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Írâj Mîrzâ Jalâlú'l-Mamâlik.

PREFACE

THIS volume concludes the task which I undertook more than twenty-two years ago, and which represents the labour of a life-time, for ever since I began the study of Persian in the summer of 1880, being then only eighteen years of age, the desire to write a complete Literary History of Persia has increasingly possessed me. The first instalment, “from the earliest times until Firdawsí,” carried the history down to the early days of the eleventh century of the Christian era, and was published in
1902; and the continuation, down to the Mongol Invasion in the middle of the thirteenth century, in 1906, both these volumes being published by Mr. Fisher Unwin. Fourteen years elapsed ere the third volume, entitled A History of Persian Literature under Tartar Dominion (A.D. 1265-1502), saw the light. The reasons which led me to issue it in a form and under a title differing somewhat from its predecessors are explained on p. viii of the Preface, but essentially it constitutes the third volume of the Literary History of Persia, just as this, which deals with the last four centuries (A.D. 1500-1924), and is entitled, as foreshadowed in the same Preface (p. ix), A History of Persian Literature in Modern Times, is to be regarded as the fourth and last volume of the work.

Although I cannot regard this present volume as superior to its three predecessors in form or interest, and am fully aware of its defects, I think that it contains more new matter and represents more original research than the others. Owing to the opinion prevalent not only in Europe, but to a considerable extent in Turkey and India also, that poetry is the only department of Persian literature which merits much attention, and that little poetry worth reading has been produced since the time of Jâmí, the literature of the last four centuries has been very much neglected, and

the sources of which I have made use are almost exclusively Persian, and, until the nineteenth century is reached, when printing and lithography were gradually introduced into Persia, chiefly manuscript. In the formation of my Persian library I have always had regard to the requirements of my work rather than to mere beauty of illumination, illustration, or handwriting, and I have been singularly fortunate in acquiring the very interesting collection of the late Sir Albert Houtum Schindler and a number of the rare and precious manuscripts collected by the late Hájí ‘Abdu’l-Majíd Belshah. To Mr. A. G. Ellis I am indebted for the generous loan, often for a period of several years, of many rare books to which I could not otherwise have obtained access; while for constant and ungrudging help I am under the deepest obligations to his successor in the Oriental Book Department of the British Museum, Mr. E. Edwards, as well as to Dr. L. Barnett, the Head of that Department.

I wish that I could have profited more by the counsel of my Persian friends, especially Mirzá Muḥammad Khán of Qazwin and Hájí Mirzá Yahyá of Dawlatábhád, during the progress of this work, but to my old acquaintance Husayn Dánish Bey of the Ottoman Public Debt, a notable man of letters both in Persian and Turkish, I am indebted for many valuable and illuminating observations. Another old friend, Sayyid Ḥasan Taqi-zádá, fortunately chanced to visit this country after an absence of some fourteen years while the last sheets of this book were passing through the Press, and he most kindly read through the proofs and favoured me with numerous observations and corrections which will be noticed under the Errata and Addenda. From well-read and intelligent Persians the European student of their language can learn many things not to be found in books, at any rate in books to which he has access, while their taste and judgement, even if at times he cannot wholly agree with them, are almost always suggestive and deserving of consideration. Only a few days ago I received

a visit from the learned Shaykh Kázm ad-Dujayli, an Arabic-speaking Shí’a of ‘Iráq who has recently joined the teaching staff of the London School of Oriental Studies, and I enquired of him what, in his opinion, were the best Arabic books on Shí’a doctrine. He at once named the five following works, none of which I had previously heard of, much less seen, though all have been printed or lithographed in Persia:

2. Kitábu’l Qawáin, by al-Qummi.
5. Kitábu’l-Wasá’íl, by Hájí Mirzá Husayn an-Núrí

I will not attempt to thank individually all those who by their sympathy and interest have encouraged me in my book, or who by their skilful craftsmanship have given it form and substance. The writing of it has been a pleasure, and the satisfaction. Even its errors and imperfections will, I trust, by provoking criticism and stimulating research, serve to advance and extend our knowledge of the subject, and if, as I hope, I have been single-minded in this aim, I shall prefer the reasoned criticism of competent scholars to the undiscriminating praise of over-zealous friends, even as Sa’dí says: —

\[\text{کُتُيبَةَ أَبْنَيِنَا مِن تَعْمَّدِ مَحَاسِنِي، عَلَانِيّى هَذَا وَمِرْتُرِ بَرَاطِنِ;}
\]

“Thou who recountest my virtues, thou dost me harm in sooth:
Such is my outward seeming, but thou hast not known the truth.”

EDWARD G. BROWNE.
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ERRATA AND ADDENDA

(The letters T.z. in brackets at the end of a note indicate that the correction was suggested by Taqí-záda.)
p. 170, l. 14. “Read معاصر (‘ways,’ ‘passages’) for مقات (‘Tombs’), which gives no good sense.” [T.z.] The washing of the feet before praying is a Sunnī practice; the Shī‘a confine themselves to mere stroking of the foot (mash) with the damp hand. The clasping of the hands mentioned in the succeeding misrā‘ is also characteristic of the Sunnis; the Shī‘a let them hang down by their sides.

p. 187, l. 14. “For مخلقا‘ No Shī‘a could have written this verse without exposing himself to the charge of blasphemy.” [T.z.]

p. 188, last three lines. “The Asrār-i-Shahādāt is commonly ascribed to Mullá Āqá-yi-Darbāndi, entitled ‘the Promoter of mourning for the Holy Family’ (Murawowij-i-‘Azā-dārī-yī-Ahl-i-Bayt).” [T.z.]

p. 220, last paragraph. “Mention should be made of the poems of Şafi‘-‘Alī Shāh, and of his versified Persian commentary on the Qur‘ān.” [T.z.] (I can find no mention of him in the Majmā‘u‘l-Fuṣahā‘, the Riyāḍu‘l-Ārifīn, the Bustānu‘s-Sīyāḥat, or any of the Catalogues at my disposal.)

p. 221, “Rüdāgī,” and p. 299, “Rūdakī” should be identical in spelling, and I believe that the latter form is the more correct.

p. 222. “Mention should be made of V. Zhukovski’s collection of Persian Tašnīf, with Russian translations, published at St Petersburg in 1902. Bereźine also published nine Tašnīf with English translations set to music and adapted to the piano.” [T.z.] (I find that I possess the former work, which is entitled ОбАзСЫ ВПЕРСИПДСАГО НАРОДНАГО ТВОРЧЕСТВА, but I cannot identify the latter.)

p. 338 “Two half-verses (misrā‘) have been accidentally omitted after l. 7. The two verses should run thus” [T.z.]: —

عکس تو قتل‌آماده‌ترین در آبینه عالیه
زانگ‌جه فهم زندگی کوشاده‌تر
تا آن‌که زندگی‌که‌ی عود جنین اقامت

p. 355, l. 1. There is some difference of opinion as to the proper vocalization of the place-name which I have written “Tanakabūn.” Taqi-zāda thinks it should be “Tunukabūn,” while Riḍā-qi is his Anjuman-ārā-yī-Nāshīrī gives it as “Tanakabūn.”

pp. 369-370. “The titles ‘Muḥaqqiq-i-Ardabīlī’ and ‘Muqaddas-i-Ardabīlī’ both belong to Mullá Ḍhām, so that the first line on p. 370 should read “The same mujahid of Ardabil, also entitled Muḥaqqiq,” etc.

p. 370, last line. “Hājjī Mirzá Ḥasan-i-Shirāzī and Hājjī Mirzá Ḥasan-i-Ashtiyānī are not to be mentioned in the same breath. The former was to the latter as a king is to a petty local governor.” [T.z.]

p. 373. “Āqá Jamāl-i-Khwānsāri was the author of the well-known book on the superstitions of Persian women entitled Kitáb-i-Kilthūm Nānā. His father, Āqá Ḥusayn-i-Khwānsāri, was called Ustādu‘l-Kull fi l-Kull (‘the Master of All in All’), and, besides many facetiae, wrote glosses on the Shahid-i-thānī’s commentary on the Lum’a.” [T.z.]

p. 378, II. 19 et seqq. “Many similar catechisms (with such titles as Risāla-i-‘amaliyya, Mas‘ila, Nukhba, and the like) have been composed in the last century, and as many as a hundred may have been printed. One of the best known is the Jāmī‘u‘l-sh-Shattāt of Mirzā Abū’l-Qāsim ibnul-Ḥusayn ar-Riḍāwī al-Qummi, author of the Kitāb-i-Qawāmin.” [T.z.] Concerning the last-named writer, see Edwards’s Catalogue of Persian printed books, cols. 60 and 61.


---

1 It is, however, ascribed, as I have ascribed it, to Isma‘īl Khán Sarbāz by Edwards in his Catalogue of Persian Books in the British Museum, col. 302-3. The life of Mullá Āqá-yi-Darbāndi, who died at an advanced age sometime before A.D. 1873, is given in the Qisasu‘l-Ulamā‘ (Tīhrān lith. ed. of 1304/1886, pp. 75-9). Amongst his works mention is there made of one entitled Iksiru‘l-‘ībādāt fi Asrārī’sh-Shahādāt.
p. 407, fourth line from the end, and p. 435, l. 5. “The Abwâbu’l-Janân was not by Mullá Muḥsin-i-Fayḍ, but, so far as I remember, by Mullá Ḥusayn Wâ‘iz-i-Kâshfi, the author of the well-known Anwâr-i-Suhaylî.” [T.z.] The real author appears to have been Muḥammad b. Fatḥu’llâh Rafi’u’d-Dîn, called ‘Wâ‘iz-i-Qazwînî’ (“the Preacher of Qazwin’). See Edwards, op. cit., cols. 405-6.

p. 410. “Sayyid Muḥammad Báqir of Rasht was only a third- or fourth-rate theologian, and Mullá Aḥmad-i-Nîrâqî (p. 411) only of the second class. Much more important, though omitted here, are: —

(i) Aqâ-ya-Bibbihâni, the founder of the Uṣûli and Mujtahidi School, who flourished at the end of twelfth century of the hijra.
(ii) Shaykh Ja’far-i-‘Arab (also called al-Kabîr, ‘the Great’), who was contemporary with Fatḥ-‘Alî Shâh.
(iii) Shaykh Muḥammad Ḥasan, author of the Jawâhiru’l-Kalâm, a large work in six volumes on Shi‘aJurisprudence (see p. ix supra).
(iv) Shaykh Murtûdâ al-Anṣârî, founder of present-day Shi‘a Law, and the Master of all the mujtahids of the last seventy years with the exception of —
(v) Shaykh Hádi of Tîhrân, who was also of the first class.”

p. 430. “Sayyid Aḥmad al-Ahsâ’i was not an admirer and follower but a great enemy of Mullâ Ṣadrâ. Of modern Persian philosophers mention should have been made of Mîrzâ Abu’l-Hasan-i-Jîlwa, who died only some twenty years ago.” [T.z.] I met him in Tîhrân in the winter of 1887-8. See my Year amongst the Persians, p. 149.

p. 435. “One of the best of Mullá Muḥsin’s works is the Kalimât-i-Maknûna (‘Hidden Words’), of which mention should have been made here.” [T.z.]

p. 441. “Dr Muḥammad of Kirmânsâh, called Kufwî, who died in 1326/1908, specialized in cardiac diseases, and first called attention
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to a peculiar murmur (called in French ‘empiolement’) characteristic of embolism, on which he published a monograph in French. He also wrote several medical treatises on the Diseases of Women and Children in Persian.” [T.z.]

p. 454, l. 1. “For I’timâdu’d-Dawla read I’timâdu’s-Saltana.” [T.z.]

p. 468. “Newspapers existed in Persia before A.D. 1851, in the reign of Muḥammad Shâh (A.D.1835-1848) and even in the later days of his predecessor Fatḥ-‘Alî Shâh. See the Kâwa newspaper passim, especially No. 6 of the New Series (Dawra-i-Jadid).” [T.z.] The article in question appeared in the issue of June 8, 1921, pp. 14-16. It mentions a rather vague report of a Persian newspaper published at Dihlî in A.D. 1798, and a much more definite report of one published in Tîhrân in 1253/1837-8.

p. 486, end. “The articles to which reference is here made were not by Mîrzâ Muḥammad Khân but by myself, writing under the pen-name of Muḥâṣsil (‘Student’).” [T.z.]

p. 488. “To say ‘Mîrzâ Kâzîm-zâda,’ ‘Sayyid Jamâl-zâda,’ ‘Taqi-zâda Khân’ and the like is as contrary to Persian usage as to say in English ‘Sir Grey’ for ‘Sir Edward Grey’ and the like. Such titles as ‘Mîrzâ,’ ‘Sayyid’ and Ḥajji can only be prefixed, as ‘Khan,’ ‘Beg’ and the like can only be suffixed, to personal names, such as Ḥasan, ‘Ali and Muḥammad, not to patronymics.” [T.z.]³

---
² I have been unable to find any trace of this alleged discovery or of the French term connoting it (which I think should be empiolement), though I have consulted two eminent physicians on the subject.
³ Taqi-zâda’s letter was received in time to correct the two passages to which the two concluding notes refer, but I have allowed them to stand because the first specifies the true authorship of the articles in question, while the second lays down a rule of which I had hitherto been unaware.
⁴ Taqi-zâda’s letter was received in time to correct the two passages to which the two concluding notes refer, but I have allowed them to stand because the first specifies the true authorship of the articles in question, while the second lays down a rule of which I had hitherto been unaware.
PART I.
AN OUTLINE OF PERSIAN HISTORY
DURING THE LAST FOUR CENTURIES

CHAPTER I.
SOME GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS ON
THE ŠAFAVÍ DYNASTY.

The rise of the Šafawí dynasty in Persia at the beginning of the sixteenth century of the Christian era was an event of the greatest historical importance, not only to Persia herself and her immediate neighbours, but to Europe generally. It marks not only the restoration of the Persian Empire and the re-creation of the Persian nationality after an eclipse of more than eight centuries and a half, but the entrance of Persia into the comity of nations and the genesis of political relations which still to a considerable extent hold good. Mr. R. G. Watson in the brief retrospect with which he opens his excellent *History of Persia from the beginning of the Nineteenth Century to the year 1858* shows a true appreciation of the facts when he takes this period as his starting-point, for in truth it marks the transition from mediaeval to comparatively modern times. The Arab conquest in the middle of the seventh century after Christ overthrew the Zoroastrian religion and the Sásáníán Empire, and reduced Persia to the position of a mere province of the Caliphate, until the Caliphate itself was destroyed by the Mongols or Tartars in the middle of the thirteenth century. Both before and after this momentous event there were, it is true, independent or quasi-independent dynasties ruling in Persia, but these were generally of Turkish or Tartar origin, like the Ghaznavis, Saljúqs, Khwárazmsháhs, and Houses of Chingiz and Timúr; or, if Persian like the Buwayhids, exercised control over a portion only of the old Persian Empire. To the

Şafawí dynasty belongs the credit of making Persia “a nation once again,” self-contained, centripetal, powerful and respected, within borders practically identical in the time of Sháh ‘Abbáš the Great (A.D. 1587-1628) with those of the Sásáníán Empire. It was then that Isfahán, whither he transferred the seat of government from Qazwín, became, as the Persian saying runs, “Half the world” (*Nisf-i-Jahán*), or “Medio mundo” as Don Juan of Persia has it, abounding in splendid buildings and skilful craftsmen, frequented by merchants from distant lands, and visited by diplomatic missions, not only from India, Transoxiana and Turkey, but from almost every European state from Russia to Spain and Portugal.

Yet, in spite of its importance and the abundant materials available, no good complete history⁶ of the Şafawí dynasty has yet been written. The outlines given by Sir John Malcolm and Sir Clements Markham in their histories of Persia are inadequate in scope and inaccurate in detail, and are based on very limited materials, and those not by any means the most authentic. The abundance and variety of the materials, the inaccessibility of many important sources of information, and the polyglot character of the documents concerned constitute serious obstacles to one who aspires to treat adequately of this period. The four most important contemporary Persian records of its earlier portion, down to the death of Sháh ‘Abbás the Great, are the Şafwatu’s-Şafá, containing the biography of Shaykh Şafiyyu’d-Dín, that celebrated saint of the thirteenth century from whom the dynasty derives its name; the *Nasab-námá-i-Silsila-i-Şafawiyya* on the genealogy of the family, with valuable biographical details of its earlier representatives not to be found elsewhere; the
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*Ahsanu’t-Taváríkh*, completed in A.D. 1577, only about a year after the death of Shah Ṭahmásp, whose reign together with that of his father and predecessor Sháh Isma’îl, the founder of the dynasty, it records ; and the *Ta’rikh-i-ʿAlam-ārā-yi-ʿAbbáši*, an immense monograph on the reign of Sháh ‘Abbás the Great. Not one of these has been published, much less translated, and all except the last are very rare even in manuscript. Of the *Nasab-námá* and the *ʿAlam-ārā* I am fortunate enough to possess copies which formerly belonged to the late Sir Albert Houtum-Schindler, while the incomparable generosity of Mr. A. G. Ellis placed at my disposal manuscripts of the two other histories mentioned above. And though the authors of later general histories in Persian, such as Rídá-qulí Khán in his supplement to Mirkhwánd’s *Rawdatu’s-Şafá*, have made use of some of these works, they too often not merely abridge but grievously distort the passages they cite.

Of such wanton distortion the following is a good instance. In July, A.D. 1599, Sháh ‘Abbás the Great sent to Europe a mission accredited to the Courts of Russia Poland, Germany, France, Spain, England and Scotland, and to the Pope of Rome

---

5 London: Smith and Elder, 1866.
6 Of Krusinski’s and Hanway’s admirable accounts of the later Şafawí period I shall speak in chap. iii.
7 Since this was written I have received through a Persian correspondent a copy of the excellent lithographed edition of the Şafwatu’s-Şafá published at Bombay in 1329/1911.
and the Seniory of Venice. This mission included Husayn ‘Ali Beg⁸ as Persian Envoy, with four Persian gentlemen or “knights” (caballeros, as they are called in Don Juan of Persia’s narrative), fifteen Persian servants, the celebrated Sir Anthony Sherley with fifteen English attendants, two Portuguese friars, and five interpreters.
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Travelling by way of the Caspian Sea and the Volga, they first visited Moscow, where they remained for five or six months; thence through Germany to Italy, where they were not permitted to go to Venice for fear of offending an Ottoman envoy who happened to be there at the time, but were well received at Rome, where they arrived in April, 1601, and remained for two months. Thence they proceeded by ship from Genoa to the south of France and so to Spain, where three of the four “Persian knights” adopted the Catholic faith and took the names of Don Philippe, Don Diego and Don Juan of Persia.

Sir Anthony Sherley, whose relations with his Persian colleague had from the first been very strained, separated himself from the mission at Rome, but up to that point the independent accounts written by himself and some of his companions⁹ enable us to check Don Juan’s narrative. Don Juan, however, having apostasized from Islam, dared not return to Persia to meet the fate of a renegade, so that for the tragic sequel we must turn to the Persian historians. In the ‘Alam-ārā-yi-‘Abbāsī under the year 1022/1613-4¹⁰ we find an account of the arrival at Iṣfahān of ambassadors from the King of Spain, accompanied by several Christian priests and a Persian envoy returning from Europe¹¹. The latter, who had incurred the Sháh’s displeasure, was incontinent put to death in the most cruel manner, without being permitted any opportunity for explanation or apology; and the Sháh then explained to the Spaniards that he had dealt thus with him because of sundry treasonable and disrespectful acts of
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which he had been guilty during his mission, such as opening letters sealed with the royal seal and making known their contents; wearing mourning on the occasion of the Queen of Spain’s death; and selling the credentials to the Pope with which he had been provided to a merchant who should impersonate him and derive what profit he could from the transaction. “But,” the Sháh concluded, “the chief of his faults and the chief reason for his punishment was that he behaved so ill towards the attendants who accompanied him, and vexed them so much, that several of them adopted the Christian faith and remained in Europe in order to escape from his tyranny, so that zeal for Islam required his punishment, and thus he received his deserts.”

Turning now to Rídá-quli Khán’s supplement to the Rawdatu’s-Ṣafá, a general history of Persia compiled about A.D. 1858, we find an account of the same event obviously copied, with very slight modifications, from the ‘Alam-ārā-yi-‘Abbāsī, but with one important and most wanton alteration, for Sháh ‘Abbás is there represented as saying that the chief of his ambassador’s faults was that several persons were disposed to embrace Islam and come to Persia, but the Persian envoy treated them so ill that they repented of their intention, returned to the Christian faith, and remained in that country. For this deliberate falsification of history I can only account by supposing that Rídá-quli Khán did not wish to encourage the idea that a Persian Muslim could possibly become a Christian; but the moral I wish to draw is that the later Persian historians must be used with great caution, and that every statement should, where possible, be traced to contemporary records.

Before leaving this subject, I must refer to an erroneous conjecture of Sir John Malcolm’s arising from an inadequate use of the Persian sources. In the year 1002/1593-4, being the seventh year of Sháh ‘Abbáṣ’s reign, Jalál, the Chief Astrologer, foretold dis-
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aster to the occupant of the Throne, and advised that the Sháh should abdicate for a few days and substitute for himself some person worthy of death on whom the prediction of the stars might be fulfilled. This was accordingly done, and a man named Yússuf was made king for three days, at the conclusion of which he was put to death, and Sháh ‘Abbáṣ resumed the Throne. Sir John Malcolm¹² says that this Yússuf, “whom Persian authors take care to tell us was an unbeliever,” was “probably a Christian,” but this is an error; he belonged to a heterodox Muslim sect called Nuqṭawīyya (“People of the Point”) who believed in metempsychosis and other heretical doctrines, and of whose appearance and destruction a full account is given by the ‘Alam-ārā-yi-‘Abbāsī¹³ and reproduced in the Rawdatu’s-Ṣafá. It is therefore essential, if a true history of the Ṣafáis is to be written, that we should go back to the original sources, and, as a preliminary, that these sources, at present existing only in manuscript, should be published.

---

⁸ Don Juan calls him (f. 120v⁵) “Uzen Aly Bech,” but Antonio di Govea has “Ussein Alibeg,” which shows clearly that the first part of the name is Husayn, not Úzín, as I had at first supposed.

⁹ See especially The Sherley Brothers...by one of the same House (Chiswick, 1828), pp. 22-35.

¹⁰ F. 230 of my MS. marked H. 14.

¹¹ Although the envoy is here named Dengiz Beg Shámlü with the title of Yūz-bāshí (Captain), not Husayn ‘Ali Beg, as in Don Juan’s narrative (f. 120v⁵), there can, I think, be little doubt as to their identity.


¹³ Ff. 46⁶-47⁰ of my MS. H.14.
The Persian histories, however, are only part of the material available for such a work: the numerous and in some cases excellent Turkish chronicles, published and unpublished, dealing with this period, and especially with the Turco-Persian wars which continued almost without intermission during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, constitute an indispensable supplement and corrective. Almost more important is Firídūn Bey’s great collection of Turkish State Papers entitled Munša’āt-i-Salātīn, compiled some time before 991/1583 and published at Constantinople in two volumes in 1274/1858.

The diplomatic correspondence contained in this valuable and insufficienly-appreciated book is arranged chronologically and is partly in Turkish, partly in Arabic, and partly in Persian. From the time of Timúr onwards much of it is concerned with contemporary Persian affairs, and of the last half of the first volume a large portion consists of letters interchanged between the Sultāns Bāyazīd II (A.D. 1482-1512), Salīm I (A.D. 1512-1520), and Sulaymān I (A.D. 1520-1566) on the one hand, and Shāh Ismā’īl (A.D. 1500-1524) and his son and successor Shāh Ṭāhmāsp (A.D. 1524-1576) on the other. There are also valuable journals of certain campaigns, such as that which culminated in the Battle of Chālédirān, so disastrous to the Persians, on August 23, 1514, wherein the movements of the Ottoman army and the incidents of their outward and homeward marches are chronicled day by day. Other State Papers, both Persian and Turkish, which exist only in manuscript, have hitherto remained practically unexplored. A third class of materials of which it is impossible to overestimate the importance consists of the writings of Europeans who visited Persia during this period on diplomatic, missionary or commercial business. Thanks to the liberal attitude of Shāh ‘Abbās the Great towards Christians, the number of these in his and the succeeding reigns was very large. The best general account of them and their works with which I have met is that given by the late M. Charles Schefer, in the Introduction (pp. i-cxv) to his edition of l’Estat de la Perse en 1660 by le Père Raphaël du Mans, Superior of the Capuchin Mission at Isfahān, a man singularly qualified by his high character and intellectual attainments, as well as by his protracted sojourn of fifty years (A.D. 1644-1696) in Isfahān, to speak with authority. The works enumerated by M. Schefer are variously written in Dutch, English, French, German, Italian, Latin, Portuguese and Spanish, but many of the more important have appeared in two or three different languages. Of their authors (excluding the earlier Venetian envoys to the Court of Uzūn Ḥasan, such as Caterino Zeno, Josepcho Barbaro and Ambrosio Contarini, most of whom visited Persia during the latter half of the fifteenth century, and consequently before the rise of the Şafawi dynasty) the best known are Anthony Jenkinson, the Sherley brothers, Cartwright, Parry and Sir Thomas Herbert of the English, and of the others Antonio di Govve, Don García de Silva Figuerosa, Olearius, Teixiera, Pietro della Valle, Tavernier, Thevenot, and last but not least Chardin and Pétis de la Croix. M. Schefer does not carry his survey beyond the seventeenth century, but the final downfall of the Şafawis before the Afghān onslaught in A.D. 1722 found an able historian in the Jesuit Père Krusinski, while letters from some of the Dutch merchants in Isfahān, a few of which have been published by H. Dunlop in his Perziē (Haarlem, 1912; pp. 242-7), serve to illuminate the tragic details of that disaster. From this time until the rise of the present Qājār dynasty towards the end of the eighteenth century comparatively few Europeans visited or resided in Persia, a fact due partly to the unsettled state of the country, and the consequent difficulties in the way of missionary or commercial enterprises, and partly to the changed political conditions. The object of the numerous diplomatic missions from various European countries which visited Persia during and immediately before the Şafawi period was, in nearly all cases, to seek her cooperation in combating the formidable power of the Ottoman Turks, which was at its height during the period which began with their conquest of Constantinople in A.D. 1453 and culminated in the reigns of Sultāns Salīm “the Grim” and Sulaymān “the Magnificent” (A.D. 1512-1566), of whom the former conquered Egypt and the Holy Cities and assumed the title of Caliph, while the latter only failed by the narrowest margin to capture Vienna. So formidable did the Turkish menace appear to European statesmen that Busbecq, Ferdinand’s ambassador at the Court of Sulaymān, expressed himself in the following remarkable words: “‘Tis only the Persian stands between us and ruin. The Turk would fain be upon us, but he keeps him back. This war with him

---

14 When this was written, I possessed only the first volume, which contains 626 pp. and comes down to the year 966/1558. By the kindness of my friend Huṣayn Dānish Bey I have since acquired the second volume also.

15 Some other very interesting State Papers from the Dastūrū ‘l-‘Inshā‘ of Sārī ‘Abdu’l-Ḥāf Efendi (d. 1079/1668) have also been published and annotated by the late M. Ch. Schefer in his Chrestomathie Persane (Paris, 1885), vol. ii, pp. 218-259 and 259-300.


17 To these we must not omit to add the Mirātu ‘l-Mamālik (“Mirror of Kingdoms”) of the gallant Turkish admiral Sūdī ‘Āli Ra‘is, who travelled overland from India to Turkey in A.D. 1554-6, and was received by Shāh Ṭāhmāsp at Qazwīn. Vambéry’s English translation of this book (Luzac, London, 1899) leaves a good deal to be desired.
affords us only a respite, not a deliverance. In A.D. 1722 when the Şafawi dynasty, long degenerate, finally collapsed, Persia was left for the moment a negligible quantity, the Turks had ceased to be a menace to Europe, and the bitter sectarian quarrel which lay at the root of two centuries of Turco-Persian warfare gradually lost much of its virulence, especially after the development of the more conciliatory policy of the great Nádird Sháh. Under these changed conditions the earlier European policy became at once unnecessary and impossible.

From this brief survey of the sources whence our knowledge of the Şafawi dynasty is derived, we must now pass to the consideration of its chief characteristics. These, though clear enough in general outline, present a series of very interesting problems
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which even yet cannot be regarded in all cases as definitely solved. These problems group themselves under the headings of Nationality, Religion, Art and Literature, and in this order we shall now proceed to consider them.

**NATIONALITY.**

It has been said above that to the Şafawis belongs the credit of making Persia, after the lapse of eight centuries and a half, “a nation once again.” This is true, but the nationalism which thus found expression was very different in several respects from the various forms of nationalism with which we are familiar at the present day. Language and race, which are the key-notes of the latter, played a very small part in it compared with religion. At no time was the mutual hatred of Turk and Persian more violent and bitter than during the eight years (A.D. 1512-1520) when Sultán Salím “the Grim,” and Sháh Isma’íl, the founder of the Şafawi power, were the respective protagonists of the two nations. The despatches of this period, recorded by Firídún Bey, pass from the realm of diplomacy to that of vulgar abuse, and “rascally Red-heads” (Awbásh-i-Qizil-básh) is the polite expression wherewith the Turkish Sultán refers to his Persian foes. The cause of this intense hatred, equally adequate and obvious, will be discussed under the heading of “Religion,” but it did not extend to race or language. When America entered the late War it was stated in the newspapers that in certain towns the people, to give vent to their hatred of everything German, collected all the German books they could find and burned them. No Turk or Persian of the sixteenth century would have given expression to his feelings of hostility in so puerile a fashion. On the contrary, it is a remarkable fact that while Sultán Salím and Sháh Isma’íl both possessed considerable poetic talent, the former wrote almost exclusively in Persian, and the latter, under the pen-
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name of Khaṭá’í, almost exclusively in Turkish. Ottoman hatred was directed against the heretical Qizil-básh as misbelievers, not as Persians (Irání), while the Persian language (Fársí) continued to hold its position as the polite idiom of literature and diplomacy. And though the ancient conflict between Irán and Túrán was familiar to all educated Turks and Persians in the classical Sháh-náma, or “Book of Kings,” of Firdawsí, Salím, in the following curious exordium to a despatch written in April, 1514 (Şafar, 920)²⁰, compares himself to the legendary Persian kings Firídún, Kay-Khusraw and Dárá, while likening his Persian opponent Sháh Isma’íl to the Turkish protagonist Afrásiyáb:

[After the doxology] “But to proceed. This excellent address hath been issued on our part, we who are the Refuge of the Caliphate, the slayer of the infidels and polytheists,

---


19 See E. J. W. Gibb’s History of Ottoman Poetry, vol. ii, p. 261, for a brief account of Salím’s Persian Diwán, of which a most sumptuous edition, based on numerous MSS., by the late Dr. Paul Horn, was printed in Berlin as a gift to the late Sultán ‘Abdu’l-Hamid from the ex-Emperor of Germany in 1904. A number of Sháh Isma’íl’s Turkish poems are given in my ms. of the Sıl sı lı t u ’ n-Nasab-i-Şafawiyya. See J.R.A.S. for July, 1921, p. 412, where other references are given.

20 See Firídún Bey, vol. i, p. 381.

21 An interesting proof that, contrary to the views of Professor Nallino, the position of Caliph was already claimed by Sultán Salím, as it certainly was by his son and successor Sulaymán.
the extirpator of the foes of the Faith, the humbler of the Pharaohs’ pride, the tarnisher of the Kháqán’s crowns, the King of those who fight and strive for Religion, whose pomp is as that of Firdúṣ, whose Court is as that of Alexander, whose justice and equity is as that of Kay-Khusraw, that Darā of noble descent, Sultán Salim Sháh, son of Sultán Búyázíd, son of Sultán Muhammad Kháñ, to thee, who art the ruler of the Persians, the most mighty general and puissant leader, the Dahhák of the time, the Darāb of the combat, the Afrásiyáb of the age, the famous Amir Isma’il.”

On the other hand I have only found one verse wherein Sháh Isma’il is definitely identified with the Persian as contrasted with the Shi’a cause. This verse occurs in the Aḥsan’-r-Tawárikh and runs:

فروزنده، تاج و تخت ضیان، 
فرزانده، احترم چاپیان؛

“The illuminator of the crown and throne of the Kayánians. The upholder of the star of the Káwayán.”

For the rest, the seven tribes who formed the back-bone of the Qızıl-hásh army were, as their names Rúmlú, Shámlú, Mawsjíllú, etc., sufficiently indicate, almost exclusively Turkish, as were the principal officers of the Safawí army, whose war-cry, as we learn

from the rare history of Sháh Isma’il, was not “Long live Persia!” or the like, but, in the Turkish language, “O my spiritual guide and master whose sacrifice I am!”

صدای قریان اولدهیمگ و صدای اولدهیمگ پیرو مرسوم مرشید معمول شیوی و
شعار قریان ناجیه، قریان است در مینته میشه، شعار زاده اند اختمانیده.

More than a century after Isma’il’s death, when the capital had been transferred from the north of Persia to Isfahán, Turkish seems still to have been the language generally spoken at Court. These instances, to which might be added many more, will suffice to show how different was the spirit which animated the Safawí revival (though it undoubtedly produced that homogeneity which is the basis of national sentiment) from the Nationalism of the modern Pan-Turians and “Young Persians,” who put the extension and purification from foreign elements of the national language in the foremost place in their programme. At the present time the Turkish nationalists of Angora proclaim their new Caliph in Turkish instead of in the time-honoured Arabic, while Ridá Kháñ, the Persian military dictator, strives to introduce in his army a purely Persian military terminology.

RECESSION.

Although the Muhammadans, according to their own statements, are divided into seventy-two or seventy-three different sects, in later times at any rate, when certain controversies, such as those connected with Free Will and Predestination and the

22 Literally, “he who rubs in the dust the noses of the Pharaohs,” alluding to Sultán Salim’s conquest of Egypt and overthrow of the Mameluke dynasty.
23 The Kháqán is the title given to the king of Túrán and the Turks. The word is, I believe, Mongol, and is identical with the alternative forms Qí’án and Kháñ.
24 Dahhák is the Azhi-dahák or Dragon-king of the Avesta, represented in the Sháh-náma as an Arab usurper.
25 Under the year 908/1502-3, f. 47ª of Mr. A. G. Ellis’s ms.
26 The second dynasty of the ancient legendary kings of Persia.
27 Káwa was the patriotic blacksmith who led the revolt against the foreign usurper Dahhák, and whose leather apron became the national standard under the name of Diráfsí-á Káwayán.
Creation of the Qur‘án, have sunk into a subordinate position, it may fairly be said that the capital and cardinal division is into the People of the Sunnat and the People of the Shi‘á. Scattered communities of the latter are found in Asia Minor, Syria (where they are called Mutawallí, pl. Matáwila), India and other Muhammadan lands, but in Persia only is the Shi‘á doctrine not only that held by the great majority of the people, but also the State Religion. Before considering how it was raised to this position by the Ṣafawís about the year A.D. 1500, we must briefly consider its essential nature, and here we cannot do better than quote Shahristání, the learned author of the Kitábu’l-Milal, or “Book of Sects,” who died in the middle of the twelfth century, and who writes of them31 as follows:

“The Shi‘á. — They are those who took the side of (Sháya‘ú) ‘Ali in particular, declaring him to be Imám and Khalífa by explicit written deed, public or secret, and believing that the Imámate cannot quit his posterity; and that, should it do so, it is only by reason of wrong wrought by another, or prudential renunciation on his own part32. They assert that the Imámate is not a question of expediency but of principle: it does not depend on popular choice, so that an Imám can be set up by their appointment, but is an essential of Religion which it is not permissible for even the Apostle of God to ignore or neglect, and which cannot be transferred or committed to the common people. They are united in their assertion as to the necessity of such explicit designation [of the Imám on the part of his predecessor] and the established innocence of the Imáms of all sins, small or great, and also

in their principles of recognition and repudiation, alike in word, deed and faith, save in cases of ‘prudential concealment’ (taqiyya), in which point, however, some of the Zaydis oppose them. As to the actual transmission of the Imámate. however, there is much discussion and difference of opinion, and at each such transmission and stage there is an argument, a doctrine and a schism. There are five [principal] divisions, the Kaysánís, the Zaydis, the Imámis, the Extremists (Ghulát) and the Isma‘ílis, of whom some incline in their principles to the Mu‘tazila, some to the Sunna and; some to Anthropomorphism (tashbih).”

Put in a briefer, clearer and more concrete form, this means that all the Shi‘á reject and repudiate the first three of the “Four Orthodox Caliphs” (al-Khulafa’u’r-Ráshídún), Abú Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthmán, who were elected, and hold that ‘Ali, the cousin of the Prophet Muhammad and the husband of his daughter Fátima, should have succeeded him, and had in fact been nominated by him as his successor; and that after ‘Ali the succession continued in his family by Divine Right. But even within this family there was no place for election, each Imám specifically choosing and nominating his successor, as the Prophet had chosen and nominated ‘Ali. Amongst those who agreed in these general principles, however, there was plenty of room for disagreement as to details. Some of the Shi‘á were content that the Imám should be descended from ‘Ali, and were therefore ready to recognize Muhammad ibn’l-Hanafíyya, “the son of the Hanafite woman”; others, including the “Sect of the Seven” or Isma‘ílis and the “Sect of the Twelve” or Imámis, with which last we are chiefly concerned, limited the succession to the children born to ‘Ali by his wife Fátima, the Prophet’s daughter. With the third Imám Ḥusayn, ‘Ali’s younger son by Fátima, a new factor came into operation, for, according to quite early and respectable historians, such as
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al-Ya‘qúbí33, a daughter of the last Sásánían king of Persia, Yazdigird III, was given to him in marriage and bore him a son named ‘Ali and entitled Zaynu’l-‘Ábidin, who was the Fourth Imám, and who combined in himself direct descent from the Prophet through his daughter Fátima and from the ancient Royal House of Persia. Small wonder that to him and his descendants the loyal devotion of the Persians was so freely rendered!

Thus we see that the quarrel between Sunní and Shi‘á is by no means one of names and personalities only, but of the essentially antagonistic doctrines of Democracy and the Divine Right of Kings. The Arabs are, and always have been, in large measure democratic in their ideas, while the Persians have ever been disposed to see in their Kings divine or semi-divine beings. And if the idea of a humanly-elected head of the State be repugnant, how much more that of an Imám, or Vice-gerent of the Prophet, chosen by popular suffrage? Hence the Imámí and Isma‘íli sects of the Shi‘á have always had their stronghold in Persia, though under the Sunni Turkish dynasties of the Ghaznawís and Saljuq they were kept in a state of subordination34. They were more favoured under the Buwayhíds and some of the Mongols, notably Gházán and Khudá-banda (Uljaytú), but they first obtained unquestioned supremacy throughout the whole of Persia under the Ṣafawís.

Who, then, were these Šafawís, when did they so vehemently adopt the Shi‘á doctrine, and how did they succeed in establishing their supremacy?
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32 E.g. the second Imám, al-Ḥasan, elder son of ‘Ali, ostensibly surrendered his rights “for prudential reasons” (taqiyya) to the Umayyad Mu‘áwiyá, but he could not really divest himself of the sacred quality of Imám.
33 He wrote about the end of the ninth Christian century, and his excellent history, edited by Houtsma, was published at Leyden in two vols. in 1883. See also vol. 1 of my Lit. Hist. of Persia, p. 229 and n. 2 ad calc.
34 Abundant illustrations of this are furnished by such works of the Saljuq period as the Siyásat-náma and the Ráhátu’ṣ-Ṣudár.
 Şafawi is the adjective formed from Şafi, a notable Şûfi saint, named in full Şafiyyu’d-Din, who died in Gilán in A.D. 1334 at the age of 85 in the odour of sanctity, and who claimed to be descended in the twentieth degree from Mûsá Kâzin the seventh Imâm. That he was really a man of note in his own time is proved beyond doubt by the way in which his contemporaries, the great statesman and historian Rashidu’d-Din Faḍlu’l-Hâh, speaks of him in his letters, and also by the fact that an immense biography of him, the  Şafawati’s-Şâfâ, was composed shortly after his death, largely from data supplied by his son  Şadrú’d-Din, which has been used directly or indirectly by all the historians of the great dynasty whereof he was the ancestor. Shâh Isma’îl, the actual founder of the dynasty, was sixth in descent from him, but I have found no evidence to prove that he himself adopted the violent Shi’a views characteristic of his descendants. The little evidence available points rather the other way, for in a letter written to Isma’îl’s son Shâh Ţâhmâsp in A.D. 1529-30 by the Uzbek leaders, they say that, according to what they have heard, Shaykh Şafiyyu’d-Din was a good Sunni, and express their astonishment that Ţâhmâsp “neither follows the example of His Holiness Murtâdâ ‘Ali, nor that of his forefather.” Khwâyā ‘Ali, grandson of Şafiyyu’d-Din and great-great-grandfather of Shâh Isma’îl, is the first member of the House who shows a strong Shi’a bias and holds converse in his dreams with the Imâms, and his grandson Junayd and his great-grandson Hayward are the first to assert their claims with the sword and to die on the field of battle.

At the beginning of the fifteenth century, then, the Şafawis were simply the hereditary pîrs, murshids, or spiritual directors of an increasingly large and important order of darwishes or Şûfis which drew its adherents not only from Persia but from the Turkish provinces of Asia Minor, where they appear to have carried on an active propaganda. How successful this promised to become in later days is shown by the dreadful massacre of some forty thousand of the Shi’a perpetrated in his dominions by  Sultân Salîm “the Grim” as a preliminary to his great campaign against Shâh Isma’îl in A.D. 1514. To these devoted darwishes or murids, as their war-cry cited above (p. 15) sufficiently shows, the head of the Şafawi House, even after he had ceased to be a Shaykh and had become a Shâh, continued to be regarded as the pîr or murshid. Chardin, Raphael of Mans, and other reputable authorities have scoffed at the title “Great Sophi,” by which the Şafawi Şahs are commonly designated by contemporary European diplomats and writers, on the ground that the Şûfis were generally poor and humble people and of doubtul orthodoxy, despised and rejected of men, and unlikely to lend their name to the Great King of Persia. But in the Persian histories of the Şafawis, even in the Silsîlatu’n-Nusab compiled about the time when Raphael of Mans wrote, and still more in the Ahsanu’t-Tawârîkh and other earlier chronicles, the Şûfis, especially the Şûfis of Rûm (i.e. Turkey in Asia), are represented as the cream of the Şafawi army; we read of “self-sacrifice, courage, and whatever else is inseparable from Şûfi- hood” and of unworthy and disloyal acts described as “un-Şûfi-like”(nâ-Şûfi). What, then, more natural than that he who was regarded not only as the Shâh of Persia
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but as the Shaykh of these devoted darwishes or Şûfis, whose courage amazed contemporary Venetian travellers, should be called in Europe “the Great Şûfi” or “Sophi”? At any rate no more probable origin has been suggested for this term, which can scarcely be regarded as a corrupt pronunciation of Şafawi.

It would appear that an idea prevailed in Europe (based, perhaps, on vague recollections of the Magi or Wise Men from the East) that Sophi was derived from sîf̄ûs, an opinion which Don Juan of Persia is at pains to refute; for, having described how Shâh Isma’îl immediately after he had conquered Tabriz adopted the title of “gran Sophi de Persia,” he adds: “no Sophi por sabio, como algunos mal entendieron, pensando que venía de Sîpos vocablo Griego, sino de Sophi, que es vocablo Persiano, y quiere dezir, lana, ó algodon” (“Not Sophi in the sense of wise, as some have erroneously supposed, thinking it to come from the Greek word sîf̄ûs, but from Sophi, which is a Persian word meaning wool or cotton” (21)). The rapid rise to power of Isma’îl is one of the most remarkable events in Persian history, especially in view of his forlorn and threatened childhood. His father, Shaykh Hayward, was killed in A.D. 1490 when he was only about three years of age, and he and his two brothers, of whom the elder, Sultân ‘Ali, also fell in battle about A.D. 1495, were in constant danger from the Turkmân rulers of the “White Sheep” dynasty, and had many hair-breadth escapes in which they owed their lives to the devoted loyalty of their faithful Şûfis. Only seven of these accompanied Isma’îl when, at the age of thirteen, he set out from Lâhijân for Ardabil to win a kingdom or perish in the attempt, but at every

---

35 For the full pedigree, see the J.R.A.S. for July, 1921, p. 397 and n. 1 ad calc.
36 Ibid., pp. 417-18.
37 For the text of this passage, see p. 43 infra.
40 Ibid., p. 259, and pp. 71-3 infra.
41 L’Estat de la Perse en 1660, ed. Schefer, pp. 16-17.
42 See J.R.A.S. for July, 1921, the Persian words on the illustration facing p. 415.
43 Ed. Valladolid. 1604. f. 50r.
44 Krusinski agrees with this view. See p. 68 of the English version (London, 1728).
45 He was born on Rajab 5, 892 (June 27, 1487).
stage he received reinforcements, so that at Ṭārum his army numbered fifteen hundred men, and by the time he reached Arzinján on his way to attack Farrukh-Yaṣár, King of Shírwan, it had increased to seven thousand. Within a year he had taken Tabriz, been crowned king of Persia, and, despite the attempts of his counsellors to dissuade him, imposed the Shi’a doctrine on his subjects. He was warned that two-thirds of the people of Tabriz were Sunnis, and that the introduction into the prayers and professions of Faith of the distinctively Shi’a clauses, and more especially the cursing of the first three Caliphs, Abú Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthmán, might lead to trouble. “God and the Immaculate Imams are with me,” he replied, “and I fear 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.” He was as good as his word, and when the above-mentioned anathema was uttered all men were commanded, on pain of death, to exclaim, “May it (i.e. the curse) be more, not less!” (Bish bád, kam ma-bád!).

Ruthless and bloodthirsty as he showed himself, Sháh Isma’il, as depicted by contemporary Venetian travellers, had many attractive characteristics. At the age of thirteen he was, according to Caterino Zeno, “of noble presence and a truly royal bearing, … nor did the virtues of his mind disaccord with the beauty of his person, as he had an elevated genius, and such a lofty idea of things as seemed incredible at such a tender age.” Angiolillo describes him as “very much beloved … for his beauty and pleasing manners”; and, when grown to man’s estate, as “fair, handsome, and very pleasing; not very tall, but of a light and well-framed figure; rather stout than slight, with broad shoulders. His hair is reddish; he only wears moustachios, and uses his left hand instead of his right. He is as brave as a game-cock, and stronger than any of his lords; in the archery contests, out of the ten apples that are knocked down, he knocks down seven.” The anonymous merchant, after describing Isma’il’s doings in Tabriz, adds “from the time of Nero to the present, I doubt whether so bloodthirsty a tyrant has ever existed,” yet adds a little further on that at Caesarea “he caused proclamation to be made that everyone who brought provisions for sale should be liberally paid, and forbade his men, under pain of death, to take even as much as a handful of straw without paying for it, as it was a friendly city.” He further describes him as “amiable as a girl, left-handed by nature, as lively as a fawn, and stronger than any of his lords,” and says that “this Sophi is loved and reverenced 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.”

The closest historical parallel to the Šafáwi movement is, I think, afforded by the propaganda in favour of the ‘Abbásids carried on by Abú Muslim in Persia with so great a success in the first half of the eighth century of our era. Both were consciously religious and only unconsciously, though none the less truly, racial; the chief difference was that the later movement had to confront in the person of the Ottoman Sultán Salim a far more energetic and formidable antagonist than the earlier in the Umayyad Caliph Marwán, and hence its more limited success; for while the ‘Abbásid cause triumphed throughout almost the whole of the Eastern lands of Islám, the Šafáwi triumph was limited to Persia, though without doubt at one time it threatened Turkey as well. Fear is the great incentive to cruelty, and it was chiefly fear which caused Sultán Salim to massacre in cold blood some forty thousand of his Shi’a subjects. Fear, however, was not the only motive of this ferocity; with it were mingled anger and disappointment. For Sultán Salim was what is now called a Pan-Islamist, and his ambition was to be not merely the Sovereign of the greatest and most powerful Muslim State, but the supreme head of the whole Muslim world. His conquest of Egypt and the Holy Cities of Mecca and Madīnah in A.D. 1517, and his assumption of the title of Caliph, which, whether by threats or promises, or a combination of the two, he induced the last titular ‘Abbásid Caliph to surrender to him, might well have given him this position but for Sháh Isma’il and the barrier of heterodoxy which he had erected between the Turks, Egyptians and other Sunnis to the West and their fellow-believers to the East in Transoxiana, Āfghánistán, Balkhishtan and India. The Persians not only refused to recognise Sultán Salim as Caliph, but repudiated the whole theory of the Caliphate. The Turkish victory over the Persians at Cháldírān in August, 1514, failed of its results owing to the refusal of the Ottoman troops to push home their advantage, and thus robbed the succeeding Egyptian campaign of its full measure of success, and left a lasting soreness which served greatly to weaken the political power of Islám and to impose a check on Turkish ambitions whereby, as we have seen, Europe greatly profited. Between A.D. 1508, when it was taken by the Persians, and A.D. 1638, when it was finally recovered by the Turks, Baghdád, once the metropolis of Islám, changed hands many times as the tide of these bitter and interminable wars ebbed and flowed, until the increasing weakness and effeminacy of the later Šafáwi kings left Turkey in undisputed possession of Mesopotamia.

**ART AND LITERATURE.**

---

46 The original text is quoted on p. 53 *infra, ad calc.*
One of the most curious and, at first sight, inexplicable phenomena of the Ṣafawi period is the extraordinary dearth of notable poets in Persia during the two centuries of its duration. Architecture,

miniature-painting and other arts flourished exceedingly; the public buildings with which Sháh ʿAbbás adorned his realms, and especially his capital Iṣfahán, have not ceased to command the admiration of all who beheld them from his time until the present day; and Bihzád and the other artists who flourished at the Timúrid court of Herát found worthy successors in Ridá-yyi-ʿAbbási and his colleagues. Yet, though poets innumerable are mentioned in the Tuhfa-i-Sámí and other contemporary biographies and histories, there is hardly one (if we exclude Jámi, Háttífí, Hiláli and other poets of Khurásán, who were really the survivors of the school of Herát) worthy to be placed in the first class. During the seventy stormy years of Timúr’s life there were at least eight or ten poets besides the great Ḥáfíz, who outshone them all, whose names no writer on Persian literature could ignore; while during the two hundred and twenty years of Ṣafawi rule there was in Persia, so far as I have been able to ascertain, hardly one of conspicuous merit or originality. I say “in Persia” advisedly, for a brilliant group of poets from Persia, of whom ʿUrífí of Shíráz (d. A.D. 1590) and Śá’íb of Iṣfahán(d. A.D. 1670) are perhaps the most notable, adorned the court of the “Great Moghuls” in India, and these were in many cases not settlers or the sons of emigrants, but men who went from Persia to India to make their fortunes and returned home when their fortunes were made. This shows that it was not so much lack of talent as lack of patronage which makes the list of distinctively Ṣafawi poets so meagre. The phenomenon is noticed by Ridá-quli Khán in the preface to his great anthology of Persian poets entitled Majmaʿu-l-Fuṣáhá, composed in the middle of the last century, as well

as by European scholars like the late Dr. Ethé, who have written on Persian poetry; with this difference, that the European writers commonly speak of Jámi as the last great Persian poet, and consider that during the four centuries which have elapsed since his death Persia has produced no poet of eminence, while Ridá-quli Khán, rightly as I think, places certain modern poets of the Qájár period, notably such men as Qá’ání, Furúghi and Yaghmá, in the first rank.

That no great poet should have arisen in Persia in days so spacious and so splendid as those of the Ṣafawis seemed to me so remarkable that I wrote to my learned and scholarly friend Mirzá Muḥammad Khán of Qazwin, to whose industry and acumen students of Persian owe so much, to ask him, first, whether he accepted this statement as a fact, and secondly, if he did, how he explained it. In reply, in a letter dated May 24, 1911, he wrote as follows:

“There is at any rate no doubt that during the Ṣafawi period literature and poetry in Persia had sunk to a very low ebb, and that not one single poet of the first rank can be reckoned as representing this epoch. The chief reason for this, as you yourself have observed, seems to have been that these kings, by reason of their political aims and strong antagonism to the Ottoman Empire, devoted the greater part of their energies to the propagation of the Shiʿa doctrine and the encouragement of divines learned in its principles and laws. Now although these divines strove greatly to effect the religious unification of Persia (which resulted in its political unification), and laid the foundations of this present-day Persia, whose inhabitants are, speaking generally, of one faith, one tongue, and one race, yet, on the other hand, from the point of view of literature, poetry, Suʿfísm and mysticism, and, to use their own expression, everything connected with the ‘Accomplishments’ (as opposed to the

‘Legalities’)\footnote{This biography of contemporary poets by Prince Sám Mirzá, the son of Sháh Ismaʿíl, is another work which urgently needs publication.}, they not merely fell far short in the promotion thereof, but sought by every means to injure and annoy the representatives of these ‘Accomplishments,’ who were generally not too firmly established in the Religious Law and its derivatives. In regard to the Sufis particularly they employed every kind of severity and vexation, whether by exile, expulsion, slaughter or reprimand, slaying or burning many of them with their own hands or by their sentence. Now the close connection between poetry and Belles Lettres on the one hand, and Suʿfísm and Mysticism on the other, at any rate in Persia, is obvious, so that the extinction of one necessarily involves the extinction and destruction of the other. Hence it was that under this dynasty learning, culture, poetry and mysticism completely deserted Persia, and the cloisters, monasteries, retreats and rest-houses [of the darwishes] were so utterly destroyed that there is now throughout the whole of Persia no name or sign of such charitable foundations, though formerly, as, for instance, in the time of Ibn Baṭṭúta, such institutions were to be found in every town, hamlet and village, as abundantly appears from the perusal of his Travels, wherein he describes how in every place, small or great, where he halted, he alighted in such buildings, of which at the present day no name or sign exists. Anyone ignorant of the circumstances of the Ṣafawi period might well wonder whether this Persia and that are the same country, and the creed of its inhabitants the same Islám; and, if so, why practically, with rare exceptions, there exists now not a single monastery throughout the whole of Persia, while in those parts of Turkey, such as Mesopotamia, Kurdistan and
Sulaymániyya, which did not remain under the Ṣafawí dominion, there are many such buildings just as there were in Ibn Baṭūṭa’s days.

“At all events during the Ṣafawí period in place of great
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poets and philosophers there arose theologians, great indeed, but harsh, dry, fanatical and formal, like the Majlisis, the Muḥaqqiq-i-thání, Shaykh Ḫurr-i-Āmulí and Shaykh-i-Bahá’í, etc.”

Most professional poets in the East are primarily panegyrists, and if Riḍá-qulí Khán is correct in his assertion that the Ṣafawí kings, especially Tahmásp and ‘Abbás the Great, expressed a wish that laudatory poems should be addressed to the Imámís rather than to themselves, another and a more creditable cause for the diminution of poets in their realms is indicated. More material benefits were to be looked for from the Great Moghuls\(^{50}\) than from the Imámís, and hence the eyes and feet of the more mercenary poets turned rather to Díhil than to Karbalá. But to religious poetry commemorating the virtues and sufferings of the Imámís a great impetus was given in Persia, and of these poets Muḥtašam of Káshán (d. A.D. 1588) was the most eminent. But, besides these more formal and classical elegies, it is probable that much of the simpler and often very touching verse, wherein the religious feelings of the Persians find expression during the Muḥarram mourning, dates from this period, when every means was employed to stimulate and develop these sentiments of devotion to the House of ‘Ali and detestation of its oppressors. On the other hand the dramatization of these moving scenes, which now form so remarkable a feature of the Muḥarram mourning (Ta’ziyá), and are often described by European writers as “Miracle Plays,” seems to have taken place at a much later period. That careful writer Olearius spent the month of Muḥarram, A.H. 1047 (May-June, 1637) at Ardabil, the sanctuary of the Ṣafawí family,
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gives a very full description of all that he saw, the mournings, wailings, lamentations and cuttings culminating on the ‘Ashūrâ, the tenth day of the month or Rúz-i-Qatí, but he makes no mention of any dramatic representations, so that it is pretty certain that none existed at that time. To elucidate this point I addressed enquiries to two well-informed and intelligent Persian friends, Sayyid Taqi-záda and Mirzá Ḫusayn Dánish. The former expressed the opinion that while the solemn recitations known as Rawḍa-khvání (i.e. the reading from the pulpit of the Rawdatu sh-Shuhadá, or “Garden of the Martyrs,”) and other similar books) dates from Ṣafawí times, the Ta’ziya-gardání, shabih, or “Passion Play” was of much later date, and perhaps owes something to European influences. The latter also placed the origin of these “Passion Plays” (of which Sir Lewis Pelly’s translations give a good idea to the English reader) about the end of the eighteenth or beginning of the nineteenth century, i.e. at the beginning of the Qájár period, and incidentally cited the following interesting verses by Shaykh Riḍá-yi-Kurd in illustration of the view that the Persian dislike of ‘Umar is due not less to the fact that he conquered Persia and overthrew the Sásánian dynasty than to his usurpation of the rights of ‘Ali and Fátima:

\[
\text{بی‌کتت یمیر بیدری ہندی آدم اجرم \(\hat{a}\)ر} \\
\text{بر باو داد رے و رشبہ جمیرا} \\
\text{این عورت برغصب خلافت رعی نسبت} \\
\text{بآل عورتین قربتات عجرم \(\hat{a}\)}
\]

“‘Umar broke the back of the lions of the thicket:
He cast to the winds the thews and sinews of Jamshid.
This quarrel is not about the usurpation of the Caliphate from ‘Ali:
Persia has an ancient grudge against the House of ‘Umar.”

In conclusion we must not omit to notice another step taken by the Ṣafawí kings which added greatly to the
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consolidation of Persia and the prevention of a continued outflow of men and money from the country, namely the exaltation and popularisation of Mashhad, Qum and other holy cities of Persia, whereby the tide of pilgrims was to a considerable extent confined within the limits of their Empire, in which, as we have seen, the most sacred shrines of Karbalá, Najaf and Mashhad ‘Ali were long included before they finally fell under Turkish dominion\(^{51}\).

\[\text{POSTSCRIPT.}\]

\(^{50}\) The liberality of Humáyún towards poets and men of letters is especially noticed under the year of his death (962/1555) in the Ahsanu ‘t-Tawāríkh. This and the succeeding topics will be more fully discussed in a subsequent chapter.

\(^{51}\) See Krusinski, op. cit., pp. 159-161.
I am indebted to my friend Mr. H. L. Rabino, of H.B.M.’s Consular Service, for the following valuable notes on the celebration of the Muharram mourning at Baghdád as early as the fourth Muhammadan (tenth Christian) century. I have only the text of the two passages (one in German and the other in Persian): the reference was probably given in the accompanying letter (December 23, 1922), which has unfortunately been mislaid. I have an impression that they are taken from one of Dorn’s articles, probably published in the Mélanges Asiatiques. The whole quotation runs as follows:
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“Institution of the mourning for the Chief of Martyrs in Baghdád in A.H. 352 [A.D. 963].

“It is related in the History of Ibn Kathir the Syrian that Mu’izzu’d-Dawla Ahmad ibn Buwayh issued orders in Baghdád that during the first ten days of Muharram all the bazaars of Baghdád should be closed, and that the people should wear black for mourning and betake themselves to mourning for the Chief of Martyrs [the Imam Husayn]. Since this procedure was not customary in Baghdád, the Sunni doctors regarded it as a great innovation; but since they had no control over Mu’izzu’d-Dawla, they could do nothing but submit. Thereafter every year until the collapse of the Daylamite [or Buwayhí] dynasty, this custom of mourning was observed by the Shi’ites in all countries during the first ten days of Muharram. In Baghdád it continued until the early days of the reign of Tughríl the Saljúq.”

CHAPTER II.
THE CREATION OF THE ŠAFAVÍ POWER TO 930/1524.
SHÁH ISMA’ÍL AND HIS ANCESTORS.

That Shaykh Šafíyyu’d-Dín, the saintly recluse of Ardabil from whom the Šafaví kings of Persia derived their descent and their name, was really an important and influential person in his own day, is a fact susceptible of historical proof. He who wins a throne and founds a great dynasty destined to endure for more than two centuries is apt, if he be of lowly origin, to create, or allow to be created, some legend connecting his ancestors with famous kings, statesmen or warriors of old, or otherwise reflecting glory on a House which, till he made it powerful and illustrious, held but a humble place in men’s esteem. But Sháh Isma’il, sixth in descent from Shaykh Šafi (as we shall henceforth call him for brevity), who founded the Šafaví dynasty about the beginning of the sixteenth century of the Christian era, and raised Persia to a position of splendour which she had scarcely held since the overthrow of the ancient and noble House of Sásán by the Arabs in the seventh century, had no occasion to resort to these devices; for whether or no Shaykh Šafi was directly descended from the seventh Imám of the Shi’a, Músá Kázim, and through him from ‘Ali ibn Abí Tálib52 and Fátima the Prophet’s daughter (and his
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claim is probably at least as good as that of any contemporary Sayyid), two facts prove that in his own time (the thirteenth century) he was highly accounted as a saint and spiritual guide.

The first and more important of these two facts is the concern shown by that great Minister Rashidu’d-Din Faḍlu’llāh for his welfare, and the desire to win his favour and intercession. In the very rare collection of the Minister’s letters known as the Munsḥa’ ‘at-i-Rashidi53—there occur two documents affording proof of this. The first is a letter (No. 45 of the collection, ff. 145b-149b of the MS.) addressed to Shaykh Ṣafīyyu’d-Dīn himself, offering to his monastery (Khānqāhā) yearly gift of corn, wine, oil, cattle, sugar, honey and other food-stuffs for the proper entertainment of the notables of Ardabil on the anniversary of the Prophet’s birthday, on condition that prayers should be offered up at the conclusion of the feast for the writer and benefactor. The second (No. 49, ff. 161a-169b) is addressed by Rashid to his son Mīr Ahmad, governor of Ardabil, enjoining on him consideration for all its inhabitants, and especially “to act in such wise that His Holiness the Pole of the Heaven of Truth, the Swimmer in the Oceans of the Law, the Pacer of the Hippodrome of the Path, the Shaykh of Islam and of the Muslims, the Proof of such as attain the Goal, the Exemplar of the Bench of Purity, the Rose-tree of the Garden of Fidelity, Shaykh Ṣafīyyu’l-Millat wa’d-Dīn (may
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God Most High perpetuate the blessings of His Holy Exhalations!) may be well pleased with and grateful to thee54." These letters, and especially the second, which is filled with the most exaggerated praises of Shaykh Ṣafī, sufficiently prove the high repute which he enjoyed amongst his contemporaries55.

The second fact germane to our thesis is that comparatively soon after his death a most extensive monograph on his life, character, teachings, doctrines, virtues and miracles was compiled by one of his followers, the darvīsh Tawakkūṭi56 ibn Ismā’il, commonly called Ibu’l-Bazzāz, apparently under the inspiration and direction of Shaykh Ṣadrū’d-Dīn, who succeeded his father Shaykh Ṣafī as head of the Order and held this position for fifty-eight years (A.D. 1334-1392). This rare and important book has never been printed57, but is the chief source of all later accounts of the head of the family and dynasty, in most of which it is frequently and explicitly cited. A much later recension of it was made in the reign of Shāh Ṭahmāsp (A.D. 1524-1576) by a certain Abu’l-
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Faṭḥ al-Ḥusaynī. I have personal knowledge of only three manuscripts, Add. 11745 of the British Museum58; No. 87 of the Pote Collection in the library of King’s College, Cambridge59; and a fine copy made at Ardabil in 1030/1621, now belonging to Mr. A. G. Ellis, who, with his customary generosity, placed it at my disposal for as long as I required it. This exhaustive work comprises an Introduction, twelve chapters, and a Conclusion, each of which is divided into numerous sections60, and its contents are summarized by Rieu with his usual precision. It contains interesting matter, diluted by much that is wearisome save to a devoted disciple, and represents on a more extensive scale the type of hagiography familiar to all Persian students in such books as the Manāqibu’l-‘Arifīn of Aflākī, available in the English version of Redhouse61 and the French of Huart62. The extracts from it included in most later histories of the family, notably the Sīlṣilatu’n-Nasab-i-Ṣafawīyya63, will suffice to satisfy the curiosity of most readers, though a careful perusal and analysis of the original work would undoubtedly yield results of value, most of the anecdotes and sayings being vouchèd for by Shaykh Ṣadrū’d-Dīn. But before further discussing Shaykh Ṣafī and his descendants something more must be said about his ancestors.
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54 Ṣafī died in 735/1334 at the age of 85. Rashidu’d-Dīn was put to death in A.D. 1318 at the age of 70 or somewhat over.

55 Or Tūkīlí (توکلی) as it is written and pointed in a note in Mr. Ellis’s manuscript.

56 Since this was written I have obtained through the kindness of one of my Persian correspondents a copy of an excellent lithographed edition published at Bombay in 1329/1911, of the very existence of which I was ignorant when this chapter was written.


58 See my Suppl. Hand-list, p. 137, No. 837.

59 Ch. vii comprises no less than 27 sections.


62 See my account of this rare and interesting work in the J.R.A.S. for July, 1921, pp. 395-418. Both Dr. Babinger and M. Minorsky have called my attention to the fact that another MS. of this work at St. Petersburg was described by Khanikoff in the Mélanges Asiatiques, i, pp. 580-583.
That the seventh Imám Músá Kázim had, besides the son ‘Ali Rıdâ who succeeded him in the Imámate, another son named Hamza, from whom Shaykh Şafi claimed descent, is a fact vouched for by the historian al-Ya’qūbī, but the next dozen links in the chain (including five Muḥammads without further designation) are too vague to admit of identification. The earliest ancestor of the Şafawis who is invested with any definite attributes is Fırvızshâh-i-Zarrin-kulâh (“Golden-cap”), who is stated by the Silsilatu ’n-Nasab to have been made governor of Ardabil, henceforth the home and rallying-point of the family, by a son of Ibrâhîm-i-Adham, here represented as king of Persia. Ibrâhîm-i-Adham, however, though reputed of kingly race, renounced the world, became a notable saint, and died about A.D. 780 in Syria, and history knows nothing of any son of his who succeeded to a throne in Persia or elsewhere. Fırvızshâh died after a prosperous life at Rangin in Gilân, and was succeeded by his son ‘Awad, of whom nothing is recorded save that he lived and died at Isfaranjân near Ardabil. His son Muhammad earned the title of Hâfiz because he knew the Qur’ân by heart, an accomplishment for which he is said to have been indebted to the Jīnne, who kidnapped him at the age of seven and educated him amongst themselves for a like number of years. The two succeeding heads of the family, Şalâhu’‑d‑Din Rashid and Quţbu’‑d‑Din Aḥmad, seem to have lived quietly at Kalkhorān, devoting themselves to agriculture, until a fierce incursion of the Georgians compelled the latter to flee to Ardabil with his family, including his little son Aminu’‑d‑Din Jibrâ’‑il, then only a month old. Even here they were not left unmolested: the Georgians pursued them and they had to take refuge in a cellar, where their lives were only saved by a devoted youth, who, ere he fell beneath the swords of his assailants, succeeded in concealing the entrance to the cellar by throwing down a large earthen jar over it. Quţbu’‑d‑Din himself was severely wounded in the neck and hardly escaped with his life, and his grandson Shaykh Şafi, who was born during his life, used to relate that when his grandfather took him on his shoulder he used to put four baby fingers into the scarf left by the wound. In due course Quţbu’‑d‑Din was succeeded by his son Aminu’‑d‑Din Jibrâ’‑il, farmer and saint, who adopted Khwāja Kamálu’‑d‑Din ‘Arabshâh as his spiritual director, and married a lady named Dawlat; she in due course, in the year 650/1252‑3, bore him the son who afterwards became famous as Shaykh Şafiyu’‑d‑Din, with whom the family suddenly emerges from comparative obscurity into great fame. The author of the Silsilatu ’n‑Nasab, not content with giving the year of his birth, further fixes the date as follows. At the time of his birth Shams‑i‑Tabriz had been dead five years, Shaykh Muḥyi’‑d‑Din ibnu’‑l‑Arabi twelve years, and Najmu’‑d‑Din Kibrâ’ thirty‑two years. He was five years old when Hûlāgû Khân the Mongol conquered Persia, twenty‑two on the death of Jalâlu’‑d‑Din Rûmî, and forty‑one on the death of Sa’‑dî. The eminent saints contemporary with him included Amir ’Abdu’‑l‑llâh‑i‑Shirâzî, Shaykh Najîbu’‑d‑Din Buzghûsh, ‘Alâ’‑u’‑d‑Dawla‑i‑Samnâni and Shaykh Maḥmüd‑i‑Shabistarî (author of the Gulshan‑i‑Râz or “Rose‑bed of Mystery”). He had three elder and two younger brothers, and one elder sister, being thus the fifth in a family of seven; and his father died when he was six years of age.

SHAYKH ŞAFIYYU’‑D‑DIN (A.D. 1252‑1334).

Hitherto we have suffered from the exiguity of biographical details, but now we are rather embarrassed by their abundance. The Şafwatu ’s‑Şafâ, it is true, probably contains all that can now be known about Shaykh Şafi, but it is a voluminous work, containing some 216,000 words, and written in a fairly simple and direct style without much “stuffing” (hashwu) or rhetorical adornment, so that anything approaching a full analysis of its contents would in itself constitute a volume of considerable size. It is lamentably deficient in dates, and in general deals rather with the spiritual than the material aspects of the life of Shaykh Şafi and his director Shaykh Zâhid‑i‑Gilânî. Stated as briefly as possible, its contents are as follows:

Introduction (in 2 sections). Shaykh Şafi’s advent foretold by the Prophet and by former saints, such as Jalâlu’‑d‑Din Rûmî.

Chapter I (in 11 sections, two of which are further subdivided). Early life of Shaykh Şafi. His genealogy. Portents preceding his birth. His birth and childhood. His search for a spiritual director. He finally meets Shaykh Zâhid of Gilân. His life as a disciple of this holy man. His succession to the supremacy of the Order. His spiritual affiliation up to the Prophet. Characteristics and miracles of Shaykh Zâhid.

65 For some account of the believing Jinn, see Qur’ân, lxii.
66 This, as M. V. Minorsky has pointed out to me, and not “Gilkhwârân,” is the proper pronunciation of this name.
67 Muḥammad, Şalâhu’‑d‑Din Rashid and Isma’‑il.
68 Ya’qūb and Fakhru’‑d‑Din Yûsuf.
Chapter II (in 3 sections). Some of the miracles of Shaykh Ṣafi, whereby he delivered men from the perils of the sea and of deep waters, of mountains, mist and snow, and from foes, bondage and sickness.

Chapter III (in 3 sections). Some of the miracles wrought by the favourable or unfavourable regards of Shaykh Ṣafi.

Chapter IV (in 6 sections, two of which are further subdivided). Some of Shaykh Ṣafi’s sayings, and his explanations of verses of the Qur’ān, traditions of the Prophet, utterances of the Saints, and allegorical verses of the poets.

Chapter V (in 3 sections). Some of Shaykh Ṣafi’s miracles connected with the Jinn, with animals, and with inanimate objects.

Chapter VI (undivided). Ecstacies and devotional dancing of Shaykh Ṣafi.

Chapter VII (in 5 sections). Various miracles of Shaykh Ṣafi, such as thought-reading, foretelling future events, converse with the dead, etc.

Chapter VIII (in 27 sections). Further examples of the virtues, powers, pious actions, effective prayers, intuitions and views of Shaykh Ṣafi, vouched for by his son Shaykh Ṣadru’d-Dīn.

Chapter IX (in 2 sections). Last illness and death of Shaykh Ṣafi.

Chapter X (in 3 sections). Posthumous miracles of Shaykh Ṣafi.

Chapter XI (in 3 sections). The fame and greatness of Shaykh Ṣafi and his vicars (Khulafā) throughout the world.

Chapter XII (in 2 sections). Miracles wrought by Shaykh Ṣafi’s disciples.

Conclusion.

That so comparatively small a portion of this voluminous work should be biographical is disappointing but not surprising, for how can those who regard themselves as belonging to the Timeless and Placeless (Lá Makán) be expected to trouble themselves about dates or similar details? All these hagiographies, indeed, have a similar character, and deal chiefly with the pious sayings, devout practices and supernatural achievements (karámāt) of those whose lives they record.

That these karámāt69 have an interest of their own in connection with Psychical Research has been recognised by D. B. Macdonald in his excellent book on The Religious Attitude and Life in Islam70 and by Cl. Huart in his Saints des Derviches Tourneurs71. The latter classifies the psychical phenomena recorded in his original, the Mandāqību ʾl-ʾArīfīn (composed about 718/1318, only some thirty years earlier than the Ṣafwatuʾs-Ṣafā, which was very probably modelled on it), as follows:

- dreams; knowledge of future events; second sight and divination of hidden objects; thought-transference; luminosity of bodies, human and inanimate; automatic opening of closed doors; ubiquity; anaesthesia and immunity against poisons; action on material objects at a distance; production of the precious metals; abnormal muscular, digestive and sexual powers and physical enlargements of the body; shifting features and instability of countenance; apparitions; psychotherapy; replies to difficult questions; conversions to Islam; sermons to animals; vengeance of the Saints; mental alienation; protracted seclusion and fasting; talismans; sudden disappearances. Examples of all, or nearly all, of these phenomena are to be found in the Ṣafwatuʾs-Ṣafā, while a smaller but fairly representative selection is contained in the Sīsilatuʾn-Nasah, but a detailed examination of them, though not without interest and value, would be out of place in this volume. It must be noted, however, that certain aspects of these Muslim saints, as recorded by their disciples and admirers, are to Western minds somewhat repellent; their curses are no less effective than their blessings, and their indulgences no less remarkable than their abstentions, while g""
Záhid, on the other hand, Gházan Khán the Mongol İlkhan showed the greatest respect, especially after the saint had exhibited his powers of mind-reading, which so impressed Gházan that he insisted on kissing his feet.

Externally the life of Shaykh Şafi, especially after he became the disciple of Shaykh Záhid and settled at Ardabil, was not very eventful. As a child he was serious, unsociable and disinclined for play. At a comparatively early age he appears to have got a “concern” about religion, and to have seen visions and held converse with the Unseen World. Finding no adequate direction in Ardabil, and hearing the fame of Shaykh

Najibu’ddin Buzghúsh of Shiráz, he desired to go thither, but, having finally overcome his mother’s opposition to the journey, arrived there only to find the saint dead. While at Shiráz he made the acquaintance of many notable saints and darwishes, and of the celebrated poet Sa’dí, of whom, however, he seems to have formed but a poor opinion. Indeed he appears to have treated the poet with scant civility, even refusing to accept an autograph copy of his poems. Finally Zahiru’ddin, the son and successor of Shaykh Buzghúsh, told Shaykh Şafi that no one could satisfy his spiritual needs except Shaykh Záhid of Gilán, whose personal appearance and dwelling-place on the shore of the Caspian Sea he described to him in detail. Four years elapsed, however, ere he was successful in tracking down the elusive saint, then sixty years of age, by whom he was cordially welcomed, and with whom he spent the next twenty-five years of his life.

Shaykh Záhid’s full name, as given in the Ṣafwatu’ss-Ṣafā, is Táju’ddin İbráhím ibn Rawshan Amir ibn Bábíl ibn Shaykh Pindár (or Bundár) al-Kurdi as-Sanjání, and the mother of his grandfather Bábíl is said to have been a Jinniyya. The title of Záhid (“the Ascetic” or “Abstemious”) was given to him by his Director Sayyid Jamál’u’ddin for reasons which are variously stated. He gave his daughter Bábí fátima in marriage to Shaykh Şafi, to whom she bore three sons, of whom the second, Șadru’ddin, ultimately succeeded his father as head of the Order. The author of the Silsilatu’n-Nasab was one of his descendants, who were collectively known as Pir–zāda and apparently continued to enjoy high consideration during the whole Şafawi period.

From the data given by the Silsilatu’n-Nasab, viz. that
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Illustration: Shaykh Abdál Pir–zāda presenting the captured horse of the Uzbek leader, Din Muḥammad Khán, to Sháh ʿAbbás the Great]
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Shaykh Záhid was 35 years older than Shaykh Şafi, that both died at the age of 85, and that the latter died in 735/1334, we may conclude that the former died about 700/1300; and this is corroborated by the further statement that his grandson Șadru’ddin was born in 704/1305, four years after his death. Shaykh Şafi now became head of the Order, and held this position for 35 years, when he died, and was in turn succeeded by his son Şadru’ddin. He produced some poetry both in the dialect of Gilán (in which also several of his conversations with Shaykh Záhid were conducted) and likewise in ordinary Persian. Though one of his quatrains56 testifies to his love of ‘Ali (“how muchsoever he in whose heart is a grain of love for ‘Ali may sin, God will forgive him” are his words), I find no evidence that he held those strong Shi’a views which subsequently characterised his descendants. There is, indeed, a piece of evidence to the contrary in the Ahsanu’r-Tawáríkh, an important unpublished history of the first two Şafawi kings composed in the reign of Şáh Ṭahmásp and including the years A.H. 901–985 (A.D. 1495–1577)77. In a letter of remonstrance addressed to this ruler by the Uzbek ʿUbayd Khán in 936/1529–1530 the following sentence occurs8:

و پدر غزارت شیا جناب محروم شیع صفیرا همه‌شنین شیعه ام که می‌تریز، اهل سنت و جمعیت بوده مارا حیرت و خاتم رشد می‌بینم که شیا نه روش حضرت مرتضی علی رابطه و نه روش پدر خلیلریا
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“We have thus heard concerning your ancestor, His sainted Holiness Shaykh Şafi, that he was a good man and an orthodox Sunnی, and we are greatly astonished that you neither follow the conduct of Murtaḍá ‘Ali nor that of your ancestor.”

54 According to Jámi (Nafaḥat, p. 548) he died in Shábán 678 (Dec. 1279).
55 On Monday, Muḥarram 12, 735 (Sept. 12, 1334).
57 Mr. A. G. Ellis most kindly placed at my disposal his ms. of this rare book, to which all subsequent references are made.
58 F. 166v.
He did much, however, to extend and develop the Order of which he was the Superior, and his influence is illustrated by a statement of Mawlãná Shamsu’d-Din Barniqi of Ardabil, quoted in the Silsilatu’n-Nasab, that the number of those who came to visit him along one road only—that from Marãgha and Tabrîz—in the course of three months amounted to some thirteen thousand. 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 Sultãns.

Shaykh Ṣadru’d-Din succeeded his father at the age of 31 in 735/1334 and controlled the affairs of the Order for 59 years until his death in 794/1392. He also composed verses in Persian, and is besides credited with many miracles, the most celebrated of which was his recovery and restoration to Ardabil of the door of the principal mosque which had been carried off by the Georgians when they raided that city about 600/1203-4. Amongst the most celebrated of his disciples was the poet Qâsimu’l-Anwâr, whose orthodoxy was somewhat suspect, and who was expelled from Herât by Shâh-rukh under circumstances which I have discussed elsewhere. That Shaykh Ṣadru’d-Din’s influence and ac-

[page 45]
tivities also aroused the suspicions of neighbouring potentates is shown by the action of Malik-i-Ashraf, who lured him to Tabriz and kept him in confinement there for three months, when, warned by a dream, he released him, but subsequently attempted to recapture him and compelled him to flee into Gilân. Other holy and learned men suffered at the hands of this tyrant, and one of them, the Qâdi Muhýi’d-Din of Barda’a, depicted in such vivid colours the odious oppression of Malik-i-Ashraf to Jâni Beg Khán son of Uzbek, the ruler of the Dastî-i-Qipchâq, that the latter invaded Adharbâiyân, defeated Malik-i-Ashraf, and put him to death. According to the Silsilatu’n-Nasab he also had an interview with Shaykh Ṣadru’d-Din, treated him with great respect, and confirmed to him the possession of certain estates whereof the revenues had formerly been allocated to the shrine at Ardabil.

Shaykh Ṣadru’d-Din, like his father Shaykh Ṣâfi, performed the pilgrimage to Mecca at the end of his life, and is said to have brought back with him to Ardabil the Prophet’s standard. Shortly after his return he died, in 794/1392, and was succeeded by his son Khwája ‘Alí, who controlled the affairs of the Order for thirty-six years until his death on Rajab 18, 830 (May 15, 1427). This happened in Palestine, where he is buried, his tomb being known as that of “Sayyid ‘Alí ‘Ajami.” Like his father and grandfather he

[page 46]
was a worker of miracles and a poet, and over two hundred of his Persian verses are quoted in the Silsilatu’n-Nasab. In him strong Shi’a tendencies reveal themselves: instigated by the Ninth Imám Muhammad Taqi in a dream he converts the people of Dizful, by a miraculous stoppage of their river, to a belief in and recognition of the supreme holiness of ‘Alí ibn Abí Ṭâlib; and he exhorts Timûr, whose regard he had succeeded in winning by a display of his psychical powers, to “chastise, as they deserve, the Yazidi Kurds, the friends of Mu’âwiya, because of whom we wear the black garb of mourning for the Immaculate Imám.” More celebrated is his intercession with Timûr on behalf of a number of Turkish prisoners (asîrân-i-Rûm) whose release he secured, and whose grateful descendants, known as “the Turkish Şûfîs” (Şûfiyân-i-Rûmlû), became the most devoted adherents and supporters of the Şâfawi family.
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Shaykh Ibrāhīm, better known as Shaykh Sháh, succeeded his father in 830/1427 and died in 851/1447-8. Little is recorded of him save the names of his six sons, and he is even omitted entirely in the succession by the Ta ’rīkh-i-‘Ālam-ārā-yi-‘Abbāsī. He was succeeded by his youngest son Shaykh Junayd, with whom the militant character of the family first asserted itself. He visited Dīyār Bakr and won the favour of Úzūn Hasan, the celebrated ruler of the “White Sheep” Dynasty, who bestowed on him the hand of his sister Khadija in marriage. This alliance, combined with the assembly round his standard of ten thousand Sūfī warriors (ghuzāt-i-Ṣūfiyya), “who deemed the risking of their lives in the path of their perfect Director the least of the degrees of devotion,” aroused the alarm of Jahāns̄hāh̄, the Turkmān ruler of Ādharbāyjān and the two ‘Īrāqs, and other neighbouring princes, and Shaykh Junayd fell in battle against Shīrwānshāh̄. His body, according to one account, was brought to Ardabīl and there buried, but according to others it was buried near the battle-field at a village variously called Qurēyāl, Qurēyāl or Qurēyān.

Shaykh Haiyar (the “Sechaidar” of Angiolello), like his father Junayd, whom he succeeded, found favour in the eyes of the now aged Úzūn Hasan, his maternal uncle, who gave him in marriage his daughter Marta, Ḥalimā, Bākī Āqā or ‘Ālam-šāh Begum, whose mother, the celebrated Despina Khâtūn (“Despinaconat”), was the daughter of Kalo Ioannes, the last Christian Emperor of Trebizond, of the noble Greek family of the Commeni. The anonymous Venetian merchant whose narrative is included in the Italian travels in Persia in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries describes him as “a lord about the rank of a count, named Secaidar, of a religion or sect named Sophi, reverenced by his co-religionists as a saint and obeyed as a chief. There are,” he continues, “numbers of them in different parts of Persia, as in Natolia (Anatolia) and Caramania (Qaramán), all of whom bore great respect to this Secaidar, who was a native of this city of Ardouil (Ardabīl or Ardawī), where he had converted many to the Suffavean (Ṣafa-wi) doctrine. Indeed he was like the abbot of a nation of monks; he had six children, three boys and three girls, by a daughter of Asambe (Hasan Bey, i.e. Úzūn Hasan); he also bore an intense hatred to the Christians.” He it was who, divinely instructed in a dream, bade his followers adopt in place of the Turkmān cap (tāqiya-i-Turkmān) the scarlet cap of twelve gores (Tāj-i-duwāzda tark) from which they became universally known as “Red Heads” (Qizil-bāsh in Turkish; Surkh-sar in Persian). “They are accustomed,” says the anonymous Venetian merchant cited above (p. 206 of the Italian Travels), “to wear a red caftan, and above that a high conical turban made with a dozen folds, representing the twelve sacraments of their sect, or the twelve descendants of ‘Ali.”

Shaykh Haiyar, like his father, fell in battle against the hosts of Shīrwānshāh̄ and his Turkmān allies at Ṭābarsarān near Darband. Twenty-two years later his death was avenged and his body recovered and brought to Ardabīl by his redoubtable son Shāh Isma’il, who was at this time (Rajab 20, 893: June 30, 1488) only a year old.

SHĀH ISMA’IL.
(Born 892/1487; crowned 905/1499-1500; died 930/1523-4)

Nothing could appear more unpromising than the position of the three little sons of Shaykh Haiyar, who were for the moment entirely at the mercy of their father’s enemies. Sūltān Ya’qūb, the son of Úzūn Hasan, however, shrank from killing them for the sake of their mother, who was his sister, and contented himself with exiling them to Iṣṭākhr in Fārs, where they were placed in the custody of the governor Manṣūr Beg Parnāk. According to Angiolello, however, the three boys were confined on an island in the “Lake of Astumar” (identified by the translator with Lake Van) inhabited by Armenian Christians, where they remained for three years and became “very much beloved, especially Ismael, the second, for his beauty and pleasing manners,” so that when Rustam, the grandson of Úzūn Hasan, after the death of his uncle Ya’qūb, sent a

---

88 These particulars are from the Ta ’rīkh-i-‘Ālam-ārā-yi-‘Abbāsī.
89 In 850/1456 according to Babinger, op. cit., p. 83.
90 See Pers. Lit. iii, p. 407.
91 Translated and edited by Charles Grey and published by the Hakluyt Society in 1873, pp. 139-207.
92 These were Sultān ‘Ali Mirzā (or Pādshāh), Isma’il, and Ibrāhīm, according to the Ta ’rīkh-i-‘Ālam-ārā-yi-‘Abbāsī, but they are differently given in the Aḥsanu ’t-Tawārīkh.
93 See the late Sir A. Houtum-Schindler’s note on this in the J.R.A.S. for 1897, pp. 114-115. For a long note on Qizil-bāsh, see Babinger’s Schajch Bedr ed-Din, pp. 84-5 of the Sonderabdruck.
94 This, of course, is an error, for the Twelve Imāms include ‘Ali, who was the first of them and was succeeded by eleven of his descendants.
95 According to the rare history of Shāh Isma’il represented by Add. 200 of the Cambridge University Library, however, Shaykh Haydar was killed in 895/1490.
96 P. 101-2 of the Hakluyt Society’s translation by Charles Grey.
received him with much honour, conferred on him all the paraphernalia of sovereignty and the title of Pádisháh, and despatched him to attack Baysunqur, whom he defeated and slew in a battle near Ahar. Having thus got rid of his rival, Rustam sought to rid himself of his ally, who, warned by one of his Turkmán disciples, fled to Ardabil, but was overtaken by his enemies at the neighbouring village of Shamási and killed in the ensuing skirmish in the year 900/1494-5. His two brothers, however, reached Ardabil in safety, and were concealed by their faithful followers during the house-to-house search instituted by the Turkmáns, until an opportunity presented itself of conveying them secretly into Gilán, first to Rasht, where they remained for a short period, estimated at anything from seven to thirty days, and then to Láhiján, the ruler of which place, Kháñi Kháñi Mírzá ‘Ali, accorded them hospitality and protection for several years. It is related that on one occasion when their Turkmán foes came to look for them he caused them to be suspended in a cage in the woods so as to enable him to swear that they had no foothold on his territory.

To the valour and devotion of Isma’íl’s disciples, the “Súfís of Láhiján,” contemporary European writers testify as forcibly as the Persian historians. “This Sophi,” says the anonymous Italian merchant, “is loved and reverenced 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. ... The name of God is forgotten throughout Persia and only that of Ismael remembered.” “The Sufiaveans fought like lions” is a phrase which repeatedly occurs in the pages of the Venetian travellers. Yet for all this, and the numbers and wide ramifications of the Order (“from the remotest West to the limits of Balkh and Bukhárá,” says the rare history of Sháh Isma’íl, speaking of the days of his grandfather Junayd), it is doubtful if their astounding successes would have been possible in the first instance but for the bitter intermecine feuds of the ruling “White Sheep” dynasty after the death of the great and wise Úzún Hasan in A.D. 1478, from which time onwards their history is a mere welter of fratricidal warfare.

Isma’íl was only thirteen years of age when he set out from the seclusion of Láhiján on his career of conquest. He was accompanied at first by only seven age devoted “Súfís,” but, as he advanced by way Tárum and Khalkhál to Ardabil, he was reinforced at every stage by brave and ardent disciples, many from Syria and Asia Minor. Ordered to leave Ardabil by the Turkmán Sultan ‘Ali Beg Chákárí, he retired for a while to Arjáwán near Astárá on the Caspian Sea, where he amused himself with fishing, of which he was very fond; but in the spring of A.D. 1500 he was back at Ardabil, having rallied round him a goodly army of the seven Turkish tribes who constituted the backbone of the

Safáwi military power. He now felt himself strong enough embark on a holy war against the Georgian “infidels” and a war of revenge against Farrukh-Ýasár, king of Shirván, whom he defeated and killed near Gulístán (906/1500). He decapitated and burned the corpse, built a tower of his enemies’ heads, destroyed the tombs of the Shirwánsháhs, and exhumed and burned the remains of the last king, Kháñl, who had killed his grandfather Shaykh Junayd. The noble dynasty thus extinguished claimed descent from the great Sásanian king Anúsharwán (Núshirwán), and numbered amongst them the patron of the famous panegyrist Kháñání.

Having captured Bákú (Bádkíya, Bádkúba) Isma’il, advised in a dream by the Imáms, decided to raise the siege of Gulístán and march on Adharbáván. Alwand and his “White Sheep” Turkmán endeavoured to arrest his advance, but were utterly defeated at the decisive battle of Shúrúr with great slaughter. Alwand fled to Arzinján, while Isma’il entered Tabríz in triumph and was there crowned King of Persia (907/1501-2). Henceforth, therefore, we shall speak of him as Sháh Isma’il, but by the Persian historians he is often entitled Kháñání-i-Iskandar-sháh (“the Prince like unto Alexander in state”), as his son and successor Sháh Íštárá is called Sháh-i-Dín-panáh (“the King who is the Refuge of Religion”).

97 The following portion of this account, taken from the rare history of Sháh Isma’il mentioned in n. 1 on p. 15 above, has been published with translation by Sir E. Denison Ross in the J.R.A.S. for 1896 (vol. xxvii), pp. 264-283.
98 P. 206 of the Hakluyt Society’s Travels of Venetians in Persia (London, 1873). See also p. 223 of the same volume, where Vincentio d’Alessandri speaks in similar terms of the devotion of his subjects to Íštárá, the son and successor of Isma’il. Most of this passage has been already quoted on p. 23 supra.

