid. Once the qizilbāsh ceased to revere the Shāh as their murshid, their power could only be kept in check by a strong and effective ruler. When the Shāh wished for their support, he was forced to appeal to their loyalty as Shāhī-sevans, "those who love the Shāh" (2), and the very fact that the Shāh was obliged to appeal for their support is a further clear indication of the changed relationship between the Shāh and the qizilbāsh. In practice, appeals to the sentiment of shāhī-sevanī proved a poor substitute for the earlier unquestioning obedience of the Ṣūfīs to their murshid. As the qizilbāsh dissociated themselves from the murīd-murshid relationship with the Shāh, they reverted to their former and primary loyalty to their tribe and to their tribal chief.

The failure satisfactorily to incorporate the Ṣūfī organization of the former Ṣafawid order in the administrative system of the Ṣafawid state is one of the most important features of the reign of Isma'īl I. As a result of this failure, the earlier relationship on the religious plane between leader and follower, the close bond between murshid and murīd, strengthened by frequent visits to and personal contact with the leader, and reinforced by the missionary activities of numerous pīrs and khalīfas, in practice no longer obtained. The former Ṣūfī organization, after the establishment of the Ṣafawid state, constituted a "state within a state", and continued to exist

(1) Browne, iv, 404, q. Qiṣaṣ al-'Ulamā of Muḥammad b. Sulaymān Tanukabūnī.

(2) See TM, 13.

long after it had become devoid of any practical significance. Professor Minorsky records that as late as 1629 the Shāh was still theoretically recognized as murshid-i kāmīl (1).

As regards the administration of the state, the early Ṣafawid period, as we have seen, was characterized by the lack of differentiation between the classes in the state, and by the absence of any clear definition of the function of the principal officials. Before or by the time of the death of Isma'īl I it is possible to observe certain tendencies which are of great importance in regard to the manner in which the organization of the Ṣafawid state developed under his successors. First, there was a change in the status of the wakīl. The wakīl ceased to be styled wakīl-i nafs-i nafs-i humāyūn, and tended increasingly to be regarded simply as the head of the bureaucracy, and hence to be identified with the wazīr. The title of wakīl-i nafs-i nafs-i humāyūn reflected the original Ṣūfī conception of the wakīl as the vicegerent to whom both the temporal and the spiritual authority of the Shāh was delegated. The wakīl-i nafs-i nafs-i humāyūn played a leading part in political affairs, was one of the principal military commanders, and had considerable influence in regard to the selection of officials to fill the post of ṣadr, a fact which is a further indication of the dependence of the ṣadr on the political institution. The fact that the title of wakīl-i nafs-i nafs-i humāyūn was last used in respect to Amīr 'Abd al-Bāqī, who was killed at the battle of Chāldirān, is clearly a recognition of the fact that, after Chāldirān, the original Ṣūfī organization of the Ṣafawid order no longer had any practical relevance to the organization of the Ṣafawid state. Second, by the time of the accession of Tahmāsp, the primary task of the ṣadr, the imposition of doctrinal

(1) TM. 126.

uniformity, had been accomplished, and as a result there was from then on a decline in the power and authority of the ṣadr. The conduct of waqf affairs became the chief preoccupation of the ṣadr, but from time to time ṣadrs made unsuccessful attempts to regain in some measure their former influence in political affairs.

During the first decade of the reign of Ṭahmāsp, a succession of powerful qizilbāsh amīrs usurped the authority of the ruling institution, that is to say, the Shāh, and took the administration of the state into their own hands. The power of the amīr al-umarā was at its highest during this period, and thereafter steadily declined. The decline in the political and military influence of the amīr al-umarā, and the corresponding increase in that of the qurchībāshī, which is evident during the second half of the reign of Ṭahmāsp, may reflect the increasing importance and influence of the Georgian and Circassian chiefs and their retainers at court. The qurchīs were primarily responsible for the protection of the Shāh's person and for guarding the royal palaces (1), and this function would naturally assume greater importance in view of the presence of non-Turkomān troops at court.