These were the Shámlú, Rúmlú, Ustájlú, Takállú, Dhu’l-Qadar, Afshár and Qájár. From the two last respectively there arose in later days Nádir Sháh and the present Royal House of Persia.
Already Sháh Isma’íl and his partisans had given ample proof of their strong Shi’a convictions. Their battle-cry on the day they slew Shirvánsháh was Alláh! Alláh! wa ‘Allá waliyyu’lláh (God! God! and ‘Ali is the Friend of God!”)\(^\text{101}\), while Alwand was offered peace if he would embrace this doctrine and pronounce this formula\(^\text{102}\). But now Sháh Isma’íl resolved that, with his assumption of the kingly rank, the Shi’a faith should become not merely the State religion but the only tolerated creed. This decision caused anxiety even to some of the Shi’a divines of Tabriz, who, on the night preceding Isma’íl’s coronation, represented to him that of the two or three hundred thousand inhabitants of that city at least two-thirds were Sunnis; that the Shi’a formula had not been publicly uttered from the pulpit since the time of the Imáms themselves; and that if the majority of the people refused to accept a Shi’a ruler, it would be difficult to deal with the situation which would then arise. To this Sháh Isma’íl replied, “I am committed to this action; God and the Immaculate Imáms are with me, and I fear 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\(^\text{103}\).” Nor did he content himself with glorifying ‘Ali and his descendants, but ordained the public cursing of the first three Caliphs of the Sunnis, Abú Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthmán, and that all who heard the cursing should respond.

“May it be more, not less!” (Bísh bád, kam ma-bád!) or suffer death in case of refusal.

Immediately after his coronation, according to the Aḥsanu’r-Tawāríkh\(^\text{104}\), he ordered all preachers (Khuṭábá) throughout his realms to introduce the distinctively Shi’a formulæ “I bear witness that ‘Ali is the Friend of God” and “hasten to the best of deeds” (hayya ila khayrí l’amal) into the profession of Faith and the call to Prayer respectively; which formulæ had been in abeyance since Tughrîl Beg the Saljuq had put to flight and slain al-Basásírî five hundred and twenty-eight years previously\(^\text{105}\). He also instituted the public cursing of Abú Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthmán in the streets and markets, as above mentioned, threatening recalcitrants with decapitation. Owing to the dearth of Shi’a theological works the religious instruction of the people necessitated by the change of doctrine presented great difficulties, but finally the Qádí Naṣrú’l-láh Zaytáni, produced from his library the first volume of the Qawá’idu’l-Islám (“Rules of Islám”) of Shaykh Jamálú’d-Dín ibn ‘Alí ibn’u-Muḥāhir al-Ḥillí\(^\text{106}\), which served as a basis of instruction “until day by day the Sun of Truth of the Doctrine of the Twelve [Imáms].”

increased its altitude, and all parts and regions of the world became illuminated by the dawning effluences of the Path of Verification.”

Of the anger and alarm aroused by these proceedings in the neighbouring kingdoms, and especially in the Ottoman Empire, we shall have to speak presently, but first we may with advantage give from the Aḥsanu’r-Tawāríkh\(^\text{107}\) the list of potentates in Persia itself at this time who claimed sovereign power: (1) Sháh Isma’íl in Ádharbáyján; (2) Sulţán Murád in most of ‘Iráq; (3) Murád Beg Báyándari in Yazd; (4) Ra’ís Muḥammad Karra (? \(\equiv\) Aharqú); (5) Husayn Kiýá-yi-Cháláwí in Samnán, Khwár and Fírúzkúh; (6) Bárik Parnák in ‘Iráq-i-‘Arab; (7) Qásim Beg ibn Jahángir Beg ibn ‘Alí Beg in Díyár Bakr; (8) Qádí Muḥāmad in conjunction with Mawlá’á Mas’úd in Káshán; (9) Sulţán Ḥusayn Mirzá (the Timúrid) in

---

\(^{101}\) Add. 200 of the Cambridge University Library, f. 35b.

\(^{102}\) Add. 200 of the Cambridge University Library, f. 40.

\(^{103}\) Íbid., f. 44b. The text of this important passage, to which reference has already been made (p. 22 supra), runs as follows:

\(^{104}\) F. 44 of Mr. A. G. Ellis’s manuscript.

\(^{105}\) See Weil’s Geschichte der Chalifen, vol. iii, pp. 92-102. Al-Basásírî was the Commander-in-chief of the troops of the Buwayhid al-Maliku’r-Rahim. He espoused the cause of the Fāṭimid Caliph al-Mustanṣir and attempted to depose the ‘Abbásid Caliph al-Qā‘ím. He was killed on Dhú’l-Qa‘da 6, 451 (Dec. 14, 1059). Since Isma’íl was crowned in 907/1501-2, we must understand “previously” as referring not to this event, but to the composition of the Aḥsanu’r-Tawāríkh, or rather this portion of it, for it extends to the year 985/1577, while the date we require is 979/1571-2 (451 + 528 = 979).

\(^{106}\) The name is defective in the ms., but most closely resembles this. Such a writer is mentioned towards the end of the fifth Majlis of the Majalisu’l-Mú minin, but he has no work bearing precisely this name. It is possible that the popular Sharáyí’u’l-Islám of another al-Hilli is intended. See Rieu’s Arabic Supplement, p. 212.

\(^{107}\) F. 45 of Mr. Ellis’s MS.
of the “Yazidi” Kurds next demanded his attention. Their leader, Shir Şarım, was defeated and captured in a bloody battle wherein several important officers of Sháh Isma’íl lost their lives. To their relatives the Kurdish prisoners were surrendered to be put to death “with torments worse than which there may not be.” War was next waged against the conjoined forces of

108 According to contemporary European accounts he was put to death in cold blood by Isma’il. See p. 62 infra.
109 Add. 200 of the Cambridge University Library, f. 55.
111 "آن صوفی، صاحب یاد کردن انتقال".
112 According to Add. 200 of the Cambridge University Library (f. 61) the body was conveyed to Iṣfahán and there blown to pieces in the maydān with gunpowder.
114 Embassy to the Court of Timour, A.D. 1403-6, published by the Hakluyt Society, 1859, pp. 149-150.
115 W. Erskine’s History of India, etc. (London, 1854), vol. ii, p. 281.
116 “All the Curds,” says the anonymous Italian merchant (p. 157), “are truer Mahometans than the other inhabitants of Persia, since the Persians have embraced the Suffavean doctrine, while the Curds would not be converted to it: and though they wear the red caftans, yet in their hearts they bear a deadly hatred to them.”
Sultán Murád, the thirteenth and last of the “White Sheep” dynasty, and ‘Alá’ú’d-Dawla Dhú’l-Qadar (the “Aliduli” of the Italian travellers of this period), who, refusing Isma’íl’s proposal that he should “set his tongue in motion with the goodly word ‘Ali is the Friend of God, and curse the enemies of the Faith” (to wit, the first three Caliphs), appealed for help to the Ottoman Turks. Sháh Isma’íl, however, was not to be denied, and successively captured Dhíyar Bakr, Akhláq, Bitlis, Arjish, and finally in 914/1508 Baghídád itself, whereby he obtained possession of the Holy Shrines of Karbalá and Najaf, so dear to Shi’a hearts, where he hastened to offer prayers and thanksgivings. At Ḥuwayza he showed that, ardent Shi’a as he was, he would not tolerate the exaggerated veneration of ‘Ali characteristic of the Ghulát, represented there by certain Arabs called Musha’shi’, who venerated ‘Ali as God, and, invoking his name, would cast themselves on sharp swords without sustaining injury, after the fashion of the modern ‘Īsáwíyya of North Africa. Their leader, Mir Sultán Muhşin, died about this time, and was succeeded by his son Sultan Fayyád, who claimed for himself divine honour. Sháh Isma’íl ruthlessly suppressed these heretics, and proceeded to Dízíf and Śúshtara, receiving the submission of the Lur chieftain Sháh Rustam, who won his favour by “the utterance of prayer and praise in the Luri tongue with extreme sweetness.” Thence Sháh Isma’íl made his way eastwards to Fárs, encamped for a while at Dárábjiyrd, and organised a great hunting expedition, of which the special object was a kind of mountain goat which yields the “animal antidote” (pádzahr-i-haywání)119. He also put to death the Qádí Muhammad-i-Káshi, who held the high ecclesiastical office of Śadr, and replaced him by the Sayyid-i-Sharíf of Āstárábád, who was descended on his mother’s side from the celebrated Jurjáni. He further erected at Qaṣr-i-Zár a mausoleum in memory of his brother Sultán Aḥmad Mírzá, who had died there, and, under the title of Najm-i-Tháni (“the Second Star”), appointed Amir Yá’r Ahmad-i-Khúzání of Īsfáhán to succeed “the First Star,” Amir Najmu’d-Din Maś’úd of Rasht, who had recently died and been buried at Najaf. The poet Ummid celebrated this appointment in a very ingenious and sonorous qasída beginning:
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From Fárs Sháh Isma’íl marched into Shírwán (where Shaykh Sháh, the son of Farrukh-Yásár, had re-established himself), recovered the body of his father Shaykh Ḥaydar and conveyed it to Ardabíl for burial, as already related, and took Darbád.

So far Sháh Isma’íl had been chiefly occupied in putting down minor princes and pretenders and in consolidating his power in Persia, of which he had to the West and North-West greatly enlarged the territories, and had almost restored the ancient frontiers of Sásánían times. Hitherto he had hardly come into conflict with the two powerful enemies who were destined to give so much trouble to himself and his successors, to wit the Uzbekhs of Central Asia and the Ottoman Turks. Of his relations with these formidable rivals we must now speak, but, before doing so, a few more words may be said of Sháh Isma’íl’s character and appearance. As usual, a much more vivid picture of these is given by contemporary travellers than by his own countrymen, though his courage, energy, cruelty and restless activity are sufficiently apparent in the Persian chronicles of his reign. At the age of thirteen, when he began his career of conquest, he was, according to Caterino Zeno120, “of noble presence and a truly royal bearing, as in his eyes there was something, I know not what, so great and commanding, so sonorous and such a characteristic of the modern White Sheep of North Africa. Their leader, Mir Sultán Muhşin, died about this time, and was succeeded by his son Sultan Fayyád, who claimed for himself divine honour. Sháh Isma’íl ruthlessly suppressed these heretics, and proceeded to Dízíf and Śúshtara, receiving the submission of the Lur chieftain Sháh Rustam, who won his favour by “the utterance of prayer and praise in the Luri tongue with extreme sweetness.” Thence Sháh Isma’íl made his way eastwards to Fárs, encamped for a while at Dárábjiyrd, and organised a great hunting expedition, of which the special object was a kind of mountain goat which yields the “animal antidote” (pádzahr-i-haywání)119. He also put to death the Qádí Muhammad-i-Káshi, who held the high ecclesiastical office of Śadr, and replaced him by the Sayyid-i-Sharíf of Āstárábád, who was descended on his mother’s side from the celebrated Jurjáni. He further erected at Qaṣr-i-Zár a mausoleum in memory of his brother Sultán Aḥmad Mírzá, who had died there, and, under the title of Najm-i-Tháni (“the Second Star”), appointed Amir Yá’r Ahmad-i-Khúzání of Īsfáhán to succeed “the First Star,” Amir Najmu’d-Din Maś’úd of Rasht, who had recently died and been buried at Najaf. The poet Ummid celebrated this appointment in a very ingenious and sonorous qasída beginning:
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From Fárs Sháh Isma’íl marched into Shírwán (where Shaykh Sháh, the son of Farrukh-Yásár, had re-established himself), recovered the body of his father Shaykh Ḥaydar and conveyed it to Ardabíl for burial, as already related, and took Darbád.

So far Sháh Isma’íl had been chiefly occupied in putting down minor princes and pretenders and in consolidating his power in Persia, of which he had to the West and North-West greatly enlarged the territories, and had almost restored the ancient frontiers of Sásánían times. Hitherto he had hardly come into conflict with the two powerful enemies who were destined to give so much trouble to himself and his successors, to wit the Uzbekhs of Central Asia and the Ottoman Turks. Of his relations with these formidable rivals we must now speak, but, before doing so, a few more words may be said of Sháh Isma’íl’s character and appearance. As usual, a much more vivid picture of these is given by contemporary travellers than by his own countrymen, though his courage, energy, cruelty and restless activity are sufficiently apparent in the Persian chronicles of his reign. At the age of thirteen, when he began his career of conquest, he was, according to Caterino Zeno120, “of noble presence and a truly royal bearing, as in his eyes there was something, I know not what, so great and commanding, which plainly showed that he would yet some day become a great ruler. Nor did the virtues of his mind disaccord with the beauty of his person, as he had an elevated genius, and such a lofty idea of things as seemed incredible at such a tender age. … He had vigour of mind, quickness of perception, and a personal valour … never yet … equalled by any of his contemporaries.” Angio-
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lello121 speaks of “his beauty and pleasing manners” when he was a child, and relates how, in his campaign against ‘Alá’ú’d-Dawla (“Alidoli”), “he supplied himself with provisions, paying for everything, and proclaiming abroad that

117 They are thus enumerated in the Ahsanu’l-Tawârikh (f. 109 of Mr. Ellis’s MS.); (1) Qará ‘Uthmán; (2) ‘Ali Beg; (3) Sultán Ḥamza; (4) Jāhángír Mírzá (these four ruled over Dhíyar Bakr only); (5) Úzún Hasan; (6) Khalíf; (7) Ya’qúb; (8) Báysunghur; (9) Rustam; (10) Ahmad Beg; (11) Muhammad Mírzá; (12) Alwand Mírzá; (13) Sultán Murád.


119 In this hunting expedition 56,700 head of game are said to have been killed.

120 Narrative of Italian Travels in Persia (Hakluyt Society, London, 1873), pp. 46-8. See p. 22 supra, where part of this passage has been already cited.

121 Narrative of Italian Travels in Persia, p. 102 and p. 22 supra.

122 Ibid., pp. 109 and 196, and p. 23 supra.
everyone might bring supplies to the camp for sale, and that anyone taking anything without paying for it would be put to death.” “This Sophi,” he says a little further on, “is fair, handsome, and very pleasing; not very tall, but of a light and well-framed figure; rather stout than slight, with broad shoulders. His hair is reddish; he only wears moustachios, and uses his left hand instead of his right. He is as brave as a game-cock, and stronger than any of his lords; in the archery contests, out of the ten apples that are knocked down, he knocks down seven; while he is at his sport they play on various instruments and sing his praises.” “He is almost worshipped,” he remarks in another place, “more especially by his soldiers, many of whom fight without armour, being willing to die for their master. While I was in Tauris [Tabriz] I heard that the king is displeased with this adoration, and being called God!” The anonymous merchant describes him at the age of thirty-one as “Very handsome, of a magnificent countenance, and about middle height; he is fair, stout, and with broad shoulders, his beard is shaved and he only wears a moustache, not appearing to be a very heavy man. He is as amiable as a girl, left-handed by nature, as is lively as a fawn, and stronger than any of his lords. In the archery trials at the apple he is so expert that of every ten he hits six.” The same writer, on the other hand, after describing his massacre of Alwand’s soldiers, of the male and female kinsmen of Sultan Ya’qub, of three

hundred courtezans of Tabriz, of “eight hundred h according Blasi who had been brought up under Alumut [i.e. Alwand], of “all the dogs in Taurus,” and of his own mother [or step-mother], concludes, “From the time of Nero to the present, I doubt whether so bloodthirsty a tyrant has ever existed.” He presented, in short, the strangest blend of antithetical qualities; and we are alternately struck by his personal charm, his unquestionable valour, generosity and — within certain limits — justice, and repelled by actions, such as those recorded above, revealing a savagery remarkable even in that cruel and bloodthirsty age. His courage was shown not only on the field of battle but in the chase. Hearing after his conquest and occupation of Tabrīz of a singularly fierce man-eating lion which had its lair in a thicket and terrified the inhabitants of the neighbourhood, he insisted, in spite of all remonstrances, in destroying it single-handed with the bow he knew so well how to use. At the age of thirteen he had already slain a fierce bear in like manner in a cave near Arzinjan. When “immense treasures” fell into his hands on the capture of one of the Caspian ports, “he divided them amongst his men, keeping nothing for himself.” Yet the same traveller who reports this instance of generosity and political foresight (for in consequence of it “he was joined by numbers, even those who were not Sufis flocking to his standard in hopes of receiving gifts of this nature from the valiant Ismael”) describes how the Shāh with his own hand cut off the head of the unfortunate young prince “Alumut,” captured by treachery, whom he himself had seen bound in chains in a tent; and tells of even darker deeds wrought at Tabriz on the occasion of the Shāh’s

second entry into that city in A.D. 1520. Towards the Sunnis he showed himself ruthless, sparing neither eminent divines like the learned Farīdū-Dīn Ahmad, a grandson of the celebrated scholar Sa’du-Dīn-i-Taftāzānī, who for thirty years had held the office of Shaykhul-Islām in Herāt, nor witty poets like Bannā’i, who perished in the massacre of Qarshi in 918/1512. But perhaps the most conspicuous instance of a ferocity which pursued his foes even after their death was his treatment of the body of his old enemy Muḥammad Khān Shaybānī, or Shaybak, the Uzbek, of which we shall have to speak very shortly.

It has already been stated that the foreign relations of Shāh Isma’īl, after he had cleared Persia of the “White Sheep” and other rivals for the sceptre of that ancient kingdom, were chiefly with three Powers, the Timūrids, who still kept a precarious hold on Herāt and portions of Khurasān and Central Asia; the formidable Uzbeks of Transoxiana; and the Ottoman Turks. With the last two, rigid Sunnis in both cases, the relations of Persia were, and continued to be, uniformly hostile; with the Timūrids, themselves menaced by the Uzbeks, comparatively friendly and at times very cordial. The aged Sultān Hūsayn ibn Bayqarā, whose brilliant and luxurious court at Herāt was so famous a centre of literature and art, is reckoned amongst the rulers who, with less success than Shāh Isma’īl, endeavoured to replace the Sunni by the Shi’a doctrine in their dominions, and Bābur, whether

——-

123 Ibid. p. 111. See pp. 22-3 supra.
124 Ibid., p. 115.
125 Ibid., p. 202. Part of this passage has been already quoted on p. 23 supra.
126 I am at a loss to explain this word.
127 Ahsanu’t-Tawārikh (Ellis ms.), f. 74b.
128 Ibid., f. 26.
129 Travels of a Merchant, p. 188.
130 Ibid., pp. 197-8. The Habību’l-Siyar and other Persian histories, however, represent Alwand as dying a natural death. Cf. p. 55 supra.
131 Travels of a Merchant, p. 207.
132 He was put to death in Ramadān, 916/December, 1510.
133 See Dr. F. R. Martin’s Miniature Paintings and Painters of Persia etc., pp. 35-6.
from conviction or policy, showed enough partiality towards the Shi‘a faction to cause grave disaffection amongst his Central Asian Sunni subjects. There existed, then, in this case no such essential cause of enmity as in the two others, while a common hatred of Shaybání Khán and his redoubtable Uzbeks naturally tended to unite Bâbur to Isma‘il.

It is beyond the scope of this work to enter into a detailed account of the decline of the Timúrid and the rise of the Uzbek power, of which ample particulars may be found in Erskine’s and other works. Suffice it to say that Shaybání or Shaybak Khán, a direct descendant of Chingiz Khán, first became prominent about A.D. 1500, when he captured Samarqand and Bukhára, and later Táshkand and Farghána. He invaded Khurásán in 911/1505–6, in the year of Sultán Husayn’s death, and in the course of the next year or two practically exterminated the Timúrids, with the exception of Bâbur and Bâdi‘u’z-Zamáń, of whom the latter sought refuge with Sháh Isma‘il. It was not until 916/1510–11, however, that he came into direct conflict with Sháh Isma‘il, whom he had provoked by a raid on Kirmán in the previous year and a most insulting letter in reply to Isma‘il’s politely-worded remonstrance. Sháh Isma‘il was not slow to respond to his taunts, and,

the rest of his realms being for the moment tranquil, at once marched into Khurásán to meet him, visiting on his way the Shrine of the Imám ‘Ali Rídá at Mashhad, so sacred in Shi‘a eyes. The decisive battle was fought on Dec. 1 or 2, 1510, at Táhir-ábád near Merv, where, after a stubborn and protracted conflict, the Uzbeks were utterly defeated and Shaybáni killed. When his body was found under a heap of slain, Sháh Isma‘il ordered the limbs to be cut off and distributed to different parts of his kingdom, and the head to be stuffed with straw and sent as a grim gift to the Ottoman Sultán Bâyazid II at Constantinople. The bones of the skull he caused to be mounted in gold and made into a drinking-cup for his own use, and one hand he sent to Aqâ Rustam Rúz-afzún, the ruler of Mázandárán, by a special messenger, Darwish Muhammad Yásá‘úl, who cast the hand on to Rustam’s skirt as he sat amidst his courtiers at Sári, crying “Thou didst say, ‘My hand on Shaybak Khán’s skirt’ (dast-i-man-ast u dámán-i-Shaybak Khán)40. Io, his hand is now on thy skirt!” So astounded were those present by this audacity that none lifted a hand to stay the messenger’s departure, and Rustam received so great a shock that he soon afterwards sickened and died. Of the drinking-cup the following grim anecdote is told. One of Shaybání’s trusted advisers, Khwája Kamálu’d-Dín Ságharchi, saved his life by professing the Shi‘a faith, and was admitted into the service of Sháh Isma‘il. One day at a banquet the latter, pointing to the drinking-cup, asked him if he recognized the skull of his late master. “Yes, glory be to God,” replied Kamálu’d-Dín; “and how favoured by fortune was

he! Nay, fortune still abides with him, so that even now he rests in the hands of so auspicious a being as thyself, who continually drinks the Wine of Delight!”

Shaybání Khán was sixty-one years of age at the time of his death and had reigned eleven years. He was, as already stated, a fanatical Sunni and had grievously persecuted the Shi‘a in his dominions: now it was the Sunnis who suffered in their turn at the hands of Sháh Isma‘il. The Uzbek power, in spite of this disaster, was far from being broken, and, though a formal peace was concluded between them and the Persians a few months afterwards, they had an ample revenge at the battle of Ghujduwán, where Bâbur and his Persian allies suffered a disastrous defeat and many of their leaders, including Najm-i-Thání, were slain in November, 1512. During the whole of the sixteenth century they were a constant menace to Persia, and accounts of their raids into Khurásán occur with monotonous iteration in the pages of the Persian historians of this period.

---

136 For example, the History of the Moghuls of Central Asia etc., by N. Elias and Sir E. Denison Ross (London, 1898), and, of course, the incomparable Memoirs of Bâbur, in the tasteful new edition of Erskine and Leyden’s translation annotated and revised by Sir Lucas King (Oxford, 1921).
138 See Erskine’s History of India, vol. i, pp. 297 et seqq. The text of this long letter is given in the Ahsanu ‘t-Tawârîkh (Ellis MS., ff. 80h et seqq.).
139 According to the history of Sháh Isma‘il contained in Add. 200 of the Cambridge University Library (f. 141), Prince (afterwards Sultán) Salím was greatly offended at this, and had a violent quarrel with his father Bâyazid on the subject.
140 I.e. “I seek protection from him.”
We must now turn to the far more important relations of Persia with the Ottoman Turks at this period, on which more light is thrown by the State Papers so industriously compiled and edited by Firidun Bey in 982/1574 under the title of *Munsha’át-i-Salátín* ("Correspondence of the Kings") than by most of the Persian or Turkish historians. These letters, which passed between successive Ottoman Sültáns and neighbouring rulers, as well as between them and their sons, ministers and governors, are sometimes in Turkish and sometimes in Persian or Arabic. Unfortunately many of them are undated. They have hitherto been so little used that no apology is needed for summarizing the contents or indicating the purport of such of them as concern the Şafawís down to the death of Sháh Isma’il in 930/1523-4, that is, during the reigns of the Ottoman Sültáns Báyazíd II (886-918/1481-1512), Salím I (918-926/1512-1520), and the first four years of Sulaymán the Magnificent (926-930/1520-1524).

(1) *From Ya’qúb Pádisháh of the “White Sheep” dynasty to Sultán Báyazíd, announcing the defeat and death of Shaykh Haydar (Sháh Isma’il’s father)*, (p. 309). This letter, in Persian, is undated, but must have been written soon after Shaykh Haydar, who is called the "President of the people of error" (Sar-i-halga-i-arbáb-i-daláл), was killed on June 30, 1488. The writer assumes that the news of the destruction of “these misguided rebels, enemies of the Prophetic Dispensation and foes of Church and State” will be welcome to all good Muslims.

(2) *Sultán Báyazíd’s answer to the above, also in Persian and undated* (p. 311). Congratulations are offered to Ya’qúb on the victory of “the Báyandi” hosts of salvation” over the “misguided Haydari faction” (gurúh-i-dállá-i-Haydáriyya).

(3) *From Sháh Isma’il to Sultán Báyazíd II, requesting that his disciples in Asia Minor may not be prevented from visiting him at Ardabil* (p. 345). This letter, undated and in Persian, is important as proving how numerous were the partisans of the Şafawís in the Ottoman dominions.

(4) *Sultán Báyazíd’s answer to the above, also in Persian and undated* (pp. 345-6). The Ottoman Sultán says that, having investigated the matter, he finds that the motive of many of these pilgrims is not the desire to fulfil a pious duty, but to escape from the obligation of military service.

(5) *From Sháh Isma’il to Sultán Báyazíd on the same subject, also in Persian and undated* (pp. 346-7). He explains that he has been compelled to enter Ottoman territory to chastise his foes, but intends thereby no unfriendly or disrespectful act towards Báyazíd, and has strictly enjoined his soldiers to respect the persons and property of the inhabitants.

(6) *Sultán Báyazíd’s answer to the above, also in Persian and undated* (p. 347). Báyazíd accepts Isma’il’s assurances, and has ordered his officials to co-operate with him in a friendly spirit.

(7) *From Alwand, the Áq-Qoyúnlu ruler of Persia, to Sultán Báyazíd, in Persian, except the Arabic prologue, and undated* (pp. 351-2). Alwand announces the arrival of Báyazíd’s envoy Mahmúd Áq Cháwúsh-báshi with his master’s letter, urging the Báyandi or Áq-Qoyúnlu family to unite against their common enemy, the “rascally Red-heads” (Awbáš-i-Qızíl-bášh). Alwand promises to do his best, whether his relations help him or not, provided he can count on material and moral support from Báyazíd.

(8) *Báyazíd’s answer to the above, also in Persian and undated* (pp. 352-3). He commends Alwand’s resolve, and promises help against the “rebellious horde of the Qızíl-báshes” (ta’fí-i-bághíyā-i-Qızíl-báshíyya).

(9) *From Báyazíd to Hájji Rustam Beg the Kurd, in Persian, dated Rabí’i, 908/September 1502* (p. 353). He asks for correct information as to the doings of the Qızíl-báshes and the result of their struggle with the Áq-Qoyúnlu or Báyandi princes, to be communicated to his envoy Kaywán Cháwúsh.

(10) *Hájji Rustam’s reply to the above, in Persian and undated* (pp. 353-4). The writer states that the “religion- rending Qızíl-báshes” (Qızíl-báš-i-Madhhab-kharážš), having defeated Alwand and Murád of the Áq-Qoyúnlu family, are now seeking an alliance with Egypt against the Ottoman Turks, and are advancing on Mar’ ash and Diyar Bakr.

(11) *From Sultán Báyazíd to Sultán Ghúrí of Egypt, in Arabic, dated 910/1504-5* (pp. 354-5). This letter contains an allusion to “the man who has appeared in the Eastern countries and defeated their ruler and overcome their peoples,” which, as appears from the answer, refers to Sháh Isma’il, or possibly Sháh-quist.

(12) *Answer to the above, in Arabic, undated* (pp. 355-6). This letter contains a reference to “the victory of the misguided Qızíl-báshi faction in the Eastern countries,” described as a “public calamity which has appeared in those regions.”

---

141 Printed at Constantinople in 1274/1858. Until lately I only possessed vol. i, which comprises 626 pp. and comes down to about 966/1558-9. For some account of this most important work, see von Hammer’s *Gesch. d Osmanisch. Reich*, iv, p. 15; Flügel’s *Vienna Catalogue*, i, pp. 282-3; *Z.D.M.G.*, vii, p. 460; Notices et extraits, v, pp. 668-688; Rieu’s *Turkish Cat.*, pp. 80-83; and Hájji Khalifa (ed. Flügel), v, p. 488.

142 Báyandi is an alternative name for the Áq-Qoyúnlu, or “White Sheep” dynasty.
These are the only letters in Sultan Bāyazid’s correspondence directly connected with the Ṣafawis, though there are others of interest to students of Persian history addressed to Sultan Abu’l-Ghazi Ḥusayn (911/1506), the poet Jāmi’143, the philosopher Jalālū’d-Dīn Dawānī, and the Shaykhul-Islām of Herāt Farīdu’d-Dīn ʿAḥmad-i-Taftāzānī (913/1507), who was put to death by Shāh Isma’il three years later for refusing to subscribe to the Shī’a doctrine. Before we consider the State Papers of Sultan Salīm’s reign, something more must be said of the beginnings of that bitter strife between Turkey and Persia which is one of the most prominent features of the whole Ṣafawi period, and has done so much to undermine the unity and weaken the power of Islam. And here we cannot do better than quote the opening paragraph of
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old Richard Knolles’s account of the formidable Shi’a revolt in Anatolia promoted by the celebrated Shāh-quli (“King’s servant”), called by the Turks Shayṭān-quli (“Devil’s servant”), the son of Ḥasan Khalīfa a disciple of Isma’il’s father Shaykh Ḥaydar.

“After so many troubles,” says Knolles, “Bajazet gave himself unto a quiet course of life, spending most part of his time in study of Philosophy and conference with learned men; unto which peaceable kind of life he was of his own natural disposition more inclined than to Wars; albeit that the regard of his State and the earnest desire of his Men of War drew him oftentimes even against his Will into the Field. As for the Civil Government of his Kingdom he referred it wholly to his three principal Bassaes, Alis, Achmetes and Jachia144, who at their pleasure disposed of all things. After that he had in this quiet and pleasing kind of life to his great contentment passed over five years, of a little neglected Spark suddenly arose such a Fire in Asia as was hardly after with much blood of his People and danger of that part of his Empire quenched; the reliques whereof yet trouble those superstitious People at this day. Which thing was brought to pass by the crafty device of Chasan Chelife and Schach Culi his Boy (whom some call Teckel Seachoculu and others Techellis)145, two Hypocritical Persians; who flying into those countries and with the counterfeit shew of feigned Holiness having procured to themselves a great name amongst those rude People, with a number of windy headed Followers (filled with the novelty of their new
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Doctrine) raised first such a diversity of opinions about the true successors of their untrue Prophet, and afterwards such a Rebellion amongst the People, as that the one yet remaineth, and the other was not in a good while after without great bloodshed appeased.”

There follows a lengthy account of this dangerous rebellion, in which the Turks suffered several severe reverses and lost many notable officers, including the Grand Vezir Khâdîm ‘Ali Pasha, ere the rebels were dispersed, killed, or driven into Persia. Instead of rewarding or comforting the fugitives, however, Shâh Isma’il put many of them to death at Tabriz, because, as Knolles says146, they had plundered a caravan of rich merchants; but, according to the most modern Turkish historian148 in order to clear himself of complicity in the eyes of Bâyazid. Knolles adds that “Techellis himself (i.e. Shâh-quli), to the terror of others, was burnt alive”; but, according to the Turkish historian, he fell at the same time as ‘Ali Pasha in the battle of Gyuk Chây, between Siwâs and Qaysâriyya, in which statement the Ahsanu ‘r-Tawârikh149 agrees. “Techellis thus put to flight,” continues Knolles, “Jounsé150 caused strait inquisition to be made through all the Cities of the lesser Asia for all such as had professed the Persian Religion; and them whom he found to have borne Arms in the late Rebellion he caused to be put to death with most exquisite tortments and the rest to be burnt in their Foreheads with an hot Iron, thereby forever to be known; whom together with the Kinsfolds and Friends of them that were executed or
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fled with Techellis he caused to be transported into Europe and to be dispersed through Macedonia, Epirus and Peleponnesus, for fear lest if Techellis, now fled into the Persian Kingdom, should from thence return with new Forces, they should also again repair unto him and raise a new Rebellion. This was the beginning, course, and ending of one of the most dangerous Rebellions that ever troubled the Turkish Empire; wherein all, or at leastwise the greatest part, of their Dominions in Asia might have been easily surprised by the Persian King, if he would thoroughly have prosecuted the occasion and opportunity then offered.” These events are placed by Knolles in A.D. 1508, but by the Ahsanu ‘r-Tawârikh in 917/1511-12, the year before Bâyazid’s death.

144 I quote the sixth edition of his *Turkish History,* with Sir Paul Rycaut’s continuation, published in London in 1687. The passage in question occurs on p. 315 of vol. i.
145 I.e. ‘Ali, ʿAḥmad and Yahlīyā Pashas.
146 These names stand for Ḥasan Khalīfa, Shāh-quli, and Takallū or Tekellū, i.e. of the Tekkê-īli.
149 Ff. 90-91 of Mr. A. G. Ellis’s ms.
150 Yûnus Pasha, Grand Vezir to Sultan Selim, executed in 923/1517.
It is curious that little or nothing is said by the Persian historians about this massacre of the Shi’a in Turkey, which von Hammer describes as one of the most dreadful deeds ever perpetrated in the name of Religion, not excepting the cruelties of the Inquisition or the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. That most of the Turkish historians ignore it is less astonishing, since it can hardly be a matter of pride for them. Knolles appears to be mistaken in placing it in the reign of Bayazid II, for there can hardly have been two such massacres, and one certainly took place in 1514 after the accession of Salim, as witnessed by Nicolo Giustiniani in an account dated October 7 of that year. The number of victims is placed by Sa’duddin, Solaq-zada and ‘Ali Abu’l-Fadl, the son of Idris of Bitlis, at 40,000. The particulars given by the last-named writer, quoted by von Hammer in the original Persian verse transliterated into the Roman character, are as follows:

Von Hammer’s translation, which can hardly be bettered, runs as follows:

"Der Sultan wohlbewandert, voll Verstand,
Schickt kund’ge Schreiber aus in jedes Land;
Aufzeichnen sollen sie nach Stamm und Stammen
Die Jünger dieses Volks mit Nahm und Nahmen.
Von sieben Jahren bis auf siebzig Jahr
Bring’ im Diwan die List’ ein jeder dar.
Es waren Vierzigtausend grad enthalten
In den Verzeichnissen von Jung und Alten,
Die Bringer dieser Listen wurden dann
Gesandt an die Statthalter mit Ferman.
Wo immer hin die Feder war gekommen,
Ward Fuss für Fuss das Schwert zur Hand genommen.
Es wurden hingerichtet in dem Land
Mehr als die Zahl, die in den Listen stand."

Turning now once more to the Munsha’át of Firidún Bey, we find the following letters belonging to the reign of Sultan Salim which bear on his relations with Persia.

(13) From Sultan Salim to ‘Ubayd Khan the Uzbek, in Persian, dated the end of Muḥarram, A.H. 920 (March 27, 1514), only five months before the Battle of Chāldirān (pp. 374-7). In this long letter, sent by the hand of a certain Muḥammad Bey, Salim denounces “that vile, impure, sinful, slanderous, reprehensible and blood-thirsty Ṣūfī-cub” (to wit Shah Isma’il), “at whose hands the people of the Eastern lands are rendered desperate” and calls upon ‘Ubayd Khan to do his part in avenging the death of his father Shaybak Khan.

(14) Answer to the above, also in Persian, dated the end of Jumāda ii, 920 (August 21, 1514), pp. 377-9. In this letter ‘Ubayd Khan describes how he has already avenged his father and slain “the lesser dog, agent and lieutenant of the greater dog (i.e. Shah Isma’il), who in his quintessential folly had conferred on him the title of Najm-i-Thání,” and promises to aid

---

151 See von Hammer, op. cit., vol. ii, p. 403 ad calc. The passage runs: “Che il Signor havea mandá a far amazzar tutti della secta di Sofi.”

152 Ibid., p. 638.

153 This victory of the Uzbeks over the allied forces of Shah Isma’il and Bābūr took place on Ramadān 17, 918 (Nov. 26, 1512). Amir Najmu’d-Din Mas’ūd (“the First Najm” or “Star”) died in 915 (1509-1510) and was succeeded in his office and title by Amir Yār Ahmad-i-İsfahānî, called Najm-i-Thání, “the Second Najm” or “Star.”
the Turkish Sultán in extirpating the “inconsiderable remnant” of the “rascally infidels and heretical ‘Red-heads’”.

(15) From Sultán Salim to Sháh Isma’íl, in Persian, dated Safar, 920 (April, 1514), pp. 379-381. This letter, written in the most arrogant and offensive tone, calls on Isma’íl to repent of his heresies and evil practices, especially the cursing of “the two Shaykhs” (Abú Bakr and ‘Umar), and threatens, should he continue obdurate, to invade and wrast from him “the lands which he has usurped by violence.”

(16) From Sultán Salim to Muhammad Beg Āq-Qoyúnlu, in Persian, dated the end of Safar, 920 (April 25, 1514), pp. 381-2, congratulating him on the sound Sunni principles of himself and his family and subjects, and inviting his co-operation against the “heretical ‘Red-heads’.”
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(17) Reply to the above, in Persian, dated the end of Rabi’i’i, 920 (June 23, 1514), p. 382. From this it appears that Salím’s letter was brought by an envoy named Ahmad Ján, who took back the answer, and that the writer was in great fear that the correspondence might be discovered.

(18) Sultán Salim’s second letter to Sháh Isma’íl, in Persian and undated, pp. 382-3. In this letter Salim lays claim to the Caliphate, accuses Sháh Isma’il and his family of heresy and immorality, and calls on him to repent and suffer Persia to be annexed to the Ottoman dominions.

(19) Sultán Salim’s third letter to Isma’íl, in Turkish, dated the end of Jumáda i, 920 (July 23, 1514) and written from Arzinján, taunting him with his apparent unwillingness to try the fortune of battle.

(20) Sháh Isma’il’s reply to Sultán Salim’s three letters, in Persian and undated (pp. 384-5). This is apparently the letter to which Creasy refers in his History of the Ottoman Turks (ed. 1877, pp. 136-7)) for the writer hints that Salim’s secretary must have written under the influence of bang or opium, and sends a gold casket filled with a special preparation of one or both of these narcotics, sealed with the Royal Seal, by the hand of his messenger Sháh-qi’l Ághá.

(21) Sultán Salim’s fourth letter to Isma’íl, in Turkish, dated the end of Jumáda ii, 920 (August 21, 1514)) again challenging him to battle.

Shortly after this last letter was written, namely early in the month of Rajab, 920 (August-September, 1514), a great battle was fought between the Turks and Persians at Cháldírán, situated some 20 parasangs from Tabríz, where 3000 of the former and 2000 of the latter were slain, but the Turkish artillery decided the day, and Sháh Isma’il, notwithstanding the valour shown by him and his devoted followers, was forced
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to give way and to fall back beyond Tabríz, which was occupied by the Turks on Rajab 16, 920 (Sept. 6, 1514). Many men of note on both sides were slain; of the Turks Hasan Pasha, Begler-begi of Rumelia, who commanded the left wing of the Ottoman army, Hasan Bey, Governor of Morea, Úways Bey of Caesarea, Ayáis Bey of Latakia, and many other high civil and military officials; of the Persians Amir Sayyid-i-Sharif of Shíráz, a protagonist of the Shi’a doctrine, Amir ‘Abdu’l-Báqi, a descendant of the noted saint Sháh Ni’matulláh of Kirmán, Sayyid Muḥammad Kamúna of Najaf, Khán Muḥammad Kháń, and many others.

Sultán Salim, greatly elated by his success, immediately despatched the usual bombastic proclamations of victory (fatḥ-náma) to his son Sulaymán, to the Khán of the Crimea, to the Kurdish chieftains, to Sultán Murád, the last of the Āq-Qoyúnlu or “White Sheep” dynasty, to Sháh Rustam of Luristán, to the Governor of Adrianople, and others. The texts of these documents are given by Firídún Bey (pp. 386-96), but they are followed (pp. 396-407) by a document of much greater historical value, namely a detailed journal of the movements of the Turkish army from the time they marched out of Adrianople on Muharram 3, 920 (March 20, 1514) until they returned to winter at Amásiya at the end of the same year (Nov.-Dec., 1514). They marched in 105 stages from Adrianople to Tabriz by way of Constantinople, Caesarea, Siwás, Arzínján, Cháldírán, Kháń and Marand; thence back to Amásiya in 58 stages, by way of Nakhuwán, Jisr-i-Jubán, and Bayburt. They erected a pyramid of the skulls of their enemies on the field of battle, handed over to Ja’far Bey one of Sháh Isma’il’s wives who fell into their hands, and massacred Khálid Bey and 150 of his Qizil-básh companions at the village of Sáhilán the day before they entered Tabriz, in which city, however, they seem to have behaved with
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moderation, as even the Persian historian of Sháh Isma’il testifies. Sultán Salim remained there only about a week (Sept. 6-14, 1514), when he departed, taking with him the Timúrid Prince Bādi’u’z-Zamán, the fugitive son of the late Sultán Abú’l-Gházi Ḫusayn ibn Bayqará, and a number of skilled artisans whom he proposed to settle in his dominions. Within two or

---

154 On the first of the month (Aug. 22, 1514) according to Firídún Bey (p. 402).
155 Add. 200 of the Cambridge University Library, f. 151.
156 He died at Constantinople four months later of the plague.
three weeks of his departure Sháh Isma’íl was back in Tabríz. According to Sir John Malcolm157, “the effect of so great a reverse upon the sanguine mind of Isma’íl was deep and lasting, and though before of a cheerful disposition he was never afterwards seen to smile.” But as a matter of fact the defeat, decisive as it was, had little permanent effect, since the discontent and nostalgia of the Janissaries compelled the Ottoman Sulṭán to withdraw from Persian territory, and, save for the extirpation of the little Dhu’l-Qadar dynasty158 at Kamákh near Arzinján in the spring of A.D. 1515, his martial ardour was fully occupied, until his death in A.D. 1520, with the subjection of Egypt, Syria and Arabia.

Sháh Isma’íl, on his return to Tabríz after the battle of Cháldírán, sent a very polite and apologetic letter159 by the hand of Núru’d-Dín ‘Abdu’l-Wahháb to Sulṭán Salim, who, apparently, vouchsafed no reply, but some months later (end of Rajab, 921 = Sept. 9, 1515) wrote in Turkish a long letter to ‘Ubayd Khán the Uzbek inciting him to persecute the Shí’á160.

The documents connected with Sulṭán Salim’s reign fill another 84 pages of Firídún Bey’s compilation161, but, with one notable exception, contain only incidental abusive references to Sháh Isma’íl. The exception is formed by two poems, one in Persian and the other in Turkish, addressed to Sulṭán Salim by an unpatriotic Persian named Khwája Iṣfahání, probably identical with Khwája Mawláná-yi-Iṣfahání, a fanatical Sunní who attached himself to the Uzbek Shaybak Khán, and whose death is recorded in the Aḥsanu ’r-Tawáríkh under the year 927/1521162.

The following verses from the Persian poem will suffice to give an idea of its character.
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...ala’i qāsād farruq-e, muntazar

Bhagat’i padshah hikmat-e, shah sad-sta’

Asas din tor dar dina nabi’i

Tow shah matran bi jā nahi’i

Sad-khāsh din er hamsa to’

Jahan dar zib bar munt-pho’

Em malak shirahat mashq-e, hame az rauzi sultan hishr-e ast

Zebad dar tuz-sal dar faris, farz dan

Ghum afandad zu sra taj qol bhor’

Gumadi talash az sra’i matn-zar

Fagh astun bihori az tesh sra’
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157 History of Persia, vol. i, p. 504. I can find no confirmation of this in the Persian histories which I have consulted.
158 According to the Aḥsanu ’r-Tawáríkh comprised only four rulers, Malik Aṣlán, Sulaymán, Nāṣiru’d-Din and ‘Alá’u’d-Dawla, of whom the last, together with four of his sons and thirty of his followers, was decapitated by Sulṭán Salim’s soldiers on June 13, 1515.
159 Firídún Bey, vol. i, pp. 413-414.
160 Ibid., pp. 415-416.
161 The last ends on p. 500.
162 From a line in his Turkish poem it appears that his home was in Khurásán and Khwárazm (Khiva), which he had been compelled to leave since “Infidelity had completely destroyed the Home of Faith, and established itself in the Seat of Religion.”
O messenger of auspicious aspect, carry my prayer to the victorious King.

Say, ‘O King of all the World, thou art today accredited in valour.

Thou didst lay the foundations of Religion in the World; thou didst restore the Holy Law of Muṣṭafá [Muḥammad].

Religion hath been renovated by thy zeal, the World lies under the burden of thy favour.

If the realm of the Holy Law is firmly established, it is all through the fortune of Sulṭán Salim

Persia and Turkey quake through fear of thee, since thou hast cast from his head the crown of the Red-cap.163

O victorious one, thou hast cast his crown from his head: now manfully cast his head from his body!

The Red-head is like the viper; until thou crushest his head it availeth nothing.

Thou art today, through thy noble qualities, the Vicar (Khalífa) of God and of Muḥammad.

Dost thou hold it right that the guebre164 and brute-heretic should revile the Companions of the Prophet?165

If thou dost not break him by the strength of thy manhood, and if thou turnest back without having cut off his head,

If he obtains amnesty in safety, I will seize thy skirt in the day of Resurrection.

Thus have I seen in the accounts of the Prophet, that Dhu'l-Qarnayn ("the Two-horned")166 was Emperor in Rome.

For this cause did he style himself Dhu'l-Qarnayn, because he added the dominion of Persia to that of Rome.167

---

163 Burk is a Turkish word denoting a kind of tall fur cap, and Qizil-burk ("Red-cap") is, of course, equivalent to Qizil-básh (Persian Surkh-sar) “Red-head.”

164 The word gabr (anglicized by Thomas Moore as “guebre”) properly denotes a Zoroastrian, but is constantly applied by writers of this period to any non-Muslim, infidel or heretic, like the corresponding gyawur ("giaour") of the Turks. See p. 95 infra.

165 This, of course, refers to the cursing of Abú Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthmán instituted by Sháh Isma’il. See pp. 53-4 supra.

166 This mysterious person is commonly (as here) identified with Alexander the Great. See Qur’án xviii, 82, 85, 93 and commentary thereon.

167 The term Rúm was applied successively to the Roman, the Byzantine and the Ottoman Empires, and by the Persian historians of this period the Ottoman Sulṭán is constantly called Qaysar-i-Rúm.
His two horns were sovereignty throughout the World; his orders ran through East and West.
Come, break the Idol by the aid of the Faith, and add the Kingdom of Persia to the Throne of Rome168:

Sultán Salim died in 926/1520, having reigned, according to the Aḥsanu’r-Tawārīkh, 8 years, 8 months and 8 days. He was succeeded by his son Sulaymán, called by his countrymen “the Law-giver” (Qānīnī) and by Europeans “the Magnificent.” The Persian poet Amini composed a poem on his accession, of which each half-verse (mīṣrā’) yields the date 926. The following verse is cited as a specimen by the Aḥsanu’r-Tawārīkh:

بیادی زمان ملت کرامانی، بکاوس عد و سامیان ثانی،

“Fortune hath given the Kingdom of Desire to the Kā’ûs of the Age, the Second Solomon.”

Three years later (in 929/1523), when Sultán Sulaymán conquered Rhodes, another Persian Poet, Niyázi, commemorated this victory in an equally ingenious qaṣīda beginning:

در اوّل جالوسی بیو سلوازی، دوم فتح آورود از آی نیازی،

where the first half-verse gives the date of Sulaymán’s accession (926/1520), and the second the date of the conquest of Rhodes169.

Sháh Isma’il died on Monday, Rajab 19, A.H. 930 (May 23, 1524) at the age of 38 after a reign of 24 years, and was buried with his fathers at Ardabil. He left four sons, Thāmāsp, born on Dhu’l-Hijja 26, A.H. 919 (Feb. 22, 1514), who succeeded him; Alqás, born in 922/1516, and Sám and Bahram, both born in the following year; besides five daughters170. In his reign the sword was more active than the pen. He not only eliminated all of his numerous rivals in Persia, but greatly enlarged her frontiers. “His kingdom,” says the Aḥsanu’r-Tawārīkh171,
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“included Ádharbájyán, Persian ‘Iráq, Khurásán, Fárs, Kirmán and Khúzistán, while Diyár Bakr, Balkh Merv were at times under his control. In the battle-field he was a lion wielding a dagger, and in the banquet-hall a cloud raining pearls. Such was his bounty that pure gold and worthless salt were alike in his sight, while by reason of his lofty spirit the produce of ocean and mine did not suffice for t

168 The term Rūm was applied successively to the Roman, the Byzantine and the Ottoman Empires, and by the Persian historians of this period the Ottoman Sultan is constantly called Qaysar-i-Rūm.
169 Aḥsanu’r-Tawārīkh (Mr. Ellis’s Ms., f. 128). The first mīṣrā’ gives the correct date (926), but the second, as written in the Ms. (with Dūrmar), gives 940. I have emended this to Dūrmar, which gives 930, though this is still one too much.
170 Khánish Khánum, Pari-Khán Khánum, Mihimbánú Sulţánúm, Firangis Khánum and Zaynab Khánum.
171 F. 131.
172 These battles were fought in 906/1500, 907/1501, 908/1503, 916/1510, and 920/1514 respectively. In all except the last Sháh Isma’il was victorious.
As regards literature, there was, as elsewhere explained, an extraordinary dearth of remarkable poets in Persia during the whole Şafawi period\textsuperscript{173}, while the great theologians belong to a later time when the Shi‘a faith, raised by Shāh Isma‘il to the position of the established national religion of Persia, had taken firm root. Most of the celebrated writers whose deaths are recorded in the Ahsanu‘r-Tawārikh and other chronicles of Isma‘il’s reign really belong to the brilliant circle who gathered round the Timúrid Sultán Abu‘l-Gházi Husayn and his talented Minister Mír ‘Alí Shír Náwá’í. Such were the poets Hátífí, nephew of the great Jámi, who died in 927/1521; Amír Husyn Mu’amá’í (d. 904/1498-9); Banná‘í, who perished in the massacre wrought by Isma‘il’s general Najm-i-Ṭáhirí\textsuperscript{174} at Qarshí in 918/1512; Hiláli, who was killed by the Úzbeks at Herát in 935/1528-9 for his alleged Shi‘a proclivities; the philosopher Jalálu‘d-Dín Dawání (d. 908/1502-3); the historian Mirkhwání (d. 903/1497-8 at the age of 66); and the versatile Húsayn Wá‘iz-i-Káshífí, commentator, ethicist and narrator, best known as the author of the Anwár-i-Suhaylí\textsuperscript{175}. The poet Qásimí celebrated the achievements of Sháh Isma‘il in a Sháh-náma, hitherto unpublished and but rarely met with even in manuscript\textsuperscript{176}, completed ten years after the death of that monarch, who appears to have been less susceptible than most Persian potentates to the flattery of courtiers and venal verse-makers\textsuperscript{177}.

\begin{center}
CHAPTER III.
CULMINATION AND DECLINE OF THE ŞAFAWÍ POWER, FROM SHÁH ŢÁHMÁSP (A.D. 1524-1576) TO SHÁH HÚSAYN (A.D. 1694-1722).
\end{center}

Ţáhmásp, the eldest of Isma‘il’s sons, was only ten years of age when he succeeded his father. He reigned over Persia for fifty-two years and a half, and died on May 14, 1576. In the contemporary chronicles he is usually denoted as Sháh-i-Dín-panáh (“the King who is the Refuge of Religion”). The date of his accession is commemorated in the following verse:

\begin{center}
\textquote{\textit{Thou didst take thy place on the throne of gold after the Victorious King!}}
\end{center}

Of the numerous records of his long reign two, on which in what follows I shall chiefly draw, are worthy of special note; his own autobiography\textsuperscript{179} from his accession on Monday, Rajab 19, 930 (May 23, 1524), to his shameful surrender of the Turkish Prince

\begin{center}
Báyázid, who had sought refuge at his court, in 969/1561-2; and the excellent Ahsanu‘r-Tawārikh of Hasan Beg Rúmlú, concluded in 985/1577-8 only a year after Ţáhmásp’s death. The autobiography, possibly suggested by Bábur’s incomparable Memoirs, is far inferior to that most instructive and amusing work, and is not greatly superior to the over-estimated Diaries of
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{173} See pp. 24-29 \textit{supra}.
\textsuperscript{174} See p. 74 \textit{ad calc}.
\textsuperscript{175} Accounts of the more notable of these writers will be found in the preceding volume of this history, \textit{Persian Literature under Tartar Domination}.
\textsuperscript{176} See Rieu’s \textit{Persian Catalogue}, pp. 660-661.
\textsuperscript{177} See p. 28 \textit{supra}.
\textsuperscript{178} \(3 + 1 + 10 + 2 + 4 + 200 + 20 + 200 + 80 + 400 + 10 = 930\) A.H. = 1523-4 A.D.
\textsuperscript{179} Printed by the late Dr. Paul Horn in vol. xlv of the Z.D.M.G. (1890), pp. 563-649; and lithographed in vol. ii of the \textit{Matla‘u’sh-Shams} of Muhammad Hasan Khán l’imád-í’s-Sáfí, pp. 165-213.
the late Náširu’d-Dín Sháh; but it throws some valuable light on the mentality of Ṭahmásp, and on those inner conditions which it is so difficult to deduce from the arid pages of the official chronicles, containing for the most part a mere record of interminable wars and massacres, and leaving us quite in the dark as to the social and intellectual state of the people. That Ṭahmásp was a bigot is indicated both by Sir John Malcolm and Erskine, though the former historian takes the more favourable view of his character, describing him as “of a kind and generous disposition,” and adding that he “appears to have possessed prudence and spirit, and, if he was not distinguished by great qualities, he was free from any remarkable vices.” Anthony Jenkinson, who carried a letter of recommendation from Queen Elizabeth, had a not very gratifying audience with him at Qazwin in November, 1562. The Venetian Ambassador Vincentio d’Alessandri, who was accredited to his Court in 1571, describes him, “in the sixty-fourth year of his age, and the fifty-first of his reign,” as “of middling stature, well formed in person and features, although dark, of thick lips and a grizzly beard,” and says that he was “more of a melancholy disposition than anything else, which is also known by many signs, but principally by his not having come out of his palace for the space of twelve years, nor having once gone to the chase nor any other kind of amusement, to the great dissatisfaction of his people.” He further describes him as boastful, but unwarlike and “a man of very little courage”; as caring little for law and justice, but much for women and money; as mean and avaricious, “buying and selling with the cunning of a small merchant.” “Notwithstanding the things mentioned above,” he concludes, “which make one think he ought to be hated, the reverence and love of the people for the King are incredible, as they worship him not as a king but as a god, on account of his descent from the line of ‘Alí, the great object of their veneration,” and he cites the most extraordinary instances of this devotion and even defication, which is not confined to the common people but extends to members of the Royal Family and courtiers, and to the inhabitants of the remotest parts of his realms. One magnanimous act of the king’s reign, which led to a great alleviation of the burden of taxation imposed on his people, the Venetian Ambassador ascribes to the influence of a dream, “in which the Angels took him by the throat and asked him whether it was becoming to a king, surnamed the Just and descended from ‘Alí, to get such immense profits by the ruin of so many poor people; and then ordered him to free the people from them.” This story is likely enough, for Ṭahmásp in his Memoirs records numerous dreams to which he evidently attached great importance. Thus in a dream ‘Alí promises him victory over the Uzbeks about A.D. 1528, and a year or two later at Herát advises him as to another campaign, whereon he remarks, “the belief of this weak servant Ṭahmásp as-Šafawi al-Músawi al-Ḥusayní is that whoever sees His Holiness the Commander of the Faithful (i.e. ‘Alí), on whom be the blessings of God, in a dream, that which he says will come to pass.” Again in his twentieth year two consecutive dreams, in the second of which he sought and obtained from the Imám ‘Alí Riḍá confirmation of the first, led him to repent of wine-drinking and other excesses, and to close all the taverns and houses of ill-repute in his domains, on which occasion he composed the following quatrain:

```
یکچند بین امری سره شدمی؛ یکچند بیافوی ترآلوه شدمی؛
شسته داپآ توه آسومه شدمی:

هون یک بود، یک بود، یک بود.
```

“For a while we pursued the crushed emerald; For a while we were defiled by the liquid ruby; Defilement it was, under whatever colour: We washed in the Water of Repentance, and were at peace.”

This “repentance” or conversion of Sháh Ṭahmásp is recorded in the Ahsanu’t-Tawárikh under the year 939/1532-3.

181 A History of India under ... Baber and Humáyún (London, 1854), vol. ii, pp. 285 etc.
182 For the text of this curious letter, see the Hakluyt Society’s Early Voyages and Travels to Russia and Persia (No. lxxii, London. 1886), pp. 112-114.
183 Ibid., pp. 144-147.
184 Travels of Venetians in Persia (Hakluyt Society, 1873), pp. 215 et seqq.
185 P. 584 of Horn’s Denkwürdigkeiten cited above p. 84, n. 2.
186 Horn, loc. cit., p. 592.
187 These three epithets refer to his ancestors Shákhý Saḥfíyyu’d-Dín, the Imám Músá al-Kázim and the Imám Ḥusayn.
188 Horn, loc. cit., p. 600, also cited in the Atash-kada (Bombay lith., 1277/1860-1, p. 17).
189 I.e. Bang or Hashísh (Cannabis Indica), as explicitly stated in the Atash-kada.
190 I.e. wine.
About the same time the army of the Ottoman Sultán Sulaymán, profiting as usual by Persia’s preoccupation with one of the constantly recurring Uzbek invasions of her north-eastern province, marched into Adharbáiyán, where it was overtaken by a premature but violent snow-storm (it was in the month of October), in which numbers of the Turkish troops perished. This disaster to the arms of his hereditary foe Sháh Ṭáhmásp ascribes to “the help of God and the aid of the Immaculate Imáms.” It has been commemorated in the following forcible quatrain, given in the Aḥsanu’r-Tawárikh and the Ta’rikh-i-ʿĀlam-ārā-yi-ʿAbbási:

I went to Sultániyya, that rare pasture-ground:
I saw two thousand dead without grave or shroud.
‘Who,’ said I, ‘killed all these Ottomans?’
The morning breeze arose from the midst saying ‘I!’”

Other dreams are meticulously recorded by Sháh Ṭáhmásp in his Memoirs: at Ardábíl he sees and converses with the vision of his ancestor Shaykh Šafiyyu’d-Dín; on another occasion he receives encouragement from the spirit of Shaykh Shihábu’d-Dín, and other allegorical dreams are recorded under the years 957/1550 and 961/1554.

In his domestic relations Sháh Ṭáhmásp was unhappy, though not perhaps more so than most contemporary Asiatic sovereigns, notably the Ottoman Sultáns. He had three younger brothers, Sám (notable as a poet and biographer of poets), Bahrám and

Alqáš, of whom the first and third rebelled against him. Sám Mírzá was cast into prison in 969/1561-2 and was ultimately put to death there in 984/1576-7 by Ṭáhmásp’s successor. The case of Alqáš was much worse, for he was a traitor as well as a rebel, and not only took refuge with Sultán Sulaymán at Constantinople, but incited him to attack Persia and took an active part in the ensuing war against his own country. At Hamadáín, in 955/1548, he plundered the house of his sister in-law, the wife of Bahrám Mírzá, and later advanced as far as Yazdikhwáíst, where he made a massacre of the inhabitants, but in the following year he was defeated and fell into the hands of his brother Bahrám, who handed him over to Ṭáhmásp. The King imprisoned him in the Castle of Alamút, according to his own Memoirs, or, according to the Aḥsanu’r-Tawárikh, in the Castle of Qahqaha, where he perished a week later. “In short,” says Ṭáhmásp in recording the event, “after some days I saw that he did not feel safe from me, but was constantly preoccupied, so I despatched him to a fortress with Ibráhím Kháán and Hasan Beg the centurion, who took him to the Castle of Alamút and there imprisoned him. After six days, those who had custody of him being off their guard, two or three persons there, in order to avenge their father whom Alqáš had killed, cast him down from the castle. After his death the land had peace.” It can scarcely be doubted that Ṭáhmásp approved, if he did not actually arrange, this deed of violence. Bahrám Mírzá died the same year at the age of 33.

Much worse was the case of the unfortunate Prince Báyázíd, son of the Ottoman Sultán Sulaymán, who, deprived of his government of Kútáhiyya and driven from his native land by the intrigues of his father’s Russian wife Khurram (whose
October 30, 1562, and Ṭahmásp, moved partly by fear of the Turkish power, partly by bribes, disregarded his solemn promises to the contrary and caused or suffered the unfortunate Prince and his four little sons to be put to death, and, as Anthony Jenkinson says, “sent his head for a present, not a little desired, and acceptable to the unnatural father.” Ṭahmásp seems to have overcome any scruples he may have felt in breaking his solemn promises to the guest he thus betrayed by handing him over not directly to his father, but to the emissaries of his brother Salim. The case is bad enough even as stated by the Sháh himself in his Memoirs, which conclude with a pretty full account of this episode199, ending thus:

“At this date ‘Alí Aqá came from his Majesty the Sultán200, and of [my] Nobles and Court everyone who had sent a present received its equivalent, save in the case of my own gift and offering, which on this occasion also had not proved acceptable; and there was a letter full of hints and complaints. I said, ‘Here have I arrested and detained Prince Bâyazid with his four sons for the sake of His Majesty the Sultán and Prince Salim; but since I have given my word not to surrender Bâyazid to the Sultán, I have determined that when the Sultán’s commands arrive and likewise the emissaries of Prince Salim, I will surrender [Bâyazid] to the latter, so that I may not break my promise.’ So when the Sultán’s messengers arrived, I said, ‘Your Excellency and Hasan Aqá are welcome, and I will act according to the commands of His Majesty and in no wise transgress his orders, but faithfully accomplish whatever service he may indicate. But in return for so material a service I desire from His Majesty the Sultán and Prince Salim such reward and recompense as may be worthy of them; and, moreover, I hope of the Sultán in a friendly way that no hurt may befall Prince Bâyazid and his sons’.”

Needless to say this pious wish in no wise influenced the tragic course of events, but the Sháh’s compliance with the Sultán’s impertinent demands led to a temporary amelioration of the relations between Persia and Turkey which is reflected both in Anthony Jenkinson’s narrative and in the concluding State Papers contained in the first volume of Firídún Bey’s Munsha’át, in which for the first time Ṭahmásp is addressed by Sulaymán with decent civility, though there is no explicit reference to this event.

More creditable and better known is the reception of Humáyûn, the son of Bâbur and Emperor of Dihlî, at the Court of Ṭahmásp in A.D. 1544 when he was driven out of his own dominions. Of the hospitality which he received Sir John Malcolm201 speaks with enthusiasm; but Erskine202, giving less weight to the official accounts than to the “plain unvarnished tale” of Humáyûn’s servant Jawhar203, takes the view (which he

supports by numerous illustrations) that in reality “Humáyûn had much to suffer and many humiliations to endure”; and that in particular great pressure was brought to bear on him to compel him to adopt the Shí’a faith, which might have gone even further but for the moderating influence of the Sháh’s sister Sultánun Khánûm, the Minister Qâdî-i-Jahân and the physician Nîru’d-Dîn. One of the pictures in the celebrated palace of Chahîl Sûtûn204 at Isfahán represents an entertainment given by Ṭahmásp to Humáyûn.

The foreign relations of Persia during the reign of Ṭahmásp were chiefly, as in the reign of his father Isma’il, with three states — Turkey, the Uzbeks of Transoxiana, and the so-called “Great Moghuls” of Dihli. During the greater part of his reign (until 974/1566-7) the great Sultán Sulaymán occupied the Ottoman throne; afterwards Salim II (“the Sot”), and, for the last two years of his life (982-4/1574-6) Murâd III. Of the Uzbeks rulers ‘Ubâyd Khán, until his death in 946/1539-40, and afterwards Dîn Muḥammad Sultán were his most formidable foes, who ceased not to trouble his eastern, as did the Ottoman Turks his western borders. Of the “Great Moghuls” Bâbur (died 937/1530-1), Humáyûn (died 962/1555) and Akbar were his contemporaries. Anthony Jenkinson, as we have seen, came to him with credentials from Queen Elizabeth in A.D. 1561, and some thirteen years later, towards the end of his reign, the arrival of a Portuguese mission from Don Sebastian is recorded in the Ahsanû’î-Tawârîkh under the year 982/1574-5, but it met with a bad reception.

Between the Ottoman Turks on the one hand and the Uzbeks on the other, Persia enjoyed little peace at this period, and these campaigns on the N.E. and N.W. frontiers
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200 Here, as elsewhere, called Khwândgâr, apparently a corruption of Khudáwandgâr (“the Lord”), itself in turn corrupted by the Turks into Khûnkâr (“the Shedder of Blood”).
202 History of India under ... Baber and Humáyûn (London, 1854), vol. ii, pp. 280 et seqq.
203 Translated by Major Charles Stewart and printed in London in 1832 for the Oriental Translation Fund.
succeeded one another with varying fortune but with monotonous reiteration. Sulṭán Sulyāmán’s chief campaigns were in 940-942/1534-6, when Baghdād was taken from the Persians and Ādharbāyjān invaded205; 950/1543-4; 953-955/1546-8, when the Shāh’s brother Aḥqās allied himself with the Turks; 959/1552, when the Persians recovered Arjīsh; and 961/1554, when Sulyāmān burned Nakhwūn and attacked Ādharbāyjān for the fourth time. The Turkish military power was at this time at its zenith, and was formidable not only to the Persians but to the great European Powers, who, indeed, were thankful for such diversion of its activities as the Persians from time to time effected, so that Busbeq, Ferdinand’s ambassador at the Court of Sulyāmān, declares that “only the Persian stood between us and ruin”206. Creasy207 speaks of the “pre-eminence of the Turks of that age in the numerical force and efficiency of their artillery”; and adds that “the same remark applies to their skill in fortification, and in all the branches of military engineering.” Inferior as were the Persian to the Ottoman troops alike in discipline and equipment, it was much to their credit that they were able to offer as stout a resistance as they did, especially as the continual object of Turkish diplomacy at this time was to incite the Uzbeks, Turkmans, and other Sunni peoples, to combine with them in attacking “the rascally Red-heads” (Qizil-bāsh-i-Awbāsh). Of this policy the State Papers of Sulyāmān’s, as of his father Salīm’s, reign afford ample evidence; for instance the letter addressed to a Turkmān chief about the end of 960/1553 (given on pp. 612-613 of Firidūn Bey’s Munsha’āt) and transmitted to him, apparently, by four of his representatives, Muḥammad, Mir Aḥū Turāṭ, Mir Ṭūṭi and Sundūk, who, after performing the Pilgrimage, had visited the Sultān’s Court at Constantinople on their homeward journey, and had delighted him with accounts of their achievements against the Persians.

The wars with the Uzbeks were equally continuous, especially until the death of the redoubtable ‘Ubayd Khān, the son of Shaybāk Khān, a direct descendant of Chingiz, in 946/1539-40, at the age of fifty-three, after a reign of thirty years. He is said by the Ahbāsan-i-Tawārīkh to have suffered defeat in only one of the seven campaigns he fought against the Persians. Ťūs, Mashhad, and especially Herāt suffered terribly during these wars, which were nearly always accompanied by severe religious persecutions. The poet Hīlālī fell a victim to the Sunni fanaticism of the Uzbeks at Herāt in 935/1528-9, as the poet Bannā’ī had fallen a victim to Shī‘a intolerance at Qarshī in 918/1512-13; and under the year 942/1535-6 the Ahbāsan-i-Tawārīkh gives the following graphic account of the persecution of the Shi‘a which took place on the capture of Herāt by ‘Ubayd Khān on Rajab 20, 942 (January 14, 1536):
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“Every day by order of that unbelieving Khān (‘Ubayd) five or six individuals were slain for Shi‘a proclivities on the information of ignors persons in the market-place208 of Herāt. Godless villagers and treacherous townsmen would seize anyone against whom they cherished a grudge and drag him before the judge, asserting that in the time of the ‘Red-heads’ (i.e. the Shi‘a Persians) he used to curse Abū Bakr and ‘Uthmān’209; and on the word of these two ignorant witnesses the judge would pronounce sentence of death on the victim, whom they would then drag to the market-place of Herāt and put to death. Through their sinister acts the waves of sorrow and the hosts of mischief attained their culmination, while plunder and looting took place throughout the confines of Khurāsān.”

205 A complete diary of this campaign against the “arch-heretic Qizil-bāsh King Ṭahmāsp” will be found in vol. i of Firidūn Bey’s Munsha’āt, pp. 584-598. The Ottoman army left Constantinople on June 10, 1534, occupied Baghdād in December of the same year, and returned to Constantinople on Jan. 7, 1536.
206 See p. 11 supra.
208 Chahr-siag from which is derived the modern Turkish chárshi is the point of intersection of two main bázárs; a sort of Oriental Oxford Circus, affording the greatest publicity.
209 The omission of ‘Umar, unless due to a scribe’s error, is remarkable.
With the Georgians also the Persians were constantly at war during this period, to wit in 947/1540-1, 950/1543-4, 958/1551, 961/1554, 963/1556, 968/1560-1, and 976/1568-9. These wars were also waged with great ferocity, and it is worth noting that contemporary Persian historians constantly speak of the Christian inhabitants of Georgia as “guebres” (gabrán, a term properly applicable only to the Zoroastrians), as in the following verse describing the first of these campaigns:

In that stony wilderness those beasts had established themselves, the native land of man-stealing guebres.”

In this campaign, as the Ahsanu’t-Tawáríkh informs us, such of the Georgians as consented to embrace Islám were spared, but those who refused were put to the sword; and similarly, in speaking of the campaign of 958/1551 the same history says:

“The victorious champions encompassed the lands of the sinful unbelievers, lowlands and highlands, and every mountain and ridge whither that misguided one [their ruler] had fled was levelled with the plain by the trampling of the [Persian] warriors. Not one who drew breath of those polytheists saved his soul alive from the circle of wrath and vengeance of ‘and God encompasseth the unbelievers;’ and, by lawful heritage, the wives, families and property of the slain passed to their slayers.”

Besides these greater wars, there were minor operations against the more or less independent rulers of Gilán, and the last representatives of the ancient but expiring dynasty of the Shírívansháhs, who boasted descent from the great Núshirván. Although the last of this line, Sháhrukh ibn Sultán Farrúkh ibn Shaykh-Sháh ibn Farrúkh-Yásá, was put to death by Tahmásp in 946/1539-40, nine years later we read of a scion of the house named Burhán in conflict with Isma’il Mirzá. In Gilán, Khán Ahmad, the eleventh ruler of a petty dynasty which had ruled for two hundred and five years, was defeated and interned in the Castle of Qahqaha in 975/1567-8. In 981/1573-4 Tabrız was terrorized by a gang of roughs who were not reduced to order and obedience until a hundred and fifty of them had been put to death. Barbarous punishments were frequent. Muzaffar Sultán, governor of Rasht, was for an act of treason perished through the streets of Tabrız, decor-

ated for the occasion, amidst the mockery of the rabble, and burned to death in an iron cage, suspended under which in a particularly cruel and humiliating fashion Amir Sa’du’d-Dín ‘Ináyatu’l-láh Khúzání simultaneously suffered the same fate. Khwája Kalán Gúríyáni, a fanatical Sunní who had gone out to welcome ‘Ubayd Kháñ the Uzbek and was accused of speaking slightly against the Sháh, was skinned in the market-place of Herát and the stuffed skin exhibited on a pole. Ruknú’d-Dín Mas’úd of Kázárún, a most learned man and skilful physician, incurred the Sháh’s displeasure and was burned to death. Muḥammad Sálíh, a liberal patron of poets, in whose honour Hayratí composed a panegyric, had his mouth sewn up because he was alleged to have spoken disrespectfully of the King, and was then placed in a large jar which was afterwards thrown to the ground from the top of a minaret.

According to the Ahsanu’t-Tawáríkh, Sháh Tahmásp was in his youth much interested in calligraphy and painting; he also liked riding on Egyptian asses, which consequently became fashionable, and were adorned with golden trappings and gold-embroidered saddle-cloths. Alluding to these idiosyncrasies a ribald poet with the extraordinary nom de guerre of Búqu’l-Ishq (“the Trumpet of Love”) lampooned him in this verse:

ٌبِنُ تَكْفُلُ عَمَّوُسْ تَرْخَی ِتَعْرَیفَانَدُ ﺗَحْبَبَ و تَنَاغُ ﻓِرْوانِی و خَرَابَانُنَا
“The scribe, the painter, the Qazwiní and the ass
Obtained easy promotion without trouble.”

He made a great ostentation of piety, “regarding most things as unclean, and often spitting out his half-eaten food into the water or the fire,” in view of which it is satisfactory to know that “he would not eat in company.” He was also punctilious about such matters as cutting his nails, and would spend the day after this operation in the bath.
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Ṭahmásp died on Tuesday, Safar 15, 984 (May 14, 1576) at the age of sixty-four after a reign of fifty-three years and a half, the longest reign, according to the Aḥsanu ‘r-Tawārīkh, of any Muhammadan sovereign except the Fātimid Caliph al-Mustansir bi’l-láh.121 Eleven of his sons are enumerated in the history just cited, of whom nine at least survived him. The eldest, Muhammad Khudá-banda, who was about forty-five years of age, though he succeeded to the throne a year later, renounced it on his father’s death on account of his partial blindness, this infirmity, whether natural or deliberately inflicted, being regarded in the East, and especially in Persia, as an absolute disqualification for the exercise of regal functions.122 His younger brother Ḥaydar, taking advantage of the absence from the capital of his brothers, of whom Isma’il was imprisoned in the Castle of Qahqáha, while the others were for the most part resident in distant provinces, endeavoured to seize the throne, but was murdered in the women’s apartments, where he had taken refuge, by the partisans of his brother Isma’il, who was proclaimed king in the principal mosque of Qazwin nine days after his father’s death.

Isma’il’s reign was short but sanguinary, and in his drastic methods of dealing with possible competitors for the Crown he rivalled the most ruthless of the Ottoman Sultanáns. He first put to death his two brothers Sulaymán and Muṣṭafá; then, after providing an elaborate funeral for his father at Mashhad and a gorgeous coronation for himself at Qazwin, in which his remaining brothers occupied their due positions, he resumed his fratricidal activities. On Sunday the sixth of Dhu‘l-Hijja, A.H. 984 (Feb. 24, 1577), he put to death the following princes: Sulṭán Ibráhím Mirzá, poet, artist, musician and calligrapher;
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his nephew Muhammad Ḥusayn Mirzá, a lad of eighteen, who had already been deprived of his eyesight; Sulṭán Maḥmúd Mirzá; his son Muhammad Bāqir Mirzá, a child of two; Imám-qua’l Mirzá, and Sulṭán Aḥmad Mirzá. He next turned his attention to those princes who were resident in outlying provinces, such as Bad’u’z-Zamáň Mirzá and his little son Bahrám Mirzá in Khurásán, Sulṭán ‘Ali Mirzá in Ganja, and Sulṭán Ḥasan Mirzá in Ṭíhrán, all of whom he destroyed. Only by a most wonderful chance, accounted by his biographer Iskandar Munshi123 as a miraculous intervention of Providence, did the little Prince ‘Abbás Mirzá, destined to become the greatest of Persia’s modern rulers, escape his uncle’s malevolence. The blood-thirsty Isma’il had actually sent ‘Ali-qua’l Kháń Shámlú to Heráť, of which ‘Abbás Mirzá, though only six years of age, was the nominal governor, to put the young prince to death, but the emissary, whether actuated by pity or superstition, delayed the accomplishment of his cruel task till the sacred month of Ramádán should be over, and ere this respite had come to an end a courier arrived bringing the joyful news of Isma’il’s death, the manner of which was as discreditable as his life. On the night of Sunday, Ramádán 13, A.H. 985 (Nov. 24, 1577), being at the time the worse for drink, he had gone out in search of adventures into the streets and bázárs of the city accompanied by one of his favourites, a confectioner’s son named Hasan Beg, and other disreputable companions, and towards dawn had gone to rest in Hasan Beg’s house, where he was found dead later in the day. Some suggested that he had been poisoned, or first drugged and afterwards strangled, while others maintained that he had merely taken an overdose of the opium
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wherewith he was wont to assuage the pain of a colic to which he was subject. But his death was so welcome to all that no great trouble seems to have been taken to arrive at the manner of it, and it does not even appear that any punishment was inflicted on Hasan Beg, who, indeed, is said to have been also half paralysed when found124.

Muhammad Khudá-banda, in spite of his blindness, was now placed on the throne which he had refused on the death of his father Sháh Ṭahmásp. He was at this time about forty-six years of age125 and was resident at Ṣhiráź, having been replaced in his former government of Heráť by his little son Prince ‘Abbás Mirzá, whose narrow escape from death has just been described. The new king at once set out for Qazwin, and amongst those who welcomed him at Qum was Hasan Beg Rúmülí, the author of the Aḥsanu ‘r-Tawārīkh, which important but unpublished history was concluded in this very year and contains the most authoritative account of the events above narrated. That this account is in places confused and must be
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211 He reigned sixty lunar years, A.H. 427-487 (A.D. 1035-1094).
212 See Chardin’s Voyages (Paris, 1811), vol. v, pp. 241-244.
213 Author of the well-known monograph on Sháh ‘Abbás the Great entitled Ta’rikh-i-‘Ālam-ārā-yi-‘Abbási.
214 He was born at Heráť on Ramádán 1, 978 (Jan 27, 1571).
216 According to the Aḥsanu ‘r-Tawārīkh he was born in 938/1531-1.
supplemented by later histories like the Khuld-i-Barin and Ta’rikh-i-’Alam-árá-yi-‘Abbási arises from the fact that the author, for his own personal safety, had to walk with great caution amidst the rapidly-changing circumstances of these perilous times.

At Qazwin, Muḥammad Khudá-banda received the homage of Sulaymán Páshá, a great-grandson of Abū Sa’id the Timúrid, who greeted him with the following verses:
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“O King, thy gate is the qibla of the Kings of the world,
Heaven is subjugated and earth surrendered to thee:
In thy reign the thread of royalty hath become single”
But, Praise be to God, though single it is strong!”

The able, ambitious and beautiful Princess Pari-Khán Khánum, Tahmáp Sháh’s favourite daughter, by a Circassian wife, who had played a prominent part in the troubles succeeding his death, and aspired to rule in fact if not in name, was put to death at Muḥammad Khudá-banda’s command by Khalíl Kháñ Afshár, together with her mother’s brother Shamkhál Kháñ, and Sháh Shujá’, the infant son of the late King Isma’íl. In consequence of these pitiless slaughters the representatives of the Šáfawí Royal Family were now reduced to Sháh Muḥammad Khudá-banda himself and his four sons, Ḍámzá, ‘Abbás, Abú Tálib and Tahmásp. The first, who is sometimes reckoned amongst the Šáfawí kings (since he seems for a while to have exercised regal functions during his half-blind father’s life-time), was murdered by a young barber named Khudá-verdi on the 22nd of Dhu’l-Ḥijja, 994 (Dec. 4, 1586). Abú Tálib was thereupon nominated Walí-’ábd, or Crown Prince, instead of his elder brother ‘Abbás, who was still in Khurásán, but who speedily appeared on the scene with his guardian and tutor Murshíd-šír Kháñ Ustájílá,
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inflicted condign punishment on those who had prompted the murder of his elder brother Ḍámzá, and rendered his two younger brothers harmless by depriving them of their eye-sight and imprisoning them in the Castle of Alámút. His father abdicated in his favour after a reign of ten years in Dhu’l-Qa’dá, 995 (October, 1587), and Sháh ‘Abbás ascended the throne to which he was destined to add so great a glory. He and his three brothers were all the sons of one mother, a lady of the Mar’áši Sáyíds of Mázandarán, who seems to have resembled her sister-in-law Pari-Khán Khánum in her masterful character as well as in her tragic fate, for she, together with her aged mother and many of her kinsfolk and countrymen, was murdered by some of the Qizíl-básh nobles who objected to her autocratic methods and dominating influence over her irresolute and peace-loving husband, being of opinion that —

فرعفي نبات دو ران عادانان، حشة باباکی معروس آید از ماکباین’

“No luck remains in that household where the hen crows like a cock.”

Muhammad Khudá-banda was born in 938/1531-2, was forty-six years of age when his father Sháh Tahmásp died in 984/1576-7, reigned ten years after the death of his brother Isma’il, survived his abdication eight or nine years, and died in 1004/1595-6. His character is thus described by Rídá-šír Kháñ in his Supplement to the Rawdatu’s-Safá: “He had some knowledge of all the current sciences, and was incomparable in understanding and judgement, virtue and discernment, bounty and generosity, and expression and eloquence. Being a ‘servant of God’ (Khudá-banda) he showed an excessive
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elemency in matters of administration, war, anger and punishment, and, so far as possible, would not consent to the death of any one. Though he struck the first blow at Khudá-verdi the barber, this was only according to the enactment of the Holy

217 I suppose this alludes to the practical extermination of the rest of the Royal Family by Isma’il II.
218 Sir John Malcolm (op. cit., vol. i, pp. 514 and 517) appears to confuse her with her mother, since he calls her “the favourite Suliána of the deceased monarch” (Tahmásp), and “the sister of Shamkhál.” In the ‘Alam-árá-yi-‘Abbási she is enumerated as the second of Tahmásp’s eight daughters, but according to other Persian historians she was one of the five daughters of Sháh Isma’il and the sister of Tahmásp. See p. 81 supra, n. 2 ad calc. By “Don Juan of Persia” she is called the Infanta.
219 Called by “Don Juan of Persia” (f. 104v) “Cudy de Lac” (i.e. Dallák), “que es como si dijeramos en Español, Cudi el barbero del Rey.”
220 “Don Juan of Persia,” f. 107b.
221 Supplement to the Rawdatu’s-Safá.
Law. In consequence of his weak eyesight he seldom gave public audience, and, while he tarried in the women’s apartments, the Sayyida [his wife] gave effect to his commands, and, in order more effectively to control affairs, herself sealed the documents. ... In short, he was a king with the qualities of a religious mendicant, or a religious mendicant endowed with regal pomp (Pādishāh darwish-khīsāl, yā darwish pādishāh-jalālī)

His reign, though short, was troubled not only by the domestic tragedies indicated above, but by the Turks, Uzbeks, Crimean Tartars, Georgians and other external foes, who, encouraged by the spectacle of those internecine struggles which succeeded the death of Tahmāsp, sought to profit by the distractions of Persia.

Sháh 'Abbás I, commonly and justly called “the Great,” was only sixteen or seventeen years of age when he ascended the throne in 996/1588, and died in Jumādá 1, 1038/Jan. 1629 at the age of 60 after a reign of 43 lunar years, in which, by general agreement, Persia reached the highest degree of power, prosperity and splendour ever attained by her in modern times. His position at first was, however, fraught with dangers and difficulties. Not only was his kingdom threatened, as usual, by the Ottoman Turks on the west and the Uzbeks on the east, but many of the provinces were in revolt and the country was distracted by the rivalries and ambitions of the great Qızıl-básh
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nobles of different tribes, in the hands of two of whom, Murshid-quli Khán and 'Ali-quli Khán, the young King seemed at first to be a mere puppet. When the former accompanied him to Qazwīn to place him on the throne, the latter was left in Khurásán to bear the brunt of the Uzbek attack, to which, after a defence of nine months, he fell a victim. 'Abbás, suspecting Murshid-quli Khán of deliberately withholding help from his rival, caused him to be murdered one night in camp at Sháhhrúd, thus freeing himself from an irksome tutelage, and becoming a sovereign ruler in fact as well as in name. Realizing that he could not possibly wage successful war simultaneously with the Turks and the Uzbeks, he determined, with far-sighted prudence, to make peace, even on unfavourable terms, with the former in order to check the encroachments of the latter and to devise some mechanism to control the disorderly rivalries of the Qızıl-básh nobles, whereby his authority and the efficiency of his military force were paralysed. The terms of the treaty with Turkey included the surrender of the towns and districts in Ádharbájyán and Georgia conquered by the Ottoman troops during a war which had lasted more than twelve years (985-998/1577-1590), such as Tabrīz, Ganja, Qārs, Nakhjuwán, Shaki, Shamākhi and Tiflīs, as well as part of Luristán; the abandonment of the cursing of the first three Caliphs, Abū Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthmán; and the sending as a hostage to Constantinople of Sháh 'Abbás’s nephew Haydar Mīrzā, who departed with the Turkish general Farhád Pāshá for the Ottoman capital, where he died two years later.

Sháh 'Abbás next proceeded to subdue Shirāz, Kirmán, Gilán and Khurram-ábād in Luristán, and to inflict condign punishment on Ya’qūb Khán Dhu’l-Qadar and other rebels. Meanwhile 'Abdu’l-Múmin Khán and his Uzbeks were again ravaging Khurásán, and the
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Sháh, advancing to attack them, was stricken down by fever at Tihrán. While he lay sick and unable to move, the holy city of Mashhad was taken and sacked by the savage Uzbeks and many of its inhabitants slain. Sabzawār suffered a similar fate in 1002/1593-4; but three or four years later, 'Abdu'lláh Khán, the Uzbek sovereign, died, and his son, the above-mentioned 'Abdu’l-Múmin Khán, was killed by his own people. It was at this juncture (April, 1598) that Sháh 'Abbás was at length able to attack the Uzbeks in force and drive them out of Khurásán, which now at length enjoyed a period of peace and tranquillity. On his return from this victorious campaign to Qazwīn in the autumn of the same year, he found awaiting him there those celebrated English soldiers of fortune Sir Anthony and Sir Robert Sherley, whose romantic adventures are fully described in several excellent monographs. These, who were accompanied by some dozen English attendants, including at least one cannon-founder, aided him greatly in the reconstruction of his army and especially in providing it with artillery, the lack of which had hitherto so severely handicapped the Persians in their wars with the Turks, so that, as it is quaintly phrased in Purchas’s Pilgrims, “the mighty Ottoman, terror of the Christian world, quaketh of a Sherley fever, and gives hopes of approaching fates. The prevailing Persian hath learned Sherleian arts of war; and he which before knew not the
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use of ordnance, hath now five hundred pieces of brass and sixty thousand musqueteers; so that they, which at hand with the sword were before dreadful to the Turks, now also, in remoter blows and sulphurean arts, are grown terrible.” The discipline

---

222 The murderer of his son Ḥamza. See p. 101 supra and n. 3 ad calc.
223 He was born, according to the 'Ālam-ārā-yī-‘Abbāsī, on Ramaḍān 1, 978 (Jan. 27, 1571), or 979 (Jan. 17, 1572). The words دل form the chronogram of his coronation.
224 The author of the 'Ālam-ārā-yī-‘Abbāsī says that he himself saw amongst those slain at Sabzawār women with children at the breast.
225 In 1006/1597-8, according to the 'Ālam-ārā-yī-‘Abbāsī.
226 e.g. “The Sherley Brothers, an historical Memoir of the Lives of Sir Thomas Sherley, Sir Anthony Sherley, and Sir Robert Sherley, Knights, by one of the same House” (Evelyn Philip Shirley; Roxburgh Club: Chiswick, 1848); “The Three Brothers, or the Travels and Adventures of Sir A., Sir R. and Sir T. Sherley in Persia, Russia, Turkey, Spain, etc., with Portraits” (Anon., London, 1825).
of the Persian army had also been improved by the elimination of the more ambitious and disobedient Qizil-básh nobles; the creation of a composite tribal force known as Sháh-seven (“King-lovers”), united not by tribal allegiance but by personal devotion to the King; and the formation of a regular infantry comparable in some degree to the Turkish Janissaries.

A year or two later circumstances were favourable for the long-projected attempt to recover the provinces wrested from Persia by the Turks during the interregnum which succeeded the death of Táhásp. The reign of the feeble Muhammad III was approaching its end, and Turkey was weakened by a prolonged war with Austria and by the so-called Jaláli revolt in Asia Minor when Sháh ‘Abbás opened his campaign in 1010/1601-2. Tabríz was retaken “with cannon, an engine of long-time by the Persians scorned as not beseeming valiant men,” in 1012/1603-4, and two years later the celebrated Turkish general Chígála-záda Sinán Páshá (“Cicala”) was defeated near Salmás and compelled to retreat to Ván and Diyár Bák, where he died of chagrin. Baghdád and Shírwán were recaptured by the Persians about the same time, but the former changed hands more than once during the reign of Sháh ‘Abbás, and the occasion of its recapture from the Turks in A.D. 1625 gave rise to an

interchange of verses between Háfíz Páshá and Sulútán Murád IV which has attained a certain celebrity in Turkish literary history.

No coherent and critical account of these wars between the Persians on the one hand and the Turks, Uzbeks and Georgians on the other has yet, so far as I know, been written, but the materials are ample, should any historian acquainted with Persian and Turkish desire to undertake the task. The enormous preponderance of the military element in such contemporary chronicles as the Ta’ríkh-i-‘Alam-árá-yi-‘Abbási renders them very dull and arduous reading to anyone not specially interested in military matters; even from the point of view of military history they are vitiated by overwhelming masses of trivial details and the absence of any breadth of view or clearness of outline. Many matters on which we should most desire information are completely ignored, and it is only here and there incidentally that we find passages throwing light on the religious and social conditions of the time. Of the recapture of the Island of Hurmuz in the Persian Gulf from the Portuguese in March, 1622, by a combined Anglo-Persian force we have naturally very detailed contemporary English accounts.

Allusion has already been made in the introductory chapter to the splendour and prosperity of Isfahán under Sháh ‘Abbás, and to the number of foreigners, diplomatists, merchants and missionaries, which his tolerant attitude towards non-Muslims brought thither. These and other similar matters are very fully discussed in the first volume of the great monograph on his reign entitled Ta’ríkh-i-‘Alam-árá-yi-‘Abbási, half of which consists of an Introduction (Muqaddama) comprising

twelve Discourses (Maqála). The first of these, dealing with his ancestors and predecessors, is much the longest, and in my manuscript occupies about two hundred pages; the others, though much shorter, often occupying only a page or two, are more original, and deal with such matters as the religious devotion of Sháh ‘Abbás; his wise judgement and wide knowledge; his worthiness to be regarded as a Sáhib-Qirá, or “Lord of a fortunate Conjunction”; his miraculous preservation on several occasions from imminent peril; his wise administration and care for public security; his inflexible severity; his pious foundations and charitable bequests; his wars and victories; his birth and childhood; and an account of the most eminent nobles, divines, ministers, physicians, calligraphers, painters, illuminators, poets and minstrels of his reign. Speaking of his severity (Maqála vi) the author, Iskandar Munshi, says that no one dared to delay one moment in the execution of any order given him by the King: “for instance, should he command a father to kill his son, the sentence would be carried out immediately, even as the decree of destiny; or should the father, moved by parental tenderness, make any delay, the command would be reversed; and should the son then temporize, another would slay both. By such awful severity the execution of his commands attained the supreme degree of efficiency, and none dared hesitate for an instant in the fulfilment of the sentence inevitable as fate.” He also compelled his officers, on pain of death, to be present at all executions; held each provincial-governor and local magistrate responsible for the security of the roads in his district; and punished falsehood with such severity that it was generally believed that if anyone ventured to lie to him, he was informed of it from the Spirit World. Yet at other times he would be very friendly and unassuming in his intercourse with his

courtiers and attendants, careful of their rights and just claims, and ready to overlook accidental and involuntary shortcomings. Though not averse from the banquet and the wine-bout, he was greatly concerned to be correctly informed as

---

227 An account of the heretic Jaláli is given by Munajjim-báshí (Sahá ‘jfú-l-Akbbár, Turkish version, ed. Constantinople, A.H. 1285, vol. iii, p. 471). He and many of his followers were killed near Siwás in 925/1519, but evidently the sect which he founded retained its vitality for the better part of a century afterwards.


229 Pp. 24-5 supra.
to the circumstances of the neighbouring kings and countries, and devoted much attention to the development of his Intelligence Department. He was also something of a linguist, and not only appreciated but occasionally composed poetry.

Amongst the towns and districts which benefited most from his munificence were, besides his capital Iṣfahān, Mashhad and its holy shrine of the eighth Imām ‘Ali Riḍá, which, as we have seen, he rescued from the savage and fanatical Uzbeks and raised to a position of the greatest glory and honour; Ardabil, the original home of his family; Qazwin, the earlier capital of the Šafawis; Kāshān, near which he constructed the celebrated dam known as the Band-i-Qurāḏū₂²³, Astarābād; Tabriz; Hamadān; and the province of Māzandarān, one of his favourite resorts, which he adorned with several splendid palaces and the great causeway extending from Astarābād to Ashraf, of which full particulars are given in Lord Curzon’s great work on Persia. As regards his conquests, his armies reached Merv, Nīsābūr, and even Balkh in the north-east, and Nakhljuwān, Erivan, Ganja, Tiflis, Darband and Bākū in the north-west.

No useful purpose would be served by enumerating here all the notable persons in each class mentioned by Iskandar Munshi, who wrote, as he repeatedly mentions in the course of his work, in 1025/1616, but the most important are, amongst the divines and

[page 110]

men of learning, Mīr Muḥammad Dāmād and Shaykh Bahā’u’d-Dīn Āmili; amongst the calligraphists, Mawlawānā Ishāq Siyāwushānī, Muḥammad Ḥusayn-i-Tabrīzī, Mīr Mu’izz-i-Kāshī, Mīr Ṣadrū’d-Dīn Muḥammad, and others; amongst the artists and miniature painters, Muẓaffār ‘Allī, Zaynu’l-ʿAbidin, Sādiq Beg, Ṣubī’l-Jalābār, and others; amongst the poets, Dāmīrī, Muḥtasham, Wāṣīf-i-Qazwī, Mīr Haydar Mu’a’mma’ī, the brothers Tayfūr and Dā’ī, Wālīh and Malik of Qum, Hātim of Kāshān, Šabrī Rūzbihānī, Hisābī, the Qādī Nūr-i-Iṣfahānī, Hālatī, Halākī, Māzhari of Cashmer, and the Qazwinis Fuṟūghī, Tabkhi, Sultānūl-Fuqarā, Kā’kār and Sharmī; and amongst the singers and minstrels, Ḥāfiz Ṭāhir, Jāḥīj-i-Bākharzī, Ḥāfiz; Hāshim-i-Qazwīnī, Mīrzā Muḥammad Kamānchā’ī, Ustād Muḥammad Mū’mīn, Ustād Shāshuwar-i-Chahār-tārī, Ustād Shams-i-Shaypurghū’ī-i-Warāmīnī, Ustād Mā’sūm Kamānchā’ī, Ustād Sultān Muḥammad Ṭanbūrā’ī, Mīrzā Ḥusayn Ṭanbūrā’ī, Ustād Sultān Muḥammad-i-Changī, and the Qīṣā-khwāns (story-tellers) and Shāhnāma-khwāns (reciters of the ‘Epic of Kings’), Haydar, Muḥammad Khursand and Šāfī, of whom the two last were brothers and natives of Iṣfahān. It is because the fame of the singers, minstrels and musicians who constitute this last class is in its nature so ephemeral that I have enumerated them in full, as indicating what forms of musical talent were popular at the court of Shāh ‘Abbās. That Shāh ‘Abbās deserved the title of “the Great” there can be no question, and many of his severities have been palliated, if not excused, even by European historians like
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Sir John Malcolm, but his cruel murder of his eldest son Šafī Mirzā and his blinding of another, Khudā-banda Mirzā, and the tragic circumstances connected therewith, form a dark page in the records of his otherwise glorious reign, which ended with his death in the early part of A.D. 1629. He was succeeded by his grandson Sām Mirzā, who, on his accession, took the name of his unfortunate father, and mounted the throne of Persia under the title of Shāh Šafī I.

There is a well-known tradition of the Muḥammadans that Solomon died standing, supported by the staff on which he leaned, and that his death remained unknown to the Jinn, who laboured at his command in the construction of the Temple, for a year, until the wood-worm ate through the staff and the body fell to the ground. This legend may well serve as a parable of the century of Šafawī rule which followed the death of Shāh ‘Abbās the Great, who, by his strength and wisdom, gave to Persia a period of peace and outward prosperity which for nearly a hundred years protected his successors from the results of their incompetence. Four of his house succeeded him ere the catastrophe of the Afghan invasion in A.D. 1722 effected its downfall, to wit, his grandson Shāh Šafī above mentioned (A.D. 1629-1642); his great-grandson Shāh ‘Abbās II (A.D. 1642-1666); his great-great-grandson Šafī, subsequently recrowned under the name of Sulaymān (A.D.1666-1694); and his great-great-great-grandson Shāh Ḥusayn (A.D. 1694-1722). Of Shāh Šafī, Krusinski says that “tis certain there has not been in Persia a more cruel and bloody reign than his” and describes it as “one continued series
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of cruelties”; while Hanway observes that “he interfered so little in the affairs of the government that the Persians would have scarcely perceived they had a king, had it not been for the frequent instances of barbarity which stained his reign with

---

²²³ See my Year amongst the Persians, pp. 185-6.

²³⁰ See Vol. i, pp. 376-8, etc.

²³² Of these titles, Ḥāfiz denotes a Qur’ān-reciter or rhapsodist; Kamānchā’ī a violinist; Chahār-tārī a player on the four-stringed lute; Shāypurghū’ī a trumpeter; Ṭanbūrā’ī a drummer; and Changī a harper.

²³³ History of Persia (ed. 1815), vol. i, pp. 555-6.

²³⁴ Ibid., pp. 560-5.

²³⁵ See the commentaries on Qur’ān xxxiv, 13.


²³⁷ Revolutions of Persia (London, 1753), vol. i, p. 20.
blood’; and that “by his own folly he lost Kandahar and Babyl[on] [Baghdad], two of the most important places on his
frontiers.” Than Shâh ‘Abbâs II, on the other hand, according to Krusinski238, “next to Ismael I and Schah-Abas the Great,
Persia never had a better king of the family of the Sophies.” Although, like his father and predecessor, he was “too much
subject to wine, and committed some acts of cruelty, yet, abating a few excursions, of which he might justly be reproached,
he shewed himself, during the whole course of his reign, truly worthy of the crown he wore.” “The farther he advanced into
his reign,” continues the Jesuit, “the more he was beloved by his subjects and the more feared by his neighbours. He loved
justice, and had no mercy of the governors and other public officers who, abusing their authority, oppressed the people,
of which several instances may be seen in Tavernier. He had a great and noble soul, was very kind to strangers, and openly
protected the Christians, whom he would not have in the least molested for their religion, saying, ‘That none but God was
master of their consciences; that, for his own part, he was only governor of externals; and that all his subjects being equally
members of the State, of what religion soever they were, he owed justice to them all alike.’” This reign, however, was the last
flicker of greatness in the Šafawi dynasty, for Sulaymân (to quote Krusinski239 once more), a “degenerated very much from
the virtues of his father Schah-Abas II, and made his reign remarkable only by a thousand instances of cruelty,

Illustration: SHÁH ‘ÁBBAS THE SECOND
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the bare mention of which is shocking. When he was in wine or in wrath nobody about him was sure of life or estate. He
caused hands, feet, nose and ears to be cut off eyes to be plucked out, and lives to be sacrificed upon the least whim that took
him; and the man that was most in his favour at the beginning of a deabuch was generally made a sacrifice at the end of it.
This is the character given us of him by Sir John Chardin, who was in part a witness of what he relates as to this matter.
Persons thought their lives in such danger whenever they approached him that a great lord of his Court said, when he came
from his presence, that he always felt if his head was left standing upon his shoulders. It was under this prince that Persia
began to decay. He thought so little like a king that when it was represented to him what danger he was in

Shâh Husayan, the last Šafawi king (for his nominal successors Tahmâsp II and ‘Abbâs III were mere puppets in the
hands of Nâdir Shâh), was very unlike his predecessors, for his clemency was so excessive as “rendered him incapable of any
severity, though never so moderate and necessary,” while having one day accidentally wounded a duck with his pistol “he
himself was as much terrified as if he had really committed murder, and made the same exclamation as is customary in Persia
upon the shedding of human blood, by saying Kanlu oldum241, i.e. ‘I am polluted with blood’; and that very instant he caused
two hundred tomons to be given to the poor as an atonement for what he thought a
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great sin.” He was something of a scholar and theologian, much under the influence of the Mullâs, and so careful of his
religious duties and so much attached to the reading of the Qur’an as to earn for himself the nick-name of Mullâ or “Parson
Husayn”242. “Though at first a vehement prohibitionist, he was later induced by his grandmother, instigated by wine-loving
courtiers and power-seeking eunuchs, to taste the forbidden liquor, which gradually obtained such a hold on him that “he
would not by any means hear the mention of business, but left it all to the discretions of his ministers and eunuchs, who
governed the kingdom just as they pleased, and took the greater license because they were very sensible they had nothing to
fear from a prince who was so weak as to refer the very petitions he received to them without so much as reading them”243.

In such a work as this, which is concerned primarily with Persian literature and only secondarily with Persian history,
and that only in broad outlines, save in the case of periods which witnessed some definite change in the national outlook, it is
unnecessary to enter into a more detailed account of the later Šafawi period; the more so because several excellent accounts
of the decline and fall of this remarkable dynasty, and of the state of Persia at that time, are readily accessible to the English
reader. Of these the following may be especially commended.

Adam Olearius, Secretary to the Embassy sent by Frederick Duke of Holstein to Russia and Persia, was in the latter
country from November, 1636 until February, 1638. His Voyages and Travels, originally written in Latin, were translated
into French and thence, by John Davies, into English. I have used the English version published in 1669. Olearius, or
Oelschläger, to give him his original

241 قنلو اولدم
242 Krusinski, op. cit., p. 71.
243 Ibid., p. 76.
name, was a careful observer, and seems to have had a very fair knowledge both of Persian and Turkish, and his work is one of the best accounts of Persia in the seventeenth century.

Le Père Raphaël du Mans, Superior of the Capuchin Mission at Isfahán, was born in A.D. 1613, went to Persia in 1644, and died there in 1696. His *Estat de la Perse en 1660* in the learned edition of M. Schefer (Paris, 1890) gives a valuable if not very lively account of Persian institutions at a somewhat later date than Olearius.

The Chevalier Chardin was born in A.D. 1643, was twice in Persia for about six years each time (A.D. 1664-70 and 1671-77), and settled in London in 1681, where he died in 1713. Of the numerous editions of his *Voyages en Perse* I have used that of the learned Langlès (Paris, 1811) in ten volumes, of which the last contains (pp. 151-244) an admirable *Notice chronologique de la Perse, depuis les temps les plus reculés jusqu’à ce jour* by the editor, carried down to the time of Fath-’Ali Sháh Qájár.

Shaykh ‘Ali Hazín, who traced his descent from the celebrated Shaykh Záhid-i-Giláí, the spiritual director of Shaykh Šáfiyyu’-d- Din, the ancestor of the Šáfawi kings, was born in A.D. 1692 at Isfahán, where he spent the greater part of his time until he left Persia for India, never to return, in A.D. 1734. He wrote his *Memoirs* (published in the original Persian with an English translation by F. C. Belfour in 1830-1) in 1741, and died at Benares at a ripe old age in 1779. Though he was himself involved in the disaster which overtook Isfahán in 1722, he gives a much less vivid and moving picture of the sufferings of its inhabitants during the siege by the Afghánns than that drawn by Krusinski and other European observers. His portraits of contemporary statesmen, theo-

logians and poets, on the other hand, lend a special value to his book.

Father Krusinski, Procurator of the Jesuits at Isfahán for some eighteen or twenty years previous to A.D. 1722, compiled an admirable *History of the Revolution of Persia* from the beginning of the Šáfawi dynasty down to A.D. 1727 in which the circumstances of the Afghán invasion and its consequences are narrated in the utmost detail.

Jonas Hanway, who was in Persia in A.D. 1743-4, wrote and published in 1753 in two volumes an *historical account of the British Trade over the Caspian Sea, with a Journal of Travels*, which he supplemented by two further volumes on the Revolution of Persia, the first containing *The Reign of Shah Sultan Hussein, with the Invasion of the Afghans, and the reigns of Sultan Mir Maghmud and his successor Ashreff*, and the second *The History of the celebrated usurper Nadir Kouli, from his birth in 1687 till his death in 1747*, to which are added *some particulars of the unfortunate reign of his successor Adil Shah*. For the earlier part of his history Hanway is much indebted to Krusinski, but for the later period (A.D. 1727-1750), including the whole account of Nádir Sháh, he is an independent and most valuable authority, while his narrative is throughout lively and agreeable to read.

These are only a few of the many writers and travellers whose works throw light on this period. I have mentioned them because they are the ones I have chiefly used, but a long and serviceable account of a much larger number will be found in Schefer’s Introduction to his edition of le Père Raphaël du Mans mentioned above. The European writers are here, for reasons well set forth by Sir John Malcolm, more instructive and illuminating than the Persian historians, for whom, as he says, “we can hardly imagine an era more unfavourable. A period of nearly a century elapsed without the occurrence of any one political event of magnitude; and yet the extraordinary calm was productive of no advantage to Persia. The princes, nobles, and high officers of that kingdom were, it is true, exempt from the dangers of foreign or internal war; but their property and their lives were the sport of a succession of weak, cruel and debauched monarchs. The lower orders were exposed to fewer evils than the higher, but they became every day more unwarlike; and what they gained by that tranquillity which the State enjoyed lost almost all its value when they ceased to be able to defend it. This period was distinguished by no glorious achievements. No characters arose on which the historian could dwell with delight. The nation may be said to have existed on the reputation which it had before acquired till all it possessed was gone, and till it became, from the slow but certain progress of a gradual and vicious decay, incapable of one effort to avert that dreadful misery and ruin in which it was involved by the invasion of a few Afghan tribes, whose conquest of Persia affixed so indelible a disgrace upon that country that we cannot be surprised that its historians have shrunk from the painful and degrading narration.”

Shaykh ‘Ali Hazín takes precisely the same view. “Many ages having now elapsed,” says he, “since civilization, tranquillity, and the accomplishment of all worldly blessings had attained a state of perfection in the beautiful provinces of Irán, these were become a fit object for the affliction of the malignant eye.” The indolent King and princes, and the army that sought nothing but repose and for near a

---

244 *History of Persia* (London, 1815), vol. 1, pp. 568-570.
245 P. 106 of Belfour’s text = p. 116 of his translation.
246 The Evil Eye is called by the Arabs *‘Aynu ‘l-Kamāl*, “the Eye of Perfection,” because anything perfect of its kind is especially exposed to its attacks.
hundred years had not drawn the sword from the scabbard, would not even think of quelling this disturbance\(^{247}\), until Mahmūd\(^{248}\) with a large army marched into the provinces of Kirmān and Yazd, and, having committed much plunder and devastation, proceeded on his route to Īsphān. This happened in the early part of the year 1134/1721."

Jonas Hanway\(^{249}\) speaks in a similar strain. "Persia never enjoyed," says he, "a more perfect tranquillity than in the beginning of the present [i.e. the eighteenth] century. The treaties she had concluded with her neighbours were perfectly observed and secured her against any foreign invasions; whilst the effeminacy and luxury of her inhabitants, the ordinary consequences of a long peace, left no room to apprehend any danger from the ambition of her own subjects. This monarchy, which had suffered so many revolutions in past ages, seemed to be settled on a solid foundation when the news of its subversion surprised the whole world. The authors of this amazing catastrophe were a people hardly known even to their own sovereigns, and have now acquired a reputation only by the fame of those nations which they brought under their subjection. These people … are comprised under the general denomination of Afghans\(^{250}\)."

The policy of Shāh ‘Abbās the Great has been described above as one of wise and far-sighted, but this statement needs some qualification; for, while it greatly strengthened the power of the Crown, it undoubtedly conduced in the end to the weakening of the nation and the degeneration of its rulers. Previous kings had been embarrassed chiefly by ambitious relatives, powerful tribal chiefs, and turbulent townsmen; and for all these things Shāh ‘Abbās set himself to provide remedies. Instead of allowing his sons to hold high administrative posts and take a prominent part in wars, he either blinded them or put them to death, or immured them in the haram, where, as Krusinski well explains\(^{251}\), they lead a life of hardship and privation rather than of luxury and pleasure, while receiving a very imperfect education, and falling under the influence of the palace eunuchs, who ended by becoming the dominant power in the State. To his destruction of the great nobles and tribal chiefs, and his creation of the Shāh-sevens as a counterpoise to the seven tribes to whom his predecessors owed their power, allusion has already been made\(^{252}\). A more extraordinary example of his application of the maxim *Divide et impera* was his deliberate creation in all the large towns of two artificially antagonized parties, named, according to Krusinski\(^{253}\); *Pelenk* and *Felenk*, who indulged at intervals in the most sanguinary faction-fights, they being, as Krusinski puts it, "so opposite, and so much enemies one to the other, that people in different States, in arms against one another, do not push their aversion and enmity farther." He adds (p. 92) that "though they fought without arms, because they were not supposed to make use of anything else but stones and sticks, it was with so much fury and bloodshed that the King was obliged to employ his guards to separate them with drawn swords; and hard it was to accomplish it, even with a method so effectual, insomuch that at Isphān in 1714 they were under a necessity, before they could separate the combatants, to put about three hundred to the sword on the spot."

Besides the eunuchs, there grew up and attained its full development under “Mullā Ḥusayn,” the last unhappy though well-meaning occupant of the Ṣafawī throne at Īsphān, another dominant class whose influence hardly made for either spiritual unity or national efficiency, namely the great ecclesiastics who culminated in the redoubtable Mullā Muḥammad Bāqir-i-Majlīsī, the persecutor of Šūfis and heretics, of whom we shall have to speak at some length in a future chapter. His admirers\(^{254}\) call attention to the fact that his death, which took place in 1111/1699-1700\(^{255}\), was followed in a short time by the troubles which culminated in the supreme disaster of 1722, and suggest that the disappearance of so saintly a personage left Persia exposed to perils which more critical minds may be inclined to ascribe in part to the narrow intolerance so largely fostered by him and his congener.

\(^{247}\) The seizure of Qandahr by the revolted Afgháns led by Mír Wáys.

\(^{248}\) The son and successor of Mír Wáys.

\(^{249}\) *Revolutions of Persia*, vol. i, p. 22.

\(^{250}\) The Afgháns are, however, mentioned by the Arabian historian Ibnu’l-Āthir in several places, the earliest mention being under the year 366/976-7. They were very troublesome in S.E. Persia in the middle of the fourteenth century. See my Abridged Translation of the *Ta’rikh-i-Guzida* (E. J. W. Gibb Series, xiv, 2), pp. 161 et seqq.


\(^{252}\) See p. 106 *supra*.

\(^{253}\) *Op. cit.*, p. 91. Hanway (vol. iii, p. 32 *ad calc.*, and p. 33) calls them *Peleuk* and *Feleuk*. At a later period they were known as Ḥaydari and Ni’mati.

\(^{254}\) E.g. the Qīṣaṣu’l-‘Ulamá, p. 216 of the lithographed edition of 1306/1888-9.

\(^{255}\) The chronogram is غم و حزن.
CHAPTER IV.

AN OUTLINE OF THE HISTORY OF PERSIA DURING
THE LAST TWO CENTURIES (A.D. 1722-1922).

Only after much hesitation and several tentative experiments have I decided to endeavour to compress into one chapter two centuries of Persian history. Were this book, primarily intended as a political history of Persia, such an attempt would be out of the question; for this long period witnessed the Afghán invasion and its devastations; the rise, meteoric career, and sudden eclipse of that amazing conqueror Nádîr Sháh; the emergence in a world of chaos and misery of Karîm Khán-i-Zand, generally accounted the best ruler whom Persia ever possessed, and of his gallant but unfortunate successor Lutf-‘Alî Khán; the establishment of the still reigning Qájár dynasty, and within that period the occurrence, amidst many other important events, of two remarkable phenomena (the rise and growth of the Bábí religious movement since 1844, and the political Revolution of 1906) which profoundly affected the intellectual life and literary development of Persia, each one of which might well form the subject of a lengthy monograph rather than a chapter. This book, however, is written not from the political but from the literary point of view, and the historical part of it is only ancillary, and might have been omitted entirely if a knowledge of even the general outlines of Oriental history formed part of the mental equipment of most educated Europeans. From this point of view much fuller treatment is required for periods of transition, or of great intellectual activity, than for periods of unproductive strife not so much of rival ideas and beliefs as of conflicting ambitions. To the latter category belongs the greater part

of the two centuries which must now engage our attention. During this period the literary language (which, indeed, had become fixed at any rate in the fourteenth century, so that the odes of Hâfîz, save for their incomparable beauty, might have been written but yesterday) underwent no noticeable change; few fresh forms of literary expression were developed until the middle of the nineteenth century; and few fresh ideas arose to modify the Shi’a frenzy of Şafawí times until the rise of the Bábí doctrine in A.D. 1844, of which, however, the literary effects were less considerable than those of the Revolution of 1906. Moreover excellent and detailed accounts of the Afghán invasion, of Nádîr Sháh, and of the earlier Qájár period already exist in English, several of which have been mentioned at the end of the preceding chapter

256; these could hardly be bettered, and would only be marred by such abridgment as would be necessary to fit them into the framework of this book. Hence I have deemed it best to limit myself in this chapter to a brief outline of the more salient events of these last two centuries.

THE AFGHÁN INVASION (A.D. 1722-1730).

Unlike the Arabs, Mongols, Tartars and Turks, who were instrumental in effecting previous subjections of Persia by foreign arms, the Afgháns are, apparently, an Irâniân and therefore a kindred race, though differing materially in character, ‘from the Persians. The Persian language is widely spoken in their wild and mountainous country, while in their own peculiar idiom, the Pushtô, James Darmesteter saw the principal survivor of the language of the Avesta, the scripture of the Zoroastrians. They are a much fiercer, hardier, and more warlike people than the Persians, less refined and ingenious, and

fanatical Sunnis, a fact sufficient in itself to explain the intense antagonism which existed between the two nations, and enabled the Afgháns to give to their invasion of Persia the colour of a religious war.

In A.D. 1707 Qandahr, a constant bone of contention between the Şafawí kings of Persia and the “Great Moghuls” of India, was in the possession of the former, and was governed in a very autocratic manner by a Georgian noble named Gurgín Khán. Mir Ways, an Afghán chief whose influence with his fellow-countrymen made him an object of suspicion, was by his orders banished to Işfâhân as a state prisoner. There, however, he seems to have enjoyed a considerable amount of liberty and to have been freely admitted to the court of Şâh Husayn. Endowed with considerable perspicacity and a great talent for intrigue, he soon formed a pretty clear idea of the factions whose rivalries were preparing the ruin of the country, and with equal caution and cunning set himself to fan the suspicions to which every great Persian general or provincial governor was exposed. This was the easier in the case of one who, being by birth a Christian and a Georgian of noble family, might, without gross improbability, be suspected of thinking more of the restoration of his own and his country’s fortunes than of the maintenance of the Persian Empire, though there seems in fact no reason to suspect him of any disloyalty.

Having sown this seed of suspicion and completely ingratiated himself with the Persian Court, Mir Ways sought and obtained permission to perform the pilgrimage to Mecca. While there he took another important step for the furtherance of his designs. He sought from the leading ecclesiastical authorities a fatwâ, or legal opinion, as to whether the orthodox Sunni subjects of a heretical (i.e. Shi’a) Muslim ruler were bound to obey him, or were justified, if occasion

256 See pp. 114-118 supra.
arose, in resisting him, if necessary by force of arms. The decision, which supported the latter alternative and so accorded with his designs, he carried back with him to Isfahán and subsequently to Qandahár, whither he was permitted to return, with strong recommendations to Gurgin Khán, in 1709. There he soon organized a conspiracy against the latter, and, taking advantage of the temporary absence of a large part of the Persian garrison on some expedition in the neighbourhood, he and his followers fell on the remainder when they were off their guard, killed the greater number of them, including Gurgin Khán, and took possession of the city. It was at this juncture that the fatwá obtained at Mecca proved so useful to Mir Ways, for by it he was able to overcome the scruples of the more faint-hearted of his followers, who were at first inclined to shrink from a definite repudiation of Persian suzerainty, but who now united with the more hot-headed of their countrymen in electing Mir Ways “Prince of Qandahár and General of the national troops”.

Several half-hearted attempts to subdue the rebellious city having failed, the Persian Government despatched Khusraw Khán, nephew of the late Gurgin Khán, with an army of 30,000 men to effect its subjugation, but in spite of an initial success, which led the Afgháns to offer to surrender on terms, his uncompromising attitude impelled them to make a fresh desperate effort, resulting in the complete defeat of the Persian army (of whom only some 700 escaped) and the death of their general. Two years later, in A.D. 1713, another Persian army commanded by Rustam Khán was also defeated by the rebels, who thus secured possession of the whole province of Qandahár.

Mir Ways, having thus in five or six years laid the foundations of the Afghán power, died in A.D. 1715, and was succeeded by his brother Mir ‘Abdu’l-láh, whose disposition to accept, under certain conditions, Persian suzerainty led to his murder by his nephew Mir Mahmúd, son of Mir Ways, who was forthwith proclaimed king. The weakness of the Persian government thus becoming apparent, others were led to follow the example of the Afgháns of Qandahár. Amongst these were the Abdáli Afgháns of Herát, the Uzbekds of Transoxiana, the Kurds, the Lazgís and the Arabs of Bahrayn, and though the Persian General Şafi-qilí Khán with 30,000 troops succeeded in defending an Uzbek armý of 12,000, he was immediately afterwards defeated by the Abdáli Afgháns.

In A.D. 1720 Mir Mahmúd assumed the aggressive, crossed the deserts of Sístán, and attacked and occupied Kirmán, whence, however, he was expelled four months later by the Persian General Lutf-‘l-Álí Khán, who, after this victory, proceeded to Shiráz and began to organize “the best-appointed army that had been seen in Persia for many years” with a view to crushing the Afgháns and retaking Qandahár. Unfortunately before he had accomplished this his position was undermined by one of those Court intrigues which were so rapidly destroying the Persian Empire, and he was deprived of his command and brought as a prisoner to Isfahán, while the army which he had collected and disciplined with such care rapidly melted away, and the spirits of the Afgháns were proportionately revived. The capture and sack of Shamákhi by the Lazgís and the appearance of strange portents in the sky combined still further to discourage the Persians, while the ordering of public mourning and repentance by Sháh Husayn tended only to accentuate the general depression.

The fatal year 1722 began with the second siege and

capture of Kirmán by Mir Mahmúd. The most remarkable incident connected with this was that he was joined by a number of "guebres" (gabr), the small remnant of the Persians who still profess the ancient religion of Zoroaster, and who exist in any number only in the cities of Kirmán and Yazd and the intervening region of Rafsínján with its chief town Bahramábád. Why these people should have attached themselves to foreign Muslims to make war on their Muslim compatriots it is hard to understand, unless the fanaticism of the Shi’a divines was responsible for driving them into this extraordinary course. Still more remarkable, if true, is Hanway’s statement that they provided Mir Mahmúd with one of his best generals, who, though he bore the Muhammadan name of Nasrú’lláh, was, according to the same authority, “a worshipper of fire, since there were two priests hired by the Sultan who kept the sacred flame near his tomb.”

From Kirmán Mir Mahmúd marched by way of Yazd, which he attempted but failed to take by storm, to Isfahán, having scornfully refused an offer of 15,000 támáns, to induce him to turn back, and finally pitched his camp at Gulpábád, distant some three leagues from the Şafawi capital. After much dispute and diversity of opinions, the Persian army marched out of Isfahán to engage the Afgháns on March 7th and on the following day, largely through the treachery of the Wáli of ’Arabistán, suffered a disastrous defeat.

The battle of Gulpábád, fought between the Persians and the Afgháns on Sunday, March 8, 1722, decided the fate of the Şafawi dynasty as surely as did the battle of Qâdisíyya in A.D. 635 that of the Sásáníans, or the conflict between the Caliph’s troops and

---
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260 At that time, according to Hanway (loc. cit., p. 100), equivalent to £37,500.
the Mongols outside Baghád in A.D. 1258 that of the ‘Abbásids. Between these three battles, moreover, there was a remarkable point of similarity in the splendour and apparent strength of the defenders and the squalor and seeming weakness of their assailants. The similarity in this respect between the battles of Qādisiyya and Baghád has been noticed in a well-known passage of the Kitábu’l-Fakhri\textsuperscript{261}, to which the following account of the battle of Gulnábád by Hanway\textsuperscript{262} forms a remarkable parallel:

“The sun had just appeared on the horizon when the armies began to observe each other with that curiosity so natural on these dreadful occasions. The Persian army just come out of the capital, being composed of whatever was most brilliant at court, seemed as if it had been formed rather to make a show than to fight. The riches and variety of their arms and vestments, the beauty of their horses, the gold and precious stones with which some of their harnesses were covered, and the richness of their tents contributed to render the Persian camp very pompous and magnificent.

“On the other side there was a much smaller body of soldiers, disfigured with fatigue and the scorching heat of the sun. Their clothes were so ragged and torn in so long a march that they were scarce sufficient to cover them from the weather, and, their horses being adorned with only leather and brass, there was nothing glittering about them but their spears and sabres.”

These three great and decisive battles resembled one another in several respects. In each case a great historic dynasty, the extent of whose inward decay was masked by its external splendour, and apparent, because hitherto unchallenged, strength and supremacy, collapsed before the fierce onslaught of a hardy and warlike folk, hitherto hardly known, or accounted as little better than barbarians; and in each case the more or less prolonged process of degene-

ration which rendered the final catastrophe not only possible but inevitable is fairly obvious to subsequent historians, even if its extent and significance were not realized until the fatal touchstone was applied. The results, however, differed widely according to the character and abilities of the assailants. The Arab invaders of the seventh century established an Empire which endured for six centuries and effected a profound and permanent change in the lands and peoples whom they brought under their sway. The Mongol conquests were even more extensive, reaching as far as China and Thibet to Germany and Russia, but the cohesion and duration of the vast Empire which they created were far inferior. The Afghán conquest, with which we are now concerned, was little more than an extensive and destructive raid, resulting in some seventy-five years of anarchy (A.D. 1722-1795), illuminated by the meteoric career of that Napoleon of Persia, Nádír Sháh, and ending in the establishment of the actually reigning dynasty of the Qájárs. The actual domination of the Afgháns over Persia only endured for eight or nine years\textsuperscript{263}.

Seven months elapsed after the battle of Gulnábád before the final pitiful surrender, with every circumstance of humiliation, of the unhappy Sháh Ḥusayn. In that battle the Persians are said to have lost all their artillery, baggage and treasure, as well as some 15,000 out of a total of 50,000 men. On March 19 Mír Mahmúd occupied the Sháh’s beloved palace and pleasure-grounds of Farahábád, situated only three miles from Isfahán, which henceforth served as his headquarters. Two days later the Afgháns, having occupied the Armenian suburb of Júlfá, where they levied a tribute of money and young girls, attempted to take Isfahán by

storm, but, having twice failed (on March 19 and 21), sat down to blockade the city. Three months later Prince Ţahmásp Mirzá, who had been nominated to succeed his father, effected his escape from the beleaguered city to Qazwin, where he attempted, with but small success, to raise an army for the relief of the capital.

Soon after this, famine began to press heavily on the people, who clamoured to be led against the besiegers, but their desperate sortie failed owing to the renewed treachery of Wálí of ‘Arabistán, who was throughout these dark days the evil genius of the unhappy king. The Persian court, indeed, seemed to have been stricken with a kind of folly which was equally ready to repose confidence in traitors and to mistrust and degrade or dismiss brave and patriotic officers like Lutf-‘Ali Khán. For three or four months before the end the sufferers of the people from famine were terrible: they were finally reduced to eating dogs, cats, and even the corpses of their dead, and perished in great numbers. The pitiful details may be found in the pages of Krusinski, Hanway, and the contemporary accounts written by certain agents of the Dutch East India Company then resident at Isfahán, of which the original texts have been included by H. Dunlop in his fine work on Persia (Perzje, Haarlem, 1912, pp. 242-257).

\textsuperscript{261} See vol. ii of my Lit. Hist., p. 462, for the translation, and pp. 97-8 of Ahlwardt's edition for the text of this passage.
\textsuperscript{262} Revolutions of Persia (London, 1753), vol. i, pp. 104-5.
\textsuperscript{263} Mahmúd the Afghán laid siege to Kirmán in January, 1722, and captured Isfahán in October of the same year. His cousin Ashraf, who succeeded him, was killed by Balúchis in 1730.
At the end of September, 1722, Sháh Husayn offered to surrender himself and his capital to the Afghán invader, but Mír Mahmúd, in order still further to reduce by famine the numbers and spirit of the besieged, dragged out the negotiations for another three or four weeks, so that it was not until October 21 that Sháh Husayn repaired on foot to Farahábád, once his favourite residence, now the headquarters of his ruthless foe, to surrender the crown which Mír Mahmúd assumed six days later. When news of his father’s abdication reached
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Táhmasp Mirzá at Qazvín he caused himself to be proclaimed king, but was driven out of that city on December 20 by the Afghán general Amánu’lláh Khán, who on his way thither received the submission of Qum and Káshán.

Táhmasp was now reduced to the miserable expedient of invoking the help of Russia and Turkey, who had already fixed covetous eyes on the apparently moribund Persian kingdom and had occupied Gilán and Tíflis respectively. On September 23, 1723, a treaty was signed whereby, in return for the expulsion of the Afgháns and the restoration of his authority, Táhmasp undertook to cede to Russia the Caspian provinces of Gilán, Mázandarán and Gúrgán, and the towns of Bákú, Darband and their dependencies. Soon afterwards the Turks took Erivan, Nakhjúwán, Khúy and Hamadán, but were repulsed from Tabríz. On July 8, 1724, an agreement for the partition of Persia was signed between Russia and Turkey at Constantinople.

Meanwhile Mír Mahmúd was continuing his cruelties at Išfahán. In A.D. 1723 he put to death in cold blood some three hundred of the nobles and chief citizens, and followed up this bloody deed with the murder of about two hundred children of their families. He also killed some three thousand of the deposed Sháh’s body-guard, together with many other persons whose sentiments he mistrusted or whose influence he feared. In the following year (A.D. 1724) the Afghán general Zábardast Khán succeeded, where his predecessor Naṣrú’lláh had failed and fallen, in taking Shíráz; and towards the end of the year Mír Mahmúd prepared to attack Yazd, which had hitherto remained unsubdued. The Muslim inhabitants of that town, fearing that the numerous Zoroastrians dwelling
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in it might follow the example of their co-religionists of Kírmán and join the Afgháns, killed a great number of them.

About this time Mír Mahmúd, alarmed at the increasing insubordination of his cousin Ashraf, and, we may hope, tormented by an uneasy conscience on account of his cruelties, betook himself to a severe course of self-discipline and mortification, which did but increase his melancholy and distemper, so that on February 7, 1725, he murdered all the surviving members of the royal family with the exception of the deposed Sháh Husayn and two of his younger children. Thereafter his disorder rapidly increased, until he himself was murdered on April 22 by his cousin Ashraf, who was thereupon proclaimed king. Mír Mahmúd was at the time of his death only twenty-seven years of age, and is described as “middle-sized and clumsy; his neck was so short that his head seemed to grow to his shoulders; he had a broad face and flat nose, and his beard was thin and of a red colour; his looks were wild and his countenance austere and disagreeable; his eyes, which were blue and a little squinting, were generally downcast, like a man absorbed in deep thought.”

The death of Peter the Great about this period made Russia slightly less dangerous as a neighbour, but the Turks continued to press forwards and on August 3, 1725, succeeded at last in capturing Tabríz. They even advanced to within three days’ march of Išfahán, but turned back before reaching it. They subsequently (A.D. 1726) took Qazvín and Marágha, but were defeated by Ashraf near Kírmánsháh. Negotiations for peace were meanwhile in progress at Constantinople, whither Ashraf had sent an ambassador named ‘Abdu’l-‘Azíz Khán, whose arrogant proposal that his master should be Caliph of the East and the Ottoman
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Súltán Caliph of the West caused great umbrage to the Porte. The war, however, was very unpopular with the Turkish soldiers and people, who failed to see why they should fight fellow-Sunnis in order to restore a heretical Shí’a dynasty, though the ‘uláma were induced to give a fatwá in favour of this course, on the ground that a divided Caliphate was incompatible with the dignity or safety of Islám. Finally, however, a treaty of peace was concluded and signed at Hamadán in September, 1727.

This danger had hardly been averted when a far greater one, destined in a short time to prove fatal to the Afgháns, presented itself in the person of Nádîr-quí, subsequently known to fame as Nádîr Sháh, one of the most remarkable and ruthless military geniuses ever produced by Persia. Hitherto, though he was now about forty years of age, little had been heard of him; but this year, issuing forth from his stronghold, that wonderful natural fastness named after him Kalát-i-Nádîr, he defeated an Afghán force and took possession of Nishápúr in the name of Sháh Táhmasp II, at that time

264 For the contents of the six articles, see Hanway’s Revolutions of Persia, i, pp. 200-1.
265 See p. 126 supra.
266 For its provisions, contained in nine articles, see Hanway, op. cit., i, pp. 254-5.
267 This fortress, which is jealously guarded, Lord Curzon attempted but failed to penetrate. See his Persia, vol. i, pp. 125-140, especially the bird’s-eye view on p. 134.
he temporarily assumed about this time), made a solemn entry into Nishápúr, amidst the rejoicings of the inhabitants, and shortly afterwards occupied Mashhad and Herátt. He also despatched an ambassador to Constantinople, whence in return a certain Sulaymán Efendi was sent as envoy to Persia.

Meanwhile Ashraf, having taken Yazd and Kirmán, marched into Khurásán with an army of thirty thousand men to give battle to Ţahmásp, but he was completely defeated by Nádir on October 2 at Dámghán. Another decisive battle was fought in the following year at Múrčakhúr near Ísfahán. The Afgháns were again defeated and evacuated Ísfahán to the number of twelve thousand men, but, before quitting the city he had ruined, Ashraf murdered the unfortunate ex-Sháh Ḥusayn, and carried off most of the ladies of the royal family and the King’s treasure. When Ţahmásp II entered Ísfahán on December 9 he found only his old mother, who had escaped deportation by disguising herself as a servant, and was moved to tears at the desolation and desecration which met his eyes at every turn. Nádir, having finally induced Ţahmásp to empower him to levy taxes on his own authority, marched southwards in pursuit of the retiring Afgháns, whom he overtook and again defeated near Persepolis. Ashraf fled from Shírúz towards his own country, but cold, hunger and the unrelenting hostility of the inhabitants of the regions which he had to traverse dissipated his forces and compelled him to abandon his captives and his treasure, and he was finally killed by a party of Balúch tribesmen. Thus ended the disastrous period of Afghán dominion in Persia in A.D. 1730, having lasted eight years.

The Career of Nádir
Until his assassination in A.D. 1747.

Although it was not until A.D. 1736 that Nádir deemed it expedient to take the title of King, he became from A.D. 1730 onwards the de facto ruler of Persia. Of his humble origin and early struggles it is unnecessary to speak here; they will be found narrated as fully as the circumstances permit in the pages of Hanway, Malcolm and other historians of Persia. Sháh Ţahmásp was from the first but a roi faînéant, and his only serious attempt to achieve anything by himself, when he took the field against the Turks in A.D. 1731, resulted in a disastrous failure, for he lost both Tabríz and Hamadán, and in January, 1732, concluded a most unfavourable peace, whereby he ceded Georgia and Armenia to Turkey on condition that she should aid him to expel the Russians from Gilán, Shírwán and Darband. Nádir, greatly incensed, came to Ísfahán in August, 1732, and, having by a stratagem seized and imprisoned Ţahmásp, proclaimed his infant son (then only six months old) as king under the title of Sháh ‘Abbás III, and at once sent a threatening letter to Aḥmad Páshá of Baghdád, which he followed up by a declaration of war in October.

In April of the following year (1733) Nádir appeared before Baghdád, having already retaken Kirmánsháh, with an army of 80,000 men, but suffered a defeat on July 18, and retired to Hamadán to recruit and recuperate his troops. Returning to the attack in the autumn he defeated the Turks on October 26 in a great battle wherein the gallant and noble-minded Tópál ‘Osmán (‘Uthmán) was slain. Having crushed a revolt in favour of the deposed Sháh Ţahmásp in Fárs, he invaded Georgia in 1734, took Tíflís, Ganja and Shamákhí,

and obtained from Russia the retrocession of Gilán, Shírwán, Darband, Bákú and Rashít. In the following year (1735) he again defeated the Turks near Erivan, and captured that city and Erzeroum.

On the following Nawrúz, or Persian New Year’s day (March 21, 1736), Nádir announced to the assembled army and deputies of the nation the death of the infant Sháh ‘Abbás III and invited them to decide within three days whether they would restore his father, the deposed Sháh Ţahmásp, or elect a new king. His own desire, which coincided with that of most of his officers and soldiers, was evident, and, the unwilling minority being overawed, the crown of Persia was unanimously offered to him. He agreed to accept it on three conditions, namely: (1) that it should be made hereditary in his family; (2) that there should be no talk of a restoration of the Šafawís, and that no one should aid, comfort, or harbour any member of that family who might aspire to the throne; and (3) that the cursing of the first three Caliphs, the mourning for the death of the Imám Husayn, and other distinctive practices of the Shi’á should be abandoned. This last condition was the most distasteful to the Persians, and the chief ecclesiastical authority, being asked his opinion, had the courage to denounce it as “derogatory to the welfare of the true believers”—a courage which cost him his life, for he was immediately strangled by Nádir’s orders. Not content with this, Nádir, on his arrival at Qazwín, confiscated the religious endowments (awqáf) for the expenses of his army, to whom, he said, Persia owed more than to her hierarchy. Towards the end of the year he concluded a favourable
treaty with Turkey, by which Persia recovered all her lost provinces; and in December he set out at the head of 100,000 men against Afgánistán and India, leaving his son Riḍá-quli as regent.

The next two years (A.D. 1737-9) witnessed Nádīr Sháh’s
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greatest military achievement, the invasion of India, capture of Lahore and Delhi, and return home with the enormous spoils in money and kind which he exacted from the unfortunate Indians, and which Hanway estimates at £87,500,000. Having taken Qandahár, Kábül and Peshawur in 1738, he crossed the Indus early in the following year, captured Lahore, and in February, 1739, utterly defeated the Indian army of Muhammad Sháh, two hundred thousand strong, on the plains of Kámrál. Delhi was peaceably occupied, but a few days later a riot occurred in which some of Nádīr’s soldiers were killed, and he avenged their blood by a general massacre of the inhabitants which lasted from 8 a.m. until 3 p.m., and in which 110,000 persons perished. He never dreamed of holding India, and, having extorted the enormous indemnity mentioned above and left the unhappy Muhammad Sháh in possession of his throne, with a threat that he would return again if necessary, he began his homeward march in May, turning aside to chastise the predatory Uzbeks of Khiva and Búkhárá, which latter town he captured on November 28, 1739.

During the absence of Nádīr Sháh his son Riḍá-quli had put to death the unfortunate Ţâhmásp and most of his family at Sábzawár, and began to show signs of desiring to retain the powers with which he had been temporarily invested by his father. Being suspected of instigating an unsuccessful attempt on Nádīr’s life, he was deprived of his eyesight, but with this cruel act the wonderful good fortune which had hitherto accompanied Nádīr began to desert him. His increasing cruelty, tyranny, avarice and extortion, but most of all, perhaps, his attempt to impose on
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his Persian subjects the Sunni doctrine, made him daily more detested. His innovations included the production of Persian translations of the Qur’án and the Gospels. The latter, on which several Christians were employed, he caused to be read aloud to him at Ţáhrán, while he commented on it with derision, and hinted that when he found leisure he might (perhaps after the model of Akbar) produce a new religion of his own which should supplant alike Judaism, Christianity and Islám. His military projects, moreover, began to miscarry; his campaign against the Lazgí in A.D. 1741-2 did not prosper, and in the war with Turkey in which he became involved in 1743 he was unsuccessful in his attempt to take Mosul (Mawṣīl). Revolts which broke out in Fárs and Shírúmán were only suppressed with difficulty after much bloodshed. However he put down a rebellion of the Qájárs at Astarábád in A.D. 1744, defeated the Turks in a great battle near Erívan in August, 1745, and concluded a satisfactory peace with them in 1746. In the following year Nádīr Sháh visited Kírmán, which suffered much from his cruelties and executions, and thence proceeded to Mashhad, where he arrived at the end of May, 1747. Here he conceived the abominable plan of killing all his Persian officers and soldiers (the bulk of his army being Turkmáns and Uzbeks and consequently Sunni), but this project was made known by a Georgian slave to some of the Persian officers, who thereupon decided, in the picturesque Persian phrase, “to breakfast off him ere he should sup off them.” A certain Şáliḥ Beg, aided by four trusty men, undertook the task, and, entering his tent
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by night, rid their country of one who, though he first appeared as its deliverer from the Afgán yoke, now bade fair to crush it beneath a yoke yet more intolerable. At the time of his death Nádīr Sháh was sixty-one years of age and had reigned eleven years and three months (A.D. 1736-47). He was succeeded by his nephew ‘Alí-quli Khán, who assumed the crown under the title of ‘Adíl Sháh, but was defeated and slain by his brother Ibráhím in the following year. He in turn was killed a year later (A.D. 1749) by the partisans of Nádīr’s grandson Sháhrúḵ, the son of the unfortunate Riḍá-quli and a Şáfawí princess, the daughter of Sháh Ḥusayn, who now succeeded to the throne. Youth, beauty and a character at once amiable and humane did not, however, secure him against misfortune, and he was shortly after his accession deposed and blinded by a certain Sayyid Muhammad, a grandson on the mother’s side of the Şáfawí Sháh Sulaymáň II. He in turn soon fell a victim to the universal violence and lawlessness which now prevailed in Persia, and Sháhrúḵ was restored to the throne, but again deposed and again restored to exercise a nominal rule at Mashhad over the province of Khurásán, which Aḥmád Khán Abdáli (afterwards famous as Aḥmád Sháh Durráni, the founder of the modern kingdom of Afgánistán) desired, before leaving

268 Revolutions of Persia, ii, p. 188. The loss to India he puts at one hundred and twenty million pounds and the number of those slain at 200,000 (Ibid., p. 197).
270 According to the Ta’rikh-i-ba’d Nádîriyya (ed. Oskar Mann, Leyden, 1891, pp. 15 et seq.), which gives a very full account of the matter, the four chief conspirators, Muhammad Khán Qájár, Músá Beg Afshá, Qoja Beg Gündüzlá and Muḥammad Şāliḥ Khán, were accompanied by seventy young volunteers, but only four had the courage to enter Nádīr’s tent. The assassination took place on Sunday, 11 Jumáda ii 1160 (June 20, 1747).
Persia, to erect into a buffer state between that country and his own. The remainder of the blind Sháhrúkh’s long reign was uneventful, and he survived until A.D. 1796, having reigned nearly fifty years.
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THE ZAND DYNASTY (A.D. 1750-1794)

“The history of Persia,” says Sir John Malcolm, “from the death of Nádir Sháh till the elevation of Aqá Muḥammad Kháñ, the founder of the reigning family, presents to our attention no one striking feature except the life of Karím Kháñ-i-Zand. The happy reign of this excellent prince, as contrasted with those who preceded and followed him, affords to the historian of Persia that description of mixed pleasure and repose which a traveller enjoys who arrives at a beautiful and fertile valley in the midst of an arduous journey over barren and rugged wastes. It is pleasing to recount the actions of a chief who, though born in an inferior rank, obtained power without crime, and who exercised it with a moderation that was, in the times in which he lived, as singular as his humanity and justice.”

Karím Kháñ, however, who fixed his capital at Shíráz, which he did so much to beautify and where he is still gratefully remembered, never ruled over the whole of Persia and never assumed the title of Sháh, but remained content with that of Wákíl, or Regent. Originally he and a Bakhtiyári chief named ‘Ali Mardán Kháñ were the joint regents of “a real or pretended grandson of Sháh Husayn”, in whose name they seized Isfahán, where they placed him on the throne. Before long they fell out; ‘Ali Mardán Kháñ was killed; and Karím Kháñ became the de facto ruler of Southern Persia. His rivals were the Afghán chief Azád in Ádharbáýján and the North-west, and in the Caspian provinces Muḥammad Hasan the Qájár, son of that Fath-‘Alí Kháñ who was murdered by Nádir at the outset of his career, and father,
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of Aqá Muḥammad Kháñ, the actual founder of the Qájár dynasty.

Azád was the first to be eliminated from this triangular contest. He defeated Karím Kháñ and compelled him to evacuate not only Isfahán but Shíráz, but, rashly pursuing him through the narrow defile of Kamáíjí, fell into an ambush, lost most of his followers, and finally, having sought refuge first with the Páshá of Baghdád and then with Heraclius, Prince of Georgia, threw himself upon the generosity of Karím Kháñ, who received him with kindness, promoted him to the first rank among his nobles, and treated him with so generous a confidence that he soon converted this dangerous rival into an attached friend.

In A.D. 1757, about four years after the battle of Kamáíjí, Karím Kháñ had to face a fierce onslaught by his other rival, Muḥammad Hasan Kháñ the Qájár, who, after a striking initial success, was finally driven back into Mázdándárán, where he was eventually defeated and killed in A.D. 1760 by Karím Kháñ’s general Shaykh ‘Alí Kháñ. From this time until his death in the spring of 1779 Karím Kháñ practically ruled over the whole of Persia except Khurásán, where the blind and harmless Sháhrúkh exercised a nominal sovereignty. The chief military exploit of his reign was the capture of Bawsha from the Turks in 1776, effected by his brother Sádiq, who continued to administer it until Karím’s death, when he relinquished it to the Turks in order to take part in the fratricidal struggle for the Persian crown.
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“The most important, if we consider its ultimate consequences, of all the events which occurred at the death of Karím Kháñ, was the flight of Aqá Muḥammad Kháñ Qájár, who had been for many years a prisoner at large in the city of Shíráz.” As a child he had suffered castration by the cruel command of Nádir’s nephew ‘Adil Sháhli, on account of which the title of Ághá or Aqá, generally given to eunuchs, was added to his name. After the defeat and death of his father Muḥammad Hasan Kháñ the Qájár in A.D. 1757, he fell into the hands of Karím Kháñ, who interned him in Shíráz, but otherwise treated him kindly, and even generously, so far as was compatible with his safe custody. He was even allowed to gratify his passion for the chase in the country round Shíráz on condition of re-entering the city before the gates were closed at night-fall. Returning to the city on the evening of Safar 12, 1193 (March 1, 1779), and learning through his sister, who was an inmate of the Palace, that Karím Kháñ lay at the point of death, he suffered a favourite hawk to escape, and made its pursuit an excuse for spending the night in the plain. Next morning, two hours after dawn, having learned that Karím Kháñ had breathed his last, he took advantage of the prevailing confusion to make his escape northwards, and travelled so swiftly that he reached Isfahán on the third day, and thence made his way into Mázdándárán, which thenceforth became the base of

273 R. G. Watson’s History of Persia, p. 44.
274 Sir John Malcolm’s History of Persia, vol. ii, p. 125. The two preceding pages contain a graphic account of the battle of Kamáíjí, as narrated to the author on the spot by persons who had themselves taken part in it.
277 Ibid., p. 263.
278 Taʾrikh-i-Zandiyya, p. 6, 1. 1.
those operations by which, fifteen years later, he accomplished the final overthrow of the Zand dynasty and won for his own house that supremacy over Persia which they hold to this day.

It is unnecessary to describe here the fratricidal wars

which during the next ten years (A.D. 1779-89) sapped the power of the Zand dynasty while Áqá Muḥammad Kháñ, with incredible self-control and political sagacity, was uniting and consolidating the Qājār power. Within the year which witnessed Karim Kháñ’s death four of his house had successively mounted his throne, to wit, his son Abu’l-Faṭḥ, his nephew ‘Ali Murád, his son Muḥammad ‘Ali, and his brother Šádiq. The last-named, together with all his sons except Ja’far, was put to death in March, 1782, by ‘Ali Murád, who thus regained the throne, but died at Murchakhur near Iṣfahán in January, 1785, and was succeeded by Ja’far, the date of whose accession is commemorated in the following ingenious chronogram by Ḥájjí Sulaymán of Káshán called Šabáni280:

بضمط سالٍ جلوس مباركٍ مهمون

كه هست مباده تاريخ عشترٍ دوران

نوشت صلتك صباحي زقصر سلطائي

على مراد برون شد نشست جعفر خان

“To record the year of the blessed and auspicious accession
Which is the initial date of the mirth of the age,
The pen of Šabáni wrote: ‘From the Royal Palace
‘Ali Murád went forth, and Ja’far Kháñ sat’ [in his place].”

The letters composing the words Ḥaqr-i-Sultání yield the number 550; from this we subtract (355) equivalent to ‘Ali Murád, which gives us 195; to this we add the number equivalent to Ja’far Kháñ (1004), which finally gives us the correct date A.H. 1199 (A.D. 178 5).

Ja’far Kháñ was murdered on 25 Rabí‘ i, 1203 (January 23, 1789), and was succeeded by his son, the gallant and unfortunate Luṭf-‘Alí Kháñ, of whose personality Sir Harford Jones Brydges has given so attractive an account. “The reader, I hope,” he

says281, “will pardon me if I treat the reign and misfortunes of the noble Luṭf-‘Alí more in detail than usual. I received great kindness and attention from him when he filled the throne; and under a miserable tent I had the honour of sitting on the same horse-cloth with him when a fugitive! His virtues endeared him to his subjects; and the bravery, constancy, courage and ability which he manifested under his misfortunes are the theme of poems and ballads which it is not improbable will last as long as the Persian language itself. He was manly, amiable, affable under prosperity and, under calamities as great and as severe as human nature can suffer, he was dignified and cool and determined. That so noble a being, that a prince the hope and pride of his country, should have been betrayed by a wretch282 in whom he placed, or rather misplaced, his confidence — that his end should have been marked by indignities exercised on his person at which human nature shudders — that his — little son should have suffered loss of virility — that his daughters should have been forced into marriage with the scum of the earth — that the princess his wife should have been dishonoured — are dispensations of Providence, which, though we must not arraign, we may permit ourselves to wonder at.”

It is fortunate that we possess such disinterested appreciations of poor Luṭf-‘Alí Kháñ, the last chivalrous figure amongst the kings of Persia, for such of his compatriots as described his career necessarily wrote after the triumph of his implacable rival and deadly foe Áqá Muḥammad Kháñ, and therefore, whatever their true sentiments may have been,

dared not venture to praise the fallen prince, lest they should incur the displeasure of the cruel Qājār. Short-lived as the Zand dynasty was, it began and ended nobly, for its first representative was one of the best and its last one of the bravest of all the long line of Persian monarchs.

280 Ta’rikh-i-Zandíyya, pp. 24-25.
281 The Dynasty of the Kajars, etc. (London, 1833), pp. cxx-cxxi. Sir H. J. Brydges “visited Shiráz for the first time in 1786.”
282 To wit, the notorious Hájjí Ibráhím — “the scoundrel,” as Sir H. J. Brydges calls him (Account of ... H.M.’s Mission, etc. vol. i. pp. 95-96), “whose mad ambition and black heart brought ruin on his confiding King, and misery the most severe on his fellow-citizens.”
The Reigning Qájáír Dynasty (A.D. 1796 onwards).

The full and detailed accounts of the reigning Qájáír dynasty already available to the English reader render any attempt to summarize their history in this place quite unnecessary. Aqá Muhammad Khan was not actually crowned until A.D. 1796, and was assassinated in the following year, so that he wore the crown of Persia for not more than fifteen months, but his reign practically began on the death of Karim Khán in A.D. 1779, though “he used to observe that he had no title even to the name of king till he was obeyed through the whole of the ancient limits of the Empire of Persiá,” so that it was only after he had finally subdued Georgia that he consented to assume the title of Sháh. His appearance and character are admirably summarized by Sir John Malcolm in the following words:

“Áqá Muhammad Khán was murdered in the sixty-third year of his age. He had been ruler of a great part of Persia for upwards of twenty years, but had only for a short period enjoyed the undisputed sovereignty of that country. The person of that monarch was so slender that at a distance he appeared like a youth of fourteen or fifteen. His beardless and shrivelled face resembled that of an aged and wrinkled woman; and the expression of his countenance, at no times pleasant, was horrible when clouded, as it very often was, with indignation. He was sensible of this, and could not bear that anyone should look at him. This prince had suffered, in the early part of his life, the most cruel adversity; and his future conduct seems to have taken its strongest bias from the keen recollection of his misery and his wrongs. The first passion of his mind was the love of power; the second, avarice; and the third, revenge. In all these he indulged to excess, and they administered to each other: but the two latter, strong as they were, gave way to the first whenever they came in collision. His knowledge of the character and feelings of others was wonderful; and it is to this knowledge, and his talent of concealing from all the secret purposes of his soul, that we must refer his extraordinary success in subduing his enemies. Against these he never employed force till art had failed; and, even in war, his policy effected more than his sword. His ablest and most confidential minister, when asked if Áqá Muhammad Khán was personally brave, replied, ‘No doubt; but still I can hardly recollect an occasion when he had an opportunity of displaying courage. The monarch’s head,’ he emphatically added, ‘never left work for his hand.’”

Áqá Muhammad Khán was succeeded by his nephew the uxurious and philoprogenitive Fath-Áli Sháh. He was avaricious and vain, being inordinately proud of his handsome face and long beard, but not by nature cruel (at any rate compared to his late uncle), and it is related that, though obliged by custom to witness the execution of malefactors, he would always avert his face so as not to behold the unhappy wretch’s death-agony. He was something of a poet, and composed numerous odes under the pen-name of Khágán. Politically the chief features of his reign were the Anglo-French rivalry typified by the missions of Malcolm and Harford Jones Brydges on the one hand, and Jaubert and General Gardanne on the other (A.D. 1800-1808); the growing menace of Russia, resulting in the successive disastrous treaties of Gulistán (A.D. 1813) and Turkman-cháy (A.D. 1826); and the war with Turkey in A.D. 1821, concluded in 1823 by the Treaty of Erzeroum. Other notable events of this reign were the disgrace and death of the traitor Hájjí Ibráhím and the almost complete extirpation of his family about A.D. 1800, the massacre of Grebaidoff and the Russian Mission at Tíhrán on February 11, 1829, and the premature death, at the age of forty-six, of the Sháh’s favourite son ‘Abbás Mírzá, the Crown Prince, “the noblest of the

---

283 Sir Harford Jones Brydges’ *Dynasty of the Kajars translated from the Original Persian Manuscript* (London, 1833) opens with a valuable Introduction (Preliminary matter) filling pp. xiii-exci. The text of the original, entitled Ma’áthir-i-Sultániyya, was printed at Tabriz in Rajab, 1241 (March, 1826) and comes down to that year, but Brydges’ translation ends with the year 1226/1811-12, and, in the latter part especially, differs very greatly from the printed text. Sir John Malcolm’s *History* ends with the year 1230/1814; R. G. Watson’s excellent monograph with A.D. 1857-8. The latest *History of Persia*, by Sir Percy Molesworth Sykes (2nd edition, London, 1921), is continued down to the actual year of publication.

284 Like Nádžir, he was crowned by acclamation in the Plain of Múqán in the spring of 1796, and met his death on June 17, 1797.


287 The infamous traitor Hájjí Ibráhím, who personally communicated to Sir John Malcolm the opinion here recorded.

288 According to the Násikh ‘i-Tawáríkh, the issue of Fath-Áli Sháh during the 47 years of his mature lifetime amounted to two thousand children and grandchildren, and would, adds the historian, during the twenty-one years intervening between his death and the date of writing, probably amount to about ten thousand souls. He enumerates 57 sons and 46 daughters who survived him, 296 grandsons and 292 granddaughters, and 158 wives who had borne children to him. R.G. Watson (History of Persia, p. 269) puts the number of his children at 159. In any case the number was so large as to justify the well-known Persian saying Shutur u shupush u shahzáda hama já payádá xt (“Camels, lice and princes are to be found everywhere”).


Kajar race,” as Watson calls him, in A.D. 1833. His heart-broken father only survived him about a year, and died at the age of sixty-eight on October 23, 1834, leaving fifty-seven sons and forty-six daughters to mourn his loss.

Fath-‘Alí Sháh was succeeded by his grandson Muḥammad, the son of ‘Abbás Mirzá, who, ere he was crowned on January 31, 1835, was confronted with two rival claimants to the throne, his uncle the Żillu’s-Sultân and his brother the Farmán-farmá. These,

however, were overcome without much difficulty by Persian troops commanded by Sir Henry Lindsay Bethune, and though the new Sháh had every reason to be grateful to England and Russia for assuring his succession, the fact that these two powerful neighbours had for the first time intervened in this fashion was an ominous portent and a dangerous precedent in the history of Persia. The same year witnessed the fall and execution (on June 26, 1835) of the celebrated Qá’im-maqám Mirzá Abu’l-Qásim, hitherto the all-powerful minister of the King, still regarded by his countrymen as one of the finest prose stylists of modern times. He was succeeded as Prime Minister by the notorious Ḥájjí Mirzá Āgháší, concerning whom many ridiculous anecdotes are still current in Persia.

The year 1835 witnessed the fall and execution (on June 26, 1835) of the celebrated Qá’im-maqám Mirzá Abu’l-Qásim, hitherto the all-powerful minister of the King, still regarded by his countrymen as one of the finest prose stylists of modern times. He was succeeded as Prime Minister by the notorious Ḥájjí Mirzá Āgháší, concerning whom many ridiculous anecdotes are still current in Persia.

Of the origin and doctrines of the Isma’ílí heresy or “Sect of the Seven” (Ṣáḥi ʾiyya), some account will be found in the first volume of this work, while their destruction by Hūlagú Khán the Mongol in the middle of the thirteenth century of our era is briefly described in the second. But, though their power in Persia was shattered, they still continued to exist, and, from time to time, to reappear on the pages of Persian history. In the volume of the Násíkhū’t-Tawārikh dealing with the reigning Qájár dynasty several references to them occur. The first, under the year 1232/1817, refers to the death of the then head of the sect Sháh Khalílu’lláh, the son of Sayyid Abu’l-Ḥasan Khán, at Yazd. Under the Zand dynasty Abu’l-Ḥasan had been governor of Kirmán, whence on his dismissal he retired to the Maḥallát of Qum. There he received tribute from his numerous followers in India and Central Asia, who, it is recorded, if unable to bring their offerings in person, used to throw them into the sea, believing that they would thus be conveyed into the hands of their Imám; but, when possible, used to visit him in his abode and deem it an honour to render him personal service, even of the most menial kind. His son, Sháh Khalílu’lláh, transferred his abode to Yazd, but after residing there two years he was killed in the course of a quarrel which had arisen between some of his followers and the Muslim citizens of Yazd, instigated by a certain Mulla Ḥusayn. The Sháh punished the perpetrators of this outrage, gave one of his daughters in marriage to Áqá Khán, the son and successor of the late Imám of the Isma’ílís, and made him governor of Qum and the surrounding districts.

We next hear of this Áqá Khán in 1255/1839 or 1256/1840, when, apparently in consequence of the arrogant

behaviour of Ḥájjí ‘Abdu’l-Muḥammad-i-Maḥallátí, instigated by the minister Ḥájjí Mirzá Āqáší, he rebelled against Muḥammad Sháh and occupied the citadel of Bám, but was obliged to surrender to Fírúz Mirzá, then governor of Kirmán, who pardoned him and sent him to Ṭīhrán. Here he was well received by Ḥájjí Mirzá Āqáší and was presently allowed to return to his former government in the district of Qum. Having sent his family and possessions to Karbalá by way of Baghdád, so as to leave himself free and unencumbered, he began to buy swift and strong horses and to recruit brave and devoted soldiers, and when his preparations were completed he set out across the deserts and open country towards Kirmán, pretending that he was proceeding to Mecca by way of Bandar-i-‘Abbás, and that the government of Kirmán had been conferred upon him. Prince Bahman Mirzá Bahá’u’l-dawla, being apprised of his intentions, pursued and overtook him as he was making for Shahr-i-Bábák and Sírján, and a skirmish took place between the two parties in which eight of the Prince’s soldiers and sixteen of the Áqá Khán’s men were killed. After a second and fiercer battle the Áqá Khán was defeated and fled.

---

291 Ibid., p. 269.
292 His father, Mirzá ‘İsá of Faráhán, bore the same title. Notices of both occur in vol. ii of the Majma’u’l-Fusahá, pp. 87 and 425. Some account of his literary achievements will be given when we come to consider the prose-writers of the Qájár period in the penultimate chapter of Part iii of this volume.
294 Lit. Hist. of Persia, i, pp. 391-4 15, etc.
295 Ibid., ii, pp. 190-211; 453-460.
296 R. G. Watson in his History of Persia gives a fairly full account of the insurrection (pp. 331-334).
to Lár, whence he ultimately escaped to India, where his descendant, the present Áqá Khán²⁹⁷, lives a wealthy and spacious life at Bombay when not engaged in his frequent and extensive travels.

The rise of the Bábí sect or religion, which began in the later years of Muḥammad Sháh’s reign, was an event of the most far-reaching significance and importance, and forms

[page 150]

the subject of an extensive literature²⁹⁸, not only in Persian and Arabic, but in English, French, German, Russian and other European languages. Since it would be impossible to give an adequate account of its eventful history and extensive developments in this volume, and since ample materials for its study are already available even in English (indeed, thanks to the success attained by its missionaries in America, especially in English), no attempt at recapitulation will be made here. Sayyid ‘Ali Muhammad the Báb has himself (in the Persian Bayán) fixed the date of his “Manifestation” (Zuhúr) as May 23, 1844 (5 Jumáda i, 1260), just a thousand years after the disappearance or “Occultation” (Ghaybat) of the Twelfth Imám, or Ímám Mahdí, to whom he claimed to be the “Gate” (Báb). Neither the idea nor the expression was new: the Ímám Mahdí had four successive “Gates” (Abwáh) by means of whom, during the “Lesser Occultation” (Ghaybat-i-Ṣúghra), he maintained communication with his followers; and the “Perfect Shi’á” (“Shi’á-i-Kámil”) of the Shaykhí School, in which the Báb pursued his theological studies, connoted much the same idea of an Intermediary (Wásiá), or Channel of Grace, between the Concealed Imám and his faithful followers. Later the Báb “went higher” (báláatár raft), to use the expression of his followers, and claimed to be first the “Supreme Point” (Nuqáta-i-A’lá), or “Point of Explanation” (Nuqáta-i-Bayán), then the Qá’ím (“He who is to arise” of the House of the Prophet), then the Inaugurator of a new Dispensation, and lastly an actual Divine Manifestation or Incarnation. Some of his followers went even further, calling themselves Gods and him a

[page 151]

“Creator of Gods” (Khudá-áfarín) while one of them went so far as to write of Bahá’u’lláh²⁹⁹:

خلقه گویند خداانی و من اندر غضب آهیم
پره بر داشه مهندن بخود نگند خداانی

“Men say Thou art God, and I am moved to anger:
Raise the veil, and submit no longer to the shame of Godhead!”

Although the Bábí movement led to much bloodshed, this took place almost entirely after the death of Muḥammad Sháh, which happened on September 5, 1848, though already the Báb was a prisoner in the fortress of Mákú in the extreme N.W. of Persia, while in Khurásán, Mázandarán and elsewhere armed bands of his followers roamed the country proclaiming the Advent of the expected Mahdí and the inauguration of the Reign of the Saints, and threatening those sanguinary encounters between themselves and their opponents which were at once precipitated by the King’s death and the ensuing dislocation and confusion.

Dark indeed were the horizons at the beginning of the new reign. The Wali-‘ahd, or Crown Prince, Náṣiru’d-Dín, was absent at Tabríz, the seat of his government, at the time of his father’s, death, and until he could reach Tihrán his mother, the Mahd-i-‘Ulúyá, assumed control of affairs. Hájí Mirzá Áqáí, whose unpopularity was extreme, not only ceased to act as Prime Minister, but had to flee for his life, and took refuge in the Shrine of Sháh ‘Abdu’l-‘Azím³⁰⁰. Disturbances broke out in the capital itself, and more serious revolts in Burújírd, Kirmánsháh, Kurdístán, Shiráz, Kirmán, Yazd and Khurúsán. The young Sháh, then only seventeen years of age³⁰¹, finally

[page 152]

reached the capital on October 20, 1848, was crowned the same night, and immediately appointed as his Prime Minister Mirzá Taqí Khán, better known as the Amir-i-Nízám, who, notwithstanding his lowly origin (his father was originally cook to


²⁹⁸ For a bibliography of the literature to 1889 see my Traveller’s Narrative written to illustrate the Episode of the Báb (Cambridge, 1890, vol. ii, pp. 173-211; and for the subsequent literature, my Materials for the Study of the Bábí Religion (Cambridge, 1918), pp. 175-243.

²⁹⁹ Cited in the Hasht Bihisht, f. 244° of my ms. The verse is ascribed to Nabil of Zarand, who killed himself at ‘Akká on Bahá’u’lláh’s death on May 28, 1892.


³⁰¹ He was born on July 17, 1831.
the Qá‘ím-maqáţm)\textsuperscript{302}, was one of the greatest men and most honest, capable and intelligent ministers produced by Persia in modern times. “The race of modern Persians,” exclaims Watson\textsuperscript{303} enthusiastically, “cannot be said to be altogether effete, since so recently it has been able to produce a man such as was the Amír-i-Nízám”; and the Hon. Robert Curzon, in his Armenia and Erzeroum, has described him as “beyond all comparison the most interesting personage amongst the commissioners of Turkey, Persia, Russia and Great Britain who were then assembled at Erzeroum.” In the brief period of three years during which he held the high office of Prime Minister he did much for Persia, but the bright promise of his career was too soon darkened by the envy and malice of his rivals. The tragic circumstances of his violent and cruel death in his exile at the beautiful palace of Fin near Káshán are too well known to need repetition\textsuperscript{304}, but the admirable fidelity of his wife, the Sháh’s only sister, can not be passed over in silence. “No princess educated in a Christian court, says Watson\textsuperscript{305}, “and accustomed to the contemplation of the brightest example of conjugal virtues that the history of the world has recorded could have shown more tenderness and devotion than did the sister of the Sháh of Persia towards her unfortunate husband.” Her untiring vigilance was, however, finally tricked and out-

\textsuperscript{302} Some account of the two celebrated men, father and son, who bore this title will be found in the account of modern prose-writers of note in Part iii of this volume. See p. 147 supra, ad calc.

\textsuperscript{303} See Watson’s History, p. 264.

\textsuperscript{304} Ibid., pp. 398-406.

\textsuperscript{305} Ibid., p. 403.

\textsuperscript{306} Founded in 1894.

The Bábís, however, had no cause to love Mirzá Taqí Khán, whose death they had already striven to compass, and whose ultimate fate was regarded by them as a signal instance of Divine retribution, since, apart from other measures which he had taken against them, he was responsible for the execution of the Báb himself at Tabriz on July 9, 1850. The Báb indeed, helpless prisoner that he was, had kindled a flame which proved inextinguishable, and which especially illumines with a lurid glow the first four years of Nášíru’d-Dín Sháh’s reign. The story of the almost incredible martial achievements of the Bábís at Sháykh Tábarsí in Mázandarán, at Zanján, Yazd, Nayríz and elsewhere during the years 1849-1850 will never be more graphically told than by the Comte de Góbineau, who in his incomparable book Les Religions et les Philosophies dans l’Asie Centrale combines wit, sympathy and insight in an extraordinary degree. I personally owe more to this book than to any other book about Persia, since to it, not less than to an equally fortunate and fortuitous meeting in Iṣfahán, I am indebted for that unravelling of Bábí doctrine and history which first won for me a reputation in Oriental scholarship. Góbineau was for some time a “prophet without honour in his own country,” but, while France long neglected him, Germany produced a “Góbineau-Vereinigung\textsuperscript{306}\textsuperscript{306}” and several important works\textsuperscript{307} on his life and writings. The militant

\textsuperscript{306} Founded in 1894.

phase of Bábísm. culminated in the attempted assassination of Nášíru’d-Dín Sháh by three members of the sect on August 15, 1852, and the frightful persecution which followed, wherein twenty-eight more or less prominent Bábís, including the beautiful and talented poetess Qurrátú’l-‘Ayn, suffered death with horrible tortures\textsuperscript{308}. Most of the leading Bábís who survived emigrated or were exiled to Baghdád, and thenceforth, though the sect continued to increase in Persia, the centre of its activity, whether at Baghdád, Adrianople, Cyprus or Acre, lay beyond the frontiers of Persia.

It is unnecessary here to discuss the causes and course of the short Anglo-Persian War of 1856-7, brought about by the seizure of Herát by the Persians. It began with the occupation by the British of the island of Khárák in the Persian Gulf on December 4, 1856, and was officially terminated by the Treaty of Peace signed at Paris on March 4, 1857, by Lord Cowley and Farrukh Khán, though, owing to the slowness of communications at that time, hostilities actually continued for another month. They did not end a moment too soon for Great Britain, for almost before the ratifications were exchanged the Indian Mutiny broke out. The need then experienced for better communications between England and India led in 1864 to the introduction into Persia of the telegraph, to which further extension was given in 1870 and 1872, and this, as pointed out by Sir Percy Molesworth Sykes (whose History of Persia\textsuperscript{309} is almost the only book which gives a continuous

\textsuperscript{307} I possess two by Ludwig Schemann, Eine Biographie and Quellen und Untersuchungen (Strassburg, 1913 and 1914). The monthly review Europe for October, 1923 (No. 7), has published a very important Numéro consacré au Comte de Góbineau, which contains (pp. 116-126) an excellent article by M. Vladimir Minorsky entitled Góbineau et la Perse, followed (pp. 127-141) by a list of his published and unpublished works, a biography, and an account of Le mouvement Gobiniste en Allemagne et en France.


\textsuperscript{309} I refer to the second and enlarged edition, published in 1921, in which (on p. 526 of vol. ii) March of that year is mentioned as the current date at the time of writing.
and coherent narrative of events from 1857 to 1921), had far-reaching reactions\textsuperscript{310}, and was one of the factors in the modernization of Persia. Others were the extension of the Press (first introduced into Tabriz by ‘Abbás Mirzá about A.D. 1816) and consequent wider diffusion of literature; the slow growth of journalism since 1851\textsuperscript{311} down to its enormous expansion during the Revolution of 1906-1911 and again after the Russian collapse; the foundation of the Dáru ’l-Funún, or Polytechnic College, at Tíhrán in 1851, and the introduction of European science and instruction; and, in a lesser degree, the Sháh’s three journeys to Europe in 1873, 1878 and 1889, though it is doubtful whether he or his attendants derived more advantage from what they saw in the course of their peregrinations than Persian literature did from his accounts of his experiences.

Nášírú’d-Din Sháh was only a little over seventeen years of age when he was crowned on the 24th of Dhu’l-Qa‘da, 1264 (20 October, 1848), and would have entered upon the fiftieth year of his reign on the same date of the Muhammadan year A.H. 1313, corresponding to May 5, 1896. Four days earlier, however, when all the preparations for the celebration of his jubilee were completed, he was shot dead by Mirzá Riád of Kírmán, a disciple of that turbulent spirit Sayyid Jamálú’d-Díns al-Afgán, in the Shrine of Sháh ‘Abdu’l-‘Azím a few miles south of Tíhrán. Of the events which led up to this catastrophe and their significance I have treated fully in my History of the Persian Revolution of 1905-1909, and will not attempt to epitomize here matters which are fully discussed there, and which it would be a waste of space to recapitulate. The seeds of the Revolution were sown, and even began to germinate, about the time of the Sháh’s third and last visit to Europe, fruitful in ill-advised concessions, which (especially the Tobacco concession of 1890) were a potent factor in stimulating the political discontents which found their first open expression in the Tobacco-riots of 1891 and culminated in the Revolution of 1905. If we ignore the external relations of Persia with foreign Powers, especially England and Russia, which form the principal topic of such political histories as that of Sir Percy Molesworth Sykes, we may, broadly speaking, that of the long reign of Nášírú’d-Din Sháh the first four years (A.D. 1848-52) were notable for the religious fermentation caused by the Bábis, and the last six years Sháh’s reign, (A.D. 1890-6) for the political fermentation which brought about the Revolution in the following reign; while the intervening period was, outwardly at any rate, one of comparative peace and tranquillity. It was my good fortune to visit Persia in 1887-8 towards the end of this period, and, while enjoying the remarkable security which then prevailed in the country, to see almost the last of what may fairly be called mediaeval Persia. To this security I hardly did justice in the narrative of my travels\textsuperscript{312} which I wrote soon after my return, for I hardly realized then how few and short were the periods, either before or after my visit, when a young foreigner, without any official position or protection, could traverse the country from North-West to South-East and from North to South, attended only by his Persian servant and his muleteers, not only without danger, but practically without the occurrence of a single disagreeable incident. And if this remarkable security, which compared favourably with that of many European countries, had originally been brought about by frightful exemplary punishments of robbers and ill-doers, these were no longer in evidence, and during the whole of my time in Persia I not only never witnessed an execution or a bastinado, but never heard of a specific case of either in any place where I stayed, though the ghastly pillars of mortar with protruding human bones outside the gates of Shíráz still bore witness to the stern rule of the Sháh’s uncle Farhád Mirzá, Mu’ámadu’d-Dawla, whom I met only in the capacity of a courtly and learned bibliophile. Yet withal the atmosphere was, as I have said, mediaeval: politics and progress were hardly mentioned, and the talk turned mostly on mysticism, metaphysics and religion; the most burning political questions were those connected with the successors of the Prophet Muhammad in the seventh century of our era; only a languid interest in external affairs was aroused by the occasional appearance of the official journals Irán and Itílát, or the more exciting Akhtar published in Constantinople; while at Kírmán one post a week maintained communication with the outer world. How remote does all this seem from the turmoil of 1891, the raging storms of 1905-11, the deadly paralysis of the Russian terror which began on Christmas Day in the year last mentioned, and then the Great War, when Persia became the cockpit of three foreign armies and the field of endless intrigues. The downfall of Russian Imperialism freed her from the nightmare of a century, and seemed to her to avenge the desecration of the holy shrine of Mashhad in April, 1912, while the collapse of the Anglo-Persian Agreement and consequent withdrawal of British troops and advisers has left her for the time being to her own devices, to make or mar her future as she can and will.

Since Nášírú’d-Din fell a victim to the assassin’s pistol the throne of Persia has been occupied by his son Múzáffarú’d-Dín (1896-1907), who granted the Constitution; his grandson Muhammad ‘Ali, who endeavoured to destroy it, who was deposed by the victorious Nationalists on July 16, 1909, and who is still living in retirement in the neighbourhood of


\textsuperscript{311} See p. 10 of my Press and Poetry in Modern Persia, where the whole subject is fully discussed.

\textsuperscript{312} A Year Amongst the Persians (London: A. & C. Black, 1893). This book has long been out of print and is now very scarce.
Constantinople; and his great-grandson Sulṭán Ahmad Sháh the reigning monarch. It would be premature to discuss the reign and character of the last, while the very dissimilar characters of his father and grandfather I have endeavoured to depict in my History of the Persian Revolution. But since the death of Nášíru’d-Dín-Dín Sháh twenty-seven years ago it may truly be said that the centre of interest has shifted from the king to the people of Persia, nor, so far as we can foresee the future, is it likely that we shall see another Isma’īl, another Nádir, or (which God forbid!) another Aqá Muḥammad Khán.

PART II.

PERSIAN VERSE
DURING THE LAST FOUR CENTURIES

CHAPTER V.

SOME GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS ON THE LATER AND ESPECIALLY THE RELIGIOUS POETRY OF THE PERSIANS.

Four hundred years ago the Persian language (or at any rate the written language, for no doubt fresh colloquialisms and slang may have arisen during this period) was to all intents and purposes the same as it is to-day, while such new literary forms as exist go no further back, as a rule, than the middle of the nineteenth century, that is to say than the accession of Nášíru’d-Dín Sháh, whose reign (A.D. 1848-1896) might not inappropriately be called the Persian Victorian Era. In the three previous volumes of this book each historical chapter has been immediately followed by a chapter dealing with the literature of that period; but in this volume, for the reason just given, it appeared unnecessary to break the sequence of events in this way, and to be preferable to devote the first part of the volume to a brief historical sketch of the whole period, and the second and third parts to a consideration of the literature in verse and prose, arranged according to categories.

How to arrange these categories is a problem which has cost me a good deal of thought. Nearly all those who have written on Persian literature have paid an amount of attention which I regard as excessive and disproportionate to poetry and belles-lettres, and have almost entirely ignored the plainer but more positive fields of history, biography, theology, philosophy and the ancient sciences. If we understand literature in the narrower sense as denoting those writings only, whether poetry or prose, which have artistic form, there is, no doubt, some justification for this view; but not if we take it in the wider sense of the manifestation in writing of a nation’s mind and intellectual activities. Still, in deference to the prevalent view, we may begin this general survey of the recent literature of Persia with some consideration of its poetry.

Here we have to distinguish some half-dozen categories of verse, namely (1) the classical poetry; (2) occasional or topical verse; (3) religious and devotional verse, from the formal marthiyás, or threnodies, of great poets like Muḥtasham of Káshán to the simple popular poems on the sufferings of the Imáms recited at the Ta’ziyás, or mournings, of the month of Muḥarram; (4) the scanty but sometimes very spirited verses composed by the Bábis since about 1850, which should be regarded as a special subdivision of the class last mentioned; (5) the ballads or taṣnifs sung by professional minstrels, of which it is hard to trace the origin or antiquity; (6) the quite modern political verse which has arisen since the Revolution of 1906, and which I have already discussed in some detail in another work. In this chapter I shall deal chiefly with the religious verse, leaving the consideration of the secular poetry to the two succeeding chapters.

(1) The Classical Poetry.

Alike in form and matter the classical poetry of Persia has been stereotyped for at least five or six centuries, so that, except for such references to events or persons as may indicate the date of composition, it is hardly possible, after reading a qasída (elegy), ghazal (ode), or rubá’í (quatrain), to guess whether it was composed by a contemporary of Jámi (d. A.H. 1492)
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or by some quite recent poet, such as Qá’ání. Of the extremely conventional character of this poetry I have spoken in a previous volume, and of Ibn Khaldún’s doctrine “that the Art of composing in verse or prose is concerned only with words, not with ideas.” Hence, even in the most recent poetry of this type, we very seldom find any allusion to such modern inventions as tea-drinking, tobacco-smoking, railways, telegraphs or newspapers; indeed several of the greatest modern poets, such as Qá’ání, Dávari and the like, have chiefly shown their originality by reviving certain forms of verse like the *musammat* which had fallen into disuse since the eleventh or twelfth century.

Perhaps the statement with which the above paragraph opens is too sweeping and requires some qualification, for in some of the later Persian poets Indian and Turkish critics do profess to discover a certain originality (tāza-gū’i) marking an epoch in the development of the art, and the rise of a new school. The Persians themselves are not addicted to literary criticism; perhaps because, just as people only discuss their health when they are beginning to lose it, so those only indulge in meticulous literary criticism who are no longer able, or have never been able, to produce good literature. According to Gibb, Jámí and Mír ‘Ali Shir Nawá’í, ‘Urfd of Shíráz (d. 999/1590-1) and the Indian Faydí (Feyzí, d. 1004/1595-6), and lastly Sá’íb of Iṣfahán (d. 1080/1669-70) were successively the chief foreign influences on the development of Ottoman Turkish poetry, and a great deal has been written about them by the Turkish critics. The best and fullest
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critical estimate of the leading Persian poets from the earliest times down to the latter part of the seventeenth century is, however, so far as I can judge, a work written (most unfortunately) in the Urdú or Hindustání language, the *Shi’ru’l- Ajam* (“Poetry of the Persians”) of that eminent scholar Shiblí Nu’mání. The third volume of this work, composed in 1324/5/1906-7, deals with seven Persian poets of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries of our era, namely Fighání (d. 925/1519), Faydí (d. 1004/1595-6), ‘Urfd (d. 999/1590-1), Nazíríd (d. 1021/1612-3), Tálíb-i-Ámuli (d. 1036/1626-7), Sá’íb (d. 1080/1669-170), and Ábú’ Tálíb Kálím (d. 1061/1651). All these were Persians, attracted to India by the liberal patronage of the Moghul Court, except Faydí whom Shiblí regards as the only Indian poet except Ámir Khusrw who could produce Persian verse which might pass for that of a born Persian. ‘Urfd and Sá’íb were the most notable of these seven, but even they enjoy a greater repute in India and Turkey than in their own country. The explanation of this fact offered by some Persians of my acquaintance is that they are easily understood and therefore popular with foreigners, who often find the more subtle poetry admired in Persia beyond their powers of comprehension. I must confess with shame that in this case my taste agrees with the foreigners, and that I find Sá’íb especially attractive, both on account of his simplicity of style and his skill in the figures entitled *husn-i-ta’llí* or “poetical aetiology,” and *irsálu’l-mathal* or “proverbial commission.” Nearly forty years ago (in 1885) I read through the Persian portion of that volume of the great trilingual anthology entitled *Kharábát* which deals with the lyrical
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verse of the Arabs, Turks and Persians, both odes and isolated verses, and copied into a note-book which now lies before me those which pleased me most, irrespective of authorship; and, though many of the 443 fragments and isolated verses which I selected are anonymous, more than one-tenth of the total (45) are by Sá’íb.

India, at all events, thanks to the generous patronage of Humáyùn, Akbar, and their successors down to that gloomy zealot Awrangdzib, and of their great nobles, such as Bayram Kháñ-Khánán and his son ‘Abdu’re-Rahím, who succeeded to the title after his father’s assassination about A.D. 1561, continued during the greater part of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to attract a great number of the most talented Persian poets, who found there an appreciation which was withheld from them in their own country. Badá’úní enumerates about one hundred and seventy, most of whom were of Persian descent though some of them were born in India. Shiblí gives a list of fifty-one who came to India from Persia in Akbar’s time and were received at court, and a long list is also given by Sprenger. Shiblí quotes numerous verses showing how widely diffused amongst Persian poets was the desire to try their fortune in India.

Thus Sá’íb says:

---

316 Cf. Gibb’s History of Ottoman Poetry, vol. iv, p. 4. Such allusions will, however, be found in the poem by Na’ím quoted in the latter part of this chapter, though in general it follows the orthodox *qasida* form.
319 Ridá-qúlí Kháñ explicitly says of both of them that their style is not approved by moder Persian.
321 Compiled by Ziyá (Diýá) Pasha, and published in three volumes at Constantinople in 1291-2/1874-5.
322 *Muntakhabu’l-Tawáríkh* (Calcutta, 1869), vol. iii, pp. 170-390.
323 *Shi’ru’l- Ajam*, vol. iii, p. 5.
325 *Shi’ru’l- Ajam*, vol. iii, p. 10.
There is no head wherein desire for thee danceth not, 
Even as the determination to visit India is in every heart.

And Abú Ṭalib Kalím says:

I am the captive of India, and I regret this misplaced journey 
Whither can the feather-flutterings of the dying bird convey it?
Kalim goes lamenting to Persia [dragged thither] by the eagerness of his fellow-travellers, 
Like the camel-bell which traverses the stage on the feet of others. 
Through longing for India I turn my regretful eyes backwards in such fashion 
That, even if I set my face to the road, I do not see what confronts me.

So also 'Alí-qulí Salím says:

There exist not in Persia the means of acquiring perfection: 
Henna does not develop its colour until it comes to India.

The Persian dervish-poet Rasmí, commemorating the Khán-Khánán’s liberal patronage of poets, says:

When a Muslim kills a bird for food by cutting its throat, he must pronounce the formula *Bismi'lláh* (“In the Name of God”) over it. 
Such a bird, in its (lying struggles on the ground, is called *Murgh-i-Bismil*, or *Nim-bismil*.

“Through auspicious praise of thee the fame of the perfection of that subtle singer of Shíráz reached from the East to Rûm.

In praising thee he became conversant with a new style, like the fair face which gains adornment from the tire-woman.

By the grace (fayd) of thy name Faydí, like [his predecessor] Khusraw, annexed the Seven Climes from end to end with the Indian sword.

By gathering crumbs from thy table Nazírí, the poet hath attained a rank such that other poets compose such elegies in his praise that blood drips in envy from the heart of the singer.

Men of discernment carry as a gift to Khurásán, like the collyrium of Iṣfahán, copies of Shakíbí’s verses.

By praising thee Háyáti, found fresh life (hayát): yea, the substance must needs strengthen the nature of the accident.

How can I tell the tale of Naw’í and Kufwi, since by their praise of thee they will live until the Resurrection Dawn?

Such measure of thy favour accrued to Naw’í as Amir Mu’izzí received from the favour of Sanjar.”

These poets of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries produced what the late Professor Ethé has happily termed the “Indian summer” of Persian poetry, and they had of course a host of Indian imitators and successors so long as Persian continued to be the polite language of India. These last, who were at best skilful manipulators of a foreign idiom, I do not propose to notice; and even of the genuine Persian poets, whether sojourners in India or residents in their own country, only a limited number of the most eminent can be discussed in these pages. The eighteenth century of our era, especially the troubled period intervening between the fall of the Şafawí and the rise of the Qájár dynasties (A.D. 1722-1795), was the poorest in literary achievement; after that there is a notable revival, and several poets of the nineteenth century, Qá’ání, Yaghmá, Furúghí and Wişál and his family, can challenge comparison with any save the very greatest of their predecessors.

(2) Occasional or Topical Verse.

---

328 I.e. ‘Urfí, as Shibli notes.
329 I.e. Turkey. See above, p. 80, n. 5.
330 Cf. p. 164 supra.
Some of the most interesting pieces of poetry are those composed, not necessarily by professional poets, for some special purpose or some particular occasion. These are not so often to be found in the regular ḍīwāns of verse as in the pages of contemporary histories. The following from the unpublished Aḥsanu ’l-Tawārikh may serve as specimens.