All the evidence points to the fact that at the end of Ṭahmāsp's reign the division between the Turkish and Persian elements in the Ṣafawid state was as sharp as ever. There was constant friction between Turkomān and Persian officials in the administration, and if the qizilbāsh were called upon to serve under a Persian commander, their resentment soon found expression in mutinous conduct. During the reign of Ṭahmāsp the quarrels and intrigues among the qizilbāsh, whose theoretical devotion to the Shāh no longer obtained in practice, almost brought about the downfall of the state. On the death of Ṭahmāsp, in the absence of a strong and capable ruler to

(1) Naṣr Allāh Falsafī, Zindigānī-yi Shāh 'Abbās-i Awwal, i, 211.

succeed him, fighting broke out between rival qizilbāsh factions which supported the claims of Ḥaydar Mīrzā and Isma'īl Mīrzā respectively. The conflict was exacerbated, and the issues were confused, by the presence on both sides of Georgian and Circassian chiefs and their supporters. When Ḥaydar Mīrzā was killed by a group of Circassian ghulāms, the qizilbāsh, realizing at last that the aspirations of the Georgians and Circassians constituted a threat to their own supremacy in the state, united in their support of Isma'īl Mīrzā, whom they placed on the throne at Qazwīn. On 13 Ramaḡān 985/24 November 1577, Isma'īl II was murdered (1). The amīrs and arkān-i dawlat gathered in the dawlatkhāna, and agreed to place on the throne Sultān Muḡammad Khudābanda, the only surviving son of Ṭahmāsp. Sultān Muḡammad Khudābanda, who was in Shīrāz, reached Qazwīn on 5 Dhu'l-Ḥijja 985/13 February 1578 (2), and was proclaimed Shāh with the style of Sultān Muḡammad Shāh. Effective power, however, was, as during the first decade of Ṭahmāsp's reign, concentrated in the hands of the qizilbāsh, and the country was ruled by a council of seven amīrs, one from each of the principal qizilbāsh tribes. Inter-tribal jealousies and rivalries precluded the success of such an arrangement. In 988/1580 the governor of Harāt and lala of 'Abbās Mīrzā, 'Alī Qulī Khān Shāmlū, read the khutba at Harāt in the name of 'Abbās Mīrzā. The whole country lapsed into a state of anarchy. North-western Persia was ravaged by successive attacks by the Ottomans and the Khāns of the Crimea. The ruling institution, namely Sultān Muḡammad Shāh, had been deprived of effective power by the qizilbāsh amīrs, and the latter acted each on his own authority. "Every amīr and ḡakīm considered himself a petty princeling (mulūk-i ṭawā'if), and raised the banner of despotism (istibdād) and the flag of self-reliance (ḡukūmat-i istinād)" (3). In 991/

(1) AT. 495. (2) ibid., 502. (3) Shar. ii, 284.

1583 Sulṭān Muḥammad Shāh concluded a truce of expedience (gurg-ashtī) with 'Alī Qulī Khān Shāmlū, and the latter reaffirmed his allegiance to the Shāh. The position in the country in general, however, did not improve. In 993/1585 Ḥamza Mīrza became joint ruler, in so far as any member of the royal family possessed the ability to rule in fact, with his father Sulṭān Muḥammad Shāh (1), but in the same year the Ottomans again invaded Ādharbāyjan, and occupied Tabrīz on 28 Ramaḍān 993/23 September 1585. A group of qizilbāsh amīrs seized possession of the person of Ḥamza's younger brother, Ṭahmāsp Mīrza, who was nine years of age, and had the khutba read in his name in 'Irāq-i 'Ajam and Fārs (2). The amīrs distributed among themselves offices and districts (manṣab wa ulkā), and elected Musīb Khān Sharaf al-Dīn-ūghlī to amr-i wizārat wa mushīrī-yi mamlikat. This revolt was crushed by Ḥamza Mīrza. Yet another group of amīrs declared their allegiance to Abū Ṭalīb Mīrza, another son of Sulṭān Muḥammad Shāh, but this revolt, too, was abortive (3). Finally, in May 1587, 'Abbās Mīrza, who had enlisted the support of various scattered groups of qizilbāsh in Khurāsān, 'Irāq-i 'Ajam and Fārs, took over the throne of Persia from his father and embarked on a programme of far-reaching reforms calculated to restore the stability of the Ṣafawid state (4).