In the year 961/1553-4 died three Indian kings, Māhmūd III of Gujarāt, Islām Shāh son of Shīr Shāh the Afghān of Dihlī, and Nizāmu’l-Mulk of the Deccan. This coincidence, with the date, is commemorated in the following verses:
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"In one year the [fatal] conjunction came to three princes by whose justice India was the Abode of Security. One was Māhmūd, the monarch of Gujarāt, who was youthful as his own fortune. The second was Islām Shāh, King of Dihlī, who was in India the lord of a fortunate conjunction. The third was the Nizāmu’l-Mulk-i-Baḥrī, who ruled in royal state in the kingdom of the Deccan. Why dost thou ask of me the date of the death of these three Kings? It was ‘the decline of the kings’ (961)."

The following verses by Mawlānā Qāsim commemorate the death of Humāyūn in the succeeding year (962/1554-5):

"Humāyūn, king of the realm of the Ideal, none can recall a monarch like him:"
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Suddenly he fell from the roof of his palace; precious life departed from him on the winds. Qāsim thus ciphered the date of his death: ‘King Humāyūn fell from the roof’.

The next piece, denouncing the people of Qazwin, is by the poet Ḥayratī, who died from a fall at Kāshān in 961/1553-4:

331 See S. Lane-Poole’s Mohammadan Dynasties, p. 313.
332 Ibid., pp. 300 and 303.
333 Ibid., p. 320. I doubt if Baḥrī is a correct reading: it should perhaps be Burhān, the proper name of the second of the Nizām Shāhs of Ahmadnagar, who reigned from 914 to 961 A.H. (1508-1553 A.D.).
334 My text has gāhi, which I have ventured to emend to Qāsim. For the particulars of Humāyūn’s death, see Erskine’s History of India under the first two sovereigns of the House of Taimūr, Baber and Humāyūn (London, 1854), vol. ii, pp. 527-8. The chronogram is unusually natural, simple and appropriate.
The time has come when the pivotless sphere, like the earth, should rest under thy shadow, O Shadow of God!

O King! It is a period of nine months that this helpless one hath remained in Qazwin ruined, weary, wounded and wretched.

I found the practices of the Sunnis in humble and noble alike: I saw the signs of schism in small and great:

Poor and rich with washed feet at the Tombs: hands clasped in the mosques to right and to left.

In the time of a King like thee to clasp the hands in prayer is an underhand action, O King of lofty lineage!

The judge of this Kingdom is of the race of Khälíd ibnu’l-Walíd; the Mufti of this city is the son of the worthless Sa’id.

By the sword of the victorious King the brother, father, friend, kinsman and family of both have been slain together.

Say thyself, O wise King, whether now this group are the propagandists of the enemy, or the clients of the victorious King.

If there cannot be a public massacre one might [at least contrive]
a private massacre for the special satisfaction of the Divine Majesty.

These are not subjects whose slaughter would cause a reduction of the revenue or would check the spending power of the country; Nay, rather each one of them consumes a quantity of the wealth of the exchequer, for they are all fief-holders and pensioners.”
The worst of these “occasional verses” is that we seldom know enough of the circumstances under which they were composed to enable us fully to understand all the allusions contained in them. What, for example, had the people of Qazvin done to the author of the above verses to arouse in him such bitter anger? Who were the Qādī and the Muftī whom he particularly denounces? How did their relatives come to be slain by the King, and of what enemy were they the propagandists? The fact that we do not know at

what date the verses were composed, and whether in the reign of Shāh Ṭahmāsp or of his father and predecessor Shāh Isma’īl, makes it harder to discover the answers to these questions, but it is interesting to learn how prevalent were the Sunni doctrines in Qazvin at the time when they were written. Of course in the case of the modern topical verses which abounded in the newspapers of the Revolutionary Period (A.D. 1906-1911 especially) the allusions can be much more easily understood.

(3) Religious and Devotional Verse.

Of the numerous poets of the Sa’fawī period who devoted their talents to the celebration of the virtues and sufferings of the Imáms, Muḥtasham of Káshán (died 996/1588) is the most eminent. In his youth he wrote erotic verse, but in later life he seems to have consecrated his genius almost entirely to the service of religion. Rídá-qi Khán in his Majma’u’l-Fusahá (vol. ii, pp. 36-8) gives specimens of both styles, of which we are here concerned only with the second. The author of the Ta’rikh-i-‘Alam-ārā-yi-‘Abbásí335 in his account of the chief poets of Shāh Ṭahmásb’s reign states that though in earlier life that king enjoyed and cultivated the society of poets, in his later years his increasing austerity and deference to the views of the theologians led him to regard them with disfavour as latitudinarians (wasí’u’l-mashrab), so that when Muḥtasham, hoping for a suitable reward, sent him two eloquent panegyrics, one in his praise and the other in praise of the Princess Pari-Khán Khánum, he received nothing, the Sháh remarking that poetry written in praise of kings and princes was sure to consist largely of lies and exaggerations, according to the well-known Arabic saying, “The best poetry is that which contains most falsehoods,” but that, since it was impossible to exaggerate the virtues of the Prophet and the Imáms, the poet could safely exert his talents to the full, and in addition would have the satisfaction of looking for a heavenly instead of an earthly reward. Thereupon Muḥtasham composed his celebrated haft-band, or poem of seven-verse strophes, in praise of the Imáms, and this time was duly and amply rewarded, whereupon many other poets followed his example, so that in a comparatively short time some fifty or sixty such haft-bands were produced. This poem is cited in most of the anthologies which include Muḥtasham, but most fully in the Kharábát336 of Diyá (Ziyá) Pasha (vol. ii, pp. 197-200). In this fullest form it comprises twelve strophes each consisting of seven verses, and each concluding with an additional verse in a different rhyme, thus comprising in all ninety-six verses. The language is extraordinarily simple and direct, devoid of those rhetorical artifices and verbal conceits which many Europeans find so irritating, and shows true pathos and religious feeling. I wish that space were available to quote the whole poem, the prototype of so many others of a similar character, but I must content myself with citing three of the twelve strophes (the fourth, fifth and sixth).

335 Ff. 138ª-139ª of my MS. marked H.13. Unfortunately this very important history has never been published.
336 This excellent anthology of Arabic, Persian and Turkish poetry was printed in three volumes in Constantinople in A.H. 1291-2 (A.D. 1874-5). See p. 164, n. 3 supra.
When they summoned mankind to the table of sorrow, they first issued the summons to the hierarchy of the Prophets. When it came to the turn of the Saints, Heaven trembled at the blow which they smote on the head of the Lion of God.\textsuperscript{337}

\textsuperscript{337} \textit{I.e.} 'Ali ibn Abí Ṭálib, the Prophet’s cousin and son-in-law and the first of the Twelve Imáms.
Then they kindled a fire from sparks of diamond-dust and cast it on Ḥasan \(^{338}\) the Chosen one.

Then they tore up from Madīna and pitched at Karbalá those pavilions to which even the angels were denied entrance.
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Many tall palm-trees from the grove of the ‘Family of the Cloak’\(^{339}\),

 did the people of Kúfá fell in that plain with the axe of malice.

Many a blow whereby the heart of Muṣṭafá [Muhammad] was rent

did they inflict on the thirsty throat of Murtaḍá ‘Alí’s successor\(^{340}\),

While his women, with collars torn and hair unloosed, raised their

laments to the Sanctuary of the Divine Majesty,

And the Trusted Spirit [Gabriel] laid his head in shame on his knees,

and the eye of the sun was darkened at the sight.

When the blood of his thirsty throat fell on the ground, turmoil arose

from the earth to the summit of God’s high Throne.

The Temple of Faith came nigh to ruin through the many fractures

inflicted on the Pillars of Religion.

They cast to the ground his tall palm-tree\(^{341}\) even as the thorn-bush;

a deluge arose from the dust of the earth to heaven.

The breeze carried that dust to the Prophet’s Tomb: dust arose from

Madina to the seventh heaven.

When tidings of this reached Jesus dwelling in the heavenly sphere,

he forthwith plunged his garments in indigo\(^{342}\) in the vat of heaven.

Heaven was filled with murmuring when the turn to cry out passed

from the Prophets to the presence of the Trusted Spirit.

Mistaken imagination fancied that this dust\(^{343}\), had [even] reached

the skirts of the Creator’s glory,

For although the Essence of the All-glorious is exempt from vexation,

He dwells in the heart, and no heart remains unvexed.

I am afraid that when they record the punishment of his murderer,

they may forthwith strike the pen through the Book of Mercy.

I am afraid that the Intercessors on the Resurrection Day may be

ashamed, by reason of this sin, to speak of the sins of mankind.

When the People of the House shall lay hands on the People of

Tyranny, the hand of God’s reproach shall come forth from its sleeve.

Alas for the moment when the House of ‘Alí, with blood dripping

from their winding-sheets, shall raise their standards from the
dust like a flame of fire!
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Alas for that time when the youths of that Holy House shall dash

together their crimson shrouds on the Resurrection Plain!

That company, whose ranks were broken by the strife of Karbalá,
at the Resurrection in serried ranks will break the ranks of the uprisen.

What hopes from the Lord of the Sanctuary\(^{344}\) can those worthless

ones entertain who wounded with their swords the quarry\(^{345}\) of the Sanctuary?

Then [finally] they raise on a spear-point that Head\(^{346}\) from whose

---

\(^{338}\) ‘Alí’s eldest son, the second Imám, said to have been poisoned at the instigation of Mu’áwiya.

\(^{339}\) The Prophet, his daughter Fáṭima and her husband ‘Alí and their sons Ḥasan and Ḥusayn once sheltered under one cloak, whence these five most holy beings are often collectively called by this title.

\(^{340}\) *I.e.* his younger son Ḥusayn, the third Imám and “Martyr of Karbalá.”

\(^{341}\) *I.e.* stature, as in the fifth verse.

\(^{342}\) The colour of mourning in Persia.

\(^{343}\) *I.e.* sorrow and vexation.

\(^{344}\) God or His Prophet.

\(^{345}\) No game or wild animal or bird may be slain within a certain radius of Mecca.
locks Gabriel washes the dust with the water of Salsabil."

Whether or no this be accounted good poetry (and of course it loses much of its beauty in a bald prose translation encumbered with notes on expressions familiar to every Persian though strange to a foreigner and a non-Muslim) it at least reveals something of that deep emotion which the memory of the unforgettable tragedy of Karbalá never fails to arouse in the breast of even the least devout and serious-minded Persian. It has, like the poetry of Naṣir-i-Khusraw, who lived nearly five centuries before Muḥtasham, the great merit of sincerity, and consequently has a claim to be regarded as genuine poetry which we seek in vain in the elaborately artificial and rhetorical compositions of many Persian poets who enjoy in their own country a far higher reputation.

One other marthiya, or elegy on the death of the Imám Husayn, I cannot refrain from quoting, both on account of the originality of its form and the generally irreligious character of its author, the poet Qá’ání (died A.D. 1853), one of the greatest and the least moral of the modern poets of Persia.

The text is taken from a lithographed collection of such poems published, without title or indication of place or date, in Persia, containing 220 unnumbered pages, and comprising the work of six poets, namely Wiṣal, Wiqár, Muḥtasham, Qá’ání, Šabáhi and Bidíl.

346 I.e. the head of the Imám Husayn.
347 One of the rivers of Paradise.
From grief! What grief? The grief of the Monarch of Karbalá!
What was his name? Husayn! Of whose race? ‘Ali’s!
Who was his mother? Fátima! Who was his grandsire? Musáfa!
How was it with him? He fell a martyr! Where? In the Plain of Máriya!
When? On the tenth of Muharram! Secretly? No, in public!
Was he slain by night? No, by day! At what time? At noontide!
Was his head severed from the throat? No, from the nape of the neck!
Was he slain unthirsting? No! Did none give him to drink? They did!
Who? Shímr! From what source? From the source of Death!
Was he an innocent martyr? Yes! Had he committed any fault? No!
What was his work? Guidance! Who was his friend? God!
Who wrought this wrong? Yazíd! Who is this Yazíd?
One of the children of Hind! By whom? By bastard origin!
Did he himself do this deed? No, he sent a letter!
To whom? To the false son of Marjána!
Was Ibn Ziyád the son of Marjána? Yes!
Did he not withstand the words of Yazíd? No!
Did this wretch slay Husayn with his own hand?
No, he despatched an army to Karbalá!
Who was the chief of the army? ‘Umar ibn Sa’d!
Did he cut down Fátima’s dear folk? No, shameless Shímr!
Was not the dagger ashamed to cut his throat?
It was! Why then did it do so? Destiny would not excuse it!
Wherefore? In order that he might become an intercessor for mankind!

---

348 Yazíd was the son of Mu’áwiya, the rival of ‘Ali and the founder of the Umayyad dynasty, who was the son of Abú Sufyán and Hind “the liver-eater” (Ákilatu’l-akhbád). The term “bastard origin” should refer to Ibn Ziyád, not to Yazíd. See the Kitábu’l-Fakhrí, ed. Ahlwardt, pp. 133-5.
What is the condition of his intercession? Lamentation and weeping!
Were any of his sons also slain? Yes, two!
Had he no other son? Yes, he had! Who was that?
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‘The Worshipper’ (Sajjád)! How fared he? Overwhelmed with grief and sorrow
Did he remain at his father’s Karbalá? No, he went to Syria!
In glory and honour? No, in abasement and distress!
Alone? No, with the women of the household I What were their names?
Zaynab, Sakína, Fáṭima, and poor portionless Kulthúm!
Had he garments on his body? Yea, the dust of the road!
Had he a turban on his head? Yea, the staves of the wicked ones!
Was he sick? Yes! What medicine had he? The tears of his eyes!
What was his food after medicine? His food was heart’

Besides these maráthí (singular marthiya), or threnodies of the classical type, the contemplation of the sufferings and misfortunes of the Imáms has inspired a copious literature, both in verse and prose, of a more popular kind. The mourning proper to the month of Muḥarram finds expression not only in the actual dramatic representations of this cycle of tragedies, of which there are at least forty (a few of which, however, are connected with prophets and holy men antecedent to Islám), but in recitations of these melancholy events known as Rawḍa [Rawza]-Khwáns. These latter are said to derive this name from one of the earliest and best-known books of this kind, the Rawdatu [Rawzatu] šh-Shuhádá (“Garden of the Martyrs”) of Husayn Wá’iz-i-Káshífi350, so that these functions are called “Rawza-readings,” whether the readings be taken from this or from some similar work, such as the Túfánu’l-Buká (“Deluge of Weeping”) or the Asráru’sh-Shahádat (“Mysteries of Martyrdom”). Such entertainments are commonly given in the month of Muḥarram by rich notables, nobles, statesmen or merchants, who provide an adequate number of professional rhapsodists or reciters of this class, called Rawza-Khwáns, and a more or less sumptuous supper to follow. I possess a copy of a curious little poem entitled Kitábú’s-Súfri ḟl dhammí’r-Riyá (“the Book of the Table, censuring hypocrisy”)351 in which the ostentation of the host and the greed of the guests is satirized with some pungency. The following lines describe how the word is passed round as to whose entertainment is likely to prove most satisfactory to the guests:

349 'Ali ibn Husayn, commonly called Zaynu’l-‘Ábidín (“the Ornament of the Worshippers”), who, on the death of his father at Karbalá, succeeded him as the Fourth Imám.
350 He died in 910/1504-5. See my Persian Literature under Tartar Dominion, pp. 441 and 503-4.
351 The author’s name is given as Turki of Shiráz, and the little book (48 pp.) was lithographed at Bombay in 1309/1891-2.
مفتون نباشد صحن و آماق
مفتون نباشد صحن و رواق
همه کسی‌رانند فریش نشین
بچیدن اسادیای ظرف
کروی ز مردان ازگیر پرست
زجاج طیع چنیه بخویش و مسگت
پایشان طیع صورت، و آنان الر
شه مانده: ستنه بر روی زر
بیشانی هموش بسیار داغ
نباشد ازین گونه مجلس شرگ
پیک زآن مبان کوید ای هیجان
پیشنهاده پاران گزار آبگان
س پس دینه عباس رئیجه مثعه
سوی بزد آن شخص سیری درویش
نیود اندر آن مجلس مختصر
بچر چهار و قهوه چهار دوز
نیشان چهار دوز از مشرمان
بچر بیای و یاد و یا تن روشن خوان
نشستن در آن بیوه نبود روا
طقه بن قد و چاهی ندارد مفا
عنوان دار آن بیوه خورشید نیست
طقه در مجلس شریعت قند نیست
و لیکن بیوزی و انس و جان
فلان سانه بزد چو بزرگ گران
عجب مجلس گن و راحت فزار
بقین دانه آن مجلس بیرست
Now hear from me a story which is more brightly coloured than a garden flower, of those who make mourning for Husayn and sit in assemblies in frenzied excitement.

All wear black for Fatima’s darling, establish houses of mourning and make lament for the King of Karbalá. In every corner they prepare a feast and arrange a pleasant assembly; they carpet court-yard and chamber, they bedeck with inscriptions arch and alcove; they spread fair carpets, they set out graceful furnishings; a host of gluttonous men, all beside themselves and intoxicated with the cup of greed, on whom greed has produced such an effect that, like the stamp on the gold, it has set its mark on their foreheads, make enquiry about such assemblies. One of them says, ‘O comrades, well-approved friends, versed in affairs, I and Hājji ‘Abbās went yesterday to the entertainment of that green-grocer fellow. In that modest entertainment there was nothing but tea and coffee, and we saw no one there except the host and one or two rawza-khwáns.

To sit in such an assembly is not meet, for without sugar and tea it has no charm. ‘God is not pleased with that servant in whose entertainment is neither sherbet nor sugar. ‘But, by Him who gives men and jinn their daily bread, in such- and-such a place is an entertainment worthy of kings, a wonderfully pleasant and comfortable entertainment, which, I am sure, is devoid of hypocrisy. There is white tea and sugar-loaf of Yazd in place of sugar, and crystal galyáns with flexible tubes, at the gargle of which the heart rejoices. The fragrance of their tobacco spreads for miles, and the fire gleams on their heads like [the star] Canopus.

---

352 I.e. her son the Imam Husayn. Jigar-gísha (lit. “corner of the liver”) is an expression very similar to the Irish cuirtLe mo eóparra.
353 Again Husayn, “the martyr of Karbalá.”
354 e. its trace is ineffaceably stamped upon them.
355 The professional reciters or rhapsodists employed on these occasions.
‘No water will be drunk there, but draughts of lemon, sugar and snow.
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‘One of the reciters is Mírzá Káshí, who, they say, is the chief of rawzâ-khwâns.
‘Another of them is the rhapsodist of Rasht, who is like a boat in the ocean of song.
‘From Kirmán, Yazd and Kirmânsháh, from Shíráz, Shúsh and Iṣfahán,
‘All are skilled musicians of melodious and charming voices: they are like the kernel and others like the shell.
‘In truth it is a wonderful entertainment, devoid of hypocrisy: by your life it is right to attend it!'
When the friends hear this speech with one accord they assemble at that banquet.’

On the whole, however, the emotion evoked by these Muḥarram mourning, whether dramatic representations or recitations, is deep and genuine, and even foreigners and non-Muslims confess themselves affected by them. “If the success of a drama,” says Sir Lewis Pelly in the Preface to his translation of thirty-seven scenes from the Ta’ziyâs, “is to be measured by the effects which it produces upon the people for whom it is composed, or upon the audiences before whom it is represented, no play has ever surpassed the tragedy known in the Mussulman world as that of Hasan and Husain. Mr Matthew Arnold, in his ‘Essays on Criticism,’ elegantly sketches the story and effects of this ‘Persian Passion Play,’ while Macaulay’s Essay on Lord Clive has encircled the ‘Mystery’ with a halo of immortality.” Even the critical and sceptical Gibbon says: “In a distant age and climate the tragic scene of the death of Hosein will awaken the sympathy of the coldest reader.” Sayyidu’sh-Shuhadá (“the Chief of the Martyrs”) the Persians call their favourite hero, who is, indeed, in their eyes more even than this, since his intercession will be accepted by God for his sinful followers even when the intercession of the Prophet has failed. “Go thou,” says the latter to him on the Resurrection Day, “and deliver from the flames every one who has in his life-time shed but a single tear for thee, every one who has in any way helped thee, every one who has performed a pilgrimage to thy shrine, or mourned for thee, and every one who has written tragic verse for thee. Bear each and all with thee to Paradise.”

To the Persian Shi’a, therefore, Husayn occupies the same position that Jesus Christ does to the devout Christian, notwithstanding the fact that the doctrine of the Atonement is utterly foreign to the original spirit of Islám. To us no Persian verse could well appear more exaggerated in its deification of a human being than this:

مرد گویند خداثی و من اندر غضب آبی،
دره بر واشته مسند به خود نگر خداثی.

Men say Thou art God, and I am moved to anger: raise the veil, and submit no longer to the shame of Godhead!”

But I am not sure whether the following verse, ascribed to the Bábí poet Nabil, would not more greatly shock the Persian Shi’a:

شهیدی طلعت نار من، بدود سوی دیار من;
سر و جان جنت نتایر من، که من در شیب شکریلا;

“O witnesses of my aspect of fire, haste ye towards my home; Make head and life my offering, for I am the Monarch of Karbalá!”
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357 Professor J. B. Bury’s edition of the Decline and Fall in seven volumes (London, 1898), vol. v, p. 391.
359 By an Azalí controversialist it is said to have been written of Bahá’u’lláh by one of his followers, but I have been told that it, or a very similar verse, was really composed in honour of Husayn.
360 Nabil is a Bábí substitute for Muḥammad, the numerical values of both names being equivalent to 92. The poet Nabil at one time after the Báb’s death advanced a claim on his own behalf, and the verse here cited appears to have been composed at this period. Later he became one of the most devoted adherents of Bahá’u’lláh, on whose death in 1892 he drowned himself at ‘Akká.
It would be an interesting study, but beyond the capacity of this volume, to trace the growth of the Ḥusayn-Legend from its comparatively meagre historical basis, as given by Ṭabarî and the earlier Arab historians, to the elaborate romance into which it has finally developed in the *taʿziyas* and *rawza-khwâns*. But the romantic element appears early, even in the narrative of Abu’ Mîkhnaf Lût ibn Yahyá, who flourished in the first half of the second century of the *hijra* (circa A.D. 750) 361, and it has even been suggested that Ḥusayn has been induced with the attributes of some far more ancient prototype like Adonis. At any rate no one at the present day can see anything more like the performances of the priests of Baal than the ghastly ceremonies of the ’Ashúrå or Rúz-i-Qatî which take place on the tenth of Muḥārram (the anniversary of Ḥusayn’s death at Karbalá) wherever there is a considerable Persian colony, but especially, of course, in Persia itself.

Certain episodes in the Ḥusayn-Legend would almost seem to indicate an unconscious sense of solidarity with the Christians on the part of the Shi’a Persians arising from their participation in the doctrine of the Atonement. The best-known example of this is the conversion and martyrdom of the “Firangí ambassador” at the Court of Yazíd 362, a very favourite scene in the *taʿziyas*, and considered especially appropriate when European visitors are included in the audience. Another instance occurs in the *Asráru’sh-Shahádat*, or “Mysteries of Martyrdom,” of Isma’il Khán “Sarbáź” 363, when Ibn Sa’d invites certain Christians to aid him in killing the Imám Ḥusayn, but when the eyes of their leader fell upon him —

![Verse in Persian]

“He saw Karbalá as the Throne of Divine Majesty, he saw that Throne wet with God’s blood 364; By the pen of imagination an impression grew in his heart, ‘Surely this is God in such glory and splendour! ‘If he be not God, then surely he is Jesus, the Son of the Throne of our Faith.’”

Thereupon, being convinced of the truth of Islám and the sanctity of Ḥusayn —

![Verse in Persian]

“With a hundred frenzied enthusiasms he sought permission to engage in the battle, and departed to offer his life as a sacrifice for Ḥusayn.”

Since, however, we also find stories of the conversion of an Indian king (presumably a pagan) and even of a lion, the object may be to emphasize the cruelty and hard-heartedness of the professing Muslims who compassed the death of Ḥusayn and his fellow-martyrs by depicting the sympathy evoked by their sufferings even in the hearts of unbelievers and savage animals.

The librettos giving the words actually spoken by the actors in the *taʿziyas* are not often met with, though lithographed copies exist, of which, by the kindness of my friend the late George Grahame, formerly Consul in different parts of Persia, I possess half a dozen. As an example of their style I shall here

---

361 See Wüstenfeld’s *Die Geschichtschreiber der Araber*, No. 19 (pp. 5-6), and his translation of this work under the title of *Der Tod des Husein ben ‘Ali und die Rache: ein historischer Roman aus dem Arabischen* (Göttingen, 1883).

362 See Pelly’s *Miracle Play*, vol. ii, pp. 222-240.

363 Lithographed with crude illustrations at Ṭhírán in 1274/1857-58.

364 This expression in the mouth of a professing Muslim is extraordinary.
cite a passage from the “Martyrdom of Ḥurr ibn Yazíd ar-Riyyáḥī³⁶⁵,” wherein an Arab from Kúfa brings to the Imám Ḥusayn the news of the execution of his cousin Muslim ibn ‘Aqíl.

³⁶⁵ This constitutes a separate scene in Sir L. Pelly’s Miracle Plays, vol. i, pp. 171-189.
"How the Arab comes from Kūfa bringing news of the martyrdom of Muslim ibn ‘Aqil.

(Arab) ‘I whom thou seest coming with an hundred passionate strains
Am the hoopoe coming from Sheba into the presence of Solomon.
I come from Kūfa, having tidings of poor Muslim,
I come enlarging the spirit like the morning breeze.
In my head is a longing to meet the son of Fāṭima 366
I come as the remedy for the pain of a wounded heart.’

(‘Abbās) ‘To this gate, of whose pavilion the dust is camphor
And collyrium for the angels’ eyes, and its servants the Ḥūris 367.
By God, this gate is the gībla 368 of all faithful folk,
And a house of healing to those stricken with sorrow!’

(Arab) ‘My salutation to thee, O exemplar of mankind;

366 I.e. the Imám Husayn son of ‘Alī and Fāṭima the Prophet’s daughter.
367 The Ḥūr ‘l-‘Ayn, or black-eyed damsels of Paradise.
368 The point to which the worshipper turns in prayer in order to face Mecca-wards.
I come from Kūfa, O leader of the people of Paradise!
For God’s sake whither goest thou, O my lord?
Explain to me [I conjure thee] by the God of Jinn and men!”

(The Imám) ‘And on thee [be my salutation], O messenger of comely face!
Even now I am going to Kūfa in an agitated condition.
They have written to me letters of longing:
Heaven draws my reins towards the land of ‘Irāq.
Tell me, therefore, if thou hast news of Muslim:
Has any one in Kūfa loyally aided him?’
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(Arab) ‘May I be thy sacrifice! Ask not of Muslim’s case!
Come, master, let me kiss thy hands and feet!
Go not to Kūfa, O King of the righteous!
For I fear that thou may’st become sorrowful and friendless.
Go not to Kūfa, O Lord! It were a pity!
Be merciful! ‘Ali Akbar369 is so young!
Go not to Kūfa! Zaynab370 will be humiliated,
And will be led captive through the streets and markets!’

(Together)

(Imám) ‘O Arab, make known Muslim’s condition!’
(Arab) ‘Lament for grief-stricken Muslim!’
(Imám) ‘Tell me, how fared it with Muslim in Kūfa?’
(Arab) ‘Know that Muslim’s fortune failed.’
(Imám) ‘Did the Kūfans drag his body through blood?’
(Arab) ‘They severed his innocent head from the kingdom of his body.’
(Imám) ‘Did they cut his body in pieces?’
(Arab) ‘They stuck his noble body on the headsman’s hook.’
(Imám) ‘Tell me, what further did these wicked people do?’
(Arab) ‘They dragged him through the city and market.’
(Imám) ‘Tell me, how fares it with Muslim’s children?’
(Arab) ‘They have become the guests of Muslim in Paradise.’
(Imám) ‘Who wrought cruelty and wrong on those children?’
(Arab) ‘Ḥārith severed their heads from their bodies.’
(Imám) ‘Alas for Muslim’s weeping eyes!’
(Arab) ‘These are the garments of Muslim’s children.’
(Both)371 ‘Alas that faithful Muslim has been slain by the cruelty of wicked men!’

It has only been possible here to touch the fringe of this vast literature of what is commonly and not inappropriately termed the Persian Passion Play, and I have had to content myself with a few specimens of the main types in which it is manifested, namely the classical threnody or elegy (marthiya) of Muḥtasham and his imitators; the more
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popular presentations of these legends in verse, prose, or mixed verse and prose, contained in innumerable and obscure lithographed books, of which I have chosen the Asrārū’sh-Shahādat as a type, not because it enjoys any supreme excellence, but simply because it is one of those of which I happen to possess a copy; and lastly the actual librettos of the dramatized ta’ziyas, to be seen at their best at the Royal Takya of Tihārān during the first ten days of the month of Muḥarram. Manuscript note-books for the use of rawza-khwāns on such occasions are commonly met with in collections of Persian books, and the full description of one such (Add. 423) will be found in my Catalogue of the Persian HSS. in the Cambridge University Library372. Most of these pieces are anonymous, but amongst the poets named are Muqbil, Mukhliṣ, Mawzūn, Nasim, Shafi’i and Lawḥi, of none of whom can I find any biographical notice.

369 The eldest son of the Imám Ḥusayn. His death forms the subject of Scene xvii of Pelly’s Miracle Play (Vol. i, pp. 287-303).
370 The daughter of ‘Ali and sister of Hasan and Ḥusayn.
371 It is not clear from the text whether this verse is uttered by one or both of the speakers.
372 No. LXVI, pp. 122-142. On this last page are given references to descriptions of other similar collections.
One of my young Persian friends who, like so many of the rising generation, deprecates the influence of the mullahs and rawza-khwáns and the religious atmosphere created by them, especially in connection with the Muharram celebrations, admitted to me that at least the work has been done so thoroughly that even the most ignorant women and illiterate peasants are perfectly familiar with all the details of these legends of martyrdom, however little they may know of the authentic history of the events portrayed or the persons represented. Even the greatest mujtahids, like Mullá Muḥammad Báqir-i-Majlisi, however little they might approve the exaggerations and even blasphemies which characterized the Passion Plays in their final popular developments, were at great pains to supply their compatriots with popular and easily intelligible religious treatises in Persian, so that a knowledge of these matters might not be confined to Arabic scholars or professed theologians.

One effect of the taʿziyas has been to create amongst the Persians a widely diffused enthusiasm for martyrdom, of which sufficient account is not taken by those who, misled by the one-sided portrait, or rather caricature, presented by Morier in his famous Hajji Baba, deem them an essentially timid and even cowardly folk. The English missionaries in Persia, who in sympathy for and understanding of the people amongst whom they work seem to me greatly superior to those whose labors lie in other fields, know better, and no one has done fuller justice to the courage and steadfastness of the Bábí and Bahá’í martyrs than the Reverend Napier Malcolm in his valuable book Five Years in a Persian Town (Yazd). Another told me an interesting story from his own experience in Isfahán. One of the chief mujtahids of that city had condemned some Bábís to death as apostates, and my informant, who was on friendly terms with this ecclesiastic, ventured to intercede for them. The mujtahid was at first inclined to take his intervention very ill, but finally the missionary said to him, “Do you suppose that the extraordinary progress made by this sect is due to the superiority of their doctrines? Is it not simply due to the indomitable courage of those whom you and your colleagues condemn to die for their faith? But for the cruel persecutions to which the Bábís have from the first been subjected, and which they have endured with such unflinching courage, would they now be more numerous or important than a hundred obscure heresies in Persia of which no one takes any notice and which are devoid of all significance? It is you and such as you who have made the Bábís so numerous and so formidable, for in place of each one whom you kill a hundred converts arise.” The mujtahid reflected for a while and then replied, “You are right, and I will spare the lives of these people”.

Many of these martyrs died with verses of poetry on their lips. Sulaymán Khán, with wicks flaming in his mangled body, sang:

باب دست جبار باره و دست زلف بار
رقسمی چندین میانه میدانی آرزوست

“In one hand the wine-cup, in the other the tresses of the Friend,
Such a dance in the midst of the market-place is my desire.”

One of the “Seven Martyrs” exclaimed, when the headsman’s sword, missing its stroke, dashed his turban to the ground:

ای خوش آن عاشق سوست که در پای حیب
سر و دستار نداند که دماد اندازد

“Happy that intoxicated lover who at the feet of the Friend
Knows not whether it be head or turban which he casts.”

Of the ancient Arabs Wilfrid Blunt well says: “Their courage was of a different quality, perhaps, from that admired among ourselves. It was the valour of a nervous, excitable people who required encouragement from onlookers and from their own voices to do their best...,” and the same holds good to some extent of the Persians. Poetry is called “Lawful Magic”

---

373 A good instance of that sense of justice (insāf) which my talented friend and former pupil Mr W. A. Smart of the Consular Service regards as one of the most admirable attributes of the Persians.

(Sihr-i-Halál) because, in the words of the author of the Chahár Maqáta,

{375} it is “that art whereby the poet…can make a little thing appear great and a great thing small, or cause good to appear in the garb of evil and evil in the form of good…in such a way that by his suggestion
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men’s temperaments become affected with depression or exaltation; whereby he conduces to the accomplishment of great things in the order of the world.”

The Karbalá legend is a potent factor in producing in these martyrs the psychological state which makes them not only endure with fortitude but glory in their sufferings. In one of the two celebrated poems ascribed to the Bábí heroine Qurratu’l-‘Ayn

{376} who was one of the victims of the great persecution of August, 1852, occurs the verse

मन र उष्णि अन मेह हुबर हें चोर छलाया बला ब्या

“For me the love of that fair-faced Moon who, when the call of affliction came to him,

Went down with exultation and laughter, crying, ‘I am the Martyr at Karbalá!’"

In its original and primitive form Bábísm was Shi’ism of the most exaggerated type, and the Báb himself the ‘Gate’ to the unseen Imám or Mahdí. Gradually he came to regard himself as actually the Imám; then he became the ‘Point’ (Nuqta), an actual Manifestation of the Supreme Being, and his chief disciples became re-incarnations, or rather “returns” or “recurrences” of the Imáms, and the whole tragedy of Karbalá was re-enacted “in a new horizon” at Shaykh Ṭabarší in Mázandarán. The nineteen chapters constituting the first “Unity” (Wáḥid) of the Persian Bayán (the most intelligible and systematic of the Báb’s writings) are entirely devoted to the thesis that all the protagonists of the Islamic Cycle have returned

{378} in this cycle to the life of the world,
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and Hájí Mírzá Jání, the earliest Bábí historian and himself a victim of the persecution of 1852, gives a long comparison between Karbalá and Shaykh Ṭabarší, greatly in favour of the latter

{379}.

In the eleventh and last section of my Materials for the Study of the Bábí Religion (pp. 341-58) I published a selection of Bábí and Bahá’í poems, and here I will only add to these a qasída comprising 133 verses composed in the spring of 1885 by Mírzá’ Na’ím of Si-dih near Isfahán, an ardent Bahá’í, whose son, as I lately heard from a friend in the British Legation at Ṭiharán, is still resident there. Mírzá Na’ím sent me an autograph copy of this poem in the summer of 1902 through my late friend George Grahame, and in the concluding colophon he states that he was born at Si-dih in 1272/1855-6 and came to Ṭiharán in 1304/1886-7. The poem is so long that I originally intended only to give extracts from it, but, finding that this could not be done without injury to the sequence of ideas, I have decided to print it in full as a typical Bahá’í utterance having the authority of an autograph.
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سراب و نحو و حروف و دروت و نجوم
ز ورفاً دقیق‌شده و چُرُن و صورت
ز اشتاق و به‌تیج و معانی و ناگ
یان و صنایع و اقوام و زنده
ز مزار و شب و همای و جنگ
ز حدیث و حجت و تفسیر و بنیت و قانون
ز سبب و همیشه خلق‌شده از حمیل خوئن
سیاست مدن و نور و همای و نیش و چلوگ
حلف و علیم و خبر و قدرت و اشکشون
طلب و علیم و همسره و نیش و قارورة
خوش‌الحسامه؛ ایده ملؤ و عجیب
طلسر و دومت و نگه‌دار و جهاد
نوره و طاغ و عادت و حال و علیه و لسن
ماربزی فلسطین و منطق پر شدید
لاحقات حوائی نسختگان مرهون
م؛ بدين علوم هلا نقیش شدیدی مده
کهن‌های معاصره سکته عالی ملیمی
از این علوم سوی عهد نه دیگر ادبی
بخش عبق‌های حل به قرب و قرن
نوری فلسطینیه سبز روستا است
فوق و هری و خلیلی نامه جلال و عونون
چرا نشون طبیعی شهید تو علیا
چیه علوم اسپری گردیده ناتوان
مکلا این حكما چیست جاذبه شگایک
خلار این جهلا چیست سرسر ملتون
۰ علوی‌شناسی یی و نه، جای و کنی و معنی.
فلسفه‌ای نش و نادر و مکرو مسیون.
همه ای‌ها، امروز است و اشکال حفظ‌کن.
نیروی‌تان هیچ‌جا نیست و جشن‌تان همه نمی‌کن.
فلسفه‌تان هیچ‌چیز و شوندگان هیچ‌چیز نون.

نیوپی، شریعت آخر برای این یا یادوت.
نیوپی چاگی از اعراب و علی و چان مامون.
به چاگی حق، مسیح این ایز اوه نفی‌ساون.
بی‌خبری و می‌کن ایست باقرین ذکایون.
۰۰ شور ر معلم الله سلاده؛ کوتون.
شور و حکیم علی‌بی‌پیرو، دیو.
هر آنچه کفتم نیای زمان بینشیو.
هرکه‌انه امکن حکایت این زمان بهن مطمئن.
علی‌شناسی همه از ایوانا و ایبی ناگمن.
فلسفه‌تان همه از ایوانا و ایبی سلیم.
ر دی‌یونار در انصف در جان ایوان.
پرتره و دانش می‌یابه از دم ره.
پرتره و حکیم به سبیله، بوتیک.
پرتره و جد و ر حجتی، پیرو.

درک است خراب یا ساخته به‌دن‌بیو.
سقیر پات فیتیـه، حکایتی پیرو.
چون سیزی اوه بیان‌ها، ارسطو و زبان.
چون بی‌می اوه قنای، دیرو بی‌می،
چون طالس و جوفی‌پاتون، دیرو درس و دیرو.
يقولون له بالعشي والأشراق
بستانه إذا يُشفىون إذا يَبَغُون
جَهان سيء عَلَهُم انقرض بِياَجى خِيراً
رَمان لن يَرى عَلى انقرض أو بِياَجى عيون

ولى تَد نُست عَان تَوْس نَص لِيس
ولى يَو حَام ضَيفَّيْنِ آبِرَيْنِ عَلى حودون
نَحَوَانه سَلْوَى رَبِّي أَزَى بَيْنَ فَديهم
زَهَي دِفْرُج غَندَ قَيسُ أَزَى بَيْنَ النَّجُوم
زَمْرَتِي نَا بَلَحَد عَلَى جُو وَنَوْنَ لَيْبَيْنِ
زَعُم لحَقَّ عَلى بَرَائِتْهُ اعتِباد و رُكُوب
حقائِقُ حَكْمِهِ حكَمَة مَهِيدون
جُواصُ عَلَمَهُ أَرْجَبَا مَهِيدون
طَيَابَ انْدَ جَوِ اِجْمَار دَر تَشْمَش و بِيْز
حقائِقُ انْدَ جَوِ اِجْمَار دَر تَشْمَش و بِيْز

زَجَّكٌ طَرقُنَ درينَ فَلَتْهُ نَا مَحدود
بُوَد عِوَانَم بِمَحدٍ بَيْنُكَدُر مَحدون
امور عاشيّراً عَام رَبِّي و خَاصُه خاص
بِفَقْر عَوَد و حَٰنَ أَصْحَبُ بَيْنِكَدُر
بَلُعْ يِنْصَرُنَ صَنِعُ سَرَانش نَرتُس
جه جَان ذَات قدَب فَيْنُطَ فُنِراتن
بِحِكْمِ حَق مُنْحَرَد بُوَد سَهْر و نَجْزَور
بَلَى لَيْنَت بَدُى يَآسِي جَسَحُ اِجْجاوا
رَمُرَت يَسْ بِمَتْحَبْتْ كَوْش طَحَون

۲۰ يَكِي بَحْشِم تَانُشَأ ذَريَّ عَقل بِبَيْن
دِرين سَراجّه حَظ رُبْعَيْنِ أَزَان بُوَد مَسَكِنٍ
نیکی ز جهان و نبات و از حیوان
بواری هزار عالی نا دیده ظاهر و مکون
ورای مثل تو مثل گو ی بود گالی
ورون جان تو جان گو ی بود مکسون
بین بدانه حکم آن وان با این مرسر
بین ب بیحش حکم آن بیشه با ابد مقرر
تلان و ظاهر از این صد جان طور و غرب
قدیر و حاول از آن صدچین تیاره عضون

۱۰ حکا بتوی محقق نکتر توانی عصر
۱۰ حکا سرا ی طبقت طبیعی نیروی
چنان چه بینی فیش حیات از این عالم
بطل از میان میام سیرسید بیطن

ز ما ورای طبیعت اگر صح میرید
بدین جبان بخدا این جبان شو وارون
ز ما ورای طبیعت در این مشق جبان
غوانی است حدازا ز حکم و عدل ازرون
گروهی از عقلا بر خلافین ماره خیل
بطمو ی به بین خوشه مزند بهمین

۱۰ غلاف طبیع نروی به دور و غیر خوشدو
غلاف طبیع فربالی ز جوهر چیزمن
بیبل طبیع بین حسی از جبان میرزل
پلیش نفس نکش غمی از وطن میرکون
ببین بشوق و شعف فروه همه مقلع
ببین فدوق و طرف زوره همه مسجد
بطمو سلیم در عدوان رازکارگ
بطمو طالغ در بلای کوناکون
جمیع منت و کورهوان ویلی نه از داوه
تبار سود و پرپشان ویلی نه از اپون
۲۰ چکونه داد خبر دنیال از اسورة
چکونه نخوش اثر قول اعما اکنون
چکونه کشت وفا و وعده جمعه صبح;
بطیق مسجد و توت و وصیت و قالبیم;
گبه بدار ساله و کوری بارششبله
گبه بکری به خدای اور و جه صبیج;
معمی آدم اردن مات سمعی;
مروج آدم بیور مبارک میمون
و وکیل‌می باشد دنیال الکمن
نه‌خیما قربانی و الحمایه الالهبدون;
۲۰ چسان بوعده سچال نهد نیسود سخن
از آن جهنی دمات زمانه باید شگون;
چکونه کشت عبان من باواقع و آتیب;
چکونه کشت پیدا او نیوو و غریبوب;
چکونه بی کسی ایلا و قنبلی است و خالی‌صور;
چکونه یکانته ایلا و غالب است و خالق زبون;
سروده به سب سرم صوصیرین آیات;
نیاها به مدر شهیر ببیتربین قانون;
چرا نیدبی باو صد هزار جان کریمان;
چرا نیدبید باو صد هزار دل میلتن;
۲۰ زجیش قدش قدیش قلبی و صدر;
ز وایش نظرش رامش ظهوی و دیطون;
عیانی علیا مشعشلش نبود خوشی
کشانی اورا راوشش نکرد نگون;
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۱۰ سخن رست شه و در ول تبار نشمو
رویه دوان ناز گنی بر سر همان مضمون
۱۰ ۱۰ مرا دلست در این روزهار بر خالصون
قریب ضرور به واژه‌هاي نیوتاهیون
وستانه جلوه گردن و رگ منچر طارس
سره شنوهد دهند کون چوئو قلمون
بس است ثابتت ای مره ثار دلیر پریان
بس است لفوتت ای بچه ته تیرامسون
۱۰ مرا سبست چه سایدیا باینی همه سوا
مرا دلست چه سایدیا باینیهمه السون
۱۰ بحیرانان چاه‌ها کهکشتات تاب و چکبت
بجز بدنی دلیر چه کهکشتات صبر و سیون
سیب بمیشاق کوچکی هد اتیم و نابل
کوب سوخت به خمیره چه الگون توند
دود عیانکه کاهی چیدید چون مادین
پرهر هواپر کاهی نزدیک چون پالدن
زن کشیت و جان لیپورو از لین
زبان کشیده و دل نیپشت ناهون
۱۰ دریا گرخت ز ویران سرای فصل و هنر
خوشا رساله عشق و موسی دیار جون
۱۰ از یکی به یکی به خورق عاقل گرفت
۱۰ کهکشتات ایلیا من ای بنا شدیمرون
۱۰ بجز ازد، رحمین از در پریان
طقه میتوانمم از این برسه و در پیرون
هلا ازد، حق این ازد کنن که ایست
گه شد ازد، حق با ازدیار مقرون

پگاهانه عید پیا بپذیر که ازد ازد، حق
اگر آرزو زیگی با قبول کنن گفتن
 شهرکه مارد حق سوی ازد راه نانا
همه گه مارد حق سوی ازد راه نمون
۱۰ همهمه کوفور بحیر وصال سر الله
به لیست در صرف اهلا قریب خرکیم
۱۰ پنج فصل نفل است فاقد الادفل
endez فردان معنی است متفاق ناهون
TARGET
۱۰ مدنی ایست بعود عموم و بار از بحار
صبری بیست ز بیست و نه فلورامین و حاق ازد ازد
۱۰ بروبی علاطم من یاف سروله آی آسیا
سرودی سین ار پویتی از ار ساون
بیش وراثی میکایی آتیله گاته آسیای
۱۰ بهی شبکه بیشتر شب شرو وین
۱۰ توهای علیه ایده ایست اسمیه توح
هیمین نیست خشک دهیا ریت یکی مون
۱۰ ۱۰ بیش ورد ازد که کریب ازد خومن
۱۰ بیش ورد که ازد گماهت ازد گذاز
بیش ازد نفس کش در شیر بیرون
۱۰ بیش ورد یکی یاد ازد بینه بحور
۱۰ بیش ورد یکی یاد پی ازد اسربی
ز که ایست نون در نقد شنی میسون
۱۰ بیش ورد یکی یاد موسی ز سر اسربی
پی چه پرخش هنری و یکی فارون
۱۰ بیش ورد یکی یاد روز الله از روشنی
پی افشا چو بیورا باه از یکنا شیون
HE IS GOD, EXALTED IS HIS STATE!

"Through the revolution of the Sphere I have a heart and an eye,
the one like the Tigris in flood, the other like a gulf of blood.
Why should I not mourn heavily, and why should I not weep bitterly,
since I cannot make my way out of the narrows of the world?
Within the circle I find not my object; I have neither foot to fare
forth nor place within.
What profiteth me if I be as Qârân in rank? What gain to me if I
be as Qârûn in wealth?
What fruit do farms and estates yield, since I must lay them aside?
What effect have daughters and sons, since I must pass away?
What pride have I in drinking wine or rose-water? What virtue have
I in wearing silk or black brocade?
Since dominion and wealth remain not, what difference between
wealthy and poor? Since time endureth not, what difference
between the glad and the sorrowful?
I take pride in my understanding while every animal is full of it;
I glory in spirit when every place overflows with it.
What is it to me that I should say what Alexander did? What is it
to me that I should know who Napoleon was?
What affair is it of mine that the moon becomes crescent or full

381 One of the seven great noble houses of ancient Persia. See Nöldéke’s Sasaniden, especially pp. 437 et seqq. These seven families constituted the Bar-bítân of the Pahlawí inscriptions, the Ahlu’l-Buyútát of the Arab historians.

382 See Qur’an, xxviii, 76 and commentary thereon in Sale’s translation and elsewhere. He is identified with Korah of the Old Testament, and amongst the Muslims is proverbial for wealth as is Croesus with us.

383 A short note on aksún, “a black brocade worn by the rich for ostentation,” will be found on p. 108 of my translation of the Chahâr Maqâla (Gibb Series, xi, 2).
because it shows its face in proportion to the shining of the sun upon it?

What advantage is it that I should know about the eclipses of the sun and moon, or that the sun is darkened through the moon, and the moon through the shadow of the earth?

What need is there for me to say that the fixed stars and planets are all suns and spheres in the vault of heaven?

What do I gain by knowing that these spheres are poised and revolving round suns, and are subject to two attractions?

What affair is it of mine that the wind, that undulating air, is light and dry above, and dense and moist below?

What have I to say to this, that the moon marches round the earth, the earth round the sun, and the sun in turn round another sun?

What should I say to this 'ramal-metre being 'sound' or 'apocopated,' or this 'rajaz-metre $matwi$ or $makhbun$'?

Or of accidence, syntax, the letters, the correct and solemn intonation [of the Qur'an], or of the pauses of the Kufans or the junctions of the Basra school?

Or of etymology, rhetoric, eloquence, style, expression, calligraphy, prosody or the varieties of poetical criticism?

Or of biography, jurisprudence, principles [of Law], controversy, deduction, tradition, proof, exegesis, the Code and the Law?

Or of drawing, geometry, algebra, observations, chronology, arithmetic, mathematics and geography in all their aspects?

Or of Politics, the Religious Law, agriculture, mining, philology, National Rights, expenditure, taxation, loans and armies?

Or of medicine, symptoms, anatomy, the pulse and the stools, the properties of all the drugs, whether simple or compound?

Or of talismans, incantations, interpretation of dreams, alchemy, mechanics, astrology, ascendants, [magic] numbers, geomancy, cyphers and spells?

Or of the philosophical sciences, and logic, ancient and modern, or of cautionary glosses and the sophistries of texts?

O waste not the coin of your life on such sciences, for a whole world of men have suffered disappointment through such transactions!

Turn from these sciences to knowledge of the Religion of the Truth, for, save knowledge of the Truth, all is deceit and vanity.

Hearken not to the spells of Philosophy, which from end to end is folly; the themes of the materialist and the cynic are all ignorance and madness.

Why dost thou consider the fancies of the naturalist as sciences?

Why dost thou assume the Divine sciences to be mere fancies?

What is the talk of these philosophers? All doubtful! What is the speech of these ignorant men? All conjecture!

Their sciences are [designed] to dispose of modesty, sincerity and purity; their arts are for [the promotion of] sin, mischief, guile

---

384 Literally, made the colour of indigo.

385 The full explanation of these terms will be found in Blochmann's Persian Prosody, or in any book treating of the metrical systems of the Arabs and Persians.

386 The two great rival philological schools of early Islam.

387 'Ilmu 'r-Rijal ("the science of notable men") means particularly the biography and authority of the transmitters of religious traditions.

388 Or God, which is the usual meaning of Haqq amongst the Persians. Gibb (Ottoman Poetry, vol. i, p. 60, ad calc.) gives "the Fact" as a translation suggested by one of his Muslim friends.

389 There is a word-play here, of the kind called tajnis-i-zā'id, between falsafah (philosophy) and safah (folly).
and wantonness!

Their whole [idea] is the socialization of the earth and the communizing\(^{390}\) of property; their whole [aim] is the diffusion of sin and the filling of their bellies!

Their ideas are all short-sighted and their outlook narrow; their arts are all phantasy, and their conditions vile!

Had it not been for the barrier of the Holy Law against this Gog\(^{391}\), no one would have been secure of honour, property, or life.

By God’s Truth, the talk of this gang of materialists is the worst pestilence in the body of the Nation and the Kingdom!

By the Divine Knowledge thou wilt become the choicest product of the two worlds; by the cynic’s philosophy thou wilt become the grandchild of an ape\(^{392}\).

Behold manifest today whatever the Prophet hath said, but whatever the philosopher hath said behold at this time discredited!

All their sciences are [derived] from the Prophets, but imperfectly; all their arts are from the Saints, but garbled.

But, regarded fairly, man in this world is distinguished by science and knowledge from all beside.

---

By knowledge and learning he finds his way to the Eternal Essence; by understanding and thought he attains to the Presence of the Why-less\(^{393}\).

It is Study of which He says ‘It is the most excellent of actions’ it is Thought whereof an hour ‘is better than seventy [years].’

The great sages, such as Socrates, Hippocrates, Aristotle and Zeno, confess His Eternal Essence,

And so also Abú ‘Ali [Avicenna], Euclid, Ptolemy, Thales, Plato, Hermes and Solon\(^{394}\).

These sanctify Him at dusk and at dawn; these glorify Him in the morning and in the evening.

The world is a head wherein the sage is the intelligence; time is a body wherein the sciences are in place of the eyes.

But thou ridest with a slack rein, and the steed of the arts is restive; thou art weak and inexperienced, and the dappled charger of the sciences is vicious.

Not having read a line thou hast doubts as to the Eternal Lord: wonderful the constitution in which antimony produces constipation!

‘Seek learning from the cradle to the grave, even in China\(^{395}\),’ from the knowledge of God, whereon trust and reliance may be placed.

Sages are dumbfounded at His wise aphorisms; men of letters are indebted to His pregnant sayings.

Natural laws are like bodies in manifestation and emergence; Divine Truths are like spirits in occultation and latency.

In this illimitable expanse for lack of space illimitable worlds are buried in one another.

Common people see ordinary things, and distinguished people special things, according to their own measure: and He ‘knows best what they describe’\(^{396}\).

A thousand Platos cannot fathom the essence of His humblest

---

\(^{390}\) The early Bábís were often accused of holding communistic views like the ancient Persian heresiarch Mazdak. Such views are here explicitly repudiated.

\(^{391}\) Alexander the Great is supposed to have built the Great Wall of China (hence called \textit{Sadd-i-Sikandar}, “the Barrier of Alexander”) to prevent the tribes of Gog and Magog (\textit{Yájúj wa Májúj}) from overrunning the world.

\(^{392}\) An evident allusion to the Darwinian theory.

\(^{393}\) God is so called (\textit{Bí-chún}) because none may question Him as to the reason of His actions.

\(^{394}\) Doubtful. The original has \textit{Shílún}, an evident error.

\(^{395}\) A well-known tradition of the Prophet.

\(^{396}\) Cf. Qur’án, xxiii, 98.
temporal work; how much less His own Eternal Essence?
The sphere and the stars move by the command of God: yea, the
eyes and eyelids are affected by the soul.

Through whom, if not by His command, is the movement of bodies
By what, if not by the water, does the mill revolve?
For once in the way of wisdom look with the eye of reflection on
this abode whereof but one quarter is habitable\(^{397}\).
In each one of the mineral, vegetable and animal kingdoms are a
thousand unseen worlds, manifest and hidden.
Beyond thy intelligence is another over-ruling Intelligence; within
thy soul is another soul concealed.
Behold the grain, which stands shoulder to shoulder with past
Eternity: behold the egg, which is conjoined with Eternity to come!
Hidden yet manifest in this latter are a hundred worlds of fowls and
chickens; eternal yet temporal in that former are a hundred
groves of fruit and branches.
How canst thou pass through the street of Truth, thou, who comest
not forth from the mansion of Nature?
Even as thou seest how the flow of life from this world reaches the
child’s inward parts through its mother’s aid,
So, if aid come not from the Supernatural to this world, by God,
this world will be ruined!
For within the narrow straits of this world God hath worlds from
the Supernatural beyond limit or computation.
Contrary to universal custom, behold a group of intelligent men
voluntarily and naturally plunging into blood\(^{398}\);
Contrary to nature, a company content with pain and grief; contrary
to nature, a party gladly enduring the cruelty of spite.
Behold a community renouncing the world by natural inclination;
see a people contentedly suffering exile from their native land!
Behold a party all slain eagerly and joyfully; behold a throng all
imprisoned with alacrity and delight;
A whole series [of victims] voluntarily enduring various torments;
a whole class by natural inclination [involved] in afflictions of
every kind;
All intoxicated and singing songs\(^{399}\), but not from wine; all self-
effaced and dissipated, but not from opium!

How hath Daniel given news of today! How hath the word of
Isaiah taken effect now\(^{400}\)?
How hath the promise of all the Scriptures been fulfilled, precisely
in conformity with the Qur’án, the Pentateuch, the Books of the
Prophets and the Gospels!
Now in the Abode of Peace [Baghdád], now in Jerusalem, now in
Mount Carmel, now in Edom, and now in Sion,
The Holy and Fortunate Land hath been determined, the Blessed
and Auspicious Day hath been fixed.
’How came the Truth [God] to us? Even as our Arabian Prophet
and our guides the Imáms indicated to us’\(^{401}\).

\(^{397}\) *I.e.* the world, whereof but one quarter is supposed to be capable of sustaining human life.

\(^{398}\) This and the following verses refer to the readiness with which the Bábís suffer martyrdom.

\(^{399}\) Like Sulaymán Khán, for instance. See p. 196 *supra*, and my *Year amongst the Persians*, p. 102.

\(^{400}\) The fulfilment of these prophecies is especially discussed in a Bábí work entitled *Istidálíyya* addressed to the Jews, and in English by Ibáhím Khayru’lláh in *Bahá’u’lláh, the Splendour of God*. To give only one instance, “a time and times and half a time” is explained as three years and a half of 360 days each = 1260. Now A.H. 1260 (A.D. 1844) was the year of the Báb’s “Manifestation.”

\(^{401}\) This verse is entirely in Arabic.
How according to promise did the Eternal Beauty\textsuperscript{402} reveal His beauty, from whose Blessed Beauty the whole world augured well?

How did God become apparent in the Valley of “the Fig”? How did He become visible in the Mount of “the Olive”\textsuperscript{403},

How does He conquer without an army while all [others] are conquered?

How does He triumph unaided while mankind are helpless [before Him]?

Without the aid of learning He intones the sweetest verses\textsuperscript{404}; without the help of others He lays down the Best Law.

Why should we not see a hundred thousand souls His sacrifice?

Why should we not see a hundred thousand hearts bewitched by Him?

By the movement of His Pen [men’s] hearts and breasts are moved; by the calmness of His Glance cometh Peace without and within\textsuperscript{80}

The turbans of the doctors\textsuperscript{405} did not extinguish His Torch; the hosts of the captains did not overthrow His Standard.

Behold how His Word permeates the world as the soul the body; behold how His Influence throbs in the spirit like the blood in the veins!

The hostility of His foes does but [attempt to] crush water in a mortar; the enmity of His rivals is but as wind in the desert.

The duration of His command in the heart keeps company with the Spirit\textsuperscript{406}; the continuance of His authority in the world is coeval with the ages.

What a fire hath He kindled in [men’s] hearts, such that no water can quench this furnace!

His authority comprehendeth the terrestrial and the subterranean regions; His fame hath passed beyond China, India and Japan.

With one glance He hath conquered two hundred countries and districts; with one [stroke of His] Pen He hath taken a hundred castles and fortresses.

How by His summons to the Faith hath He established a Church against whom until the Resurrection no opponent shall prevail!

He sought help from none to found His Law; yea, God did not raise up the heavens on pillars\textsuperscript{407}.

When, when wilt thou admit His Grace and Mercy? How, how canst thou deny His Knowledge and Power?

Thou, who canst not order the affairs of a single household, do not contend with Him who orders all the ages!

Thou, who knowest not what is expedient in thine own affairs, do not obstinately strive with the Lord of the Kingdom of ‘Be and it is’\textsuperscript{408}!

Thou dost dispute with thy father about a farthing’s damage; these\textsuperscript{409} surrender life and wealth for His sake, and deem themselves favoured.

Alas a thousandfold that I have a thousand thoughts which I cannot harmonize with these restricted rhymes!

Words have escaped my control, yet [the tale of] my heart’s pain is

\textsuperscript{402} I.e. Bahá’u’lláh, who was most commonly entitled by his followers Jamál-i-Mubárak, “the Blessed Beauty,” or “Perfection.”

\textsuperscript{403} The reference is to Súra xcv of the Qur’án, entitled “the Fig.”

\textsuperscript{404} Not, of course, verses of poetry (abyát), but the revealed “signs” (áyát) which constitute His credentials.

\textsuperscript{405} I.e. of Law and Religion. It is, I think, misleading to translate ‘Ulamá as “clergy.”

\textsuperscript{406} I.e. lasts as long as life endures.

\textsuperscript{407} See Qur’án, xiii, 2 and xxxi, 9.

\textsuperscript{408} Ibid., ii, 111; iii, 42, etc.

\textsuperscript{409} I.e. the followers of Bahá’u’lláh.
In this chameleon-like age I have a heart led astray by all kinds of trifles. The time preens itself like a peacock in varied hues; the sphere displays its blandishments like a chameleon in divers colours. Sufficient is thy burning, O Sun, for my heart is roasted! sufficient is thy turning, O Heaven, for my body is ground to powder! I have a head, but what can it do with all this passion? I have a heart, but what can it do with all this trickery?

Where can the soul find endurance and steadfastness except in the Beloved? Where can the heart find patience and rest save in the Heart’s Desire? At one time I say to myself, ‘Perfection is a disaster’: at another I laugh to myself, ‘Madness is of many kinds.’ At one time my fancy rushes through the plain like an engine; at another my desire soars in the air like a balloon. I have broken away from the body, but life will not leave the body; I have abandoned life, yet the heart is not tranquil. My heart is wearied of this ruined mansion of merit and talent welcome the kingdoms of Love! welcome the realms of Madness!

Save the Divine Will [exercised] through the channel of Omnipotence, who can drag me forth from this whirlpool? Behold, the Will of God is ‘He whom God willeth’, with whose will the Will of God is conjoined;

The unique Servant of Bahá (‘Abdu’l-Bahá), made such by the Will of God, Who ‘When He willeth aught, saith “Be!” and it is’;

A King to whom God shows us the way; a Moon who guides us towards God;

‘God’s Secret,’ the fortunate Pearl of the Ocean of Union, who is the Pearl concealed in the shell of God’s Knowledge;

Beside his excellence, excellence lacks its excellency; beside his bounty Ma’n is a withholder of benefits.

His enemy is a foe unto himself whom even his friends renounce: he who obeys him is secure of himself and trusted by mankind.

In praise of the countenance of Him round whom the [Divine] Names revolve I would sing psalms, were I granted permission by Him. I continued to utter in praise of His Essence what God Himself hath said, not the verse of ‘the poets whom the erring follow’.

O Vice-gerent [Khalífa] of the All-merciful, O Ark of Noah, be not
grieved because the Truth hath been weakened by violation [of the Covenant].

In the Dispensation of Adam, Qábîl [Cain] cruelly and despitefully shed his brother's blood without fault or sin [on his part].

In the Dispensation of Noah, when Canaan[s] broke his father's Covenant, by the disgrace of a repudiated affiliation he was drowned in the Sea of Shame.

In the Dispensation of Jacob, Joseph the faithful was imprisoned in the bonds of servitude by the wiles of his brethren.

In the Dispensation of Moses from amongst the children of Israel one was such as Aaron and another such as Qârûn[s].

In the Dispensation of the Spirit of God [Jesus Christ] from amongst the Disciples one in cruelty became like Judas [Iscariot] and one in sincerity like Simon [Peter].

In the Dispensation of His Holiness the Seal of the Prophets [Muḥammad] one of his people was in faithfulness Abû Dharr and another Abû Sha'îyûn.

In the Dispensation of His Holiness the Supreme [the Báb] two persons were [entitled) Waḥîd, one was faithful and brave, the other a cowardly traitor.

In the Dispensation of the Most Splendid Countenance [Bahá'u'lláh] it must likewise needs be so, one faithful to the Covenant, the other a vile violator thereof.

I will not open my lips to curse, but God says, 'Whosoever breaketh my Covenant is accursed.'

This people wilfully shut their eyes to the Truth, for the Truth is apparent from the False in all circumstances.

I swear by Thy Face, O Exemplar of all peoples! I swear by Thy Hair, O Leader of all the ages!

I swear by Thy Substance, to wit the Majesty of the Absolute! I swear by Thy Truth, to wit the Reality of the Why-less!

I swear by Thy Countenance, to wit His [God's] dawning Countenance!

By the earth at Thy Feet, to wit the Alchemy of Desire! By the dust on Thy Road, to wit the tutty of [our] eyes!

By the spot pressed by Thy foot in the Land of 'the Fig'! By the place of adoration of mankind adorned by 'the Olive'!

[By all these I swear] that my heart cannot remain tranquil without praising Thee, for the debtor cannot lay his head tranquilly on the pillow.

Yet how can Na'îm utter Thy praises? [He is as one] unproved who steps into the Oxus.

418 According to Muhammadan tradition, he was a son or grandson of Noah, who, on account of his unbelief, was not saved in the Ark, but perished in the Flood. See Qur'ân, xi, 42, and commentary thereon.

419 See the note on verse 4 of this poem (p. 209, n. 2 supra).

420 I can find no mention of such a person, and suspect that the reading is corrupt.

421 The title Waḥîd ("Unique") appears to have been taken by the early Bábís as numerically equivalent to Yahyá, but this equivalency can only be obtained by writing the letter yá (ا) in the latter name only twice instead of three times (א). Thus misspelt, it, like  א would yield the number 28. At any rate, as we learn from Mírzá Jání's Nuqátatu'l-Káf (Gibb Series, vol. xv, pp. 243, 250, 257, 259) the title was first given to Sayyid Yahyá of Dáráb, the leader of the Nayriz rebellion, and on his death was transferred to Mírzá Yahyá Şúbхи-Azal, the half-brother and rival of Bahá'u'lláh, who is therefore called "the Second Waḥîd" (א א). It is, of course, to him that Na'îm applies the term "cowardly traitor."

422 The allusion here is to Bahá'u'lláh's sons (half-brothers) 'Abbás Efendi 'Abdu'l-Bahá and Muhammad 'Ali, between whom arose the same dispute about succession as arose in the previous generation between their father and his half-brother Şúbhi-Azal.

423 See p. 212, n. 1 supra.

424 See p. 214, n. 4 supra.
May he who obeys Thy command be secure from the deceits of the Flesh! May he who is the captive of Thy thraills be protected from the delusions of the time!”

Some apology is needed for quoting and translating in full so long a poem by an author so modern, so little known outside the circle of his own coreligionists, and, as he himself admits (verse 94), so comparatively unskilful in the manipulation of rhyme and metre. On the other hand the Bábí and the subsequent and consequent Bahá’í movement constitutes one of the most important and typical manifestations of the Persian spirit in our own time; and this poem, wherein an ardent enthusiasm struggles with a somewhat uncouth terminology, does on the whole faithfully represent the Bahá’í Weltanschauung. The following brief analysis may help the reader better to understand the line of thought which it pursues.

**Analysis of Na’ím’s Poem.**

Dissatisfaction of the author with the ordinary pursuits of life, and recognition of the vanity of worldly wealth, pomp and learning (verses 1-25).

True religion celebrated as the only thing which can satisfy the human soul; and materialism, socialism and communism condemned (verses 26-37).

True wisdom and its seekers and expounders, including the ancient Greek philosophers, praised (verses 38-48).

The wonder of the Universe, which is permeated throughout by God’s Spirit (verses 49-60).

Man’s need of Divine Revelation, which is as the need of a little child for its mother’s milk (verses 61-63).

Eagerness of the followers of the Báb and Bahá’u’lláh for suffering and martyrdom (verses 64-69).

Fulfilment of former prophecies in this Dispensation (verses 70-74).

Proofs of the truth of Bahá’u’lláh’s claim (verses 75-94).

The poet resumes his theme with a new *matla’,* or initial verse (95), and first speaks of himself and his own condition (verses 95-105). He next passes to the praise of Bahá’u’lláh’s son ‘Abbáš Efendí, better known after his father’s death (on May 28, 1892) as ‘Abdu’ll-Bahá (verses 106-114), and offers consolation for the antagonism of his half-brother and the Náqizín, or “Covenant-breakers,” who supported him, by numerous analogies drawn from previous Dispensations (verses 115-125). The last eight verses (126-133) constitute the peroration. The understanding of the poem, of course, presupposes a fairly complete knowledge of the history, doctrines and spiritual outlook of the Bábís and Bahá’ís, and to render it intelligible I have had to annotate the translation to an extent which I regret. It is, so far as my knowledge goes, the most ambitious attempt to expound this doctrine and point of view in verse.

It might be expected that I should include in this section some account of the later mystical poetry of the Šúfís, but, though such poetry continues to be produced down to the present day, I have met with none which attains the level of Saná’í, ‘Aṭṭár Jalálu’d-Dín Rúmí, Maḥmúd Shabistarí, Jámí, and the other great mystics discussed in the previous volumes of this work. There was, perhaps, little new to be said, and little that could be better expressed than it had been already, while

under the Šáfawís at any rate circumstances were particularly unfavourable to the expression of this class of ideas. The beautiful Tarjí’-band of Háthí of Iṣfahán, which will be given at the end of the next chapter, is the only masterpiece of Šúfí poetry produced in the eighteenth century with which I am acquainted.

(5) The Taṣníf or Ballad.

This class of verse, ephemeral as our own topical and comic Songs, leaves far fewer and slighter traces in literature than its actual importance would lead us to expect. A *taṣníf* about the Šáhib-Díván beginning:

\[\text{دَکُشَأَرَ سَخَتَ زِبَرُ سُرْسُرُّذِكَ} \\
\text{دَکُشَأَرَ سَخَتَ بَيَ جَوُوبِ وَ فِلَكَ} \\
\text{حَبِّ دَکُشَأَ حَبِّ دَکُشُأَ} \]

(“He made [the garden of] Dil-gushá under ‘the Slide’; He made Dil-gushá with the sticks and the stocks:}
was the most popular ballad when I was in Shíráz in the spring of 1888\textsuperscript{425}, but it is probably now as little remembered as an almost contemporary ribald English satire on a certain well-known Member of Parliament who “upset the milk in bringing it home from Chelsea.” I have no doubt that the taṣnīf or ballad sung by the troubadour and wandering minstrel existed in Persia from very early — perhaps even from pre-Islamic-times. Bárābād and Sakisá may have sung such topical songs to Khusrwú Parwíz the Sásmání thirteen hundred years ago, as Rúdáqí almost certainly did four centuries later to the Sámáníd prince who was his patron\textsuperscript{426}, and a fragment of a

[page 222]

typical taṣnīf (called by the curious name of ḥarárâ) sung in Iṣfahán on the occasion of the capture and execution of the heretic and assassin Ahmad ibn ‘Aṭṭáš\textsuperscript{427}, is recorded in the history of the Saljúqs composed by Abú Bakr Najmu’d-Dín Muḥammad ar-Ráwandi early in the thirteenth century of our era, under the title of Ráḥatu’s-Ṣūdūr wa Ṣuyúṭu’s-Sūrûr. The authorship of these taṣnīfs is seldom known, and they are hardly ever committed to writing, though my friend the late George Grahame, when Consul at Shíráz in 1905, very kindly caused a small selection of two score of those most popular at the time in that city and in Tíhrán, Iṣfahán, Rasht, Tabríz, and elsewhere, to be written down for me; and a selection, adapted as far as possible to the piano, was published in or about 1904 under the title of Twelve Persian Folk-Songs collected and arranged for voice and pianoforte by Blair Fairchild: English version of the words by Alma Strettell (Novello & Co., London and New York). In this excellent little book the songs are well set, well rendered into English, and intelligibly if not ideally transliterated, and the following sentence from the short prefatory note shows how sensible the compiler was to the indescribable charm of Persian minstrelsy:

“But one needs the setting of the Orient to realize what these songs are: the warm, clear Persian night; the lamps and lanterns shining on the glowing colours of native dresses; the surrounding darkness where dusky shadows hover; the strange sounds of music; voices, sometimes so beautiful, rising and falling in persistent monotony — all this is untranslatable, but the impression left on one is so vivid and so full of enchantment that one longs to preserve it in some form.”

Most of these taṣnīfs are very simple love-songs, in which lines from Ḥáfíz and other popular poets are sometimes
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incorporated; the topical, polemical and satirical class is much smaller, though in some ways more interesting as well as more ephemeral. A parody or parallel of such a taṣnīf may be produced to accord with fresh circumstances, as happens nearer home with the Irish \textit{Crean Bean Bócc} and the Welsh \textit{mochyn du}. An instance of such an adaptation is afforded by the second poem cited in my \textit{Press and Poetry of Modern Persia} (pp. 174-9). Of course in the taṣnīf the air is at least as important as the words, and a proper study of them would require a knowledge of Persian music, which, unhappily, I do not possess. Indeed I should think that few Europeans had mastered it both in practice and theory, or could even enumerate the twelve \textit{maqáms} and their twenty-four derivatives (\textit{shu'ba})\textsuperscript{428}.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{(6) Modern political verse.}
\end{itemize}

Of this I have treated so fully in my \textit{Press and Poetry of Modern Persia} (Cambridge, 1914) that it is unnecessary to enlarge further on it in this place. It is a product of the Revolution of 1905 and the succeeding years, and in my opinion shows real originality, merit and humour. Should space permit, I may perhaps add a few further specimens when I come to speak of the modern journalism with which it is so closely associated, and which, indeed, alone rendered it possible. The most notable authors of this class of verse include ‘Aríf and Dakhaw of Qazwín, Ashraf of Gílán, and Bahá’í of Mashhad, all of whom, so far as I know, are still living, while the two first named are comparatively young men. Portraits of all of them, and some particulars of their lives, will be found in my book above mentioned.

---

\textsuperscript{425} See my \textit{Year amongst the Persians}, p. 283.
\textsuperscript{428} One of the clearest and most concise treatises on this subject which I have seen is contained in a manuscript from the library of the late Sir A. Houtum-Schindler (now in my possession) entitled \textit{Bahjatú’r-Rawáj}. 

---

CHAPTER VI.
Almost any educated Persian can compose tolerable verses, and the great majority do so, while the number of those who habitually indulge in this pastime on a considerable scale and have produced diwâns of poetry has been at all times fairly large. Moreover this poetry is as a rule so conventional, and the language in which it is written so unchanged during the period under discussion, that if a hundred ghazals, or odes, by a hundred different poets who flourished during the last four centuries were selected, avoiding those which contained any reference to current events, and omitting the concluding verse of each, wherein the poet generally inserts his takhallus, or nom de guerre, it is extremely doubtful whether any critic could, from their style, arrange them even approximately in chronological order, or distinguish the work of a poet contemporary with Shâh Isma’i’ll the Şafawi from one who flourished in the reign of Nâşir’u’d-Dîn Shâh Qâjâr. Nor do the tadkhiras, or Memoirs of Poets, give us much help in making a selection, for when discussing contemporaries the author is very apt to make mention of his personal friends, and to ignore those whom he dislikes or of whom he disapproves. Thus influential or amiable rhymsters of mediocre ability are often included, while heretics, satirists and persons distasteful or indifferent to the author, though of greater talent, are often omitted. When Ri’dâ-qulî Khân “Hidáyat,” author of that great modern anthology entitled
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*Majma’u’l-Fuṣâhá* (“the Concourse of the Eloquent”)⁴²⁹, comes to speak of his contemporaries, we constantly come across such expressions as

“He had a special connection with me, and I a sincere regard for him⁴³⁰; “I saw him in Shíráz⁴³¹r; I repeatedly called on him and he used to open the gates of conversation before my face⁴³²r; “I sometimes get a talk with him⁴³³r; “for a while he established himself in Fârs, where at that time the writer also was living; I used constantly to have the honour of conversing with him, for he used to open the gates of gladness before the faces of his friends⁴³⁴r; and so forth. How many of the 359 “contemporary poets” mentioned in this work⁴³⁵r were included on such personal grounds rather than on account of any conspicuous merit? I once went through the list with my excellent old friend Hájî Mírzâ Yahyâ Dawlâtábádi, a man of wide culture and possessing a most extensive knowledge of Persian poetry, of which he must know by heart many thousands of verses, and asked him which of them he considered really notable. Out of the whole 359 he indicated five (Ṣâbâ of Kâshân, Furûqhi of Bîstâm, Qâ’âni of Shíráz, Mijmar of Shíráz, and Nashât of Shíráz) as of the first class; two (Wiqâr of Shíráz, and the author himself, Hidáyat) as of the second; and two (Surûsh of Shíráz and Wiqâr of Shíráz) as of the third;
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that is, he regarded about one out of every forty mentioned as having a claim to real distinction.

In any case, therefore, a very rigorous selection must be made, the more so when it is a question of poets whose beauty does not depend solely on form, and can, therefore, be preserved in some degree in translation. In making this selection I have included such poets as enjoy any considerable fame in their own country, and any others whom I happen to have come across in the course of my reading (a mere fraction of the total number) who make any special appeal to myself. It is doubtful how far a foreigner is competent to criticize; he may say that he personally admires or dislikes a particular poet, but I doubt if he should go so far as to class him definitely on this ground as good or bad. The taste of even the Turks and Indians, who are more familiar with Persian poetry than we can easily become, differs very considerably from that of the Persians themselves, who must be reckoned the most competent judges of their own literature. In this connection I should like to direct the reader’s attention to a very apposite passage in P. G. Hamerton’s *Intelectual Life*.⁴³⁶ Speaking of a Frenchman who had learned English entirely from books, without being able either to speak it, or to understand it when spoken, and “had attained what would certainly in the case of a dead language be considered a very high degree of scholarship indeed,” he says: “His appreciation of our authors, especially of our poets, differed so widely from English criticism and English feeling that it was evident he did not understand them as we understand them. Two things especially proved this: he frequently mistook declamatory versification of the most mediocre quality for poetry of an elevated order; whilst, on the other hand, his ear failed to perceive the music of the musical poets, as

---

⁴²⁹ Composed in 1284/1878-8 and lithographed in 2 vols. at Tîhrân in 1295/1878.
⁴³⁰ Vol. ii, p. 64, s.v. Ághâh-i-Shíráz.
⁴³⁵ They occupy pp. 58-679 of vol. ii, but were not all strictly contemporary, a few being as early as the first half of the eighteenth century.
Byron and Tennyson. How could he hear their music, he to whom our English sounds were all unknown?" Transform this Frenchman into an Indian or a Turk, and substitute “Persian” for “English” and “Qā‘ání” for “Byron and Tennyson,” and the above remarks admirably apply to most Turkish and Indian appreciations of Persian poetry.

Of the poets who died between A.D. 1500 and 1600 some ten or a dozen deserve at least a brief mention; of those between A.D. 1600 and 1700 about the same number; between A.D. 1700 and 1800 only one or two; between A.D. 1800 and 1885 about a score. Those who outlived the date last-mentioned may be conveniently grouped with the moderns, who will be discussed separately. The following are the poets of whom I propose to speak briefly, arranged in chronological order of their deaths (the dates of birth are seldom recorded) in the four periods indicated above.

I. Between A.D. 1500 and 1600 (A.H. 906-1009).

Several of the poets who really belong to this period have been already mentioned in my Persian Literature under Tartar Dominion, namely, Mír ‘Ali Shír Nawá’í, d. 906/1500-1 (pp. 505-6); Husayn Wá’iz-i-Káshífí, d. 910/1504-5 (pp. 503-4); Banná’í, killed in the massacre at Qarshí in 918/1512-3 (p. 457); and Hiláli, killed by ‘Ubayd’lláh Khán the Uzbek as a Shi’a in 936/1529-30 (p. 459). Of the last-named only need anything further be said here.


Mawlánu ‘Abdu’l-láh Hátífí of Kharjír in Khurásán derives his chief fame from the fact that he was the nephew of the great Jámí, who, according to the well-known story437, tested his poetical talent before allowing him to write by bidding him compose

a “parallel” to the following verses in Firdawsi’s celebrated satire438 on Sultán Maḥmúd of Ghazna:

```persian
درختی که تغییر درختی ندارد
گریز می‌کند که دیگر نخست‌گاهی ندارد
ور از جوی مغاده بی‌گمان‌های
به بیب فلک و دری و شیش‌نام
سر انجماد کوه‌های بخار آورده
هناب میوه‌های بار آورده
```

“A tree whereof the nature is bitter, even if thou plantest it in the Garden of Paradise,
And if, at the time of watering, thou pourest on its roots nectar and
fine honey from the River of Paradise439,
It will in the end give effect to its nature, and bring forth that same bitter fruit.”

Hátífí produced the following “parallel,” which his uncle Jámí approved, except that he jocularly observed that the neophyte had “laid a great many eggs on the way440:

```persian
اگر پیشهٔ تو یاد ظلمت سرخیت، نیست یوسر طارس باش بیتگاه
بی‌پیشهٔ آن پیشه پورترش، ز انجیر جسته یکی اورتش
دهی آتش از بشکهٔ سه‌سلیم، بدان پیشه دم‌دود دم‌جبثیل
شود عاقبت پیشهٔ تو، زاغ زاغ، پرند پرورده طاووس باش
```

“If thou should’st place an egg of the crow compounded of darkness
under the Peacock of the Garden of Paradise,

438 The satire is given at the end (pp. 63-6) of the Persian Introduction to Turner Macan’s edition of the Sháh-náma (Calcutta, 1829). These verses occur on p. 66, ll. 5-7.
439 Probably the celestial river of Salsabil is intended.
440 Majma’u’l-Fuṣahá, vol. ii, p. 54. Hátífí’s verses are given on the last page (436) of vol. iii of Ziyá Bey’s Kharábát.
And if at the time of nourishing that egg thou should’st give it grain
from the Fig-tree of the Celestial Gardens,

And should’st water it from the Fountain of Salsabil, and Gabriel
should breathe his breath into that egg,
In the end the crow’s egg will become a crow, and vain will be the
trouble of the Peacock of Paradise.”

 Hátfí was one of the innumerable poets who strove to compose a “Quintet” (Khamsa) rivalling that of Nizámí of Ganza.
Two of his five subjects were the same, the romances of Laylá and Majnún and of Shírín and Khusrav; the Haft Manzår
formed the parallel to the Haft Paykar; while the Timúr-náma formed the counterpart to the Síkandár-náma, except that, as
Hátfí boasts, his poem was based on historical truth instead of on fables and legends. He also began, but did not complete,
a similar historical poem on the achievements of Sháh Isma’il the Šafawi, who paid him a surprise visit as he was returning
from a campaign in Khurásán in 917/1511-12. This poem is in the style and metre of the Sháh-náma of Firdawsi, and is
titled Sháh-náma-i-Haḍrat-i-Sháh Isma’íl.

Hátfí belongs essentially, like so many other representatives of Art and Letters in the early Šafawi -period, to the circle
of Herát formed under the liberal patronage of the later Timúrids.

2. Bábá Fíghání of Shíráz (d. 925/1519).

Fíghání appears to be one of those poets who are much more highly esteemed in India than in their own country, for
while Shiblí in his Shi’ru’l-’Ájam (vol. iii, pp. 27-30), like Wálíh in his Riyádú’sh-Shu’árá, deems him the creator of a new
style of poetry,

[page 230]

Rídá-qúlí Khán only accords him a brief mention in his Riyádú’l-’Árifin and entirely omits him in his larger Majma’u’l-
Fusáhá, while the notices of him in the Átash-káda and the Tuhfá-i-Sámí are very brief. He was of humble origin, the son of a
cutler or a vintner according to different accounts, and seems to have lived the life of a somewhat antinomian dervish.
In Khurásán, whither he went from Shíráz, he was unappreciated, even by the great Jámí, with whom he forgathered; but at
Tabríz he subsequently found a more appreciative patron in Sulṭán Ya’qúb the Prince of the “White Sheep” Turkmánis. He
repented in later life and retired to the Holy City of Mashhad, so that perhaps this verse of his ceased to be applicable:

آلووده! شراب فغاني بصاح رفت، آه ملاتکش حکمی تازه بو گرتنده،

Stained with wine Fíghání sank into the earth: alas if the Angels
should sniff at his fresh shroud!

The longest extracts from his poems are given in the Majálísu’l-Mú’minín, but these are all qasídás in praise of ‘Alí,
presumably composed towards the end of his life, and, though they may suffice to prove him a good Shi’a, they are hardly of
a quality to establish his reputation as a great poet.

3. Ummídí (or Umídí) of Tihrán (d. 925/1519 or 930/1523-4).

Little is known of Umídí except that his proper name was Arjásp, that he was a pupil of the celebrated philosopher

---

441 Published at Calcutta by Sir W. Jones in 1788.
442 Lithographed at Lucknow in Oct. 1869. It comprises about 4500 verses.
443 Rieu’s British Museum Persian Catalogue, p. 654.
444 There is another similar and homonymous poem by Qásími. See R.M.P.C., pp. 660-1. The Library of King’s College, Cambridge,
possesses a ms. of this latter (Pote Collection, No. 238).
446 Lithographed at Tihrán, 1305/1887-8, p. 122.
447 On this account he originally wrote verse under the “pen-name of Sakkáki.
448 Lest they should by the smell of the wine know him for the toper he was.
449 One is tempted to conjecture from this name that he may have been a Zoroastrian, but I have found no further evidence to support this
supposition.
Jalálú’-d-Dín Dawání, that his skill was in the *qasida* rather than the *ghazal*, that he was on bad terms with his fellow-townsmen, on whom he wrote many satires, and that he was finally killed in Ṭihrán in a quarrel about a piece of land, at the instigation of Qiwámú’-d-Dín Núr-bakhshi. Námi, one of his pupils, composed the following verses and chronogram on his death:

![Verse Image]

“The much-wronged Umídí, wonder of the Age, who suddenly and contrary to right became a martyr,
Appeared to me at night in a dream and said, ‘O thou who art aware of my inward state,
Write for the date of my murder’⁴⁵⁰. “Alas for my blood unjustly shed, alas!”’

Reference has already been made (p. 59 *supra*) to a *qasida* composed by him in praise of *Najm-i-Thání*, and probably his poetry consisted chiefly of panegyrics, though he also wrote a *Sáqí-náma* (“Book of the Cup-bearer”) of the stereotyped form. Manuscripts of his poems are very rare, but there is one in the British Museum⁴⁵¹, comprising, however, only 17 leaves, and even these few poems were collected long after his death by command of Sháh Šáfi. Mention is, however, made of him in most of the *tadhkiras*, and the *Atash-kada* cites 24 verses from his *Sáqí-náma*.

and 70 verses from his other poems. Amongst these are the following, also given in the *Majma’u’l-Fuṣahá* (vol. ii pp. 7-8):

```
روات مدرسه کر شکنون پیاد است،
قصور میکده ظرف میزاب قصور;
پناه مدرسه از جنی عالی و سراف،
خواب آمیز و جوامع همچنان معمر.
```

“If the College hall should be turned upside down it matters little;
but may no injury befall the halls of the Wine-houses of Love!
The College buildings, high and low, were destroyed, while the
taverns continued to flourish just the same.”

---

⁴⁵⁰ This chronogram gives A.H. 925 (A.D. 1519), but 930/1523-4 is the date given by Sám Mírzá, and 929/1522-3 in the *Ahsanu’t-Tawáríkh*, and, by implication, in the *Haft Iqlím*.

⁴⁵¹ Or. 3642, ff. 180-197. See Rieu’s *Persian Supplement*, p. 269. The author of the *Haft Iqlím*, writing more than seventy years after the death of Umídí, his fellow-townsmen and apparently kinsman, says that in his day the well-known verses of the poet consisted of 17 *qasidas*, 3 *ghazals*, a few fragments and quatrains, and the *Sáqí-náma*.
Thou art a half-drunk Turk, I am a half-slain bird; thy affair with me is easy, my desire of thee is difficult.
Thou settest thy foot in the field, I wash my hands of life; thou causest sweat to drip from thy cheek, I pour blood from my heart.
Behind that traveller in weakness and helplessness I rise up and subside like the dust until the halting-place is reached.
When shall the luck be mine to lift him drunken from the saddle, while that crystal-clear arm embraces my neck like a sword-belt?
Thou bearest a dagger and a goblet: the faithful with one accord drink blood beside thee and give their lives before thee.
Now that my scroll of praise is rolled up, hearken to the tale of Ray: it is a ruin wherein a madman is governor: A madman on whom counsel produced no effect; a madman whom chains did not render sensible.
He is a madman full of craft, my old enemy; be not secure of him, and be not heedless of me.
From the arbiter of eloquence this point is hidden, that a distracted mind is not disposed to verse.
My genius would snatch the ball of verse from all and sundry, if only the bailiff were not in my house!”

4 and 5. The two Ahlis.

These two homonymous poets, the one of Turshíz in Khurásán (d. 934/1527-8) and the other of Shíráz (d. 942/1535-6), of both of whom the names are more familiar than the works, must, as Rieu has pointed out, be carefully distinguished. Both are ignored by Rīḍá-qulí Khán, and both belong.

---

452 See p. 166, n. i supra.
453 This common simile is derived from the game of polo.
the former actually, the latter spiritually, to the Herât school which gathered round Sulṭán Ḥusayn and Mir ‘Ali Shîr. This school, to which also belonged Ūzûrī (d. 1024/1615), likewise of Turshiz, seems never to have been popular in Persia, except, perhaps, in their own day in Khurâsân, but enjoys a much more considerable reputation in India, where Ūzûrâ, whose very name is almost unknown in Persia, enjoys an extraordinary, and, as I think, quite undeserved fame, especially as a writer of extremely florid and bombastic prose. Ahlî of Shîrâz excelled especially in elaborately ingenious word-plays (tajnisât) and other rhetorical devices.

6. Hilâlî (killed in 935/1528-9).

Hilâlí, though born in Astarâbâd, the chief town of the Persian Province of Gurgân, was by race a Chaghatây Turk, and was in his youth patronized by Mir ‘Ali Shîr Nawâ’î. His most famous poem, entitled Shâh u Darwish, or Shâh u Gadâ (“the King and the Beggar”), has been harshly criticized by Bâbur himself455 and in later times by Sprenger456, but warmly defended by Ethê, who translated it into German verse457. He composed another mathnawi poem entitled Sîfâtu l-‘Ashiqîn (“the Attributes of Lovers”) and a number of odes collected into a Diwân. Ridâ-qli Khan says458 that in Khurâsân he was regarded as a Shî‘a, but in Irâq as a Sunni. Unhappily for him ‘Ubaydu’llâh Khân, the fanatical Uzbek, took the former view, and caused him to be put to death as a “Râfidî.” It is curious, in view of this, that he is not mentioned in the Majâlisu l-Mû‘minin amongst the Shî‘a poets; and perhaps, as asserted in the Haft Iqlim, the

envy of two of his rivals at the Uzbek Court, Baqâ’î and Shamsu’d-Din Kûhistâni, rather than his religious views, may have caused his execution, which ‘Ubaydu’llâh Khân is said to have subsequently regretted. The following verses, however, seem to indicate Shî‘a propensities:

محجّبٍ عربيٍ هُو ذَوْ سَرَائِ،
حسّي ضَحِّ عَكَال وَرَش نِسْبَ حَكَال بَوْسٍ أَوْ,
شنيّ ذَابّةٍ كَلّمَتْهُ نُوَّر هَمْجُ مُصِيحٍ,
بِدِين حَيّتُ دَيْس لَعْلِي رُوحٌ بَورُو أَوْ.
جَهَمَ مَن مَدِينَةِ عَلَيْهِ دَرَسُ مَرِاً,
عَجِب مَحْجَمَةٍ حَيّيّتُ من سَگّ دِرَاأوْ.