As stated above, this thesis can only be regarded as a preliminary study of the development of the early Ṣafawid period, and many problems remain unsolved. For instance, the precise relationship between the Ṣafawid order and other contemporary Ṣūfī orders has yet to be established, and the details of the early Ṣafawid administrative system, of which only the most important features have been described in this thesis, have still to be filled in, either

(1) Shar. ii, 274. (2) ibid., 282. (3) ibid., 284. (4) For the nature of the measures taken by Shāh 'Abbās, see my article 'Abbās I, in EI², Vol. I, fasc. i (1954), pp. 7-8.

by further research into existing sources, or by the discovery of fresh material. J. Aubin has already shown what can be achieved in this direction through the study of hitherto unpublished documents.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

(A). Primary Sources.

For a list of the primary sources, see pp. v-xi.

(B). Secondary Sources.

(I) Persian MSS. Sources.

Dastūr al-Wuzarā (British Museum MS. Or. 234) (Khwāndamīr).

Majālis al-Mu'minīn (British Museum MS. Add. 23,541) (Qādī Nūr Allāh Shūshtarī).

Majālis al-'Ushshāq (British Museum MS. Or. 208), probably the work of Mīr Kamāl al-Dīn Ḥusayn (see Storey, 960).

Maṭlūb al-Ṭalibīn (India Office MS., Éthé 653) (Muḥammad Būlāq Dihlawī).

Salīmnama (British Museum MS. Add. 24, 960) (Ḥakīm al-Dīn Idrīs Bitlīsī).

Tadhkira-yi Shūshtariyya (British Museum MS. Add. 23,534) Sayyid 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥusaynī al-Shūshtarī).

Tārīkh-i Shāh Isma'īl wa Shāh Ṭahmāsp (British Museum MS. Or. 2,939) (Amīr Maḥmūd b. Khwāndamīr).

(II) Persian Printed Sources.

Aubin, J., Matériaux pour la Biographie de Shāh Ni'matullāh Walī Kermānī, Tehran and Paris 1956.

Dorn, B., Muhammedanische Quellen zur Geschichte der Südlichen Küstenländer des Kaspischen Meeres, St. Petersburg 1850-8.

Hamd Allāh Mustawfī, Nuzhat al-Qulūb (E. J. W. Gibb Memorial Series Vol. XXIII), Leiden 1915.

Kasrawī, Sayyid Ahmad Tabrīzī, Nizhād wa Tabār-i Safawiyya, in Āyanda ii/1927-8, 357-65, 489-97, and Bāz nam Safawiyya, in ibid., 801-12.

Lees, W. N., Nafahāt al-Uns of Jamī, Calcutta 1858.

Muhammad Haydar Dughlāt, Ta'rikh-i Rashīdī (ed. N. Elias and trans. Sir E. Denison Ross), London 1895.

Naṣr Allāh Falsafī, Jang-i Chāldirān, in Majalla-yi Dānishkada-yi Adabiyāt-i Tihān, i/2, 1953-4.

Tadhkira-yi Shāh Tahmāsp (ed. Phillott), Calcutta 1912.

Van Loon, J. B., Ta'rikh-i Shaikh Uwais, The Hague 1954.

(III) Non-Persian Sources.

A Chronicle of the Carmelites in Persia, 2 vols., London 1939.

Arberry, A. J., Sufism, London 1950.

Aubin, J., Deux sayyids de Bam au XVe siècle, Wiesbaden 1956.

idem, Notes sur quelques documents Aq Qoyunlu, in Mélanges Louis Massignon, Damascus 1956.

Ayalon, D., Gunpowder and Firearms in the Mamluk Kingdom, London 1956.

Bellan, L.-L., Chah 'Abbās I, Paris 1932.

Browne, E. G., A Literary History of Persia, London 1902-24.

Chardin, Sir J., Voyages... en Perse, et autres lieux de l'Orient..., 3 vols., Amsterdam 1711.

Corbin, H., Nāsir-e Khosraw, Kitāb-e Jāmi' al-Hikmatain,
Tehran and Paris 1953.

Donaldson, D.M., The Shi'ite Religion, London 1933.

Du Mans, R., Estat de la Perse en 1660, Paris 1890.

Encyclopaedia of Islam, 1st ed., Leiden 1913-38; new ed.,
Leiden 1954-.

Fyzee, A. A. A., A Shi'ite Creed, Islamic Research
Association Series No. 9, 1942.

Gibb, H. A. R., and Bowen, H., Islamic Society in the
Eighteenth Century, Part 1, O.U.P., 1950.

Howorth, Sir H. H., History of the Mongols from the 9th
to the 15th century, London 1876-.

Ibn Hasan, The Central Structure of the Mughal Empire,
O.U.P., 1936.

Islām Ansiklopedisi, Istanbul 1940-.

Ivanow, W., Brief Survey of the Evolution of Ismailism,
Leiden 1952.

Kissling, H. J., Zur Geschichte des Derwischordens der
Bajrāmijje, in Südost-Forschungen, xv/1956.

Lambton, A. K. S., Contributions to the Study of Seljuq
Institutions, Ph. D. Thesis, London 1939.

-idem, Landlord and Peasant in Persia, O.U.P., 1953.

Lane-Poole, S., The Mohammedan Dynasties, 2nd ed., 1925.

Le Strange, G., The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate,
Cambridge 1930.

Lewis, B., Some observations on the significance of Heresy
in the History of Islam, in Studia Islamica, i, 1953.

Minorsky, V., A Soyūrghāl of Qāsim b. Jahāngīr Aq Qoyunlu
(903/1498), in BSOS, ix/4, 1937.

-idem, A Civil and Military Review in Fārs in 881/1476, in
BSOS x/1, 1939.

-idem, The Poetry of Shāh Isma'īl, in BSOAS x/4, 1942.

-idem, Jihānshāh Qarā Qoyūnlū and his poetry, in BSOAS
xvi/2, 1954.

-idem, A Mongol Decree of 720/1320 to the Family of Shaykh
Zāhid, in BSOAS xvi/3, 1954.

-idem, The Aq Qoyunlu and Land Reforms, in BSOAS xvii/1955.

-idem, Persia in A.D. 1478-1490, Royal Asiatic Society
Monographs Vol. XXVI, London 1957.

-idem, Shaykh Bālī-Efendi on the Safawids, in BSOAS xx/
1957. (This article was published after the completion
of this thesis).

Petrushevsky, I. P., Sbornik statey po istorii Azerbayjana,
i, Baku 1949.

Rabino, H. L., Coins of the Jalā'ir, Kara Qoyūnlū, Masha'sha
and Aq Qoyūnlū Dynasties, in the Numismatic Chronicle,
6th Series, Vol. X, 1950.

Roemer, H. R., Staatsschreiben der Timuridenzeit, Wiesbaden
1952.

Ross, Sir E. Denison, Early Days of Shāh Isma'īl, in JRAS
1896.

Storey, C. A., Persian Literature, a bio-bibliographical
survey, London 1927 -.

Shubir

Muhammad

Muhammad

Thesis

Sykes, Lieut.-Col. P.M., A History of Persia, London 1915.

Tavernier, J.B., The Six Voyages of John Baptista

Tavernier...through Turkey into Persia and the East

Indies, London 1678.

Travels of Venetians in Persia, Hakluyt Society, London

1873.