“Muhammad the Arabian, the honour of both worlds: dust be upon the head of him who is not as dust at his Door!
I have heard that his life-sustaining ruby lip uttered, like the Messiah, this tradition:
‘I am the City of Knowledge and ‘Ali is my Door’: a marvellously blessed tradition! I am the dog of his Door459!”

7. Lisânî (d. 940/1533-4).

Lisânî of Shîrâz is the last of the twenty-two Persian Shî‘a poets mentioned in the Majâlisu l-Mû‘minin and deserves mention rather on account of his devotion to that faith than by reason of his poetic talent; for, although he is said to have produced more than 100,000 verses, they are little known and seldom met with460, and, though mentioned in the Atash-kada and the Haft Iqlim, he is ignored by Ridâ-qli Khân. Most of his life was spent at Baghdad and Tabriz, in which latter

454 Persian Catalogue, pp. 657-8. See also Ethê’s India Office Persian Catalogue, col. 785, No. 1432, where a very valuable autograph ms., made in 920/1514, is described.
455 See my Persian Literature under Tartar Dominion, p. 459.
456 Oude Catalogue, p. 427.
459 I.e. the dog of ‘Ali. Kalb-‘Ali is not uncommon as a name amongst the Shî‘a, and, as we have seen, the Safawi kings gloried in the title “Dogs of the Threshold of ‘Ali ibn Abî Ṭâlib.” These verses are taken from the Majma’u l-Fusahâ.
460 There is a copy of his Diwân (Or. 307) in the British Museum. See Rieu’s Persian Catalogue, pp. 656-7.
town he died just before it was taken by the Ottoman Sultan Sulayman. “On account of his devotion to the Twelve Imáms,” says the author of the Majális, “Lisání would never remove from his head the twelve-gored kingly crown” until, when Sultan Sulayman the Turk was advancing to occupy Tabriz, it happened that news of his near approach reached Lisání when he was engaged in prayer in the great Mosque of Tabriz. On hearing this news, he raised his hands in prayer, saying, ‘O God, this usurper is coming to Tabriz: I cannot remove this crown from my head, nor reconcile myself to witnessing his triumph, therefore suffer me to die, and bring me to the Court of Thy Mercy!’ He then bowed his head in prayer, and in that attitude surrendered his soul to the Beloved.” The following quatrain is characteristic:

گو یبد لسانی گلد از بندش، در خاک شور چو و بوده حاجتندش،

باشد طغرد مفقود شسر نزند، جیه مبر ای و باره، دژرندش.

“If the joints of Lisání break apart, and his needy body passes into the dust,

By God, from the horizon of his heart naught will appear save the love [or sun]

of ‘Ali and his eleven descendants!”

His poems, in the preservation of which he seems to have been very careless, were collected after his death by his pupil Sharif of Tabriz, but so slovenly was the compilation that, according to the Atash-kada, it was known as Sahwu ‘l-Lisán, or “Lapsus Linguae.”

8. Fuḍūlī (Fuzuli) of Baghdád (d. 970/1562-3).

Fuḍūlī is reckoned amongst the Turkish rather than the Persian poets, and is fully discussed by Gibb in vol. iii of his monumental History of Ottoman Poetry (ch. iv, pp. 70-107). That he became an Ottoman subject was due to the fact that Baghdad,

where he was probably born, and where he spent nearly all his life, was taken from the Persians by the Turks in 940/1535; but, as Gibb says462, “he composed with equal ease and elegance in Turkish, Persian, and Arabic.” He is described by the same scholar463 as “the earliest of those four great poets who stand pre-eminent in the older literature of Turkey, men who in any age and in any nation would have taken their place amongst the Immortals.” That his status in the Persian Parnassus is so much lower is due rather to the greater competition and higher standard of excellence prevailing there than to any lack of skill on his part in the use of the Persian language.464 That he was of the Shi‘a faith is clear from several of his verses, and from his Ḥadiqatu s-Su‘dá465, a Turkish martyrology modelled on the Persian Rawdatu ‘sh-Shuhádá of Ḥusayn Wá‘iz-i-Káshífí.

As I have referred to Gibb’s great work on Ottoman Poetry, I may here express a doubt as to his claim466 that the kind of poem entitled Shaḥr-angíz (or “City-thriller,” as he renders it) is a Turkish invention, and that there is no similar poem in Persian literature.” Sám Mirzá in his Tuhfá-i-Sámi (compiled in 957/1550) mentions at least two poets, Waḥídí of Qum and Harfí of Isfahán, who composed such poems, the former on Tabriz, the latter on Gilán, and though these were probably written later than Masíh’s Turkish Shaḥr-angíz on Adrianople, there is nothing to suggest that they were regarded as a novelty or innovation in Persia. Harfí’s poem, called Shaḥr-áshúb (“City-disturber”) seems to have been bitterly satirical, for the

unhappy poet was deprived of his tongue in consequence, as Sám Mirzá relates:

شهر آشوری هیچ چنین جهت آنها (بیني گيلان) و صرم آنها اتهم و اورا یا مریدی میثاقی ناپذیره ربایشان اما این جالانه اورا از برف اشعار بی‌گام می‌پیاکست له جهت هجو اهل گیلان.

461 Concerning this distinctive head-dress, which gave to the Persian Shi‘a their name of Qizil-básh (“Red-heads”), see p. 48 supra.

462 Loc. cit., p. 72.

463 Ibid., p. 71.

464 He has a complete Persian Díván, of which a MS. (Add. 7785) exists in the British Museum, and which has been printed at Tabriz. See Rieu’s Persian Catalogue, p. 659.

465 See Rieu’s Turkish Catalogue, pp. 39-40.

9. Wahshí of Báfq (d. 991/1583).

Though born at Báfq, a dependency of Kirmán, Wahshi spent most of his life at Yazd. His poetry, especially his *Farhád u Shirin* and his ghazals, are highly praised in the *Tā’rikh-i-Ālam-ārā-yi-Abbási*, the *Ātash-kada*, and the *Majma’u’l-Fuṣahâ*.

He also wrote panegyrics on Sháh Tahmásp and his nobles, concerning which the author of the work last-named remarks that in this branch of the poetic art none of the poets of the middle period can compare with the ancients. He did not finish the *Farhád u Shirin*, which was completed long afterwards (in 1265/1848-9) by Wişál. He wrote two other mathnáwí poems, the *Kholi-Barin* (“Supreme Abode of Bliss”) and *Náźir u Manzúr*, besides ghazals (odes) and qit’as (fragments), a large selection of which are given in the *Majma’u’l-Fuṣahâ* and the *Ātash-kada* (pp. 111-120). The following *murabba*, or “foursome,” given in both these anthologies, is rather pretty and unusual.
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468 See Rieu’s *Persian Catalogue*, pp. 663-4.
“O friends, hearken to the account of my distraction! Hearken to the tale of my hidden sorrow! Hearken to the story of my disordered state! Hearken to my description of my bewilderment! How long shall I hide the account of this grievous story? I burn! I burn! How long shall I refrain from telling this secret?

For a while I and my heart dwelt in a certain street: the street of a certain quarrelsome beauty. We had staked Faith and heart on one of dissolute countenance; we were fettered in the chains of one with chain-like tresses. In that chain was none bound save me and my heart: of all that exist, not one was captive then.

Her bewitching narcissus-eyes had not then all these love-sick victims; her curling hyacinthine locks held then no prisoner; she had not then so brisk a business and so many customers; she was a Joseph [in beauty] but found no purchaser. I was the first to become a purchaser; it was I who caused the briskness of her market.

My love was the cause of her beauty and comeliness; my shame gave fame to her beauty; so widely did I everywhere describe her charms that the whole city was filled with the tumult of the spectators. Now she has many distracted lovers, how should she think or care for poor distracted me?

Since it is so, it is better that we should pursue some other aim, that we should become the sweet-voiced songsters of some other rose-bower, that we should become the nightingales of some other rose-cheeked beauty, that for a few days we should follow some other charmer. Where is some fresh young rose whose eloquent nightingale I may become, and whom I may [thus] distinguish amongst the youthful beauties of the garden?

Although the fancy for thy face hath passed away from Wašshì’s mind, and the desire for thy charming figure hath departed from his heart, and one vexed in heart departed in heart hath departed in vexation from thy street, and with a heart full of complaints hath departed from the displeasure of thy countenance, God forbid that I should forget thy constancy, or should listen to man’s counsels of expediency!”
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10. Maḥmūd Qārī of Yazd (d. 993/1585).
11. Muḥtasham of Kāshān (d. 996/1587-8).

Maḥmūd Qārī of Yazd, the poet of clothes, who died two years after Wašshì and three years before Muḥtasham, was mentioned in the preceding volume of this work469 in connection with the two earlier parodists ‘Ubayd-i-Zákānì and Bushaq (Abū Ishqāq) of Shirāz; while the far more notable Muḥtasham has been already discussed at some length in the preceding chapter470 in connection with the religious poetry on which his fame chiefly rests. Of the erotic verse of his early youth and of his panegyrics on Sîh Ĥāmîs copious specimens are given in the Ātash-kada, but these are neither so distinguished nor so characteristic as his elegies (marâthi) on the martyrdom of Husayn and the other Imâms, from which the extracts given in the Majma ’u ’l-Fuṣâhâ471 are chiefly taken.

12. ‘Urfī of Shirāz (d. 999/1590-1) and his circle.

Though less highly appreciated in his own country than in Turkey and India, ‘Urfī is probably on the whole the most famous and popular poet of his century472. Though born and brought up in Shirāz, his short life was chiefly spent in India, where he died in 999/1590-1 at the early age of thirty-six, some say of dysentery, others of poison. He is one of the three poets of this century (A.D. 1500-1600) discussed by Shibli Nu’mâni in his Shi’ru’l-’Ajâm473, the other two being his

[fellow-townsmen Bâbâ Fighânî, already mentioned474, and Faydî (Fayzî), brother of Akbar’s celebrated minister Abu’l-Faḍl (Abu’l-Fazîl), who, in Shibli’s opinion, was one of the two Indian poets who wrote Persian verse which would pass as the work of a genuine Persian475. ‘Abdu’l-Ĝâdîr Badâ’uni says476 that ‘Urfī and Thanâ’i were the two most popular Persian poets

469 Persian Literature under Tartar Dominion, pp. 257 and 351-3. Maḥmūd is not mentioned in the Ātash-kada, the Haft Iqlîm, or the Majma ’u ’l-Fuṣâhâ; no particulars of his life are known to me, and the date of his death must be regarded as uncertain.
470 Pp. 172-7 supra.
471 Vol. ii, pp. 36-38.
472 See Rieu’s Persian Catalogue, p. 667.
473 Vol. iii, PP. 82-133.
474 Pp. 229-230 supra.
475 The other was Amir Khusraw of Dîhî.
in India in his time, and that manuscripts of their works were to be found in every bazaar and book-shop, while Faydí’s poems, in spite of the large sums of money which he had expended in having them beautifully copied and illuminated, were little sought after. Gibb says⁴⁷⁷ that, after Jámí, ‘Urﬁ and Faydí were the chief Persian influences on Turkish poetry until they were superseded by Sá‘íb, and that “the novelty in this style lay, apart from the introduction of a number of fresh terms into the conventional vocabulary of poetry, in the deposition of rhetoric from the chief seat, and the enthronement of loftiness of tone and stateliness of language in its stead⁴⁷⁸.” Ziyá (Diyá) Pasha, in that portion of his metrical Introduction to the Kharábát which discusses the Persian poets, after praising Jámí, proceeds to speak of ‘Urﬁ and Faydí as follows:

> Faydí and ‘Urﬁ run neck-and-neck; they are the leaders of the later time.
> In Faydí is eloquence and freshness, in ‘Urﬁ sweetness and fluency.
> In Faydí are fiery exhortations, while ‘Urﬁ is strong in elegies.
> But if pre-eminence he sought, excellence still remains with Faydí.
> Faydí is clear throughout: no dots need be added to his commentary.
> But that paragon of excellence suffered martyrdom at his pupil’s hands.”

I can find no evidence in support of the last statement, which, indeed, is at variance with Badá‘úni’s exultant description⁴⁷⁹ of his painful and unpleasant death⁴⁸⁰, though perhaps the swollen face and blackened lips, which his bitter enemy describes with unconcealed Schadenfreude, may have aroused suspicions of poison. The same fanatical writer gives a series of most uncomplimentary chronograms composed by the orthodox to commemorate the death of an arch-heretic, such as:

> When infidel Faydí died, Faṣíḥ said as the date of his death, ‘A dog departed from the world in a foul fashion.’

The simplest of them all are “Faydí was a heretic;” (بود فیضی ملحدی) “he died like a dog-worshipper” (جه سگ پریشانی موت) and “the rule of heresy broke” (الخوار شکست قاعیده) all of which yield the required date A.H. 1004 (A.D. 1595). Badá‘úni also says that, with a view to restoring his shattered religious reputation, he composed a commentary on the Qur’án consisting entirely of undotted letters, adding unkindly that he was drunk and in a state of legal uncleanness when he wrote it. The author of the Majma’u’l-

[Fusahá]⁴⁸¹ in alluding to this book (which he only knew by repute) says that the author “troubled himself to no purpose” (غلت بحالم علمه), and has no word of praise for his poems, on which the author of the Atash-kada has the tepid encomium that “they are not bad.” The fullest and most appreciative account of him which I have met with is that given by Shiblí Nu’maáni in his Shi’ru’l-Ajam.⁴⁸² He composed a Khamsa ("Quintet") in imitation of Nizámí, the titles of these five poems being Markaz-i-Adwár, Sulaymán u Bilqís, Na’l u Daman (the most celebrated), Haft Kishwar, and Akbar-náma, but

---

⁴⁷⁶ Muntakahabu’r-Tawáriḵ, vol. iii, P. 285 (Calcutta, 1869).
⁴⁷⁸ Loc. cit. p. 129.
⁴⁷⁹ Muntakahabu’r-Tawáriḵ, vol. iii, pp. 299-310, especially p. 300.
⁴⁸⁰ This took place on 10 Safar, 1004 (October 15, 1595). See Rieu’s Persian Catalogue, p. 450, where the chief sources are fully enumerated.
⁴⁸¹ Vol. ii, p. 26. This commentary was entitled, according to Shiblí Nu’maáni (loc. cit., p. 65), Sawáṭi’u’l-Ilám.
⁴⁸² Vol. iii, pp. 31-81.
some of them remained incomplete. He also wrote many *qasidas* and *ghazals*, and produced several translations from the Sanskrit. None of his verses quoted by Shibl appear to me so affecting as the following on the death of his child

> ای روشنی دیه، روشن چگونه؟
> من بی لو چون، رو با چون که چونه؟
> مانیر سرعت خانه، من در فراق تو!
> تو زیر خانه ساخته می‌کن چگونه؟
> برخبر و خس هن بسته، بی‌پایین خواب تست.
> ای یاسین عمار، سنن چگونه؟

> "O brightness of my bright eyes, how art thou?
Without thee my days are dark; without me how art thou?
My house is a house of mourning in thine absence;
 thou hast made thine abode beneath the dust: how art thou?
The couch and pillow of thy sleep is on thorns and brambles:
O thou whose cheeks and body were as jasmine, how art thou?"
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Faydí was a man of varied learning and a great lover of books. His library contained four thousand six hundred choice manuscripts, mostly autographs or copied during the authors’ lifetimes. He was generous and hospitalable, and amongst those who enjoyed his hospitality was ‘Urfí of Shiráz, to whom we now turn.

‘Urfí, whose proper name was Jamálu’d-Dín Muḥammad and whose father was named Badru’d-Dín, was born and educated at Shiráz, but at an early age migrated to India, and, as already mentioned, attached himself to Faydí, with whom, however, he presently quarrelled. Badá’úní says that one day he called on Faydí and found him caressing a puppy, whereupon he enquired what the name of “the young master” (makhdúm-záda) might be. “Urfí,” replied Faydí, to which ‘Urfí promptly replied, “Mubárak bashad!” which means “May it be fortunate!” but may be taken as alluding to Faydí’s father Sháykh Mubárak and as meaning, “It should be Mubárak!”

‘Urfí next won the favour of the Ḥākim Abu’l-Fāth of Gilán, by whom he was introduced to that great nobleman and patron of letters ‘Abdu’r-Rahím, who succeeded to the title of Khán-Khánán borne by his father Bayram Khán on the assassination of the latter in 968/1560-1. In due course he was presented to the Emperor Akbar himself, whom he accompanied on his march to Cashmere in 997/1588-9.

In spite of his opportunities and undoubted talents, ‘Urfí’s intolerable conceit and arrogance prevented him from being popular, and made him many enemies. Riḍá-qúlí Khán accords him but a brief notice, and observes that “the style of his poems is not admired by the people of this age.” Criticism
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and disparagement are, indeed, courted by a poet who could write:

> نازش سعیدی بسیت خالد شیراز او چه بود؟
> گر نمی دانست باشد مولد و مأواه من.

> “Wherefore did Sa’di glory in a handful of the earth of Shiráz
If he did not know that it would be my birthplace and abode?”

Nor is this an isolated example of his conceit, for in like fashion he vaunts his superiority to Anwári, Abu’l-Faraj, Kháqáni, and other great Persian poets, and this unamiable practice may have conducd to his unpopularity amongst his compatriots, who do not readily tolerate such disparagement of the national heroes. In Turkey, on the other hand, he had, as we have seen, a great influence and reputation, and likewise in India, so that Shibl devotes to him fifty-two pages (pp. 82-133) of his *Shí’ru’l-‘Ajam*, rather more than he devotes to Faydí, and much more than he gives to any other of the seven poets he mentions in the third volume of his work. But even Shibl admits that his arrogance made him generally unpopular, a fact

---

483 *Shí’ru’l-‘Ajam*, iii, p. 50, and *Muntakhabu ‘t-Tawárikh*, iii, p. 305.
487 *Shí’ru’l-‘Ajam*, iii, p. 88.
of which he was fully aware, as appears from the following poem,488 wherein he complains of the hypocritical sympathy of the so-called “friends” who came to visit him when he was confined to bed by a severe illness:

My body hath fallen into this state, and my eloquent friends stand like pulpits round my bed and pillow.
One draws his hand through his beard and cocks his neck, saying, ‘O life of thy father! To whom is fortune constant?
One should not set one’s heart on ignoble rank and wealth: where is the Empire of Jamshid and the name of Alexander?’
Another, with soft voice and sad speech, begins, drawing his sleeve across his moist eyes: ‘O my life! All have this road by which they must depart: we are all travellers on the road, and time bears forward the riders.’
Another, adorning his speech with smooth words, says, ‘O thou whose death is the date of the revolution of news (inqilāb-i-khabar)!

Collect thyself, and beware, let not thy heart be troubled, for I will with single purpose collect thy verse and prose.
After copying and correcting it, I will compose an introduction like a casket of pearls in support of thy claims;
An index of learning and culture such as thou art, a compendium of good qualities and talents such as thou art,
I will pour forth, applying myself both to verse and prose, although it is not within the power of man to enumerate thy perfections!’

‘May God, mighty and glorious, give me health again, and thou shalt see what wrath I will pour on the heads of these miserable hypocrites!’490.

488 Shi‘ru‘l-‘Ajam, iii, pp. 92-3.
489 I think the words اقتلاع خبر must be taken as a chronogram, giving the date 986/1578-9, in which case this cannot, as Shiblí suggests (loc. cit., p. 92), have been ‘Urfi’s last illness, since he did not die until 999/1590-1.
490 This final verse is, of course, spoken by the poet himself.
Space does not allow us to follow in detail Shiblī’s interesting and exhaustive study of this poet, to whose verse he assigns six salient merits, such as “forceful diction” (ُدِرْوُ عَلَى عَبْدَ المَسْلِم), new and original combinations of words, fine metaphors and comparisons, and continuity or congruity of topics (مَسْلِم). Except for a little-known prose treatise on Ṣūfīsm entitled Nafṣīyya all his work was in verse, and included, according to Shiblī, two mathnawi poems in imitation of Nizāmī’s Makhzan u’l-Asrār and Khusrūwa Shirin, and a Diwān, compiled in 996/1588, only three years before his death, containing 26 qaṣīdas, 270 ghazals, and 700 fragments and quatrains. The following chronogram gives the date of its compilation⁴⁹¹:

این طرحِ تناة تبَحَرُ و اعجَزات
جوانْ نَقْشِ مَنْكِبْ برَمْ بواییَ
مجمعه طَارِف قَدَس تَاریخَ باَیْت
اورِ حُیون عَرَضی شَهادیَ

One of his most famous qaṣīdas, given in the Kharābāt (vol. i, pp. 169-174), is in praise of ‘Ali ibn Abī Ṭālib, and contains 181 verses. It begins:
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جَهَانْ بْکَنْدِر و دراْ جَنْدِ شِرِّ و دِرَاز
نَمِیدَهْم جَنْدِ فَرْوْشُد بَخت درْ نَابَاز

“I have wandered through the world, but alas! no city or country have I seen where they sell good fortune in the market”

‘Urﬁ is not, however, included amongst the Persian Shi’a poets to whom notices are consecrated in the Majālisu’l-Mū’mīnīn.

Concerning the numerous Persians — theologians, scholars, philosophers and poets — attracted to Akbar’s brilliant court, the third volume of Badā’ūnī’s Muntakhabu’l-Tawārīkh is a mine of information, but space will not permit us as a rule to go beyond the frontiers of the Persian Empire. The late Mr Vincent Smith in his otherwise admirable monograph on Akbar⁴⁹² is perhaps unduly hard on these poets when he says (pp. 415-6):

“The versifiers, or so-called poets, were extremely numerous. Abu’l-Fazl tells us that although Akbar did not care for them, ‘thousands of poets are continually at court, and many among them have completed a diwān (collection of artificial odes), or have written a mathnawi (composition in rhymed couplets).’ The author then proceeds to enumerate and criticize ‘the best among them,’ numbering 59, who had been presented at court. He further names 15 others who had not been presented but had sent encomiums to His Majesty from various places in Persia⁴⁹³. Abu’l-Fazl gives many extracts from the writings of the select 59, which I have read in their English dress, without finding a single sentiment worth quoting; although the extracts include passages from the works of his brother Fayzī (Faydí), the ‘king of poets,’ which Abu’l-Fazl considered to enshrine ‘gems of thought.’”

The third volume of Badā’ūnī’s Muntakhabu’l-Tawārīkh, which is entirely devoted to the biographies of the poets and men of learning who adorned Akbar’s court, contains notices of 38 Shaykhs (religious leaders), 69 scholars, 15 philosophers and phy-
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sicians, and no fewer than 167 poets, most of whom, however, though they wrote in Persian and were in many cases Persians by birth, are unknown even by name in Persia.

Amongst the most eminent names belonging, in part at any rate, to the century which we here conclude, are those of Shayk Bahā’u’d-Dīn ‘Āmilī, Mullā Muḥṣīn-i-Fayd (Faydh) of Kāshān, Mīr Dāmād, and Mīr Abu’l-Qāsim-i-Findariski, who, however, will be more suitably considered amongst the theologians or philosophers.

II. Between A.D. 1600 and 1700 (A.H. 1008-1111).

Four of the seven poets discussed at length by Shiblī in the third volume of his Shi’r u’l-‘Ajam fall within the period indicated above. These are Naẓīrī (d. 1021/1612-13), Ṭālib-i-Āmulī (d. 1036/1626-7), Abū Ṭālib Kalim (d. 1061/1651), and

⁴⁹¹ Shi’r u’l-‘Ajam, iii, p. 95.
Riḍá-qulí Khán in the enumeration of eminent contemporaries of the Ṣafawí kings with which he concludes the supplementary eighth volume written by him in continuation of Mírḵhwánd’s Rawḍatu ʿṣ-Safá mentions not one of these, but, in the period now under consideration, names only Zuḥúrí (d. 1024/1615) and Shífí (d. 1037/1627). Another poet ignored by both these writers but highly esteemed in Turkey, where, according to Gibb, “he continued for more than half a century to be the guiding star for the majority of Ottoman poets,” being “deservedly famous for his marvellous ingenuity and fertility in the invention of fresh and picturesque images and similes,” is Shawkát (or Shevket), according to the Turkish pronunciation of Buhkárá (d. 1107/1695-6). To these seven we may add, besides four or five who, though they wrote occasional verse, were primarily philosophers, and will be discussed in connection with that class, the following six, who were, perhaps, a trifle more distinguished than their innumerable competitors: Saḥábí of Astarábád (d. 1010/1601-2), Zuḥáli of Khwánsár (d. about 1024/1615), Jalál Asír (d. 1049/1639-40), Qudsí of Mashhad (d. 1056/1646-7), Salím of Ṭibrán (d. 1057/1647-8), and Amání of Mázandarán (d. 1061/1651). Although I think that Rieu goes too far when he describes Saḥíb as “by common consent the creator of a new style of poetry, and the greatest of modern Persian poets,” he is without doubt the greatest of those who flourished in the seventeenth century of our era, and, I think, the only one deserving a detailed notice in this volume, notwithstanding Riḍá-qulí Khán’s remark that “he had a strange style in the poetic art which is not now admired.”

Here follows a list of these seventeen poets, arranged chronologically according to the dates of their deaths, with brief references to the authorities who may be consulted for further particulars concerning them. These are, besides Rieu’s incomparable Persian Catalogue, Shiblí’s Shīr’u ʿl-ʾĀjam, vol. iii (Sh.), the Atash-kāda (A. K.), the Haft Iqlím (H. I., available in manuscript only), the Rawḍatu ʿl-Jannát (R. I.), the Rawḍatu ʿṣ-Safá (R. S.), the Majmaʿu ʿl-Fusáḥá (M. F.), and the Riyádu ʿl-ʾArifín (R. ʿĀ).

1. Saḥábí of Astarábád (d. 1010/1601-2). Rieu, p. 672; A. K., pp. 141-2, and H. I., s.v. Astarábád in both; M. F., ii, p. 21; R. ʿĀ., pp. 85-6. He spent forty years of his life in tending the holy shrine of Najaf, and composed, besides ghazáls, many quatrains, of which 6000 are said to be extant.

2. Naẓírí of Nishápúr (d. 1021/1612-3). Rieu, pp. 817-8; Sh. iii, pp. 134-64; A. K., pp. 131-3; H. I., s.v. Nishápúr (a long notice); M. F., ii, pp. 48-9; R. ʿĀ., pp. 236-7. The last thirty years of his life were spent in India, chiefly at Aḥmadábád in Gujerát, where he died. He was one of the many poets who benefited by the bounty of ʿAbduʾr-ʾRaḥím Khán-Khánán, who provided him with money to perform the pilgrimage to Mecca in 1002/1593-4, in response to a qasída beginning:

Through genius I cannot contain myself, like the Magian wine in the jar;
the very garments are rent on my body when my ideas ferment.
Through thy beneficence I experienced all the pleasure of this world;
what wonder if through thee [also] I should obtain provision for the other world?”

In matters of religion he was something of a fanatic, and wrote verses attacking “the heretic” Abuʾl-Fadl. He also wrote verses in praise of tobacco, some of which are quoted by Shiblí (p. 134).

3. Zuḥáli of Khwánsár (d. 1024/1615). Rieu, pp. 677-8; H. I., s.v. Khwánsár (a long notice). He was the panegyrist of Mír Dámád, and composed seven mathnawís, of which that on Maḥmúd and Ayáz (begun in 1001/1592-3, and concluded in

---

494 Other dates, e.g. 1080/1669-70, are also given. See Rieu, op. cit., p. 693.
495 History of Ottoman Poetry, vol. i, p. 130. See also vol. iv, p. 95, of the same.
496 Namely, Mír Dámád, Shaykh Baháʾuʾd-Dín, Abúʾl-Qásim Findaríski, Muḥṣín-i-Fayd and Abúʾr-Razzáq-i-Láhjí, called Fayyád.
497 Persian Catalogue, p. 693.
(4) Zuhurí of Turshiz (d. 1024/1615), murdered in an affray in the Deccan together with his fellow-poet and father-in-law Malik of Qum). Rieu, pp. 678-9; A. K., pp. 68-70; R. S., at end of vol. viii. He is, as Rieu observes, little known in Persia, though much admired in India, especially as a writer of extremely florid prose. The author of the A. K. says that in his opinion this poet’s Sāqi-nāma (“Book of the Cupbearer”) has no great beauty, in spite of the fame which it enjoys.

(5) Bahá’u’d-Din ‘Ámilí, commonly called Shaykh-i-Bahá’í (d. 1030/1620-1), was primarily a theologian, and to some extent a philosopher and mathematician, but he wrote at least two short mathnawí poems, entitled respectively Nán u Halwá (“Bread and Sweetmeats”) and Shír u Shakkar (“Milk and Sugar”). Extracts from both are given in the M. F. (vol. ii, pp. 8-10), besides a few ghazals and quatrains, and also in the R. ‘Á. pp. 45-9. Apart from his mathematical and astronomical treatises, his best-known prose work is the Kashkul (or “Beggar’s Bowl”), which has been printed at Bulāq and lithographed in Persia. This work, though written in Arabic, contains many Persian poetical citations, which, however, are omitted in the Egyptian edition. The famous mujtahid Mullá Muḥammad Taqi-i-Majlisí (d. 1070/1659-1660) was one of the most eminent of his disciples.

(6) Ṣālih-i-Ámilí (d. 1036/1626-7). Rieu, p. 679; Sh. iii, pp. 165-188; A. K., pp. 155-6, where it is said that “he had a peculiar style in verse which is not sought after by eloquent poets.” In India, whither he emigrated in early life, he was so highly appreciated that Jahangir made him his poet-laureate (Maliku’š-Shu’ārā) in 1028/1619. He was far from modest, for he boasts that before he reached his twentieth year he had mastered seven sciences:

```
با بو رومن پایه؛ اویغ مشرانه;
و ایمکن عجر فندر از آلاف رایست;
بر هندسه و منطقی و هنر و هکیت;
دستی است مرا علی بن بیسا زیادست;
وین جمله چو علی کر نکنین علیرحیفت;
طیاهر علوست بیرون جمله میرست;
در سلام و صفت خاتم ابن سعده، زکاگره;
هر نطقه سودای دل اهل سوده;
پوش نسپ شعر چو دافر مشه تو وانی;
خطای پایه مرا گان در بع سع شیدارست.
```

“My foot is on the second step of the zenith of the decades, and behold the number of my accomplishments exceeds the thousands!
In mathematics, logic, astronomy and philosophy I enjoy a proficiency which is conspicuous amongst mankind.
When all these are traversed the savoury knowledge of the Truth, which is the Master of the Sciences, is added to the sum total.
In the concatenated description of my writing this is enough, that every dot from my pen is the heart’s core of men of letters.
I put on the attribute of poetry, for I know that thou knowest that this step is to me the eighth of these ‘seven severe ones.’
```

In the following quatrain, also cited by Shiblí (p. 168), he alludes to his proposed journey to India and bids himself

```
leave his black (i.e. bad) luck in Persia, because no one would take a Hindú as a present to India”;
```

---

499 The verses are given by Shiblí, op. cit., p. 166.
500 Literally “which has the White Hand,” in allusion to one of the miracles of Moses.
501 That is, Sufism, as explained by Shiblí.
502 The word-play between suwaydá and sawád cannot be reproduced in translation.
503 This expression occurs in Qur’án xii, 48, where it denotes the “seven lean years.”
He had an elder sister to whom he was deeply attached and after a long separation she came from Persia to Ágra to see him. He thereupon sought leave of absence from the Emperor Jahangir in the following verses:

"O Master, Patron of the humble!
I have a representation [to make] in eloquent language.
I have an old and sympathetic sister, who entertains for me a mother's love.
Fourteen years or more have passed since my eyes were parted from the sight of her face.
I was removed from her service in 'Iráq, and this sin is a grievous fault of mine.

She could not bear to remain far from me, for she is as a mother to me.
Lo, she bath come to Ágra, and in longing for her my heart flutters like a pigeon.
My heart craves after her: what can I do? Yearning impels me on the road.
If leave should be granted me to visit her, it would be worth a world to me.”

Of love-poems there are only too many in Persian, but poems such as this, testifying to deep and sincere family affection, are rare enough to make them worthy of record.

(7) Shifá’í (d. 1037/1627). There exists in the British Museum (Or. 1372, f. 7v) a portrait of this poet, as well as one of his satires, entitled Sizdah-band; see Rieu, pp. 786 and 822. I cannot find in my manuscript of the Ta’rikh-i-‘Alam-ará-yi-‘Abbási, either amongst the poets or the physicians of the court of Sháh ‘Abbás, the notice of him to which Rieu refers, but there is a long account of him in M. F. (Vol. ii, pp. 21-23) and in the R. ‘Á. of the same author (pp. 213-218), as well as in A. K. (pp. 168-9). His proper name was Ḥakím (Doctor) Sharafu’d-Din Ḥasan, and he was court-physician and boon companion to Sháh ‘Abbás the Great. Ṣádqa-qul Khán says that “his medicine eclipsed his scholarship, as his poetry eclipsed his medicine”:

Besides satires and odes he composed a mathnawi poem entitled Namakdan-i-Ḥaqiqat in imitation of Saná’í’s Ḥadiqatu’l-Ḥaqiqat.

(8) Mir Muḥammad Báqir-i-Dámád of Astarábád (d. 1040/1630-1). The title Dámád (“Son-in-law”) really applies to his father, who was the son-in-law of the celebrated mujtahid Shaykh ‘Alí ibn Abdu’l-‘Al al-‘Amili. Mir Dámád, who wrote

505 Dharrá means a mote, then metaphorically any very small thing or person, so that dharrá-parwar is equivalent to the common Indian gharib-parwar, “protector of the poor.”
506 So called, I suppose, because it contains 13 strophes.
verse under the pen-name of Išhrāq, was more notable as a theologian and philosopher than as a poet. See Rieu, p. 835; M. F., ii, p. 7; R. 'A., pp. 166-7; A. K., p. 159. There are long notices of him in the Rawdātū 'l-Jammāt (pp. 114-116), and in the Ta'rīkh-i-ʿĀlam-ārā-ye-ʿAbbāsī, written in 1025/1616, while he was still living. He is there described as skilled in most of the sciences, especially philosophy, philology, mathematics, medicine, jurisprudence, exegesis and tradition, and about a dozen of his prose works are mentioned. He was one of the teachers of the great philosopher Mullā Ṣadrā of Shīrāz.

(9) Mir Abū'l-Qāsim-i-Findariskī (d. about 1050/1640-1) was also more notable as a philosopher than as a poet, but is mentioned in M. F., vol. ii, pp. 6-7; R. 'A., p. 165-6; A. K., pp. 143-4; and Rieu, pp. 815-816. One poem of his, written in imitation of Nāṣir-i-Khusraw, is cited in all the tadhkiras, and is therefore, presumably, his best known if not his, best production. It begins:

جرح با این اعتباران نفر و خوش ریاست
صورتی در زیر دارد هیچ بر بالاست
بی و رود بالا همان با اصل خود یکسان است
این سخن در نیامد هیچ فخر گاهی
گر این نصیرتی و گر علی سباست

"The heaven with these fair and pleasant stars should be beautiful;
it hath an aspect beneath, whatever there may be above.
If this lower aspect should ascend by the ladder of knowledge, it
would indeed be at one with its original.
No exoteric understanding can comprehend this speech, though it
be Abū Naṣr [al-Fārābī] or Abū ‘Alī [ibn] Sinā (Avicenna)."

Abū'l-Qāsim was extraordinarily careless of appearances, dressing like a darwish, avoiding the society of the rich

and the respectable, and associating with disreputable vagabonds. One day Shāh 'Abbās, intending to rebuke him for keeping such low company, said to him, "I hear that certain students cultivate the society of vagabonds and look on at their degrading diversions." "I move constantly in those circles," replied Mir Abū'l-Qāsim, "but I have never seen any of the students there." He made a journey to India, and there, according to the Dobistān507, came under the influence of certain disciples of Aḍhār Kaywān and imbibed Zoroastrian and Hindū or Buddhist ideas which led him to declare that he would never perform the pilgrimage to Mecca, since it would involve his taking the life of an innocent animal. Though his attainments are rated high by Rīdā-qulī Khān, very meagre details are given concerning his life; perhaps because, while more a philosopher than a poet, and more a darwish than a philosopher, he does not exactly fall into any one of these three classes, and is consequently apt to be omitted from the special biographies of each.

Among the better-known minor poets of this period are Jalāl Asīr (d. 1049/1639-40), Qudsi (d. 1056/1646-7), Salīm of Tībrān (d. 1057/1647-8), Abū Ṭālib Kalīm and Amānī of Māzandarān (both died in 1061/1651), Muhammad Ṭāhir Waḥīd (d. about 1120/1708-9), and Shawkat of Buhkārā (d. 1107/1695-6). Besides Šā'īb (d. 1088/1677-8), the greatest of them all, only the fourth, the sixth and the last of these demand any separate notice.

(10) Abū Ṭālib Kalīm (d. 1061/1651) was born at Hamadān, but, until he went to India, lived chiefly at Kāshān (whence he is often described as "Kāshānī") and Shīrāz. Rīdā-qulī Khān (M. F., ii, p. 28) gives a very meagre notice of him, but Shībī (Shīru'l-ʿĀjam, iii, pp. 205-230) discusses him at some length.

About 1028/1619 he paid a visit to his native country, but after remaining there for about two years, he again returned to India, where he became poet-laureate to Shāh Jahān. He accompanied that monarch to Cashmere and was so charmed with that country that he remained there until his death. He was a man of genial disposition, free from jealousy, and consequently popular with his fellow-poets, of whom Šā'īb and Mīr Maʿṣūm were his special friends, so that Šā'īb says:

When the poet Malik of Qum died, Abú Ṭálib composed the following verses giving the date of his death:

MLK ĀY BAND MĀL MUNNI
HÅŞ NÅSH SÅN" NÅD SÅN BÅN
JÅN ÅFÅC TÅR ÅR MÅL MUNNI
BÅNÅKÅTÅ ÅR SÅN SÅN BÅN

"Malik, that king of the realm of ideas, whose name is stamped on the coin of poetry, so enlarged the horizons of this realm of ideas that the frontiers of his domains extended from Qum to the Deccan. I sought for the date of the year [of his death] from the days: they said 'He was the chief of the Masters of Speech'" (ā Sar-i-ahl-i-sukhn båd = 1025/1616).

Most of the Persian poets who went to India to seek a fortune, or at least a livelihood, had, according to Shibli, nothing but evil to say of the country, but Kalim speaks of it with appreciations:
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On one occasion the Sultán of Turkey wrote a letter to the Emperor Sháh Jahán reproaching him with arrogance in calling himself by this title, which means “King of the World,” when he was in reality only king of India. Kalim justified his patron in the following verse:

HÅND OJÅN Z ROJ ÅHÅD ÅHDÅD JÅND ÅHDÅD BÅND
SHÄRÅH ÅHTÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅå

“Since both Hind (India) and Jahán (world) are numerically identical, the right of the king to be called ‘King of the World’ [and not merely ‘King of India’] is demonstrated.”

Shibli discusses Kalim’s merits very fully, and cites many of his verses to illustrate them. He includes amongst them especially novelty of topics, original conceits, aptness of illustration, and various synonyms. In this last respect, illustrated by the following amongst other verses, Kalim resembles the more famous Sá’ib:

RÅZÅGÅR ÅNDER ÅKHÅM BÅNÅH MÅSTÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅå

“Fate sets an ambuscade against our luck: the thief always pursues the sleeper.”

508 Malik is, of course, the Arabic equivalent of Pádisháh, “king,” and one of the two distinctive symbols of kingship is the imposition of the royal name on the current coin of the realm.
509 Shi’ru’l-ʾAjam, iii, p. 209.
510 Shi’ru’l-ʾAjam, iii, p. 209.
511 He also learned more of the vernacular than most of his countrymen. See a poem full of Hindi words cited by Shibli (op. cit., p. 211).
512 Both words yield the numerical equivalent 59.
513 Luck is called bidår (“awake”) when it is good, and khwâbida (“asleep”) when it is bad.
“The heart imagines that it has hidden the secret of love: the lantern imagines that it has hidden the candle.”

“He who has been raised up from the dust by fortune, like the rider of the hobby-horse, always goes on foot, although he is mounted.”

“My desolate state is not mended by my virtues, just like the ruin, which does not prosper through its treasure.”

“The mean man does not acquire nobility by proximity to the great: The thread does not become precious through its connection with the pearls.”

“What profits it that I, like the rosary, kissed the hands of all? After all, no one loosed the knots of my affair.”

“Her converse with me is as the association of the wave and the shore, Ever with me, yet ever fleeing from me.”

(This last verse is very similar to one by Ṣá‘īb which runs:

“Flowers and fruit are never found together in one place: it is impossible that teeth and delicacies should exist simultaneously.”)

“He who has reached [the goal] shuts his lips on ‘Why?’ and ‘Wherefore?’

514 Treasures are popularly supposed to be found in ruins.
When the journey is finished the [camel]-bell becomes tongueless.

“If thou art satisfied with thy portion, the more or less of the world is the same: When the thirsty man requires but one draught, the pitcher and the ocean are alike.”

“We are without knowledge of the beginning and end of the world: the first and last [pages] of this ancient book have fallen out.”

“He who becomes acquainted with the mysteries of the world soon departs: Whoever does his work brilliantly leaves the school.”

The following ode, cited by Shi‘bī, is typical of Kalím, and with it we may conclude this brief notice:

“Old age hath come, and the exuberance of the youthful temperament hath departed; The weakness of the body can no longer support the heavy [wine]-cup. The way of the world is not worth seeing a second time: Whoever passes from this dust-heap looks not back. Through the triumph of thy beauty over the army of Spring The blood of the roses hath risen a fathom above the top of, the Judas-tree. Acquire such a disposition that thou canst get on with the whole world, Or such magnanimity that thou canst dispense with the world. According to our creed the detachment of the ‘Anqá is not complete, For, though it retains no sign, it continues to think of name. If one cannot travel the road without sight, then how Canst thou forsake the world when thou hast closed thine eyes to it? The ill repute of Life endureth no more than two days:

516 The mythical bird called in Arabic ‘anqá and in Persian simurgh is often spoken of as “having name but not substance” (mawjúd u l- ism, mafqúd u l- jism).
O Kalim, I will tell thee how these too passed:
One day was spent in attaching the heart to this and that,
And another day in detaching it from this and that.”
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(11) Muḥammad Ṭāhir Waḥid of Qazwīn (d. 1120/1708-9)\(^{517}\) was an industrious rather than a great poet: he is said by Riḍā-qulí Khān\(^{518}\) to have left a Diwān containing 90,000 verses, which, however, were for the most part “tasteless” (malāḥātī na-dāshi), and of which only six are quoted as “the best of his poetry,” amongst them the following quatrain testifying to his Shi’a proclivities:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ا‌ز مبَر على طينَتِ هَر حضِنَه سرَشَت'} \\
\text{هدَيْن بُوِد هَبيْشَه در دِيْر وَ حَشَشَت'} \\
\text{دِر دوْنِى اْمَر در أَوْرَنْدِش بُمْثل'} \\
\text{جا گَمْر نُكنَوْه مِبْرَندِش بِيْشَت'}
\end{align*}
\]

“Whosoever’s nature is leavened with the love of ‘Alī,
Though he be the constant frequenter of church or synagogue,
Even if, for example, they should bring him into Hell
They would bear him thence to Paradise ere his place there had been heated.”

The main facts of Waḥid’s life are given by Rieu\(^{519}\). He was secretary to two successive Prime Ministers of Persia, Mirzá Taqiyuyu’d-Dīn Muḥammad and Khalīfā Sulṭān. In 1055/1643-6 he was appointed court-historiographer to Shāh ’Abbās II, became a Minister in 1101/1689-90, retired eighteen years later into private life, and died about 1120/1708-9. Five manuscripts of his historical monograph are described by Rieu, one of which (Or. 2940) comes down to the twenty-second year of the reign, 1073-4/1663. The remark of the Atash-kada, that these poems were only praised on account of the author’s rank, is probably justified. He was, according to Ethé, a friend of the poet Ṣā’īb.

(12) Shawkat\(^{520}\) of Bukhārā (d. 1107/1695-6) is at the present day almost unknown in Persia. He is not even mentioned in the Majma’u’l-_fuṣāhā and but briefly in the Riyādul-’Arīfīn, where only two of his verses are cited, together with the description of his eccentric demeanour given by his contemporary Shaykh Muhammad ‘Alī Lāhījī, called Ḥazīn, who saw him wandering about in mid-winter, bare-headed and bare-footed, with a piece of felt (namad-pārā) over his shoulders and his head covered with snow, which he did not trouble to shake off. Shawkat only deserves mention because of the reputation which he enjoys in Turkey and the influence which he exerted over Turkish poetry, an influence which Gibb emphasizes in several places in his History of Ottoman Poetry\(^{521}\).

(13) Ṣā’īb of Tabrīz\(^{522}\) (d. 1088/1677-8) is considered by Shibli\(^{523}\) as the last great Persian poet, superior in originality to Qā’ānī, the greatest and most famous of the moderns, whom he regards as a mere imitator of Farrūkhī and Minūchihīrī. Riḍā-qulí Khān, on the other hand\(^{524}\), says that Ṣā’īb has “a strange method in the poet’s path, which is not now admired.” He is, in short, like ‘Urīfī, one of those poets who, while greatly esteemed in Turkey and India, are without honour in their own country. I have already expressed\(^{525}\) my own personal opinion as to his high merits.
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\(^{517}\) The date of his death is uncertain. See Rieu’s Persian Supplement pp. 40-41, and Ethé’s India Office Catalogue of Persian MSS, cols. 900-1.

\(^{518}\) M. F., ii, p. 50.

\(^{519}\) Persian Catalogue, pp. 180-190, and the Supplement cited in the last note but one.

\(^{520}\) See Rieu’s Persian Cat., p. 698; Ethé’s India Office Persian Cat., cols. 891-2.

\(^{521}\) Vol. i, p. 130; vol. iv, pp. 96-7, 185. Cf. p. 250 supra.

\(^{522}\) Though he was born in Tabrīz he was educated and grew up in Isfahān, and is therefore often called “of Isfahān.”

\(^{523}\) Shi’ru’l-’Ajam, vol. iii, p. 189.


\(^{525}\) Pp. 164-5 supra.
According to the *Átash-kada* 526, Sá‘íb, whose proper name was Mírzá Muḥammad ‘Alí, was born in the village of ‘Abbás-ábád near Isfahán, whither his father’s family had been transferred from Tabriz by Sháh ‘Abbás. Having completed his studies in Isfahán, he visited Dihlí and other cities of India at an early age, certainly before 1039/1629-30, and was patronized by Zafar Khán and other nobles. He had only spent two years there, however, when his father, though seventy years of age, followed him to India in order to induce him to return home, for which journey he sought permission from his patron Zafar Khán in the following verses527:

شش سال بیش رفت که از اصفهان بیرون
افتاده است توسین عزور می‌گزار.
آرزوی است جذبه، گستاخ شویی می‌مان
از اصفهان چکرو و لاهور پر اثکار.
هنگام ساله والد پهلوی یار
هک چند تارب بود بیش سحر بی سخار.
و آن پیشتر خاک آرزو بھومیه یار
آیت ابیان گسته‌تر از سیل بی‌بر.
این راه دورا ز سر شوق طلی عزیز
با نامست هماشیده و با پیکر ناز.
داری امید رعاشی از آستانه تو
ای آستانه ضعیفه امید روتگاره.
مقصود او ز آمدن بی‌رن منست
لیکی حریر ویختی می‌خون گرنه.
با جمعه، عطشان‌تو از آتاق چیه.
فست دما بی‌بزرگه راه می‌بری.

[To face p. 266]

527 Shiblí’s *Shi’ru l-‘Ajam*, vol. iii, p. 194.
“More than six years have passed since the passage of the steed of my resolve from Iṣfahān to India took place. The bold attraction of my longing has brought him weeping from Iṣfahān to Agra and Lahore. I your servant have an aged father seventy years old, who has countless claims upon me by reason of the education [he gave me]. Before he comes from Agra to the flourishing land of the Deccan with reins looser than the restless torrent, And eagerly traverses this far road with bent body and feeble form, I hope for permission from thy O thou whose threshold is the Ka‘ba of the age’s hopes! His object in coming is to take me hence, therefore cause thy lips to scatter pearls [of speech] by [uttering] the word of permission, And, with a forehead more open than the morning sun, raise thy hand in prayer to speed me on my way.”

On his return to Iṣfahān, Ṣá‘īb became poet-laureate to Sháh ʿAbbás II, but had the misfortune to offend his successor Sulaymān. He died in Iṣfahān after an apparently uneventful life in 1080/1669-70. The words “Ṣá‘īb found death” give the date of his decease529.

Amongst the merits ascribed to Ṣá‘īb by Shiblī is an appreciation of Indian poets rare with the Persians. Shiblī quotes thirteen verses in which Ṣá‘īb cites with approval, by way of tadmīn or “insertion,” the words of Faydí, Malik, Tālib-i-Āmulī, Naw‘i, Awhādī, Shawqī, Fāṭḥī, Shāpūr, Muṭ‘, Awjī, Adḥam, Ḥadhīq and Rāqīm. In the following verses he deprecates the jealousy which-too often characterizes rival singers:

“Happy that company who are intoxicated with each other’s speech; who, through the fermentation of thought, are each other’s red wine. They do not break on the stone [of criticism] one another’s pearls [i.e. verses], but rather strive to give currency to the wares of one another’s shops. They pelt one another with tender-hued verses as with roses, with fresh ideas they become the flowers of one another’s gardens. Except Ṣá‘īb, the epigrammatic Maṣūm, and Kalīm, who of all the poets are kind to one another”530.

Ṣá‘īb was a great admirer of Ḥāfīz, and is also complimentary to his masters Ruknā and Shīfā’ī. Of the latter he says

528 If, as Shiblī says, these verses were composed in or about 1041/1631-2, Ṣá‘īb must have come to India about 1035/1625-6.
529 These words, however, yield the number 1081, not 1080.
530 Cf. p. 259 supra.
Who will care for poetry in Isfahan, O Ṣā’ib,
Now that Shifá’, whose discerning hand was on the pulse of poetry, is no more?

He puts Naẓírí not only above himself but above ‘Urfí. “So far,” says Shiblí531, “no objection can be made, but it is a pity that, yielding to popular approbation and fame, he makes himself also the panegyrist of Zuhúri and Jalál-i-

Asr…. This was the first step in bad taste, which finally established a high road, so that in time people came to bow down before the poetry of Naṣír ’Alí, Bí-díl, and Shawkat of Bukhárá. ‘The edifice of wrong-doing was at first small in the world, but whoever came added thereunto’32.”

Though Ṣá’ib tried his hand at all kinds of poetry, it was in the ode (ghazal) that he excelled. He was a ready wit. One of his pupils once composed the following absurd hemistich:

‘از شیب’: ‘بی می می شبکه طلب حسن’
“Seek for the bottleless wine from the wineless bottle.”

Ṣá’ib immediately capped it with the following:

‘حورا ز دل حالی از انعیمه طلب حسن’
“Seek for the truth from the heart which is empty of thought.”

On another occasion one of his friends produced the following meaningless hemistich and apparently invited Ṣá’ib to complete the verse and give it a meaning:

‘دویدن رفت ناشنا نستن معلق و مودین’

Ṣá’ib immediately prefixed the following hemistich:

‘بقدر هر سکون راحت بود بنگر تفاوت را’

so that the completed verse runs in translation:

“Peace is in proportion to every pause: observe the difference between ‘to run, to walk, to stand, to sit, to lie, to die.’

Ṣá’ib was a very careful student of the works of his predecessors, both ancient and modern, and himself compiled a great anthology of their best verses, of which, according to Shiblí533, a manuscript exists at Haydar-ábád in the Deccan, and which appears to have been utilized by Wálíh of Dághistán and other tadhkira-writers. Shiblí

compares Ṣá’ib to Abú Tammám, the compiler of the great anthology of Arabic poetry called the Hamása, inasmuch as his taste is shown even more in his selective than in his creative powers. The following are the verses by Ṣá’ib which I selected from the Kharábát and copied into a note-book many years ago534. They pleased me when I was a beginner, they still please me, and I hope that some of them at any rate may please my readers.

531 Shi’ru’l-’Ajam, vol. iii, p. 198.
532 This is a quotation from the Gulistán of Sa’dí (ed. Platts, p. 32).
534 See pp. 164-5 supra. My copy of these selected verses was completed on Sept. 4, 1885.
“When poison becomes a habit it ceases to injure: make thy soul gradually acquainted with death.”

“The roots of the aged palm-tree exceed those of the young one; the old have the greater attachment to the world.”

“In this market every head has a different fancy: everyone winds his turban in a different fashion.”

“What profit accrues from a perfect guide to those whom Fate hath left empty-handed, for even Khidr brings back Alexander athirst from the Water of Life?”

“The rosary in the hand, repentance on the lips, and the heart full of sinful longings — sin itself laughs at our repentance!”

“The place of a royal pearl should be in a treasury: one should make one’s breast the common-place book for chosen verses.”

“All this talk of infidelity and religion finally leads to one place: The dream is the same dream, only the interpretations differ.”

“The tyrant finds no security against the arrows of the victim’s sighs: Groans arise from the heart of the bow before [they arise from] the target.”

“The cure for the unpleasant constitution of the world is to ignore it: Here he is awake who is plunged in heavy sleep.”
"Flowers and fruit are never combined in one place; it is impossible that teeth and delicacies should exist simultaneously."

"Ten doors are opened if one door be shut: the finger is the interpreter of the dumb man’s tongue."

"The simple-minded quickly acquire the colour of their companions: The conversation of the parrot makes the mirror [seem to] speak."

"The march of good fortune has backward slips: to retreat one or two paces gives wings to the jumper."

"The wave is ignorant of the true nature of the sea: how can the Temporal comprehend the Eternal?"

"The touchstone of false friends is the day of need: by way of proof, ask a loan from your friends."

"The learned man is a stranger amidst the people of the world, just as the ‘witness-finger’ [i.e. the index-finger] appears strange on the Christian’s band."

"What doth it profit thee that all the libraries of the world should be thine? Not knowledge but what thou dost put into practice is thine."
The life of this transitory world is the expectation of death: to renounce life is to escape from the expectation of annihilation,

O my dear friend! thou hast more care for wealth than for life:
Thy attachment to the turban is greater than to the head.

Our heart is heedless of the Beloved, notwithstanding our complete proximity: The fish lives through the sea, yet needs not the sea.

The weeping of the candle is not in mourning for the moth: the dawn is at hand, and it is thinking of its own dark night.

To quit this troubled world is better than to enter it: the rose-bud enters the garden with straitened heart and departs smiling.

If friendship is firmly established between two hearts, they do not need the interchange of news.

When a man becomes old, his greed becomes young: sleep grows heavy at the time of morning.

To the seeker after pearls silence is a speaking argument, for no breath comes forth from the diver in the sea.
“Not one handful of earth is wasted in this tavern: they make it either into a pitcher, a wine-jar, or a wine-cup.”

“The enjoyments of both worlds will not satisfy the greedy man: Burning fire has always an appetite.”

“The humá535 of happiness came to me in old age; the shadow of fortune came to me at the time of [the sun’s] decline: Heaven became kind to me at the close of my life: peaceful slumber visited me at morning-time.”

“I talk of repentance in the days of old age; I bite my lip [in remorse] now that no teeth remain to me.”

“When perfection536 is unduly increased it becomes the destroyer of life: The tender branch breaks when it bears too much fruit.”

“The only thing which troubles me about the Resurrection Day is this, That one will have to look once again on the faces of mankind.”

535 The humá is a mythical bird of whom it is supposed that if its shadow falls on anyone he will become a king.
536 As already pointed out, perfection is regarded as a danger because it is specially obnoxious to the Evil Eye, which the Arabs call ‘Aynu’l-Kamál, “the Eye of Perfection.” See supra, p. 117, n. 2, and p. 216, n. 2.
Become placeless, for to change this place of water and clay is but to move from one prison to another.

“I do not bid thee detach thy heart from the sum of the world: detach thy heart from whatever lies beyond thy reach.”

“In the end the idolator is better than the worshipper of self: better be in bondage to the Franks than in the bondage of self.”

“If thou dost not trample under foot this world of form, then suffer until the Resurrection the torments of this tight boot.”

“Within his own house every beggar is an emperor: do not overstep thine own limit and be a king.”

“If I worship the rose according to the rites of the nightingale, it is a fault — I, who in the worship of fire am of the religion of the moth.”

“Everyone who like the candle exalts his head with a crown of gold will oft-times sit [immersed] in his tears up to the neck.”

“Formerly people used to grieve over the departed, but in our days they grieve over the survivors.”
Either one should not avert one’s face from the torrent of vicissitudes,
Or one should not make one’s home in the plain of the Phenomenal World.”

“Every tombstone is a hand stretched forth from the house of oblivion
of the earth to search for thee.”

“The hair has become white through the squeezing of the sphere, and
the milk which I had drunk in the time of childhood has
reappeared [on my head].”

“If everyone could easily become honoured in his own country,
How would Joseph have passed from his father’s embrace to a prison?”

III. Between A.D. 1700 and 1800 (A.H. 1111-1215).

From the literary point of view this century is perhaps the most barren in the whole history of Persia
so much so that the only notable poem produced by it is, so far as I know, the celebrated tarjí’-band of century. Hátif-Iṣfahání, of which I
shall speak presently. On the other hand we have two full and authoritative accounts of the period by two men of letters who
were personally involved in the disastrous events which befell Persia during and after the Afgán invasion, and who have left
us a fairly clear and detailed picture of that sad and troubled epoch. These men were Shaykh ‘Ali Ḥazín (b. 1103/1692, d.
1180/1766-7), and Lutf ‘Alí Beg poetically surnamed Ádhar (b. 1123/1711, d. 1195/1781). Both were poets, and the former
even a prolific poet, since he composed three or four diwáns, but their prose writings are, from our point of view, of much
greater interest and value than their verse.

Shaykh ‘Alí Ḥazín, whose proper name was Muḥammad ibn Abí Ṭálib of Gílán, is best known by his “Memoirs”
(Tadhkiratu’l-Aḥwál), which he composed in India in 1154/1741-2, twenty years after he had become an exile from his native
land, and which are easily accessible to students in the text and
English translation published by F. C. Belfour in 1830-31. He
was born, as he himself tells us, on Monday the 27th of Rabi’ ii, 1103 (Jan. 19, 1692) at Iṣfahán, and was directly descended in the eighteenth degree from the famous Shaykh Žáhid of Gílán, of whom some account was given in a previous chapter. The family continued to reside in Gílán, first at Astárá and then at Láhiján, until the author’s

father, Shaykh Abú Ṭálib, at the age of twenty, went to Iṣfahán to pursue his studies, and there married and settled. He died
there in 1127/1715 at the age of sixty-nine, leaving three sons, of whom our author was the eldest, to mourn his loss. Shaykh ‘Alí Ḥazín speaks in the highest terms of his father’s character and ability, and quotes a few lines from an elegy

537 Cf. p. 168 supra.
538 See pp. 38-43 supra.
539 A fourth son died in infancy. The mother survived the father by two years.
which he composed on this mournful occasion. He also mentions that, amongst other final injunctions, his father addressed to him the following remarkable words: “If you have the choice, make no longer stay in Isfahán. It were meet that some one of our race should survive.” “At that time,” the author continues, “I did not comprehend this part of his address, not till after some years, when the disturbance and ruin of Isfahán took place.”

Since the “Memoirs” can be read in English by anyone interested in their contents, it is unnecessary to discuss or analyse them here, and it will be sufficient to emphasize their importance as a picture of the author’s times, and to note a few points of literary interest. In 1135/1722-3 he began to compile a kind of literary scrap-book or magazine (majmú‘a), probably somewhat similar in character to the Kashkúl of Shaykh Bahá’u’d-Dín ‘Amílí, and entitled Muddatál-‘Umrá (“Lifetime”), but it was lost with the rest of his library in the sack of Isfahán by the Afgháns a few months later. About the same time or a little earlier he wrote, besides numerous philosophical commentaries, a book on the Horse (Faras-náma), and

published his second Diwán of poetry, and soon afterwards his third.

The Afghán invasion and the misery which it caused, especially in Isfahán, put a stop to Shaykh ‘Ali Ḥazín’s literary activities for some time. “During the latter days of the siege,” he says, “I was attacked by severe illness; and my two brothers, my grandmother, and the whole of the dwellers in my house died, so that my mansion was emptied of all but two or three infirm old women-servants, who attended me till my disorder began to abate.” Being somewhat recovered, he escaped from Isfahán early in Muḥarram, 1135 (October, 1722), only a few days before it surrendered to, and was entered by, the Afgháns. During the next ten years he wandered about in different parts of Persia, successively visiting or residing at Khurramábád in Luristán, Hamadán, Niháwand, Dízful, Shúshtar (whence by way of Baṣra he made the pilgrimage to Mecca and on his return journey visited Yaman), Kirmánsháh, Baghdád and its holy places, Mashhad, Kurdistán, Ádhárábáýján, Gilán and Tíhrán. From the last-named city he returned once more to Isfahán to find “that great city, notwithstanding the presence of the King,” in utter ruin and desertion. Of all that population and of my friends scarcely anyone remained.” It was the same at Shíráz, whither he made his way six months later. “Of all my great friends there,” he says, “the greatest I had in the world, not one remained on foot; and I met with a crowd of their children and relatives in the most melancholy condition and without resource.” From Shíráz he made his way by Lár to Bandar-i-‘Abbás, intending to go thence in

a European ship to the Hijáz, “because their ships and packets are very spacious and are fitted up with convenient apartments, and their navigators also are more expert on the sea and more skilful in their art than any other nation.” He was, however, prevented by illness and poverty (caused partly by the loss of his patrimony in Gilán, partly by the exorbitant and oppressive taxation which now prevailed) from carrying out this plan. A subsequent attempt carried him in a Dutch vessel as far as Muscat, which he found little to his liking, so that after a stay of rather more than two months he returned again to Bandar-i-‘Abbás. He next visited Kirmán, but, finding “the affairs of that ruined country in utter confusion by reason of the insurrection of a body of the Balúch tribe and other accidents,” he returned thence after a few months’ stay to Bandar-i-‘Abbás in the hope of being able to go thence once again to Baghdád and the Holy Shrines. Finding this impracticable owing to Nádir’s operations against the Turks, and unable to endure any longer the sight of the misery prevailing throughout Persia, he embarked on the 10th of Ramaḍán, 1146 (Feb. 14, 1734) for India, where, in spite of the deep dislike which he conceived for that country, he was destined to spend the remaining forty-five years of his long life. “To me,” he says, “who do not reckon the time of my residence in this country as a portion of my real life, the beginning of my arrival on the shores of this empire appears as it were the end of my age and vitality.” A little further on he says, “Altogether my nature had no agreement with the fashions and manners of this country, nor any power of patiently enduring them,” and adds a few lines lower “the sight of these dominions became more and more hateful to me, and being continually in hope of escape from them, I reconciled
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See pp. 93-4 of Belfour’s translation, to which henceforth references will be given. There is a Ms. of this work in the British Museum.

See Belfour’s Persian Catalogue, p. 483, where two other works by the same author, one on wine and measures and another on beasts of venery, are mentioned.

541 Compare text, p. 107; translation, p. 117.
542 See Rico’s Persian Catalogue, p. 483, where two other works by the same author, one on wine and measures and another on beasts of venery, are mentioned.
543 See Belfour’s translation, pp. 106 and 111, and for his fourth Diwán, which was published somewhat later, p. 176.
544 Ibid., p. 128.
545 Ibid., p. 205. This was after the expulsion of the Afgháns by Nádir.
546 Ibid., p. 207.
547 See Belfour’s translation, p. 215.
548 Ibid., p. 240.
549 Ibid., p. 253.
my mind to the incidents in the affairs of Persia, and bent my thoughts on my return thither. Although unhappily disappointed in this hope, and compelled to spend the long remainder of his days in “a country traced...with foulness and trained to turpitude and brutality,” where “all the situations and conditions...are condemned by fate to difficulty and bitterness of subsistence,” he declined to include in his “Memoirs” any account of his personal experiences in India, save in so far as they were connected with such important historical events as Nádir Sháh’s invasion and the terrible massacre he made in Dihli on March 20, 1739. So, though the “Memoirs” were penned at “the end of the year [A.H.] 1154/1743 (beginning of A.D. 1742), they deal chiefly with the author’s personal history before he left Persia twenty years earlier. The accounts of contemporary scholars and men of letters (many of whom perished during the siege of Isfahán in A.D. 1722) with whom he was personally acquainted constitute one of the most valuable features of this interesting book.

Eleven years later (1165/1752) Shaykh ‘Alí Hazín composed an account of about a hundred contemporary poets entitled Tadhkíratu l-Mu‘ásírin, which is included in the lithographed edition of his complete works published at Lucknow in 1293/1876, and of which MSS. exist in the British Museum and elsewhere.

Another and more accessible contemporary account of the poets of this period forms the last portion of the well-known Ţúsh-kàdà (“Fire-temple”) of Luţf ‘Alí Beg Ádhàr. The greater part of this book deals with the Persian poets who flourished before the author’s time, arranged in alphabetical order under the various towns and countries which gave birth to them, including Trúrán and Hindustán. This is followed by an account of sixty of the author’s contemporaries, which begins with a brief historical survey of the misfortunes of Persia during the fifty years succeeding the Afghán invasion down to the re-establishment of security and order in the South by Karím Kháñ-i-Zánd. The author recognizes the dearth of poets and men of letters during this period and ascribes it to the prevalent chaos and misery, “which,” he says, “have reached such a point that no one has the heart to read poetry, let alone to compose it”:

لغويّة بال و اختلاي حال بحثيّة حكى حكايّة حاليّة عواندن
شعر نسيت كأ بلكن كشعرنا رعد;

To most of these poets the author devotes only a few lines. The longer notices include Mullá Muḥammad Mú’mín, poetically surnamed Dú’í, who died in 1155/1742-3 at the age of ninety; Mullá Huṣayn Rafíq of Isfahán; Sayyid Muḥammad Shú’lā of Isfahán; Sayyid Muḥammad Ṣádiq of Tafrish; Mírzá Ja’far Súfí of Isfahán; a young friend of the author’s named Sulaymán, who wrote under the name Şábáḥi, and to whose poems he devotes no less than thirteen pages; Mírzá Muḥammad ‘Alí Şúbúh of Isfahán;

Áqá Taqí Şabhá of Qum; Sayyid ‘Abdu’l-Báqí Tabíb (“the physician”), whose father Mírzá Muḥammad Raḥím was court-physician to Sháh Sulţán Huṣayn, as he himself was to Nádir Sháh; Túfan of Hazár-jarib, whose death was commemorated by the author in a chronogram giving the date 1190/1776-7; Áqá Muḥammad ‘Ashíq of Isfahán (d. 1181/1767-8), to whom he devotes eight pages; and his own younger brother Isháq Beg, who wrote under the pen-name of ‘Udhrí and died in 1185/1771-2, according to the chronogram:

بابا درْعْبَتْ جاودان اسْتَحْقَقَ بيْكَّةً

Other poets noticed are Muḥammad ‘Alí Beg the son of Abdál Beg, a Frankish painter who embraced Islám, Sayyid Muḥammad Huṣayn Ghálíb, who spent fourteen years of his earlier life in India and married the daughter of the Nawwáb Sar-afráz Kháñ; Mir Sayyid ‘Alí Mushtáq of Isfahán; Sayyid Muḥammad Ṣádiq, nephew of the above-mentioned court-physician Mírzá Muḥammad Raḥím, who, besides several mathnawí poems dealing with the somewhat threadbare romances of Laylá and Majnún, Khusraw and Shirín and Wámíq and ‘Adhrá, was engaged on a history of the Zand dynasty; Mírzá

550 See Belfour’s translation, p. 255.
551 Ibid., p. 256.
552 Ibid., p. 261.
553 Ibid., p. 257.
554 See Rieu’s Pers. Cat., p. 372, and Sprenger’s Catalogue, pp. 135-141, where the contents are fully stated. Through the kindness of my friend Professor Muḥammad Shafi’ of the Oriental College, Lahore, I have recently (September, 1923) received a copy of the Kulliyyát, or Complete Works, of Shaykh ‘Alí Hazín, lithographed at Kánpúr in 1893. It comprises 1032 pp., of which this Tadhkíra occupies pp. 931-1025. I make the number of biographies contained in it 96, and of all these poets there are only about four of whom I ever heard even the names, to wit, Táhir of Qazwín, Shawkát of Buhkárá, Shafi’á Athar of Shíráz, and Luţf ‘Alí Beg Shámi.
555 “That peerless Prince of happy fortune Abu’n-Naṣr Sulţán, Karím.”
Naṣir, son of the physician Mīrzā ʿAbduʾlláh (d. 1192/1778); and Sayyid Aḥmad Hātif, the most notable of all these poets, of whom we shall shortly have to speak.

Luṭfʿ Ali Beg concludes his Ātash-kada with an autobiography of himself, from which we learn that he was born on the 20th of Rabīʿ i, A.H. 1123 (June 7, 1711) at Isfahán, but spent fourteen years of his earlier life at Qum, whither his family migrated in consequence of the Afghán menace. At the beginning of Nádir Sháh’s reign his father was made governor of Lár and the coasts of Fárs, and he resided in Shiráz. On the death of his father two years later he accompanied his uncle ʿAlíjí Muḥammad Beg on the
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pilgrimage to Mecca, and, after visiting that and the other holy places, returned to Persia, and was at Mashhad when Nádir’s victorious army returned from India. After accompanying them to Mázandarán he returned to Isfahán, and, after the assassination of Nádir Sháh, was attached for a while to the service of ʿAlí Sháh, Ibráhím Sháh, Sháh Isma’il and Sháh Sulaymán. He then seems to have retired from public life and devoted himself to the cultivation of poetry under the guidance and tuition of Mír Sayyid ʿAlí Mushtaq. With selections of this poetry, largely drawn from his Yúsuf u Zulaykhâ, he concludes the book.556

Of Sayyid Aḥmad Hātif of Isfahán, though he was the contemporary and friend of Luṭfʿ Ali Beg, no biographical particulars are given in the Ātash-kada, but only praises which appear somewhat exaggerated, since he is described as “in Arabic and Persian verse and prose the third after Aḥmad Jarir, and second only to Anwarí and Zahir.” Nearly ten pages are filled with citations from his poems, but of all these we need only concern ourselves with the beautiful and celebrated tarjí’-band by which alone Hátif’s name has been immortalized.
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556 I have used the Ātash-kada in the Bombay lithographed edition of 1277/1860. It has three defects: the numeration of the pages stops at 189; the dates are often omitted; and the accuracy of the text leaves a good deal to be desired.
راه وصل قو راه پر آسماً
در عشق تقو دری دی درمان
بندانهم چنان و دل در خلف
چهم بر حکم و توش بر فرام
گر سو صلح داری اینک دل
ور سو جشن داری اینک چنان
ریش ای شور عشق و جبهه شوق
هر طرف می شتانم حیران
آخر کاه شوی دیدار می
سوز دیمان فکشید منان
چشمه بی دور عوامی و همین
روشن از نور حق نه از نیزان
هر طرف دری درآم آتش نگذان ش
برد در طور موسی عمران
پیرو آنها پاتش افرزی
باوبی تری پیر مغچگان
صهم سیبین هندار و کل رخسار
همه شیرین روان و انگر رهان
عود و چندگی و نی و دن و بره
شغ و نغل و کل و می و ربان
سالی ماهرین و ستین مسر
محبت قلله گروی عویش المان
مغ و مغ راهه صوب و دم‌شور
غمیانها نیابه به سران
من شیونده از مسلمانی
شد آنها به‌کوشه‌شنان
بی‌پوری بی‌خست این کنند
عاشقی ای تزیر و سر گویان
گفت درخیل دهیدش از می تان
گبی‌ت ناخواهنه باشد این همان
سالی آتش دیست و آتش پرست
ربیخت در شای آنک سوان
چون هر کشیدنی هعلق مانند و هن دوش
سوخت هر شکرف از آن و هم ایمان
مست افتخار و در آن مسئذ
به‌مدعی جده شوح آن شوان
این سخن می شکیدم از اعضا
همه حلمی‌الورد و ایی‌ران
هکه یکی هست و همی نیست جوز
وحده لا اله الا هو
(بندر دوبی)
از نو ای دوست نگنست پیونده
و به‌سمت لند بناد ایند
۲۰ این یازان پیاد از ما صد سران
ور زهان تو نیم شکر همین
ای پدر یوید خرم د از عکفم
هکه نواهد شد اهل این ارزان
پنده آنن دهد عقل ای طاش
عین ز عشق تو می‌پیامین بند
من در طوی عافیت دامی
پهکنی خاک‌نگاشه‌دان بکنید
در هنیسا به‌دلیل ترسا
که امکان دارد در باد ترسرد.

۰۳ ای که دارد پیش‌های آن‌ها
هست سر وسیعی من چند پهپادی
ره بودید نیاپن‌تان نه ترانی
نگاه تئاتر بر یکی نا چند.

نام حقیقی یک‌نگه هنر شاید
نه اب و این و روی فقیه لبند.

پر شورین فتح و با من کفت
وز شکوفن و مبتل بهن لقب نند.

که گر از سر وحشت آیاکان
تجای خانی تجا می‌ند.

۲۰ در سه اسپینه‌شان شام‌تی الی
پژو او روزی توانگان افتند.

سی نگرفت بینش آن‌ها ای‌ها
پرنسان خوانی و حیرت و پرنس.

ما درین گفتگو شه‌های از پژو،
شک زنانی شاید تنرنه پنی.

که بی‌سئ و همچنین نیست جز او
و همط بناه ام ایا هر.

(بد سود)
دوش رِشت بکُنی باده‌فرش،
و اکثربی مثل دل بیوش و حیوانه.

۰۰ مجلسی نفر سپر و روشن،
مهم آن باده پر از باده‌فرش.
گفت هندوانه، شنیده هر هنر خیال کن.
ستیز گفت هان زاده می‌توان.
جریمه در ظل شمه و لشکر.
فیاغ از زمان عقل و صحت هوش.
۱۰ رون بیوه آذر بی‌پای پایش.
ما بی‌رقا همه خطرات و تفکش.
نکردن در صراع ملکوت.
این حذف‌گر سروش گفت پایش.
که پیکی هست و هیچ نبست جز او.
وحده لا از الله الهه.
(بند چهارم)
چشمه دل بار دمک همان بین،
آوازه نا دیدنست آن بینی;
گرم بالبلوچی عشق رو آری;
همه آقاقی کلستان بینی.
۱۰ بر همک اهل این سمن سیار.
گروش در آسیا تغی.
آنلی به یکی دلت همان مرغاب.
و آنچه جواهد دلت همان بین.
به سر و با گذای آسیارا.
سر زمانه چیست گردان بینی;
هم در آن سر برده قومیا;
پای بر مثاق فرمان بی‌شی.
هم در آن سر برده جمعیا;
بر سر از عرش سایسیان بینی.
گاه وسط و سباع هر یکی‌ها،
بر در خون آشین لگان نبیتی؛
دل هر یکی حکم به‌شماهاً،
آتش‌پیش در میان بینی‌ها.
همچه داری آخر بعثت دخیل،
طاهر کر چرخ روان بینی‌ها.
جان کنداری اگر یکان عشق،
عنوان‌ها عیسی‌بایان بینی‌ها.
ار مشیت چه دار به‌دلی،
و سبق ملک لا میکان بینی‌ها.
۲۰، آنچه نشیده‌گوی آن شنیده،
و آنچه در دهلی، چهره‌ای بینی‌ها.
تا بجای روستای خاطری کی‌ها،
از جهان و جابه‌بان بینی‌ها.
با یکی عشق ورزی از دل و چهره،
تا بجای الی‌بین عیان بینی‌ها.
به یکی هست و همچین نبیت جوا،
و عید عالی آن هو،
(به‌نتیجه)
پای بی پرده از جو و پی‌وار.
در تجلی اینها ای اولو امرزاد،
۲۰، شمع چوئی و آگوش بانند.
روز سی شیخ و تو در شب تار.
گو و طلبای خود ریشی بینی‌ها;
همه عالم مشاهی پی‌وار.
"O Thou to whom both heart and life are a sacrifice, and O Thou in whose path both this and that are an offering!

The heart is Thy sacrifice because Thou art a charmer of hearts; life is Thine offering because Thou art the Life of our lives. Hard it is to deliver the heart from Thy hand; easy it is to pour out our life at Thy feet.

The road to union with Thee is a road full of hardships; the pain of Thy love is a pain without remedy.

We are servants holding our lives and hearts in our hands, with eyes [fixed] on Thy orders and ears [waiting] on Thy command. If Thou seekest peace, behold our hearts; and if Thou seekest war, behold our lives!

Last night, [impelled] by the madness of love and the impulse of desire, I was rushing in bewilderment in every direction. At last desire for the [Beatific] Vision turned my reins towards the temple of the Magians.

Far from it be the Evil Eye! I beheld a secret gathering bright with the Light of Truth, not with the Flames [of Hell].

On every side I beheld that fire which Moses the son of ’Imrán saw that night on Sinai.

There was an elder [busied] with tending the fire, round about whom respectfully stood the young Magians, All silver-skinned and rose-cheeked, all sweet-tongued and narrow-mouthed. [There were] lute, harp, flute, cymbals and barbiton; candles, desert, roses, wine and basil; The moon-faced and musky-haired cup-bearer; the witty and sweet-voiced minstrel.

Magian and Magian boy, Fire-priest and High Priest, all with loins girt up for His service.

I, ashamed of my Muhammadanism, stood there concealed in a corner.

The elder enquired, ‘Who is this?’ They answered, ‘A restless and bewildered lover.’

He said, ‘Give him a cup of pure wine, although he be an unbidden guest.’

The fire-handed and fire-worshipping cup-bearer poured into the goblet the burning fire.

When I drained it off, neither reason remained nor sense; thereby were consumed both Infidelity and Faith.

I fell down intoxicated, and in that intoxication, in a tongue which one cannot explain, I heard this speech from [all] my limbs, even from the jugular vein and the carotid artery:

---

557 It is impossible adequately to preserve in English the play between dil and dilbar, ján and jánán.
‘He is One and there is naught but He:
There is no God save Him alone!’

(Strophe II)

O Friend, I will not break my ties with Thee, even though with a sword they should hew me limb from limb!
Truly a hundred lives were cheap on our part [to win] from Thy mouth a sweet half-smile.
O Father, counsel me not against love, for this son [of thine] will not prove susceptible [to counsel]!
People counsel these [others]: O would that they would counsel me concerning Thy love!
I know the road to the street of safety, but what can I do? for I am fallen into the snare.
In the church I said to a Christian charmer of hearts, ‘O thou in whose net the heart is captive!
‘O thou to the warp of whose girdle each hair-tip of mine is separately attached!
‘How long [wilt thou continue] not to find the way to the Divine Unity? How long wilt thou impose on the One the shame of the Trinity?
How can it be right to name the One True God “Father,” “Son,” and “Holy Ghost”? ’
She parted her sweet lips and said to me, while with sweet laughter she poured sugar from her lips:
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‘If thou art aware of the Secret of the Divine Unity, do not cast on us the stigma of infidelity!
‘In three mirrors the Eternal Beauty cast a ray from His effulgent countenance.
‘Silk does not become three things if thou callest it Parmiyán,
Harír and Parand558.’
Whilst we were thus speaking, this chant rose up beside us from the church-bell:

‘He is One and there is naught but He:
There is no God save Him alone!’

(Strophe III)

Last night I went to the street of the wine-seller, my heart boiling and seething with the fire of love.
I beheld a bright and beautiful gathering presided over by the wine-selling elder.
The attendants stood row on row, the wine-drinkers sat shoulder to shoulder.
The elder sat in the chief seat and the wine-drinkers around him, some drunk and some dazed,
With breasts devoid of malice and hearts pure, the heart full of talk and the lips silent.
The eyes of all, by the Eternal Mercy, beholding the Truth, and their ears hearkening to secrets.
The greeting of this one to that one, ‘Wassail!’ the response of that one to this one, ‘Drink-hale’!
With ears for the harp and eyes on the goblet, and the desire of both worlds in their embrace.
Advancing respectfully, I said, ‘O thou whose heart is the abode of the Angel Surúsh559,’

558 All these words, of which the first and last are Persian and the other Arabic, mean silk.
I am an afflicted and needy lover: behold my pain and strive to remedy it!

The elder, smiling, said to me mockingly: ‘O thou to whom the Guide of Reason is a devoted slave!’

‘Where art thou, and where are we, O thou for shame of whom the daughter of the grape sits with veiled face?’

I said to him, ‘My soul is consumed! Give me a draught of water, and abate my fire from its vehemence!’

‘Last night I was consumed by this fire: alas if my to-night be as my yestere’en!’

He said smiling, ‘Ho! Take the cup!’ I took it. He cried, ‘Ha! Drink no more!’

I drained a draught and became free from the pain of understanding and the trouble of sense.

When I came to my senses I saw for a moment One, and all else mere lines and figures.

Suddenly in the temples of the Angelic World the Surúsh whispered these words into my ear:

‘He is One and there is naught but He: There is no God save Him alone!’

(Strophe IV)

Open the eye of the heart that thou mayst behold the spirit, that thou mayst see that which is not to be seen.

If thou wilt turn thy face towards the Realm of Love thou wilt see all the horizons a garden of roses.

Thou wilt behold the revolution of the cycle of heaven favourable to all the people of this earth.

That which thou seest thy heart will desire, and that which thy heart desireth thou wilt see.

The headless and footless beggar of that place thou wilt see heavy-headed with the dominion of the world.

There also thou wilt see a bare-footed company with their feet set on the summit of the Guard-stars.

There also thou wilt see a bare-headed assembly canopied overhead by the throne of God.

Each one at the time of ecstasy and song thou wilt see shaking his sleeves over the two worlds.

In the heart of each atom which thou cleavest thou wilt behold a sun in the midst.

If thou givest whatsoever thou hast to Love, may I be accounted an infidel if thou shouldst suffer a grain of loss!

If thou melteth thy soul in the fire of Love, thou wilt find Love the

---

559 Surúsh with the Zoroastrians, like Jibrá’íl (Gabriel) with the Muhammadans, is the Angel who brings revelation.
560 Literally “with a ring in the ear,” a sign of servitude.
561 That is, how far apart are we.
562 Wine, who must veil her face before the stranger (ná-maḥram).
563 See p. 294 supra, n. 2 ad calc.
564 I.e. even the veriest beggar in the Realm of Love exercises in this lower world such authority as do the kings and rulers of earth, and is as much preoccupied by his responsibility as they are.
565 Farqadán, two bright stars in Ursa Minor, called “the Guards” or “Guardians” (from the Spanish word guardare, “to behold”) because of their “singular use in navigation.” See vol. ii of my Traveller’s Narrative, p. 125, ad calc.
566 I.e. snapping his fingers at them, taking no account of them.
Alchemy of Life;
Thou wilt pass beyond the narrow straits of dimensions, and wilt behold the spacious realms of the Placeless;
Thou shalt hear what ear hath not heard, and shalt see what eye hath not seen;
Until they shall bring thee to a place where of the world and its people thou shalt behold One alone.
To that One shalt thou make love with heart and soul, until with the eye of certainty thou shalt clearly see

‘That He is One and there is naught but He:
There is no God save Him alone!’

(Strophe V)

From door and wall, unveiled, the Friend shines radiant, O ye who have eyes to see!
Thou seestest a candle whilst the sun is on high: the day is very bright whilst thou art in darkest night.
If thou wilt but escape from thy darkness thou shalt behold all the universe the dawning-place of lights.
Like a blind man thou seestest guide and staff for this clear and level road.
Open thine eyes on the Rose-garden, and behold the gleaming of the pure water alike in the rose and the thorn.
From the colourless water [are derived] a hundred thousand colours: behold the tulip and the rose in this garden-ground.
Set thy foot in the path of search, and with Love furnish thyself with provision for this journey.
By Love many things will be made easy which in the sight of Reason are very difficult.
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Speak of the Friend in the mornings and the evenings: seek for the Friend in the gloaming and at dawn.
Though they tell thee a hundred times ‘Thou shalt not see me’567, still keep thine eyes fixed on the Vision,
Until thou shalt reach a place to which the foot of Fancy and the eye of Thought cannot attain.
Thou shalt find the Friend in an assembly whereunto not even Gabriel the trusted hath access.

This is the Road, this thy Provision, this the Halting-place: if thou art a roadsman, come and bring!
And if thou art not equal to the Road, then, like the others, talk of the Friend and scratch the back of thy head568!
O Háñif, the meaning of the Gnostics, whom they sometimes call drunk and sometimes sober,
[When they speak] of the Wine, the Cup, the Minstrel, the Cup-bearer, the Magian, the Temple, the Beauty and the Girdle,
Are those hidden secrets which they sometimes declare in cryptic utterance.
If thou shouldst find thy way to their secret thou wilt discover that even this is the secret of those mysteries,

‘He is One and there is naught but He:
There is no God save Him alone!’

567 Lan taráñ, the answer given to Moses when he desired to see God face to face. See Qur‘án, vii, 139.
568 Like one bewildered or undecided.
CHAPTER VII.

POETS OF THE QÁJÁR PERIOD.

The Qájár rule was strong though severe, and, in spite of its harshness, was, perhaps, welcome on the whole to a country which had suffered seventy years of anarchy and civil war. The brief and bloody reign of the eunuch Aqá Muhammad Khán569, who once more carried the Persian standards into Georgia and captured Tiflis, was followed by the milder administration of his nephew Fat’h-‘Alí Sháh (A.D. 1797-1834), to whose influence Riḍá-qúlí Khán, in the Introduction to his Majma’u’l-Fusúhá, ascribes the revival of poetry and the restoration of a better literary taste. He himself wrote verses under the pen-name of Kháqán, and gathered round him a host of poets to whose lives and work several monographs are devoted, such as the Zinatu’l-Madá’iḥ, the Anjuman-i-Khágáan, the Gulshan-i-Máhmúd and Sa’di-natu’l-Máhmúd, the Níyárístán-i-Dárá, and the Tadhkír-i-Muhammad-Sháhí, all of which are described by Rieu in his Supplementary Catalogue of the Persian MSS. in the British Museum (pp. 84-91), and most of which were utilized by the above-mentioned Riḍá-qúlí Khán.

One of them, the Gulshan-i-Máhmúd, contains notices of forty-eight of Fat’h-‘Alí Sháh’s sons who wrote poetry, and at a later date the Royal Family supplied Persia with another verse-making autocrat in Nášírú’d-Dín Sháh (A.D. 1848-1896), but these kingly outpourings need detain only those who accept the dictum Kalâmu’l-Múlúk Mulúku’l-Kálám (“the Words of Kings are the Kings of Words”).
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These poets of the earlier Qájár period might very well have been included in the preceding chapter, but for the inordinate length which it has already attained. The only respect in which they differed from their immediate predecessors was in their reversion to earlier models and their repudiation of the school typified by ‘Urfí, Sá’íb, Shawkat, and their congeners. This fact is established from two opposite quarters. On the one hand Shiblú, as we have seen570, takes the view that Persian poetry, which began with Rádaki, ended with Sá’íb, and that Qá’ámí and the moderns did but imitate the older classical poets, especially Farrukhi and Minúchírí. Riḍá-qúlí Khán takes the same view of the facts, but puts on them a quite different interpretation. According to him571, Persian poetry had long been on the decline and at the end of the pre-Qájár period had become thoroughly decadent, so that the early Qájár poets did well to break away from the ideals of their immediate predecessors and revert to earlier models, amongst which he especially mentions the poems of Kháqáni, ‘Abdu’l-Wási’i-Jabáli, Farrukhi, Minúchírí, Rádaki, Qaṭrán, ‘Unsurtí, Mas’úd-i-Sá’d-i-Salmán, Sá’á’, Jalálú’d-Dín Rúmí, Abu’l-Faraj-i-Rúmi, Anwári, Asádi, Firdáwsí, Nízamí, Sa’dí, Azráqi, Múkhtárá, Mu’ízzí, Lámí’i Nášír-i-Khusraw and Adíb Şábír, all of whom flourished before the Fall of the Caliphate and the Mongol Invasion in the middle of the thirteenth century. Of the later poets Háfíz was perhaps the only one who retained an undiminished prestige in the eyes of his countrymen, and it is doubtful how far even he served as a model, though this was perhaps rather because he was inimitable than because he was out of fashion, like Jámi, ‘Urfí and Sá’íb, who lost and never regained the
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position they had once held in their own country. Henceforth, therefore, the divergence between Turkish and Indian taste on the one hand and Persian taste on the other increases, while the action of the British rulers of India572 in substituting Urdú for Persian as the polite language of that country in 1835-6 tended still further to cut off India from the intellectual and literary currents of modern Persia.

It would be easy with the help of the Biographies of Poets mentioned above and others of a later period to compile a list of a hundred or two more or less eminent poets of the Qájár period, but it will be sufficient for our purpose to mention ten or a dozen of those who followed the classical tradition. Nor is it necessary to group them according to the reigns in which they flourished, though it will be convenient to arrange them in chronological order. Of one great family of poets, the sons and grandsons of Wísal (Mírzá Sháfi’, commonly called Mírzá Kúchuk) who died in 1262/1846, it was my privilege to meet several, including the brothers Farhang and Yázdání, at Shíráz in the spring of 1888573. The latter was accompanied by his own son and the son of his deceased brother who wrote under the pen-name of Hímmát. Of the three elder brothers, sons of Wísal, the eldest, Wíqár, was about forty-two years of age when Riḍá-qúlí Khán574 met him in Tíhrán in 1274/1857-8, while the second, Mírzá Mábhmúd the physician, who adopted the takhlállus of Hákím, died in 1268/1851. Of the third, Dávári, a specimen of whose work is quoted in translation in vol. ii of my Literary History, pp. 41-42, I do not know the date of decease. As his poems have not, I think, been published, I here give the Persian text on which the trans-

569 Though practically supreme for eighteen years (A.D. 1779-1797), he was not crowned until 1796 and was assassinated in the following year.
571 Fifth (unnumbered) page of the Introduction to the Majma’u’l-Fusúhá.
572 At or about the same time they ceased to subsidise the publication of Oriental texts, thus inflicting a great injury on Oriental studies.
573 See my Year amongst the Persians, pp. 267-8, and also p. 119.
Or. 4936 (Brit. Mus.), 20
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lation above mentioned is based. It is taken from a small manuscript selection of his poems given to me in Tihrân in the winter of 1887-8 by my late friend the Nawwâb Mirzâ Ḥasan ‘Ali Khán, one of his admirers and patrons.

Two stanzas of a musammat by Dâwârî.

ای بهم عرب ضیّعَتٞ آلله بهمَّا
صحب است صیوهي بدنه آن ساغر می‌را
زان می‌هد بی‌طبل از بدفی جرده وی‌را
بریات بساید سر از کلی جدیدی‌را

کهندد بناتش بدنا چون تو بی‌فتار
چون خرخ زنی کرد خراد جدیدی‌واز
گر نیست ترا باره یکی شیوه ابر کحش
بر خزز و عبارا عربی وار بر کحش

همچون عربان دامن خود تا بی‌پر کحش
پدست عبا شیوه بدان وست دگر کحش
با دامن ترمنته از آن دامن ترکش
وز عبانه برو تا بدر عانه‌ه خیمار

575 These selections are now bound up in my ms. bearing the class-mark Y. I. The whole musammat contains eight strophes, of which only the first two are here given.
This mention of my kind friend the Nawwáb reminds me of a quaint incident which occurred while I was his guest at Ţihrán in the early part of the year 1888, and which shows how relatively unprofitable is the profession of a Persian poet now compared to what it was in the “good old days” when a poet’s mouth was sometimes filled with gold or pearls as the reward of a successful poem which hit the taste of his patron. A minor poet, whose name I forget, if ever I knew it, came one day to the Nawwáb’s house and asked and obtained permission to recite a poem which he had composed in his praise. On its conclusion he received the sum of one tūmān (at that time worth about six shillings), with which he departed, apparently very well contented. But so far from the gift being deemed insignificant, the Nawwáb was subsequently reproached by some of his friends for turning the poet’s head and making him imagine that he could earn an honest livelihood by writing poetry!

This is no doubt one of the causes which are tending to put an end to the old style of poetry, especially the panegyric ḡasīda. Another still more potent one is the position attained by the Press since the Revolution of 1905-6, for the poet now tends more and more to write for the people as a whole rather than for some special patron. The transition can be very well seen in the case of poets like the unfortunate Mírzá Jahángir Kháń of Širáz, the proprietor and editor of that remarkable product of the Revolution the weekly Šür-i-İrāfīl, whose life, death, and literary activities in connection with that great national upheaval are fully discussed in my previous works, the Persian Revolution and the Press and Poetry of Modern Persia. As a poet and writer of the Revolution only did I know him until lately, when I received from my accomplished friend and former pupil Mr W. A. Smart, one of the most sympathetic Consular officers ever sent to Persia from this country, a large fragment (292 pages) of an untitled, anonymous, acephalous and incomplete Persian manuscript work containing accounts of thirty-eight poets, mostly of Fárs, who were either still living in A.D. 1910 or who had died in the course of the preceding forty years. Amongst these mention is made of Mírzá Jahángír Kháń (pp. 74-77), and specimens are given of his earlier pre-revolutionary poems, including one addressed to his friends at Širáz from
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Ţihrán, which are quite in the classical style, and bear no traces of the modern peculiarities. Two other not less eminent “transition poets” mentioned in this extraordinarily interesting volume are Abu’l-ʻHasan Mírzá, a grandson of Fath-ʻAli Sháh, born in 1264/1848, and commonly entitled Hājí Sháhku’r-Ra’ís, chiefly known as a philosophical and political writer and a strong advocate of Pan-Islamism, who also wrote poetry, mostly topical, but in the classical forms, under the pen-name of Hayrat (pp. 102-121 of my MS.); and the eminent journalist Adību’l-ʻIsmā‘īl (born in 1277/1860-1), a descendant in the third degree of Mírzá ʻĪsá the Qāʻim-Maqām, who composed verse under the pen-name of Amrí of Faráhán (pp. 39-50 of my MS.). The new poets of the Revolution were therefore, except in the case of the younger ones who have appeared since that epoch-making event, to a large extent the poets of the old school who had sufficient enthusiasm and flexibility to adapt themselves to the new conditions. But the transition itself is marked by as hard and fast a line as can mark any such historical transition, that line lying in the years 1906-7. Of course an abundance of poetry of the old type is still being produced, and I myself was gratified and honoured on the occasion of my sixtieth birthday (February 7, 1922) by receiving an album of verses contributed by sixteen of the most notable contemporary poets, besides a separate ḡasīda from ʻImádú’l-Kuttáb, that Benvenuto Cellini of contemporary Persia. Nor is there any reason to apprehend the early disappearance of the old verse-forms. The panegyric (as opposed to the philosophical and didactic) ḡasīda will probably become rarer for the reasons given above, but the mathnawi, ghazal and rubá’í will survive as long as mysticism, love and epigram continue to interest the Persians.
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After these preliminary general remarks on the poetry of the latest epoch, we may pass to the consideration of some of its chief representatives. For information as to those who flourished before about A.D. 1870 my chief sources have been the three works of that industrious writer Šiḏ-quli Kháń, poetically surnamed Hidáyat, to wit the large general biography of Persian poets entitled Majmá‘u’l-ʻFusahá (“the Concourse of the Eloquent”); the smaller biography entitled Riyáḍu’l-ʻArífín (“Gardens of the Gnostics”), which deals chiefly with the mystical poets; and the Supplement to Mírḵwánd’s Rawdatu’ṣ-Ṣafá, which carries that well-known general history down to about 1857 and was already well advanced in 1272/1855-6, when the author returned from the embassy to Khwárazm described in his Saḥārat-náma, of which the Persian text was published by the late M. Ch. Schefer with a French translation in 1876-9. At the end of the ninth volume of the Rawdatu’ṣ-Ṣafá (the second of the Supplement), which concludes the reign of Fath-ʻAli Sháh, several pages (unfortunately unnumbered, so that exact references are impossible) are devoted to the notable statesmen, poets, theologians and other eminent men of that period which sometimes contain biographical material lacking in the two earlier monographs. From these three sources,

576 It bears the class-mark J. 19 in my library.
578 Brief notices of these and other published works of the same author will be found in Mr E. Edwards’s excellent Catalogue of the Persian printed books in the British Museum (London, 1922), columns 631-2.
so far as they extend, the following particulars are chiefly drawn, but I have also made use of a rare manuscript work (possibly an autograph) entitled Tadhkira-i-Dilgushá, a biography of contemporary poets by Mirzá ‘Alí Akbar of Shíráz, who himself wrote poetry under the pen-name of

Bismil, composed about 1237/1821-2. This fine MS., written throughout in a large, clear naskh with rubrications, formerly belonged to the late Sir Albert Houtum-Schindler, and now bears in my library the class-mark J. 18. Mention is made of this author and his work by Riḍá-qúlí Khán (who in his youth used to see him at Shíráz) both in the Majma’u’l-Fuṣahá (ii, pp. 82-3) and the Riyáḍu’l-‘Árifín (pp. 243-4).

(1) Saḥáb (d. 1222/1807-8).

Sayyid Muḥammad of Iṣfahán, poetically surnamed Saḥáb, was the son of that Sayyid Aḥmad Ḥátíf mentioned at the end of the preceding chapter as almost the only notable Persian poet of the eighteenth century. Riḍá-qúlí Khán (M.F., ii, 207-11) says that he was held in high honour by Fath-‘Alí Sháh, for whom he composed, besides numerous panegyrics, a book of memoirs (presumably of poets) entitled Rashāḥát-i-Saḥáb, which I have never met with, and that his Diwán comprises only some five thousand verses. The following, censuring the conceit and arrogance of certain poets, are of some interest:\n\n\n579 M.F., ii, p. 211.
581 The Arabs say “the best poetry is that which contains most lies,” and the exaggeration characteristic of most Persian panegyrist is notorious. Cf. Lit. Hist. Persia, ii, pp. 69-70.
What in the eyes of men of judgment and sense are a hundred sorts of such 'perfection' compared with the good nature of an ordinary well-disposed man? I grant that the nazm (arrangement, or verse) of the ocean is pearls and mines of precious stones: but what is it compared with the nathr (scattering, or prose) of the pen of that Lord whose bounty is as that of the ocean?"

(2) Mijmar (d. 1225/1810-11).

Sayyid Ḥusayn-i-Tabāṭabā’i of Ardistān near Isfahān, who earned the title of Mujtahidu’sh-Shu’ārā, is noticed by Riḍā’-quql Khán in all three of his above-mentioned works. He owed his introduction to the Persian Court to his fellow-townsman and fellow-poet Mírzá ‘Abdu’l-Wahhāb Nashāt, who survived him by eighteen or nineteen years. He appears to have died young, for Riḍā-quql Khán, after praising his verse, of which but a small collection was left, says that “had he lived longer, he would probably have attained the utmost distinction,” but even as it is he is one of the five poets of this period whom my accomplished old friend Hájji Mírzá Yahyá of Dawlatábād placed in the first class. Copies of his poems are rare, but the British Museum possesses a manuscript of his Kulliyáát, or collected works. I can find nothing very noteworthy in Riḍā-quql Khán’s selections, but the two following riddles, the first on the Wind and the second on the Pen, taken from the Tadhkira i-Dilgushá, may serve as specimens of his work.
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“What is that messenger of auspicious advent and fortunate presence who is moving every day and night and hastening every year and month? Who carries musk-pods in his skirt and perfume in his collar, ambergris in his pocket, and pure musk in his sleeve? A traveller without foot or head, a madman without sense or reason, a lover without abode or habitation, a wanderer without food or sleep. None knoweth for love of whom he is so restless; none discovereth through separation from whom he is so troubled. Through him water becomes, like the hearts of lovers through the tresses of their idols, now wreathed in chains, now twisted and tormented. Now the earth dies through him, and again the world lives through him, like the faculties through old age and like the nature through youth.”

582 See p. 225 supra. The others are Furúghí, Šabá (not Safá), Nashá, and Qá ‘áni in the first class; Wíśá and Riḍá-quql Khán Hidáyat in the second; and Wiqár and Surúsh in the third.

583 Or. 3543. See B.M.P.S., No. 354, pp. 222-3.
To the rose-bush of the garden of the reasoning faculty I am a cloud raining down pearls,
Both pouring forth sugar and diffusing perfume [like] the darling’s lips and the sweetheart’s tresses.
In scattering pearls and pouring forth jewels I am [like] the nature of the Minister and the hand of the King.”

(3) Šabá (d. 1238/1822-3).

Fath-‘Alí Khán of Káshán, with the pen-name of Šabá, was poet-laureate (Maliku’sh-Shu’ará) to Fath-‘Alí Sháh. Riḍá-qlí Khán, who mentions him in all three of his works, says that no poet equal to him had appeared in Persia for nearly seven hundred years, and that some critics prefer his Shahinsháh-náma to the Sháhnáma of Firdawsi584. He also composed a Khudáwand-náma, an ‘Ibrat-náma, and a Gulshan-i-Šabá, while his Diwán is said to comprise ten or fifteen thousand verses. He was for a time governor of Qum and Káshán, but latterly devoted himself entirely to the Sháh’s service. In his youth he was the pupil of his fellow-townsmen the poet Šabáhí, who was a contemporary of Háṭif and Ádhar, and died, according to the Majma‘u’l-Fuṣáḥá, in 12006/1791-2. His eldest son Mírzá Husayn Khán, poetically surnamed ‘Andalíb (“Nightingale”), succeeded him in the laureateship. His poetry, being mostly panegyric, has little attraction for us, but is extraordinarily melodious, as the following extract from a qaṣída quoted in the Tadhkira-i-Dilgúshá (which I think it unnecessary to translate, since the beauty lies in the form only) will show:
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584 Riyāḍu l-‘Árifín, p. 264. The Shahinsháh-náma was lithographed in Bombay in 1890.
Passing over Mírzá Muḥammad-qulí Afshár ʿAlīf (d. 1240/1824–9), the younger brother of the poet Bismil, both of whom were personally known to Riḍá-qulí Khán, we come to Mírzá ʿAbdu’l-Wahháb of Isfahán, celebrated as a calligraphist as well as a poet, and master of the three languages, Arabic, Persian and Turkish. After nearly ruining himself by his prodigal hospitality and liberality to poets, mystics and men of letters, he gained the favour of Fatḥ-ʿAli Sháh, who conferred on him the title of Muʿtamadu’d-Dawla. He excelled in the ghazal, and his best-known work is entitled Ganjína (the “Treasury”). The following chronogram gives the date of his death (A.H. 1244):

“Nasháṭ (joy) hath departed from the heart of the world.”

Two eminent men, father and son, bore this title (of which the literal meaning is exactly equivalent to “lieutenant,” in the sense of vicar or deputy), Mírzá ʿĪsá of Faráhán, called Mírzá Buzurg, who acted as Deputy Prime Minister to Prince ʿAbbáš Mírzá and died in 1247/1831–2; and his son Mírzá ʿAbdu’l-Qásim, who, on the death of Fatḥ-ʿAli Sháh, fell into disgrace, and was put to death by his successor Muḥammad Sháh on June 26, 1835. The latter was, from the literary point of view, the more remarkable, but though he wrote

poetry under the pen-name of Thaná’í, he is more celebrated as a prose-writer, his numerous published letters being regarded by his countrymen as models of good style. I possess a collection of his writings, both prose and verse, compiled at the

585 The “aged son of Barkhiyá” is Áṣaf, Solomon’s Wazír; the “noble son of Ábtín” is the legendary King Firídún. I have made a slight but necessary emendation in the penultimate and antepenultimate words of this line.

586 See R. G. Watson’s History of Persia, pp. 271-2 and 287-8. His estimate of this Minister’s character differs very widely from that of Riḍá-qulí Khán.
instance of the late Prince Farhád Mírzá in 1281/1864-5, and lithographed at Tabríz in 1282/1865-6, of which the letters, addressed to various more or less eminent contemporaries but only occasionally bearing dates, occupy by far the larger portion. Many of them are diplomatic documents of some historical importance, e.g. the apology addressed to the Tsar of Russia for the murder of the Minister Grebaiodoff and his staff at Tíhrán on February 11, 1829, which is here given as a specimen of the Qá’im-maqám’s much admired style.

587 Shawwál, 1239 (June–July, 1823), is the earliest date I have noticed.
588 The circumstances are fully given by R. G. Watson, op. cit., pp. 247-57.
“The Royal Letter to the Most Great Emperor concerning the reparations for the murder of the Envoy in such wise as was desired.

“The beginning of the record is in the Name of the All-Knowing God, The Living and, All-Powerful Creator and Provider, —

— that Peerless and Incomparable Being, exempt from every ‘how’ and ‘how much’, Who is just and wise, and subdueth every wrong-doer, Who hath set a measure and limit to the recompense of every good and evil deed, and Who, by His far-reaching wisdom, reprouveth and punisheth the doers of evil, and rewardeth and recompenseth the well-doers. And countless blessings be upon the spirits of the righteous Prophets and beneficent Leaders.

But to proceed. Be it not bidden and concealed from the truth-discerning judgment of that most eminent, equitable, and just King, that brilliant and glorious Sovereign, that Lord of land and sea, my noble-natured and fortunate-starred brother, the Emperor of the Russian domains and their dependencies, whose rule is mighty and glorious, and whose standards are triumphant and victorious, that a disaster hath overtaken the Envoy of that State in the capital of this, by impulse of the vicissitudes of the time and the quarrels of his people with certain ignorant townsfolk, for which it is incumbent and obligatory on the acting officials of this Government to make reparation and give satisfaction. Therefore, in order to express our preliminary apologies and to satisfy the self-respect and honour of that esteemed brother, I have sent my dearly beloved son Khosraw Mírzá to the capital of the glorious Russian State. In the course of a friendly letter we have expressed and explained the truth as to the suddenness of this tragedy and the non-complicity of those responsible for the conduct of our Government; and secondly, having regard to the perfect accord and agreement existing between these two Heaven-high Courts, we have recognized it as incumbent on Our Royal Person to avenge the above-mentioned Envoy, and, according to his deserts, have chastised, punished or expelled from the country everyone of the inhabitants and dwellers in our Capital who was suspected of having participated in the slightest degree in this foul deed and improper action. We have even reprimanded and dismissed the chief constable of the city and the headman of the quarter, merely for the crime of being informed too late and of not having established a firmer control over the town before the occurrence of this catastrophe. Beyond all this was the retribution and punishment which befel His Reverence Mírzá Masíḥ, notwithstanding the rank of mujtahid which he holds in the religion of Islám and the respect and influence which he enjoys alike with gentle and simple, by reason of the assembly made by the townsfolk in his circle. Having regard to the concord of our two Governments, we have regarded as improper any overlooking of, or connivance at, such matters, nor hath the intercession or intervention of anyone been admitted in regard to him. Wherefore, since it was necessary to make known this procedure to that brother of goodly disposition, we have applied ourselves to the writing of this friendly letter, committing the elucidation of the details of these events to our divinely aided and favoured son Prince ‘Abbás Mírzá, our Viceroy. The hope which we cherish from the Court of God is that every moment the extent of the mutual affection of these two States of ancient
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foundation may expand and increase, and that the bonds of friendship and unity of these two Courts may be continually confirmed and multiplied by the interchange of messengers and messages: and may the end be in welfare!

"Written in the month of the First Rabī', 1245" (September, 1829).

This letter, although professedly from Fath-ʿAli Shāh, was, of course, really written by the Qāʿim-maqām. It must have been gall and wormwood to him to be compelled to write so civilly, indeed so humbly, to the Russians, of whom he says in a poem commemorating a Persian victory by ‘Abbās Mīrzā over them and the Turks.592:
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"The unlucky Turks and the ill-starred Russians on either side attempted the subjugation of Ādharbāyjān,"

and in one of his letters to Mīrzā Buzurg of Nūr, written after the conclusion of peace with Russia (probably in 1243/1828), he laments that he no longer dares speak of the "Rūs-i-manhīs" (the "sinister" or "ill-starred Russians"):

تالان سهم گذاشته در مقامه‌ی‌روز میترسپِکومِمنجونس

A later, greater, and more virtuous, but equally unfortunate, Persian Prime Minister, Mīrzā Taqī Khān Amir-i-Kabīr593, still further simplified the style of official correspondence; but the Qāʿim-maqām’s letters, though they may not strike one unused to the flowery effusions of the preceding age as very simple, mark an immense advance on the detestable rhodomontades which had for too long passed as eloquent and admirable, and probably deserve the high esteem in which, as already mentioned, they are held by the best contemporary Persian taste and judgment. A critical annotated edition of these letters would be of considerable literary and historical value, and might with advantage engage the attention of some Persian scholar whose interests are not confined to a remote past.

(6) Wiṣāl (d. 1262/1846) and his sons.

I have already mentioned Wiṣāl, some of whose gifted sons and grandsons I was privileged to meet at Shīrāz in the spring of 1888. He is generally regarded by his countrymen as one of the most eminent of the modern poets, and both Riḍā-qilí Khān who devotes lengthy notices to him in all three of his works:
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and the poet Bismil, the author of the Tadhkira-i-Dīlgushā, were personally acquainted with him, the latter intimately. His proper name was Mīrzā [Muḥammad] Shafī', but he was commonly entitled “Mīrzā Kūchuk,” and he was a native of Shīrāz. Bismil speaks in the most glowing terms of his skill in calligraphy and music as well as in verse, wherein he holds him “incomparable” (ʿadimu l-mīthāl), and praises his lofty character and fidelity in friendship, but describes him as “rather touchy” (andak zūd-ranj), a description illustrated by Riḍā-qilí Khān’s remark (in the Rawdatu’s-Safū) that he was much vexed when the Shāh, meaning to praise him, told him that he was “prodigal of talents.” He is said to have written twelve thousand verses, which include, besides qasidas and ghazals, the Bazm-i-Wiṣāl and the continuation and completion of Wābshī’s Farḥād u Shīrīn, described as “far superior to the original.” He also translated into Persian the Awtāgu’dh-Dhahab (“Collars of Gold”) of Zamakhsharī. Bismil, who professes to have read all his poems, only cites the relatively small number of 213 couplets, of which the following are fairly typical, and afford a good instance of what Persian rhetoricians call the “attribution of praise in the form of blame,” for the qasīda begins:

"The sea, the land, heaven and the stars —
Each one of them declares the King a tyrant —

---

592 Majmaʿuʿl-Fusahā, ii, p. 88.
593 For a most favourable sketch of his character, see R. G. Watson, op. cit., pp. 404-6.
594 تابع برده و شدید شدن رهبر، دو کتاب نوشته آقانامه، سواده و دیوان، همکاری بهرام باغی
595 نامه و مربوط به هنر و نقاشی نشانه،"
an opening calculated to cause consternation to courtiers, until it is stated that the sea considers itself wronged by his liberality, the mountain because he has scattered its hoarded gold like dust, the stars because they are eclipsed in number and splendour by his hosts, and so forth. As

such far-fetched conceits can hardly be made attractive in translation, I again confine myself to quoting a few lines of the original:
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Wiślá’s Farhád u Shirin has been lithographed, and ample selections from his poems are given by Riḍá-qulí Khán in his Riyáḍu l-Árifín (pp. 337-50) and Majma’u l-Fusahá (ii, pp. 528-48), which latter work also contains (pp. 548-58) an ample notice of his eldest son Wiqár, who was presented to Náṣiru’d-Dín Sháh in 1274/1857-8 at Tíhrán, where his biographer met him again “after twenty years’ separation.” The same work contains notices of Wiqár’s younger brothers, Mírzá Mahmúd the physician, poetically named Hakim (d. 1268/1851-2: pp. 102-5), and Mírzá Abu’l-Qásim Farhang, of whom I have already spoken (p. 300 supra), but not of the three other brothers Dáwari, Yazdání and Himmat. The following fine musammat by Dáwari, describing one of the Sháh’s hunting parties, I copied for myself in the house of the late Nawwāb Mírzá Hasan ʿAli Khán at Tíhrán early in the year 1888, and, as it has never been published, and I know of no other copy in Europe, I cannot resist the temptation of here assuring a survival hitherto so precarious, for it was copied on a loose half-sheet of note-paper which I only accidentally came across just now while searching for something else.
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با موفقیت منصور همانا به هم بود.
از حسرت او آتش شعله بی‌پایه.
شیای فرازم و شب کوزه بود.
رود ز غرم هجر سیامتو و شب تارا.
دوشینه همان و اول شب ناامه پاسی.
زیگی شی افکوه برگ لیبر پلاسی.
با قیر بیندوهد و پوشیده نماسی.
مه برسر گردیدن شده چون سیمین طاسی.
آمد زدربان داروی نس و هرازي.
پیچاره بیوب از دلی من اردو و تیمار.
پر بیته میان و زده خسجر بکیر بر.
سکین دام از خشجر بنوزن بحر بر.
سواری سنجاب پوشیده بیبیر.
چوشای خراسانی آبی بزیوه بر.
اربی هوس دیدن من داشت بربربر.
ازریه سوی من آمد به چکیه و شوار.
پر حاک سرد و زلف و روی از هم سهای.
خشیده دو عتاب تو از صندعه راه.
ار بی نزدیک شاهه دیگرین سیاسه.
درهم شده و رخته بیل آریکلاه.
چون هکا هون سخ و شده شیرسیاسه.
از صدمه ی بی‌بار و از زحمت بیمار.
یاد دسته که سخ ره آورد سفر دشت.
از سپیل تو نیپکی دسته بسر دشت.
This poem is simple, sonorous and graphic; the court page, who has just returned from accompanying the Sháh on a winter hunting-expedition, and is in so great a hurry to visit his friend the poet that he enters in his riding-breeches and boots (bá chakma wa shalwár), with hair still disordered and full of dust, the hardships of exposure, and lack of sleep, bringing only as a present from the journey (raháward-i-safar) roses and hyacinths (his cheeks and hair), rubies of Badakhshán (his lips), and a casket of pearls (his teeth), is a vivid picture; and if a description of the Royal massacre of game reminds us of the immortal Mr Bunker’s Bavarian battue, we must remember that the wholesale slaughters of game instituted by Chingíz Khán the Mongol in the thirteenth century, whereof the tradition still survives to some extent, were on a colossal scale, altogether transcending any European analogy.

In 1887, the year before I met Dáwarí’s brother Farhang at Shíráz, two of his unpublished poems were shown to and copied by me in London. One was a qaṣída in praise of Queen Victoria, composed on the occasion of her Jubilee, which I was asked to translate so that it might perhaps be brought to her notice, a hope not fulfilled. The other, composed in May of the same year (Sha‘bán, 1304), contained a quaint description of Paris, laudatory for the most part, but concluding with some rather severe reflections on the republican form of government. It differs widely from the poems of Farhang cited in the Majma’u’l-Fusáhá (ii, pp. 384-8), is full of French words, and produces, as was probably intended, a somewhat comic and burlesque effect. It contains 78 verses and is too long to be cited in full, but I here give the opening and concluding portions:

597 See Baron d’Ohsson’s Histoire des Mongols (the Hague and Amsterdam, 1834), vol. i, pp. 404-6; and p. 59, n. 2 supra.
Voiture.

Tramway.

Omnibus.

Boulevard.

Notre-Dame.
Lack of space compels me to pass over several poets of some note, such as Áqá Muhammad Ḥasan Zargar (“the Goldsmith”) of Isfahán, who died in 1270/1853-4; Áqá Muhammad ‘Āshiq, a tailor, also of Isfahán, who died at the age of seventy in 1281/1864; Mírzá Muhammad ‘Alí Surúsh oof Sidih, entitled Shamsu’sh-Shu’ará, who died in 1285/1868; and Áqá Muhammad ‘Alí Jayhún of Yazd, of whose life I can find no particulars save such as can be gleaned from his verses, but who composed, besides numerous poems of various types, a prose work entitled Namakdán (“the Salt-cellar”) on the model of the Gulistán, and whose complete works were lithographed at Bombay in 1316/1899, making a volume of 317 pp. Others who are reckoned amongst the poets were more distinguished in other fields of literature, such as the historians Ríḍáqul Khán Hidáyat, so often cited in this chapter (born 1215/1800, died 1288/1871-2), and Mírzá Muhammad ‘Ali Siphr of Káshán, entitled Lisánu’l-Mulk (“the Tongue of the Kingdom”), author of the Násíkhu’t-Tawáríkh (“Abrogator of Histories”) and of another prose work entitled Baráhínu’l-‘Ajam (“Proofs of the Persians”); the philosopher Hājjí Mullá Hádí of Sabzawár, who was born in 1212/1797-8, wrote a small amount of verse under the pen-name of Asrár (“Secrets”), and died in 1295/1878, and others. Of the remaining modern representatives of the “Classical School” Qá’áni is by far the most important, and after him Yaghmá, Furúghí and Shaybání, of whom some account must now be given.

(7) Qá’áni (d. 1270/1853-4).

Qá’áni is by general consent the most notable poet produced by Persia in the nineteenth century. He was born at Shiráz about 1222/1807-8, for, according to his own statement at the end of the Kitáb-i-Parishán, he completed that work on Rajab 20, 1252 (October 31, 1836), being then two or three months short of thirty years of age:

---

603 See Majma’u’l-Fuṣahá, ii, pp. 151-2.
605 Ibid., pp. 298-300.
606 Hi autobiography concludes the Majma’u’l-Fuṣahá, ii, pp. 581-678.
607 Ibid., ii, pp. 156-81.
608 See my Year amongst the Persians, pp. 131-4; and the Riyáḍu’l-‘Árifín, pp. 241-2, which, however, puts his birth in 1215/1800-1, and adds that he was sixty-three years of age at the time of writing (1278/1861-2).
His proper name was Ḥabíb, under which he originally wrote, and which he uses as his takhallus, or nom de guerre, in many of his earlier poems. Later when he and Mirzá ‘Abbás of Bisṭám, who originally wrote under the pen-name of Miskín, had attached themselves to Hasan ‘Ali Mirzá Shujá’u’s-Sultána, for some time Governor of Khurásán and Kirmán, that prince changed their pen-names respectively to Qá’ání and Furúghi, after his two sons Ogotáy Qá‘án and Furúghu’d-Dawlá\(^{609}\).

Qá’ání was born at Shíráz. His father, Mirzá Muhammad ‘Ali, was also a poet who wrote under the pen-name of Gulshan. Though Qá’ání was but a child when he died, his statement in the Kitáb-i-Paríshá\(^{610}\) that “though thirty complete years have elapsed since the death of my father, I still imagine that it was but two weeks ago” cannot be reconciled with the other statement quoted above that he was not yet thirty when he completed the book in question. The Tadhkíra-i-Dilgushá consecrates articles to both father and son, but unfortunately in my manuscript the last two figures of the date of Gulshá’s death are left blank, while it is also omitted in the notice contained in the Majma‘u’l-Fusáhá\(^{611}\), which is very meagre.

About Qá’ání’s seemingly uneventful life there is not much to be said. He appears to have spent most of it at Shíráz, where in the spring of 1888 I had the honour of occupying the room in the house of the Nawwáb Mirzá Ḥaydar ‘Ali Khán which he used to inhabit and, as we have seen, he resided for some time at Kirmán. The latter part of his life, when he had established himself as a recognized Court poet, was spent at Tíhrán, where he died in

[to face p. 328]

[Hájjí Mirzá Áqásí]
Or. 4938 [Brit. Mus.), 9
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1270/1853-4. Two of his latest poems must have been those which he wrote to celebrate the escape of Náṣiru’d-Dín Sháh from the attempt on his life made by three Bábis on August 15, 1852, quoted in my Traveller’s Narrative\(^{612}\).

---

\(^{609}\) Majma‘u’l-Fusáhá, ii, p. 394.

\(^{610}\) Tíhrán lithographed edition of Qá’ání’s works of 1302/1884-5, p. 35.

\(^{611}\) Vol. ii, p. 426.

\(^{612}\) Vol. ii, pp. 325-6.
Qâ’ání’ is one of the most melodious of all the Persian poets, and his command of the language is wonderful, but he lacks high aims and noble principles. Not only does he flatter great men while they are in power, and turn and rend them as soon as they fall into disgrace, but he is prone to indulge in the most objectionable innuendo and even the coarsest obscenity. In numerous qaṣidas he extols the virtues and justice of Hâjji Mîrzâ Āqâsî⁶¹³, the Prime Minister of Muḥammad Sháh, but in a qaṣida in praise of his successor Mîrzâ Taqí Khán Amîr-i-Kâbir he alludes to the fallen minister thus:

```
бежай, злые силы, не касайтесь меня,
как враг, ненавистный, враг мой я.
```

“In the place of a vile tyrant is seated a just and God-fearing man, In whom pious believers take pride.”

Of his innuendo the following is a good specimen:

```
غنتیش ای ترّاد داده که دو صد بوس
کنار لب لعل تو قانعمر بیش باشد
روی ترد، فردی و گفت، جیر فرد هل
کنار تو، لکن بوده نه قیر
صاحب و آنگاه رو بوسه شوید
سکوت و آنگاه ترّید جوز متقا
ماندی شاهی تو رست که برسید
خداوند باز تنّان تان به خوا
بوسه بهون سر سرا؛ دلف و گیره
در همه عشّور ممکن پی بوسه
از سرو اینک یگیو و بوسه پون تا
بوده بچه باشد که مسکّن مناردی
شکربر اینک بوسه تو وی با
روی و نیر هر دو نیک درمو بیوند
این من و اینک تو با بوسه لیریا
سجدش ای ترّاد این سستان گوی
بست خن یازن غم رمز و عرض و ایما.
```

The beauty of Qâ’ání’s language can naturally only be appreciated by one who can read his poems in the original, which is fortunately easily accessible, as his works have been repeatedly published⁶¹⁴. I have chiefly used the Tihrân lithographed edition of 1302/1884-5, and in a lesser degree the Tabrîz lithographed edition f 1273/1857, and the “Selections…recommended for the Degree of Honour” printed at Calcutta in A.D. 1907. Like most of the Qájár poets, he excels chiefly in the qaṣida, the musammat and the tarkib-band, but the following ghazal⁶¹⁵ is extraordinarily graceful and melodious:
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Examination in Persian” printed at Calcutta in A.D. 1907. Like most of the Qájár poets, he excels chiefly in the qaṣida, the musammat and the tarkib-band, but the following ghazal⁶¹⁵ is extraordinarily graceful and melodious:
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⁶¹³ Tihrân ed. of 1302/1884-5, pp. 19, 35, 40, 41, 43, 70, 82, 94, 95, 115, 123, 130 etc.
⁶¹⁵ Tihrân ed. of 1302, p. 355.
Wonderful also is the swing and grace of the poem in praise of the Queen-mother (Mahd-i- 'Ulyá) beginning:

616: Tihrán ed. of 1302, p. 309.
"Are these violets growing from the ground on the brink of the streams,
Or have the houris [of Paradise] plucked strands from their tresses?
If thou hast not seen how the sparks leap from the rock,
Look at the petals of the red anemones in their beds
Which leap forth like sparks from the crags of the mountains!"

Not inferior to this is another similar poem in praise of Mirzá Taqí Khán Amír-Kabír, beginning:

instead of the far-fetched and often almost unintelligible conceits so dear to many Persian poets, Qá’ání prefers to draw his illustrations from familiar customs and common observances, as, for example, in the following verses, wherein allusion is made to various popular ceremonies connected with the Naw-rúz, or Persian New Year’s Day:

Haft Sín. It is customary at the Naw-rúz to collect together seven objects whereof the names begin with the letter S, such as sunbul, (hyacinth), sib (apple), susan (lily), sim (silver), sir (garlic), sirka (vinegar), and sipand (rue). All the people put on new clothes at this great national festival, distribute sugar-plums amongst their friends, fill their hands with silver and corn, eat pistachio-nuts and almonds, burn aloes-wood and other fragrant substances, and greet one another with kisses.
Qā’ání is also one of the very few Persian poets who has condescended to reproduce actual peculiarities of speech or enunciation, as in his well-known dialogue between an old man and a child both of whom are afflicted with a stammer. This poem, which may more conveniently be transcribed into the Roman character, is as follows:

“Piraki lál sahár-gáh bi-tišlí alkan
Mi-shunidam kí badín naw’ hamí-ránd sukhan:
‘K’ay zi zulfát ša-ša-šubhám sha-sha-shám-i-tárík,
W’ay zi chihrat sha-sha-shámám ša-sa-subh-i-ráwshan!
Ta-ta-tirýákiam, u az sha-sha-shahd-i-la-labat
Ša-ša-sabr u ta-ta-tábám ra-ra-raft az ta-ta-tan.’
Ṭífí guftá, ‘Ma-ma-man-rá tu-tu taqlíd ma-kun!
Ga-ga-gum shaw zi baram, ay ka-ka-kamtar az zan!
Mi-mi-khwáhi mu-mu-mushítí bi-ká-kallat bi-zanám,
Ki biyuftad ma-ma-maghžat ma-mayán-i-da-dihan?’
Pír guftá, ‘Wa-wa-wa’lláhi kí ma’lúm-ast in
Ki-ki zádam man-i-bichára zi mádar alkan!
Ha-ha-haftád u ha-haftád u si sál-ast fuzún
Ga-ga-gung u la-la-lálam ba-bi-Khallág-i-Zaman!’
Ṭífí guftá: ‘Kha-khúdá-řa ša-ša-sad bár sha-shukr
Ki bi-rastam bi-jahán az ma-la-lál u ma-miḥan!
Ma-ma-man ham ga-ga-gungam ma-ma-mithlí-i-tu-tu-tú:
Tu-tu-tú ham ga-ga-gungí ma-ma-mithlí-i-ma-ma-man!’

Besides his poems, Qā’ání wrote a collection of stories and maxims in the style of Sa’dı’s Gulistán entitled Kitáb-i-Parishán, comprising one hundred and thirteen anecdotes, and concluding with thirty-three truly Machiavellian counsels to Kings and Princes. This book, which contains a certain amount of autobiographical material, occupies pp. 1-40 of the Tíhrán lithographed edition of Qā’ání’s works, and numerous other editions exist, several of which are mentioned by Mr Edwards in his Catalogue.

(8) Furúghí (d. 1274/1858).

Mention has already been made of Mírzá ‘Abbás, son Áqá Músá of Bistám, who wrote verse first under the pen-name of Miskín and later of Furúghí. He is said to have written some twenty thousand verses, of which a selection of some five thousand is placed at the end (pp. 4-75) of the Tíhrán edition (1302/1884-5) of the works of Qā’ání, with whom he was so closely associated. Unlike him, however, he seems to have preferred lyric to elegiac forms of poetry; at any rate the selections in question consist entirely of ghazals. According to the brief biography prefixed to them he adopted the Šúfí doctrine in the extremer forms which it had assumed in ancient times with Bâyazid of Bistám and Ḥusayn ibn Maňšár al-Halláj, and so incurred the suspicion and censure of the orthodox. Nášír’ú’d-Dín Sháh, in the beginning of whose reign he was still flourishing, once sent for him and said, ‘Men say that like Pharaoh thou dost advance the claim ‘I am your Lord the Supreme,’ and that thou dost openly pretend to Divinity.” “This assertion,” replied Furúghí, touching the ground with his forehead, “is sheer calumny…. For seventy years I have run hither and thither, and only now have I reached the Shadow of God!” The first three verses from the first ode cited seem to me as good and as typical as any others. They run as follows:

621 The first verse of a poem by Imámí of Herát cited on p. 116 of my Persian Literature under Tartar dominion contains a very similar thought.
622 See my Year amongst the Persians, pp. 118-19, and pp. 345-6 of the edition of Qā’ání cited above.
624 Qur’án, lxxix, 24.
625 I.e. the King.
“When didst thou depart from the heart that I should crave for Thee?
When wert thou hidden that I should find Thee?
Thou hast not disappeared that I should seek Thy presence:
Thou hast not become hidden that I should make Thee apparent.
Thou hast come forth with a hundred thousand effulgences
That I may contemplate Thee with a hundred thousand eyes.”

(9) Yaghmá of Jandaq.

Mírzá Abu’l-Ḥasan of Jandaq, chiefly celebrated for his abusive and obscene verses (Hazaliyyát), and commonly known, from his favourite term of coarse invective, as Zan-qabha, is the last poet mentioned by the author of the Majma’u’-Fuṣahá before the autobiography with which he concludes. He was for some time secretary to a very violent and foul-mouthed nobleman named Dhu’l-Fiqár Khán of Samnán, for whose amusement he is said to have written these offensive poems, collectively known as the Sardáriyyá. Though he wrote a quantity of serious verse and a number of elegant letters in prose, which are included in the large Tihrán edition of his works lithographed in 1283/1866-7, it is on his Hazaliyyát, or “Facetiae,” that his fame or infamy is based. The author of the Tadhkira-i-Dilgushá devotes but three lines to him, and was not personally acquainted with him, but had heard him well spoken of as “an amiable and kindly man and a good-natured and eloquent youth, who did not believe in making a collection of his poems.” Qáání attacked him in his own style in the following abusive verses:
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Yaghmá’s Kulliyyát, or Complete Works, as represented in the Tihrán lithographed edition above mentioned, comprise the following:

A. Prose writings (pp. 2-145), consisting of numerous letters written to friends and acquaintances, unfortunately, so far as I have seen, undated. A careful examination of these letters would undoubtedly furnish abundant materials for the poet’s biography. Many of them are addressed to unnamed friends, acquaintances or patrons, but some were written to his sons, Mírzá Isma’il who wrote poetry under the pen-name of Hunár, Mírzá Aḥmad Šafá’i, Mírzá Muḥammad ‘Alí Ḵaṭar, and Mírzá Ibráhím. Dastán, while others were written to men of more or less note whose names are given. In many of these letters he elects to write in pure Persian (Pārsí-nigárí), avoiding all Arabic words, while others, called náma-i-basíṭ, are written in a very simple style.

B. Verse.

1. Early odes (ghazaliyyát-i-qadīma), pp. 46-183.
2. Later odes (ghazaliyyát-i-ja’dida), pp. 184-203.
3. The Sardáriyya mentioned above (pp. 204-217), written in the ghazal form with the pen-name Sardár.

---

627 These poems, which occupy pp. 204-217 of the Tihrán lithographed edition of 1283/1866-7, are, however, only a fraction of the Hazaliyyát.
628 F. 53b of my MS.
629 P. 372 of the lithographed Tihrán edition of 1302/1884-5.
4. The *Qaṣṣábiyya* (pp. 218-231), similar to the last-mentioned work in form and contents, but with the pen-name *Qassab* (“Butcher”).

5. The *Kitáb-i-Ahmad* (pp. 232-247), similar to the two last, but with the pen-name *Ahmad*.


7. The *Kitáb-i-Súkúku’d-Dalíl* (pp. 266-280), another *mathnawi* in the metre of the *Sháhnáma* outwardly praising but inwardly satirizing a certain Sayyid Qanbar-i-Rawda-khwán, entitled, by Yaghmá Rustamu’s-Sádát.

8. *Maráthí* or Elegies on the deaths of the Imáms (pp. 282-301).

9. *Tarjí’-bands* and *Tarkíb-bands* (pp. 302-331), mostly of a ribald character.

10. *Qi’tát* or Fragments (pp. 332-355), mostly ribald and satirical.

11. *Rubá’iyyát* or Quatrains (pp. 356-389). also ribald.

The odes, old and new, and the elegies (Nos. 1, 2 and 8 in the above list) constitute the respectable, part of Yaghmá’s verse, in all about one-third of the whole. As for the rest, with the possible exception of No. 7, it is for the most part not fit to print, much less to translate. The poet’s favourite term of abuse *Zan-gahba*, by which he himself is commonly known, is by no means a nice expression, but, it is delicacy itself compared with much of the language he employs. On the other hand, his serious odes and elegies show that he can write fine poetry, while his command of language is almost greater than that of
Qá’ání, even though the melody of his verse be less. He also appears to have invented a type of marthiya or elegy which he calls Nūḥa-i-Sīnāzānī, or Lamentation accompanied by beating of the breast. This I supposed till lately to have been one of the new models which sprang into existence after the Revolution of 1905-6, and I gave several specimens of it in my Press and Poetry of Modern Persia. The following are the initial lines of eight of Yaghmá’s elegies of this type:

630 See No. 19 (pp. 216-218) and No. 31 (pp. 246-248).
و لیکن آهنگ،
در شب پوشیده بهتر روز مصحح آهنگ
باز سرکش آهنگ
وز صایحه آهنگ‌پزشک و رنوگ آهنگ
بای آهنگ
باز سرکش آهنگ
ست این صحبت ابحرِ درازِه‌ای با لا و یک‌تای همواره هسته باز آفراده،
شره حسن آخر نه از دره حسنی آهنگ
بای آهنگ
باز سرکش آهنگ
آلغ
و لیکن آهنگ
هو، پیام‌های عضو و تأثیر آن سیاه دروغ
وا دروغ
نصرت‌های دروغ
قلب، ایمان، را کشت و تحریک‌های دروغ
وا دروغ
نصرت‌های دروغ
آه، از هر پیامروی دین بدنی باشته،
تاخیر، گفته فراش سایه‌های بهار،
پاداش، طلوع دین حضرت نزدیا دروغ
وا دروغ
نصرت‌های دروغ
آلغ
و لیکن آهنگ
محققی پیام‌های درهمت طلوع آسان
آسان، شریف آخرا آسان
شان مادواسی این یا سیل سحر آسان
آسان، شریف آخرا آسان

آهنگی شد و تازه که از اخیر آسان
آسان، شریف آخرا آسان
با چندین دوزان خورشید درگاه آسان
آسان، شریف آخرا آسان
آلغ
و لیکن آهنگ
زین منببین له همه از عاطفان مادر نبایت
به روست
سرگون کرای فلک
چار ارکان شک چیز تا آه، آن، که از ماهی تروست
هکی روست
سرگون کرای فلک
نحو، جن و ملل مارد مالی فلک فیصل امیر
ارد قلب;
تا به شاخص
ار لدی همان تا لبیا تا لیوا تا لیبا تا لیوا
هکی روست
سرگون کرای فلک
و لیکن آهنگ
هلته، همی نی، در سال دلال قرن، دنیت
خون‌های مال هیاست
شب‌های روز، سرپوش، اقدام، مصرف، مزها
خون‌های مال هیاست
همه بی‌بی، امان، پرستش، حضور، در کن
ترک‌شکران بکین
رشتی بی‌شکن و دیوان، بی‌گی‌های اشک، سیر
خون‌های مال هیاست
آلغ
This last poem in form most closely approaches No. 19 in my *Press and Poetry of Modern Persia*. The above poems are interesting as regards their form. The following, an ordinary Nūḥa, or "Lamentation," without refrain, partly in colloquial dialect, is simple and rather beautiful. I quote only the first six of the nineteen verses which it comprises:

"My heart is very weary of life; however soon I die, it is still too late. The women’s hearts are the abode of grief and mourning; the men’s bodies are the target of swords and arrows. Their sons welter in their blood; their daughters mourn; the brother is slain; the sister is a captive. The morsel in the mothers’ mouths is their own heart’s blood; the milk in the children’s throats is liquid gore."

The captives, in place of tears and lamentations, have sparks in their eyes and fire in their souls. The outcry of the thirsty reaches down and up from the dark earth to the Sphere of the Ether."

It is curious to find in two such ribald poets as Yaghmá and Qá’ání631 so deep a religious sense and sympathy with the martyrs of their faith as are manifested in a few of their poems. Verlaine, perhaps, offers the nearest parallel in modern European literature.

Of the remaining poets who flourished during the long reign of Náṣír’u’d-Din Sháh, whose assassination on May 1, 1896, may be regarded as the first portent of the Revolution which bore its full fruit ten years later, two, Mirzá Muhammad Taqí of Káshán with the pen-name of Sipihr, and Mirzá Rídá-quli Khán Hidáyat, are better known as historians and will be mentioned as such in a later chapter, though notices of both are given by the latter in his often-quoted *Majma’u’l-Fuṣāḥá*632. Another poet of some note is Abu’n-Naṣr Fathu’lláh Khán Shaybání of Káshán, a copious selection of whose poems was printed by the Akhtar Press at Constantinople in 1308/1890-1633, and of whom a long notice (pp. 224-245) is also given in the *Majma’u’l-Fuṣāḥá*. The list might be increased almost indefinitely, did space permit, but the most notable names have been mentioned, and even to them it has been impossible to do justice.

---

631 For his beautiful marthiya on the tragedy of Karbalá, see pp. 177-181 *supra*.
632 See vol. ii, pp. 156-181: for Sipihr, and pp. 581-678 for the autobiography of Hidáyat. This great anthology was concluded in 1288/1871-2.
633 It was edited by Isma’il Naṣiri Qarāja-Dághí, published at the instigation of Mirzá Rídá Khán, afterwards entitled Arfa’u’d-Dawla, and comprises 312 pp.
Of the new school of poets produced by the Revolution in 1906 and the succeeding years, I have treated in a separate work, the *Press and Poetry in Modern Persia*, more fully than would have been possible in this volume. The most eminent of these contemporary poets are, perhaps, Dakhaw (Dih-Khudá) of Qazwin, ‘Arif of Qazwin, Sayyid Ashraf of Gilán, and Bahár of Mashhad. Dakhaw is probably the youngest and the most remarkable of them, though I do not think he has produced much verse lately. The versatility of his genius is illustrated by two of his poems (Nos. 3 and 14) cited in my above-mentioned work, on the one hand the riotous burlesque of “Kablay,” and on the other the delicate and beautiful *In Memoriam* addressed to his former colleague Mirzá Jahangír Kháán of Shíráz, editor of the *Súr-i-Ísáfíl*, of which the former was published in that admirable paper on November 20, 1907, and the latter on March 8, 1909. Bahár, entitled Maliku’sh-Shu’árá, “King of the Poets,” or Poet Laureate, was the editor of the *Now Bahá* (which after its suppression reappeared under the title *Tíza Bahá*), and was the author of several fine poems (Nos. 20, 34 and 36-47) published in my book, while ‘Arif is represented by No. 33, and Ashraf by Nos. 4-7, 9-13, 16-19, and 27. I do not think that the works of these or any others of the post-Revolution poets have been published in a collected form. They appeared from time to time in various newspapers, notably the *Súr-i-Ísáfíl*, *Násím-i-Shímál* and *Now Bahá*, and must be culled from their pages. Many of the numerous Persian papers contain a literary corner entitled *Adabiyyát* in which these poems appear. The importance of the fact that their aim must now be to please the increasing public taste and reflect the growing public opinion, not to gratify individual princes, ministers and noblemen, has been already emphasized.

Of one other poet, lately deceased, who is very highly esteemed by his countrymen, but whose writings are not yet readily accessible, something more must be said. This is Mirzá Šádíq Kháán, a great-grandson of the celebrated Qá’ímaqám, best known by his title *Adíbu’l-Mamálik*, who died on the 28th of Rabí’ ii, 1335 (Feb. 21, 1917). Three sources of information about him are at my disposal, viz. (1) a notice in my *MS. marked J. 19* on modern Persian poets (pp. 39-50); (2) an obituary notice in No. 20 of the old *Káwa* of April 15, 1917; and (3) a pamphlet published at the “Kavání Press” in 1341/1922 by Kháán Malik-i-Husayni-i-Sásání, a cousin of the poet, announcing his intention of collecting and publishing his poems, and asking help from those who possess copies of verses not in his possession. Some particulars concerning him are also given in my *Press and Poetry of Modern Persia* in connection with the various papers he edited or wrote for at different times, viz. the *Adab* of Tabríz (pp. 37-8) Mashhad (p. 38) and Tíhrán (p. 39), which extended over the period 1316-1322/1898-1905; the Turco-Persian *Irshád* (p. 39), which he edited in conjunction with Áhmád Bey Aghayeff of Qarábágh at Bákú in 1323/1905-6; the *Rúz-náma-i-Írán-i-Sultáni* (pp. 88-91), to which he contributed in 1321/1903-4; the *Iráq-i-Ájam* (pp. 118-19), which he edited in 1325/1907; and the *Májlis* (pp. 132-3), for which he wrote in 1324/1906. One of the most celebrated of his poems is also given on pp. 300-302 of the same work.

The *Adíbu’l-Mamálik* was born in 1277/1860-1, and was a descendant in the third degree of Mirzá ‘Isá Qá’ímaqám, and in the thirty-fifth degree of the Imám Zaynu’l-Ábidin. In 1307/1889-90 he was at Tabríz in the service of the Amir Nizám (Hasan ‘Ali Kháán-i-Garrúsí), in honour of whom he changed his pen-name from *Parwána* (“Moth”) to *Amírí*. In 1311/1893-4 he followed the Amir Nizám to Kirmánsáb and Kurdistán. During the two following years (1894-6) he was employed in the Government Translation Office (*Dárú’l-Tarjuma-i-Dawlati*) in Tíhrán, but in Sáfár 1314/July-August, 1896, he returned with the Amir Nizám to Ádharbáyján, where, in 1316/1898-9, he adopted the turban in place of the kuláh, became Vice-master of the Luqmániyá College at Tabríz, and founded the *Adab* newspaper, which, as stated above, he afterwards continued at Mashhad and Tíhrán. During the years 1318-20/1900-02 he travelled in the Caucasus and Khwárazm (Khiva), whence he came to Mashhad, but at the end of A.H. 1320 (March, 1903) he returned to Tíhrán, and for the next two years, 1321-2/1903-5, was the chief contributor to the *Rúz-náma-i-Írán-i-Sultáni*. In 1323/1905-6 he was joint editor of the *Irshád* at Bákú; in 1324/1906 he became chief writer for the *Májlis*. edited by Mirzá Muḥammad Šádíq-i-Tabáštábá’í; and in

634 Camb. Univ. Press, 1914, pp. xl + 357, with a Persian foreword of 5 pp. The poems (originals and translations) occupy pp. 168-308, comprise 61 separate pieces, and can be obtained separately for 5s.
635 See p. 302 supra.
636 See pp. 311-316 supra.
637 See p. 302 supra. Since writing this, my attention has been called by my friend Mirzá Salmán-i-Ásádi to an interesting article on the *Adíbu’l-Mamálik* in the periodical entitled armaghán (No. 1 of the third year, pp. 15-25).
1325/1907 he founded the ‘Irāq-i-‘Ajam. In July, 1910, he took part in the capture of Tihrān by the Nationalists, and subsequently held the position of President of the High Court of Justice (Ra‘is-i-Adliyya) in ‘Irāq and afterwards at Samnān. He lost his only daughter in 1330/1912. Two years later he was appointed editor of the semi-official newspaper Afṭāb (“the Sun”). In 1335/1916-17 he was appointed President of the High Court of Justice at Yazd, but soon afterwards, as we have seen, he died at Tihrān, aged fifty-eight.638

The special value and interest of his poems, according to Khān Malik, his cousin and intimate friend, lie not only in their admirable and original style, but in their faithful reflection of the varying moods of the Persian people during the fateful years 1906-1912. In satire it is said that no Persian poet has equalled him since the time of old Sūzan of Samarqand,639 who died in 569/1173-4. In his pamphlet Khān Malik gives the opening verses of all the poems in his possession, with the number of verses in each, and invites those who possess poems lacking in his collection to communicate them to him before Jumāda i, 1342 (December, 1923), when he proposes to publish as complete an edition as possible. The Kāwa quotes the following verses from one of his poems on the Russian aggressions in Persia, which it compares with the celebrated poems of Sa‘dī on the destruction of the Caliphate by the Mongols,640, Anwari on the invasion of the Ghuzz Turks641, and Ḥāfiz on Timūr’s rapacity:

![Verse Translation](image)

“Since the poor lamb did not forgather with its shepherd, through fear it neither slept nor rested in the plain.
A bear came forth to hunt, and bound its limbs: our lamb became the prey of that high-handed bear.
Alas for that new-born and bemused lamb! Alack for that aged and greedy bear!”

My manuscript J. 19643 enumerates twelve of his works, which include an Arabic and a Persian Diwān, a collection of Maqāmāt, a rhymed vocabulary, a volume of travels, and several books on Astronomy, Geography, Prosody, and other sciences.

PART III.

PERSIAN PROSE DURING THE LAST FOUR CENTURIES

CHAPTER VIII.

THE ORTHODOX SHĪ‘A FAITH AND ITS EXPONENTS.
THE MUJTAHIDS AND MULLÁS.

One of the chief results of the Shi‘a revival effected by the Ṣafawí dynasty was the establishment of the powerful hierarchy of mujtahids and mullás, often, but not very accurately, described by European writers as “the clergy.” This title is, however, more applicable to them than to the ‘ulamá, or “doctors,” of the Sunnis, who are simply men learned in the Scripture and the Law, but not otherwise possessed of any special Divine virtue or authority. The great practical difference between the ‘ulamá of the Sunnis and of the Shi‘a lies in their conception of the doctrine of Ijtihád, or the discovery and authoritative enunciation of fresh religious truths, based on a comprehensive knowledge of the Scripture and Traditions, and arrived at by supreme effort and endeavour, this last being the significance of the Arabic word. One who has attained to this is called a mujtahid, whose position may be roughly described as analogous to that of a Cardinal in the Church of Rome. No such dignitary exists amongst the Sunnis, who hold that the Bábu‘l-Ijtihád, or “Gate of Endeavour” (in the sense explained above), was closed after the death of the founders of their four “orthodox” schools or sects, Abú Ḥanífah (d. 150/767), Málík ibn Anás (d. circa 179/795), ash-Sháfí‘í (d. 204/820), and Ahmad ibn Muhammad ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241/855). Thus the “Gate of Endeavour,” which, according to the Shi‘a view, is still open, has for the Sunnis been closed for more than a thousand years; and in this respect the Shi‘a doctrine must be credited with a greater flexibility and adaptability than that of the
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Sunnís, though in other respects narrower and more intolerant.

As will appear in the course of this chapter, the power and position attained by these prelates tended to divert the ambitions of young men who possessed, or believed themselves to possess, the necessary intellectual qualifications from poetry, belles lettres, and other forms of mental activity to theology, and from this tendency in part resulted the dearth of poets and abundance of divines under the Ṣafawís. Those were spacious times for the “turbaned classes” (ahlu’l-‘amá‘ím) and every poor, half-starved student who frequented one or other of the numerous colleges (madrasa) founded, endowed and maintained by the piety of the Šafawi Sháhs, who delighted to call themselves by such titles as “Dog of the Threshold of the Immaculate Imáms,” or “Promoter of the Doctrine of the Church of the Twelve,” dreamed, no doubt, of becoming at last a great mujtahid, wielding powers of life and death, and accorded honours almost regal.

No class in Persia is so aloof and inaccessible to foreigners and non-Muslims as that of the mullás. It is easy for one who has a good knowledge of Persian to mix not only with the governing classes and officials, who are most familiar with European habits and ideas, but with merchants, tradesmen, artisans, landowners, peasants, darwishes, Bábís, Bahá‘ís, Şúfís and others; but few Europeans can have enjoyed intimacy with the “clergy,” whose peculiar, exclusive, and generally narrow life is, so far as my reading has gone, best depicted in an otherwise mediocre and quite modern biographical work entitled Qisáṣu‘l-‘Ulamá (“Tales of the Divines”) by Muhammad ibn Sulaymán of Tanúkábun, who was born in 1235/1819-20, wrote this book in three months and five days, and concluded it on the 17th of Rajab, 1290 (Sept. 10, 1873). It contains the lives of 153 Shi‘a doctors, ranging from the fourth to the thirteenth centuries of the Muhammadan (tenth to nineteenth of the Christian) era, arranged in no intelligible order, either chronological or alphabetical. To his own biography, which he places fourth in order, the author devotes more than twenty pages, and enumerates 169 of his works, besides various glosses and other minor writings. From this book, which I read through during the Easter Vacation of 1923, having long ago made use of certain parts of it bearing on the Shaykhis and Bábís, I have disentangled from much that is tedious, trivial or puerile, a certain amount of valuable information which is not to be found in many much better biographical works, whereof, before proceeding further, I shall here speak briefly.

What is known as ‘ilmu‘r-Rijlá ("Knowledge of the Men," that is of the leading authorities and transmitters of the Traditions) forms an important branch of theological study, since such knowledge is necessary for critical purposes. Of such Kuttubu‘r-Rijlá ("Books of the Men") there are a great many. Sprenger, in his edition of one of the most important of these, the Fihrist, or “Index,” of Muhammad ibn Ḥasan ibn ‘Ali of Tús, entitled Shaykhu‘r-Tú‘ífa, who died in 460/1067, ranks with it in importance four other works, the Asmá‘a‘u‘r-Rijlá ("Names of the Men") of Shaykh Ahmad ibn ‘Ali an-Najáshi646 (d. 455/1063); the Ma‘ālimu‘l-Ulamá of Muhammad ibn ‘Ali ibn Shahr-áshúb of Mázandarán, who died in 588/1192; the Ídáhu‘l-Ishtíbáh ("Elucidation of Confusion") of Ḥasan ibn Yúsus ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥilli (b. 648/1250; d. 726/1326); and the Lú‘lú‘atu‘l-Bahrayn647, a work of a more special character, dealing especially with the

---

644 I possess two lithographed editions of this book, the (second) Tíhrán edition, published in Šafar, 1304 (Nov. 1886), and another published (apparently) in Lucknow in 1306/1888-9.
645 Printed in the Bibliotheca Indica.
646 Lithographed at Bombay in 1317/1899-1900. In the Kashfu‘l-Hujúb (see pp. 357-8 infra) the date of the author’s death is given as 405/1014.
647 Lithographed in Bombay, n. d.
of Baḥrānī, by Yūsuf ibn ʿAḥmad ibn ʿIbrāhīm al-Baḥrānī (d. 1187/1773-4). Another work, similar to the last in dealing with a special region, is the Amalū l-ʿĀmil fi ʿUlamāʾi ʿJabal-ʿĀmil, composed by Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan ibn ʿAli...al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī (b. 1033/1623-4) in 1097/1686. All these works are written in Arabic, but of the older books of this class there is one in Persian (compiled in 990/1582) which must on no account be overlooked. This is the Majālisu l-Mūminīn (“Assemblies of Believers”) of Sayyid Nūrullāh ibn ʿArif al-Marʿashi of Shūshṭar, who was put to death in India on account of his strong Shiʿa opinions in 1019/1610-11. This book is both of a wider scope and a more popular character than those previously mentioned, since it contains, in twelve chapters, notices of eminent Shiʿās of all classes, not merely theologians, and includes not only those who adhered to the “Sect of the Twelve” (Ithnā-ʿashariyya) but all those who held that ʿAli should have immediately succeeded the Prophet.

Of modern works of this class, composed within the last sixty years, three, besides the above-mentioned Qīṣāṣu l-ʿUlamāʾ, deserve special mention. The most general in its scope, entitled Rawḍātu l-Jannāt fī Ahwālī l-ʿUlamāʾ wa-s-Sādāt (“Gardens of Paradise: on the circumstances of Divines and Sayyids”), was composed in Arabic by Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Hājjī Zaynuʾl-ʿĀbidīn al-Mǔsawī al-Khuwānsārī, whose auto-

biography is given on pp. 126-8 of vol. i, in 1286/1869-70. The biographies, which are arranged alphabetically, include learned Muslims of all periods, and are not confined to theologians or members of the Shiʿa sect. Thus we find notices of great Mystics, like Bāyazid of Bīṣṭām, ʿIbrāhīm ibn Adham, Shiblī and Ḥusayn ibn Mansūr al-Ḥallāj; of Arabic poets, like Dhuʾ-ʾRummā, Farazdaq, Ibnul-Fāriḍ, Abū Nuwās and al-Mutanabbi; of Persian poets, like Sanāʾī, Fariḍuʾd-Dīn ʿAṭṭār, Nāṣīr-i-Khusraw, and Jalālūd-Dīn Rūmī; and of men of learning like al-Bīrūnī, Thābit ibn Qurra, Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq and Avicenna, etc., besides the accounts of Shiʿa theologians down to comparatively modern times which give the book so great a value for our present purpose.

Another important work, composed in the same year as that last mentioned (1286/1869-70) but in Persian, is entitled Nujumuʾs-Samāʾ (“Stars of Heaven”). It deals with Shiʿa theologians of the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries of the hijrā (A.D. 1592-1882), and the biographies are arranged on the whole chronologically. The author was Muḥammad ibn Šādiq ibn Mahdī. Like most of these books its utility is impaired by the lack of an Index or even a Table of Contents, but it contains a great deal of useful information.

The third work of which I desire to make special mention here is primarily a bibliography, though it also contains a good deal of biographical matter. It is entitled Kasāfuʾl-Ḥujub wa-l-ʿAsār ʿan Asmāʾuʾl-Kutub wa-l-ʿAsfūr (“the Removal of Veils and Curtains from the Names of Books and Treatises”), contains notices of 3414 Shiʿa books arranged alphabetically, and was composed in Arabic by Sayyid Iʿjāz Ḥusayn, who was born in 1240/1825, and died in 1286/1870. The editor, Muḥammad Hidāyat Ḥusayn, discovered the manuscript in the excellent

Bankipore Library, and, encouraged by Sir E. Denison Ross, prepared the text for publication at the expense of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

Mention must also be made of another Arabic work on Shiʿa poets entitled Nasimatuʾs-Sahār fī-man tashayyaʿa wa shaʿar (“the Morning Breeze, on those who held the Shiʿa faith and composed poetry”) compiled by Yūsuf ibn Yaḥyā al-Yamānī as-Ṣanʿānī, a rare book, hitherto, so far as I know, unpublished, of which I am fortunate enough to possess a manuscript of the second half, containing the letters 6 to 6. Only poets who wrote in Arabic are noticed.

Of these books the Rawḍātu l-Jannāt is the most scholarly and comprehensive, but those who read Persian only will derive much instruction and some amusement from the Majālisuʾl-Mūminīn, Nuṣumuʾs-Samāʾ, and Qīṣāṣuʾl-ʿUlamāʾ. The older “Books of the Men,” such as the works of at-Ṭusī and an-Najāshī, are generally very jejune, and suited for reference rather than reading. As it is with the theologians of the Saʿfawi and subsequent periods that we are chiefly concerned here, a very few words about the older ʿulamāʾ of the Shiʿa will suffice, though with their names, titles and approximate dates the student should be familiar. The most important of these earlier divines are the three Muḥammads, al-Kulayni (Muḥammad ibn Yaʾqūb, d. 329/941), Ibn Bābawayhi (Muḥammad ibn ʿAli ibn Mūsā, d. 381/991-2), and the already-mentioned Ṭusī (Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan, d. 460/1306/1888).

1067). Of these the first composed the Kāfī, the second Man lā yahduruḥu l-Faqīh (a title which approximates in sense to our familiar “Every man his own Lawyer”), and the third the Istibṣār and the Tahdhībuʾl-Aḥkām, which are known collectively

648 An excellent lithographed edition (four vols. in one, containing in all about 750 pp. and 713 biographies) was published at Tīhrān in 1306/1888.
649 Lithographed at Lucknow in 1303/1885-6 (pp. 424).
650 It was printed at the Baptist Mission Press at Calcutta in 1330/1912, and comprises 607 pp.
651 For description of another copy see Ahlwardt’s Berlin Arabic Catalogue, vol. vi, pp. 502-3, No. 7423.
652 See the Qīṣāṣuʾl-ʿUlamāʾ, p. 221 of the Lucknow edition, s.v. Muḥammad Bāqir-i-Majlisi.
amongst the Shi’a as “the Four Books” (al-Kutubʾl-ʿarbaʾa)\textsuperscript{653}, and of which full particulars will be found in the above-mentioned Kashfuʾl-Hujub. More modern times also produced their “three Muhammad,” namely Muhammad ibn Ḥasan ibn ‘Ali...al-Hurr al-ʿAmili (author of the above-mentioned Amaluʾl-ʿAmil); Muhammad ibnuʾl-Murtada, commonly known as Mullā Muḥsin-i-Fayz (Fayḍ), who died about 1090/1679; and Muhammad Bāqir-i-Majlī (d. 1111/1699-1700)\textsuperscript{654}. Each of these also produced a great book, the first the Wasāʾil, the second the Wāfī, and the third the Biḥārāʾl-Anwār (“Oceans of Light”), which constitute the “Three Books” of the later time. These seven great works on Shi’a theology, jurisprudence and tradition are, of course, like the great bulk of the works of the Muhammadan Doctors -and Divines, written in Arabic, which language occupies no less a position in Islām than does Latin in the theological literature of the Church of Rome. Of them space will not permit me to speak further; it is the more popular Persian manuals of doctrine, whereby the great theologians of the Ṣafawī period sought so successfully to diffuse their religious teachings, which must chiefly concern us here, and even of these it will be impossible to give an adequate account. According to the Rawḍatuʾl-Jannāt\textsuperscript{655}, Kamālud-Dīn Ḥusayn of Ardabil, called “the Divine Doctor” (al-

\textit{Ilāhi}, a contemporary of Shāh Ismaʿīl I, “was the first to compose books in Persian on matters connected with the Holy Law according to the doctrine of the Shiʾa”:

\begin{quote}
نَقَلَ أَنَّهُ أُولٌ مِنْ صَنَنِ فِي الْكُرُوجِ عَلَى مَدْهِبِ الشِّبْعَةِ بَالْعَارِبِيَّة
\end{quote}

We have already seen\textsuperscript{656} what difficulty Shāh Ismaʿīl experienced on his capture of Tabrīz in finding teachers or books to inculcate the doctrines of the creed which he was determined to impose throughout his dominions, and it is not strange, though the fact is often overlooked, that it became necessary to introduce into Persia learned Arabs of the Shiʾa persuasion, where such were obtainable. Two districts furnished the bulk of these: Bahrayn, across the Persian Gulf, and Jabal ʿAmil in Syria\textsuperscript{657}. To the divines furnished by each of these two localities a special biographical work has, as we have seen, been devoted, namely the Lūʾliʾatuʾl-Bahrayn and the Amaluʾl-ʿAmil. Some of them came to Persia totally ignorant of the Persian language, like Sāyīd Niʿmatuʾl-lāh al-Jazāʾiri, who, on reaching Shirāz with his brother, had to obtain from a Persian acquaintance the sentence “Madrasa-i-Mansūriyya-rā mi-khwāhīm” (“We want the Mansūriyya College”), and even then each learned only half of this simple phrase and spoke alternately\textsuperscript{658}.

\[\text{[page 360]}\]

It is the autobiography of this same Sāyīd Niʿmatuʾl-lāh, as given in the Qisasuʾl-ʿUlamā, which furnishes us with so unusually vivid a picture of the privations and hardships experienced by a poor student of Divinity. He was born in 1050/1640-1 and wrote this narrative when he was thirty-nine years of age\textsuperscript{659}, “in which brief life,” he adds, “what afflictions have befallen me!” These afflictions began when he was only five years old, when, while he was at play with his little companions, his father appeared, saying, “Come with me, my little son, that we may go to the school-master, so that thou mayst learn to read and write, in order that thou mayst attain to a high degree.” In spite of tears, protests, and appeals to his mother he had to go to school, where, in order to escape and return to his games, he applied himself diligently to his lessons, so that by the time he was aged five years and a half he had finished the Qurʾān, besides learning many poems. This, however, brought him no relief and no return to his childish games, for he was now committed to the care of a blind grammarian to study the Arabic paradigms and the grammar of Zanjānī. For this blind teacher he had to act as guide, while his next preceptor

\textsuperscript{653} Or al-Uṣūlʾuʾl-ʿarbaʾa (“the Four Principles”). See Nuṣāmīʾuʾl-Samāʾ, p. 75.

\textsuperscript{654} See p. 120 supra.

\textsuperscript{655} Vol. i. p. 185.

\textsuperscript{656} Pp. 54-5 supra.

\textsuperscript{657} See G. le Strange’s Palestine under the Moslems, pp. 75-6 and 470.

\textsuperscript{658} Qisasuʾl-ʿUlamā (ed. Lucknow, p. 229, ed. Ṭihrān, p. 333):

\begin{quote}
...وَهُدِىَ بِأَيِّ يَدٍ لَمْ يُرْأَى هُمْ هِيَّانُ فِي طُورِهِمْ وَمِنْ يَدَاءِ سَاهِنَهُ بِهِمْ... \\
وَهُدِىَ بِأَيِّ يَدٍ لَمْ يُرْأَى هُمْ هِيَّانُ فِي طُورِهِمْ وَمِنْ يَدَاءِ سَاهِنَهُ بِهِمْ... \\
"...and was guided by a hand which no one has ever seen in that form, and by the transport of his senses..."
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{659} He died, according to the Kashfuʾl-Hujub, p. 70, No. 328, in 1130/1718. Since writing this, I have found the Arabic original of this autobiography in one of my MSS. (C. 15) entitled Kitābuʾl-Anwārīn-Nuʾmāniyya, composed by Sāyīd Niʿmatuʾl-lāh in 1089/1678. It concludes the volume, and occupies ff. 329-34.
 compelled him to cut and carry fodder for his beasts and mulberry-leaves for his silk-worms. He then sought another teacher with whom to study the Kāfīya of Ibn ’l-Ḥajib, and found an imposing personage dressed in white with an enormous turban “like a small cupola,” who, however, was unable to answer his questions. “If you don’t know enough grammar to answer these questions, why do you wear this great load on your head?” enquired the boy; whereupon the audience laughed, and the teacher rose up ashamed and departed, “This led me to exert myself to master the paradigms of grammar,” says the writer; “but I now ask pardon of God for my question to that believing man, while thanking Him that this incident happened before I had attained maturity and become fully responsible for my actions.”

After pursuing his studies with various other masters, he obtained his father’s permission to follow his elder brother to Huwayza. The journey thither by boat through narrow channels amongst the weeds, tormented by mosquitoes “as large as wasps” and with only the milk of buffaloes to assuage his hunger, gave him his first taste of the discomforts of travel to a poor student. In return for instruction in Jámi’s and Járbarí’s commentaries and the Sháfiya, his teacher exacted from him “much service,” making him and his fellow-students collect stones for a house which he wished to build, and bring fish and other victuals for him from the neighbouring town. He would not allow them to copy his lecture-notes, but they used to purloin them when opportunity arose and transcribe them. “Such was his way with us,” says the writer, “yet withal we were well satisfied to serve him, so that we might derive benefit from his holy breaths.”

He attended the college daily till noon for instruction and discussion, and on returning to his lodging was so hungry that, in default of any better food, he used to collect the melon-skins cast aside on the ground, wipe off the dust, and eat what fragments of edible matter remained. One day he came upon his companion similarly employed. Each had tried to conceal from the other the shifts to which he was reduced for food, but now they joined forces and collected and washed their melon-skins in company. Being unable to afford lamps or candles, they learned by heart the texts they were studying, such as the Alfiyya of Ibn Málík and the Kāfīya, on moonlight nights, and on the dark nights repeated them by heart so as not to forget them. To avoid the distraction of conversation, one student would on these occasions often bow his head on his knees and cover his eyes, feigning headache.

After a brief visit to his home, he determined to go to Shiráz, and set out by boat for Baṣra by the Shaṭṭu’l-’Arab. He was so afraid of being stopped and brought back by his father that, during the earlier part of the voyage, he stripped off his clothes and waded behind the boat, holding on to the rudder, until he had gone so far that recognition was no longer probable, when he re-entered the boat. Farther on he saw a number of people on the bank, and one of his fellow-passengers called out to them to enquire whether they were Sunnis or Shi’a. On learning that they were Sunnis, he began to abuse them and invoke curses on the first three Caliphs, to which they replied with volleys of stones.

The writer remained only a short while at Baṣra, then governed by Husayn Páshá, for his father followed him thither to bring him home, but he escaped privately with his brother, and, as already narrated, made his way to Shiráz and established himself in the Manṣúriyya College, being then only eleven years of age. He found one of the tutors lecturing on the Alfiyya of Ibn Málík, who, on the conclusion of the lecture, questioned him as to his aims and adventures, and finally, seizing him by the car and giving it a sharp twist, said, “O my son, do not make thyself an Arab Shaykh or seek for supremacy, and do not waste thy time! Do not thus, that so perchance thou mayst become a scholar.”

In this college also the life was hard and the daily allowance of food inadequate, and the writer’s brother wished to return home, but he himself determined to remain, copying books for a pitance, and working almost all night through the hot weather in a room with closed doors while his fellow-students slept on the roof. Often he had neither oil for his lamp nor bread to eat, but must work by moonlight, faint with hunger, while in the winter mornings his fingers often bled with the cold as he wrote his notes. Thus passed two or three years more, and, though his eyesight was permanently affected by the strain to which it was subjected, he began to write books himself, a commentary on the Kāfīya, and another, entitled Mistáhu’l-Labíb, on the Tahdhib of Shaykh Bahá’u’d-Din Muhammad. He now began to extend the range of his studies beyond Arabic grammar, and to frequent the lectures of more eminent teachers from Baghdaď, al-Āhsá and Bahrayn, amongst them Shaykh Ja’far al-Bahráni. One day he did not attend this Shaykh’s lecture because of the news which had reached him of the death of certain relatives. When he reappeared on the following day the Shaykh was very angry and refused to give him any further instruction, saying, “May God curse my father and mother if I teach

660 P. 360 supra.
661 See the Kashfu’l-Hujub, p. 146, No. 725. The author died in 1031/1621-2. He was one of the most notable theologians of the reign of Sháh ‘Abbás the Great, and is commonly called in Persia “Shaykh-i-Bahá’í.” See p. 407 infra.
you any more! Why were you not here yesterday?” And, when the writer explained the cause of his absence, he said, “You should have attended the lecture, and indulged in your mourning afterwards”; and only when the student had sworn never to play the truant again whatever might happen was he allowed after an interval to resume his attendance. Finally he so far won the approval of this somewhat exacting teacher that the latter offered him his daughter in marriage; an honour from which he excused himself by saying, “If God will, after I have finished my studies and become a Doctor (‘ālim), I will marry.” Soon afterwards the teacher obtained an appointment in India, at Haydarabád in the Deccan.

Sayyid Ni‘matu’lláh remained in Shíráz for nine years, and for the most part in such poverty that often he swallowed nothing all day except water. The earlier part of the night he would often spend with a friend who lived some way outside the town so as to profit by his lamp for study, and thence he would grope his way through the dark and deserted bazaars, soothing the fierce dogs which guarded their masters’ shops, to the distant mosque where he lectured before dawn. At his parents’ wish he returned home for a while and took to himself a wife, but being reproached by a learned man whom he visited with abandoning his studies while still ill-grounded in the Science of Traditions, he left his parents and his wife (he had only been married for three weeks) and returned to the Mansúriyya College at Shíráz. Soon afterwards, however, it was destroyed by a fire, in which one student and a large part of the library perished; and about the same time he received tidings of his father’s death. These two misfortunes, combined with other circumstances, led him to leave Shíráz and go to Iṣfahán.

During his early days at Iṣfahán he still suffered from the same poverty with which he had been only too familiar
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in the past, often eating salted meat to increase his thirst, so that the abundance of water he was thereby impelled to drink might destroy his appetite for solid food. The change in his fortune took place when he made the acquaintance and attracted the notice of that great but fanatical divine Mullá Muhammad Bāqir-i-Majlisi, perhaps the most notable and powerful doctor of the Shi‘a who ever lived. He was admitted to the house of this famous man and lived with him for four years studying theology, and especially the Traditions662. Yet in this case familiarity did not breed contempt, for, as the author mentions in his Anwár ‘u-Nu‘mániyya663, though specially favoured by this formidable “Prince of the Church,” he often, when summoned to his library to converse with him, or to help in the compilation of the Biḥáru ‘l-Anwár, would stand trembling outside the door for some moments ere he could summon up courage to enter. Thanks to this powerful patronage, however, he was appointed lecturer (mudarris) in a college recently founded by a certain Mírzá Taqí near the Bath of Shaykh-i-Bahá’í in Iṣfahán, which post he held for eight years, when the increasing weakness of his eyes and the inability of the oculists of Iṣfahán to afford him any relief determined him to set out again on his travels. He visited Sámrárá, Kázimáyn, and other holy places in ‘Iráq, whence he returned by way of Shúshtar to Iṣfahán. In 1079/1668-9 his brother died, and ten years later, when he penned this autobiography, he still
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keenly felt this loss. After visiting Mashhad he returned to Huwayzā, where he was living a somewhat solitary and disillusioned life at the time of writing (1089/1678-9). Of his further adventures I have found no record, but his death did not take place until 1130/1718, only four years before the disaster which put an end to the Šafawí Dynasty.

I have given in a somewhat compressed form the whole of this illuminating narrative, one of those “human documents” which are so rare in Persian books (though indeed, as already noted on p. 361, it was originally written in Arabic), because it throws so much light on the life of the Persian student of theology, which, for the rest, mutatis mutandis, closely resembles that of the mediaeval European student. We see the child prematurely torn from the games and amusements suitable to his age to undergo a long, strenuous, and arid course of instruction in Arabic grammar and philology, reading one grammar after another in an ascending scale of difficulty, with commentaries, supercommentaries, glosses and notes on each; we see him as a boy, now fired with ambition, pursuing his studies in theology and law, half-starved, suffering alternately from the cold of winter and the heat of summer, ruining his eyesight by perusing crabbed texts by the fitful light of the moon, and his digestion by irregular and unwholesome meals, varied by intervals of starvation; cut off from home life and family ties; submerged in an ocean of formalism and fanaticism; himself in time adding to the piles of glosses and notes which serve rather to submerge and obscure than to elucidate the texts wherein they are based; and at last, if fortunate, attracting the favourable notice of some great divine, and becoming himself a mudarris (lecturer), a mutawalli (custodian of a shrine), or even a mujtabih.

But if the poor student’s path was arduous, the possible prizes were great, though, of course, attained only by a few.
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662 As has been already mentioned (p. 359 supra), this powerful prelate was one of the “three Muḥammads” of the later time, and his great work on Shi‘a tradition, the Biḥáru ‘l-Anwár, is still accounted in Persia the most authoritative work on this subject.

663 See the Kashaʃa ‘l-Hujjhah, p. 70, No. 328. I have a ms. of this work obtained from the late Ḥājjī ‘Abdu’l-Majíd Belshah and now bearing the class-mark C. 15. As already noted (p. 361), it concludes (ff. 329-34) with the Arabic original of the narrative here given.
In the eyes of the Ṣafawi kings the mujtahid was the representative of the Expected Imám, whose name they never mentioned without adding the prayer, “M āy God hasten his glad advent!” (‘ājāla ‘llāhu faraja-hu’). He had power of life and death. Ḥājjī Sayyid Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Muḥammad Taqī of Rasht, entitled Ḥujjatu’l-Īsām (“the Proof of Islam”), is said to have put to death seventy persons for various sins or heresies. On the first occasion, being unable to find anyone to execute his sentence, he had to strike the first ineffective blow himself, after which someone came to his assistance and decapitated the victim, over whose body he then recited the funeral prayers, and while so doing fainted with emotion.\(^{664}\)

Another mujtahid, Aḡā Muḥammad Ḥāli, a contemporary of Karim Kháni-Zand, acquired the title of Šūfī-kush (“the Šūfī-slayer”) from the number of urafā and darwishes whom he condemned to death.\(^{665}\)

Another, Mullá Ṭābīb ‘Ulláh-i-Túni, induced Sháh ‘Abbáš the Great to walk in front of him as he rode through the Maydán-i-Sháh, or Royal Square, of ‘Īsfahán,\(^{666}\) with the object of demonstrating to all men the honour in which learning was held.

Mullá Hasan of Yazd, who had invited his fellow-townsmen to expel, with every circumstance of disgrace, a tyrannical governor, was summoned to ‘Īsfahán by Fath-‘Abbáš Sháh to answer for his actions, and threatened with the bastinado unless he disavowed responsibility for this procedure. As he refused to do this, and persisted that he was entirely responsible for what had happened, he was actually tied up to receive the bastinado, though it was not actually inflicted. That night the Sháh was notified in a dream of the extreme displeasure with which the Prophet regarded the disrespect shown by him to the exponent of his doctrine and law, and hastened next morning to offer his apologies and a robe of honour, which last was refused by the indignant ecclesiastic.\(^{667}\)

Mullá Ahmad of Ardabil, called Muqaddas (“the Saint,” died in 993/1585), being asked by one of the King’s officers who had committed some fault to intercede for him, wrote to Sháh ‘Abbáš the Great in Persian as follows:\(^{668}\)

> “Let ‘Abbáš, the founder of a borrowed empire, know that this man, if he was originally an oppressor, now appears to be oppressed; so that, if thou wilt pass over his fault, perhaps God (Glorious and Exalted is He) may pass over some of thy faults.

> “Written by Ahmad al-Ardabili, servant of the Lord of Saintship.”

To this the Sháh ‘Abbáš replied:

> “‘Abbáš makes representation that he accepts as a spiritual favour and has fulfilled the services which you enjoined on him. Do not forget [me] your friend in your prayers!

> “Written by ‘Abbáš, the dog of ‘Ali’s threshold.”

\(^{664}\) Qisasu’l-‘Ulāmá (Lucknow ed.), p. 138.


\(^{666}\) Ibid., part ii, p. 54.

\(^{667}\) Qisasu’l-‘Ulāmá (Lucknow ed.), pp. 99-100.

\(^{668}\) This and the following anecdote are from the Qisasu’l-‘Ulāmá (‘Īsfahán ed., p. 260; Lucknow ed., p. 132).

\(^{669}\) Because it really belongs to the Expected Imám, and is only held by the Sháh as his trustee and vice-gerent.

\(^{670}\) I.e. ‘Ali ibn Abí Ṭālib, the First Imám.
placed with his winding-sheet and ordered that it should be buried with him, “in order that,” said he, “I may argue with the Angels of the Tomb, Munkir and Nakir, that I should not be subjected to their torment.”

Still more extraordinary is another anecdote in the same work of Prince Muhammad ‘Ali Mirzā gave a thousand tiyāns to each of two mujtahids in return for a paper, duly signed and sealed, promising him a place in Paradise: One of them (Sayyid Riđā ibn Sayyid Mahdi) hesitated to do this, but the Prince said, “Do you write the document and get the doctors of Karbalā and Najaf to witness it, and I will get it (i.e. the mansion in Paradise) from God Most High.”

Many similar anecdotes might be cited, besides numerous miracles (karāmāt) ascribed to most of the leading divines, but enough has been said to show the extraordinary power and honour which they enjoyed. They were, indeed, more powerful than the greatest Ministers of State, since they could, and often did, openly oppose the Shāh and overcome him without incurring the fate which would almost inevitably have overtaken a recalcitrant Minister. Nor is this a thing of the past, as is abundantly shown by the history of the overthrow of the Tobacco Concession in 1890-1, which was entirely effected, in the teeth of the Nāṣīrū’-d-Dīn Shāh and his Court, and the British Legation, by the mujtahids, headed by Ḥājjī Mirzā Ḥasan-i-Shirāzī and Ḥājjī Mirzā Ḥasan-i-Ashtiyānī
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inspired and prompted by that extraordinary man Sayyid Jamā’ū’-d-Dīn miscalled “the Afghān” Dr Feuvrier, the Shāh’s French physician, who was in Ṭihrān at the time, gives a graphic account of this momentous struggle in his Trois Ans à la Cour de Perse. I have described it fully in my Persian Revolution of 1905-1909, and also the still more important part played by Mullā Muhammad Kāzīm of Khurāsān and other patriotic mujtahids in the Persian struggle for freedom and independence in the first decade of our era. Mullā Muhammad Kāzīm, a noble example of the patriot-priest, deeply moved by the intolerable tyranny and aggression of the then government of Russia, formally proclaimed a jihād, or religious war, against the Russians on December 11, 1911, and was setting out from Karbalā for Persia in pursuance of this object when he died very suddenly on the following day, the victim, as was generally believed, of poison. He was not the only ecclesiastical victim of patriotism, for the Tīghatū’l-Islām was publicly hanged by the Russians at Tabrīz on the ‘Āshurā, or 10th of Muharram, 1330 (January 1, 1912), a sacrilegious act only surpassed by the bombardment three months later of the shrine of the Imām Riđā at Mashhād, which many Persians believe to have been avenged by the fate which subsequently overtook the Tsar and his family at the hands of the Bolsheviks.

The mujtahids and mulāls, therefore, are a great, though probably a gradually decreasing force, in Persia and concern themselves with every department of human activity.
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from the minutest details of personal purification to the largest issues of politics. It is open to any Shi’a Muslim to submit any problem into the solution of which religious considerations enter (and they practically enter everywhere) to a mujtahid, and to ask for a formal decision, or fatwā, conformable to the principles of Shi’a doctrine. Such fatwā may extend to the denunciation of an impius or tyrannical king or minister as an infidel (takfīr), or the declaration that anyone who fights for him is as one who fights against the Hidden Imām. The fact that the greatest mujtahids generally reside at Najaf or Karbalā, outside Persian territory, greatly strengthens their position and conduces to their immunity. To break or curb their power has been the aim of many rulers in Persia before and after the Šafawīs, but such attempts have seldom met with more than a very transient success, for the mulāls form a truly national class, represent in great measure the national outlook and aspirations, and have not unfrequently shielded the people from the oppression of their governors. And although their scholarship is generally of a somewhat narrow kind, it is, so far as it goes, sound, accurate, and even in a sense critical. The finest Persian scholar I know, Mirzā Muhammad ibn ‘Abdu’l-Wahhāb of Qazwin, is one who has superimposed on this foundation a knowledge of European critical methods acquired in England, France and Germany.

On the other hand, apart from corruption, fanaticism and other serious faults, many of the ‘ulamā are prone to petty jealousy and mutual disparagement. A well-known anecdote, given by Malcolm and in the Qīṣāṣu ‘l-Ulamā, shows that great doctors like Mīr Dāmād and Shaykh Bahā’u’d-Dīn al-‘Amīlī could rise
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above such ignoble feelings; but, as the author of the latter work complains, their less magnanimous colleagues were but too prone to call one another fools and asses, to the injury of their own class and the delight of irreligious laymen. Nor was this abuse rendered less offensive by being wrapped up in punning and pedantic verses like this:

\[
\text{\textit{Wohl \ was, was doch nicht \ tun \ muß: \ was \ nicht \ zu \ tun \ ist, \ doch \ will \ man \ tun, \ zu \ tun, \ zu tun, \ doch \ will \ man \ nicht \ tun, \ doch \ will \ man \ nicht \ tun, \ doch \ will \ man \ nicht \ tun, \ doch \ will \ man \ nicht \ tun.}}
\]

“Thou art not worthy to be advanced; nay, thou art nothing more than half of the opposite of ‘advanced!’”

The opposite of “advanced” (\textit{muqaddad}) is “postponed” (\textit{mu`akhkhar}), and the second half of the latter word, \textit{khar}, is the Persian for an ass. This is a refined specimen of mullass’ wit; for a much coarser one the curious reader may refer to an interchange of badinage between Mullá Mirzá Muhammed-i-Shirwání the Turk and Aqá Jamál of Iṣfahán recorded in the Qisāṣu’l-‘Ulamá.\(^{681}\) That some mullass had the sense to recognize their own rather than their neighbours’ limitations is, however, shown by a pleasant anecdote related in the same work of Jamál’u’d-Din Muhammed ibn Ḥusayn-i-Khwánsári. As a judge he was in receipt of a salary of four thousand \textit{túmáns} a year. One day four persons successively put to him four questions, to each of which he replied, “I do not know.” A certain high official who was present said to him, “You receive from the King four thousand \textit{túmáns} to know, yet here to everyone who asks you a question you reply ‘I do not know.’” “I receive these four thousand \textit{túmáns},” replied the mullá, “for those things which I do know. If I required a salary for what I do not know, even the Royal Treasury would be unable to pay it.”

JURISPRUDENCE (FIQH) AND THEOLOGY (\textit{aqā‘ id})

Jurisprudence (\textit{fiqh}) and theology (\textit{‘aqā‘ id}), with the ancillary sciences, all of which are based on a thorough knowledge of the Arabic language, normally constitute the chief studies of the “clergy,” though naturally there is a certain tendency to specialization, the qáddám, or ecclesiastical judge, being more concerned with \textit{fiqh}, and the theologian proper with doctrine. We must also distinguish between the prevalent \textit{Usúl} and the once important but now negligible \textit{Akhbárí} school, between whom bitter enmity subsisted. The former, as their name implies, follow the general “principles” (\textit{usúl}) deducible from the Qur’\text{"}{\text{'}}n and accredited traditions, and employ analogy (\textit{qiyás}) in arriving at their conclusions. The latter follow the traditions (\textit{akhbár}) only, and repudiate analogical reasoning. Mullá Muhammed Amin ibn Muhammad Sharif of Astarábád, who died in 1033/1623-4, is generally accounted the founder of the \textit{Akhbárí} school, and was, according to the Lú’u’atu’l-Bahráynn\(^{682}\), “the first to open the door of reproach against the Mujtahids, so that the ‘Saved Sect’ (\textit{al-Firqatu’n-Nâjíya}, i.e. the Shi’a of the Sect of the Twelve) became divided into \textit{Akhbárí} and Mujtahids;” and the contents of his book \textit{al-Fawá'idu’l-Madaniyya} consist for the most part of vituperation of the Mujtahids, whom he often accused of “destroying the true Religion.” A later doctor of this school, Mirzá Muhammed Akhbarí of Bahrán, entertained so great a hatred for the Mujtahids that he promised Fath-‘Ali Sháh that he would in forty days cause to be brought to Tíhrán the head of a certain Russian general who was at that time invading and devasting the frontier provinces of Persia, on condition that Fath-‘Ali Sháh would, in case of his success, “abrogate and abandon the Mujtahids,”

Exterminate and eradicate them root and branch, and make the \textit{Akhbárí} doctrine current throughout all the lands of Persia.” The Sháh consented, and thereupon the \textit{Akhbárí} doctor went into retirement for forty days, abstained from all animal food, and proceeded to practise the “envoiment” of the Russian general, by making a wax figure of him and decapitating it with a sword. According to the story, the head was actually laid before the Sháh just as the period of forty days was expiring, and he thereupon took counsel with his advisers as to what he should do. These replied, “the sect of the Mujtahids is one which hath existed from the time of the Imámún until now, and they are in the right, while the \textit{Akhbárí} sect is scantly in numbers and weak. Moreover it is the beginning of the Qájár dynasty, You might, perhaps, succeed in turning the people from the doctrine [to which they are accustomed], but this might be the cause of disastrous results to the King’s rule, and they might rebel against him. Moreover it might easily happen that Mirzá Muhammed should be annoyed with you, arrive at an understanding with your enemy, and deal with you as he dealt with the Russian ‘Ishpukhtur.’ The wisest course is that you should propitiate him, excuse yourself to him, and order him to retire to the Holy Thresholds (Karbalá or


\(^{683}\)Bombay lith., p. 122.

\(^{684}\)See the Kashfu’l-Hujab, p. 406, No. 2242. The author wrote the book at Mecca two years before his death.

\(^{685}\)\textit{Qisāṣu’l-‘Ulamá}, Tíhrán ed., p. 132; Lucknow ed., pp. 188-9. The Russian general is here called Ishpukhtur which, as my friend M. V. Minorsky informs me, represents “Inspector” (pronounced Izpektor), and is, perhaps, influenced in its form by the popular etymology (in Ottoman Turkish = إضحي بوقد) invented by the Turkish-speaking Adharbáyánis, meaning “his work is dirt.” M. Minorsky further informed me that this general’s real name was Tsitsianoff, that he was a Georgian, and that the phrase “Have you
Najaf) and stay there; for it is not expedient for the State that such a person should remain in the capital.” This advice Fatḥ-‘Ali Sháh decided to follow.

The very dry, narrow and formal divines are called by the Persians Qishrī (literally “Huskers,” i.e. externalists), and to these the Akhbārīs in particular belong, but also many of the Usūlīs, like Mirzā Ibrāhīm, the son of the celebrated Mullā Șadrā, one of the teachers of Sayyid Ni‘matu’l-Hād Jazā’iri, who used to glory in the fact that his belief was that of the common people, and Mullā ‘Ali Nūrī, who used to pray that God would keep him in the current popular faith. On the other hand we have the more liberal-minded divines, whose theology was tinctured with Philosophy or Sūfism, the Mutakallimin, who strove to reconcile Philosophy with Religion and closely resemble the School-men of mediaeval Europe, and finally the pure philosophers, like the celebrated Mullā Șadrā of Shírāz, who, however little their ultimate conclusions accorded with orthodox theology, had generally had the training of the ālama and were drawn from the same class.

The literature produced by this large and industrious body of men, both in Arabic and Persian, is naturally enormous, but the bulk of it is so dull or so technical that no one but a very leisureed and very pious Shi’i scholar would dream of reading it. The author of the Qisasu’l-‘Ulamā remarks that the ālama often live to a very advanced age, and as their habits are, as a rule, sedentary and studious, and they devote a large portion of their time to writing, it is not unusual to find a single author credited with one or two hundred books and pamphlets. Thus the author of the Qisasu’l-‘Ulamā enumerates 169 of his own works, besides glosses, tracts and minor writings, of those of Mullā Muḥsin-i-Fayḍ (Fayz), 69 by name, but he adds that the total number is nearly 200, of those of Muḥammad ibn ‘Ali…ibn Bābawayhi, entitled as-Saduq, 189, and so on. Many of these writings are utterly valueless, consisting of notes or glosses on super-commentaries or commentaries on texts, grammatical, logical, juristic or otherwise, which texts are completely buried and obscured by all this misdirected ingenuity and toil. It was of this class of writings that the late Grand Muftī of Egypt and Chancellor of al-Azhar Shaykh Muhammad ‘Abduh, one of the most able and enlightened Muhammadan divines of our time, was wont to say that they ought all to be burned as hindrances rather than aids to learning.

The works on jurisprudence (Fiqh) also, even the best, are as a rule very unreadable to a non-Muslim. What is taught in English universities as “Muhammadan Law” is, of course, only a portion of the subject as understood in the Lands of Islam. The Shari‘at, or Holy Law, includes not only Civil and Criminal Law, but such personal religious obligations as Prayer and the Purifications necessary for its due performance; Alms; Fasting; Pilgrimage; and the Holy War (Jihād), which subjects, with their innumerable ramifications and the hair-splitting casuistry applied to all sorts of contingencies arising from them, constitute perhaps one half of the whole. It is curious that, in spite of the neglect of Shi‘a theology by European Orientalists, one of the best European books on Muhammadan Jurisprudence treats of Shi‘a Law. This is M. Amédée Querry’s Droit Musulman: Recueil de Lois.

Concernant les Musulmans Schyites; and the European reader who wishes to form an idea of the subject, with all its intricate, and, to the non-Muslim mind, puerile and even disgusting details, cannot do better than consult this monumental work, which is based on the Sharāyi’u’l-Islām fī masā’il ‘l-Ḥalāl wa ‘l-Ḥaram of the celebrated Shi‘a doctor Najmu’l-Dīn Abū’l-Qāsim Ja‘far ibn al-Ḥasan…al-Ḥilli, commonly called al-Muḥaqiq al-Awwal (“the First Verifier” or “Investigator”), who died in 676/1277-8. Other works of authority, enumerated in the Preface (vol. i, p. vii) were also consulted, as well as leading contemporary Persian jurists, by M. Querry, whose twenty-five years’ sojourn in Turkey and Persia, where he occupied important official positions, such as counsellor of the French Legation at Tihrān, singularly fitted him for the arduous task which he so ably accomplished. An excellent Index of Arabic technical terms explained in the course of the book greatly enhances its value.

Mention should be made in this connection of a Persian catechism on problems of jurisprudence (fiqh) entitled Su‘āl u Jawāb (“Question and Answer”), by the eminent mujtahid Ḥājji Sayyid Muhammad Bāqir, whose severity in enforcing the
death-penalty in cases where it is enacted by the Ecclesiastical Law has been already mentioned\textsuperscript{693}. This work, composed subsequently to 1236/1820, was very beautifully printed in 1247/1832, apparently at Isfahán, under the supervision of Mírzá Zaynú'l-Ábidín of Tabriz, “the introducer of this art into Persia.” It comprises 162 ff. of 29'6 x 20'5 c. and 28 lines, and the letters ω (su’āl, “question”) and ζ (jawāb, “answer”)

are throughout inserted by hand in red. I possess only one volume, which was to have been followed by a second, but whether this was ever completed I do not know.\textsuperscript{694} The topics are arranged in the usual order, beginning with the personal obligations of purification, prayer, alms, fasting and pilgrimage, and ending with the Kitábu’l-Wad'át, dealing with objects deposited in trust in the hands of another. An Introduction on “Principles” (Uṣūl) is prefixed to the whole, and in each book, or section, various problems connected with the topic in question are propounded, with the author’s decisions, the whole in the form of dialogue. Thus the Introduction begins abruptly, without any doxology, with the following question:

\textit{Q. “If a person follows the opinions of one of the mujtahids (may God increase the like of them!) during the life of that mujtahid, is it lawful after his death for that person to continue to follow him and act according to his sayings, or not?”}

The answer, which fills nearly a page, is to the effect that it is not lawful so to do, and that the person in question should transfer his allegiance to some other mujtahid. Numerous authorities are cited in support of this view, amongst them Muḥammad Bāqir (presumably al-Majlisí), Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdi, the “Second Martyr” (ash-Shahidu’th-Thání), and the “Second Verifier” or “Investigator” (al-Muḥaqiqu’th-Thání).

The “books,” or sections, are of very unequal length, that on Prayer occupying nearly 70 ff., and other “books,” including the last, on Trusts, only half a page. Of the latter, which contains only two questions and their answers, the full translation is as follows:

\textit{Q. — “Zayd\textsuperscript{695} sends an article in trust to a trustee, bidding him give it to So-and-so. After the arrival of the article, the trustee learns for certain that the article entrusted to him belongs to ‘Amr\textsuperscript{696}, and that the hand of the sender, etc., is the hand of borrowing and usurpation. Moreover ‘Amr lays claim to the trust. saying, ‘This trust committed to thee is my property.’ The trustee also admits the validity of his claim to the property, but says, ‘He sent it to me to give it to So-and-so; I will not give it to thee.’ Has ‘Amr legally power to assume possession of the property and take it from the trustee, or not? And to whom should the trustee surrender the trust, so that he may be cleared of all further responsibility?”}

A. — “If what has been penned actually corresponds with the facts of the case, that is to say, if the trustee knows that the property belongs to ‘Amr, and that the hand of the sender of it is the hand of usurpation and violence, it is incumbent on the said trustee to surrender such property to its owner, whether the sender gives permission for such surrender or not. For such trustee to say to ‘Amr, having knowledge of the fact that the said property really belongs to him, ‘I will not give it to thee, in view of the fact that the sender of it bade me give it to So-and-so, not to thee,’ is incompatible with the functions of a trustee, and is not conformable to the Holy Law.”

\textit{Q. — “If Zayd shall have deposited an article in trust with ‘Amr, and if nearly seventeen years shall have passed, and if, notwithstanding ‘Amr’s urgent insistence with Zayd that he should remove the said article, he neglects to do so, and the said article, without any excess or defect of action\textsuperscript{697} on ‘Amr’s part, perishes, is ‘Amr liable to any penalty, or not?”}

A. — “Provided the details as set forth in writing correspond with the facts, there will be no penalty.”

This sample of Shî’a jurisprudence must suffice, but such as desire a further illustration of the matters which preoccupy the minds of these jurisconsults and doctors may with profit read the narrative of the trial of the Báb at Tabriz for heresy about A.D. 1848, of which an account,

based on the principal Persian narratives, will be found in vol. ii of my \textit{Travellers Narrative}, pp. 277-90.

We turn now to the more interesting subject of Shî’a theology, which has hitherto hardly attracted the attention it deserves from European Orientalists, and can only receive brief and inadequate treatment here. It must suffice to sketch in outline the current popular creed, without considering its evolution from early times, and to mention a few of the chief doctrinal works written in Persian during or since the Šâfawí period. For the purpose of this outline, however, I choose not

\textsuperscript{693} See p. 368 \textit{supra}. His life is given very fully in the \textit{Qisâṣu’l-‘Ulamá} (Lucknow ed., pp. 129-78).

\textsuperscript{694} The British Museum Library also possesses only this one volume. See E. Edwards’s \textit{Catalogue} (1922), col. 458. The \textit{Qisâṣu’l-‘Ulamá} gives 1227/1812 as the date of composition, but on f. 28'6 of the text, line 2, Muharram 1236/Oct. 1820 is mentioned as the current date.

\textsuperscript{695} ‘Amr and Zayd in Muslim jurisprudence correspond to “John Doe” and “Richard Roe” of English law-books; in grammar to Balbus and Caius; and in common speech to “Tom, Dick, and Harry.”

\textsuperscript{696} \textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{697} \textit{i.e.} without any fault of commission or omission on his part.
Introduction (Muqaddama).

Sets forth that God has not created mankind in vain, but that they should worship and serve Him, and reap the recompense of their actions in the next world. He has sent, to make known to them His Will and Law, numerous prophets, of whom Muhammad is the last and greatest. He left behind him the Scripture (the Qur’an) and his holy descendants and representatives for the continued guidance of mankind. In these days of the Greater Occultation (Ghaybat-i-Kubrā) wherein we live, the true faith is deduced from the Qur’an and the sayings and traditions of the Holy Imáms. According to these, three things are required of us: (1) heartfelt belief; (2) oral confession; (3) certain prescribed acts. These are ascertained either by personal investigation and “endeavour” (ijtiḥād), or by adopting the opinions of such investigator (mujtahid) by conformity to his authority (taqlid). The author concludes by enumerating a number of heresies to be avoided, such as Pantheism (wahdatu’l-wujūd); Apotheosis and Incarnation (ittiḥād wa ḥulūl); Determinism or Fatalism (yājir); Antinomianism(suqūt-i-iḥbādat) consequent on self-mortification and discipline (riyādāt); Communism (iḥbāḥat); Defication and adoration of the Imáms; denial of the Resurrection of the body, or of any future life; sanction of the use of musical instruments, and of narcotic or intoxicating substances; Metempsychosis (tanāsukh); Anthropomorphism (tashbīh), and the like.

Mishkáti (pp. 7-28), in four sections (Misháh).
What is to be believed concerning the Essence and Attributes of God.

Belief in the Unity of God (tawḥīd) is fourfold, namely:

Section i. Unity of the Divine Essence (Tawḥīd-i-Dhāt). God is One, without partner, peer or equal; Holy; Perfect; Free from defect; not composite, or capable of being so conceived, imagined, or apprehended; neither Body, nor Light, nor Substance, nor Accident; not located, nor born, nor producing offspring; Invisible both in this world and the next700, even to the
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Prophets, Imáms and Saints, but known to us only by His acts and the signs of His Power; neither eating, nor drinking, nor clothing Himself; exempt from anger, vexation, pain, joy, height, depth, change, progression, or retrogression; Eternal and absolutely independent of all else. His Attributes are identical with His Essence, not added to or superimposed on His Essence. These Attributes are for the most part negative, and are called Șifāt-i-Salbiyya or “Privative Attributes.”

Here again the author digresses to denounce various heresies of the Sûfis, especially the idea that beautiful persons are especially the Mirrors or Tabernacles of God, and the doctrine of Pantheism (Wahdatu’l-Wujūd), according to which the relation of Phenomena to Absolute Being is similar to that between the Waves and the Sea, or to sunlight passing through windows of variously coloured glass.

Section ii. Unity of the Divine Attributes (Tawḥīd-i-Șifāt). These Attributes are of several kinds, namely (1) “Essential Attributes” (Șifāt-i-Dhāt)701, to wit, Life, Power, with its derivative Speech, and Knowledge, with its derivatives Will and Comprehension. To these six some theologians add Eternity and Truth, but these, like Speech, Will and Comprehension, are Secondary Attributes, while Life, Power and Knowledge are primary. (2) The “Privative” or “Negative Attributes” (Șifāt-i-Salbiyya), also called the “Attributes of Glory” (Jalāl) as opposed to “Perfection” (Kamál) and

698 This began in 260/873-4, when the Twelfth and last Imám disappeared, to return in “the Last Time.”
699 Communism was preached in Persia in Sásánian times (sixth Christian century) by Mazdak. From his time until that of the Bábís this accusation has been brought against many heterodox sects.
700 Ḥáfíz has accordingly been blamed by one of his critics for the verse:
این مالی اعتقاد به دلشگیری بندگی و سوگواری گرفت
“This borrowed spirit which the Friend hath entrusted to Ḥáfíz, one day I shall see His Face and surrender it to Him.”
701 Or “Positive” (Thubūtiyya), or Șifāt-i-Kamál, “Attributes of Perfection.”
“Beauty” (Jamál), are seven qualities from which God is exempt, namely, Compositeness, Corporeality, Visibility, Locality, Association or Partnership, Unreality, and Need. (3) “Effective Attributes” (Šifār-i-Fī īl), or “Attributes of Beauty” (Šifār-i-Jamál), are acts which may be ascribed or not ascribed to God at different times and in different circumstances, like “the Provider” (Rāziq), “the Creator” (Khāliq), “the Merciful, the Compassionate” (Rahmān, Rahīm), “the Bounteous” (Jawād), and so forth. In this section reference is made to other views entertained by the Ash’arīs, the Mu’tazila, the Kirāmīs, al-Balḳhī, an-Najjār, Ḥasan of Baṣra, etc.

Section iii. Creative Unity of God (Tawḥīd-i-Khalqi). God alone can create, and it is heresy to believe with the Zoroastrians that God creates only what is good, and the Devil what is evil. But God can and does use means to this end, and can delegate His creative powers to Angels or other agents. “The good or evil manifested through God’s plenipotentiary servants is not God’s act but their act, wherefore they are the recipients of reward or punishment, by reason of the option which they enjoy, so that they themselves, by their own volition, do those things which God hath commanded or forbidden. For although they act by virtue of a power and strength which they do not in themselves possess, but which God hath conferred upon them, yet, since He hath given them this option, He hath also assigned to them rewards and punishments. Yet God is the Creator of Good and Evil, while His servant is but the agent and doer thereof. Since, however, this treatise is designed for the common people, it would be out of place for us to discuss this matter [more fully] here.”

The author next proceeds to refute certain opinions entertained by the extreme Shi’a (Ghulāt), such as that ‘Ali can create, with or without God’s permission; or that he is the “Assigner of Daily Bread” (Qāsimu’l-Arzāq); or that God obtained his permission to create the universe; or that he put his hand under his prayer-mat and brought forth in it the heavens and the earth. It may, however, be believed, as is implied in sūrah traditions, that-on the Day of Judgement God will leave “the Reckoning” with ‘Ali or other of the Imāms, and will accept their intercession, and the like. Hence ‘Ali is entitled “the Face of God” (Wajhū llāh), “the Hand of God” (Yadū llāh), “the Gate of God” (Bābu’l-laḥ), and the like.

It is also necessary to believe in al-Bidā, or God’s sovereign Will, that He does what He pleases; and that He can create what He pleases “without material or period” (bīlā mādda wa mudda), that is, from nothing in the twinkling of an eye.

Section iv. Unity of Worship (Tawḥīd-i-Ībādāt). Worship is the exclusive prerogative of God, and of the Divine Essence, not of the Attributes. To worship an Attribute or Name (such as “the Word of God”) apart from the Essence is unbelief, while to worship an Attribute in conjunction with the Essence is polytheism. This is of two sorts, patent and latent. The former includes the external worship of idols, trees, stars, the sun and moon, fire and human beings; or of symbols, such as crucifixes or pictures of holy persons; the latter includes excessive devotion to wife or child, or worldly wealth, or ambition, or hypocritical ostentation of piety. The visitation of the Ka’ba at Mecca and the Tombs of the Holy Imāms is, however, permitted; as also bowing down before kings or holy and learned men, provided there be not actual prostration (sujūd), and that no worship be intended.

Mishkát II (pp. 28-31).

What is to be believed concerning the justice of God.

“It is necessary to believe that God is just, not a tyrant and that at no time hath He acted, or doth He or will He act, unjustly towards any one. This is a fundamental article of our Faith, and whosoever holds the contrary is eternally damned.” Thus begins this section, of which the most interesting portion again deals with the question of Free Will and Predestination.

“It is also necessary to believe that God neither compels His creatures to act in a given way (jabr, ‘compulsion’), nor allows

---

702 This passage is so important in connection with the doctrine of Free Will and Predestination that I give it in the original:
them unrestricted choice (tafwid), but pursues a course intermediate between these two: that is to say that He has created them equally capable of both good and evil, so that they neither act under such compulsion that their deeds are in reality God’s deeds, nor can they do what they do by their own strength and power without God’s assistance. The former belief is Determinism or Fatalism (jabr) and the latter Free Will (tafwid). The correct view is that, whatever they do, they do voluntarily, not by compulsion and constraint, although God furnishes them with the power, means, and instruments, and has indicated to them the paths of good and evil, so that whoever elects to do good becomes deserving of reward, while he who elects to do evil becomes deserving of punishment.”

The author illustrates this by the example of a carpenter’s apprentice, who, having been taught his craft and furnished with the necessary tools, is bidden by his master to make a window of a certain size and description. If instead of this he makes a door, he cannot excuse himself by pleading that his master taught him the craft and gave him the tools which enabled him to make the door. Such is the case of man if he misuses the powers and limbs which God hath given him. Here follows the well-known story of the sceptic whose three questions were answered by a darwish who struck him on the head with a clod, but here Abú Ḥanīfa and Buhūl (the “wise fool”) take the parts of the sceptic and the darwish respectively.

The author’s theory that God created the hearts of believers, unbelievers, and wavers each from a different clay, “Knowing before He created them that the believer by reason of his belief would be good, and the unbeliever by reason of his unbelief bad, and so creating each of the appropriate substance, so that there might be no question of compulsion” (jabr), is not very convincing.

Mishkát III (pp. 32-45). On the Prophetic Function, general and special.

Section i. The general Prophetic Function (Nubuwwat-i-‘āmma). The number of the true prophets antecedent to Muḥammad, “the Seal of the Prophets and the last of them,” is variously stated as from 140 to 124,000. It is necessary to believe that these, whatever their actual number, were true and immaculate (maṣūm), that is, that during the whole of their lives they were guilty of no sin, major or minor; that they all enunciated the same essential truths; and that the revelations which they received were essentially identical, though in detail the later abrogated the earlier, to wit, the Qur’ān the Gospel, and the Gospel the Pentateuch (Tawrāt). These three, together with the Psalms of David (Zubūr) and the Books of Abraham (Ṣuḥuf), are the principal Scriptures, but the total number of revealed books is estimated by some as 104 and by others as 124. Of the Prophets sent to all mankind (mursal) four (Adam, Seth, Enoch or Idris and Noah) were Syrians; five (Hūd, Śālih, Shu‘ayb, Ishmael and Muḥammad) were Arabs, and the remainder of the Children of Israel. The five great Prophets called Ulu‘l-‘Azm are Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus and Muḥammad.

Section ii. The Special Prophetic Function of Muḥammad (Nubuwwat-i-Khāṣṣa). It is necessary to believe that Muḥammad was the last of all the Prophets, and that anyone after him who claims to be a prophet is an unbeliever and should be killed by the Muslims. Also that in every virtue and excellence he surpasses all other beings; that his “Light” (Nūr-i-Muḥammad) was created thousands of years before all other creatures; that he was sent not only to all mankind but to the Jinn; and that his doctrine and law abrogate all preceding ones.

Section iii. What is to be believed touching the Qur’ān. It is the last and greatest of revealed Scriptures, abrogating all others, and is the miracle of Muḥammad, though not the product of his mind; it is temporal (hadith), not eternal (qadīm); was revealed in the pure Arabic language (as were all the Scriptures, though each prophet received his revelation in the language of his people), and was sent down on the Laylatu ‘l-Qadr (“Night of Worth”) in its entirety from the Preserved Tablet (Lawḥ-i-Maḥfūz), but was revealed by Gabriel in instalments, as occasion arose, over a period of 23 years.

Neither men nor Jinn, though all should combine, can produce the like of the Qur’ān, or even one chapter or verse of it. It contains all truth and all knowledge, and the full interpretation of it is known only to God, the Prophet, and the Imāms, and those “firmly established in Knowledge” to whom they have imparted it. The original Qur’ān is in the keeping of the Hidden Imām, and has undergone no change or corruption.

Section iv. The Prophet’s Attributes. He was “illiterate” (ummi). having never studied or received instruction from men or Jinn; he cast no shadow; a cloud used to overshadow his head; he could see behind his back as well as before his face; he was luminous to such a degree that in his presence on the darkest night his wives could find a lost needle without the aid of lamp or candle. His birth was heralded and accompanied by miracles, enumerated in detail. He was immaculate (maṣūm), and the most excellent of all beings. Gabriel was really his servant, and ‘Azrā‘i (the Angel of Death) could not approach him.

703 It is included in the extracts at the end of Forbes’s Persian Grammar, No. 67, pp. 49-51.
to receive his soul without his permission. He was neither a poet (shá‘ir), nor a magician (sáḥir), nor a liar (kadhdháb), nor a madman (diwāna), and to assert any of these things is blasphemy. He had five souls or spirits, of which the first three (called Rūḥ-i-mudraj, Rūḥ-quwwat, and Rūḥ-i-shahwat) are common to all men; the fourth, Rūḥ-i-imān, “the Spirit of Faith,” is peculiar to true believers; while the last, “the Holy Spirit” (Rūḥu’l-Quds), belongs to the Prophet alone, and his successors, the Holy Imāms.

Section v. The Prophet’s Miracles. These included the Cleaving of the Moon (shaqqu’l-qamar); knowledge of the Past, the Future, and the Unseen; raising the dead; knowledge of 72 out of the 73 Names of God, whereof not more than twenty were known to any previous Prophet, and the like. He saw

Paradise and Hell with his own eyes, and ascended into Heaven in his material body, clad in his own clothes, and wearing his sandals, which he would have put off on approaching God’s Throne, but was forbidden by God to do so.

Section vi. The Prophet’s Ascension (Mi’rāj). He ascended in his material body to the Station of “Two bow-shots or less”704, a point nearer to God than that attained by Enoch or Jesus or any angel or archangel. To assert that this Ascension was allegorical, or within himself, or spiritual and esoteric, is heresy.

Section vii. Sundry other beliefs concerning the Prophet. He was “a mortal man to whom revelations were made”705 in various ways mediate and immediate. He combined in himself the functions of Apostle (Rasūl), Prophet (Nabī), Imām, and Muhaddith, by which is here meant one who sees and holds converse with the Angels. His intercession for sinners will be accepted in the Day of Resurrection and God has bestowed on him, within certain limits, authority to command and prohibit, and to add to the obligations imposed by God in such matters as prayer and fasting. He explicitly appointed his cousin and son-in-law ‘Ali ibn Abī Ṭālib to succeed him; but to assert that Gabriel took the Revelation from a well in a plain, and, receiving permission from God to see who was the author, looked into the well and saw that it was ‘Ali; or that Gabriel mistook Muḥammad for ‘Ali and brought the Revelation to him by mistake, are blasphemous heresies.

Mishkáṭ IV (pp. 45-71).
On the Imāmate.

Section i. Enumeration of the Twelve Imámés of the Ithná-‘ashariyya or “Sect of the Twelve,” and refutation of the Sunnis, who recognize Abū Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthmán as the Khulafa, or successors and vicegerents of the Prophet; of the Kaysáníyya, who accept Muḥammad ibnu’l-Ḥanafiyya, a son of ‘Ali by another wife than Fátima, as Imám; of the Zaydiyya, who accept ‘Abdul-Ḥafṣ ibn Abī Ṭālib; of the Shi‘a, who are therefore pure, according to the prevailing view, it is not lawful to interfere with their lives, wives or property, though some Shi‘a doctors hold the contrary view.

Section ii. Knowledge of the Prophet and Imámés. This section is entirely historical or quasi-historical, giving the dates of the births, deaths, and chief events in the lives of Muḥammad and the Twelve Imámés.

The Prophet Muḥammad was born on Friday 17th (or 12th) of Rabí’i in the “Year of the Elephant,” in the year 1021 of Alexander, and in the Seventh year of the reign of Anūshtarwán “the Just.” He lived 63 years, of which 53 were spent at Mecca and ten at al-Madina, and his “Mission” began when he was forty years old. He had nine (or 12, or 15) wives and two concubines; four sons, Qásim, Ṭáhir and Ṭayyib by Khadija, and Ibráhim Mary the Copt; and three

daughters, Fátima (who married ‘Ali), and Zaynab and Ruqayya, who were married to ‘Uthmán. He died (poisoned by a Jewess of Khaybar, as asserted) on Monday the 27th or 28th of Safar, and was buried at al-Madina.

‘Ali ibn Abī Ṭālib was the immediate legitimate successor of the Prophet and the First Imám though not formally recognized as Khalifá until after the deaths of Abú Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthmán (whom the Shi‘a regard as usurpers). He waged three great wars, with the Qásitín (“wrong-doers”), i.e. Mu‘áwiya the Umayyad and his partisans; the Nákithín (“troth-breakers”), i.e. ‘A’isha, Ṭalḥa and Zubayr; and the Márqíqín (“rebels”), i.e. the Khārijites. He was assassinated by Ibn Muljam on Ramaḍán 21 at the age of sixty-three. He married twelve wives after the death of Fátima and had seventeen sons and nineteen daughters. His father Abū Ṭālib was inwardly a believer, though he made no outward profession of Islám. ‘Ali is supposed to have been the twelfth of the Awwiyá (executors, trustees, or vicegerents) of Jesus Christ.

---

704 Qur’án, liii, 9.  
705 Ibid., xviii, 110.
Fāṭima was the daughter of the Prophet by Khadija, and the wife of ‘Alī, to whom she bore three sons (al-Ḥasan, al-Ḥusayn and Muḥassin), and two daughters (Zaynab the elder and Umm Kūlhūm). She died, aged about eighteen, on the 3rd of Jumādá ii, A.H. 11 (26 August, 632).

Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī, the Second Imám, was born in Sha‘bán or Ramaḍán, A.H. 3 (January or March, 625), resigned the position of Khalīfa to Mu‘awiya, to safeguard himself and his followers, after he had held it for ten years and a half, and died of poison administered to him by Ja‘da the daughter of al-Ash‘ath ibn Nafis, known as ‘Asmā, at the instigation of Mu‘awiya, nine years and a half later. He is said to have had 60 wives, besides concubines, but others say 300 or even 600,

of whom he divorced so many that he earned the nick-name of al-Miṭlāq (“the great divorcer”); and to have had fifteen sons and two daughters, though here again there is much difference of opinion. The best known of his numerous titles is al-Muṭṭabā.’

Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī, the Third Imám, was born only six months (sic) after his brother Ḥasan; had five wives besides concubines; six sons, ‘Alī Akbar, who succeeded him as Imám, ‘Alī Awaṣa, ‘Alī Aṣghar, Muḥammad, Ja‘far and ‘Abdu‘llāh; and three daughters, Fāṭimatu‘l-Kubrā, Sakīna and Faṭimatu‘ṣ-Sughra. Account of his death at Karbalá on Muḥarram 10, A.H. 61 (October 10, 680) with 72 of his kinsmen and partisans at the age of 56, 57 or 58. Of his titles the best known is “the Chief of Martyrs” (Sayyidu’sh-Shuhadā’).

‘Ali ibn Ḥusayn, the Fourth Imám, commonly known as Zaynu’l-‘Ābidin and Sayyid-i-Sajjād. His mother was the daughter of Yazdīgird, the last Sassanian King of Persia. Her name was Shahrānrū, or, according to others, Ghazāla or Salāma. He was born in 216/830 or 217/831. He had one wife, his cousin Umm ‘Abdi‘llāh, daughter of al-Ḥasan, besides concubines. He had sixteen children (seven or twelve sons, and nine or four daughters). One of his sons, Zayd, was killed by the ‘Abbayad Caliph Hisham ibn ‘Abdu‘l-Malik, who is also said to have poisoned him in 94/712 when he was fifty-seven years of age.

Muḥammad Bāqir, the Fifth Imám, was born in A.H. 57 or 58 (A.D. 676-8), and is said to have been poisoned by the ‘Abbayad in 104/722 or 107/726-7. [From this point onwards there are so many discrepancies and conflicting statements that a more rigorous abridgment seems desirable. Thus the age of this Imám is given as 57 or 58, or even 78, all of which,

especially the last, are absolutely incompatible with the dates given for his birth and death.]

Ja‘far as-Ṣadiq, the Sixth Imám, born 80/699-700, poisoned by the ‘Abbadid Caliph al-Manṣūr in 148/765-6. He took advantage of the internecine strife between the ‘Abbasids to carry on an active propaganda for the Shi‘a doctrine, which is therefore often called after him “Ja‘fari.”

Mūsá al-Kāẓim, the Seventh Imám, born 129/746-7, poisoned by Hārūnur-Rashid in 180/796-7.

‘Ali ar-Riḍá, the Eighth Imám, poisoned by al-Ma‘mūn in 203/818-9, and buried at Mashhad.

Muḥammad Taqī, the Ninth Imám, born 195/811-11, poisoned by his wife at the instigation of the Caliph al-Mu’tasim in 220/835.

‘Ali Naqí, the Tenth Imám, born in 212/827-8, poisoned in 245/868 at the instigation of the Caliph al-Mu’tazz.

Ḥasan al-‘Askārī, the Eleventh Imám, born 232/846-7 poisoned in 260/873-4 at the instigation of the Caliph al-Mu’tamid.

The Imám Mahdī, also called Qā’imu ‘Alī Muḥammad, Ḥujjatu‘llāh and Baqiyyatu‘llāh, the Twelfth and last Imám, born in 255/869 by Narij Khātūn to Ḥasan al-‘Askarī, disappeared in 260/873-4, is still living and will return “in the last Days” to establish the Shi‘a faith and “fill the earth with justice after it has been filled with iniquity.”

Section iii. Attributes of the Imāms. It is necessary to believe that the Imāms were created from one pre-existing Light; that all blessings and all knowledge of God come through them; that through them the universe lives and moves and has its being; and that they are in every respect the most excellent of beings after the Prophet Muḥammad, and superior to all other Prophets and to the Angels, though subject to all

human needs and functions. They are also immaculate (ma‘ṣūm), innocent of any sin, small or great, co-equal, endowed with every virtue, knowledge and power. Their birth was not as that of ordinary mortals, and, like the Prophet, they were born a circumcision. After many further amplifications of the Imāms’ perfections, the author proceeds to warn his readers against certain opinions of the Ghulāt, or most extreme Shi‘a, who would put them above the Prophet and even deify them.

Mishkáṭ V706 (pp. 71-85).

---

706 Like so many Persian books, the actual divisions of this book do not correspond with the Table of Contents, which indicates five main divisions, each called Mishkát, while only four such headings actually occur in the text. This section is described as Section (Mishbáḥ) IV of Mishkát IV, but it introduces a quite new topic and should, I am convinced, be called, as I have called it, Mishkát V.
Beliefs connected with Death, Judgement and the Hereafter.

Section i. Death. The Angels, the Prophet and the Imáms are present at every death-bed, whether of a believer or an unbeliever. When the spirit leaves the body, it attaches itself to a subtle invisible body (qālib-i-mithāl-i-latīf) which is a simulacrum of the material body in the intermediate world or “World of the Barrier” (‘Alám-i-Barzakh). To believe, as do some of the common people, that these disembodied spirits enter the crops of green birds or lamps attached to the Throne of God (‘Arsh) is an error. This disembodied spirit watches the body it has quitted and the preparations for its burial, urging haste if it be a believing spirit, and delay if unbelieving, but none hears or heeds its appeal. It also sees its place in Heaven or Hell, as the case may be. A believer’s death is not always easy, nor an unbeliever’s hard. The Prophet’s description of the Angel of Death, whom he saw during his Night Ascent to Heaven.

Section ii. The Questioning of the Tomb. When the body has been buried and the mourners have dispersed, the spirit returns to the body to undergo the Questioning of the Tomb (Su’ál-i-qabr) at the hands of the Angels Munkir and Nakir, whose terrible aspect is described. If the deceased is a believer and gives satisfactory answers to their questions on his beliefs, they leave him in peace, saying, “Sleep as the bride sleeps in her bridal chamber,” and they enlarge his Tomb as far as the eye can see, and open from it a door into Paradise, so that the air of Paradise enters it and gladdens the occupant. But if he is an unbeliever, they revile him and beat him with their clubs, and fill the tomb with fire; and he cries out in agony, so that if men and Jinns could hear, they would die of terror. But the animals hear, and that is why a sheep grazing or a bird gathering grain will suddenly stop and shiver and listen intently. Those of the Shi’a who are buried at Karbalá are said to be exempt from this Questioning, and some believe that the whole plain of Karbalá, rid of all impurities, including the bodies of unbelievers and hypocrites, will be bodily transferred to Paradise. The good deeds and kindnesses of the dead may take the form of a beautiful companion who will bear them company in the tomb and dispel their loneliness

Section iii. The Squeezing of the Tomb. It is not certain whether all are subject to this, or only the unbelievers. This squeezing is not confined to those who are buried in the ground, for those who are hanged, drowned or eaten by wild beasts are equally subject to it. After the Questioning and the Squeezing, the spirit again leaves the material body and reunites with the subtle invisible body. Opinions differ as to whether this last always existed within the material body, or apart from

Section iv. Concerning the Intermediate World (‘Alám-i-Barzakh). Barzakh means something intermediate between two other things, in this case a state or world between this life and the next, more subtle than the former and more gross than the latter. Some identify it with the World of Similitudes (‘Alám-i-Mithál), others believe it to exist in this world, but in a Eighth Clime outside the Seven Climes, called Ard-i-Huwar-qilyá. The Terrestrial Paradise is in the Wádí’s-Salám in the western part of this region, and the Terrestrial Hell in the Wádí Barahút, in the eastern part. In these places respectively the souls of the Blessed and the Lost congregate and experience pleasure or pain, and when a new spirit arrives they let it rest for a while to recover from the “Questioning” and the “Squeezing,” and then interrogate it as to the friends who survived them on earth, whether they be still living or dead.

Section v. The departed spirits visit their former homes on earth to watch their families and friends, some daily, some weekly, some monthly, some yearly, some only once in several years. Some say they come in the form of green birds and perch on the roof or walls of the house and talk, but the living do not notice or attend to them because of their preoccupation with the things of this world. The spirits of the Blessed see only the

Section iv. Concerning the Intermediate World (‘Alám-i-Barzakh). Barzakh means something intermediate between two other things, in this case a state or world between this life and the next, more subtle than the former and more gross than the latter. Some identify it with the World of Similitudes (‘Alám-i-Mithál), others believe it to exist in this world, but in a Eighth Clime outside the Seven Climes, called Ard-i-Huwar-qilyá. The Terrestrial Paradise is in the Wádí’s-Salám in the western part of this region, and the Terrestrial Hell in the Wádí Barahút, in the eastern part. In these places respectively the souls of the Blessed and the Lost congregate and experience pleasure or pain, and when a new spirit arrives they let it rest for a while to recover from the “Questioning” and the “Squeezing,” and then interrogate it as to the friends who survived them on earth, whether they be still living or dead.

Section v. The departed spirits visit their former homes on earth to watch their families and friends, some daily, some weekly, some monthly, some yearly, some only once in several years. Some say they come in the form of green birds and perch on the roof or walls of the house and talk, but the living do not notice or attend to them because of their preoccupation with the things of this world. The spirits of the Blessed see only the

good things which befall, or are wrought by, their families and friends. Some say that they come on a particular day, on Monday at noon, or on Thursday, or on Friday. If their friends remember them, offering good works, prayers or fasting as a present to them, they are pleased; the happiness of the Blessed is increased, and the torments of the Lost alleviated thereby. “Therefore, my dear friend,” says the author, “you must not forget the departed in this world, but must strive, so far as in you lies, to send presents to them.” The Earthly Paradise (Bihisht-i-Dunya) is a place of rest and peace, there is no sorrow or weeping, nor any obligation to pray or fast.

---

707 This affords an interesting parallel to the Zoroastrian belief set forth in the Arda Viráf náma.
708 This is headed Misháh v (of Mishkát IV), and the numbering of the sections begins again, but it appears to me really to constitute Section iv of Mishkát V.
709 Cf. the Jism-i-Huwarqilyá’i of the Shaykhis, mentioned in my Traveller’s Narrative, vol. ii, p. 236.
711 Entitled Section ii of Misháh v (of Mishkát IV).
Section vi On the spirits of the wicked. These are also permitted from time to time to visit their homes, but they see only the evil done by their friends, and strive warn them, but cannot, and return to the Earthly Hell more miserable than before. Discussion as to the state after death of the children of believers and unbelievers, the ignorant and feeble-minded, and the insane; and concerning the Recording Angels. According to some, the male children of believers are, after their death, committed to the care of Abraham, and the female children to that of the Virgin Mary.

Conclusion (Khátima)(pp. 85-132).
Beliefs connected with the Return of the Twelfth Imám.

Section i. On his Occultation (Ghaybat). Three Occultations are distinguished, entitled “Lesser,” “Greater” and “Least.” The “Lesser Occultation” (Ghaybat-i-Šuḥrā) began on the 8th of Rabi‘ i, 260 (Jan. 1, 874), lasted 69 years, and ended with the death of the last of the four wakils who maintained communication between the Hidden Imám and his followers in 329/940-1. Then began the “Greater Occultation” (Ghaybat-i-Kubrâ), wherein no one has direct access to the “Hidden Imám,” and wherein we are now living. The “Least Occultation” (Ghaybat-i-Askhar) will last only from noon on the Friday succeeding his “Return” (Raj‘át), when he will behead the preacher (Khatîb) at Mecca and forthwith disappear again, until the morning of the next day (Saturday). The time of the Advent or “Return” of the Imám is known to God alone, but it will be heralded by numerous signs, of which forty-eight or more are enumerated by our author, and of which the most celebrated are the coming of the wicked and hideous Sufyânî, whose army the earth will finally swallow up; the appearance of a figure in the sun; the multiplication of misleading divines and lawyers and of poets; the abounding of tyranny and oppression; the appearance of Antichrist (Dajjâl) riding on his Ass; the assembling of 313 chosen supporters of the Imám in Tâliqân of Khurasân, etc. After a “reign of the Saints” lasting seventy years, the Imám will die, poisoned by a woman named Mâliha, and the Imám Ḩusayn will return to earth to read the Burial Service over him. This is the beginning of what is called the “Lesser Resurrection” (Qiyámât-i-Šuḥrâ), when the Prophet and all the Imâms, as well as their chief antagonists, shall return to earth for a while, and fight their battles over again, but with a different result, since the unbelievers shall be uniformly defeated. In this first temporary Resurrection only those who are purely believers or unbelievers (Mâmin-i-Khâlis or Kâfîr-i-Khâlis) will come to life. Then they will again disappear from the face of the earth, and, after forty days’ anarchy and confusion, the tribes of Gog and Magog (Yâjûj u Mâjûj) will burst through the Wall (Sad) which keeps them back, and will overrun the earth, and eat up all the grass and herbs, and drink up the rivers.

The “Greater Resurrection” (Qiyámât-i-Kubrâ), when all the dead shall be raised to life in the same bodies they had while on earth, re-created by God’s Power as a broken brick can be re-made from its original materials, will be inaugurated by the blast of Isråfi’s trumpet, which shall draw into itself all the spirits of the quick and the dead, so that no living thing shall remain on earth save the “Fourteen Immaculate Ones” (Chahârdah Ma’ṣûm)116. Then, when their bodies have been re-created, Isråfi will again blow his trumpet, and the spirits will emerge from it like a swarm of bees, and fly each one to its own body. All animals will also be raised to life to undergo the Reckoning and be judged for their acts of violence towards one another. Then the Balance (Mîzân) will be set up for the weighing of the good and bad acts of each soul, and the scroll of each man’s deeds, written down by the Recording Angels Sâ’iq and Shahîd, will be placed in his hand.

The Seven Hells (Jihannam, Sa‘îr, Saqar, Jaḥîm, Laẓţâ, Ḥutama and Hâwîya) are next enumerated, whereof the first is for Muslims who died in sin without repenting, and who will be released when adequately punished; the second for the Jews; the third for the Christians; the fourth for the Sabaeans; the fifth for the Magians; the sixth for the idolatrous Arabs; and the seventh for the hypocrites. Unbelievers will remain in Hell for ever, but some, on account of their virtues, will remain there 712 Entitled Section iii etc., as in the preceding footnote.
713 This, I believe, is how the title should stand, but it is actually described as Mišbâh vi of Mishkât IV. See p. 395, n. 1, supra.
714 I.e. Agents or Representatives, also called “Gates” (Bâb, pl. Abwâh). The avoidance of this last title by the author is probably intentional, for he wrote in 1263/1847, just when Mirzâ ‘Ali Muḥammad’s claim to be the Bâb was creating so great a stir in Persia. See my Traveller’s Narrative, ii, pp. 226-34 and 296-8.
715 Many particulars concerning the “Occultations,” the “Gates,” and the claims to communicate with the Hidden Imám advanced by the Shaykhis and Bábís, denounced as heretics by our author, are given in the notes (especially D, E and O) at the end of vol. ii of my Traveller’s Narrative, to which the reader is referred.
716 I.e. the Prophet, his daughter Fátîma, and the Twelve Imâms.
without suffering torment, as, for example, Khusraw Anûsharwán on account of his justice, and Ḥátim of Ṭayy on account of his generosity.

Next follows a description of the Bridge of Ṣiráṭ, “finer than a hair, sharper than a sword, and hotter than fire,” which spans Hell, and over which everyone must pass, even the Prophets and Imáms and Saints, to reach Paradise. A detailed description of a very material Paradise succeeds, which in turn is followed by an account of the Purgatory or intermediate state called al-Aʿráf. This is said to be a beautiful meadow or high ground situated on the Bridge of Ṣiráṭ, and peopled by the spirits of the feeble-minded, illegitimate children, and those who are neither good enough for Heaven nor bad enough for Hell. By the intercession of the Prophet or the Imáms some of these will be subsequently admitted to Heaven. Other heavenly delights described, such as the Water of Kawthar, the “Lote-tree of the Limit” (Ṣidratuʾl-Muntahá), and the Ţúbá-tree. When every soul has been assigned its place in Heaven, Hell or al-Aʿráf, Death will be led forth in the form of a black sheep and slain, to show that henceforth there is neither fear nor hope of death.

**Conclusion (Khátima)**717 (pp. 132-138).

**[Section ii.] On the meaning of Unbelief (Kufr) and Belief (Ímán).** Five meanings of Kufr in the Qurʾán are distinguished, and three chief kinds in ordinary life, namely
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spiritual (qalbí), verbal (qawlí), and actual (fíʾlí). Three kinds of Ímán are also distinguished, and Ímán is distinguished from Islám. Sunnis and Shiʿa not of the “Sect of the Twelve” are believers (máʾmin), but not Muslims; they are not unclean, but will remain for ever in Hell-fire. The apostate (murtadd) from Islám is deserving of death, nor is his repentance accepted in this world, though, according to some theologians, it may be accepted in the next. But from the convert to Islám who reverts to his original faith repentance may be accepted; and a woman who apostasizes should not be killed, but imprisoned and beaten until she repents or dies in prison. The book ends with a description of five kinds of Faith and six kinds of Repentance.

Such in outline is the Shiʿa creed of contemporary Persia in its crudest and most popular form. It would be interesting to trace the evolution of that creed from the earliest times of Islám, to compare (so far as the available materials allow) the historical with the legendary Imáms, and to contrast in detail the beliefs, both doctrinal and eschatological, of the Shiʿa and the Sunnis. This, however, transcends the scope of this book, even had the preliminary work indispensable to such a study been adequately done. Even amongst the orthodox and formal (qishrí) mujtahids and mulláṣ these doctrines must often have been held in a form less crude and childish than that outlined above, though they may have deemed it wiser to leave the popular beliefs undisturbed, and to discourage speculations which might become dangerous amongst a people only too prone to scepticism and heresy. Taking only the broad divisions of theological and philosophical thought in Persia, we may distinguish in each field three main types; amongst the theologians the Akhábírs, the Uṣúlís (or Mujtahídís), and the Shaykhsis; amongst the philosophers the Mutakallimún or School-men,

[page 403]

the Faláṣīfa or ʿUkámá (Philosophers pure and simple), and the philosophical ʿSúfís. Of all these Gobineau’s account is still the most clear, lively and concise which I have met with in any European language, though it cannot be certainly affirmed that its accuracy is equal to its clarity. Thus he credits the Akhábírís, generally regarded as the strictest sect of the Shiʿa, with a certain latitudinarianism to which they can hardly lay claim; and describes the Shaykhsis as “not altogether rejecting the idea of the Resurrection of the Body,” when it was precisely their doctrine of the “subtle body” (or Jism-i-Huwarqílyá)719 which especially laid them under suspicion of heresy. The doctrines of the Shaykhís, moreover, definitely prepared the way for the still more heretical doctrines of the Bábí, who were outside the pale of Islám while the Shaykhís were just within it and counted many influential followers in high places. Of the Philosophers and ʿSúfís more will be said in another chapter, but as to the theologians we shall do well to bear in mind Gobineau’s dictum720, “Il ne faut pas perdre de vue que si l’on peut, approximativement, classer les trois opinions ainsi que je le fais, il est nécessaire pourtant d’ajouter qu’il est rare que, dans le cours de sa vie, un Persan n’ait point passé de l’une à l’autre et ne les ait point toutes les trois professées.” Mullá Muhammad Báqír-i-Majlísí, one of the greatest, most powerful and most fanatical mujtahids of the Šafáwí period, found it necessary to apologize for the tolerant and even sympathetic attitude assumed by his father Mullá Muḥammad Ṭaqí-i-Majlísí, not less distinguished than himself as a theologian, towards
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---

717 This is so headed, but see pp. 381 and 398 supra. This section might be called “Epilogue.”
the Ṣūfīs. “Let none think so ill of my father,” he says721, “as to imagine that he was of the Ṣūfīs. Nay, it was not so, for I was intimately associated with my father in private and in public, and was thoroughly conversant with his beliefs. My father thought ill of the Ṣūfīs, but at the beginning of his career, when they were extremely powerful and active, my father entered their ranks, so that by this means he might repel, remove, eradicate and extirpate the roots of this foul and hellish growth (in Shajara-i-Khabitha-i-Zaqqūmiyya). But when he had extinguished the flames of their infamy, then he made known his inner feelings, for he was a man of the utmost virtue and piety, ascetic and devout in his life,” etc.

Yet Mullá Muḥammad Bāqir, in spite of his formalism and fanaticism, his incredible industry in writing books in simple and easily intelligible Persian in order to popularize the Shi‘a doctrines, and his ruthless persecution of the Ṣūfīs, is credited with posthumous gleams of a higher humanity722. One saw him in a dream after his death and asked of him, “How fares it with you in that world, and how have they dealt with you?” He answered, “None of my actions profited me at all, except that one day I gave an apple to a Jew, and that saved me.”

The Qiṣaṣu‘l-‘Ulamá contains 153 biographies of eminent divines, of whom the following twenty-five appear to me the most interesting and important. They are here arranged, as far as possible, chronologically, the serial number of each biography in the book being indicated in brackets after the name723.
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Autograph of Mullá Muḥammad Bāqir-i-Majlísí

Or. 4937 (Brit. Mus.), p. 105

I. Pre-Ṣafawi divines.

1. Muḥammad ibn Ya‘qūb al-Kulayní (No. 96), entitled Thiqatu‘l-Islám, author of the Kāf, d. 329/941.
2. Muḥammad ibn ‘Ali ibn Ḥusayn ibn Músá ibn Bābawayhi of Qum, called Ṣadūq (No. 95), d. 381/991-2. Of his works 189 are enumerated in the Qiṣaṣu‘l-‘Ulamá, the most important being that entitled Man lá yahduruhu ‘l-Faqīh, which, like the Kāf mentioned in the last paragraph, is one of the “Four Books.”

722 Ibid., part i, p. 216. The author discredited the tale, which is described as widely current. As regards this theologian’s literary activity, he is said on the same page to have been accustomed to write 1000, “bayts,” i.e. 50,000 words, daily.
723 They are numbered in both editions in the abjad notation, e.g. Kulayná as ١٩٦ (96); Najjáshí as ١٣٢ (132), etc.

4. Sayyid Murtadá, entitled ‘Alamu’l-Hudá (No. 98), d. 436/1044. He was the great-great-grandson of the Seventh Imám, Músá al-Kázím.

5. Ahmad ibn ‘Ali an-Najjáší (No. 132), d. 455/1063. He was a disciple of the Shaykh-i-Mufíd, and the author of the well-known Kitáb ‘r-Rijál.

6. Muhammad ibn Ḥasan ibn ‘Ali at-Ṭásí, called Shaykhu’l-Ṭáifa (No. 100), d. 460/1067. He was the third of the older “three Muḥammadahs” (the others being Nos. 1 and 2 supra), and the author of two of the “Four Books,” the Tahdhibu’l- Ḥkám and the Istibsá’r, and of the well-known Ṣift-i-Sháhá and of the well-known Sháhá and of the well-known Fihrist, or Index of Shi’a books.

7. Nasíru’d-Dín-i-Ṭásí, entitled Muḥaqqiq (“the Investigator”), even more celebrated as a philosopher and man of science than as a theologian (No. 90), d. 672/1274. His most famous works are the Akhláq-i-Násírí on Ethics, the Astronomical Tables called Zíj-i-Ilkání, compiled for Húlágú Kháni the Mongol, and the Tajrid on Scholastic Philosophy, a favourite text for the countless host of commentators and writers of notes and glosses.

8. Najmu’d-Dín Ja’fár ibn Yaháyá, known as Muḥaqqiq-i-Awwáli (“the First Investigator”), the author of the Shará-
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y’u’l-Islámi (No. 89), born 638/1240-1, died Muḥarram 726/Dec. 1325. As a youth he showed some poetic talent, which was, however, sternly repressed by his father, who told him that poets were accursed and poetry incompatible with a devout life.

9. Ḥasan ibn Yusuf ibn ‘Ali ibn Mu’tahhar al-Ḥillí, commonly called ‘Allámá-i-Hillí (“the Sage of Hilla”) (No. 83), died in the same month and year as the above-mentioned Muḥaqqiq-i-Awwáli, who was ten years his senior. Of his works 75 are enumerated in the Qisas. ‘Allámá-i-Hillí came of a great family of theologians, which produced in a comparatively short period ten mujtahids. His father was one, and his son, entitled Fakhru’l-Muḥaqqiqín (No. 86), another.

10. Shaykh Shamsu’Dín Muhammad ibn Makki ... al-‘Amílí, called Sháhid-i-Awwáli (“the First Martyr”) (No. 82), was put to death at Damascus about midsummer 786/1384274 by judgement of the two Qádis Burhánu’d-Din the Málikí and Ibn Jamá’a the Khálí.

II. Ṣafáwí and post-Ṣafáwí divines.

11. Nírú’Dín ‘Ali ibn ‘Abdu’l-‘Ali, known as Muḥaqqiq-i-Thaní (“the Second Investigator”) (No. 84), came to Persia from Karak, his native place, and was highly honoured and esteemed by Sháh Ṭahmásp I. He died in 940/1533-4.

12. Ahmad ibn Muḥammad, called Muqaddas-i-Ardabílí “the Saint of Ardabil” (No. 83), was highly honoured by Sháh ‘Abbás the Great. He died in 993/1585.

13. Mir Muhammad Báqír-i-Dámád (No. 77), the grandson of Muḥaqqiq-i-Thaní (No. 11 supra), also stood high in the favour of Sháh ‘Abbás, and died in 1041/1631-2.
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Concerning his book the Širá’u’l-Mustaqím (“the Straight Path”) a Persian poet composed the following epigram:

صراط المستقيم مير داماد مسلمان نشور خاطر مباند

He himself wrote poetry under the takhallus, or pen-name, of Ishráq.

14. Shaykh Muḥammad Bahá’u’Dínal-‘Amílí, commonly called Shaykh-i-Bahá’í (No. 37), was equal in fame, influence and honour with the above-mentioned Mír Dámád, these two being amongst the men of learning who gave most lustre to the court of Sháh ‘Abbás the Great. The literary activities of Shaykh-i-Bahá’í, who was born near Ba’labakk in 953/1546, and died in 1031/1622, were not confined to theology. In that subject his best-known work is the Jámí‘i’-’Abbásiá, a popular Persian manual of Shi’a Law, which he did not live to complete. He also compiled a great collection of anecdotes in Arabic named the Kashkál (“Alms-bowl”), a sequel to his earlier and less-known Mikhláit. He also wrote several treatises on Arithmetic and Astronomy, and composed the Persian mathnawi poem entitled Nán u Halwá (“Bread and Sweetmeats”).

15. Muḥammad ibn Murtádá of Káshán, commonly known as Mulla Muḥsin-i-Faydí (No. 76), though reckoned “a pure Akhbári” and detested by Shaykh Ahmad al-Asá’í the founder of the Shaykhi sect, who used to call him Musí’ (“the Evil-doer”) instead of Muḥsin (“the Well-doer”), was in fact more of a mystic and a philosopher than a theologian. His best-known theological work is probably the ‘Abwábu’l-Janáán (“Gates of Paradise”), composed in 1055/1645. Ten years later he went from Káshán to Shíráz to study philosophy with Mullá Šadrá, whose daughter he married. He was also a poet, and in the

724 This is the date given in the Qisas, but the Lú’í’atu’l-Bahráyn gives 780/1378-9.

725 “May the Musulmán not hear nor the unbeliever see Mír Dámád’s Širá’u’l-Mustaqím.”
Majma‘u’l-Fuṣahá the number of his verses is said to amount to six or seven thousand.

16. Mir Abu’l-Qásim-i-Findariskí, though omitted from the Qiṣṣu’l-Ulamá, was accounted “the most eminent philosopher and Súfí of his time, and stood high in the estimation of Sháh ‘Abbás I, whom he is said, however, to have scandalized by his habit of mixing with the lowest orders and attending cock-fights.” He spent some time in India in the reign of Sháh-Jáhán and died in Isfahán about 1050/1640-1.

17. Múllá Šadrú’l-Dín Muḥammad ibn Ibráhím of Shíráz, commonly called Múllá Šadrá, is unanimously accounted the greatest philosopher of modern times in Persia. That in the Qiṣṣu’l-Ulamá no separate article should be devoted to one whose life was a constant conflict with the “clergy,” and whose clerical disguise was even more transparent than that of his teachers Mír Dámád and Shaykh-i-Báhí, is not surprising, but much incidental mention is made of him in this and other similar works, like the Lú’lú’atu’l-Bahráyn, and his teaching affected theology, notably that of the Shaykhi school, in no small degree. His death is placed by the Rawdátu’l-Jannát about 1070/1660, but by the Lú’lú’atu’l-Bahráyn twenty years earlier.

18. ‘Abdu’r-Razzáq-i-Láhijí, like Múllá Muḥsin-i-Fayd, was a pupil of Múllá Šadrá. His two best-known works, both in Persian, are the Sar-máya-i-Imán (“Substance of Belief”) and the Gawhar-i-Múrād (“Pearl of Desire”).

[to face p. 408]

Autograph of Múllá Šadrá of Shíráz, the Philosopher

Or. 4935 (Brit. Mus.), 1

shared with Shaykh Ṭabarísí, the author of the Majma‘u’l-Bayán, the curious belief in the “essential meaning” of words, by which he meant that there existed a real relation between the sound and meaning of every word, so that having heard the sound of a strange word it was possible by reflection to conjecture the sense.
The last six persons mentioned were all philosophers as well as, or even more than, theologians. The following, except the last, Ḥājjī Mullā Hádí, are all Shi'a divines of the strictest type.

19. Mullā Muhammad Taqi-i-Majlisi (No. 36) is said to have been the first to compile and publish Shi'a traditions, which he received from the Muḥaqiq-i-thānī, in the Ẓafawi period. Allusion has already been made to his alleged Ṣūfī proclivities. He died in 1070/1659-60, a date expressed by the ingenious chronogram 731:

```
امیر شرع اوادت بی سر و با گفت فضل
```

“The crown of the Holy Law fell: scholarship become headless and footless.”

By removing the “crown,” i.e. the initial letter, of گر and the “head” and “foot,” i.e. the initial and final letters of ، we get the three letters گر = 800 + 200 + 70 = 1070.

20. Mullā Muhammad Bāqir-i-Majlisi (No. 33), son of the above, who has been already mentioned repeatedly in this chapter, was even more famous than his father. His great work is the Bihārū'l-Anwār (“Oceans of Light”), an immense compilation of Shi'a traditions; but he composed many other works, of which the following are in Persian: 'Aynu'l-Hayāt (“the Fountain of Life”); Mishkātū'l-Anwār (“the Lamp of Lights”); Ḥilātu'l-Muttaqin (“the Ornament of the Pious”); Ḥayātu'l-Qulāb (“Life of Hearts”),
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not completed; Tuhfatu'z-Zá'īrin ("the Pilgrims' Present"); Jalā'ul-'Uyūn (“the Clearing of the Eyes”)732, etc. He died, as already stated, in 1111/1699-1700.

21. Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdi of Burujird, entitled Bahru'l-'Ulūm (“the Ocean of Learning”) (No. 27), was born in 1155/1742-3, and appears to have died about 1420/1824-5.

22. Sayyid Muhammad Bāqir ibn Sayyid Muḥammad Taqī of Rasht, entitled Ḥujjatu'l-Islām (No. 26), has been already mentioned for his severity in inflicting punishments for infractions of the Sharī'at. He was wealthy as well as influential, and, according to the Rawdātū'l-Jannāt (p. 125), spent 100,000 “legal dīnār” in building a great mosque in the Bidābād quarter of ISHEDH. He was born about 1180/1766-7, went to ‘Īraq to pursue his studies at the age of sixteen or seventeen, returned to ISHEDH in 1216 or 1217 (1801-3), and died on Sunday the 2nd of Rabī‘ i, 1260 (March 23, 1844). According to his namesake, the author of the Rawdātū'l-Jannāt, his death was mourned for a whole year by the people (presumably the devout and orthodox only!), because none after him dared or was able to enforce the rigours of the Ecclesiastical Law to the same extent. By a strange coincidence, the “Manifestation” of Mirzā ‘Ali the Bāb, and the subsequent rise of that heresy which did so much to weaken the power of the orthodox Shi’a faith, took place just two months after his death.

23. Shaykh Ahmad ibn Zaγnu'd-Dīn ibn Ibrāhīm al-Ahsā'ī, the founder of the Shaykhi school or sect, spent most of his life at Yazd, whence he went by way of ISHEDH to Kirmánshāh. There he remained until the death of the
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governor of that city, Prince Muḥammad ‘Ali Mirzā, son of Fath-‘Ali Shāh, who favoured him and invited him to make his abode there. He then retired to the Holy Shriners of ‘Īraq, where he composed most of his numerous works, of which the most famous are the Šarḥu'z-Ziyārātī'l-Kabīrā and the Šarḥu'z-Fawā'id. He vehemently opposed Mullā Šadrā, Mullā Muḥsin-ī-Fayd, and the Šafīf, but was himself denounced as a heretic by Hájjī Mullā Muḥammad Taqī of Qazwīn, whose death at the hands of a Bābī assassin about A.D. 1847 earned him the title of “the Third Martyr” (Shahid-i-Thālīth). Shaykh Aḥmad died in 1243/1827-8, being then nearly ninety years of age 734.

24. Mullā Aḥmad-i-Nirāqī, who died of cholera in 1244/1828-9, was a poet as well as a theologian, and composed a Persian poem entitled Tāqdis in imitation of the Mathnawi of Jalālū'd-Dīn Rūmī. His poetical name was Šafā'i, and an article is consecrated to him in the Majmā'ul-Fuṣahā (vol. ii, p. 330).

25. Hájjī Mullā Hādi of Sabzawār,735, the last great Persian philosopher, also wrote poetry under the nom de guerre of Asrār. He was born in 1212/1797-8 and died in 1295/1878.

CHAPTER IX.

PROSE WRITERS UNTIL A.D. 1850.

---

731 These data are from the Rawdātū'l-Jannāt, pp. 129-31. The notice in the Qisas is very incomplete.
733 The dīnār in modern Persia is of merely nominal value, and 100,000 (= 10 Tūmāns) are only worth £.2 to £.4, but originally the dīnār was a gold coin worth about 10 francs, and this latter is presumably what is here intended.
734 Most of these particulars are taken from the Rawdātū'l-Jannāt, pp. 25-7.
735 For an account of his life furnished by one of his disciples, see my Year amongst the Persians, pp. 131-43.
Oriental writers on the art of rhetoric classify prose writings, according to their form, into three varieties, plain (‘ārī), rhymed (muqaffā), and cadenced (musajja’). We may divide them more simply into natural and artificial. To us, though not always to our ancestors, as witness the Euphuists of Elizabethan days, artificial prose is, as a rule, distasteful; and if we can pardon it in a work like the Arabic Maqāmāt of al-Harī or the Persian Anwār-i-Suhaylī, written merely to please the ear and display the writer’s command of the language, we resent it in a serious work containing information of which we have need. It is a question how far style can be described absolutely as good or bad, for tastes differ not only in different countries but in the same country at different periods, and a writer deemed admirable by one generation is often lightly esteemed by the next, since, as the Arab proverb says, “Men resemble their age more than they do their fathers.” But when a serious historian takes a page to say what could be easily expressed in one or two lines, we have a right to resent the wilful waste of time inflicted upon us by his misdirected ingenuity. Before the Mongol Invasion in the thirteenth century Persian prose was generally simple and direct, and nothing could be more concise and compact than such books as Balkh’s Persian version of Tabari’s great history, the Siyāsat-nāma of the Niẓām-ull-Mulk, the Safar-nāma of Nāṣir-i-Khusraw, the Qābūs-nāma, or the Chahār Maqāla. Mongol, Tartar and Turkish influences seem to have been uniformly bad, favouring as they did flattery and bombast. The historian Waşşāf, whose chronicle was presented to Uljāytū in A.D. 1312, was the first great offender, and unhappily served as a model to many of his successors. In recent times there has been a great improvement, partly due to the tendency, already remarked in the case of verse, to take as models the older writers who possessed a sounder and simpler taste than those of the post-Mongol period, and partly to the recent development of journalism, which, if not necessarily conducive to good style, at least requires a certain concision and directness. In point of style, arrangement, and, above all, documentation the quite recent but little-known “History of the Awakening of the Persians” (Ta’rikh-i-Bidāri-yi-ʿIrānīyān) of the Nāẓim-ull-ʿIrām of Kirmān (1328/1910), unfortunately never completed, is incomparably superior to the more ambitious general histories of Ridā-qi Khān and the Lisānu’l-Mulk (the Supplement to Mirkhwánd’s Rawdatu’l-Sahā and the Nāṣīkhlu’r-Tawārikh) compiled some fifty years earlier.

Of prose works written simply to display the linguistic attainments and rhetorical ingenuities of the authors I do not propose to perpetuate the memory, or to say more than that, when they embody historical and other matter of sufficient value to render them worth translating, they should, in my opinion, if they are to be made tolerable to European readers, be ruthlessly pruned of these flowers of eloquence. As an instance I will take one passage from that very useful and by no means very florid history of the early Šafawi period the Ahsanu’r-Tawārikh (985/1577-8), of which I have made such extensive use in the first part of this volume. It describes the war waged on the blind Shāhrukh Dhu’l-Qadar by Muḥammad Khān Ustājū in the spring of 914/1508-9, and begins thus:

“In the spring, when the Rose-king with pomp and splendour turned his face to attack the tribes of the Basil, and, with thrusts of his thorn-spear, drove in rout from the Rose-garden the hibernal hosts — A roar arose from the cloud-drums, the army of the basils was stirred;
All this could much better be said in one line:

"In the spring Khán Muḥammad Ustájlú encamped in summer quarters at Márdin."

Graceful poetic fancies are all very well in their proper place, but in a serious history they are inappropriate and irritating. The trouble is that, as has been remarked already, nearly all literary Persians, and consequently historians, are poets or poetasters, and they unhappily find it easier and more entertaining to mix poetry with their history than history with their poetry, even their professedly historical poetry. In discussing the later prose literature of Persia I shall therefore confine myself to what has substantial value apart from mere formal elegance, and shall treat of it, according to subject, under the five following headings:

1. Theology.
2. Philosophy.
3. The Sciences — mathematical, natural and occult.
4. History — general, special and local.
5. Biography and autobiography, including travels.

Theology in Persia during the period with which we are dealing, that is from the establishment of the Ṣafawi dynasty to the present day, means Shi‘a theology, and by extension the semi-heterodox doctrines of the Shaykhis and the wholly heterodox doctrines of the Bábis and Bahá‘ís. A large portion of this theological literature — in older times almost all, and even now a considerable amount — is in Arabic, the sacred language of Islám and of the Qur‘án, and much of it in all Muslim countries is almost unreadable, save for a few professional theologians, and, it may be added, quite unprofitable. Some learned man writes a theological, philological, or logical treatise which achieves renown in the Colleges where the ‘ulamá get their mediaeval training. Some one else writes a commentary on that treatise; a third produces a super-commentary on the commentary; a fourth a gloss on the super-commentary; a fifth a note on the gloss; so that at the end we are confronted with what the immortal Turkish wit Khoja Naṣru’d-Din Efendi called “soup of the soup of the soup of the hare-soup,” a substance devoid of savour or nutriment, and serving rather to conceal than to reveal its original material. Shaykh Muḥammad ‘Abduh, late Grand Mufti of Egypt and Chancellor of the University of al-Azhár, than whom, perhaps, no more enlightened thinker and no more enthusiastic lover of the Arabic language and literature has been produced by Islám in modern times, used to say that all this stuff should be burned, since it merely cumbered bookshelves, bred maggots, and obscured sound knowledge. This was the view of a great and learned Muhammadan theologian, so we need not scruple to adopt it; indeed the more we admire and appreciate the abundant good literature of Islám, the more we must deplore, and even resent, the existence of this rubbish. In reading the lives of the ‘Ulamá in such books as the Rawdátu'l-Jannát and the Qīṣaṣu’l-‘Ulamá we constantly find a theologian credited with forty, fifty, or sixty works of this type, which nobody reads now, and which, probably, no one but his pupils ever did read, and they only under compulsion. Even to enumerate these treatises were it possible, would be utterly unprofitable.

The great achievement of the Shi‘a doctors of the later Ṣafawi period, such as the Majlísí, was their popularization of the Shi‘a doctrine and historical Anschauung in the vernacular. They realized that to reach the people they must employ the language of the people, and that in a simple form, and they reaped their reward in the intense and widespread enthusiasm for the Shi‘a cause which they succeeded in creating. We have already seen how few Shi‘a books were available when Sháh Isma‘íl first

---

741 The rainbow is called “Rustam’s bow” (Kamán-i-Rustam) in Persian.
742 Pp. 54-5 supra.
established that doctrine as the national faith of Persia, and, according to the Rawdáţu’-l-Jannáţ,743 Mullá Muḥammad Taqí Majlísí was ‘the first to publish the Shi’a traditions after the appearance of the Şafáwi dynasty.’ His even more eminent son Mullá Muḥammad Báqír compiled on this subject the immense Biḥáţu’-l-Anwár (“Oceans of Light”) in Arabic, and in Persian the following works: ‘Aynuat’-l-Hayát (“the Fountain of Life”), containing exhortations to renunciation of the world; Mishkáţu’-l-Anwár (“the Lamp of Lights”); Hílyátu’-l-Muttaqín (“the Ornament of the Pious”), on example and conduct; Hayátu’-l-Qulúb (“the Life of Hearts”) in three parts, the first on the Prophets before Muḥammad, the second on the Prophet Muḥammad, and the third on the Twelve Imáms, but only part of it was written and it was never completed; Tuhfatu’z-Zá’irín (“the Pilgrims’ Present”); Jala’u’-l-‘Uyín (“the Clearing of the Eyes”); Miqásáşu’-l-Máṣáḥíf, on the daily prayers; Rábi’u’l-Asá’ibí (“the Spring of Weeks”); Zádu’l-Má’ád (“Provision for the Hereafter and numerous smaller treatises. Oddly enough one of the most notable of his Persian theological works, the Haqqatu’-l-Yaqín (“Certain Truth”), which was compiled in 1109/1698, and beautifully printed at Tihrán so early as 1241/1825, is omitted from this list. The late M. A. de Biberstein Kazimirski began to translate this book into French, but abandoned his idea, sent his manuscript translation to me, and urged me to continue and complete the work he had begun;

a task which, unfortunately, I have never had leisure to accomplish, though it would be well worth the doing, since we still possess no comprehensive and authoritative statement of Shi’a doctrine in any European language.

The basic works of the Shi’a faith, namely the Qur’án (the Word of God) and the Traditions (the sayings and deeds of the Prophet and the Imáms), are naturally in Arabic. The numerous Persian religious treatises may be roughly classified in three groups — the doctrinal, the historical, and the legal. In practice doctrine and history are almost inevitably intermixed, especially in the sections dealing with the Imámate, where attempts are made to prove that the Prophet intended ‘Ali to succeed him; that Abú Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthmán were usurpers of his rights; that the Imáms were twelve in number, no more and no less, and that they were the twelve recognized by the “Sect of the Twelve” (Ithná-‘Asharíyya) and none other. Thus while the earlier sections of these doctrinal works dealing with God and His Attributes border on Metaphysics, the later sections are largely composed of historical or quasi-historical matter, while the concluding portions, dealing with Heaven, Hell, the Last Judgement, and the like, are eschatological.

The style of these books is generally very simple and direct, and totally devoid of rhetorical adornment, but commonly affects an imitation of the Arabic idiom and order of words, not only in passages translated from that language, but throughout, as though these theologians had so steeped their minds in the Qur’án and the Traditions that even when using the Persian language the thought must follow Arabic lines. The following example, taken from the beginning of the second volume of the Haqqatu’-l-Yaqín745, will suffice to illustrate this peculiarity:
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Mašád IX: establishing the ‘Return’ (Raj’át).

‘Know that of the number of those things whereon the Shi’a are agreed, nay, which are of the essentials of the true doctrine of that Truth-pursuing body, is the ‘Return.’ That is to say that in the time of His Holiness the Qā’ím746, before the Resurrection, a number of the good who are very good and of the bad who are very bad will return to the world, the good in order that their eyes may be brightened by seeing the triumph of their Imáms, and that some portion of the recompense of their good deeds may accrue to them in this world; and the bad for the

743 Tihrán lithographed ed. of 1306/1888, p. 129.
744 Ibid., p. 119.
745 Tihrán printed ed. of 1241/1825, f. 142b.
746 ‘He who shall arise,’ i.e. the Imám Mahdí or Messiah of the Shi’a.
punishment and torment of the world, and to behold the double of that triumph which they did not wish to accrue to the Imámás, and that the Shi‘a may avenge themselves on them. But all other men will remain in their tombs until they shall be raised up in the general Up­raising; even as it has come down in many traditions that none shall come back in the ‘Return’ save he who is possessed of pure belief or pure unbelief, but as for the remainder of mankind, these will [for the time being] be left to themselves.”

It is true that here the sentence most Arabian in construction may be the literal translation of a tradition not given in the original Arabic, which must evidently run something like this:

لا يرجع في الْرَجْعَةِ آخَرٌ من له مَسْحِ الْإِيْمَانِ أو مَسْحِ الْكَفْرِ·

but the influence of Arabian syntax is constantly apparent.

Another class of Shi‘a theological writings consists of polemical works directed against the Sunnis, the Şüfis, the Shaykhís, the Bábís and Bahá‘ís, and the Christians. The Sunnis are naturally attacked in all manuals of doctrine with varying degrees of violence, for from Nádir Sháh downwards to Abu’l-Hasan Mirzá (“Hájji Shaykhу’-r-Ra‘i’s”), an eager contemporary advocate of Islamic unity747, no one has been able to effect an appeasement between these two great divisions of Islám, and a more tolerant attitude in the younger generation of Persians, so far as it exists, is due rather to a growing indifference to Islám itself than to a religious reconciliation. Attacks on the Şüfis, especially on their Pantheism (Wáhdatu’l-Wujúd), are also often met with in general manuals of Shi‘a doctrine, but several independent denunciations of their doctrines exist, such as Aqá Muḥammad ‘Ali Bihbíháni’s Risála-i-Khayrátíyya748, which led to a violent persecution of the Şüfís and the death of several of their leaders, such as Mír Ma‘súm, Muṣṭaqu ‘Alí and Núr ‘Alí Sháh749; and the Muṭá’á’inu’s-Ṣíḥáyya of Muḥammad Ráfí‘ ibn Muḥammad Sháfí‘ of Tabriz, composed in 1221/1806750. The latter even has recourse to the Gospels to prove his case, quoting Christ’s saying “Beware

of them which come to you in sheep’s clothing (ṣuf, wool), but within they are ravening wolves.”

The Islamo-Christian controversy has also produced a considerable literature in Persian, which has been discussed by Professor Samuel Lee in his Controversial Tracts on Christianity and Mohammedanism (Cambridge, 1824). Several such works were written in the first quarter of the seventeenth century by Sayyid Aḥmad ibn Zaynu’d-Dín al-‘Abídín al-‘Alawi, one in refutation of Xavier’s Ä‘ina-i-Haqq-numá ("Truth-revealing Mirror"), and another directed against the Jews. Later the proselytizing activities of Henry Martyn the missionary called forth replies from Mírzá Íbráhim and others751.

The Shaykhí sect or school derived its origin and its name from Shaykh Aḥmad ibn Zaynu’d-Dín al-‘Aḥsá‘í, a native not of Persia but of Bahráyn, who died, according to the Rawdátu-l-Jannár752, at the advanced age of ninety in 1243/1827-8, and was succeeded by Sayyid Káhím of Rašt, who numbered amongst his disciples both Sayyid ‘Alí Muḥammad the Báb, the originator of the Bábí sect, and many of those who subsequently became his leading disciples, and Hájji Muḥammad Karím Kháñ of Kirmán, who continued and developed the Shaykhí doctrine. This doctrine, essentially a rather extreme form of the Shi‘a faith, was accounted heterodox by several eminent mujtahids, such as Hájji Mullá Muḥammad Taqi of Qazwín, the uncle and father-in-law of the celebrated Bábí heroine Qurratu’l-‘Ayn, whose hostility to the Shaykhís and Bábís ultimately cost him his life, but earned for him from the orthodox Shi‘a the title of the “Third Martyr” (Shahíd-i-Thálíth)753. Some account of the

Shaykhís and their doctrines, sufficient for the ordinary student of Persian thought, is given in Note E (pp. 234-44) at the end of the second volume of my Traveller’s Narrative754. Shaykh Aḥmad was the author of numerous works, all, I think, in Arabic, of which the titles are given in the Rawdátu-l-Jannár (p. 25), which asserts amongst other things that he held the Şüfís in great detestation, notwithstanding his own unorthodox views on the Resurrection. Naturally the pantheistic and latitudinarian opinions of these mystics are distasteful to dogmatic theologians of every kind, whether orthodox Shi‘a or Sunni, Shaykhí, Bábí and Bahá‘í, or Christian. Henry Martyn evidently felt that he had far more in common with the ordinary

747 His pamphlet on the “Union of Islám” (Itíhádú’l-Islám) was lithographed at Bombay in 1312/1894-5.
748 Composed in 1211/1796-7. See the full and interesting account of the work in Rieu’s Persian Catalogue, pp. 33-4.
749 For a full account of these events, see Malcolm’s History of Persia, ed. 1815, vol. ii, pp. 417-22.
750 Of this I possess a good Ms. dated 22 Jumádá ii, 1222 (27 Aug. 1807).
752 Pp. 25-6, of the Tíhrán lithographed edition of 1306/1888.
753 See vol. ii of my Traveller’s Narrative, pp. 197-8 and 310-12.
754 See also A.-L.-M. Nicolas, Essai sur le Cheikhisme (Paris, 1910), pp. 72. A list of Shaykh Aḥmad’s writings is given.
fanatical mullá of Shiráz than with the elusive and eclectic Şûfî. The later Shaykhis and Bábís, though both derive from a common source, hold one another in the utmost detestation; and at least one of the doctors of theology who examined and condemned the Báb at Tabriz towards the end of the year A.D. 1847, Mullá Muḥammad Mámaqání, belonged to the Shaykhi school.\(^{755}\)

The Bábí-Bahá’í movement, of which the effects have now extended far beyond the Persian frontiers even to America, has naturally given rise to a far more extensive literature, which forms a study in itself, and which I have discussed elsewhere.\(^{756}\) Of the Báb’s own writings the Persian Bayán and the Dalá’íl-i-sab’á (“Seven Proofs”) are the most important of those composed in Persian.\(^{757}\) Bahá’u’lláh’s Íqán (“Assurance”)
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is the earliest reasoned apology, and was written before he advanced his claim to be “He whom God shall manifest.” His later “Tablets” (Alwáh), many of which are in Persian, are innumerable; amongst them the “Epistles to the Kings” (Alwáh-i-Salátín) are the most interesting and important. There is also an abundant Azáli literature, and each dichotomous schism has given rise to a fresh crop of controversial pamphlets. Of systematic refutations of the Bábí and Bahá’í doctrines in Persian the most elaborate are the Ihqáq u’l-Haqq (“Verification of the Truth”) of Áqá Muḥammad Taqi of Hamadán,\(^{758}\) composed about 1326/1908; and the Minháj u’l-Talibín\(^{759}\) of Hájjí Husayn-qulí, an Armenian convert to Islám, lithographed at Bombay in 1320/1902. The Bábís and Bahá’ís have developed a somewhat distinctive style of their own in Persian which possesses considerable merits. Some of Bahá’u’lláh’s “Tablets” (Alwáh) addressed to Zoroastrian enquirers are even written in pure Persian without admixture of Arabic. Their most important works, like the Kitáb-i-Aqdas (“Most Holy Book”), are, however, written in Arabic. From the point of view of style, both in Persian and Arabic, an immense improvement was effected by Bahá’u’lláh, for the style of Mírzá ‘Ali Muḥammad the Báb was, as Gobineau says, “terne, raide, et sans éclat,” “dull, stiff, and devoid of brilliance.”

2. Philosophy.

Philosophy (Hikmat, Filsafa) is defined by the Muslims as “a knowledge of the true essence of things, as they really are, so far as is possible to human capacity.” It is divided into two branches, the theoretical (nazari), and the practical (’amalí). The former comprises Mathematics (Riyádiyyát), Natural Science (’Ilmu’-r-Tabí’at), and Metaphysics (Má wará’ ba’l or fawq [page 424]
at-Tabí’at); the latter Ethics (Tahdhibu’l-Akhláq), Economics (Tadbiru’l-Manzil), and Politics (Siyyasatu’l-Mudun). The three best-known Persian treatises on Practical Philosophy, namely the Akhláq-i-Náširi, Akhláq-i-Jaláli, and Akhláq-i-Muḥsini\(^{760}\) all belong to the period preceding that which we are now discussing, and I do not recollect any important Persian work on the subject which has appeared since. We may therefore confine our attention here to the first, or theoretical, branch of Philosophy, and in this section to Metaphysics, which on the one hand borders on Theology, and on the other on Science. It is generally admitted that a very close connection existed between the Shi’a and the Mu’tazíla\(^{761}\) in early ‘Abbásid times, and it is well known that the latter were the most enlightened and philosophic of the theological schools of Islám, and that in particular they were the champions of Free Will against the rigid Determinism which subsequently triumphed, to the great detriment of the intellectual development of the Muhammadan world. Those sections of Shi’ite theological works which treat of the Nature and Attributes of God are, therefore, of a more philosophical character than is commonly the case in Sunni books of a similar type.

Muslim Philosophy, like Muslim Science, admittedly and avowedly owes almost everything to the Greeks. Its development from the middle of the eighth century of the Christian era, when under the early ‘Abbásid Caliphs the work of translating into Arabic the works of the most eminent and celebrated Greek thinkers began, down to the deadly blow inflicted on Islamic civilization by the Mongol Invasion and the destruction of
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Baghdád and the ‘Abbásid Caliphate in the middle of the thirteenth century, has been repeatedly traced by European scholars. For a broad general view, characterizing the chief exponents of the different schools of Islamic thought, Dr T J de Boer’s

\(^{755}\) See Traveller’s Narrative, vol. ii, p. 278.
\(^{757}\) French translations of both have been published by the learned and impartial A.-L.-M. Nicolas.
\(^{758}\) Materials, pp. 189-90.
\(^{759}\) Ibid, pp. 196-7.
\(^{760}\) See my Persian Literature under Tartar Dominion, pp. 442-4.
\(^{761}\) See de Boer’s Hist. of Philosophy in Islam, translated by E. R. Jones (London, 1903), pp. 33, 43, 72 and 84; and Goldziher’s Vorlesungen über der Islam (Heidelberg, 1910), pp. 234 et seqq.
be done, and few scholars are competent to undertake it. As regards Philosophy in Persia during the last three or four centuries, all one can say is that half a dozen thinkers have established a great reputation amongst their countrymen, but how far this reputation is deserved is a question which has not yet received a satisfactory answer. These thinkers are, in chronological order, as follows: (1) Shaykh Bahá’u’l-Din al-‘Amíli (d. 1031/1622); (2) Mír Dámád (d. 1041/1631-2); (3) Mullá Şadrá (d. 1050/1640-1); (4) Mullá Muḥsin-i-Fayd (d. after 1091/1680); (5) Mullá ‘Abdu’r-Razzáq al-Láhijí; and, in quite modern times, (6) Hájjí Mullá Hádi of Sabzawár (d. 1295/1878).

Now Muslim philosophers are of two sorts, those whose philosophy is conditioned by and subordinated to revealed Religion, and those whose speculations are not so limited. The former are the Mutakallimún or Ahl-i-Kalám, the Schoolmen or Dialecticians, the latter the Hukmá (pl. of Ḥakím) or Faláṣífa (pl. of Fayláṣíf), the Philosophers proper. Of the six persons mentioned above, Mullá Şadrá certainly and Hájjí Mullá Hádi possibly belong to the second class, but the four others to the first. These four, however, if less important from the point of view of Philosophy, were in other ways notable men of letters. Biographies of all of them except Mullá Hádi, who is too modern, are given in the Rawdátu’l-Jannát, or the Qiṣaṣu’l-‘Ulámá, from which, unless otherwise stated, the following particulars are taken.

The first five were more or less contemporary, and are, to a certain extent, interrelated. Shaykh Bahá’u’l-Din and Mír Dámád both enjoyed considerable influence and stood in high favour at the court of Sháh ‘Abbás the Great, yet there was no jealousy between them, if we may believe the pleasing anecdote about them and the Sháh related by Sir...
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John Malcolm, Mullá Şadrá was the pupil of both of them, while Mullá Muḥsin-i-Fayd and Mullá ‘Abdu’r-Razzáq al-Láhijí were both his pupils and his sons-in-law.

1. Shaykh Bahá’u’l-Din al-‘Amíli.

Shaykh Bahá’u’l-Din Muḥammad ibn Ḥusayn ibn ‘Abdu’ṣ-Ṣamad al-Haráthí al-‘Ámíli al-Hamdání al-Jab’í was one of the numerous Shi’a doctors who came to Persia from Jabal ‘Amíl in Syria, whence he derived the nisba by which he is commonly known, though by the Persians he is most often spoken of as “Shaykh-i-Bahá’í.” His father Shaykh Ḥusayn, a disciple of Shaykh Zaynu’d-Dín “the Second Martyr” (Shahid-i-Tháni), came to Persia after his master had been put to death by the Turks for his Shi’ite proclivities, bringing with him the young Bahá’u’l-Din, who applied himself diligently to the study of Theology in all its branches, Mathematics and Medicine. His teachers included, besides his father, Mullá ‘Abdu’l-Láh of Yazd, a pupil of Jalálu’d-Dín-i-Dawání, the author of the Akhláq-i-Jalálí, who was in turn a pupil of the celebrated Shaykh-i-Shirafí-Jurjání. In Mathematics he studied with Mullá ‘Ali Mudhahhib (“the Gildcr”) and Mullá Afiḍal of Qá’in, while in Medicine he was the pupil of ‘Ali’u’d-Din Maḥmúd. In due course he attained great celebrity as a theologian and jurist, and became Şadr or Shaykhu’l-Islám of Isfahán. After a while he was possessed with the desire to make the pilgrimage to Mecca, and on his homeward journey visited, in the guise of a darwish, Mesopotamia, Egypt, the Hijáž.
and Palestine, and made the acquaintance of many learned men and eminent doctors and mystics.

Shaykh-i-Bahá’í was born at Ba’labakk in Syria on Muḥarram 17, 953 (March 20, 1546), and died on Shawwal 12, 1031 (August 20, 1622). His principal works are the Jámí’-i-‘Abbásí, containing legal decisions (fatáwá); the Zubda; the Miftáhu’l-Faláh; the Tashríhu’l-Aflák (“Anatomy of the Heavens”); the Khulāsatu’l-Ḥisáb on Arithmetic; the Khashkūl (“Beggars’ Bowl”), a large miscellany of stories and verses, the latter partly in Persian; a similar work called the Mikhlát; also a Persian mathnawí poem entitled Nán u Ḥalwá (“Bread and Sweetmeats”) describing his adventures during the pilgrimage to Mecca, and another entitled Shír u Shakar (“Milk and Sugar”). Extracts from these poems, as well as from his ghazals, are given in the Majma’u’l-Fuṣḥá (vol. ii, pp. 8-10).


Mír Muḥammad Báqír of Astarábád, with the pen-name of Ishráq, commonly known as Dámad (“son-in-law”), a title properly belonging to his father Sayyid Muḥammad, whose wife was the daughter of the celebrated theologian Shaykh ‘Ali ibn ‘Abdu’l-‘Ali, pursued his earlier studies at Mashhad, but spent the greater part of his life at Isfahán, where, as we have seen, he stood in high favour with Sháh ‘Abbás the Great, and where he was still living when the author of the Ta’rikh-i-‘Ālam-ārā-yi-‘Abbásí wrote in 1025/1616. He died in 1041/1631-2. Most of his writings were in Arabic, but he wrote poetry in Persian under the takhallús of Ishráq. He seems to have had a taste for Natural History as well as Philosophy, for, according to the Qisasu’l-‘Ulamá, he made an observation hive of glass in

order to study the habits of bees. It is stated in the same work that after his death his pupil and son-in-law Mullá Ṣadrá saw him in a dream and said, “My views do not differ from yours, yet I am denounced as an infidel and you are not. Why is this?” “Because,” replied Mír Dámad’s spirit, “I have written on Philosophy in such wise that the theologians are unable to understand my meaning, but only the philosophers; while you write about philosophical questions in such a manner that every dominie and hedge-priest who sees your books understands what you mean and dubs you an unbeliever.”

3. Mullá Ṣadrá of Shíráz.

These Persian verses are omitted in the Cairo ed. of 1305/1887-8, but are contained in the Ţhrán lithographed ed. of 1321/1903-4.
that Mullá Ṣadrá is therefore probably right when he says\textsuperscript{769} that “the Philosphy of Ṣadrá is the source of the metaphysics of early Bábísm,” and that\textsuperscript{770} “the origin of the philosophy of this wonderful sect must be sought in the Shí‘a sect of the Shaykhis, the founder of which, Shaykh Aḥmad, was an enthusiastic student of Mullá Ṣadrá’s philosophy, on which he had written several commentaries.”

The two most celebrated of Mullá Ṣadrá’s works, all of which, so far as I know, are in Arabic, are the Asfār-i-Arba‘a, or “Four Books”\textsuperscript{771}, and the Shawāhidu r-Rubūbiyya, or “Evidences of Divinity.” Both have been lithographed at Tihrán, the first in two folio volumes in 1282/1865, the second, accompanied by the commentary of Hājí Mullá Hādí of Sabzawár, without indication of date or place of publication. Amongst his other works which I have not seen the Rawdātul-Jannāt (p. 331) enumerates a Commentary on the Uṣūlul-Kāfī, the Kitābul-Hidāya, notes on the metaphysical portion of Avicenna’s Shifā, a Commentary on the Ḥikmatul-Ishrāq (presumably that of the celebrated and unfortunate Shaykh Shihābū’d-Din-Suhrawardi, known, on account of his execution for heresy, as al-Maqtūl), the Kitābūl-Wāridāti’l-Qalbiyya, the Kasru Aṣnāmi’l-Jāhiliyya, or “Breaking of the Idols of Ignorance,” several commentaries on various portions of the (Qur‘ān, etc.

Of Mullá Ṣadrá’s philosophical doctrines, in spite of their

high reputation in Persia, I know of only two brief and necessarily superficial accounts in any European language. The Comte de Gobineau devotes several pages\textsuperscript{772} to them, but his information was probably entirely derived orally from his Persian teachers, who were very likely but ill-informed on this matter, since he concludes his notice with the words “la vraie doctrine de Moulla-Sadrá, c’est-à-dire d’Avicenne,” while the Rawdātul-Jannāt\textsuperscript{773} explicitly states that he was an Ishrāqi ("Illuminatus" or Platonist) and strongly condemned the Aristotelians or Peripatetics (Maskhā’ūn), of whom Avicenna was the great representative.

The other shorter but more serious account of Mullá Ṣadrá’s doctrine is given by Shaykh Muḥammad Ḥaqqī, formerly a pupil of Dr McTaggart at this University of Cambridge, and now himself a notable and original thinker in India, in his excellent little book entitled Development of Metaphysics in Persia: a contribution to the History of Muslim Philosophy\textsuperscript{774}, p. 175, but he devotes much more space (pp. 175-95) to the modern Hājí Mullá Hādí of Sabzawár, whom he regards as Mullá Ṣadrá’s spiritual successor, and who, unlike his master, condescended, as we shall presently see, to expound his ideas in Persian instead of in Arabic. It may be added

that Mullá Ṣadrá speaks with great respect of that eminent Maghrībi Shaykh Muḥyī’d-Din ibnul’-Arabi, whose influence, non-Persian though he was, was probably greater than that of any other thinker on the development of the extremer forms of Persian philosophical-mystical speculation.

\textsuperscript{769} Development of Metaphysics in Persia (Luzac, London, 1908), p. 175.

\textsuperscript{770} Ibíd., p. 187.

\textsuperscript{771} Gobineau has misunderstood Asfār (which is the plural of Sīf, “a book,” not of Safār; “a journey”) when he writes (Rel. el Philos., 1866, p. 81), “Il a écrit de plus quatre livres de voyages.” In the same way he mistranslates the title of one of the Báb’s earlier works, the Ziyārat-nāma (“Book of Visitation”) as “un journal de son pèlerinage.”

\textsuperscript{772} Les Religions et les Philosophies, etc. (1866), pp. 80-92.

\textsuperscript{773} P. 331. The passage runs in the original:

\textsuperscript{774} London, Luzac and Co., 1908. Muḥammad Ḥaqqī has set forth his own doctrines (which, as I understand them, are in the main an Oriental adaptation of Nietzsche’s philosophy) in a short Persian mathnawi poem entitled Asrār-i-Khudi, lithographed at the University Press, Lahore, and translated into English with an introduction and Notes by my friend and colleague Dr R. A. Nicholson (The Secrets of the Self, London, Macmillan & Co., 1920).

Muḥammad ibn Murtadá of Kāshān, commonly called Muḥsin with the poetical pen-name of Fayḍ, was a native of Kāshān, and, as already said, the favourite pupil and son-in-law of Mullá Ṣadrá. In the Rawḍátu’l-Jannát (pp. 542-9) and the Qisasu’l-Ulamá much fuller notices of him are given than of his master, and, since he was not only a theologian and a philosopher but likewise a poet of some note, he is also mentioned in the Riyáḍu’l-‘Arifin (pp. 225-6) and the Majma’u’l-Fiṣahá (ii, 25-6). His literary activity was enormous: according to the Qisasu’l-Ulamá he wrote nearly two hundred books and treatises, and was surpassed in productivity by hardly any of his contemporaries or predecessors except Mullá Muḥammad Bāqir-i-Majlisí. Sixty-nine of these works, of which the last, entitled Sharḥu’s-Ṣadrí775, is autobiographical, are enumerated in the Qisas, but fuller details of them are given in the Rawḍát (pp. 545-6), where the dates of composition (which range between 1029/1620 and 1090/1680) are in most cases recorded. His age at this latter date, which is also notified as the year of his death, is stated as eighty-four776, so that he must have been born about 1006/1597-8. Of one of his works, the Mafáthu’sh-Sharáyi’, I possess

Autograph of Mullá Muḥsin-i-Fayḍ

Or. 4937 (Brit. Mus.), p. 84

what appears to be an autograph copy, made in 1042/1632-3, now bearing the class-mark C. 18.

When Mullá Muḥsin wished to leave his home in Kāshān and go to Shíráz to study under the celebrated theologian Sayyid Májid of Bahrayn, his father opposed this project, and it was finally agreed to take an augury (tafa’u’d) from the Qur’án, and from the poems ascribed to the first Imam ‘Ali ibn Abi Ṭālib. The former yielded the verse (ix, 123) “If a part of every band of them go not forth, it is that they may diligently instruct themselves in Religion”; the latter the following lines rendered particularly apposite by the words suḥbatu Májaḍi, “the society of some noble one,” which might in this case be taken as referring particularly to the above-mentioned Sayyid Májid:

775 It was written in 1065/1654-5. See Rawḍátu’l-Jannát, p. 546. It is wrongly entitled Sharḥ-i-Ṣuwar in the Indian lithograph of the Qisas.
776 Rawḍátu’l-Jannát, pp. 542 and 549.
“Go abroad from the home-lands in search of eminence, and travel, for in travel are five advantages: The dissipation of anxiety, the acquisition of a livelihood, knowledge, culture, and the society of some noble one (majíd). And if it be said, ‘In travels are humiliation and trouble, the traversing of deserts and the encountering of hardships,’ Yet the death of a brave man is better for him than his continuance in the mansion of abasement, between humiliation and an envious rival.”

After these clear indications, Mullá Muḥsín’s father no longer opposed his desire to go to Shiráz, where he pursued his studies not only with the aforesaid Sayyid Mājid, but also with Mullá Ṣadrá. It is difficult to accept the statement of the Qisāṣ that this took place in 1065/1654-5, for this would make him nearly sixty years of age before he began his serious studies with Mullá Ṣadrá or married his daughter.

Mullá Muḥsín is described in the Qisāṣ as a “pure Akhbārī” (Akhbārī-ye-Ṣīrf), a Šūfī, and an admirer of Shaykh Muḥy’ī’d-Dīn ibn’l-ʿArabī. Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsá’ī, who, as we have seen, wrote commentaries on two of the books of his master Mullá Ṣadrá, detested him, and used to call him Musī’ (“the ill-doer”) instead of Muḥsín (“the well-doer”), and to speak of the great Shaykh as Mūmitu’d-Dīn (“the Slayer of Religion”) instead of Muḥy’ī’d-Dīn (“the Quickener of Religion”). According to an absurd story in the Qisāṣ, Mullá Muḥsín was chosen by Sháh ʿAbbás to confute a Christian missionary sent by the “King of the Franks” to convert the Persians. The sign offered by this missionary was that he would specify any article held in the closed hand of his opponent. Mullá Muḥsín chose a rosary (tasbīḥ) made of clay taken from the tomb of the Imám Ḥusayn. The Christian hesitated to speak, but, when pressed, said, “It is not that I cannot say, but, according to the rule I observe, I see that in thy hand is a portion of the earth of Paradise, and I am wondering how this can have come into thy possession.” “Thou speakest truly,” replied Mullá Muḥsín, and then informed him what he held, and bade him abandon his own faith and accept Islam, which,

according to the narrator, he was constrained to do. Though extremely pious in most respects, Mullá Muḥsín scandalized the orthodox by his approval and sanction of singing. His best-known Persian compilation is probably the Abwāb’l-Janān (“Gates of Paradise”) composed in 1055/1645, on prayer and its necessity, but few of his numerous writings have been published or are now read and at the present day, at any rate, his name is more familiar than his works.

5. Mullá ʿAbdu’r-Razzāq-i-Lāhijī.

The subject of this notice resembled Mullá Muḥsín in being a pupil and son-in-law of Mullá Ṣadrá and a poet, who wrote under the pen-name of Fayyād, but his writings, though much fewer in number, are more read at the present day. The best known are, perhaps, the philosophical treatise in Persian entitled Gawhār-i-Murād (“the Pearl of Desire”), and the Sar-māyā-i-Imān (“Substance of Faith”), also in Persian, both of which have been lithographed. The notices of him in the Rawdātu’l-Jannāt (pp. 352-3) and the Qīṣāṣu’l-Ulmā are short and unsatisfactory. The latter grudgingly admits that his writings were fairly orthodox, but evidently doubts how far they express his real convictions and how far they were designed from prudential motives to disguise them, thus bearing out to some extent the opinion expressed by Gobineau.

777 Pp. 429-30 supra.
778 This is called khaby, and thought-reading damir. See my translation of the Chahār Maqāla, p. 64 and n. 2 ad calc., and pp. 130-1.
779 Not to be confounded with a later homonymous work on Ethics.
I have been obliged to omit any further notice than that already given\textsuperscript{781} of the somewhat elusive figure of Mir Abü’l-Qāsim-i-Finderiski, mentioned by Gobineau\textsuperscript{782} as one of the three teachers of Mullá Şadrá, because, apart from the brief notices of him
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contained in the \textit{Riyádú’l-‘Áriffin}\textsuperscript{783} and the \textit{Majma’u’l-Fusáhá}, in both of which the same poem is cited, and the passing reference in the \textit{Dabistán}\textsuperscript{784} to his association with the disciples of Kaywán and adoption of sun-worship, I have been unable to discover any particulars about his life or doctrines. He appears to have been more of a \textit{qalandar} than a philosopher, and probably felt ill at ease in the atmosphere of Shi’á orthodoxy which prevailed at Isfahán, and hence felt impelled to undertake the journey to India. He must, however, have subsequently returned to Persia if the statement in the \textit{Riyádú’l-‘Áriffin} that his tomb is well known in Isfahán be correct.

Gobineau (\textit{op. laud.}, pp. 91-110) enumerates a number of philosophers who succeeded Mullá Şadrá down to the time of his own sojourn in Persia, but most of them have little importance or originality, and we need only mention one more, who was still living when Gobineau wrote, and whom he describes as “personnage absolument incomparable.”

6. Hájjí Mullá Hádí of Sabzawár.

It is not, however, necessary to say much about this celebrated modern thinker, since his philosophical ideas are somewhat fully discussed by Shaykh Muḥammad Ḥábál at the end of his \textit{Development of Metaphysics in Persia}\textsuperscript{785}, while I obtained from one of his pupils with whom I studied in Ṭihrán during the winter of 1887-8 an authentic account of his life, of which I published an English translation in my \textit{Year amongst the Persians}\textsuperscript{786}. According to this account, partly derived from one of his sons, Hájjí Mullá Hádí the son of Hájjí Mahdí was born in 1212/1797-8, studied first in his native town of Sabzawár, then at Mashhad, then at Isfahán
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with Mullá ‘Ali Núrí. Having made the pilgrimage to Mecca, he visited Kirmán, where he married a wife, and then returned to Sabzawár, where the remainder of his life was chiefly spent until his death in 1295/1878. His best-known works, written in Persian, are the \textit{Asrárū’l-Ḥikam} (“Secrets of Philosophy”) and a commentary on difficult words and passages in the \textit{Mathnawí}; in Arabic he has a versified treatise (\textit{Manzúma}) on Logic; another on Philosophy; commentaries on the Morning Prayer and the \textit{Jawshan-i-Kabir}; and numerous notes on the \textit{Shawáhidu’r-Rubúbiyya} and other works of Mullá Şadrá. He also wrote poetry under the pen-name of Asrár, and a notice of him is given in the \textit{Riyádú’l-‘Áriffin} (pp. 241-2), where he is spoken of as still living and in the sixty-third year of his age in 1278/1861-2, the date of composition. Most of his works have been published in Persia in lithographed editions.

3. The Sciences — Mathematical, Natural and Occult.

As stated above\textsuperscript{787}, Mathematics (\textit{Riyyádiyyá}) “the Disciplinary” and \textit{Taḥbí hostility} the Natural Sciences, in conjunction with Metaphysics (\textit{Má wará or Má ba’da’i-Ṭabí’át}), constitute the subject-matter of the theoretical or speculative branch of Philosophy, of which, therefore, they form a part. It is probable that to this manner of regarding them is partly due the unfortunate tendency noticeable in most Muslim thinkers to take an \textit{a priori} view of all natural phenomena instead of submitting them to direct critical observation. The so-called “Arabian,” \textit{i.e.} Islamic, Science was in the main inherited from the Greeks; its Golden Age was the first century of the ‘Abbásid Caliphate (A.D. 750- 
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850), when so much trouble and expense was incurred by the Caliphs, especially al-Manṣúr, Hárúnu’r-Rashid and al-Ma’mún, to procure good and faithful Arabic translations of the great Greek philosophers, naturalists and physicians; and the great service it rendered to mankind was to carry on the Greek tradition of learning through the Dark Ages of Europe down to the Renaissance.

\textsuperscript{781} See pp. 257-8 and 408 \textit{supra}.  
\textsuperscript{782} \textit{Op. laud.}, p. 82.  
\textsuperscript{783} Pp. 165-6.  
\textsuperscript{784} Shea and Troyer’s translation (London, 1843), vol. i, pp. 140-1.  
\textsuperscript{785} Pp. 175-95.  
\textsuperscript{786} Pp. 131-4.  
\textsuperscript{787} Pp. 423-4 \textit{supra}. 
So much is generally admitted, but there remains the more difficult and still unsolved question whether the Arabs were mere transmitters of Greek learning, or whether they modified or added to it, and, in this case, whether these modifications or additions were or were not improvements on the original. This question I have endeavoured to answer in the case of medical science in my Arabian Medicine, but I was greatly hampered by insufficient acquaintance with the original Greek sources. For such investigation, whether in the Medicine, Mathematics, Physics, Astronomy or Chemistry of the Muslims, three qualifications not often combined are required in the investigator, o wit, knowledge of the science or art in question, knowledge of Arabic (and, for later writers, of Persian and even Turkish), and knowledge of Greek. In the case of the “Arabian” (i.e. Muslim) physicians the conclusion at which I arrived (already reached by Dr Max Neuburger in his monumental Geschichte der Medizin was that Rhazes (Abu Bakr Muḥammad ibn Zakariyyā ar-Rāzī, i.e. a native of Ray in Persia) was, as a physician, far superior to the more celebrated and popular Avicenna (Ibn Sinā), and was, indeed, probably the greatest clinical observer who ever lived amongst the Muslims. The notes of actual cases which came under his observation, as recorded in parts of his great “Continens”
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(al-Ḥāwī), have an actual and not merely a historical or literary value; and even from his methods of treatment it is possible that here and there a hint might be obtained. Avicenna was more logical, more systematic, and more philosophical, but he lacked the Hippocratic insight possessed by his great predecessor.

In my Arabian Medicine I sketched the history of the art amongst the Muslims from its beginnings in the eighth century of our era down to the twelfth, but made no attempt to follow it down to the period which we are now considering. The Mongol Invasion of the thirteenth century, as I have repeatedly and emphatically stated, dealt a death-blow to Muslim learning from which it has not yet recovered. Medical and other quasi-scientific books continued, of course, to be written, but it is doubtful if they ever approached the level attained under the early ‘Abbāsid Caliphs and maintained until the eleventh, and, to some extent, until the thirteenth century of our era. That they added anything which was both new and true is in the highest degree improbable, though I cannot claim to have carefully investigated the matter. A long list of these books is given by Dr Adolf Fonahn in his most useful work entitled Zur Quellenkunde der Persischen Medizin which has pointed the way for future investigators. Of these later works the most celebrated is probably the Tuhfatu’-Mū’minīn, compiled for Sháh Sulaymán the Šafawī by Muḥammad Mú’mín-i-Ḥusaynî in A.D. 1669. It deals chiefly with Materia Medica, and there are numerous editions and manuscripts, besides translations into Turkish and Arabic.

What has been said about Medicine holds good also of Zoology, Botany, Chemistry, etc., and in a lesser degree of Mathematics, Astronomy and Mineralogy. Fine work
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has been done in some of these subjects by experts who also possessed an adequate knowledge of Arabic. I will only instance Woepcke in Algebra, Wiedemann in Mechanics, Hirschberg in Ophthalmology, and, amongst younger men, Holmyard in Chemistry. All these, I think, have come to the conclusion that the standard attained by the best Muslim investigators surpassed rather than fell short of what is generally supposed. Yet it is often difficult to assure oneself that direct observation, which is the foundation of true science, has played its proper part in ascertaining the phenomena recorded. Dr Badhlu’r-Rahmán, now Professor of Arabic in the Oriental College at Lahore, when he was a Research Student in this University, took as the subject of his studies the works of al-Jāḥiz, who, on the strength of his great book on animals, the Kitábu’l-Ḥayawān, is often regarded as one of the leading naturalists of the Arabs. At my request this able and industrious young scholar devoted especial attention to the question whether the writings of this author afforded any proof that he had himself observed the habits of any of the animals about which he wrote. A passage was ultimately found which seemed conclusive. In speaking of instinct al-Jāḥiz says that when the ant stores corn for food it multiplies each grain in such a way as to prevent it from germinating. After numerous fruitless enquiries as to the truth of this statement, I finally ascertained from Mr Horace Donisthorpe, one of the chief British authorities on ants, that it was correct, and I began to hope that here at last was proof that this old Muslim scholar had himself observed
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a fact of Natural History apparently unknown to many modern Zoologists. Unhappily I subsequently discovered the same statement in Pliny, and I am afraid it is much more likely that it reached al-Jāḥiz by tradition rather than by direct observation.

790 Leipzig, 1910, pp. v + 152.
791 See Fonahn, op. laud., pp. 89-91. See also B.M.P.C., pp. 476-7.
792 E.g. by Fr. Wüstenfeld in his Geschichte der Arabischen Ärzte und Naturforscher (Göttingen, 1840), pp. 2 5-6 (No. 65). Carl Brockelmann’s view is correct (Gesch. d. Arab. Lit., i, p. 152), but his criticism of Dr L. Leclerc’s remarks on the subject (Hist. de la Médecine Arabe, i, p. 314) hardly appears justified.
In each of the “Arabian” sciences the same question arises and demands an answer which only one thoroughly versed in the scientific literature of the ancients can give. Does Ibnul-Baytār’s great Arabic work on medicinal plants, for example, contain any information not to be found in Dioscorides? Be the answer what it may, it is doubtful whether the later Muslim writers on these various sciences ever surpassed, or even equalled, their predecessors. In quite recent times, especially since the foundation of the Dāru’l-Funūn, or Polytechnic College, at Tihrān early in the reign of Nāṣiru’d-Dīn Shāh, numerous Persian translations or adaptations of European scientific works have been made, but these are entirely exotic, and can hardly claim to be noticed in a work on Persian Literature. A number of them are mentioned in my Press and Poetry of Modern Persia, pp. 154-66, under the heading “Modernising Influences in the Persian Press other than Magazines and Journals.” But of those Persians who since the middle of the nineteenth century have successfully graduated in the European schools of science, I know of none who has hitherto made a reputation for original research.

In conclusion a few words must be said about the Occult Sciences, excluding Astrology and Alchemy, which are in the East hardly to be separated from Astronomy and Chemistry. Alchemy is called in Arabic and Persian Kīmīyā, and the names of four other Occult Sciences, dealing with Talismans, Necromancy, and the like, are formed on the same model, Līmīyā, Hīmīyā, Sīmīyā, and Rīmīyā, the initial letters being derived from the words Kulluhu Sirr (“All of it is a Mystery.” The book entitled Asrār-i-Qāsimī (“Secrets of Qāsim”)793 in Persian, and the Shamsu’l-Ma’ārif (“Sun of Knowledges”)794 of the celebrated Shaykh al-Būnī in Arabic, may be regarded as typical of this class of literature, but to the uninitiated they make but arid and unprofitable reading. Ibn Khaldūn is the only Muslim writer I know of who has sought to discover a philosophical and rational basis for these so-called sciences, and his ideas have been collated with the theories of modern Psychical Research in a most masterly manner by Professor Duncan Black Macdonald in his interesting and suggestive book entitled The Religious Attitude and Life in Islam795. I have always kept an open mind as to the reality of the powers claimed by Occultists, and, when opportunity offered, have always gone out of my way to investigate such manifestations. Disappointment has invariably been my portion, save in two cases: a “magician” whom I met in Kīrmān in the summer of 1888, who, amidst much vain boasting, did accomplish one feat which baffled my comprehension796; and the late Shaykh Ḥabīb Ahmad, author of an astonishing work in English entitled The Mysteries of Sound and Number797, who, if nothing more, was an amazingly skilful thought-reader.

4. History — General, Special and Local.

It must be admitted, with whatever unwillingness and regret, that in the art of historical compilation the Persians

fall far short of the Arabs, who, indeed, excel in this branch of literature. The earlier Muslim annalists like Ta’bari, with their verbatim narratives by eye-witnesses of the events recorded transmitted orally through carefully scrutinized chains of traditionists, are not only singularly graphic but furnish us, even at this distance of time, with materials for history of which, thanks to these isnāds, it is still possible to estimate the authenticity, even if our judgement as to the strength of the respective links in the chain does not always agree with that of Muslim critics. The later Arab historians selected, condensed, and discarded these somewhat wearisome if valuable isnāds, but their narrative, as a rule, continues to be crisp, concise, graphic and convincing. The best of the earlier Persian historians, down to the thirteenth century, though lacking the charm of the Arabian chroniclers, are meritorious and trustworthy. The bad taste of their Tartar and Turkish rulers and patrons gradually brought about a deterioration both of style and substance, very noticeable between Juwayni’s Ta’rikh-i-Jahān-gushāy (completed about 658/1260) and its continuation, the Ta’rikh-i-Wassāf (completed in 712/1312), which, as already observed798, exercised an enduring evil influence on subsequent historians in Persia. Of later Persian histories I have met with few equal to a history of the Caliphate by Hindūshāh ibn Sānjar ibn ‘Abdu’llāh as-Sāhibī al-Kirānī, composed in 724/1324 for Noṣratu’d-Dīn Ahmad al-Atabak of Lurīstān, and entitled Tajārihush-Salaf (“Experiences of Yore”). This, however, is entirely and avowedly based on the delightful Arabic history of Šafīyyu’d-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-‘Alawī at-Tiqtāqī, composed in 701/1302, commonly known

793 Lithographed at Bombay in 1885 and 1894.
794 I possess the lithographed edition of 1318/1900, but others have appeared in India and Egypt.
796 See my Year amongst the Persians, pp. 453-5.
798 P. 413 supra.
as the Kitābu’l-Fakhri\(^{799}\), but here entitled Munyatu’l-Fuḍalā fi Tawārikhī’l-Khulafā wa’l-Wazarā (“the Desire of Scholars on the History of the Caliphs and their Ministers”). That it never appealed to the debased taste which we are here deploiring is sufficiently shown by the fact that not only has it never been published, but, so far as I know, it is represented only by my manuscript, G. 3 (copied in 1286/1870), and one other (dated 1304/1886-7) in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris\(^{800}\).

It would be a wearisome and unprofitable task to enumerate the many Persian historical works composed during the last four centuries. Of the histories of special periods the most important have been not only described but freely quoted in the first part of this volume, notably the Šafatū’s-Ṣafād for the life of Shaykh Ṣafiyu’d-Dīn from whom the Ṣafawi kings were descended; the monograph on Shāh Isma’īl’s described by Sir E. Denison Ross in the J. R.A.S. for 1896, pp. 264-83; the Ah sanction-Tawārikh, completed in 985/1577-9 by Ḥasan-i-Rūmī; and the Ta’rikh-i-Ālam-arā-yi-ʿAbbāsī of Iskandar Munshi, composed in 1025/1616. There are other monographs on the later Ṣafawi period such as the Fawāʼid-i-Ṣafawīyya (1211/1796-7) and the Tadhkira-i-Āl-i-Dāwūd (1218/1803-4), which I would fain have consulted had they been accessible to me. For the post-Ṣafawi period we have several excellent European accounts which render us less dependent on the native historians, some of whose works moreover (e.g. the Ta’rikh-
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i-Zandiyya\(^{801}\) and the Mujmalu’t-Ta’rikh-i-Ba’d-Nādīriyya\(^{802}\) have been published in Europe, while others, such as the Durra-i-Nādīrī of Mīrzā Mahdi Khān of Astarābād, are easily accessible in Oriental lithographed editions. These monographs contain valuable material and are indispensable to the student of this period, but they are generally badly arranged and duly brief, and further marred by the florid and verbose style of which we have just been complaining.

For the general histories of our present period, from Khwāndāmīr’s Habību’s-Siyar (929/1523) at the beginning to Riḍā-quīlū Khān’s Supplement to the Rawdatu’s-Safā and Lisānu’l-Mulk’s Nāsīku’t-Tawārikh at the end, with the very rare Khuld-i-Barin (1071/1660-1) in the middle, there is even less to be said, since, though for events contemporary with their authors they have the same value as the monographs just mentioned, for the earlier periods they are not even good or judicious abstracts of the carelessly selected authorities from whom they derive their information. They are, moreover, histories not of the Persian people but of the kings, princes and nobles who terrified over them and contended with one another for the spoils; wearisome records of bloodshed, violence and rapine from which it is hard to derive any general concepts of value\(^{803}\). Only by diligent and patient study can we extract from them facts capable of throwing any real light on the religious, political and social problems which a historian like Ibn Khalidūn would have handled in so masterly a manner.

There are, however, hopeful signs of improvement in recent times. Poor Mīrzā Jānī of Kāshān, though a merchant without much literary training wrote his Nuqatu’l-Kāfi\(^{804}\) on the history of the Bābī sect, of which in 1852 he was one of the proto-martyrs, with violence and passion indeed, but with knowledge, in plain and simple language without that florid rhetoric which we find so intolerable; while the unfinished “History of the Awakening of the Persians” (Ta’rikh-i-Bidārī-yi-Irānīyān) of the Nāzīmu’l-Īslām of Kirmān\(^{805}\), with its ample documentation and endeavour to estimate personal characteristics and influence on political events, seems to me to stand on an altogether higher level than any preceding Persian historical work composed during the last six or seven centuries.

5. BIOGRAPHY, AUTOBIOGRAPHY AND TRAVEL.

Muslim writers have always evinced a great partiality for biography, which may be general, dealing with the lives of eminent men of all sorts, like Ibn Khalikān’s Wahfāṭu’l-A’yān (“Obituaries of Notable Men”) and the Rawdatu’l-Jannāt, of which I have made such extensive use in the latter part of this volume, the former composed in the thirteenth, the latter in the late nineteenth century, and both in Arabic; and the ambitious but unfinished modern Persian Nāma-i-Dānish-warān (“Book of Learned Men”) compiled by a committee
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\(^{799}\)Originally edited by Ahlwardt from the Paris MS. 895 (now 2441) and published at Gotha in 1860. A revised text was published by H. Derenbourg at Paris in 1895, and there are at least two cheap and good Egyptian editions. A French translation by Emil Amar has been published by the Société des Études Marocaines (Paris, 1910).

\(^{800}\)See Blochet’s Cat. des Mscr. Persans etc. (Paris, 1905), vol. i, p. 251 (Schefer 237 = Suppl. Pers. 1552).

\(^{801}\)Ed. Ernst Beer, Leyden, 1888.

\(^{802}\)Ed. Oskar Mann, Leyden, 1891.

\(^{803}\)Compare Mr Vincent Smith’s judicious remarks on this subject in his monograph on Akbar, pp. 386-7.

\(^{804}\)Published in 1910 as vol. xv of the “E. J. W. Gibb Memorial” Series.

\(^{805}\)This work was published in lithographed fasciculi, and, so far as it has reached me, comprises the Introduction (Muqaddama) of 273 pp.; vol. i, completed on the 20th of Dhu’l-Qa’dā, 1328 (Nov. 23, 1910), which carries the narrative down to what is called the Hijrat-i-Šughrā (December, 1905), and comprises 256 pp.; and vol. ii, completed at the end of Safar, 1330 (Feb. 18, 1912), comprising 240 pp. Whether is any likelihood of the work being completed I do not know.
of some half a dozen scholars, of which the first volume was lithographed at Tihrân in 1296/1879 and the second in 1312/1904. More often such works treat of the biographies of some particular class of men, such as Ministers, Physicians, Poets or Theologians; or they follow a geographical or a chronological arrangement, merging on the one hand into geography and on the other into history. Khwândamîr’s Dastûru’l-Wizarâ (“Models for Ministers”)807, composed, according to the chronogram implicit in the title, in 915/1509-10, affords us a Persian example of the first type falling at the beginning of the period reviewed in this volume. For the Physicians and Philosophers no Persian work approaches the level of al-Qīfī’s Ta’rikhu’l-Hukamâ808 and Ibn Abî Usâybi’a’s Uyûnu’l-‘Anfâ fi Tabaqâtî’l-‘Aṭibba809 both composed in the thirteenth century of our era, a period so rich in Arabic biographical works. Biographies of poets, on the other hand, abound in Persian, especially in the later period, since Shâh Isma’il’s son Sâm Mirzâ set the fashion with his Tuhfa-i-Sâmi (a continuation of Dawlatshâh’s “Memoirs of the Poets”) compiled in 957/1550. Eminent representatives of the Shi’a sect, both Arabs and Persians of every category from kings to poets, form the subject-matter of the very useful Majâlîsu’l-Mûminin (“Assemblies of Believers”), the author of which, Sayyid Nûru’llâh of Shâshhtar, was flogged to death in 1019/1610-11 by order of Jahângîr at the instigation of the Sunnis, and who is therefore called by his fellow-believers the “Third Martyr” (Shahîd-i-Thâlîth)810.
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Of the older geographical-biographical works the Athâru’l-Bilâd (“Monuments of the Lands”) of Zakariyyâ ibn Muḥammad ibn Mahîmîd al-Qazwîni811, and the Persian Haft Iqlîm (“Seven Climes”), composed in 1028/1619 by Amin Aḥmad-i-Râzî, are typical specimens812. Monographs on different provinces or cities of Persia are also fairly common, and generally include notices of the more eminent natives of the region discussed. Of modern biographical works produced in Persia I have made extensive use, especially in the chapter on the Theologians, of the Arabic Rawdâtu’l-Jannât fi Ahwâlî’l-‘Ulamâ wa’s-Sâdât (“Gardens of Paradise, on the circumstances of Men of Learning and Leading”). This comprehensive work, which deserves to be better known, contains some 742 notices of eminent Muslim scholars, saints and poets, ancient and modern, and was compiled by Muhammad Bâgîr ibn Ḥajî Aḥmad Zaynu’l-‘Âbidîn al-Mûsawî of Khwânsâr in the latter half of the nineteenth century. A good lithographed edition (except that, as usual, it has no Index) appeared at Tihrân in 1306/1888. The notices are arranged in alphabetical order, not very strictly observed, under personal names, such as Aḥmad, ‘Alî, Muḥammad, etc., which, of course, are seldom the names by which those who bear them are commonly known. Thus the Muḥammads, who fill the greater part of the fourth and last volume and comprise a hundred and forty-three articles, include the great Shi’a theologians generally referred to as al-Kulaynî, Ibn Bâbawayh and
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Shaykh-i-Muḥîd; the historians Ṭabarî and Shâhristânî; the scientists Râzî and Bîrûnî; the thinkers Fârâbî, Ghazâlî and Muḥîy’d-Dîn ibnu’l-‘Aràbî; and the Persian poets Ṣânî’î, Farîdu’d-Dîn ‘Aṭṭâr and Jalâlû’d-Dîn Rûmî, nor is any subordinate plan, chronological or other, discernible within these sections, so that the owner of the book who wishes to consult it regularly is compelled to make his own Index or Table of Contents.

The other book which I have constantly consulted as to the lives of the theologians is the Persian Qisâsu’l-‘Ulamâ (“Stories of the Doctors”) of Muḥammad ibn Sulaymân of Tanakûbûn, who wrote it in 1290/1873813. It contains about a hundred and fifty biographies of Shi’a divines, and is more readable, if less accurate, than the work previously mentioned. Another useful Persian book on the same subject is the Nuṣjumû’î’l-Sâmâ (“Stars of Heaven”) composed by Mîrzâ Muḥammad ‘Alî in 1286/1869-70814, dealing with the Shi’a doctors of the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries of the hijra (seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth of the Christian era). There exist also two special monographs in Arabic on the Shi’a divines of Bâhrâyn and Jabal ‘Âmil, the Lû’li’atu’l-Bâhrâyn (“Pearl of Bâhrâyn”) of Shaykh Yusûf ibn Aḥmad al-Bâhrâni, who flourished in the eighteenth century; and the Amalu’l-Âmil fi ’Ulamâ’î’ Jabal ‘Âmil (“the Hoper’s Hope, on the Doctors of Mount ‘Âmil”), by Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan ibn ‘Alî al-Hûr al-Âmilî, who belongs to the previous century.

Mention must also be made of another modern biographical work of a somewhat special character, which,

806 See my Press and Poetry in Modern Persia, pp. 165-6.
807 Compare Rieu (B.M.P.C.), p. 335. I have a good modern ms. professedly collated with the original in 1268/1851-2, now marked J. 11.
808 Edited by Professor Julius Lippert (Leipzig, 1903).
809 Printed in Cairo in two volumes in 1299/1882.
811 Edited in the original Arabic by F. Wüstenfeld (Göttingen, 1848), and followed in the succeeding year by the same author’s “Wonders of Creation” (“Ājâ’ ibii’l-Makhluqât”).
812 In the Haft Iqlîm the biographical element preponderates. Unfortunately it remains unpublished, though a critical edition was begun by Mawlawî ‘Abdul-Muqṭâdir, of which, so far as I know, only the first fasciculus (pp. x + 111) has been printed at Calcutta in 1918.
813 I possess two lithographed editions, one, the second Tihrân edition, published in 1304/1886; the other, apparently at Lucknow, in 1306/1888-9.
814 Lithographed at Lucknow in 1303/1885-6.
though the work of a Persian, is written in Turkish. This is the *Khāṭṭ u Khāṭṭājān* ("Writing and Writers")\(^{815}\), a history of the art of Calligraphy and its votaries by the learned Mirzā Ḥabib of Ifshāhān, who spent the latter period of his life in Constantinople, where he was a member of the *Anjuman-i-Maʿārif*, or Turkish Academy.

These are but a selection of the more useful or less known biographical works, of which many more will be found described in Rieu’s, Ethère’s, and other catalogues of Persian manuscripts. Of autobiographies the most notable is that of Shaykh ‘Aļi Ḥazīn, which contains one of the few first-hand Persian accounts of the Afghān Invasion and fall of Ifshāhān in A.D. 1722. Travels are a special form of autobiography, in which His late Majesty Nāṣīrū’d-Dīn Shāh indulged freely. An account of the mission of Farrukh Khān Āminu’l-Mulk to London and Paris at the close of the Anglo-Persian War in 1857-8 was written by one of his staff, Mirzā Ĥusayn ibn ‘Abdu’l-Īllāḥ, but has never been published\(^{816}\). It concludes with a description of the French Departments of State and Public Institutions. More valuable and varied in its contents is the *Bustānu ’s-Sīyāḥat* ("Garden of Travel") of Ḥājjī Zaynu’l-‘Abīdīn of Shīrwān\(^{817}\), who wrote it in 1247/1831-2. In a brief autobiography under the heading Shamākhi he tells us that he was born in mid-

[page 451]

Sha’bān, 1194 (August 15, 1780), and was taken to Karbalā’, where he thenceforth made his home, when only five years old. He travelled extensively in ‘Īraq, Gilān, the Caucasus, Ādharbāyjān, Khūrāsān, Afghānīstān, Indīa, Kashmir, Badakhshān, Turкistān, Transoxiana, the Persian Gulf, Yaman, the Hijāz, Egypt, Syrīa, Turkey in Asīa and Armeṇiā, and in Persīa also visited Tīhrān, Hamadān, Ifshāhān, Shīrāz and Kirmān. He ‘was a Shī’īte and a darwīsh of the Order of Shāh Ni’matū’l-Īlāḥ, and in this double capacity made the acquaintance and enjoyed the friendship of many eminent doctors (‘ulamā’) and “gnostics” (‘uraʃā). The author, a man of intelligence and a keen observer, does not give a continuous narrative of his travels, but arranges his materials under the following heads:

*Chapter I*. Account of the Prophet, his daughter Fā’timā, and the Twelve Imāms.

*Chapter II*. Account of certain doctors, gnostics, philosophers, poets and learned men.

*Chapter III*. On sundry sects and doctrines.

*Chapter IV*. Geographical account of towns and villages visited by the author in Persīa, Turkīstān, Afghānīstān, Indīa, parts of Europe and China, Turkey, Syrīa and Egypt, the names of these places being arranged alphabetically.

*Promenade (Sayr)*. Prolegomena on the arrangement of this Garden, and on certain matters connected therewith.

*Rose-bed (Gulshan)*. Countries and persons to describe which is the ultimate object of the book, arranged alphabetically in twenty-eight sections, corresponding with the letters of the Arabic alphabet.

*Spring (Bahār)*, containing four Rose-bowers (Gulzār):

(i) On the interpretation of dreams;

(ii) Names of certain halting-places of the author on his travels;

(iii) Various anecdotes;

(iv) Conclusion.

[page 452]

The book contains a great deal of miscellaneous biographical and geographical information, which, owing to the alphabetical arrangement generally observed, and the very full table of contents prefixed, is fairly accessible to the reader. The author was full of curiosity, and, though unable to visit Europe, lost no opportunity of cultivating the society of European travellers and acquainting himself with the peculiarities of their countries by hearsay. Under the article *Fīrāŋ* (pp. 385-7) he discusses the general characteristics of the chief European nations, amongst whom he puts the French first, the Austrians second, and the English third; and he gives a long account of his conversations with an Englishman whom he calls “Mr Wiklis” (میر ویکلیس)\(^{818}\) and with whom he became acquainted at ‘Azīmābād. He also cultivated the society of the Austrian ambassador at Constantinople, who invited him to visit his country, “but,” he concludes, “since there was no great spiritual advantage to be gained by travelling in that country, I declined.” More valuable is his account of the various religions and sects of Asia, in which he treats, amongst other matters, of the Zoroastrians, Mazdakites, Jews, Christians, Hindu’s, Šūfīs and Ghulāt (extreme Shī’a).

It would be impossible to notice here the many excellent books of reference, historical, biographical and geographical, which have been produced in Persia since the middle of the nineteenth century. Many of them, it is true, are for the most part compiled and condensed from older works, both Arabic and Persian, but some contain valuable new matter, not to be found

\(^{815}\) A very nicely printed edition of this book was published at Constantinople in 1305/1887-8.

\(^{816}\) My MS. K. 7, copied in 1276/1860 for Prince Bahman Mirzā Bahā’u’l-Dawla, came to me amongst the Schindler MSS. Concerning Farrukh Khān’s mission, see R. G. Watson’s History of Persia 1800-1858, pp. 456 *et seqq*.


\(^{818}\) Perhaps a corruption of Wilkins (ویکلینس).
Elsewhere. Something must, however, be said as to certain peculiarities connected with this later literature and with the world of books in modern Persia.

European students of Persian are, as a rule, unless they have lived in that country, accustomed to think in terms of manuscripts, and to turn to Dr Rieu’s admirable catalogues of the British Museum MSS. for information as to literary history. But since the introduction into Persia of printing and lithography, especially since about 1880, the importance of the manuscript literature has steadily diminished, the more important books written being either transferred to stone or set up in type from the original copy. This printed and lithographed literature has not hitherto received nearly so much attention as the older manuscript literature, and it is often impossible to obtain ready and trustworthy information as to the authors and contents of these modern books. The recent publication of Mr Edwards’s Catalogue of the Persian printed books in the British Museum marks a great step in advance of anything previously accomplished, but the notices are necessarily very brief, and contain, as a rule, no particulars about the authors and only the most general indication of the character of their works. What is needed is a catalogue raisonné of Persian books composed during the last century and lithographed or printed in Persia, for it is much easier, for reasons which will be stated immediately, to ascertain what has been published in Persian in Turkey, Egypt and India. The fact is that the Persian book trade is in the most chaotic condition. There are no publishers or booksellers of substance, and no book-catalogues are issued. Most books have no fixed price or place of sale; many have no pagination; hardly any have indexes or tables of contents. Often books comprising several volumes change their size and shape, their plan, and even their nature, as they proceed, while the author not unfrequently changes his title. Let us take as an illustration a few of the numerous works of reference published under the name of Mirzá Muḥammad Ḥasan Kháń, who successively bore the titles of Ṣání’u’d-

Dawla, Mú’tamán’s-Sultań, and I’timádú’d-Dawla, and was the son of Hájji ‘Ali Kháń of Marágha, originally entitled Hájíbú’d-Dawla and later I’timádu’s-Salṭana. Now first of all it is very doubtful whether these books were really written by Ṣání’u’d-Dawla at all; at any rate it is commonly asserted that he coerced various poor scholars to write them, and ascribed the authorship to himself, proceedings of which the latter must be regarded as wholly reprehensible, whatever may be said in extenuation of the former. In 1293/1876 he published the first volume of the Mirátu’l-Buldán (“Mirror of the Lands”), a geographical dictionary of Persian towns and villages, largely based on Yáqút’s well-known Arabic Mu’jamu’l-Buldán, containing the first four letters of the alphabet (atories). Of this volume, however, there appear to have been two editions, the first ending with the notice of Tabriz and containing 388 pages, the second, published a year later (1294/1877), extending to Tihrán, and containing 606 pages. Having reached Tihrán, however, the author, growing tired, apparently, of geography, decided to continue his work as a history of the reigning king Náširu’d-Din Sháh, and to add at the end of each remaining volume a Calendar and Court Directory for the current year. Vol. ii, therefore, comprises the first fifteen years of the Sháh’s reign (298 pp.) and the Calendar (45 pp.) for the year of publication (1295/1878). Vol. iii continues on the same lines, and contains the years xvi–xvii of the current reign (264 pp.) and the Calendar (50 pp.). At this point, however, the author seems to have remembered his original plan, and in vol. iv he continues the geographical dictionary with the next two letters of the alphabet (ными) at which point he reverts to history, and gives an account of the events of the year of publication (1296/1879), followed by the annual Calendar. More-

over, in order to celebrate this reconciliation of geography and history, the size of this fourth volume is suddenly enlarged from 10½ x 6¾ inches to 13½ x 8¼ inches.

By this time the author appears to have grown weary of the “Mirror of the Lands,” for after a year’s rest he began the publication of a new book entitled Mongzám-i-Náširí, of which also three volumes appeared in the years 1298–1300/1881–3. Of these three volumes I possess only the first and the third. The first contains an outline of Islamic history from A.H. 1-656 (A.D. 622-1258), that is, of the history of the Caliphate (pp. 3-239), followed by an account of the chief events of the solar year beginning in March, 1880, both in Persia and Europe (pp. 239-57), and the usual Calendar and Court Directory (42 pp.). The third volume contains a history of the reigning Qájárd dynasty from 1194/1779 to 1300/1882 (pp. 32-387), followed again by the Calendar for the last mentioned year.

Next year the author began the publication of a new work in three volumes entitled Matla’u’sh-Shams (“the Dawning-place of the Sun”). This opens with a perfunctory apology for the incomplete condition in which the “Mirror of the Lands” was left. However, says he, since the next two letters of the alphabet are há (c) and khá (h), and since Khurásán is the most important province beginning with the latter, and since His Majesty Náširu’d-Din Sháh, whose faithful servant he is, and to whom this and his other works are dedicated, had recently made the journey thither in order to visit the holy shrine of the

---

819 London, 1922: 968 columns. The works are arranged under their authors, but there is a General Index of Titles and a Subject Index.
CHAPTER X.

THE MOST MODERN DEVELOPMENTS
(A.D. 1850 ONWARDS).

I have endeavoured to show that under the Qajär Dynasty, especially since the middle of the nineteenth century, the old forms of literature, both prose and verse, took on a fresh lease of life, and, so far from deteriorating, rose to a higher level than they had hitherto reached during the four centuries (roughly speaking A.D. 1500-1900) with which we are dealing in this volume. We must now consider three or four quite recent developments due in the first instance to what Mirzā Muhammad ‘Alí Khán “Tarbiyat,” the real author of my Press and Poetry in Modern Persia (pp. 154-66), calls “Modernizing Influences in the Persian Press other than Magazines and journals.” Amongst these he assigns an important place to the various scientific text-books compiled by, or under the supervision of, the numerous Europeans appointed as teachers in the Dāru’l-Funūn and the Military and Political Colleges in Tihriran from A.D. 1851 onwards, and the Persian translations of European (especially

821 See pp. 84 et seqq. supra.
822 For a list of the books I bought in Persia in the autumn of 1888, see my Year amongst the Persians, pp. 554-7.
823 Compare p. 551 of the book mentioned in the preceding footnote.
French) books of a more general character, such as some of Molière’s plays and Jules Verne’s novels, which resulted from an increased interest in Europe and knowledge of European languages. Of such books, and of others originally written in Persian in this atmosphere, he gives a list containing one hundred and sixty-two entries, which should be consulted by those who are interested in this matter. The Revolution of A.D. 1906, with the remarkable development of journalism which it brought about, and the increase of facilities for printing resulting from this, gave a fresh

impulse to this movement, which, checked by the difficulties and miseries imposed on Persia by the Great War, seems now again to be gathering fresh impetus. What we have to say falls under three heads, the Drama, Fiction and the Press, of which the first two need not detain us long.

The Drama.

The only indigenous form of drama is that connected with the Muḥarram mournings, the so-called “Passion Plays” discussed in a previous chapter, and, even in their case it is not certain that they owe nothing to European influence. Three at least of Molière’s plays (Le Médecin malgré lui, Le Misanthrope, and another entitled The Ass, which I think must be intended for L’Étourdi) have appeared in Persian translations, but are seldom met with, and seem never to have attained any great popularity. I possess only Le Misanthrope, printed at Constantinople in the Taṣwīr ‘l-Afkār Press in 1286/1860-70. The title is rendered as Guzārīsh-i-Mardum-gūrīz (“the Adventure of him who fled from mankind”), the characters are Persianized, and the text is in verse and follows the original very closely, though occasionally Persian idioms or proverbs are substituted for French. Here, for instance, is the rendering — in this case a paraphrase — of the “Vieille chanson” in Act I, Scene 2:

“Si le roi m’avait donné
    Paris, sa grand’ ville,
   Et qu’il me fallût quitter
   L’amour de ma mie,
   Je dirais au roi Henri
   ‘Reprenz votre Paris,
   J’aime mieux ma mie, o gail
   J’aime mieux ma mie!”

The following Persian version of Act II, Scene 7, if compared with the original, will give a fair idea of the translator’s method. The characters are Mū’nis (Alceste), Fatīna (Célimène), Laylā (Éliante), Nāṣīḥ (Acaste), Naʾīm Beg (Philinte) and Farrāsh (un garde de la Maréchaussée):

824 Pp. 172-94 supra.
منس (به پیش فرَش می‌روید)... چه هست فرماییش؟

نیا به بیجنیا
فرَش توان دو حرف با سرگار
منس رئیس دیوان آنرا که بادم فرَش
مراد بست بدادست حاضر باش
بتو...

منس یکه؟ بیسن؟
فرَش آرا بیتد
منس برای چه چهار
فرَش بحرف مفت (ابدی) و حضرت سرگار
قیفته بنامی: چسین؟
امبدی واوگفتاند وست وبلغ
چند شعر سه چاژانه است وقع و محل
هکنون ز پیش بخواهند بست ووگه شمار

منس من و مداده به‌گردر نمی‌گردد اقرار
نامی با چه به‌خوانند داد صلح و صفا
بحکمبای برگزار کمگ بود تنسب
قهر شعرایی به مردان چکی تصدیق
ار آنچه کفت‌هار اکثر نیست زان مرجوع
بود است هرمه بخواهای
نامی نیبیوان گذرم شعرها به و پوج است
نامی قبول رای تو خواهند وچای خواهند هست
لبروا

منس مهموم اما نبیوان ابدا
ز رای هوش گیور
نامی بر تو خود بینیا
منس مکگ بمحکم شیب حضرت کرد و مناسب
فهر شعرایی شیش‌های پات به‌این گروه
و گرنه فاش گپکرم حضرت شعرش پدند
پاییز اینکه چنین شاعران بدار خشنده
(به نعمان پاک و نعیم با گد همینه که به سید میرزا)
حقیقت که چنین سنگر هر نیود گیان
که بهود باشچه‌هستندان!

نامی روان نهان،
قیفته چغا شبارا باید
روم وی در هر
بیگشته اینجا تا کش مکش برم از هر
No indication of the translator’s identity appears on the title-page of my edition, nor is there any prefatory matter. Curiously enough, in the very same year in which this Persian version of Le Misanthrope was published (1286/1869-70) Ahmad Vefiq (Ahmad Wafiq) Pasha printed his Turkish translations of George Dandin, Le Médecin malgré lui, and Le Mariage Forcé825, while Tartufe appeared in Turkish somewhat later826.

In 1291/1874 there was lithographed in Tihra a volume containing seven Persian plays with an Introduction on the educational value of the stage by Mirza Ja’far Qaraja-daghli. These plays were originally written in Adharbayjani Turkish by Mirza Fath-Ali Darbandi, and were published in Tiflis about A.D. 1861. Five of them have been republished in Europe, with glossaries, notes and in some cases translations. These are (1) the Wazir of Lankuran, text, translation, vocabulary and notes, by W. H. D. Haggard and G. le Strange (London, 1882); (2) Trois Comédies traduites du dialecte Turc Azeri en Persan et publées... avec un glossaire et des notes par C. Barbier de Meynard et S. Guyard (Paris, 1886); (3) Monsieur Jourdan, with translation, notes, etc. Edited by A. Wahrmund (Vienna and Leipzig, 1889). The three comedies contained in No. 2 are the “Thief-catching Bear” (Khirs-i-qulduz-baxsan), “the Advocates” (Wukala-yi-Murafa’a), and “the Alchemist” (Mulla Ibrâhim Khalil-i-Kimiyâ-gar). The two remaining plays, hitherto unpublished in Europe, are “the Miser” (Mard-i-Khasis) and “Yusuf Shah the Saddler”.827
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Three more plays, written, at a date unknown to me, by the late Prince Malkom Khan, formerly Persian Minister in London, were partly published as a feuilleton (pâ-wareq) in the Tabriz newspaper Itihad (“Union”) in 1326/1908. A complete edition, from a copy in the library of Dr F. Rosen, the well-known scholarly German diplomatist, was published in 1340/1921-2 by the “Kaviani” Press in Berlin. These plays are (1) the “Adventures of Ashraf Khan, Governor of Arabistan, during his sojourn in Tihra in 1232/1817”; (2) the “Methods of Government of Zamkan Khan of Burujird,” placed in the year 1236/1820-1; and (3) “Shah-qi Mirza goes to Karbalah and spends some days at Kirmanshah with the Governor Shah Murad Mirza.”

Finally in 1326/1908 there appeared at Tihra a bi-weekly newspaper called “the Theatre” (Tiyâtr) which published plays satirizing the autocratic régime. I possess only a few numbers, containing part of a play entitled “Shaykh ’Ali Mirza, Governor of Malayir and Tulysirkân, and his marriage with the daughter of the King of the Fairies.”

These are all the Persian plays I have met with. All are comedies, and all are satires on the administrative or social conditions of Persia. In the “Wazir of Lankuran” a rather weak and common-place love-story is combined with the satire, but generally speaking this element is lacking, and the object of the writer is simply to arouse dislike and contempt for the old-fashioned methods of government. In other words, these productions, like the “Travels of Ibrâhim Beg,” of which we shall shortly have
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to speak, are primarily political pamphlets rather than plays. Hardly one of them has ever been acted on the stage, and none has produced an effect comparable to Kemal Bey’s Turkish play Watam, yahod Silistra.829 In short the drama has not succeeded in establishing itself in Persia even to the extent which it has done in Turkey.

The Novel.

Of stories after the style of the “Arabian Nights” or the more popular and indigenous “Husayn the Kurd” there is in Persia no end, but of the novel properly so called there is even less to be said than of the drama. Two rather ambitious attempts in this direction have recently come under my notice, and it is characteristic of recent tendencies to glorify Zoroastrian Persia that both of them deal with pre-Islamic times, the one with Cyrus, the other with Qubad and his son and successor Anusharwan (Nushirwan) and the heresiarch Mazdak.

The former (or rather the first volume of it, which, to judge by the colophon, was intended to be followed by two more volumes) was completed in 1334/1916, and printed at Hamadan in 1337/1919. It is entitled “Love and Lordship” (Ishaq u Saltanat), and was written by a certain Shaykh Mûsá, Director of the “Nu’rat” Government College at Hamadan, who was

826 Ibid., p. 59 and n. 1 ad calc.
827 “The Alchemist” was translated by G. le Strange in the J.R.A.S. for 1886 (pp. 103-26); “Yusuf Shâh” in the same journal for 1895 (pp. 537-69) by Colonel Sir E. Ross; and the text of the same was published in 1889 at Madras by E. Sell. See E. Edwards’s Catalogue of the Persian Printed books in the British Museum, 1922, col. 207-8.
828 Since this was written I have come across a little comedy entitled “Ja’far Khan comes from Europe” (Jafar Khan nasib fi Jumhur) by Hasan Muqaddam, printed at Tihra and actually performed there about two years ago.
829 Gibb (op. ladu., vol. v, p. 15) alludes very briefly to the outburst of patriotic enthusiasm aroused by this play “Fatherland” when it was first acted in the theatre of Gedik Pasha. Sultân ’Abdu’l-’Aziz was highly displeased and alarmed, and banished Kemal Bey to Famagusta in Cyprus.
good enough to send me a copy in January, 1920. It is described in the colophon as “the first novel (roman) composed in Persia in the Western fashion”:

*Wem tāyif khanān tā'yif āzāmanī ast, khanān tāyif khanān āzāmanī ast, khwan tāyif khanān āzāmanī ast.*

and I remember a news-vendor on one of the Bosphorus steamers offering me a Turkish version of the

It aims at being a historical novel, but the proper names generally have their French, not their Old Persian, forms, e.g. “Mitrádát” (correctly explained as *Mihr-dád*), “Akbátán” (Ecbatana, instead of *Hagmatána*, for Hamadán), “Agrádát,” “Íspákú (Spako)” and “Síyákzár” (Cyaxares, for Huvakhshtara), though Cambyses (Kambújiya) takes the intermediate form “Kábúzijá.” The lengthy descriptions of the scenes and persons introduced into the story, and the numerous dialogues are evidently copied from European models. The story itself, into which an element of love as well as of war is introduced, is readable if not very thrilling, but is overloaded with dates, archaeological and mythological notes, and prolix historical dissertations ultimately based for the most part on the statements of Herodotus mixed with information derived from the Avesta. There is no attempt to make use of archaic language or to eschew the use of Arabic words, but the author has at any rate avoided glaring anachronisms. The following short extract (p. 247) from the description of the preparations for the marriage of Cyrus will suffice to show how far removed is the style of this book from that of the type of story hitherto current in Persia:

*Belaya ibín ibrá'ím ūrisi ast, ḍi khanān tāyif āzāmanī ḍi khanān tāyif āzāmanī ast.*

“*Yes! These preparations are the preparations for a wedding, and I do not think that it can be the wedding of anyone else than Cyrus, the mighty King of Persia and Media, for today none but he commands in so great a measure the affection of the people of Ecbatana, so that they regard his wedding as a great festival, and have decorated the bazaars, and from the bottom of their hearts make manifest their joy and gladness.*”

I do not know what measure of success this “historical novel” has achieved in Persia, nor did I ever meet with more than the one copy sent me by the author, accompanied by a letter dated 4 Şafar, 1338 (Oct. 30, 1919), in which he requested me to review it in the *Times*. I hope he will accept this brief notice as the best I can do to make his book known in Europe as a praiseworthy attempt to instruct while entertaining his countrymen, and to introduce a literary form hitherto unknown in Persia.

The second of the two historical novels mentioned above was printed at Bombay in 1339/1920-1, was written by Şan‘ati-záda of Kirmán, and is entitled “the Ensnarers: or the Avengers of Mazdak.” Like the last it is incomplete, for it ends (on p. 110) with the words “*here ends the first volume,*” though how many more the author intended to add does not appear, nor do I know whether any further instalment was actually published. In general style it much resembles “Love and Lordship,” but presents more archaeological errors, as, for instance, where (p. 10) a portrait of the Sásánian king Bahrán Gúr is described as bearing a label written in the cuneiform character (*khātt-i-mikhi*)!

Before leaving this subject I must at least mention a Persian translation of three episodes in the career of the immortal Sherlock Holmes, translated from a Russian version by Mír Isma‘íl ‘Abdu’lláh-záda, and printed at the Khurshid Press in Šíhrán in 1323/1905-6. They are entitled respectively the “Episode of the Gold Spectacles,” the “Account of Charles Augustus Milvertón,” and “the Village Lords.” Holmes in passing through a Russian medium has been transmuted into "Khums" (خُمس), or "Khúmis" (خُمیس) (בומוס): Dr Watson

has been more fortunate. The adventures are narrated in the simplest possible style, and would form an admirable reading-book for beginners in Persian, if the book were obtainable in any quantity, which is unlikely. In Turkey Sherlock Holmes had an enormous success, and I remember a news-vendor on one of the Bosphorus steamers offering me a Turkish version of the

---

830 دار کشتی یا انتقام خواجهان مزرعه.
831 The original is entitled “the Adventure of Appledore Towers.”
“Engineer’s Thumb,” while the late Sulṭán ‘Abdu’l-Ḥamid was said to entertain the greatest admiration for Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, and to desire above all things to put him in charge of his Secret Police.

It is hard to say whether Ḥájjí Zaynu’l-‘Ábidin of Marágha’s fictitious “Travels (Siyáhat-náma) of Ibráhím Beg,” which, according to Mirzá Muḥammad ‘Ali Khán “Tarbiyát,” had an appreciable effect in precipitating the Persian Revolution of A.D. 1905-6, should be reckoned as a novel or not. The hero and his adventures are, of course, fictitious, but there is little exaggeration, and they might well be actual. The book is a bitter satire on Persian methods of government and social conditions, which are depicted in the most sombre colours, with the definite object of arousing discontent in order to bring about reform. The Persians are very sensitive to ridicule, but on the whole bear it much better than most European nations, and most Persian reformers have made extensive use of satire as a means of promoting their objects. This Siyáhat-náma is well and powerfully written in a simple yet forcible style, and I know of no better

reading-book for the student who wishes to obtain a good knowledge of the current speech and a general, if somewhat lurid, idea of the country.

In this connection mention should also be made of the Persian translation made by the talented and unfortunate Ḥájjí Shaykh Ahmad “Ruḥí” of Kirmán of Morier’s Ḥájjí Bábá, published as Colonel D. C. Phillott at Calcutta in 1905. This book, like the last, is a clever satire on the Persians, the more remarkable as being the work of a foreigner; but it belongs rather to the domain of English than Persian literature. All that I had to say about it is contained in the Introduction (pp. ix-xxiii) which I contributed to the edition published by Messrs Methuen in 1895, and all that need be said about the Persian translator and his work has been well said by Colonel Phillott in his Introduction to the Persian text.

The Press.

Of Persian journalism, which has been the most powerful modernizing influence in Persia, I have treated so fully in a previous monograph on the subject that little need be said here, save by way of summary. Printing was introduced into Persia about a century ago by ‘Abbás Mirzá, and the first Persian newspaper appeared about A.D. 1851, in the third year of Náṣiru’d-Dín Sháh’s reign. It was soon followed by others, but these early news-sheets, issued by the Government, were entirely colourless, and even when I was in Persia in 1887-8 the only Persian newspaper worth reading was the Akhtar (“Star”), published weekly at Constantinople. It was founded in 1875, and lasted about twenty years. Prince Malkom Khán’s Qānūn (“Law”)

appeared in 1890 and was printed and published in London, but in consequence of its violent attacks on the Persian Government, the Sháh, and his Ministers, its circulation in Persia was prohibited. The Calcutta Ḥablú’l-Matin first appeared in 1893, the Thurayyá (“Pleiades”) in Cairo in 1898, and the Parvarish, which replaced it, in 1900. These were the most important Persian papers published outside Persia, and it was not until 1907, when the Revolution was an accomplished fact, and the conflict between King and Parliament was at its height, that independent and influential newspapers began to appear in Persia itself. Amongst the most interesting of these from a literary point of view I should place the Šūr-i-Isráfíl (“Trumpet of Isráfíl” — the Angel of the Resurrection), the Násim-i-Shimád (“Breeze of the North”), the Muṣáwáti (“Equality”), and the Naw Bahádár (“Early Spring”). The first, second, and fourth of these supplied me with many fine poems from the pens of Dakhaw, Sayyid Ashraf of Gilán, and Baháár of Mashhad, for my Press and Poetry in Modern Persia, but the Charand-parand (“Charivari”) column of the Šūr-i-Isráfíl also contained some excellent and original prose writing of which I shall now give two specimens, since they are unlike anything else which I have met with in Persian. Both are by Dakhaw: the first appeared in No. 1 of the Šūr-i-Isráfíl (May 30, 1907); the second in No. 2 (June 6, 1907).

---

832 See my Press and Poetry of Modern Persia, pp. 22 and 164. The Persian text was printed in three volumes, the first at Cairo without date; the second at Calcutta in 1323/1905, though publication was apparently delayed until 1907; the third at Constantinople in 1327/1909. The name of the author appears only on the title-page of vol. iii. A German version of the first volume by Dr Walter Schulz was published at Leipzig in 1903 with the title Zustände im heutigen Persien wie sie das Reisebuch Ibrahim Begs enthüllt.

833 See pp. vii-viii of the English Introduction. to this work, and also my Persian Revolution, pp. 93-6.

حالاً من تجربه پیاده‌نامه مسلمان جهت ارایه اطلاعات می‌گوییم.

به دلیل اینکه ترک تراک می‌گیرد است و با اینکه آن‌ها به این‌جا دو ترک می‌کنند و مخصوص البته ترک تراک می‌کنند. به این دلیل که ترک تراک‌ها می‌گردد و مخصوص البته ترک تراک‌ها می‌کنند. به این دلیل که ترک تراک‌ها می‌گردد و مخصوص البته ترک تراک‌ها می‌کنند.
After several years travelling in India, seeing the invisible saints, and acquiring skill in Alchemy, Talismans and Necromancy, thank God, I have succeeded in a great experiment; no less than a method for curing the opium-habit! If any one in any foreign country had made such a discovery, he would certainly have received decorations and rich rewards, and his name would have been mentioned with honour in all the newspapers. But what can one do, since in Persia no one recognizes merit?

Custom is a second nature, and as soon as one becomes habituated to any act, one cannot easily abandon it. The only curative method is to reduce it gradually by some special procedure, until it is entirely forgotten.

To all my zealous, opium-eating, Muslim brethren I now proclaim the possibility of breaking the opium-habit, thus. First, they must be firmly determined and resolved on abandoning it. Secondly, one who,

---

835 The Abdál ("Substitutes") and Awtád ("Pegs") are two classes of the Rijál’-l-Ghayb, or “Men of the Unseen World,” who play an important part in the cosmogony of the Mystics.

836 Concerning these Occult Sciences, see pp. 441-2 supra.
for example, eats two mithqāls\(^837\) of opium daily should every day diminish this dose by a grain (nukhūd) and add two grains of morphine

in its stead. One who smokes ten mithqāls of opium should daily reduce the amount by one grain, adding instead two grains of hashish (Indian hemp). Thus he should persevere until such time as the two mithqāls of opium which he eats are replaced by four mithqāls of morphine, or the ten mithqāls of opium which he smokes by twenty mithqāls of hashish. After this it is very easy to substitute for morphine pills hypodermic injections of the same, and for hashish ‘curds of Unity\(^838\).’ O my zealous, opium-eating brethren, seeing that God has made matters so easy, why do you not save yourselves from the annoyance of men’s foolish chatter, and the waste of all this time and money? Change of habit, if it be effected in this way, does not cause illness and is a very easy matter.

“Moreover great and eminent men who wish to make people forget some evil habit act in precisely this way. See, for example, how well indeed the poet says that intelligence and fortune are closely connected with one another. For example, when our great men consider that the people are poor and cannot eat wheaten bread, and that the peasant must spend all his life in cultivating wheat, yet must himself remain hungry, see what they do.

“On the first day of the year they bake the bread with pure wheat-flour. On the second day in every hundredweight (kharwār) they put a maund of bitter apricot stones, barley, fennel-flower, sawdust, lucerne, sand — I put it shortly as an illustration — clods, brick-bats and bullets of eight mithqāls. It is evident that in a hundredweight of corn, which is a hundred maunds, one maund of these things will not be noticed. On the second day they put in two maunds, on the third three, and after a hundred days, which is three months and ten days, a hundred maunds of wheat-flour have become a hundred maunds of bitter apricot stones, barley, fennel-flower, sawdust, chaff, lucerne and sand, and that in such fashion that no one has noticed it, while the wheaten bread habit has entirely passed out of men’s minds.

“In truth intelligence and fortune are closely connected with one another!

“O my zealous, opium-eating brethren! Assuredly you know that man is a little world, and has the closest resemblance to the great world; that is to say, for example, that whatever is possible for man may happen also in the case of animals, trees, stones, clods, doors,

walls, mountains and seas; and that whatever is possible for these is possible also for men, because man is the microcosm, while these form part of the macrocosm. For example, I wanted to say this, that just as it is possible to put a habit out of men’s minds, even so is it possible to put a habit out of the minds of stones, clods, and bricks, because the closest resemblance exists between the microcosm and the macrocosm. What sort of a man, then, is he who is less than even a stone or a clod?

“For example, the late mujtahid Hájji Shaykh Hádí\(^839\) built a hospital and settled on it certain endowments so that eleven sick persons might always be there. So long as Hájji Shaykh Hádí was alive the hospital was accustomed to receive eleven patients. But as soon as Hájji Shaykh Hádí departed this life, the students of the college said to his eldest son, ‘We will recognize you as the Master only when you spend the hospital endowments on us!’ See now what this worthy eldest son did by dint of knowledge. In the first month he reduced the number of patients by one, in the second by two, in the third by three, in the fourth by four.; and so in like fashion until the present time, when the number of patients has been reduced to five, and gradually, by this excellent device, these few also will disappear in the course of the next five months. See then how by wise management it is possible to expel habit from the minds of every one and every thing, so that a hospital which was accustomed to eleven patients has entirely forgotten this habit without falling ill. Why? Because it also forms part of the macrocosm, so that it is possible to drive a habit out of its mind, just as in the case of man, who is the microcosm.”

“Dakhaw.”

\(^837\) The mithqāl = 4-60 grammes, and is divided into 24 nukhūd (“peas”), each of which consists of 4 grains or barley-corns (gandum).

\(^838\) Dūgh-i-Wahdat, or Banjāb, is a mixture of hashish and curdled milk similar to asrār, habb-i-nashāt, etc. Bīq-i-Wahdat (“the trumpet of unity”) is the name given by hashish-smokers to a paper funnel through which the smoke of the drug is inhaled.

پیام‌های، مکتب شریعت

کلی‌الهی دخوا تقدیبی گفتنی دخوا مدعی مصموئی مشکلی
بوشانت روی می‌داد خلق مکروه، این آن‌ها خیال و سوءصدای
از تیبو نبود می‌گفت باینها تهوه نریاکی شده، در توهه اطاق پای
ملق امرده; اما نکته‌ها تو دلالات حلقه همان طوره‌ها توی صور
سنابل توشت بودی، پویا، پاوکی، به مرای نمیدانم، پاوه تحقیل عمار
حیبی‌ها و لی‌ها و سیبا کاغذی در ونیاون، حکم انجام نامه، هر
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یعنی یک راه باردارک درگر بود وی لشکر ایران آن را را بدل نیوی
همینکه لشکر ایران یک بعد دبور یونان رضی دید این یونانی‌ها
به‌ضمیت حتف با قدرن جلو رازی گرفتند؛ حب عملاً
ایران چه خواست برسی خنده؛ برود چطور بروید؛ بر گردود چطور بروی
اند مانده سیاه و سرگرم، عدا رستح چند شاعری خواب
افته‌است (ع.) نه در غرفی دارم شاد و نه رویی در وطن دارم آلم!
از آن‌جا خودت باشد گمانه راست بی‌ایم یک داد وده لشکر ایران دردند
بوشکی یک نفر از آن جغراف قبی آفتاب پر یک گاه‌های دویست
یعنی یک نفر گرم‌داری ندار یک نفر نور پرست یک نفر نرم‌مان
دوست از لشکر یونان جدا شد، و همه چا یا تریش یا برهن
امد تا نارحب ایران‌ها و کش شلیک اسیر خبر مداده، خوش‌
آمده صفا طولیت فصل بر خطر بینا آتش‌های با آتش‌شایات
ان حکم به آن شنیزنا ایران را نشان داد، که ما یونانی‌ها
آن‌جا لشکر تداریف آن شاه از آن راه ابروی می‌توانند می‌ریزند
برای‌ها ایران‌ها هر قبیل حضرت و از آن راه وقته داخل خواه یونان
شدن؛
حالا حمله اینجا نیست؛ راستی تا باد نرته اسر آن گرم‌
نوارا هم عرض خبر، هرچند قدری یوزان ما سکون‌است اما چه
میشود هر چه! است قبیل‌ سابق یوزان با
نیا دانش چرا هر وقت من این اسراب می‌شود معلم هر سوی
ایران یاد می‌آید، با چربی ملی یوزان، در آن وقت عصر
خانه چه‌که! غیر از تنها علم و سیاست معلم کرده، قرار‌گیره‌
جناب میرزا عبد الرزاق خان مخنزان بعد از مه‌پای‌زی
نگه‌ی جنابی راه ماسباله از بار‌، رویا که یک‌دست من دبستان
گفته‌همه‌ها بقیه با وجود حساب است مطلب ندارش باشد.
Translation.

Charand-parand. City letter.

In old days you used sometimes to be a help to people: if any difficulty befell your friends, you used to solve it. Latterly, there being no sign or sound of you, I kept telling myself that perhaps you too had taken to opium and were lolling at the foot of the brazier in the corner of the room. Now don’t tell me that, you queer mug, quietly, without any one’s knowledge (I do not know whether in order to study

For the half slang use of “Kablá’i” (= Karbalá’i), see my Press and Poetry of Modern Persia, pp. 179-82.

Lam dádan (slang), “to loll, lounge.”

Equivalent to balık, “perhaps.”

Náquláy huqqa, explained as equivalent to the French “drôle de type.”
Alchemy, Talismans and Necromancy, as you have written in the Šür-i-Isráfíl) have cut and run to India. Surely then you have found the key to a treasure also! At any rate, if I have entertained an unworthy suspicion of you, you must forgive me: I ask your pardon! Anyhow, praise be to God, you have got safely back, a lasting cause of thankfulness, for you have come at just the right moment, seeing that affairs are all topsy-turvy.

“May God forgive everybody’s departed friends! May the earth not whisper it to him! In Qağázán we had a certain Mullá Ínak-‘Ali, a rawda-khwán, and a very impudent fellow. Whatever may be the case now, he was at that time very thick with me. When he went to recite a rawda, he used first of all to put forward a long-winded prologue. He used to say (saving your presence), ‘In this way the matter will be more ass-plain’ (no need to quarrel over a mere illustration). It occurs to me that it would not be a bad thing if I too were to begin with a prologue for you, simply in order that you may get the hang of the matter.

“In olden days there was in the world one great Persian Empire with the State of Greece as its neighbour. At that time the Persian Empire was puffed up with pride. It was very well pleased with itself, and, if you will pardon the expression, its pipe took a lot of filling. Its ambition was the King-of-Kingship of the world. Yes, there was then in Persia no ‘King’s Darling,’ ‘State’s Sweetheart,’ ‘Pet of the Province,’ ‘Beauty of the Privy Chamber,’ ‘Charmer of the Presence,’ or ‘Minion of the Kingdom.’ Nor had they yet made ‘slides’ in their palaces. Nor did the Mullás of that time include a ‘Club of the Canon Law,’ ‘Chamberlain of the Canon Law,’ or ‘Park of the Canon Law.’ At that time, in short, there did not exist a ‘Carriage of Islam,’ ‘Table

and Chair of the Faith,’ or ‘Russian Horse of Religion.’ Fine days were those indeed, which were in truth the time of King Wizwizak!

“But to be brief. One day the Persian Government collected its armies and quietly advanced to the back of the wall of Greece. Now to enter Greece there was only one way, by which way the Persian army must needs pass. Yes, but behind that way there was a lane like the Āshi-kunán of the Mosque of Āqá Sayyid ‘Azizü’llâh, that is to say, there was another narrow lane, but the Persian army did not know about it. As soon as the Persian army arrived behind the wall of Greece, they saw that these seven-fold rascals of Greeks had blocked the road with troops. Well, what dust must Persia now scatter on her head! How, if she would advance, should she advance, or bow, if she would retreat, could she retreat? She was left abased and confounded. God have mercy on the poet who so well says, ‘Neither does my heart rejoice in exile, nor have I any honour in my native land,’ etc. But, since things must somehow come right, suddenly the Persian army saw one of those Ja’far-qihi Ağás, a son of the Begler-Āqá of Cossacks, in other words a certain friend of the foreigner and hospitable humanitarian, gently detach himself from the Greek army, and, stepping softly, approach the Persian host. ‘Peace be upon you,’ said he; ‘Your arrival is fortunate! You are welcome! Your visit is a pleasure! May your journey be without danger!’ All the while he was quietly pointing out to the Persians with his forefinger that Āshi-kunán lane. ‘We Greeks,’ said he, ‘have no troops there. If you go that way, you can take our country.’ The Persians agreed, and by that road entered the Greek land.

“This, however, is not the point…. By the bye, while I remember, let me mention the name of this foreigner’s friend, though it comes a trifle heavy on our tongues; but what is to be done? His name was Ephiáltés… God curse the Devil! I don’t know why it is that whenever I hear this name I think of some of our Persian Ministers…. But let us return to the point.

---

844 This formula is common amongst the Zoroastrians. See my Year amongst the Persians, p. 375, Here it implies that the Mullâ was dead.
845 Inak is the Turkish for a cow. The name is, of course, meant to be ridiculous. Qağázán may be a misprint for Qazân.
846 See pp. 181-2 supra.
847 Har chand bi-adabíst, “Although it be an incivility” to use such an expression. Khar-fahm (“ass-plain”) means comprehensible to the greatest fool.
848 “To have wind in the brain,” a common expression for conceit.
849 Lulâhingash khaylî âb mi-girît, “Its jug held a lot of water,” said of one who has a great capacity for self-esteem.
850 The innumerable titles conferred by the Persian Government form a constant subject of mockery. The fictitious titles here mentioned are, of course, intended to be both barbarous in form and degrading in meaning.
851 The reference is to the sursurak in the Nigarâstân Palace at Thîrán. See my Year amongst the Persians, p. 96.
852 An imaginary “good time” in the remote past, as we might say “in the days of good King Cole.”
853 I understand that this is the name of a narrow lane, or passage, in Thîrán. It means “Reconciliation Street.”
854 The name of a Persian officer in the Cossack Brigade.
855 Pà-war-chin, “picking up the feet.”
856 An expression used when some ill-natured or inappropriate idea occurs to the mind, as though it had been suggested by Satan.
sum of science and political acumen, Mírzá ‘Abdu’r-Razzaq Khán, engineer, and lecturer in the School of the Cossack barracks, after a three months’ pedestrian tour drew for the Russians a military map of the road through Mázandarán, he his friends said, ‘It is a pity that such a man of spirit should not have a title.’ So some twenty of us sat for three days and nights considering what title we should obtain for him, but nothing occurred to our minds. Worst of all, he was a man of taste. ‘Any title obtained for me,’ says he, ‘must be virgin; that is to say, no one else must have borne it before me.’ We enquired of the State Accountants, who said there was no ‘virgin title’ left. We opened our dictionaries, and found that neither in the languages of the Persians, Arabs, Turks, or Franks from A to Z was there one single word left which had not been employed as a title at least ten times over. Well, what were we to do? Would it be pleasing to God that this man should thus remain untitled?

“However, since such things must come right, one day, being in a state of extreme dejection, I picked up a history book which was at hand in order to distract my mind. No sooner had I opened the book than I read in the first line of the right-hand page: ‘Ever afterwards the Greeks stigmatized Ephialtes as a traitor whose blood might lawfully be shed.’ O you cursed Greeks, what had poor Ephialtes done to you that you should call him a traitor? Is hospitality to strangers blasphemy in your creed? Do you not believe in kindness to foreigners?

“In short as soon as I saw this name I said, ‘Nothing could be better than that we should adopt this name as a title for Mírzá ‘Abdu’r-Razzaq Khán, both because it is ‘virgin,’ and because these two persons have the closest resemblance to one another. This one was kind to strangers and so was that one. This one was hospitable to guests and so was that one. This one said, ‘Had I not acted thus, another would have done so,’ and so did that one. There was only one difference between them, namely, that the buttons of Ephialtes’s coat were not made of native forest-wood. Well, supposing they were not, such trifles are unworthy of consideration.’

“In short, we friends assembled and gave an entertainment and made great rejoicings. We also instantly despatched a telegram to Káshán bidding them send quickly five bottles of Qamšar rose-water and two boxes of sugared walnuts, so that we might present them [to the Sháh] and secure the title. In the midst of these proceedings Hájji Maliku’t-Tujjár,857 conceded the Astárá road to the Russians.

I don’t know what scoundrel told him the history of this title, but he put his two feet in one shoe858 and declared that he was a heaven-sent genius, and that this title was his rightful property. Now for some months you don’t know what a hullabaloo is going on, with Mírzá ‘Abdu’r-Razzaq Khán on the one hand, supported by his science of Geometry, and Hájji Maliku’t-Tujjár on the other with his persuasive eloquence and his quotations from the poems of Imru’u’l-Qays and Násir-i-Khusraw-i-‘Alawi. O Kablá’i Dakhaw, you don’t know in what toil and moil we are caught! If you can deliver us from this calamity it would be as though you had freed a slave for God’s sake, and may God, if He will, forgive your sons!

“May God make one day of your life a hundred years! Today is a day for zealous endeavour. For the rest, you are the best judge. I have nothing more to submit.

“Your faithful servant, GADFLY.”

It is difficult in a translation to do justice to these articles, which mark an absolutely new departure in Persian satire, and are written in a style at once idiomatic and forcible. Though they appeared under various pseudonyms, I fancy they were all written by Dakhaw, who, little as he wrote, on the strength of them and a few of his poems859 deserves, in my opinion, to occupy the first rank amongst contemporary Persian men of letters. It is to be regretted that, though a comparatively young man, he has apparently produced nothing during the last ten or twelve years.

Of the last twelve years I have little to say. The beginning of 1912 saw the culmination of Russian violence and oppression in Persia, and, for the time being, the end alike of liberty and literary effort. Then came the War, when Persia became the passive victim of three contending foreign armies,

857 This title, “King of the Merchants,” was at this time borne by Hájji Muḥammad Kázim, whose accomplishments were reputed greater than his honesty.
858 This means to stand firm, be obstinate.
859 Especially “Kabláy,” and his elegy on Mírzá Jahángír Khán, the latter a poem of rare beauty and feeling. See my Press and Poetry of Modern Persia, pp. 179-82 and 200-4.
with little profit to expect from the success of any of them, while there was scarcity everywhere and famine and devastation in the western provinces. To Persia at least the Russian Revolution came as a godsend, while the subsequent withdrawal of Great Britain after the failure of the Anglo-Persian Agreement left her at last more or less mistress in her own house. How far she will be able to make use of the breathing-space thus accorded her remains to be seen.

Surprise has sometimes been expressed that during the War there should have existed in Persia a considerable pro-German party, largely composed of prominent Democrats and Reformers. The explanation is simple enough. Imperial Russia was hated and feared, and with good reason, and any Power which diverted her attention from her victim and threatened her supremacy was sure of a large measure of popularity, while Persia had no reason to fear or dislike Germany, which lay remote from her borders and had at no time threatened her independence. Germany, of course, took advantage of this sentiment, and carried on an active propaganda, of which the curious history remains to be written. One of the chief organs of the propaganda was the Kāwa (Kaveh) newspaper published at Berlin, nominally once a fortnight, from January 24, 1916, to August 15, 1919. There was a long gap between the combined Nos. 29 and 30, July 15, 1918, and Nos. 31 and 32, October 15, 1918; between No. 33, Nov. 15, 1918, and No. 34, March 1, 1919; and between this last and the final number of the old series mentioned above, which appeared five months and a half later. On January 22, 1920, appeared the first number of the New Series (Dawra-i-Jadid), which definitely renounced politics in favour of literature and science, while keeping the same external form and high

standard of style and typography. In this form the paper, now appearing only once a month, endured for two years more, the last number (No. 12, Jahrg. 2, Neue Folge) being dated December 1, 1921, and containing no less than 33 large pages, closely printed in double columns.

During its propagandist days the contents of the Kāwa were, of course, chiefly political, and, though valuable for the light they throw on events in Persia, and especially on the doings of the Nationalist “Committee of Defence,” have little bearing on literary matters until after the armistice, though here and there exceptions to this rule occur. Thus No. 4 (March 14, 1916) contains a Kurdish poem[^60]; No. 20 an obituary notice of that eminent man of letters Sayyid Muhammad Sādiq “Qā’im-maqa’mi”[^61], better known by his title of Adibu’l-Mamálík, who died on the 28th of Rabí‘ ii, 1335 (Feb. 21, 1917); No. 21 an account of some of the scientific results obtained by Captain Niedermayer’s mission to Afgáhnístán[^62]; No. 23 an article by Professor Mittwoch on the artist Riḍá-yi-‘Abbási[^63]; No. 26 an account of Persian students in Germany; No. 33 (Nov. 15, 1918), à propos of a new publication, which, though bearing the Persian title Ráh-i-Naw (the “New Road”), was written in German, a brief sketch of various attempts to reform or replace the Persian alphabet; No. 34 (March 1, 1919) an account of the foundation in Berlin of a Persian Literary Society, and a letter from Mírzá Muḥammad of Qazwín on a point of Persian orthography; and No. 35 (August 15, 1919) a long and very interesting article by the writer last named on the

[^60]: Reprinted from the Persian newspaper Rastakhíz (“the Resurrection”).
[^61]: So called on account of his descent from the celebrated Mírzá Abu’l-Qásim Qā’im-maqa’m. See pp. 311-16 supra.
[^62]: Translated from the Neue Orient, Nos. 4 and 5, May, 1917.
[^63]: Translated from No. 7 of Die Islamische Welt.
[^64]: Two such early attempts are discussed, both taken from Arabic books of authority, such as Ibn Qutayba’s Kitábū’sh-Shír wa’sh-Shu’árā, the Kitábū’l-Aghání, and Ţabarí’s great history. The earliest goes back to the reign of Yazíd ibn Mu’áwiya (A.H. 60-4 = A.D. 680-4).
these lines, that which is today in the highest degree necessary for Persia, which all patriotic Persians should exert themselves to promote, literarily, with all their strength, and should place before everything else, is threefold.

“First, the adoption and promotion, without condition or reservation, of European civilization, absolute submission to Europe, and the assimilation of the culture, customs, practices, organization, sciences, arts, life, and the whole attitude of Europe, without any exception save language; and the putting aside of every kind of self-satisfaction, and such senseless objections as arise from a mistaken, or, as we prefer to call it, a false patriotism.

“Secondly, a sedulous attention to the preservation of the Persian language and literature, and the development, extension, and popularization thereof.

“Thirdly, the diffusion of European sciences, and a general advance in founding colleges, promoting public instruction, and utilizing all the sources of material and spiritual power … in this way …

“Such is the belief of the writer of these lines as to the way to serve Persia, and likewise the opinion of those who, by virtue of much cultural and political experience, share his belief.

“Outwardly and inwardly, in body and in spirit, Persia must become Europeanized.

“In concluding this explanation of fundamental beliefs, I must add that in the writer’s opinion perhaps the greatest and most effective service of this sort which one could render would be the publication in Persia of translations of a whole series of the most important European books in plain and simple language.”

In pursuance of this programme, there are a certain number of articles on the German system of education, the proceedings of the Perso-German Society," and the arrangements for facilitating the studies of Persian students in Germany; but matters connected with the language and literature of Persia supply the subject-matter of most of the articles. Thus we find in the year 1920 a series of admirable articles by Taqizáda [sic] (signed Muḥassíl) on the most notable Persian poets of early times," an original article written in Persian by

Dr Arthur Christensen of Copenhagen on the existence of verse in Pahlawi," a discussion on the evolution of the Persian language during the last century," articles entitled “Bolshevism in ancient Persia” on Mazdak," comparisons between Eastern and Western research and its results (greatly in favour of the latter), entitled Munáẓara-i-Shab u Rúz (“Dispute between Night and Day”), the four periods of the Persian language since the Arab conquest," “a Touchstone of Taste,” on good modern Persian verse and what the writer calls “Karbalá’í verse”; Pahlawi, Arabic and Persian sources of the Sháh-náma; ancient and modern translations from Arabic into Persian, and a very interesting article on the “Sources of eloquent Persian and ‘Khán-i-Wálída Persian’,” in which the writer ridicules and condemns the slavish imitation of Turkish idiom and style practised by certain young Persians resident in Constantinople. These articles, in most cases, display a wealth of knowledge, critical ability, and originality which I have nowhere else encountered in Persian, and deserve a fuller analysis than can be accorded to them in this volume.

During the last year of its existence (1921) the Kháwa maintained the same high standard, publishing many articles, both historical and literary, which were fully up to the level of the best European scholarship. A series of important historical articles on “the Relations of Russia and Persia during the period of the Aq-Qoyúnlu and Ṣafawi dynasties, down to the beginning of the reign of Āqá Muḥammad Kháñ
Qájár,” written by Sayyid Muḥammad ‘Ali Jamál-záda, also appeared as a monthly supplement, and showed very wide and judicious use of all available sources, both Eastern and Western. The sudden cessation of the paper after December, 1921, was a great loss to Persian learning and scholarship.

In June, 1922, there appeared at Berlin a new Persian literary and scientific review entitled ʻIrán-shahr, edited by Ḩusayn Kázím-záda, which, though described as a “Revue... bimensuelle,” actually appeared only once a month. It is of a lighter and more popular character than was the Káwa, and shows a more marked preference for matters connected either with pre-Islamic Persia, or with the problems with which the progressive Persians of today are confronted. No. 7 (December, 1922) contains a long article on the sending of Persian students to Europe, in the third section of which, “on the place and manner of study” (pp. 162-4), the writer argues that such students should go to England or Germany rather than to France, for the following reasons:

“We Persians (with the exception of the people of ʻAdharbáỳján, whose nature and character agree better with those of the Anglo-Saxons), in respect to character, nature, capacity and mental tendencies, more closely resemble and approach the French, that is to say the Latin races, since quick and piercing intelligence, self-confidence, versatility of thought, wit and acuteness of perception, sociability and amiability in intercourse on the one hand, and inconstancy, fickleness of character, quickly-developed weariness and want of perseverance, recklessness, and lack of moderation in action on the other, are characteristic of the nature and disposition both of ourselves and of the French.”

This view seems to have commended itself to the Persians generally, for while in August, 1922, there were seventy

Persian students in Germany, in the following December the number had increased to over 120876.

In Persia itself the Press, paralysed for a time after the Russian aggressions of 1912, has resumed its activities, especially since the conclusion of the War; but owing to the badness of the communications and the irregularity of the posts one has to be content with somewhat fragmentary information about it. No. 4 of the Káwa for 1921 (pp. 15-16) contained a brief list of Persian papers and magazines which had come into being since the beginning of A.H. 1334 (November, 1915). These, forty-seven in number, were arranged alphabetically, the place of publication, name of the editor, and date of inauguration, being recorded in each case. Ţihrán leads the list with eighteen papers, next comes Shiráz with seven, Tabriz and Rasht with four each, and ʻIsfáhán, Mashhad, Kirmán, Kirmánscháh, Khúy, Bushire, Bákú, Heráát, Kábul and Jalálabád (the last three in ʻAfgánistán) with one or two each. More than half of these-papers (twenty-five) first appeared in A.H. 1338 (began on Sept. 26, 1919). That the list is far from exhaustive is shown by the fact that of nine Persian magazines of which copies were sent me by their editors or by friends, only two, the ʻĀlam-i-Niswán (“Women’s World”) and the Armaghán (“Gift”), appear in the above list. The latter is one of the best, containing many poems, including some by the late Adíbu’l-Mamálik, and accounts of the proceedings of the “Literary Society” (Anjuman-i-Adabí) of Ţihrán. The others are the Bahár (“Spring”), very modern and European in tone, but including some interesting poems; the Fúrúgh-i-Tarbiyat (“Lustre of Education”); the Dánish (“Knowledge”), published at Mashhad; the Mimát u Hayát (“Death and Life”), entirely devoted to European inventions and material progress; the Fírdawsí, edited and written by diplomés of the American College at Ţihrán; the Párs, written half in

Persian and half in French, which first appeared at Constantinople on April 15, 1921; and the Ganjína-i-Ma’árif (“Treasury of Sciences”), of which the first number appeared at Tabriz on October 24,1922. None of these approach the ʻIrán-shahr, still less the Káwa, in excellence of matter or form. An exception should perhaps be made in favour of the Gul-i-Zárd (“Yellow Rose”), which appeared in Ţihrán about the end of August, 1920, and in which the editor, Mírzá Yahyá Khán, used to publish the poems he composed under the nom de guerre of Rayhání.

The establishment in Berlin of the “Kaviani” Printing-press (Cháp-khána-i-Káwayání) owned and managed by Mírzá ‘Abdu’ṣh-Shukúr and other Persians anxious to meet the growing demand for cheap, correct, and well-printed Persian books, marks another very important stage in the Persian literary revival; and at the present time there exists no other Press which can rival it in these respects. Besides modern plays and treatises on Music, Agriculture and the like, and tasteful productions of such well-known classics as the Gulistán of Šádi and the “Cat and Mouse” (Músh u Gurbá) of Ūbayd-ı-Zákání, the managers have had the spirit and enterprise to print such rare works of the great writers of old as the Žádu’l-Musáfírin (“Travellers’ Provision”) of ʻNásír-ı-Khusraw, a book of which only two manuscripts (those of Paris and King’s College, Cambridge) are known to exist; and are now (November, 1923) printing the Wajh-i-Dírát (“Way of Religion”) of which the unique manuscript has recently been discovered at Petrograd, though books of this sort, recondite in character, costly to print, and unlikely to command a large sale, must almost inevitably be published at a loss. In Mírzá Muḥammad Ghání-Žáda the Press possesses a most competent scholar, who carries on the high traditions of criticism and accuracy established by Mírzá Muḥammad Khán of Qazwín.

In the following Index where many reference-numbers occur under one heading the more important are printed in Clarendon type, which is also used for the first entry under each letter of the alphabet. To save needless repetition, all references to any name common to several persons mentioned in the text are brought together under one heading, the individuals bearing this name being arranged either in chronological order, or in order of importance, or in classes (rulers, men of letters, poets, etc.). The letter b. between two names stands for Ibn (“Son of…”), and n. after the number of a page indicates a footnote. The addition in brackets of a Roman number after a name or book indicates the century of the Christian era in which the man lived or the book was written. Prefixes like Abú (“Father of…”) and Ibn (“Son of…”) in Muhammadan, and de, le, von in European names are disregarded in the alphabetical arrangement, so that names like Abú Sa‘íd, Ibn Siná, le Strange, de Slane, etc., must be sought under S, not under A, I, L or D. Titles of books and foreign words are printed in italics. A hyphen preceding a word indicates that the Arabic definite article al- should be prefixed to it.